

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH
As it is Found in the Sermons in the
Book of Acts, Chapters I - XIII

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

by
William M. Ramsay



FOREWORD

Four factors have prompted the writer to select as his subject the Christology of the primitive church as it is found in the sermons in the Book of Acts, chapters 1-13.

First, there is a wide-spread movement in theological circles today manifesting itself in various forms, sometimes called a theology of "the Word", sometimes "Biblical Theology", sometimes "the New Biblicism", but in various ways seeking to found Christian theology once again upon the teachings of the Bible. The writer is a product of this movement.

Second, so much has been written, often of highly controversial nature, with regard to the titles of Jesus in Acts that it seems proper now to collect and compare the various ideas that have been proposed.

Third, the form criticism of such men as Martin Dibelius and the research with regard to the kerygma done by Prof. C. H. Dodd have recently focused such attention on the sermons in Acts that the whole question of primitive Christology needs now to be reconsidered in the light of this new criticism.

And finally, the writer is himself a preacher of Christ. This work is being completed from the midst of his labors as a home missionary in the State of Tennessee. He has studied again and again the first sermons of the

first missionaries of Christ in the hope that he may learn also to be a preacher of the good news. From his personal point of view, to the extent to which this has been accomplished the work will have been worthwhile.

William M. Ramsey
Knoxville, Tennessee

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION:	THE PROBLEM	- p.1
I	CRITICISM OF ACTS, Its Text, Authorship, and Accuracy	- p.6
II	CRITICISM OF THE SERMONS, Their Sources and Form	- p. 52
	NOTE ON THE SERMONS OF PETER	- p. 90
III	JESUS AS THE FULFILMENT OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL HOPE OF LATE JUDAISM (in the Sermons of Peter)	- p. 92
IV	JESUS AS THE FULFILMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT HOPE (in the Sermons of Peter)	- p. 116
V	JESUS AS A MAN ON EARTH (in the Sermons of Peter)	- p.146
VI	JESUS AS EXALTED (in the Sermons of Peter)	- p. 170
VII	JESUS AS A LIVING AND PRESENT POWER (in the Sermons of Peter)	- p. 185
VIII	THE CHRISTOLOGY OF STEPHEN'S PREACHING	- p. 196
IX	THE CHRISTOLOGY OF PAUL'S PREACHING	- p. 223
X	LATER NEW TESTAMENT DEVELOPMENTS OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTOLOGY	- p. 241
XI	CONCLUSIONS	- p. 267
	APPENDIX I - A STUDY OF THE VERB <u>KERUSSO</u>	-
	APPENDIX II - DODD'S CHART OF THE <u>KERYGMA</u>	
	APPENDIX III - HEBERT'S SERMON FROM OLD TESTAMENT QUOTATIONS	
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	

INTRODUCTION - THE PROBLEM

"What think ye of Christ, whose son is he?" This is the essential question for Christian faith. Matthew 22:42 records it as having been put by Jesus Himself, after lesser questions had been disposed of. For it is not simply historical facts about the life of Jesus with which Christianity is concerned. It is the interpretation of these facts. "What think ye ... whose son ..." For theology a supreme question is Christology.

For Catholic Christianity the formulae of the creeds adopted by the early councils of the church give the classic answer.

We believe ... in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, Begotten of the Father before all the ages, Light of Light, true God of true God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, through whom all things were made; who for us men and for our salvation came down from the heavens, and was made flesh of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and rose again on the third day according to the Scriptures, and ascended into the heavens, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and cometh again with glory to judge living and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end ...¹

Historical research may go behind this Greco-Roman statement to the pages of the New Testament, standard for orthodox Protestant thought. Indeed, with the epistles of Paul, perhaps as early as 50 A.D., the historian has a clear

1. from the Nicene Creed as recorded by H. Bettenson: Documents of the Christian Church, p. 37.

if not full, picture of what at least part of the early church thought about Jesus.

But here historical research enters what Principal Duncen has likened to a dark tunnel.¹ At one end of the tunnel is the certain fact of the crucifixion of Jesus. At the other end one emerges in the clear light of the Pauline epistles. But the twenty years of Christian witness between the crucifixion and the writing of I Thessalonians is in a sense the most important and yet the least known period in the history of Christian thought.

Moreover, work on the tunnel primarily must be done from the latter end. If Jesus himself wrote anything we do not possess it now. No contemporary of His attempted any strictly "objective" account of His personality so that we might evaluate Him. However, historically accurate they may be, the gospels are themselves interpretations of Jesus. They are written from faith to faith. Behind the witness of the early church historical research can go only by inference. What we can know is the impression He made on His early followers.

Thus, it is at the same time historically almost impossible and theologically almost unnecessary to get behind the earliest Christian witness to Christ. It is

1. G. Duncen: Jesus, Son of Man, p. 3.

impossible, for our records are all of and for faith. It is unnecessary, for the essential question in orthodox theology is not historical data but theological interpretation: "What think ye of Christ?"

But to get as close to the events Christologically as possible, to discover the nature of the very earliest interpretation of Christ- this historic inquiry may attempt, and this faith seeks. This is the task of this thesis.

Is it possible to find a Christology earlier than that of I Thessalonians (assuming it to be the earliest New Testament book)? Can we find any light in the dark tunnel between the fact of the crucifixion and the interpretations of Jesus given in the earliest New Testament books. One ancient document, claiming for itself a certain historical accuracy, professes to shed such light. One work attempts to describe the earliest interpretations given Jesus, long before the epistles were written, before even the beginning of the mission to the Gentiles and the incorporation of Greek ideas into Christian theology. One book attempts to describe the witness to Christ given on the Day of Pentecost itself. It is the Acts of the Apostles. In it, if it can be trusted, one may find in brief form, at least the kind of thing that was preached in the earliest days of the Palestinian Church.

But can Acts be trusted? Acts itself is a product of a time at the very least twenty-five and in all proba-

bility more than fifty years later than the earliest events it professes to describe. As an historical source is it reliable? It will be seen that there is no easy answer to this question. This thesis will undertake a critical investigation of Acts in general and then in particular of the sources from which the early chapters and their sermons were drawn. Even so it will still be necessary to examine critically the Christological ideas found in these sermons to see if they can indeed fit the context of primitive Palestinian Christianity.

If, however, we find reason to believe the picture of the first preaching to be historical then we have indeed a primary source for determining the first Christology. Our task then becomes to study these few verses in the light of their Jewish background and of the events of which the church was born and thus to determine the nature of the primitive Christology. What did these words mean at the time in which they were said? What was the first Christology?

The investigation, then, is a double one. We seek to determine whether or not the early chapters of Acts really can be trusted in their picture of the earliest Christian witness. And we seek to determine what this witness was, with regard to one point of theology, Christology.

To the author it is a thrilling undertaking. For

it may be that we are now going to what is in the sense described the primary historical source to determine the primary question of life.

CHAPTER I. CRITICISM OF ACTS - ITS TEXT, AUTHORSHIP, AND ACCURACY

This survey of certain problems in the criticism of The Acts is not designed to answer all the questions connected with the book. In our brief study of the textual problems involved we seek the answer to only one question: To what extent is our text trustworthy in giving us a record of what the author reported as being the first witness to Jesus?

Yet even so limited a study as this thesis must consider the textual difficulties which are involved in Acts. Over no other book of the New Testament has there been so much controversy among textual critics. The variant readings, especially of the "Western" text, are too numerous and too well attested to be ignored. Even Ropes, whose book on the text of Acts is the most thorough study of the subject and who strongly upholds the superiority of Codex B to the Western text, admits that D is early and the work of one man.

That the "Western text," if, as I hold, not the work of the original author of Acts, was a definite rewriting, rather than an accumulation of miscellaneous variants, ought not to have been doubted, and that for two reasons. In the first place, it has an unmistakably homogeneous internal character. Secondly, its hundreds of thousands of variants are now known to have arisen in a brief period, scarcely, if at all, longer than fifty years after the book first passed into circulation. In that period a pedigree of successive copies was short, and to produce so many variants the mere natural

licence of copyists would be insufficient.¹

Such considerations have led to various theories, of which one of the most widely discussed is that of Frederick Blass. His explanation is that Luke is the author of both texts.

One copy of the Gospel was that sent to Theophilus; but when Luke afterwards came to Rome, he would of course be requested by the Roman Christians, who heard of his having written a Gospel, to give them, too, a copy of it, and he would write out that copy in the course of perhaps a month and give it to them ... Likewise the Acts, which were written in Rome, would be given to the Romans first in one copy, and afterwards sent to Theophilus in another copy.²

Thus the existence of two texts is explained by the fact that Luke had two centers of activity: Asia and Rome. The first production of each was naturally more prolix, the second more condensed, since the work was

becoming somewhat tedious for the author ... so he was naturally disposed to omit many unessential circumstances and details, which he had formally given.³

This theory fits the fact that the Western text has additions in Acts and omissions in the Gospel. That the same man is the author of both texts is attested by the fact

1. J. H. Ropes: in The Beginnings of Christianity, Jackson and Lake, eds. Vol. III, p. viii.

2. F. Blass: The Philology of the Gospels, p. 100.

3. Ibid., p. 104.

that both were so widely distributed by such an early date. Moreover, the language in the variants he lengthily demonstrates to be Lucan. And in the same work he seeks to refute in detail the charges made by Weiss and Page that the author of D misunderstood the original at certain points.

Perhaps the chief defender of the theory that D is the original text by the author and that the so-called "Neutral" text is later, the result of miscopying, is A. C. Clark, in his book The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts. His theory of how the variations arose springs from analogies in the transmission of the Latin text of Cicero. He believes that at one time the gospels were written in columns of very short lines of ten or twelve letters each and the Acts in columns written in irregular sense lines. The variations which produced the shorter readings resulted from the accidental omission of these short lines by copyists. Hence the longer Western text is more nearly the original.

The most recent defender of the Western Text is Matthew Black, who in his recent book An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts defends the Western text on the ground that it is more frequently stained with Aramaic constructions and idioms.

Nevertheless it would appear that the more probable view is that the "Neutral" text, B χ , is in most respects

more trustworthy. The Neutral text has been defended against the supporters of D by the great majority of scholars, notably in works by Sir William Ramsay, James Moffatt, J. H. Ropes, Wilfred Knox, and Sir Frederick Kenyon.

Blass' view presents grave difficulties. Had Luke wanted to shorten his text he could have done so in much more simple ways. For example, there are three accounts of the conversion of Paul given in Acts, and two accounts of the conversion of Cornelius. It would have been simpler to shorten the work by omissions in the case of these and other duplications. Clark's theory cannot explain the fact that the "omissions" of B tend to fall into certain categories, notably phrases giving religious tone and color, such as the guidance of the Holy Spirit (Acts 17:15; 19:1; 20:3), expansions of references to the Name (Acts 6:8, 8:39, 14:10; 18:8), or expansions of the simple name Jesus into the Lord Jesus (Acts 7:55), the Lord Jesus Christ (13:32), or Jesus Christ (20:21). Yet it is not likely that anyone would have deliberately shortened the book at the expense of such phrases, as Blass' theory and Clark's second theory would suggest. And Kenyon¹ has shown that the hypothesis of columns of such short lines as Clark proposes is very unlikely indeed. Clark himself abandons his theory of accidental omission in his latest

1. F. Kenyon: The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts, p. 19 f.

work, The Acts of the Apostles. (1933)

Ropes summarizes the case against D thus:

The "Western" fulness of words, the elaboration of religious expressions, such as names for Christ and the plus of conventional religious phrases, the fact that the difference in language and mode of narration can often be explained as due to superficial difficulties in the other text, occasional misunderstanding, as would appear, or at least neglect, of the meaning of the other text (for instance Acts 20:3-5), the relative colourlessness and a certain neivete of the "Western", all contrast unfavorably with the greater conciseness, sententiousness, and vigour, and occasionally the obscurity, of the Old Uncial text ... And even more decisive is the fact that in all the excess of matter which the Western text shows, virtually nothing is to be found beyond what could be inferred from the Old Uncial text.¹

We can see, he maintains, how most of the variations in D have arisen, especially the additions of conventional phrases to "heighten" the devotional character of the book. The omission of such phrases seems highly unlikely.

If, however, the "Western" text is generally inferior it is still valuable as an ancient witness. Many of its variants may be correct, and thus it serves as a useful check on the standard text.

With respect to the Christology of the sermons there is really little variation between the two types of text. All the key titles for Jesus which occur in B also occur in D. The essential content of the sermons

1. J. H. Ropes: op. cit., p. cccxiv

is unchanged. We will consider significant variations when we come to the exegesis of the sermons. But no important point of the Christology hinges upon them.

With regard then to the sermons as a record of the earliest Christology the study of the text of Acts gives us four suggestions:

- (1) The "Neutral" or "Standard" text is probably more accurate, though D constitutes a valuable check upon it.
- (2) The fact that widely differing texts of Acts were circulated at an early date is one hint that Acts was written some years before the end of the first Century.
- (3) That even a very early editor found it necessary to "heighten" the Christology of Acts by adding conventional phrases to the name of Jesus suggests the primitive character of its Christology.
- (4) And there is sufficient similarity even between the most widely divergent texts to give us confidence that we really possess the thought of these sermons in approximately the form in which the author recorded it.

The Authorship of Acts.

The historical value of the sermons in Acts is by no means entirely dependent upon the authorship of the book as a whole. Yet the question of authorship surely does have bearing on the subject. If, as seems probable, the traditional view is true, that the Acts is the work of Luke, the companion of Paul, and an actor in the so-

called "We-passages", then we know two important things about the sermons. They were written by a man who was personally acquainted with Paul, to whom some of these sermons are attributed, by a man who had heard him preach. And these sermons are given us by a man who was himself engaged in the First Century Christian world mission.

The traditional view of Acts, held almost unchallenged until the last century, is that Acts is the work of the companion of Paul called "Luke, the beloved physician", and mentioned in Col. 4:14, Philemon 24:2, and II Tim. 4:11. It has also been maintained by most scholars that the Third Gospel and Acts are by the same author. This second view is still almost universally held. Hawkin's Horae Synopticae and Harnack's works are generally regarded as having established this point beyond question. The only serious challenge to the theory that the two books are by the same author is that of A. C. Clark in The Acts of the Apostles (1933), and this challenge may be confidently said to have been fully answered by Wilfred L. Knox in his little book of the same title which appeared in 1948.

But as to the Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts there has been not nearly such unanimity of opinion. Early in the last century the Tubingen School developed its theory that Acts is the work of a second century Christian who wrote with the purpose of reconciling two elements in the

early Church, the more Judaistic followers of Peter, and the broader and more missionary-minded followers of Paul. Under the influence of this theory such writers as Bruno Bauer held that Acts was historically worthless, a purely idealized picture of the early church designed to bring the two factions into harmony by picturing the early church as being always in peaceful agreement. It was held that Paul and Peter were carefully balanced by the author of Acts, each being given the same miracles, Paul being made subservient to the Jerusalem Church and Peter being made a good Paulinist. Though certain traces of this view may still linger in some modern scholarship it may be confidently stated that in its extreme form the Tubingen theory has now been completely abandoned. Even Galatians makes it clear that Paul really was in agreement with the Church at Jerusalem on basic issues and that Peter really was on the side of the world mission, whatever his controversy with Paul about eating with Gentiles. And subsequent study of Acts had made it clear that the author had various purposes, of which reconciling church factions cannot be thought the chief.

Since the writings of Bishop Lightfoot British criticism has tended toward a consistently conservative view with regard to Acts. In Germany the works of Adolf Harnack marked a complete change from the older position, Acts being regarded as the work of Luke written, according to Harnack's final view, about the year 64 A.D. He, like

most British writers, accepted W. K. Hobart's The Medical Language of St. Luke as having proved linguistically that the author of Luke-Acts was a physician and thus the companion mentioned by Paul. The archeological research of Sir William Ramsay brought remarkable proofs of the accuracies of Acts, particularly in certain details of geography and government. Even though Cadbury in his book Style and Literary Method of Luke (1920) pretty well demolished the argument from the medical language the traditional view remained most popular among scholars, at least in Britain. Thus J. W. Hunkin in 1922 could summarize the area of general agreement among British writers on Acts in the following words:

At the present time it is probably true to say that propositions such as the following would be accepted by the great majority of British scholars:

- (i) That the Acts is a product not of the second century but of the first:
- (ii) That there is a very strong probability that the author of the 'we sections' is the author both of the Acts and of the third gospel:
- (iii) That he possesses a great deal of accurate information with regard to St. Paul's journeys, some of it being first-hand:
- (iv) That whatever be his sources for the early chapters of the Acts these "Scenes from Early Days" are well chosen and consistent, and give a picture of the march of events which is at any rate, on the whole, correct in outline.¹

The very volume in which these words appear has brought a certain change in the situation they describe.

1. J. W. Hunkin, in Jackson and Lake's The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, p. 433.

If in 1922 one could look upon those four points as generally accepted results of critical scholarship, at least of English - language scholarship, the publication of the second volume of The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I, The Acts of the Apostles, edited by F. J. Foskes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, made it clear that there was still strong difference of opinion. Though the five volumes of this work which have now appeared have endeavored to present various views on important questions and to present both sides of the more controversial issues, the editors make clear their own view is that Acts is the work of an unknown author who wrote between 95 and 100 A.D.¹. And it must be admitted that the weight of their work is against the traditional view. Acts is regarded as being by a man who could not have known Paul, who wrote at a comparatively late date, and who was in many ways ignorant of the early church.

If, therefore, this thesis bases a part of its critical defence of the sermons in Acts on the theory of the Lucan authorship of the book it must do so only after a somewhat thorough examination of this question. The Beginnings of Christianity is not only the most thorough critical study of Acts in the English language, it is probably the most critical study of any book of the Bible in any language. Here and at certain other points this thesis must proceed with great caution, recognizing that it is doing so against weighty

1. The Editors, in Jackson & Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, p. 359.

opposition and owning its great debt to the very work with which at certain points it presumes to disagree.

The statement in these volumes of the reasons against the Lucan authorship of Acts is that of Professor Hans Windisch in an article entitled "The Case Against the Tradition".¹ It is a sane, thorough, and scholarly review of the subject, probably the best defence yet written of this position. Before endeavoring to answer it we shall give a brief account of its arguments here.

After a brief summary of the history of criticism of the Acts Windisch begins by making certain important concessions to the traditional view. The "we sections" he regards as reliable. Acts he admits is a unity, both internally and with the Third Gospel. That there are certain legends and distortions of history in the book does not necessarily preclude Lucan authorship. Against certain Dutch critics he accepts the authenticity of the Pauline epistles. The author of Acts did not use the epistles of Paul. And a date within the first century he regards as probable. He regards dependence of the author upon Josephus as likely but as not sufficiently well established to serve as an argument here. Finally

1. H. Windisch: in The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, pp. 298-359.

he outlines what he admits to be the strong case for Lucan authorship which can be built on these assumptions.

The fundamental argument which Windisch finds strong enough to prove the opposite position is that the Lucan Paul is not consistent with the Paul of the authentic epistles. Here he freely admits his debt to the Tübingen school. First he lists certain inconsistencies which are capable of explanation but together point to the difficulty: Paul emphasizes in Galatians that no human agency had a share in his conversion, whereas Acts gives Ananias a place. The account of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion differs from that in Acts. Here the "some days" of Acts 9:25 conflicts with the three years of Galatians 1:18; and the public preaching of Acts 9:26 conflicts with his anonymity in Gal. 1:18ff. Paul's going first to the Jews seems inconsistent both with Gal. 1:16, 2:7 and with the Gentile authorship of the book. Paul's circumcision of Timothy in Acts 16:1-3 is inconsistent with his refusal to circumcise Titus in Gal. 2:3. And, "the most palpable error", Paul is pictured as entering into a Jewish ceremony as a sort of bargain with James on the occasion of his last visit to Jerusalem. Windisch is aware that there are answers to these arguments, but their cumulative weight bears heavily against Lucan authorship.

But the really important issue is that of the problems

raised by Acts 15. "For the critical investigator the decisive point must always be the Lucan presentation of the Council of Jerusalem."

In the first place the council is represented as taking place on a third visit of Paul to Jerusalem, whereas Galatians represents it as his second. He is aware that some endeavor to equate the visit of Gal. 2 with that of Acts 11, but this he finds difficult. Luke would surely have mentioned the agreements reached in the conversations mentioned in Galatians, so important to the Gentile mission. Again there is too much agreement between the accounts of Acts 15 and Gal. 2: the cause of the meeting is the same, the subject of contention is the same, the same leaders confer, etc. And when one has agreed that the two accounts must be compared it appears either that Luke is wrong about Paul's having made the visit recorded in Acts 11 or that some even more difficult solution must be found.

Two smaller difficulties he finds explainable but worth mentioning. Galatians records a private meeting, Acts a public one. In Acts Paul goes to Jerusalem because he is sent to inquire about circumcision; in Galatians he goes up by revelation.

But three inconsistencies Windisch is sure no skill can explain away. The first is the speech of Peter, Acts 15:7-11. Here Peter speaks of himself as called to

be a missionary to the Gentiles. This directly conflicts with Galatians 2:6. Galatians states that Peter and the others had to be convinced by him that the Gentiles ought to be evangelized.

Could a man who had known Paul have allowed Peter to claim that God had long before made him the apostle of the Gentiles? And further, no one even partially conversant with the facts could have made Peter condemn the Law as an intolerable yoke...¹

The second major inconsistency is that James is made to quote the Septuagint and to misinterpret it at that. No one who knew James could have really fabricated such a speech for him, Windisch believes.

The third point, which Windisch develops in more detail, is that of the difficulties surrounding the Apostolic Decree, Acts 15:20,28ff;21:25. He rejects with reason the version of the decree found in the "Western" text and the interpretation of the decree, based on that text, that it was a sort of primitive moral catechism. The decree he is sure is a food law. Now if the decree is genuine it seems amazing that Paul makes no mention of it in Galatians. Nor is there any sign that Paul's opponents used it, though its legalistic demands would have fit their purpose. Though the address on the decree was limited, Luke himself states that Paul published it in the South Galatian communities. Again the conflict between Paul and Peter described in Galatians 2 as taking

1. Ibid, p. 323.

place at Antioch after the council is unintelligible if the decree had been agreed upon. And finally this decree would surely have been used by Paul at Corinth and have prevented the dispute arising referred to in I Corinthians 8-10. And if, as Windisch is sure, the decree is therefore unhistorical, Luke cannot have recorded it. Luke must have known what was required of Christians in the areas of the Pauline mission. He must have known Pauline congregations which had never heard of the decree. A companion of Paul could certainly have gotten the facts from Paul. And if the decree was discussed on Paul's last visit to Jerusalem, Acts 21:25, Paul's companion would have heard of its origin then. Phillippians 3:2 suggests that the congregation there had never heard of so Jewish a decree, yet Luke is supposed to have worked in the Phillipian church himself.

The only solution to the problem, Windisch feels, is that some writer found an account of the Jerusalem Council and also a copy of the decree which must have been issued later, without the participation of Paul, and he erroneously combined the two. "Only a later comer, ignorant of Paul's attitude toward the Law", could have done this.

Having thus established his main contention Windisch now turns to the later sections of Acts, especially the "we sections", the chief stronghold of those who argue for Lucan authorship.

The abrupt introduction of the "we" in Acts 16:10 and elsewhere is "rather astonishing". An author personally concerned would have explained his presence. Our author must simply have been using an old diary here and there. He admits that the matter in these passages is in general historical.

But the second half of Acts abounds in difficulties. The story of the imprisonment at Philippi (Acts 16:19ff) is inconsistent and incredible. Certain accounts of journeys are incorrect. The speeches at Athens and at Miletus are unPauline. Paul goes to Jerusalem with the taking of money for the poor as only a secondary reason (compare I Cor. 16:1-4; II Cor. 8-9, Rom. 15:25-28). The speeches in Paul's defence are inconsistent and are based on an account of his conversion, of which "the whole story is probably legendary". Paul is guilty of hypocrisy before the Council (Acts 23:1-9). Paul is presented as a Jewish Christian in Jerusalem. Insufficient mention is made of the church at Rome, though Paul was so interested in it he had written it. Yet all the above difficulties come in places where the traditional view would imply a well qualified witness.

Finally, with regard to Paul, Windisch finds the author has omitted many things which any friend of Paul would have reported: his pastoral work, his theological emphases, and especially his controversies, which he ignores or glosses over.

With regard to the earlier chapters of the book, the non-Pauline section, the difficulties continue. He misunderstands speaking with tongues, "Paulinites" Peter, records the "legendary" conversion of Cornelius, and glorifies the early church beyond the bounds of history. The Gospel is un-Pauline. The late date of the book argues against it being by a companion of Paul. And the arguments which oppose the views he has stated Windisch considers anew and finds untenable.

Now it must be admitted that Windisch has presented his arguments carefully and forcefully. One might say that at times he has been ingenious in finding fault with Acts. So thoroughly has he presented the case against the Lucan authorship that it would be incredible that the great weight of recent scholarship should have decided against him were it not that there were certain grave difficulties in his argument and even stronger arguments on the other side. Yet the fact is that most of the recent works on the subject have held to the Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts. To mention only a few of the discussions by scholars who have written on this subject in support of the Lucan authorship since the appearance of Windisch's article, we might list the New Testament Introductions of E.J. Goodspeed, A. H. McNeile, and E. F. Scott, the commentaries on Luke by B. S. Easton and by William Manson, and the recent book entitled The Acts of

The Apostles by Wilfred L. Knox. In the discussion which follows special acknowledgement must be made of the rather devastating criticism of Windisch's work by Vincent Taylor in an article entitled "The Lucan Authorship of the Third Gospel and the Acts".¹

In answering Windisch one must concede in the beginning that he is probably right in finding Acts the work of a date much later than certain of the controversies it describes. And he is again undoubtedly right that the author glorifies the early church and glosses over the less pleasant aspects of its beginnings, sometimes perhaps neglecting the strict accuracy of a historian in the interest of his apologetic purpose. Assuming a date of around 85 A.D. for the book, we must ask, however, not whether the author has ever done this but whether Luke could have done so, writing thirty-five years after the event. That discrepancies between Acts and the epistles do not preclude Lucan authorship Windisch himself began by admitting, though he seems to have neglected this concession later:

Whether Acts is historical and whether it is to be attributed to Luke are two different questions. Even when a report about Paul or Peter appears unhistorical, it does not follow that Luke would have been able to recognize it as such, and would therefore have been incapable of accepting it as true.²

1. V. Taylor, in The Expositor, Series 9, Vol. IV, pp.282-291.

2. H. Windisch: op. cit., 317.

It is simply too much to require absolute accuracy of Luke in every account of the early church, even though Luke had been for a time associated with Paul. Nor can we ask of him the freedom from apologetic purpose and the utter detachment of a modern historian.

For example there is the Council of Jerusalem, which Windisch holds must be the decisive point in investigation. If one grants that the author has here idealized the relationship of Paul and the Jerusalem leaders does it then follow that this author could not have been a friend of Paul? Is it not exactly Luke's purpose to present Paul as in agreement with the Jerusalem church and that church as in agreement with Paul? Is this inconsistent with the fact that Paul is his hero and many years earlier had been his friend?

But that any serious glossing over of the facts has occurred is not really so clear as Windisch thinks. If there was one person more concerned than our author to show that Paul and the Church in Jerusalem were in essential accord that person was Paul himself. The very account in Galatians is that he laid before the Jerusalem leaders his views on salvation and circumcision, fearing that he had "run in vain", and that Peter, James, and John approved his course. As Windisch himself began by admitting, Peter was really, even according to Paul, on the Hellenist rather than on the Jewish side. Stan -

ton is right in saying that in Windisch one hears the voice of the now discredited Tübingen School.¹

The second major difficulty connected with the Jerusalem council, that James is assigned a speech which is based on a quotation from the Septuagint, is not really so difficult. Indeed the picture of James as the leader of the Jerusalem Church, as conservative, even legalistic, in his views, and yet as approving Paul's program of evangelization, if not his disregard of certain ceremonies, is quite that of Galatians. That the speech put in his mouth uses the Septuagint shows only that the author has given us its substance in Greek freely. It says nothing against the substantial accuracy of the picture, and nothing of the authorship of our account except to suggest that the author (as Luke) was a Greek.

The decrees, it must be admitted, form a problem. Yet here the difficulty is not insurmountable. If one agrees with Windisch that the decrees are really later than the Council the error is not incredible for Luke. In his sources he found these decrees, probably already in connection with the Jerusalem Council. He knew that an agreement had been reached which permitted Gentiles to enter the Church without circumcision. He naturally assumed that Paul spread this decree. But he reports

1. V. H. Stanton: "Style and Authorship in the Acts of the Apostle", Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. XXIV, pp. 361-381.

its spread only in churches where he himself is not present. Mention of the decree as being spread by Paul stops before the "We sections" begin. If Luke has here concentrated the whole controversy into his somewhat idealized account of the Jerusalem Council surely his error is not inexplicable.

But again it is not really clear that Luke is wrong at all.

Equally unconvincing is the argument that Paul could not have agreed to the food-laws laid down by the Council. If he had gained his main point, that the Gentile converts need not be circumcised, there was no reason why he should not accept a rule with regard to food which was harmless in itself, and was at the moment rightly regarded as essential to the common life of the Church. It was circumcision that was the obstacle to any widespread conversion of the Gentiles in view of the Greek dislike of mutilation of any kind. On the other hand sharing in the common meal and eucharist was the centre of the life of the Church. If Jews would not eat with uncircumcised Gentiles at Antioch, it meant that Gentiles would become an inferior caste in the Church; but with the growth of Gentile Churches a refusal to recognise the Jewish law as to kosher meat would mean that the Jews would be in danger of becoming an inferior caste; and this would be equally undesirable ... Paul's failure to allude to the decrees in I Cor. 8:1ff. is easily intelligible in view of the situation at Corinth; it would have been futile to appeal to the Council against the disorderly elements which claimed a complete liberty 'in Christ'; it would only have strengthened the case of the Jewish opponents who refused to recognize him as an Apostle in the full sense if he had appealed to any authority but his own.¹

The Gentiles who claimed the higher gnosis were not likely

1. W. L. Knox: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 47.

to listen to Jewish decrees. Luke's picture may be exactly accurate that Paul won his major point and cared little about the rest, delivered the decrees to the designated churches, but then ceased to concern himself about them except to preach that circumcision was not necessary. Thus it would appear that neither solution to the difficult problem of the decrees, that they were later than the Council or that they were agreed to by Paul, is really at all fatal to the Lucan authorship of Acts.

Again it must be admitted that the chronology is a difficult problem. But the denial of the Lucan authorship of Acts does nothing toward solving it. Windisch himself offers no carefully developed solution. There are, however, three possibilities as to the chronology here. The first is that Acts is exactly right in placing the Jerusalem Council on Paul's third visit to Jerusalem. It is only on this assumption that one can charge a conflict in chronology with Galatians as does Windisch. Yet this, the traditional view, is surely not opposed to Lucan authorship. Bishop Lightfoot has defended it in his Commentary on Galatians quite cogently. One explanation, defended by Streeter, is that Luke is in error in coupling Paul with Barnabas for the famine visit in Acts 11. This is an understandable error, surely, and its discovery neatly resolves the difficulty. But Lightfoot does not find even that concession necessary. As he points out, what Galatians 1-2 affirm is simply

that this was Paul's second meeting with the apostles, not that it was the second visit to Jerusalem. As Moffatt says:

Paul is not writing a protocol in Gal. 1-2, which would be falsified were he to omit any visit to the Jewish capital; all his argument requires is a note of the occasions when he was brought into contact with the apostles at Jerusalem, and of this there is no mention in Acts 11:30, which seems even to exclude (by the reference to the elders) any communication between them and the Cilician evangelist.¹

And indeed the persecution by Herod at that time makes it quite possible that the apostles were not then in Jerusalem.

A second solution to the problem of chronology is that proposed by Sir William Ramsay and followed by more recent writers such as Principle G. S. Duncan and Wilfred Knox. This view equates the meeting described in Acts 2 with the visit to Jerusalem in Acts 11. Points of similarity include the fact that in both Paul is accompanied by Barnabas, he goes according to special revelation, helping the poor has a place in both visits, and both describe private meetings. This solution avoids several difficulties and is by no means untenable. That discussion of circumcision should be repeated on Paul's third visit to Jerusalem may seem to some, as to Windisch, unlikely, but there is clearly no point at which this

1. J. Moffatt: Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament, p. 309.

solution can be said to be impossible.

But even if one takes the view which might seem most detrimental to Luke's accuracy, namely that Acts 15 and Acts 11 are doublets referring to the same event, the Lucan authorship is still not seriously endangered. This view seems to be that of Jackson and Lake. It was first fully developed by Harnack, one of the strongest supporters of Lucan authorship for Acts. It simply supposes that Luke found in Antioch an account of Paul's having been sent to Jerusalem with a fund for famine relief. This he put in Acts 11. In Jerusalem he found an account of the conference, failed to recognize that it occurred on Paul's famine visit, and placed in on a third visit to Jerusalem. The early chapters of Acts probably do contain such doublets, but they do not disprove the Lucan authorship of the book. Thus none of the three reconstructions of the chronology precludes Lucan authorship for Acts.

Finally, with relation to the Council at Jerusalem, it is another of those points which Windisch begins by admitting, and then seems to forget, that in Galatians Paul is a party man in the heat of battle. His account of the conference is written from one point of view in order to prove one point. Luke's is written from quite another point of view and a good many years later in order to achieve an entirely different purpose. The agreement between the two accounts is perhaps more remarkable

than their disagreement in the light of these considerations.

As for the rest of Windisch's argument he is quite right in saying that the Jerusalem Council is the decisive issue. If he has not made his case there he cannot make it at all. And it does not seem that he has really made it here.

Most of his remaining criticisms fall into two categories. Either some event is recorded which Windisch thinks must be legendary, or someone is pictured as saying something which does not seem appropriate to Windisch. Yet in the "we sections", at least, the miracles are few in number and not unbelievable in character. Nor can one assume that Luke would look upon seemingly miraculous events with the sceptical eye of a modern Continental critic. One cannot so lightly dismiss Paul's conversion as "legendary". As to the un-Pauline character of the speeches attributed to Paul we will have more to say in this thesis. But few would agree with Windisch that the speech at Miletus is not suitable, and in it Luke has put exactly the account of Paul's pastoral activities which Windisch blames Luke for omitting. If Paul is made a hypocrit before the Council this suggests fact rather than idealized fiction. As to his omissions Stanton points out that the book would have been bulky indeed had it included all that Windisch thinks it should.

The basic error of Windisch is that of the Tubingen

School of making Paul anti-Jewish and Peter anti-Gentile. Paul in his epistles never opposes circumcision for Jews. "To the Jews I became a Jew" is not a statement put in the mouth of Paul by an author who never knew him. It is Paul himself as he speaks in I Corinthians 9:20.

And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak became I as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.

So much for the picture of Paul as making bargains with James. As to the conflict with Peter it is Paul who writes of his gospel that "whether it were I or they so we preach" (I Cor. 15:11). Taylor summarizes Windisch's basic difficulty:

The writer is too certain as to what St. Luke would not have written, too well-informed about the fixity of St. Paul's opinions, and the result is that he presents a form of argument which forty years of Lucan research ought to have antiquated.¹

One final word should be said against Windisch's rather mildly suggested argument based on the date of the book. He and others in The Beginnings of Christianity hold it likely that the author used Josephus' works and that therefore the book could not have been written by a contemporary of Paul. This argument, however, is probably

1. V. Taylor: op. cit., p. 291.

wrong on both counts. That Luke used Josephus is by no means proven, and that he did not live long enough to have done so is even less certain.

One of the most recent supporters of the hypothesis that Luke used Josephus is Klausner¹. He rests his case on four coincidences: (a) Gamaliel's speech refers to Judas' revolt, also mentioned by Josephus. (b) The death of Herod Agrippa I is recorded in somewhat similar fashion by both. (c) The Egyptian of Acts 21:38 also is mentioned in Josephus. And (d) the famine in the days of Claudius Caesar is mentioned by both. Here it must be said that these are rather scanty parallels. But when one examines them carefully it appears that as to Judas' revolt (a) Luke has missed the date given in Josephus badly and has substituted for the "great multitude" mentioned as following Judas the more exact number 400. As to the Egyptian (c) the discrepancy is even greater, for here Luke lists his followers at 4000 while Josephus says 30,000. The theory demands not only that Luke borrow from Josephus but that he then forget much of what Josephus said. When one remembers that these are facts of history as accessible to one historian as to another the alleged dependence seems utterly unnecessary.

1. J. Klausner: From Jesus to Paul, pp. 225ff.

But even if it be held that the author did borrow from Josephus this does not mean that he could not have been Luke. Tradition says that Luke lived to be 74.¹ Assuming that Luke was a young man, like Timothy, when he first went with Paul, around the year 50 A.D., Luke may have lived into the beginning of the Second Century. Goodspeed in his Introduction to the New Testament slyly remarks that most of the critics who deny that Luke could have lived to write a book after the appearance of Josephus' works in 93 A.D. are themselves older than Luke would have had to be.

It would appear, then, that none of the objections brought against the Lucan authorship of Acts really preclude it, indeed that few of the objections really even make the Lucan authorship unlikely. We turn, therefore, to the positive evidence which does affirm the traditional view.

First of all we may note the antiquity and the unanimity of the early authorities which ascribe Acts to Luke. Few books can claim better attestation. The Muratorium fragment clearly designates Luke the physician and companion of Paul as the author both of the Third Gospel

1. A. Harnack: Luke the Physician, note, p. 4.

end of the Acts, and adds "Luke compiled for 'most excellent Theophilus' what things were done in detail in his presence." Irenaeus makes equally clear statements of this identification and points to Luke as the author of the "we sections" and as the Luke mentioned by Paul in his epistles. Tertullian, Clement, Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and others agree.¹ Now this unchallenged and early ascription to Luke is the more impressive since Luke is otherwise comparatively unimportant. Luke's name would never have been picked over that of Timothy or Titus in order to give the book authority in the early church. Thus comparisons with other works which have been given apostolic names by the tradition break down. Moreover, as Goodspeed says:

It is one thing to have lost the name of the Jewish author of Matthew, but his gospel was anonymous, while Luke's work is dedicated to Theophilus and so can hardly have been anonymous. Moreover, it was like the Greeks to claim their literary productions and write under their own names.²

If then the tradition is early, unanimous, and difficult to explain on other grounds it would seem that it ought to be believed.

The second great reason in support of the traditional view is the evidence of the use of the first person pronoun in the book. The preface to the gospel begins it, as the

1. See Jackson & Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, pp. 209-264 for a full collection of the early testimonies.

2. E. J. Goodspeed: An Introduction to the New Testament, p. 201.

author states his purpose and method. The preface to Acts continues it. Then the first person is resumed in Acts 16:10 and continues until the account of Paul's imprisonment and departure from Philippi. It reappears when Paul is again at Philippi in Acts 20:5,6, and it continues to be used here and there through the remainder of the book as the lengthy account is given of Paul's return to Jerusalem, his trials, and his journey to Rome. Now the logical assumption is that the first person is used of the writer in each case. None would deny that this is so in the prologue. Here the writer addresses a man, using the first person of himself and apparently assuming that it will be understood. Thus he is known to Theophilus. His use of the first person elsewhere must be related to this fact. Theophilus knows that the writer was once associated with Paul. That at certain places the writer himself enters the narrative, therefore, is quite natural.

But any other explanation for the ἡμᾶς of Acts 16:10 seems impossible. The old explanation that the author used the first person in order to claim the authority of an eye witness has been abandoned. The author in his preface has given too straightforward an account of his relationship to the events he describes for this to be possible. It is doubtful that he could have deceived Theophilus. And there hardly seems to be any imaginable motive which would cause him to introduce the "we" at just the places he does simply as a fiction. Moreover the factual tone and

the established accuracies of the "we" account have caused almost everyone to agree in recent works that the "we" sections are by an eyewitness.

But the alternative usually adopted by those who oppose the Lucan authorship (Windisch, for example) is that the author has here made use of a diary by some companion of Paul. In support of this it may be urged that Luke probably did use written sources and that there are literary parallels for such a practice. The parallels suggested, however, are not really parallel. Mention is frequently made of Ezra and Nehemiah, but Luke-Acts is not a mosaic comparable to these. The parallels cited from Greek literature are few, late, and unconvincing. And there are serious objections to the idea that Luke can have used such a document here. For one thing it is utterly impossible to reconstruct such a document. It breaks off with the author in Philippi. It takes up again after an interval of years at the point where Paul returns to Philippi. This is a strange kind of document. But if there was more of it, as surely there must have been, why was so little used? And if more of it was used why was the "we" preserved in these places and only in them?

And the "we sections" give themselves every evidence of being by the author of the whole of Luke-Acts. We have pointed out that this assumption alone can explain their relationship to the two prefaces. But there are many other

ties as well. Linguistically the book of Acts is admittedly a unity.¹ The language of the "we sections" is that of the rest of Luke-Acts. If the author here used a diary-source he evidently put it entirely into his own words. Yet how then did he allow the "we" to remain? In the gospel the transitions from Marcan to non-Markan source material are smooth enough, and Luke is acknowledged by all to be a master of Greek style. It would seem impossible that by carelessness or indifference or habit he could have allowed the "we" to remain, while otherwise completely rephrasing his source. The angular abruptness of such a suddenly introduced "we" is exactly the sort of thing Luke is elsewhere careful to avoid.

But the agreement of the "we sections" with the rest of Luke-Acts is not simply verbal. Harnack² notes the following points of unity in thought and interest: same interest in the miraculous and in healing; same geographical interest; same interest in the Spirit; the evil spirit is the first to recognize the emissaries of God at Phillipi (compare Luke 8:28); Paul goes first to the synagogue, as in the rest of the book; a convert is baptized with his whole house, as in the rest of the book; Paul teaches "the way"; "the bread is broken"; there are elders in the

1. See Sir J. C. Hawkins: Horae Synopticae, pp. 14ff. Subsequent investigations have tended simply to confirm Hawkins' results.

2. A. Harnack: Luke the Physician, p. 26 ff.

church at Jerusalem; James is the head of the church there; "the will of God be done" is used (compare Luke 22:42); Paul is ready to die "for the name of the Lord Jesus"; Paul heals by the laying on of hands; and Philip is "one of the seven" (Acts 21:8, a clear reference back to Acts 6:1-6).

In this connection it ought to be carefully noted that the Paul of the "we sections" is the Paul of the rest of the book. It is in these, incidentally, that he makes the "un-Pauline" bargain with James. Windisch has admitted that the "we sections" are based on a personal recollection of Paul. Instead of discrediting the Lucan picture of Acts on the ground that it is inconsistent with that of the epistles, he should have shown that in the earlier sections it is not consistent with that of the diary-source. But this, of course, he cannot even attempt.

If, then, the language, the details, and the Paul of the "we sources" are those of the author of the book there seems to be little left to the diary-source but the "we" itself, precisely the sort of verbal oddity which Luke was careful elsewhere to erase.

The simple explanation of the "we" passages, the one which has commended itself so strongly to the majority of scholars that they have rejected on the basis of it all arguments alleged against Lucan authorship, is that the first person refers to the author of Luke-Acts himself, the man who has addressed this work to Theophilus.

One final consideration with regard to the "we sections" would seem to put the matter beyond doubt. It would appear that the language of the "we sections" is in fact much more given to Lucan peculiarities than any passage in which Luke is revising a source. This view had been proposed by Harnack, but his presentation of it has been subjected to a severe criticism by H. J. Cadbury¹. V. H. Stanton, however, has reviewed the whole subject and has gone into this linguistic argument more thoroughly than either Harnack or Cadbury. He is able to point out Cadbury's error in the matter. He in turn enters into a comparison of Luke 8:25-39, where Luke is obviously using a Marcan source, with three passages from the "we sections", Acts 26:9-18; and 21:1-18.

I find that in the narrative parallel to Mark which, with one exception of three verses, is most revised, there is on an average a little over one Lucan peculiarity to each verse. On the other hand in the "we" section, of the three named above, in which there are fewest peculiarities, namely, Acts 21:1-18, there are on an average twice as many; in 20:4-16 four times, and in 16:9-18 nearly five times as many. They are spread through the passages and are far from being all of one kind.²

He has determined what are "Lucan peculiarities" by the same statistical method accepted by Cadbury. It seems clear that the "we sections" are the composition of the reviser of the rest.

1. H. J. Cadbury, in Jackson & Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, p. 161 ff.

2. H. Stanton: op. cit., American Journal of Theology, Vol. XXIV, p. 380.

The only real explanation of the "we sections" then is that they are the natural claim by the author of the book to have been a companion of Paul at certain times in his career. There seems every reason to accept his claim as honest. Although from Paul's epistles we know that he was a companion of Paul he has not named himself, being known, of course, to Theophilus, but has simply told in the first person those events of which he was himself a witness.

The third major reason for holding to the Lucan authorship of Acts is that its remarkable accuracy at numerous points seems to imply that the author had access to excellent information. Only a first century Christian, himself in the midst of the mission activity of the early church, could have done so well.

We have already had occasion to discuss the alleged discrepancies between Acts and the epistles of Paul and have endeavored to show that these are capable of simple explanation. On the other hand it is not so easy to explain their large measure of agreement without supposing an author who at least had access to remarkable sources.

C. W. Emmet¹ has given an excellent statement of this general agreement. Unless one holds to a theory of absolutely infallible inspiration of the scripture one

1. C. W. Emmet: "The Case for the Tradition", in Jackson and Lake's The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, pp.265-297.

must not ask for complete agreement. But the agreeing details are too numerous to be ignored. Among the coincidences between Acts and the Epistles which Emmet lists are these: Jerusalem, not Galilee as the gospels would have suggested, is the center of the church. Believers are called "disciples", "saints", or "brethren", but Luke like Paul avoids the title "Christians". The Twelve, with Peter and John named, lead the church. Along with them are the apostles, including Barnabas. James and the other brethren of the Lord are prominent. Thanksgiving and the Breaking of Bread are closely connected. With reference to Galatia, assuming the South Galatian theory, we find coincidences between the epistle and Acts 14 such as the mention of Barnabas as well known, miracles, persecutions, and the reception of Paul as a god. The Thessalonian epistles agree with Acts 17 as to the presence of a large gentile element within the church there, the hostility of the Jews, the close association of Silas and Timothy, and the teaching there. The Corinthian epistles also fit well. Paul speaks of his visit there in terms which suggest his reaction to his failure at Athens. Both sources mention his working at his trade there. Crispus is a prominent convert. Aquila and Priscilla figure. Apollos' work is mentioned by both. Romans agrees with Acts in implying that Paul planned to visit Rome but with a trip to Jerusalem first. Among the minor characters in Acts mentioned also in the

epistles Emmet mentions, in addition to those already named, Silvanus (Silas), Sopater (Sosipater), Aristarchus, Tychicus, Trophimus, and Gaius. That the name of Luke himself is omitted in Acts is significant. The reference to the bringing of alms to Jerusalem by Paul fits in well with numerous references to this practice in his epistles. Indeed the agreement of Acts and the body of Pauline letters is such that each throws light on the other.

Acts rightly understood is the best commentary on the letters of Paul, and the letters on the Acts. If Luke had never known or read those letters, then all the more remarkable is it as a proof of the truth and historicity of both that the agreement is so perfect.¹

But we have here been calling attention only to factual details. We have already had occasion to point out that the Paul of Acts is the Paul of the epistles. Perhaps most striking of all is the agreement between the epistles and Acts in the picture which they give of the thought of the early church. But this we must discuss at some length in later chapters of this thesis.

But not only is Acts shown to be the work of a well-informed and early Christian by its relationship to the epistles of Paul, perhaps the most dramatic proofs of its accuracy have come from archeological and historical research. In this field, of course, the name of Sir William M. Ramsay stands pre-eminent. Ramsay began his research

1. W. M. Ramsay: The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, p. 52.

into the area of the Pauline travels confident that the critics of his day were right in placing Acts as a Second Century work of no historical value. The discovery of the accuracy of the geographic detail of Acts 14:6, he says, brought his first tendency toward a change of view. The geographical notation implying the crossing of a border in Paul's flight here had been regarded as obviously wrong because of a statement of Cicero which clearly contradicted it. But the discovery of a boundary stone marking this boundary showed clearly that the author was accurate on this detail. The boundary existed there from 37 A.D. to 72 A.D. That is to say that a later writer would probably have been mistaken about this border. Only one who had been near it in this very period would have been likely to give the detail accurately. But this was only the first of many such discoveries. In the light of Ramsay's research almost all scholars have come to look upon Acts as in general accurate on political and geographical details and to regard at least the "we source" as being the work of an eye-witness. But the accuracies found by Ramsay are by no means confined to this "source". For example, our author is right as to the proconsulship of Sergius Paul (Acts 13:7) in name, date, and title, a fact quite remarkable in view of the constantly changing political situation in the Roman empire. The famine did occur in 46 A.D., Ramsay is sure, though once this had been doubted.

The author is right that Pisidian Antioch was the center of a Region and that it was technically not in Pisidia. The careful tracing of the journey and of the ports especially speaks of a well-informed witness. The proconsulship of Gallio is confirmed. Yet all these accuracies occur outside the "we sections". These and many others are noted in Ramsay's St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen. Such discoveries led Ramsay to reverse his position completely and to argue powerfully for the accuracy and the Lucan authorship of Acts.

We have argued for the Lucan authorship of Acts on the basis of the ancient and unanimous witness to this fact in the earliest authorities, from the fact that this is the only logical conclusion to be drawn from the "we sections", so obviously by the author of the whole work, and from the accuracies of the book as shown by a comparison of its details with the Pauline epistles and by the discoveries of archeological research.

Finally, there are a number of minor considerations which point to Luke as the author. None of these taken in themselves prove the point, perhaps, but their cumulative effect is tremendous.

For one thing, it is generally agreed that from the epistles we know of no other companion of Paul who was present at all of the events which the author of Acts describes in the first person. Timothy and Titus, for example,

simply cannot be fitted into the picture. Luke, however, appears at the right times in the Pauline epistles.

Another line of evidence is that Luke-Acts, at least in the opinion of many scholars, shows signs of having been written by a physician. As we have already stated, Hobart's seemingly convincing argument to prove this has now been largely discredited by the work of Cadbury. However, at least this much of the argument remains, that Luke's language, if not peculiar to physicians, is at least that of the educated Greek, a professional man. And Luke does manifest a certain interest in healings and pictures Christ as The Great Physician (see Luke 4:23).

A third fact which seems to fit well with the theory of Lucan authorship is that it is now generally agreed that Acts is a first century work. Indeed most of those who reject the theory that the author borrowed from Josephus - which theory we have discussed above and have shown to be poorly founded - would date Acts before the persecution under Domitian, which occurred in the last decade of the first century. The reasons for this are many. W. L. Knox writes, "The book, if not 'Holy Scripture', was a Christian classic well before A.D. 117,"¹ bases this on what he believes to be quotations from Acts by Polycarp and Ignatius and perhaps in II Timothy 3:2. This surely implies an early

1. W. L. Knox: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 2.

date. That the writer was not familiar with Paul's epistles- which almost all agree to be true- implies that he wrote at an early date, for these were soon collected. This is especially important since our writer was intensely interested in Paul and had been at pains to get information about his hero. Surely a late writer who had done careful research and who had secured the "diary-source" would also have gotten a copy of Galatians. That our writer is so obviously independent of Paul's epistles is one of the strongest indications not only that he was an early writer but also that he was drawing on some other source. It makes the theory of first-hand information all the more likely. Another hint of the early date is that our writer, though he knows, does not use the name "Christian". He writes before the term ἡ ἐκκλησία has become standard for the Church. Harnack¹ finds other linguistic hints of the early date as already noted, the fact that by 150 A.D. widely divergent texts of Acts were known suggests an early date. Assuming that the majority of scholars are right in dating the Third Gospel as being after the fall of Jerusalem and allowing for other factors noted we suggest a date at approximately 85 A.D. This fits well with the theory that the book was

1. A. Harnack: Luke the Physician, p. 24 ff. and The Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels, p. 104 ff.

written by a younger contemporary of Paul, one who may sometimes have idealized the picture of the early church in retrospect.

The locale of the book certainly fits well with the traditional view. As we will point out in the next section, most modern source analysis tends to find three strands of tradition in the early chapters of Acts: a Jerusalem tradition, a Caesarean tradition, and an Antiochian tradition. Early tradition associates Luke with Antioch. The author of the "we sections" visited Jerusalem and spent some months in Caesarea. Negatively this is confirmed by the utter lack of information which our author has about the spread of the gospel to such places as Alexandria and Damascus. He seems to know the traditions of the above three cities and to know Paul. But of other areas than these and those of the Pauline travels he knows nothing. The whole picture fits perfectly the traditional view of Luke as the Greek companion of Paul.

Among the lesser arguments which have some weight we may finally point out these. Aristerchus appears three times in Acts, while so important a man as Titus, for example, is not mentioned. Aristerchus appears, however, only twice in the epistles, but both times he is in the company of Luke. This suggests a certain association, an explanation of his prominence in Acts. Again it has been urged that there is a certain vividness in the portrait of Paul given us in Acts which suggests someone who knew

him as the author. Only as read in the light of Acts do the epistles give us a full picture of the character of the man, his moods and temper and ambition and actions. Acts offers a sharp portrait. And the intense interest of the author in the spread of the gospel suggests one who like Luke was actively engaged in that mission.

To recapitulate: We have shown that the objections so carefully raised to the Lucan authorship of Acts are poorly founded. On the other hand we have found four great streams of evidence which seem to prove about as conclusively as any such matter can be proved that Luke, the companion of Paul, was the author of the book. These lines of evidence are: (1) The most ancient authorities all agree that Luke is the author. (2) The evidence of the "we sections" is that the author was a companion of Paul. (3) Acts abounds in accuracies both in its general picture and in its details, so much so that it clearly suggests a companion of Paul as its author. And (4) there are numerous little hints, such as time, locale, and interests, which point either to Luke or some other companion of Paul as the author.

We have not entered into this lengthy discussion of the authorship of Acts without reason. It is, of course, of no consequence whether the name of our author was Luke or something else. But that we have identified him as a companion and fellow worker of Paul is a matter

of real importance. It has definite bearing on our research into the sermons in Acts. We are now prepared to assert the following things about the sermons in the light of this research:

(1) Our sermons are reported to us by a man who, in spite of minor errors, was an accurate historian. Even if one feels that the arguments above have failed to prove the Lucan authorship at least there can be little doubt on this, the main issue. He is capable of accuracy both in the general picture, agreeing with the epistles, and in details. Therefore we have a strong a priori reason for trusting the picture he gives us of the early preaching.

(2) Our author knows a great deal about Paul and may be presumed capable of giving us an accurate account of Paul's preaching. Indeed it seems probable that he was a companion of Paul and that he had therefore actually heard Paul preach many times.

(3) If we are right that the author of the whole is to be identified with the author of the "we sections", then our author was personally acquainted with many other preachers in the early church. For example, he had visited with Philip (Acts 21:8), and he was associated with other companions of Paul. And he had visited the Jerusalem church.

(4) And if we are right that he is the Luke of Philemon 24 we may even go a step further and assume that he was a preacher himself.

If, therefore, we are right in our survey thus far we may begin our study of the sermons themselves with a certain already-formed confidence that they present to us an accurate picture of early Christian preaching.

But before we examine the sermons we must first briefly consider what may be said as to the sources upon which Luke drew for these and the other parts of his book.



CHAPTER II. CRITICISM OF THE SERMONS - THEIR SOURCES AND FORM

The sermons with which this thesis deals all lie within the first half of the book of Acts. The author does not claim to have been present at the preaching of any of them. It is therefore necessary for us to investigate the sources which Luke used in composing these chapters.

First of all, we may assert quite confidently that Luke did use sources and that probably some of these were written. The preface to the Third Gospel makes this clear. The scenes from the early days of the church, though perhaps somewhat idealized, have definitely more of the character of fact than of fancy. The occurrence of "doublets" (two accounts of the same event), as described below, also suggests such sources. And, what is perhaps most important of all, we are in possession of one of Luke's written sources for his gospel, Mark, and are able to discern something of the character of another, "Q".

If then Luke did make use of sources, some probably written, we must examine into these sources. In connection with Luke's use of Mark three points are to be noted. First, Luke translates his material into his own vocabulary and style. If Mark were not extant no source critic could ever have told by style and vocabulary where Luke was following it and where he was "freely composing". Second, Luke has freely re-arranged Mark's order to suit his purpose. And, third, Luke has in general adhered closely to his source.

except for these alterations. Especially is this true in his reproduction of the speeches of Jesus. We will discuss this point more fully below.

If we are right in our beliefs that Luke is the author of the book, then there is no great source problem with regard to chapters 16-28. Luke was himself a participant in many of the events narrated, was a companion of the man around whom these stories center, and was daily associated with eyewitnesses of many of the events narrated at which he himself was not present. Those who reject the Lucan authorship of the book as a whole usually suppose the "diary-source" to underlie a good part of the second half of Acts as its basis.

However, we are here concerned with those sermons which lie in the earlier chapters of the book, before the writer himself has come upon the scene. Luke here purports to give an account of the earliest days of the church, including its preaching. The question of the accuracy of this picture is inseparably bound to that of the sources of his information.

A brief survey of the various types of source theory which have been held will be necessary.

Wilfred Knox remarks:

In the early decades of the present century splitting the Acts was almost as popular a pastime with

the critics as splitting the atom with the scientists in the present decade.¹

Indeed the effort at source analysis began much earlier². As early as 1847 Schwanbeck proposed three sources for the early chapters of Acts: a biography of Peter, the story of the death of Stephen, and a biography of Barnabas, and the latter half of the book being based on reminiscences of Silas. In 1880 Wendt suggested one Jerusalem source for the early chapters. By the last decade of the 19th Century numerous theories were being proposed. Van Manen found two sources, the Acts of Peter and the Acts of Paul. Sorof suggested that the work of Luke was revised by Timothy to give it a more Jewish caste. Spitta believed the primary work to be that of Luke (including the speeches), a source of great historical value, but that this was combined with a less trustworthy and more Jewish source designed to magnify Peter, the two being combined by a much later redactor. Clemen produced a complex theory involving three sources, a Hellenist source, a Peter source, and a Paul source, the latter perhaps by Luke, the hands of three redactors being also traced. Hilgenfeld suggested that a redactor has used three sources: a Jewish-Christian Acts of Peter, a more Hellenized Acts of the Seven, and the Acts of Paul.

1. W. L. Knox: op. cit., p. 16.

2. The list which follows is derived largely from discussions of source criticism in two works: J. Moffatt: op. cit. 286-289; and R. J. Knowling: The Acts of the Apostles, in Expositors' Greek New Testament, Vol. II, pp. 16ff.

Jungst believed the "we-journal" to continue through the book, but to this added an Ebionite source and the work of two redactors. Bless and Briggs traced a single Jerusalem source to John Mark.

Early in the present century, however, a somewhat more orderly picture began to emerge with the work of Adolf Harnack. His source analysis, variously modified, has received far more recognition from subsequent critics than the earlier theories. It merits our more careful attention.

Harnack¹ carefully traces three sources for the first half of Acts, emanating from three centers of tradition: Jerusalem, Caesarea, and Antioch. The Jerusalem source he divides into two parallel sources. Source A we find in Acts 3:1-5:16. This source he regards as being of high historical value, probably originally in Aramaic. Jerusalem source B consists of Acts 1(?); 2:1-47; 5:17-24. This source gives a much more impressive account of the early church, but compared with A it is of very low historical value. That these two sources are really parallel accounts of the same events he deduces from the fact that in both we have a sermon, an outpouring of the spirit, and account of conversions, an account of the communal life of

1. A. Harnack: The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 165 ff.

the church, mention of wonders and signs accompanying fear, and an arrest, trial, imprisonment, and release. The order of these events has been badly mixed by source B, but that the combining of the two accounts gives us doublets about these events Harnack thinks obvious.

The second source Harnack finds is a Caesarean source: Acts 8:5-40; 9:31-11:18; 12:1-24. This source is perhaps the same as Jerusalem source A. It carried on the interest in Peter of source A, but it is also to be associated with Philip, (Acts 8:40; 21:8,9). It tells of Philip's missionary journey which brings him to Caesarea, and of Peter's assistance in that work; it tells of Peter's experience with Cornelius in Caesarea; and finally it tells of Herod's imprisonment of Peter and Herod's death in Caesarea.

The third major source according to Harnack is an Antiochene source, or Jerusalem-Antioch source. This includes Acts 6:1-8; 4:11:19-30; 12:25-15:35. This source centers around Antioch, or rather the relationship between Antioch and Jerusalem, and perhaps derives from Silas. It begins with an account of the election of the seven, one of whom is from Antioch, and traces the origins of the spread of Christianity to the persecution which follows Stephen's death. It tells of the founding of the Antioch church. Paul is introduced in the first part of the source and is brought to Antioch in the second, whence he takes

alms to Jerusalem. The source resumes as he and Barnabas return from Jerusalem; their first journey is described; and there is an account of the Jerusalem conference, to which they are sent by the Antioch church. This Antiochene source Harnack thinks to be a written one.

Harnack's theory has a great deal to recommend it. The sources are logically centered around the places where the traditions were preserved. The association with certain people as their source seems quite possible. The prominence of certain characters in each ties each source together. Harnack is able to show that in most cases the sections which come from the same source fit together nicely. And his theory accounts for at least some of the doublets in Acts. This theory, as we have pointed out, fits well with the traditional picture of the life of Luke, and Harnack ascribes the second half of the book and the editing of the first half entirely to him.

The majority of critics since Harnack's time have tended to follow a pattern more or less similar to his. Johannes Weiss finds an Antiochene source and a Jerusalem source. Ramsay denies the theory of written sources but emphasizes the grouping of traditions around people, notably Peter, Philip, and Mark. Thus he carries even further Harnack's suggestion that Philip was a source, suggesting that Philip's daughters may well have given Luke such material. This, of course, fits well with the view

that the author of the whole is the companion of Paul who visited Philip (Acts 21:8). Jackson and Lake¹ tend to follow Harnack. They also suggest that Harnack's source A is connected with John Mark, who, rather than the apostle John, is really the John associated with Peter in the early chapters, that B is a continuation of the Jerusalem source used at the end of Luke's gospel, and that Stephen's story contains doublets (as we shall describe more fully below). McNeile tends also to follow Harnack. Knox's book², the most recent discussion of the question, tends to question Harnack's view. However, he too looks upon the first five chapters as a Jerusalem source, probably originally in Aramaic. And he too thinks Philip a likely source.

There are perhaps certain modifications to make in Harnack's theory. For one thing, though Harnack is probably right in finding doublets in Acts and in suggesting that these point to the use of sources, one may question whether or not he is justified in making his sharp distinction between Jerusalem sources A and B, with the assumption that chapters 2 and 3 are doublets. Of these chapters Torrey writes:

1. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 145 ff.

2. W. L. Knox: op. cit., pp. 16-32.

But the two events are essentially different from each other, and each is highly significant in its own way. The second is the natural sequel to the first, and I do not see how it is possible to deny that there¹ is progress in the narrative from one to the other.

Knox thinks it incredible that two documents, probably Aramaic, should have restrained themselves to the modest figures of 3,000 and 5,000 for the number of converts, in view of the exaggerations so common in Josephus. The complete jumbling of the order of B is difficult to explain, nor does the sequence of events become clear if one eliminates B. This would imply an imprisonment before Pentecost, which seems strange. Nor does Harnack offer any real explanation for the origin and preservation of such "contradictory" documents. Therefore we must be very cautious about accepting the distinction between A and B. The second major objection to be raised to Harnack's theory is that it perhaps does not allow enough place for oral sources. By no means all are convinced that all the Antiochene source, for example, was written before Luke. And finally it is to be pointed out that there are still doublets unexplained, for example those in the Stephen story, suggesting that there are sources still behind the sources Harnack has found.

Yet in the main it would seem that Harnack's

1. C. C. Torrey: The Composition and Date of Acts, p. 62.

source analysis is right. The theory that Luke used three sources (oral and written), a Jerusalem, a Caesarean (from Philip), and an Antiochene source, seems altogether likely.

Of great significance is the fact of Luke's use of a tradition which goes all the way back behind the Hellenistic Churches to Palestine itself. Since the first of the sermons attributed to Peter claim to present the Christology of the original Palestinian Church, it is important to examine into this Palestinian element in Luke's writing.

As early as Holsten critics were suggesting a Jewish-Christian source in Acts, especially in the speeches. Bernard Weiss tried to trace such a source through the first fifteen chapters. Feine connected it with the Gospel. And nearly all the subsequent source theories we have mentioned have found some place for it. This one point of agreement amidst so much disagreement is not without reason.

For one thing there is the generally recognized place of special Caesarean and Jerusalem material in the Third Gospel. Most of Luke's insertions fit this description. Luke's preference for the Jerusalem tradition concerning the resurrection is a case in point. No less an authority on the synoptics than Streeter writes of this Palestinian "Proto-Luke" thus:

Neither Mark nor Proto-Luke is infallible; but as historical authorities they should probably be regarded as on the whole of approximately equal value. But, if so, this means that far

more weight will have to be given by the historian in the future to the Third Gospel, and in particular to those portions of it which are peculiar to itself.¹

B. S. Easton goes even further: "'L' is not only more Palestinian than Mark but, as a written document, it is earlier".² And Knox writes:

Whatever our judgment as to the truth of the narrative of the early chapters of S. Luke's Gospel may be ... there can be no doubt that St. Luke has succeeded in reproducing in them in a very remarkable degree the atmosphere of the earlier form of Pharisaical piety ...³

These chapters are not Pauline Hellenism. They go back to Palestine itself.

Again the vividness with which events are described suggests a Jerusalem source in Acts. Klausner writes:

But even in the first part of the book, that is to say, in the first twelve chapters, there is so much information containing details and names, that it would have been difficult to obtain them by hearsay and to remember them so exactly unless the author had a written source before him. Thus it is necessary to assume that also in the first chapters the author made use of written sources along with oral.⁴

And those who would deny that the source is written would agree that the events of the early chapters could not have been narrated without the aid of some really valuable

1. B. H. Streeter: The Four Gospels, p. 222.

2. B. S. Easton: Christ in the Gospels, p. 12.

3. W. L. Knox: St. Paul and the Church at Jerusalem, p. 90, note.

4. J. Klausner: From Jesus to Paul, p. 218.

oral source.

But while there has been a certain general agreement that there is this Palestine tradition in Luke-Acts, as shown by various indications, on one point there has been greater difference of opinion: the view of many that the language of these chapters itself betrays a Palestinian origin.

That the language of Luke-Acts abounds in "Semitisms" all agree.

Some of these Semitisms are recognizable even in the secondary stage of English translation: "he was added to his fathers", "it came to pass", "the feet of ... are at the door", "his face was going", "by the hand of" or "mouth of", "on the face of the earth", "by the mouth of the sword".¹

Such phrases are semitic in origin wherever they appear. But many of these, of course, may be traced to Luke's apparent devotion to the Septuagint.

The question, however, whether in the early chapters of Acts we may discern a source or sources actually written in Aramaic is somewhat more debatable. Final judgment on such a matter must, of course, be reserved for a little group of experts in this highly specialized field, but a survey of the results they currently offer is of interest.

The theory of an Aramaic source for "I. Acts" is especially to be associated with the name of C. C. Torrey.

1. H. J. Cadbury: The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 73.

The appearance of his book The Aramaic Source in Acts brought the whole question to the scholarly world as never before. But as Torrey begins his book by saying, the idea was not new with him. He quotes Harnack, Wendt, and Moffatt as having already suggested the likelihood of such a source in Acts.

It is Torrey's view that Acts 1-15 is almost entirely composed of a sometimes unskillful translation of a single Aramaic document. He rests his case on a series of instances where he believes Luke's slavishly literal translation of the Aramaic original has resulted in certain constructions which are impossible Greek but, retranslated, make smooth Aramaic. For example, the Greek of Acts 10:36, 37 has puzzled commentators for years. (One may confirm at least this quite readily by examining the various attempts to translate these verses made by commentator after commentator during the last 100 years.) But Torrey argues that if one translates this passage back into Aramaic literally, the Aramaic gives a smooth construction which in English would be

As for the word which the Lord of all sent to the children of Israel, proclaiming good tidings of peace through Jesus Christ: ye know that which took place in all Judea...¹

It will be noted that this example is taken from Peter's sermon to Cornelius' household. Torrey finds numerous

1. C. C. Torrey: op. cit., p. 35.

such instances, of which two more which he regards as among the most obvious occur in Peter's sermon in chapter 3 (Acts 3:16 and 3:24).

Critics such as Burkitt and Goodspeed were quick to answer Torrey, but the chief result of their criticisms of his position has been rather to discredit his view of the unity of "I Acts" than to disprove Aramaic sources. Indeed most subsequent criticism, while flatly rejecting Torrey's view that Acts 1-15 comes from a single source, has tended to take up the position that Luke did use Aramaic written sources.

J. de Zwaan examines the whole matter with great care in The Beginnings of Christianity.¹ He finds certain faults in Torrey's method and thinks the evidence very weak for certain parts of "I Acts". But in his view it seems likely that certain sections do come from Aramaic source, notably Acts 1:6-5:16 and Acts 9:31-11:18. Thus the sermons of Peter all come in sections which he regards as stemming from the Aramaic. As to the speech of Stephen, he thinks it impossible to judge regarding its linguistic origin since it is so largely composed of quotations from scripture. (It will be noted that de Zwaan's view accords well with the general source theory we have adopted.)

Among recent critics who have held essentially this

1. J. de Zwaan, in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. II, pp.30-65.

view we may list C. H. Dodd, A. H. McNeile, E. F. Scott, and W. L. Knox.

Much more cautious, however, is the recent study of the whole problem of New Testament Aramaic by Matthew Black. He regards the Aramaisms in Acts as "a poor foundation upon which any source-criticisms of value could build". But though he is thus hesitant he writes:

The most likely places where Semitic sources were used by Luke, apart from the sayings of Jesus, are in the first two chapters of his Gospel and in the speeches of Peter and Stephen in the early chapters of Acts.¹

It is these sermons, of course, with which we are concerned.

Surely the net result of research into the Aramaic question is to suggest that there is likelihood that Luke used Aramaic sources in the early chapters of Acts for at least some of the sermons he records. If this be true it is a fact of great importance, suggesting as it does that Luke has here taken us behind the Hellenistic Church of Paul's letters to the original Palestinian community. This, of course, is exactly what he claims to do.

To return, then, to our basic problem, what light does the general source criticism of Acts shed upon the sermons as a record of primitive Christology? We suggest the following conclusions:

1. M. Black: op. cit., p. 207.

(1) Luke did use sources. He writes as a historian. His picture of the early church is not based on fancy but on research.

(2) It seems likely that these sources came from Antioch, Caesarea, and Jerusalem.

(3) The Caesarean source quite possibly was Philip himself.

(4) And the Jerusalem source in vividness and detail and quite possibly in language betrays its primitive origin.

Do the sermons in Acts actually give us a true picture of the first Christian preaching?

In our discussion of this question we have been proceeding from the general to the particular. If we are right in our argument thus far we have already gone a long way toward establishing an affirmative answer. It has been shown that the author is one who knew Paul and the other early preachers and was himself engaged in the world mission of the early church. It has been shown that he is trustworthy in his reporting. And it has been shown that he used ancient and reliable sources for his history. These considerations may well give us a certain bias in favor of Luke's report.

We now turn to a consideration of the sermons themselves. From an examination of the sermons themselves does it appear that we have here a picture of the earliest preaching, including its Christology?

In his very scholarly article in The Beginnings of Christianity on "The Speeches in Acts"¹ Henry J. Cadbury defends the position that as a rule these speeches are "devoid of historical basis in genuine tradition". His work here is undoubtedly the best defence of this position yet written. It is therefore worthy of a detailed discussion here.

(1) First of all it is urged that the free composition of such speeches is the habit of all writers of antiquity in the Greco-Roman culture. This custom is now generally recognized. Paul Wendland² and E. Norden³ among the earlier German form critics of this century had already pointed to many parallels in Greek secular literature to Luke's use of such speeches. Cadbury's own book on this and allied subjects is perhaps the first work of form criticism written in America.⁴ And Martin Dibelius carries the whole discussion even further in one of his last works.⁵ Dibelius lists four purposes for

1. H. J. Cadbury: in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol.V, pp. 404-427.

2. P. Wendland: Die Urechristlichen Literaturformen, p.265.

3. E. Norden: Agnostos Theos

4. H. J. Cadbury: The Making of Luke-Acts, pp. 184ff.

5. N. Dibelius: Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die Antike Geschichtsschreibung.

which ancient authors placed speeches in the mouths of their characters: to present the conflicting sides of an encounter; to illuminate a particular moment; to show the character of a man; or to present the general thought of the work. The ultimate aim was to show the lessons of history. The classic example, of course, is the ancient historian Thucydides, who has told us how he composed the speeches which make up perhaps a fourth of his history. The speech was a standard and useful device. We must assume that Luke is a man of his times here.

(2) The speeches do not seem to have the character of shorthand reports. They are much too short to be actual speeches. And accurate reporting is hardly likely in the circumstances in which they were delivered.

(3) The language and style of every speech is Lucan. Numerous illustrations can be given to prove this.

(4) The speeches are essentially alike, showing the mind of one author rather than of the various speakers.

Julicher earlier wrote :

The similarities found in the speeches and the religious standpoint which they represent are due simply to the fact that Luke manufactured those utterances and put his own thoughts into the mouth of both Apostles. Paul is not moulded after a Judaistic type, nor is Peter assimilated to Paul, but Paul and Peter alike have a Lucan, i.e. a catholic, character given them.¹

Cadbury notes not only the general repetitions of thought but also how the same favorite texts from the Septuagint

1. Translated and quoted from Julicher's Einleitung by P. H. Chase: The Credibility of the Acts, p. 107.

are quoted by various speakers and how one sermon is used to supplement another, each contributing to Luke's purpose. As to alleged parallels between the sermons attributed to Peter and the epistles of Peter, or the parallels between the speeches attributed to Paul and the Pauline epistles Cadbury has what seems a strong argument. He lists these parallels, then draws up other lists showing similar parallels between Peter's speeches and Paul's epistles and between Paul's speeches and non-Pauline epistles. Cadbury is sure that all the speeches in Acts obviously come from one mind, as is shown both in language and thought.

(5) Frequent quotations from the Septuagint show that the speeches are not from Aramaic sources.

(6) Certain of the speeches contain glaring errors and anachronisms. Thus Gamaliel's speech in Acts 5 contains reference to an uprising which really did not occur till some years later. Again, Peter, in Acts 1, is made to tell the disciples of the fate of Judas, obviously for the benefit of the reader rather than his hearers.

(7) And finally, as is pointed out most fully by Dibelius, the speeches are given us according to the author's purpose. Each has its place in the plan of the whole book. For example, the sermon of Acts 13 is given

us as an illustration of Paul's synagogue preaching. Again when Luke wants to defend his hero he does so by letting him deliver a series of speeches in his own behalf, in the trial scenes at the end of the book.

In short, there are definite indications here that we are dealing with the work of an artist, one whose concept of history-writing is the imaginative one of his time, who has made use of the current technique of putting speeches in the mouths of his characters in order to present his story in an attractive manner.

Now it must be said that Cadbury has in a sense completely made his case. He cannot really be called in error on any of the above eight points. Yet when the above has been said a great deal remains to be added. Indeed a number of factors seem to indicate that though Cadbury is undoubtedly right that the hand of Luke is to be discerned in every speech yet the sermons do give us an accurate picture of early preaching.

(1) First of all, it will be well to look at the locus classicus for determining the habits of ancient historians, the words of Thucydides, Book I, chapter 22:

As to the speeches which were made either before or during the war, it was hard for me, and for others who reported them to me, to recollect the exact words. I have therefore put into the mouth of each speaker the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I thought he would be likely to express them, while at the same time I endeavored

as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said. Of the events of the war I have not ventured to speak from any chance information, nor according to any notion of my own; I have described nothing but what I either saw myself, or learned from others of whom I made the most careful and particular enquiry...¹

Now this is clear. Thucydides has invented speeches. For his account of the events he has adhered closely to the facts, but the speeches are in a different category. Yet in doing so it ought to be noted carefully that he has tried as nearly as possible to "give the general purport of what was actually said". He is careful to deny that he has written to please his own or his reader's fancy. Even in the speeches he claims to write as a sober historian.

Now therefore if we assume that the sermon in Acts 13 is the "free composition" of Luke as a Greek historian we must also assume that he is trying to give the general purport of what was actually said as accurately as he can. Luke knew Paul. He had heard him speak in similar situations many times. Presumably he could report quite accurately. And similarly, if, as we have seen, Luke was well informed as to the early church, even where he is "freely composing" in the manner of Greek historians we have reason to trust his picture of the early preaching.

(2) Again we must take more note than Cadbury has of the important evidence of the Third Gospel. P. C.

1. Jowett's translation.

Burkitt has given a valuable account of "Luke's Use of Mark" in the second volume of Jackson and Lake's The Beginnings of Christianity. On pages 112 and 116 he discusses its bearing on the speeches in Acts. Burkitt selects the speech in Luke 21:7-36 as one most nearly comparable to those in Acts. Examining this discourse independently Burkitt finds first of all that its vocabulary and style are clearly Lucan. It contains four "Lucan peculiarities" and sixteen peculiarly Lucan words. Especially to be noted also are such phrases as "set your hearts" (cf. Luke 1:66 and Acts 5:4) and "not a hair of your head shall perish" (cf. Acts 27:34). Clearly this discourse would seem to be a "free composition" of Luke. Secondly, Burkitt notices the suspicious circumstance that the siege of Jerusalem is foretold in such detail as to suggest composition after the event. Third, the discourse is placed in an improbable situation, since it does not seem appropriate for a public address. All these arguments, Burkitt says, would have to be raised against the speech's being anything other than the creation of Luke were this discourse to be considered as those in Acts must be. But what are the facts? In this case we have the certain knowledge that the discourse is based directly upon a written source, Mark 13:3-37. In general Luke has stayed close to his sources. It is true that he has reproduced the speech in

his own words. The vocabulary is Lucan. He has interpreted Mark at certain points. And he has changed the setting of the speech. But as to the general content Burkitt gives a summary of the discourse in Luke and writes:

Is this a summary of the speech in Luke? It would stand equally well for that in Mark. The length and detail of the common summary is a measure of the general faithfulness of Luke to his sources, and of the confidence we may reasonably place in his reports of speeches in his second volume.¹

Now it must be said that Cadbury and Dibelius are not entirely unaware of the difficulty this presents for their view. Cadbury mentions the closeness with which Luke sticks to his sources in reporting words of Jesus. He suggests that this offers no analogy because the speeches of Jesus are not in the formal setting of those of Acts, and because Luke regarded the words of Jesus as a special case. But it may be answered that the discourse discussed above, unlike some of the others in the gospel, is in every way analogous to those in Acts. And we must ask how Cadbury knows that Luke regarded the words of Jesus in so different a light as far as reporting is concerned. One suspects Cadbury here is disregarding the known habit of Luke in order to make Luke conform to the habits of secular Greek writers. Dibelius, too, seems to stumble here. He maintains that Acts is in a different category from the gospels. They were not written to Greeks but to the early believers. They were read in

1. F. C. Burkitt, in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. II, p. 115.

churches. But Acts was written to Theophilus and was not used for worship among the believing Christians. To attract the cultured Greek Theophilus Acts has to conform to the pattern of Greek history. It was separated from the gospels in style as in use. Hence its speeches are "freely composed" even though those in the gospels are not. But the obvious error of Dibelius here is that he does not give sufficient consideration to the fact that the Third Gospel was addressed to Theophilus quite as much as was Acts. It is highly doubtful that Luke thought himself to be writing holy scripture in either. Whatever the difference in the use the early community soon gave them Luke seems to have written the two books to the same person in the same way. There seems to be no objective reason whatsoever to set aside Burkitt's argument. And if it stands then we must make certain important modifications in Cadbury's. We may continue to agree with Cadbury that the style and language of the sermons in Acts is that of Luke. We may recognize that he has used the Septuagint instead of the Hebrew scriptures. We may suspect that he has sometimes altered the setting of an address. And yet we must say that in the light of the passage discussed above all these truths tell us not a thing with regard to whether or not Luke is reproducing a written source. Indeed the evidence from our writer's known habit, clearly established in his use of Mark, is that in important doctrinal speeches Luke is adhering

closely to the thoughts of his sources.

(3) A third consideration is the real variety of the speeches. Now there is a definite uniformity about the sermons, as Cadbury has pointed out, and the important significance of this will be discussed below. But at the same time there are certain indications that Luke has not lost sight of the individual thought of the speaker. Cadbury's discussion here is quite misleading. He recognizes the parallels between the sermons attributed to Peter and I Peter. But he answers by another list showing parallels between Peter's sermons and the epistles of Paul (plus Hebrews). The difficulty with his argument, of course, is that the epistles of Paul constitute quite a large body of literature. It would be strange indeed if one could not from all of them find verbal parallels to the little body of Petrine sermons. A true comparison would be that of the parallels between the Petrine sermons and I Peter as compared with a list of parallels drawn from some one epistle of Paul of similar length. This, of course, Cadbury does not attempt. Again Cadbury points to parallels between Paul's speeches and non-Pauline literature, but here again the field is so broad that some parallels are inevitable. Actually the parallels between I Peter and the sermons attributed to Peter are such as to suggest to many that they go back to a common tradition of Petrine thought,¹ and the parallels between Acts 13 and Galatians

1. See E. G. Selwyn: The First Epistle of St. Peter, pp. 33-36.

are too many and too striking to be accidental. These parallels we will examine more fully below in our discussion of the thought of the different sermons.

(4) Even in matters of language and style it is not always clear that the speeches are Lucan. The evidence already listed which has been given by the Aramaic scholars on the question seems to suggest an Aramaic source for at least some of the sermons of Peter. It is of course true that the sermons as we have them are now in Lucan Greek, even unto quotations from the Septuagint. But so is the rest of Acts, including those sections which probably come from ancient and even Aramaic sources. There is no ground in linguistic or any other type of source investigation to pry the sermons loose from the ancient and probably Aramaic sources in which they seem embedded. And linguistically the sermons abound in Hebraisms. F. C. Chase has discussed these at some length.¹ Among his examples are such phrases as ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλείται, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί and υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμι. Their parallels he finds in IV Maccabees, which contains one of the few Jewish sermons we have. IV Macc. 8:19 is perhaps the only known parallel for the phrase ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί. "The whole house of Israel" (Acts 2:13) does not occur again in the New Testament, but it is a frequent phrase in Jewish prayers. The formula "The God of Abraham and of

1. F. C. Chase: The Credibility of the Acts, p. 105ff.

Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our fathers" (Acts 3:13) is the formula with which the first of the Eighteen Benedictions begins. "Sons of the Covenant" (Acts 3:25) has its parallel in Psalms of Solomon 17:17 (Cf. Eph. 30:5). If in such phrases we have the "free composition" of Luke we must say at least that he is composing well. And this is all we need ask.

(5) But the Palestinian flavor of these sermons is more than verbal. (We will postpone discussion of the primitive character of their Christology.) Let us note, for example, the eschatology:

If we compare the eschatology of Acts with that of the Gospels on the one hand, or of the sub-apostolic age on the other, we shall see that it possesses several peculiar characteristics of its own. It is the eschatology of an age when the whole Church was Judaeo-Christian, and as yet untouched by the influence of the Gentile world. In after times Judaeo-Christianity became, first an antiquated school of thought, and later still, a heresy. But in these first days of the Catholic Church, the whole ground work of thought is Jewish to the core, and the outlook for the moment limited to the Chosen People. It almost seems as if the commission to preach to all the nations has passed out of the mind of the Church until the Master recalled it to her memory by the force of outward circumstances.¹

In eschatology, in nationalism, in their continual reliance upon the Old Testament scripture, in their character as apologetics for a Jewish audience, and in their relationship to the problems which the early church must have faced these sermons seem perfectly to reflect the

1. E. C. Dewick: Primitive Christian Eschatology, p. 242.

primitive preaching. One may discover anachronisms in Gamaliel's speech, but no such errors have been found in these sermons. The sermons speak in Jewish terms to a Jewish audience. Ramsay writes, "They are like contemporary documents enclosed in a history written in a later period."

Indeed it must be said that something of this is universally recognized. Cadbury is as aware as Chase of the Jewish characteristics of these sermons. The difference really becomes a question as to whether the author has used written sources or not. Cadbury believes Luke has achieved this picture of Jewish Christianity through the use of "historic imagination" and that the sermons have thus "considerable historical value". "Probably these addresses give us a better idea of the early church than if Luke had striven for realism", he writes.¹ Chase, Ramsay, Goguel and others find it difficult to believe that so vivid and apparently accurate a picture could be the result of the "historic imagination" even of so well-informed a writer as Luke. Goguel, answering Loisy on this point, suggests that for Luke to have produced such Jewish writings as these sermons would have required him to have the insight of a modern critic. But whether or

1. H. J. Cadbury, op. cit., p. 427.

not Luke is using written sources is not the important issue. That it is generally agreed that the picture he gives us is Palestinian is the significant thing. In these sermons we have not the thought of a Greek writer of the sub-apostolic age but that of the original Palestinian church.

(6) But perhaps the most important work of all with regard to these sermons is the research, most of it done since Cadbury's work, with regard to the early kerygma and its form. This work, especially as done by Martin Dibelius and C. H. Dodd, demands our careful attention. It would appear to establish beyond question that the sermons in Acts do give us a true picture of the early Christian preaching.

Something of the nature of the early preaching is suggested by the Greek word used. What we have called "sermons" or "preaching" the New Testament calls κήρυγμα, kerygma.

If the literal meaning of the word is to be pressed, it refers to the function of a herald (keryx) who proclaims an event which has happened or is going to happen. A herald announced the outbreak of a war, the result of a battle, the accession of a king, or the calling of an assembly. His task was not that of arguing or persuading, but simply that of making a fact known.¹

One may hesitate to press the distinction between κήρυγμα and διδασχί quite as far as does C. H. Dodd, for throughout the New Testament there is διδασχί in the κήρυγμα

1. E. F. Scott: Varieties of New Testament Religion, p. 22.

and there is κήρυγμα in the διδασχῆ . But the nature of the κήρυγμα in the New Testament suggests an almost literal fulfilment of the basic meaning of the word.

Friedrich, in Kittl^o's Wörterbuch writes:

At the center of the New Testament kerygma stands Lordship. A sermon, however, is not an explanatory lecture about the essence of the kingdom of God, but proclamation, announcement of an event.¹

It is thus quite different from teaching and moral instruction and exhortation.

Apart from the sermons in Acts, what can we say of the content of this preaching? The New Testament as a whole gives a remarkably consistent picture here. In Appendix I we have listed the references containing the verb κηρύσσω noting where the verb is found, who preaches, and what is preached. From this chart it may be readily seen that the verb is widely distributed throughout the New Testament and that its basic meaning remains everywhere essentially the same. Now especially to be noted are the objects of the verb. Viewed from a simply numerical basis a definite pattern emerges.

The most frequent object of κηρύσσω is the name Ἰησοῦς itself, or some title such as χριστός or κύριος . Thus in Acts 19:13 Paul preaches "Jesus",

1. G. Kittel, editor: Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testaments, Band III, p. 710. (our own translation)

in II Cor. 1:19 "Jesus Christ, the Son of God", and in II Cor. 1:5 "Christ Jesus the Lord". Jesus Himself is that which the early church preached, especially Jesus as Lord and Christ.

But, second, simply following the statistical pattern, stands the list of eleven references to preaching "The Kingdom", ἡ βασιλεία. So John preached (Matt. 3:1), so Jesus Himself preached (Matt. 4:17); and so the disciples preached (Luke 9:12). It is true that these references to preaching the kingdom or to preaching the gospel of the kingdom lie for the most part in the synoptic gospels, but it can hardly be doubted that they reflect not simply the use of the word in the days of Jesus' earthly life but also the practice of the early church. The early preaching, therefore, was an eschatological message: the kingdom is at hand. And this is related to Jesus Himself as Lord and Christ.

Almost equally numerous are the references to preaching the gospel, εὐαγγέλιον. This is often the gospel of the kingdom (Mark 1:14), or it may stand for the Christ-centered message (Gal. 2:2, Col. 1:23). It suggests the "good news" of the eschatological event of Jesus Christ. κηρύσσω is virtually a synonym for εὐαγγελίζω, "to proclaim good tidings."

Eight times the object of κηρύσσω is some account of Jesus' deeds or of the events of his life, death, and resurrection. Five of these occurrences are

accounts of how someone preaches what Jesus has done for him, as the demoniac, Luke 4:39, or the leper, Mark 1:45. Thus preaching is a testimony to Jesus as a power in one's life. The other three are references to the death and resurrection of Jesus (I Cor. 15:11,12).

Finally we may note six references to preaching repentance or forgiveness, which apparently are bound up in the preaching with the good news of the eschatological event in Jesus the Lord.

Beginning with John's proclamation in Matt 3:1, and moving to that of the disciples in Luke 9:2 and on to the post-resurrection message, a connection such as this emerges: The first preaching is the eschatological message of the kingdom. Preaching of the kingdom is always preaching of repentance and the preaching of repentance always preaching of the kingdom. The reason for penitence is the nearness of the kingdom. Hence forgiveness finds its place. Thus preaching is the proclamation of an event. And to the kingdom, ἡ βασιλεία belongs the king, ὁ βασιλεύς. Thus the Lordship of Jesus stands at the center of the message. It is the consistent picture of the New Testament as a whole that the primitive preaching was the proclamation of the eschatological event of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus as the Eschatological Messiah, of His power to save, and of repentance and forgiveness. That the sermons in Acts fit this picture well is obvious.

A second line of approach for establishing the content of the ancient kerygma is that of a study of the Pauline epistles, noting especially those passages which suggest Paul's dependence upon pre-Pauline thought. This work, especially as done by Professors C. H. Dodd and A. M. Hunter, is of great importance in our study.

The locus classicus for this study of course is I Cor. 15.¹ Paul begins by stating that this is the content of his preaching, and that it is that which he himself received. Paul emphasizes this by two technical verbs for "receive" and "hand down", equivalent of the official Jewish terms for the taking over and passing on of tradition. παραλαμβάνειν corresponds to לָקַח and παραδιδόναι to נָתַן . The fourfold use of ὅτι suggests a formula much as quotation marks in modern punctuations. Verse 11 declares that this formula was not the personal creed of Paul but that of Peter and James as well, that of the leaders of the earliest Palestinian community. The ὅτι clauses stop with verse 5, so that we cannot say how much further the paradosis goes, but there is surely the suggestion of the repetition of an established statement of doctrine at least this far. Moreover the emphasis on the matters not directly connected with the resurrection, the subject with which Paul is dealing, suggests that they are brought in as part of

1. We here follow chiefly A. M. Hunter: Paul and His Predecessors, p. 14, 15, and W. Dibelius: From Tradition to Gospel, p. 21.

the formula. If this be true then Paul's preaching, and the preaching of the very first Christians also, emphasized the death of Jesus the Christ as being for our sins and according to the scripture and emphasized the resurrection.

I Thessalonians 1:9,10 gives another summary of Paul's preaching, again with emphasis on the death and resurrection of Jesus as God's Son, his coming to judge the world, and the salvation He has brought.

Dodd, Hunter, and others recognize Rom. 1:2-5 as another statement of a pre-Pauline formula. These verses, according to Hunter,

describe Jesus as a real man who was acknowledged as Messiah (for primitive Christianity the descent from David was important as the guarantee that Jesus was the Messiah foretold in prophecy) and who after (or as a result of) the resurrection of the dead was appointed Son of God. This is not the Christological position of St. Paul. Paul's doctrine - witness Rom. 8:3; I Cor. 10:4; II Cor. 8:9; Gal. 4:4 - is incarnationist; this is adoptionist. In Rom. 1:3ff we learn of One who was a true man born of David's lineage whom God appointed Son of God after the Resurrection. The resurrection is the birthday of the Son of God.¹

Other passages which seem to contain the Pauline or pre-Pauline kerygma are: I Cor. 1:23; 2:1,2; Rom. 10:8,9; Gal. 3:1. All of these and others have been listed and discussed at length by Professor Dodd. In Appendix II we have reproduced Dodd's chart showing the parallels between the pre-Pauline and Pauline kerygma, as found in

1. A. M. Hunter: Paul and His Predecessors, p. 28.

the Pauline epistles, and the sermons in Acts.

By an examination of such passages Dodd is enabled to reconstruct the kerygma according to Paul, a kerygma which Paul claims to share with the primitive Jerusalem church as well. According to Dodd it consists of these points:

The prophecies are fulfilled, and the new Age is inaugurated by the coming of Christ.
 He was born of the seed of David.
 He died according to the Scriptures, to deliver us out of the present evil age.
 He was buried.
 He rose on the third day according to the Scriptures.
 He is exalted at the right hand of God, as Son of God and Lord of quick and dead.
 He will come again as Judge and Saviour of men.¹

Running through the sermons in Acts Dodd now finds an almost identical pattern:

First, the age of fulfilment has dawned...
 Secondly, this has taken place through the ministry, death, and resurrection of Jesus, with proof from the Scriptures that all took place through "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God".
 Thirdly, by virtue of the resurrection, Jesus has been exalted at the right hand of God, as Messianic head of the new Israel...
 Fourthly, the Holy Spirit in the Church is the sign of Christ's present power and glory...
 Fifthly, the Messianic Age will shortly reach its consummation in the return of Christ...
 Finally, the kerygma always closes with an appeal for repentance, the offer of forgiveness and of the Holy Spirit, and the promise of "salvation"..²

1. C.H. Dodd: The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, p..17.

2. Ibid., pp. 21-23.

Paul, then, stands as a sure witness to the primitive quality of the sermons in Acts.

Along somewhat independent lines of form criticism Martin Dibelius has arrived at quite similar results. He, too, notes the same sort of pattern running through each of the sermons in Acts.

If the author of Acts was not bound by the composition of the speeches, but had the right to shape them according to his own ideas (as he feels Cadbury has proved) the question arises why he did not exercise this right with more concern about variations.¹

The author could vary his speeches cleverly to suit his characters when he wished. The logical explanation seems to be that this uniformity reflects a set form in the early preaching.

And the propagation remained subject neither to personal taste, nor to the circumstances of the hour, but took place in a regular manner in the service of certain interests and for the purpose of reaching certain goals.²

Thus he concludes:

The repetition of the message in the course of the preaching in Acts, and the assurance which Paul gives that he himself had received such a message, show that in the handling of the message we are dealing with a widespread custom of Christian missionaries and preachers. In this form the events which formed the basis of all preaching for conversion were brought home to the non-Christian. The Christians were in this manner also ever and again reminded of that piece of history which guaranteed their salvation. We have a right to presuppose such

1. M. Dibelius: From Tradition to Gospel, p. 16.

2. Ibid., p. 13.

a custom both in Aramaic and in Greek speaking regions, for such a mode of carrying on tradition obviously corresponds to use in Palestinian and Hellenistic Judaism.¹

Thus in his discussion of the relationship of the speeches in Acts to Greek literary forms and the habits of Greek historians² Dibelius carefully notes that the sermons are in a class by themselves. We may suppose that many speeches in Acts are composed in the style of the Greek historians. But the Greek tradition offers no parallel to the sermons. These are clearly examples of a unique form, the kerygma. And as typical example of this kerygma Dibelius points to the sermon of Peter in Acts 10. Indeed Dibelius interprets the whole of the New Testament in the light of these sermons. They become the basis especially for his whole approach to the gospels, in which he believes the most primitive stratum to be that most closely associated with the kerygma.

Now all of this research with regard to the kerygma form is of the greatest importance for our study. All of the sermons attributed to Peter and also the sermon in Acts 13 attributed to Paul are in this pattern. There appears therefore to be the strongest sort of evidence

1. M. Dibelius: From Tradition to Gospel, p. 21

2. M. Dibelius: Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die Geschichtschreibung, p. 34.

that these sermons are based squarely on the oldest type of tradition, whether that tradition was written or oral. Moreover we have here a witness to the oldest type of Christology. The kerygma passages in the epistles serve as a yardstick by which we can measure not only the form of the sermons but also their thought about Christ. And in both cases the witness tends altogether to certify the antiquity of the Acts tradition.

Now of course this is not to be pressed too far. What Dodd and the others have shown is that in their form, their outline, the sermons in Acts are primitive. The skeletal structure, as it were, is that of the first preaching. This would seem to be almost beyond doubt. But it remains quite open to question whether the particular expansions of this form which we have in Acts conform to the primitive tradition. The form we must regard as ancient. It remains possible, however, that the content at various places represents the late thought of the author. Therefore in our exposition of the Christology of these sermons in the next section of this thesis we must still examine critically every major idea appended in these sermons to this framework to see what may be said of its antiquity. But at least we may take it that Dodd, Dibelius, and others of this school have made clear that the sermons do at least in form and general outline represent the primitive preaching. And this is a strong indication with regard to the whole.

To summarize this part of the discussion, then, we may conclude the following: (1) Whether "free composition" or not, these speeches come to us from a well informed First Century missionary seeking to write real history. (2) We know from the Third Gospel that Luke's habit was to adhere closely to his sources presenting speeches. (3) The speeches do show certain marks of the thought of those to whom they are attributed. (4) Their language suggests their Palestinian origin and their unity with Luke's Palestinian sources. (5) Their thought seems strictly Jewish-Christian. And (6) they are perfectly in the kerygma mold, both of form and thought, as everywhere attested by the New Testament, as outlined as pre-Pauline by Paul himself, and as clearly recognized by the best form criticism. For these reasons, then, we may approach these sermons as a valid source for determining the thought of the primitive church.

We are now in a position to summarize the first section of this thesis:

This section has been designed as a critical introduction to the sermons in the first half of Acts. We have been concerned with one question: To what extent are these sermons a valid historical source for determining the thought of the primitive church? We have argued that the following points suggest that we

do have here a valuable record of the early preaching:

First, that we do have a trustworthy text, its early variations showing its antiquity.

Second, that the sermons come to us from the pen of Luke, a companion of Paul and himself a First-Century missionary.

Third, that Luke writes as in some sense a real historian, using ancient and perhaps even Aramaic sources.

And, finally, that the sermons themselves betray their primitive character in language, style, thought, and adherence to the oldest kerygma form.

This does not mean that we may trust every sentence in these sermons without further question. In the discussion of their Christology we must still critically examine certain points as they arise. But the above arguments do strongly affirm that in general the sermons constitute a source of the highest value historically for discovering the earliest thought of the church. With this confidence we shall now examine them with a view to determining their Christology.

NOTE ON THE SERMONS OF PETER

THE CHRISTOLOGY OF PETER'S PREACHING

Few would doubt that Luke is accurate in making Peter the spokesman of the early church. A consistent tradition holds that it was he who, when turned, "strengthened the brethren". (Luke 22:32). If Paul maintains a certain independence of Peter he readily acknowledges Peter's priority in time as a man "in Christ". The Synoptics uniformly make him first spokesman of the Great Confession. And in the First Epistle of Peter we have at the very least what an early Christian believed to be an accurate picture of Petrine thought.

By "the sermons of Peter" we here designate five passages. Acts 2:14-39 and Acts 3:12-26 are sermons of Peter to a crowd at Jerusalem. Acts 10:34-43 is to Cornelius, a "God-fearer", and his household, and is generally regarded as the most typical example of the kerygma form. The other two passages, Acts 4:8-12 and Acts 5:29-32, are recorded rather as speeches of defence made by Peter when on trial than as sermons. But these speeches are obviously equally little specimens of the kerygma, not the argued defences which Luke presents in later chapters but proclamations of the gospel.

In considering these sermons together we would

not overlook the fact that each is a unit in itself. The titles suggested by Chase indicate their individuality.¹ The subject of the sermon at Pentecost he calls "Jesus the Nazarene, the enthroned Messiah". The sermon in Acts 3 Chase entitles "Jesus, the Glorified Servant, the Restorer". The defences proclaim "Jesus, Rejected by the Rulers, Raised by God to be the Saviour". And to Cornelius Peter preaches, "Jesus, Lord of All ". That there are also numerous differences and sometimes even contradictions in details we shall note more fully below. But their general similarity and their common ascription to Peter justifies their being considered together.

We shall present the Christological thought of these sermons under five heads. First, we must examine this thought in the light of the eschatological expectation of late Judaism, especially as found in the apocalyptic literature of the Pseudepigrapha. Second, we shall examine it from the standpoint of the Old Testament Messianic hope. Third, we shall investigate the presentation of the historical Jesus in these sermons. Fourth, we shall examine the doctrine of Jesus' exaltation here proclaimed. And finally, we shall discuss those elements of thought about Jesus which seem to spring from the continuing experience of Jesus as a Power present to the church. We proceed now to the first of these.

1. F. C. Chase: op. cit., p. 12.

CHAPTER III. JESUS AS THE FULFILMENT OF THE ESCHATOLOGICAL HOPE OF LATE JUDAISM (IN THE SERMONS OF PETER)

It is a matter of the highest importance for the interpretation of the Petrine sermons in Acts, and a point which (in our opinion) has received too little attention from the majority of commentators, that the framework of these sermons is that of the eschatology of late Judaism.

Luke makes this emphatically clear in the very beginning of the first sermon which he presents. Although the type of thought represented by the quotation from Joel (Acts 2:16-21) is scarcely that most characteristic of Luke himself, the sermons here accorded make this the starting point of Peter's preaching. "This is that which was spoken of ... the last days ... wonders ... signs ... the day of the Lord ..."

That we may not miss the meaning he has altered the Septuagint reading μετὰ ταῦτα, "after these things", to ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, "in the last days". (Compare Is. 2:2; Mic. 4:1; II Tim. 3:1; Heb. 1:2; I John 2:18.) The quotation places us squarely in the world of apocalyptic. The prophesying of common men and women here spoken of was assigned by an early Midrash to the future world.¹ The cosmic signs of the end were well known.

1. Strack-Billerbeck: Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament, Vol. II p. 616.

Speaking of the glorious day when God shall reign and the wicked be destroyed the author of The Assumption of Moses writes (10:5):

And the horns of the sun shall be broken and he shall be turned into darkness: and the moon shall not give her light, and be turned wholly into blood.

(Compare Matt. 24:29.) The first Christian preaching includes the proclamation of The Great and Terrible Day of the Lord.

Our concern here is to note that the influence of the eschatological and apocalyptic literature goes beyond the framework of the sermons to the Christology itself. Where in the Old Testament can one find reference to a man appointed by God to be "the Judge of quick and dead" (Acts 10:42)? Where in the Old Testament can one find this mysterious Figure "whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things" (Acts 3:21)? Indeed, for the very title $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ as applied to a coming cosmic being we must turn to such a work as I Enoch. In spite of differences to be noted, it is clearly in relation to this literature, we shall argue, that the sermons in Acts are (in part at least) to be understood.

That this really was the nature of the first Christian preaching seems likely. True, serious scholars have argued that there was little Messianic expectation in late Judaism, that first century eschatology was wholly the product of Christianity. Others have argued

exactly the reverse, that Christianity was simply the product of this hope. The truth would appear to be between these two extremes. By the first century one apocalyptic work was already universally known (Daniel), and others had their influence. Yet it is true that in that type of Judaism which was making so strong an appeal to the Greco-Roman world, the type seen in Philo, eschatological and Messianic expectation had fallen far into the background. The eschatological-apocalyptic type of thought was Eastern, especially Palestinian. It was on Palestinian soil that Jesus was recognized as the promised Messiah-Christ, who would come to judge the world. This proclamation sprang not from Alexandria with its Logos thought but from Jerusalem and the earliest days. W. Bousset has perhaps overstated his case in excluding certain other types of thought from early Christology, but he is undoubtedly right that the gospels show clearly that the "Son of Man" type of thought was firmly embedded in the mind of the earliest church.¹

Unfortunately we cannot draw a portrait of the Messiah of First Century expectation even in Palestine.

... it cannot be too strongly emphasized that there was no generally accepted opinion, no organized and consistent teaching, above all no orderly Messianic doctrine possessing the faintest shadow of authority. The thing itself was of faith, all the rest was free field

1. W. Bousset: Kyrios Christos, p. 5 ff.

for imagination.¹

However, G. Schürer endeavors to construct an outline of this expectation in a pattern which offers certain striking analogies to that of Acts: (1) the last tribulation and perplexity, or "travail of the Messiah"; (2) Elijah's coming as forerunner; (3) the appearing of the Messiah; (4) the last attack of the Hostile Powers; (5) the destruction of the Hostile Powers; (6) the renovation of Jerusalem; (7) the gathering of the dispersed; (8) the Kingdom of Glory in Palestine; (9) the renovation of the world; (10) the general resurrection; and (11) the last judgment.² This is only a very general pattern, and not every work of late Judaism can be fitted even into it. Nevertheless, the parallels between this outline and Acts make it clear that we are here on common ground. The Messiah appears, the hostile powers attack, but their overthrow is imminent, a time of renovation is at hand, a glorious kingdom is coming, and there is to be a resurrection and judgment to salvation and condemnation. We are amply justified, therefore, in beginning our interpretation of the Christology of these sermons in the light of the pseudepigraphic and apocalyptic literature.

1. Jackson & Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. I, p. 356.

2. G. Schürer: A History of the Hebrew People, Div. II, Vol. II, pp. 154 ff.

1) First of all we may note two titles applied to Jesus which abound in and at least in part derive their meaning from this late Jewish literature.

Of all titles applied to Jesus clearly the most important is the title $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, Christ. Consistent tradition has it that it was Peter who thus proclaimed his Master. Luke emphasizes its importance by recording this title as the very climax of Peter's first sermon: "Let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ!" (Acts 2:36)

Luke's use of $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ this way is especially significant. Even by the time of Paul's epistles the term, unintelligible to Gentile ears, had already come to be used rather as a proper name. For Paul the formula "Jesus Christ" is a presupposition. Luke also uses $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ as a proper name.

It is only either when, as it were, he stops to think, or when he is reproducing his sources, that he uses the word as a title.¹

That in the sermons he carefully uses the term as a title is a tribute to Luke's historical accuracy.

The first Christology, then, if we may use a redundant expression, was a "Christ Christology". What did

1. H. J. Cadbury, in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. I, p. 367.

the title mean?

That this word carried with it certain Old Testament connotations we shall note more fully in the next chapter. But here it is our concern to emphasize a fact often overlooked: nowhere in the Old Testament is the title used of a heavenly figure comparable to that described by Peter. The only possible exception is the highly debatable one of Daniel 9:25,26. And even if the interpretation be rejected that Daniel here refers to a contemporary figure this is the exception which proves the rule. Daniel is itself probably the latest book of the Old Testament and an apocalyptic work. For a parallel which will enable us to understand Peter's use of the term we must turn to late Judaism.

Following the authority of R. H. Charles¹ we take it that the first extant use of the term "Anointed One" as applying to a coming agent of God promised for the future is that of I Enoch (48:10; 72:4). Here we meet a wholly transcendent being; for it would appear that the title "Anointed One" of I Enoch 48:10 is simply another name for the figure which in the same passage is called "Son of Man" (48:2) and "The Elect One" (49:2). A modern critic might be able to pry these titles apart or to ascribe them to different sources, but Peter

1. R. H. Charles: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigraphy, Vol. II, p. 185.

and his contemporaries can hardly have failed to assume that they referred to the same Person. "Christ" here stands as the title for a cosmic Spirit, now in heaven with God, utterly holy and righteous, a Man, chosen from all eternity, who is soon to judge the world at the last judgment and resurrection, and to rule in glory. This, we maintain, is what Peter means in calling Jesus "the Christ".

G. S. Duncan¹, Jackson and Lake², and others press the distinction between "Christ" and "Son of Man" in Jewish thought. It is doubtless true that a more typical picture of the Messiah as drawn by late Judaism is that of The Psalms of Solomon 17 and 18. Here the title is applied to a coming king, a son of David, who is pictured as restoring the monarchy in ideal form. Yet even here, though the Messiah is a man, he almost breaks the bonds of human limitations. He is sinless, miraculously empowered with strength, understanding, and righteousness, and filled with the Spirit of the Lord. Thus even this passage attests the tendency of late Judaism to transcend human limitations in its picture of the expected "Christ".

On the other hand, Duff is probably going too far in arguing that the title applied to Jesus is an ascrip-

1. G. S. Duncan: Jesus, Son of Man, p. 66.

2. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. I, p. 371.

tion of divinity.¹ He takes the phrase *χριστός κύριος* of Ps. Sol. 17:36 in the light of 17:38 and of 17:51, which he translates "Jahweh Himself is King..." He also takes the heading of Psalm of Solomon 18 *ψάλμος τῷ Σαλαμωνῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ χριστοῦ κυρίου* as presenting "Lord" and "Christ" as synonymous.² Thus he argues that Jahweh Himself is the predicted Messiah. *χριστός* becomes a title partaking of the divine attributes of *κύριος*. When Jesus was called "Christ" he was actually being given a title "Solomon" applied to God. There is much in this that is highly questionable. Charles explanation of the *χριστός κύριος* of 17:36 is that it represents an error of translation from the Hebrew construct form *היהוה יהוה*. This seems quite possible. The genitive of the title of Psalm 18 is much more likely that of the familiar phrase "Anointed of the Lord". Yet it is undeniably true that the picture here and elsewhere of Jahweh as himself ruling over his people is of great importance. Here as in many other places the ascription of full divinity to the Messiah becomes latent if not yet explicit.

Thus, though the term "Christ" was used in many ways, its use in Peter's sermons seems best understood in

1. A. Duff: "The Rise of the Title 'Messiah' ", Expositor, 8th series, Vol. XXV, 1923, pp. 205-215.

2. For a discussion of the title *κύριος*, see the next chapter of this thesis.

the light of the passage from I Enoch discussed above. Jesus is not a temporal ruler belonging to the present age of time and mortality. Rather as the wholly transcendent being of Enoch does Peter's Christ appear. Thus Peter can say of him, as we would translate:

And he shall send the Christ appointed for you (cf. Enoch's "Elect One"), Jesus, whom it is necessary for heaven to receive until the time of restoration of all things... (Acts 3:20,21)

As "Christ" Jesus is preached to be as a heavenly being utterly beyond human limitations, now in heaven, and soon to preside at a cosmic judgment.

A second title best understood in the light of late Jewish apocalyptic is ὁ δίκαιος , the Righteous One.¹ This title, used of Jesus only in the sermons in Acts (3:14; 7:52) is recognized even by such cautious scholars as Jackson and Lake as probably applied to Jesus by the earliest Jerusalem church.²

As a name for the coming One it is found twice in Enoch:

And when the Righteous One shall appear before the eyes of the righteous...
Where then will be the dwelling of the sinners...
(I Enoch 38:2)

And after this the Righteous and Elect One shall cause the house of his congregation to appear...

1. For a discussion of its association with cultic ideas see below, p 139; and for its association with "the Servant of the Lord" see chapter V below.

2. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 83.

And these mountains shall not stand as the earth before his righteousness... (I Enoch 53:6,7)

And righteousness is repeatedly stated to be a quality of the Son of Man:

This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness With whom dwelleth righteousness... (I Enoch 46:3)

This is the Son of Man who is born unto righteousness, And righteousness abides over him, And the righteousness of the Head of Days forsakes him not... (I Enoch 71:14)

This is also essential to the character of the coming messiah of the Psalms of Solomon (17:35) but "The Righteous One" is not here used as a title as in Acts and I Enoch. If we are right in the connection we seek to establish then the title "The Righteous One" is to be understood as a name having connotations of coming cosmic judgment.

2) The concept of Jesus as now enjoying a hidden existence with God is an even more striking indication that the early Church looked upon him as the Messiah of the apocalypses.

That Peter pictures Jesus as being now in heaven in a position of special favor, awaiting the time when he will return to judge the earth, is made very clear. Jesus is pictured as being at God's right hand (Acts 2:34 and possibly 2:33 and 6:31); and he is now received in heaven in exaltation until the final cosmic event (Acts 3:21).

This concept of the concealment of the Messiah is of course without Old Testament parallel. But the

writings of late Judaism shed much light upon it. Of the Son of Man "Enoch" writes:

And for this reason hath he been chosen and hidden
before Him,
Before the creation of the world and forevermore.
(48:6)

And the kings and the mighty and all who possess
the earth shall bless and glorify and extol him
who rules over all, who was hidden.
For from the beginning the Son of Man was hidden,
And the Most High preserved him in the presence
of His might,
And revealed him to the elect. (62:6,7)

And this concept is by no means confined to Enoch.

IV Esdras 13 pictures the Messiah as rising from the sea, and adds, "This is he whom the Most High reserves for many times, through whom he will save creation." (IV Esdras 13:26) Justin's Dialogue with Trypho (chapter 8) seems to reflect an early Jewish attempt to reconcile this idea with that of Davidic sonship. In it there is reference to the legend that the Messiah has been born of a human mother but a tempest has blown him away to his place of concealment. The Jew says:

Christ, even if he has been born and exists anywhere, is unknown and does not yet even know himself until Elias shall come and anoint him, and make him manifest to all.¹

The Targum of Micah 4:8 gives the reason for the concealment of the Messiah: "on account of the offences of the congregation of Zion."

Here again, therefore, Acts and the late Judaistic

1. J. Drummond: The Jewish Messiah, p. 281.

writings seem somewhat in accord and the influence of the contemporary expectation upon the first Christology is made clear.

In passing it may be noted that while the sermons make no mention of Jesus' pre-existence, in the light of the passages quoted above it is clear that if we are right in our belief that the earliest Christology presented Jesus as like Enoch's Son of Man then the idea of pre-existence was latent from the very first. The status of Jesus at the right hand of God is, however, for the sermons primarily a matter of the exaltation, a marked departure from any psuedepigraphic thought.

3) A third enlightening parallel lies in that the early Christians, like the writers of the Jewish apocalypses, awaited the manifestation of Christ as a coming cosmic event, to be accompanied by the "restoration of all things."

It is this which explains the $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ spoken of in Acts 3:21 as associated with Christ's coming. We have already noted that Schürer lists the renovation of Jerusalem and later the renovation of all the world as standard parts of the eschatological pattern. The curse which was put upon the earth at the fall is removed with the manifestation of the Messiah.

And I will transform the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light:
And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing... (IEnoch 45:5)

Schultz calls this the hope of "the last age- a glorified replica of the creation epoch, so that the beginning and the end complete the cycle".¹ Some pictured this restoration at the beginning of Messiah's reign (I Enoch 45: 4,5), others, at the conclusion (IV Esdras 7:30,31).

Peter's Christ was to be the Great Restorer.

4) Much more significant is the fact that Jesus is presented as the eschatological judge of all humanity at this manifestation.

According to Acts the proclamation of Jesus as judge was of the utmost importance in the first preaching. Peter, in Acts 10:42, is pictured as making this the sum of the message which the risen Christ had commissioned the disciples to preach:

And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the Judge [κρίτης] of quick and dead.

And there is at least an implied reference to this judgment in the exhortation to repent and to receive salvation which finds its place in every sermon attributed to Peter (Acts 2:38, 3:19; 4:12; 6:31; 10:43).²

Here again we are on familiar ground. In II Baruch 40:1,2 we read:

1. H. Schultz: Old Testament Theology, Vol. II, p. 365. Note the concept of a redeemed nature in the prophets (Is. 35:1 ff; Amos 9:13, etc. compare Gen. 3:17) and the New Testament references to the Genesis story (I. Cor. 15:22, 45; Rev. 22:2). The last age is no mere repetition of the first, but many elements are repeated.

2. Note that Mark 1:15 pictures something very like this as a summary of Jesus' first preaching.

My Messiah will convict him (the evil leader) of all his impieties, and will gather and set before him all the works of his hosts. And afterwards he will put him to death, and protect the rest of My people.

Again in II Baruch 72:3 we find:

After the signs have come... and the time of my Messiah is come, he shall both summon all the nations, and some of them he shall spare, and some of them he shall slay.

And I Enoch abounds in pictures of the Elect One as judge (45:3; 49:4; 55:4; 61:8, etc.). Angels, devils, Israel, the gentiles, the living, and the dead are all judged by the Son of Man - Elect One - Messiah. As this judge Peter pictured Jesus.

That God is frequently pictured as Himself the Judge points to one more path to the ultimate ascription of deity to Jesus.

5) Closely bound to the thought of Messiah as Judge in these sermons is the proclamation of Christ as the Saviour of the penitent elect. Here again the parallels in Jewish literature both confirm the accuracy of Luke's picture and increase our understanding of the original meaning.

The proclamation of the Messiah was the proclamation of salvation. Every sermon of Peter has this at its climax. Only once is the title "Saviour" used (Acts 5:32), but salvation has its place along with judgment as a basic part of the kerygma. In the sermons of Peter this salvation will be found to be connected with two ideas: the chosen people, and ethical fitness. The

Gentile Luke does not fail to record that the first proclamation was to the elect race.

For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all them that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. (Acts 2:39)

Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers... Unto you first God... sent Him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities. (Acts 3:25,26).

Him God exalted with his right hand... to give repentance to Israel... (Acts 5:31)

But though salvation is associated with the chosen people it is based on repentance and faith. "Repent!" is the exhortation of the first two sermons ascribed to Peter (Acts 2:38; 3:19); and repentance is a gift given by Jesus (Acts 5:31; 3:26). Thus Jesus is Himself the Bestower of salvation. Salvation is for those alone who stand in a special relation to him.

For there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved. (Acts 4:12; cf. 3:16 and 10:43)

Now all of this appears exactly in line with certain ideas of the eschatology of late Judaism. Here also we see the Messiah as the agent of salvation, that salvation being bestowed upon the penitent elect.

For in those days the Elect One shall arise,
And he shall choose the righteous and holy from
among them:
For the day has drawn nigh that they should be
saved. (I Enoch 51:1,2; cf. 45:3-6; Testament
of Levi 2; Psalms of Solomon 17:33)

The Old Rabbinic literature repeatedly called the Messiah "Saviour" and described him as saving from sin. According to the rabbis at Messiah's coming the wicked and

the devils would be condemned and there would be a new communication of spirit which would turn the people of Israel to a new walk.¹

If Israel would together repent for a whole day, the redemption by Messiah would ensue. (Targum of Micah 6:8)

It is the Messiah who will with righteous omnipotence destroy the wicked at the judgment and who will deliver God's chosen people. But even in the more violent forms of this picture the redemption to be effected by the Messiah is never thought of entirely apart from considerations of righteousness, purity of heart, and return to God. The Messiah who judges is the Saviour of the penitent elect.

It is true that it has been argued that this title, "Saviour", was rather one first bestowed upon Jesus by Hellenists. This is based on the fact that "Saviour" is a common title for the emperor and that while appearing in the genuine epistles of Paul only twice (Eph. 5:23;² Phil. 3:20), it is more frequent in later works. However, Wilfred Knox is probably right in supporting exactly the opposite view. As he points out, Luke's use of the title is confined to intensely Jewish passages: the infancy narrative and the sermons. Rather it would appear that it was precisely as Christianity faced emperor worship

1. Strack-Billerbeck: op. cit., p. 67.

2. We here assume with A. H. McNeile, E. F. Scott, F. K. Abbott, etc., the Pauline authorship of Ephesians.

and the other saviour-cults of the hellenistic world that the title fell into disfavor.

Jesus as the creative Logos-Wisdom of Judaism could be represented as one with the supreme God; as a saviour he would in the hellenistic world have been in danger of becoming merely one of many saviours.¹

"Saviour" again became an accepted title for Jesus only at a time when the Church felt sufficiently sure of its position to use the language of Gentile religions without endangering the faith of its members.² The salvation offered in these sermons by Jesus the "Saviour" is exactly that combination of election, forgiveness, and purification characteristic of Palestinian thought. It is to the "Son of Man" rather than to Caesar that we must look for an understanding of Peter's term.

That Jahweh Himself was often pictured as Saviour is but one more fact suggesting that the ascription of deity to Jesus was latent in the first preaching.

6) Finally, in this connection we must note the relationship between Christ and the Holy Spirit as described by Peter and paralleled in the non-canonical Jewish writings.

1. W. Knox: Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity, p. 41.

2. For a discussion of a similar theory with regard to the title κύριος see chapter IV below. It is there argued that this title was early used in spite of similar competition from Gentile religions.

In the Petrine sermons this relationship appears to be two-fold. First, Jesus is Himself the one uniquely anointed with the Spirit. The very title "Christ" means "Anointed One". And the anointing with the Spirit is specifically affirmed (Acts 10:38). On the other hand, the Anointed One is himself pictured as pouring out the Spirit upon men (Acts 2:33). Again this is a function which in the Old Testament is exclusively ascribed to Jahweh.

Here again, whatever his means of research, Luke has placed us squarely in the world of Jewish expectation. I Enoch offers several analogous statements of the anointing of the Elect One.¹

And the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him (I Enoch 62:2).

And in him dwells the spirit of wisdom,
 And the spirit which gives insight,
 And the spirit of understanding and of might,
 And the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness. (I Enoch 49:3)

Even more striking is the passage from the Testament of Judah which combines both the thought of the anointing of the Messiah and that of the pouring out of the spirit upon others, all in the context of judgment and salvation.

And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace (cf. Acts 10:36)
 And a man shall arise (from my seed) like the sun of righteousness;
 Walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness;
 And no sin shall be found in him.

1. The "Servant of the Lord" was also anointed with the Spirit (Is. 61:1). This is discussed in chapters V and VII below.

And the heavens shall be opened to him,
 To pour out the spirit, even the blessing of the
 Holy Father;
 And He shall pour out the spirit of grace upon
 you;
 And ye shall walk in His commandments first and
 last...
 Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth:
 And from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to
 the Gentiles,
 To judge and to save all that call upon the Lord.
 Testament of Judah 24:1-6)¹

It is precisely this relationship to the Spirit of God which sets the Anointed One apart from all the rest of creation. In the light of the above background we may understand that for Peter the fact of Christ's power, his proclamation of peace, his judgeship, and his righteousness all flow from the Spirit which is the Spirit of power, wisdom, righteousness, and peace. It is through this Spirit that the Messiah is the Saviour of men. And this Spirit is utterly supernatural. Nowhere is it connected with normal events.² It is the Spirit of the transcendent God.

From our study of these parallels, therefore, two conclusions emerge.

First, these sermons as Luke has recorded them seem to fit remarkably well their context in Judaism's Messianic

1. We here follow R.H. Charles in taking the above passage as pre-Christian.

2. P. G. Hopwood: The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church, pp. 68-71.

expectation. Whether Luke has been able to give such an accurate picture by means of remarkable historical insight or simply by careful adherence to ancient sources is a question which perhaps we can never fully decide. But the fact remains that at point after point we are able to verify the Palestinian character of these sermons from the parallels in the pseudepigraphic writings.

The general impression created by this Christology is that it is thoroughly Jewish and primitive. We may put it this way: if these are not exactly the things that were said about Jesus in the primitive church they are surely the kind of things that were said.¹

In these sermons, we conclude, we have a real picture of the Christology of the Primitive Church.

The second conclusion to which our comparisons have led us has to do with the nature of this Christology. If we are right in our argument thus far, then we must conclude that from the very beginning the early Church preached Jesus as a transcendently supernatural Being, whose coming had brought all of history to its final stage. The whole grand sweep of Heilsgeschichte had found its embodiment and focal point in him. Jesus, risen from the dead, was seen as the peculiarly-endowed, Spirit-filled agent of God's cosmic judgment and blessing, now concealed on high with God in glory, and soon to return for

1. A. Hunter: Paul and His Predecessors, p. 100

the final cataclysmic event. In short, all that was grandest in the visions of such writers as "Enoch" had found its fulfilment in Him.

So much we may say with assurance. Late Messianism and primitive Christology are as alike as father and son. Jesus is called "Christ" and "The Righteous One". He is pictured as existing in heaven along with the Father, awaiting a glorious manifestation. He is proclaimed the judge of all and the saviour of the penitent elect. And He is the embodiment of the Spirit of God.

But when all this has been said certain cautions must be noted. In spite of all similarities the Christ of the sermons is not exactly the Elect One of Enoch. According to our sermons Christology has profound differences from Jewish apocalyptic. Certain of these must now be noted.

1) First we must note that the origin of primitive Christian eschatology (and thus Christology) lay not in hardship and despair but in a joyful event.

It is a universal characteristic of apocalyptic literature that it is the product of troublous times. It is persecution which breeds it. It is somber if brave literature. The Elect One of Enoch is a last desperate hope. But the primitive Christian expectation - unlike any comparable - sprang to life in the triumph of Easter and the power of Pentecost. Neither despair nor wishful

thinking seems to have the slightest place in Peter's picture of the eschatological Messiah. He can speak not simply of a Messiah hoped for or dreamed of but of One whose triumph had been publicly manifested and already begun. "This is that which was spoken of..." Here primitive Christology leaves Jewish Messianism far behind.¹

2) A second difference is that in their picture of the Messiah these sermons lack certain elements common in the Pseudepigrapha, such as a tendency to vindictiveness and certain wild speculations. Just as apocalypses usually emerge from periods of persecution by some enemy, so it is not uncommon for them to picture the Messiah as scoring a bloody triumph over that foe. The Christ of the sermons of Peter is a judge, but He is not an avenger. Rather it is forgiveness that He brings. Nor do we find in these sermons speculative demonology and cosmology and their accompanying descriptions of the physical appearance of the Messiah. Jesus is not given the nature or clearly defined status of some demon or demi-god. The memory of Jesus' earthly life was too fresh for that.

1. As Oscar Cullmann says, "The chronologically new thing which Christ brought for the faith of Primitive Christianity consists in the fact that for the believing Christian the mid point since Easter, no longer lies in the future. This recognition is of immense importance... the completely revolutionary assertion, which is shared by the entire Primitive Christian Church, that the mid-point of the process has already been reached." Christ and Time, p. 81.

3) A third notable point here is that Peter's Christology is based not simply on late Judaism but on the Old Testament itself.

It is this fact which we shall consider more fully in the next chapter. Here it is sufficient simply to call attention to the fact that it is as the one prophesied by the prophets that Peter preaches Jesus. Important as we have seen the apocalyptic element to be, we shall see that it is not to this alone, or perhaps even primarily, that Peter turns. Rather he points to the canonical scriptures themselves.

4) Finally - and this is the greatest revolution of all - primitive Christology differs from Jewish Messianism in that all is brought into relationship with the historic person Jesus of Nazareth.

This again is a point to be developed more fully below. Here we must simply remark that the preaching of a Messiah who had been crucified was so completely opposed to contemporary ideas that the Jewish nation as a whole never did accept it. Yet it was this which gave new redemptive significance to the whole. It was only the living personality of Jesus which could endow the picture of the Messiah with attributes that could awaken love and reverence and fidelity. And it was His resurrection which gave Christian eschatology its ultimate guarantee.

In the first Christian preaching Jesus was pro-

claimed to be the Messiah for whom current speculation hoped.
But He was also preached as something radically different,
as something much more.

CHAPTER IV JESUS AS THE FULFILMENT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT (in the sermons of Peter)

In spite of all the affinities with the ideas of Jewish pseudepigraphic apocalyptic noted in the preceding chapter, primitive Christology drew more deeply from other and richer sources for its greatest thoughts. For the words and thoughts with which it described Jesus, the early church reached not only back to but also behind the apocalyptic thinking of its day to the pages of canonical scripture itself. This at least is the testimony of the sermons in Acts.

This is not altogether surprising. The pseudepigraphic literature itself was based on scripture. Even the weirdest passages of I Enoch abound in quotations from the canonical books, and whatever its debt to Persian influence may have been its debt to the Old Testament is immeasurably greater. Even those ideas which in the preceding chapter we have listed as especially prominent in this type of Messianism have roots in Hebrew scripture. However enlightening it may be, the attempt to reconstruct primitive Christology in terms of these non-canonical works can be at best only partially successful. We turn, therefore, to the Old Testament and its relationship to early Christology as exhibited in the sermons of Peter.

First of all we must note the tremendous importance which the first preaching attached to the idea of Jesus as the Fulfiller and Fulfilment of the Old Testament.

The appeal to prophecy was essential to the kerygma. It formed a part of every sermon. The sermons of Peter abound in explicit statements of this message.

... this is that which was spoken by the prophet...
(Acts 2:16)

But those things, which God before had showed by the mouth of all his prophets... (Acts 3:16)

... which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began. For Moses truly said... (Acts 3:21,22)

Yee, and all the prophets from Samuel and those that follow after, as many as have spoken, have likewise foretold of these days. (Acts 2:24)

To him give all the prophets witness... (Acts 10:43)

Not simply was the claim that Jesus was the fulfilment of the Old Testament an explicit part of the preaching, it was proved by quotation after quotation and was implied in every sentence. Nestle's revised edition of the Greek New Testament notes in bold type sixteen quotations from the Old Testament in twenty-three of the sixty verses of these sermons. Each sermon is a mosaic of Old Testament words and thoughts.

All of the Old Testament was regarded as pointing to Jesus: the law, the prophets, and the writings. It was the amazing claim of the infant church that the whole of the Old Testament was written for them. The very strainedness of his exegesis of certain passages testifies to Peter's confidence that Jesus could be found everywhere in scripture (eg. Acts 4:11).

As far as our evidence goes, it was the claim of Christians from the beginning that Jesus was Messiah, not because he fulfilled this or that particular line of Messianic prophecy, but because he was the fulfilment of the age-long Jewish religious hope as a whole. The burden of the apostolic kerygma in Acts is that Jesus, in his life, death, and resurrection, is the fulfilment of all the prophecies (Acts 3:18,21; 24; 10:43, etc.).¹

He was, as Cullmann says, "the Mid-point of the redemptive line of history".

Conversely, every fact preached about Jesus was regarded as having been prophesied in scripture. In Appendix III we have reproduced Hebert's interesting presentation of this fact. Following Dodd's suggestion as the outline of the kerygma he develops each part of a typical sermon simply out of the quotations from the Old Testament used in the sermons in Acts. As every part of scripture bore witness to Jesus so every fact about Jesus was the fulfilment of scripture. Jesus was the Promised One.

That this is an accurate picture of early thought need not be doubted. Rendel Harris (Testimonies, 1920) argued that the first document of Christian literature was a collection of proof texts pointing to Jesus. This general idea has recently been abundantly demonstrated and developed in two recent books: C. H. Dodd's According to the Scriptures (1952) and B. P. W. Strather Hunt's Primitive Gospel Sources (1951). Taken together these

1. A. Hunter: Paul and His Predecessors, p. 102.

books may be said to demonstrate quite clearly the importance of the Jewish canon to the primitive church. Strather Hunt argues for the early existence of a book of "testimonies". Dodd finds behind even this a system of Old Testament exegesis using especially a number of the passages quoted in our sermons and finding in them pictures of the Christ. This system lies behind Paul, John, and the author of Hebrews, goes back evidently to the very beginnings of the Church.

In this chapter we shall discuss three features of the Old Testament thought applied to Jesus. First, we shall discuss Jesus as the Davidic Messiah. Second, we shall note the concept of Jesus as the "Prophet like unto Moses". And finally we shall note certain Old Testament ideas not thus explicit but latent in the Petrine Christology.

1) The focal point of the preaching that Jesus was the fulfilment of the Old Testament was the proclamation of Jesus as the promised Davidic Messiah.

The influence of the Old Testament upon the Christology of the first preaching was actually much broader than this. We shall note certain expansions and accompaniments of this central idea. But it was around this chief truth that the others clustered. And it is therefore in relation to this idea that we may consider three Old Testament titles which Peter applies to Jesus: "Christ", "Son of God", and "Lord".

We have already noted the relationship of the title

"Christ" to post-canonical Jewish apocalyptic. One must not, however, overlook the Old Testament connotations of the word.

Anointing, of course, is especially the ceremony whereby a man is made king (I Sam. 15:1,17; II Sam. 2:4; I Kings 1:34). Basically however "the Anointed One" is a title with a broader meaning. Anointing set aside a man for a special task, consecrated him to his calling. The servant of the Lord was anointed to preach (Is. 61:1). Also priests and cultic objects were anointed (Ex. 30:30; 40:10; Lev. 4:5). Anointing, therefore, symbolized entrance into a special relationship with God. That something of this basic meaning was retained when the title was applied to Jesus is suggested by Acts 10:38 (cf. Is. 11:2).¹ Even in the technical sense of the promised Davidic Messiah something more is meant by the title "Christ" than simply "king".

First, the Messiah would be in an altogether special sense God's minister, God's gift to His people, the God-appointed Saviour. His very name betokened this. The "Anointed One" is but an abbreviation of "The Lord's Anointed One". He would be the perfect realization of the character of the theocratic king. He would stand in a peculiar relationship of union with and dependence upon Jehovah. The stamp of God's authority would be visibly upon Him; the favour of God would be manifestly with Him.²

1. For further discussion of the relationship of anointing and the spirit see Chapter VII.

2. V. Stanton. The Jewish and the Christian Messiah, p.147.

A second point to be noted is that Jewish "Messianic" expectation involved a great deal more than a coming king. Indeed, many Old Testament passages which might be called "Messianic" present a picture of "the kingdom of God" without mentioning an individual Messiah (Amos 9:11 - 15; Jer. 31; Joel 2:18-32). Thus when the individual Messiah appears and the hope is concentrated upon him he becomes the embodiment of all this large expectation.

But, again, in the Messiah the hearts' yearnings would find absolute satisfaction. His coming was the goal of Hope; in it would be found the final fulfilment of all that had been promised to the fathers. Each successive prophet only pointed to Him; each righteous and successful king only typified Him... The long vista of expectation was closed with His form.¹

When, therefore, Peter makes the climax of his first sermon the proclamation that Jesus is "the Christ" we may assume that he meant something more than that Jesus was the judge of the apocalypses or even a promised king. Jesus was also the One peculiarly consecrated by God to be the Fulfilment of all Israel's hope.

The concept of Jesus as "Son of David" (the second Messianic" title to be discussed here) has small place in the Petrine sermons. However, Acts 2:30 makes clear that Peter accepted it as fact that Jesus was of David's line.

... knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the

1. ibid.

flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne...
(Acts 2:30, following Vaticanus with Ropes).

"Son of David" is not used as a title for Jesus, but his Davidic lineage is inferred from its prominent place in the Old Testament expectation. The particular passage here meant is probably Psalm 132, especially verses 10 and 11.

Here again it would seem that Luke's report is in accord with the historic facts. W. Bousset argues that the primitive community carefully avoided the title "Son of David".¹ He notes that in all of Mark it is applied to Jesus only once (10:47,48), and Mark 12:35-37 he interprets as an attack on this idea. We have already indicated our agreement with Bousset that the earliest Christology reflected the influence of the apocalyptic literature. However, the Petrine sermons suggest that even the earliest Christology was broader than a simple "Son of Man" expectation. Bousset agrees that "Christ" was an early title for Jesus, and while we have noted the eschatological connotation of this title it is clear that it also was associated with kingship and hence the Davidic line. We have already noted that in I Enoch the concept of the Elect One takes up into itself distinct elements from the prophet's presentation of the Davidic King. There seems no reason, therefore, to suppose that both ideas may not have had a

1. W. Bousset: Kyrios Christos, p. 4,5.

place side by side even in the earliest Christology. This view receives additional confirmation if one accepts Dodd's interpretation that Romans 1:3-5 contains a primitive formula or creed. Here again Jesus is said to be of the seed of David "according to the flesh". Moreover, the fact that Matthew and Luke give us two widely differing genealogies of Jesus tracing his ancestry back to David suggests that Jesus' Davidic sonship was a matter of faith before it was historically attested. The church in widely scattered areas accepted the common faith that as the promised Messiah Jesus was descended from David. The conflicting genealogies suggest different attempts to prove what was already in different places a matter of faith. The title "Son of David" did not come from the genealogical tables. The genealogies came from it. We take it that Luke is accurate in making Davidic sonship an incidental part of the first preaching, an inference from the concept of Jesus as the promised Messiah, though "Son of David" is not yet the characteristic title.

Somewhat more difficult, however, is the question of the third title to be considered, "Lord", *κύριος*, Kyrios. We believe Acts to be correct in making it a title used by the primitive church and in associating it with Psalm 110. But this interpretation requires considerable discussion.

It is one of the lasting contributions of Bousset's Kyrios Christos that he has enabled Christian scholarship as never before to visualize the worship of the "Lord" Jesus in its context of the worship of pagan "Lords" of the Greco-Roman cults. His work furnishes a most erudite

historical commentary on the saying of Paul:

For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or on earth; as there are gods many, and lords many; yet to us there is one God.. and one Lord, Jesus Christ... (I Cor. 8:5,6)

Yet many would question Bousset's excluding the idea of "Lordship" from the earliest Palestinian Christology.

Bousset argues that it was the Greek-speaking church which first applied the title "Lord" to Jesus. Jackson and Lake follow him in this. Bousset bases his argument on two lines of evidence. First, there is the evidence of the gospels. In the oldest gospel, Mark, Lord is rarely used. Mark 12:35-37 (quoting Psalm 110:1) he explains as using "Lord" in the "secular" not the "religious" sense. Mark 11:3 is explained as a secondary account, Mark 14:14 giving the original with its title "teacher". The vocative use in Mark 7:28 is simply the secular form of respectful address. "Q" uses "Lord" little more than does Mark. But Luke uses it frequently, being a much later work. Finally, the last gospel, John, makes it the frequent, and in the last chapters the habitual mode of address to Jesus.¹ This progression shows that "Lord" became the universally recognized title for Jesus only in later times.

The second line of argument proposed by Bousset is

1. On the other hand J. H. Bernard in The Gospel According to St. John, (International Critical Commentary) p.55 finds John's use of *κύριος* reflecting a more primitive tradition than that of the synoptics. In John the disciples first call Jesus Rabbi. Peter first among the disciples calls Him "Lord" ("Lord, to whom shall we go" John 6:68). After John 11:8 Rabbi disappears. "Lord" is always used by them, "indicating a growing reverence."

linguistic. The Aramaic equivalent of Kyrios is Mar. Mar, however, cannot be used absolutely but must be used in some such form as Marī, my Lord, or Maran, our Lord. The absolute title, The Lord, is possible only in Greek. Its application to Jesus, therefore, must have been the work of Greek speaking Christians, perhaps in the bilingual church at Antioch.

Thus the meaning of the title is to be understood from its use in the mystery cults of the first century. The term "gods" was still used of the Olympian deities. A "Lord" however, was the more approachable object of worship of a particular cult, as, e.g., Attis, in the rites of the Great Mother. Though in a sense "Lord" was lower than "God", the homage given the Lord was more heartfelt, since the Lord had shared in human experience and was more intimately related to his group of believers. This is exactly the use of the term in the passage quoted above (I Cor. 8:5,6).

Thus Jackson and Lake write:

... the title Kύριος marks the last stage in the synthesis between the Jewish elements in Christianity and the fundamental idea of the Greco-Oriental religions.¹

Convincing as these arguments seem, the objections raised by Burkitt, Rawlinson, and others appear to show that Bousset is here somewhat in error. Basically the counter-argument rests on the fact that certain passages in the

1. Jackson & Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol.I, p.417.

epistles of Paul suggest that "Lord" was the accepted title for Jesus even before these epistles were written.

Far from being a "last stage" in early Christian thought, "Jesus is Lord" appears in these passages as the primitive confession of the church. Three times it appears in Paul's epistles, and always as the basic confession. In Romans 10:9 it is said to be the statement which, when sincerely made, leads to salvation. In I Cor. 12:3 this confession is presented as the sign of the Holy Spirit. And Philip ians 2:11 pictures all creation as joining in this confession. This later passage is all the more significant if we accept the view proposed by Lohmeyer¹, and followed by Dibelius, Lowther Clarke, Hunter, and others, that this represents an early Jewish-Christian hymn. Romans 14:9-11 associates the title with something very like the kerygma formula. Like the hymn of Phil. 2:5-11 this passage echoes Is. 45:23. Again one may note Col. 2:6,7. Here Paul has given expression to what might be called the "highest" Christology he has yet voiced. Yet even here he goes back to remind his readers of the original formula of faith which they were first taught, "Jesus is Lord". Note must be taken of the two articles here: ὡς οὖν παρελάβετε τὸν χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν τὸν Κύριον . The primitive confession appears again.

Oscar Cullman in The Earliest Christian Confessions, approaches the same matter from a different point of view.

1. E. Lohmeyer: Kyrios Jesus, p. 9.

Seeking the origin of the early symbols of the faith, he finds many of the above passages and others to be examples of primitive confessions. Confessional forms grew out of the needs of baptism, worship, exorcism, persecution, and polemic. But always he traces the later longer formulas back to the original confession Kyrios Jesus Christos.

"Lord" is essential to the primitive confession.

Another indication that "Lord" was the accepted title for Jesus even in Jewish circles is the curious designation of Jesus' brothers as brethren of "the Lord" (Gal. 1:19; I Cor. 9:5).

But the clearest indication of all that "Lord" was used of Jesus in the earliest Jewish - Christian circles is the quotation by Paul of the primitive Aramaic cry, "Maranatha" (I Cor. 16:2), "Our Lord cometh", or "Our Lord, Come!"¹ Here explicitly "Lord" is used of Jesus in the Aramaic language. Bousset cannot really account for this. He suggests that while the title first was used among Greek-speaking Christians it was soon translated back to Aramaic. But this implies that the Hellenist Paul, writing in Greek, now in his letter suddenly uses an Aramaic translation of what was originally a Hellenistic Greek expression, all in writing to a Hellenistic church. This is scarcely likely. The only logical explanation seems to be that "Maranatha"

1. In all probability the latter (the imperative) is the correct translation. Its use at the Eucharist is an added testimony to its antiquity. Here it meant both (a) "Come at the eschaton" and (b) "Come now to this gathering". See O. Cullmann: Christ and Time, pp. 74, 152, 155.

was a formula of faith so early that it was formulated in Palestine Aramaic-speaking communities and so fundamental and so sacrosanct in early worship that it was known in this original form even in Corinth.

The transition from Maran to Kyrios as Christianity spread is linguistically quite explicable. Hermann Sasse lists a number of parallels, and writes of Kyrios:

Behind the Greek word lurks an Oriental idea - the thought of an inner connection between Godhead and Kingship. The epithets applied to gods and kings are interchangeable all through the East. Jahve in ancient Israel is called "King", and in later Judaism "King of Kings". The replacement of the name Jahve by Adoni belongs to the same context of ideas. In Aramaic the same process of linguistic development may be followed in the history of the word mare... It is a forerunner - if not the forerunner - of the Hellenistic κύριος in the Aramaic language ... The Kyrios-idea, then (as it becomes generally evident wherever we meet with it) is of Oriental origin. Hellenism, by supplying a Greek word which could take the place of a number of different Semitic words (adoni, mare, beal) contributed merely a new and mighty expression to it.¹

What, then, is the origin of the title as applied to Jesus? Of course in a sense this title is especially to be related to the experience of the resurrection. Various passages in Paul suggest this. And if we follow Bousset's argument at least to the extent of agreeing that Mark and "Q" are right in indicating that the title was little used of Jesus during his earthly ministry, then it would appear that Kyrios was indeed the resurrection title for Jesus.

1. H. Sasse: "The Wartburg Conference", Theology, Vol. XVII, No. 97, p. 224.

Luke's record in Acts 2 exactly corresponds to this, as he reserves use of the title till after the account of the resurrection. However, discussion of the significance of the resurrection belongs to a subsequent chapter of this thesis.¹

In so far as a particular literary origin for the term may be found it would appear that Luke is exactly accurate in making it Psalm 110 (Acts 2:34). The significance of this Psalm for primitive Christology can scarcely be overemphasized. That it really was a favorite Old Testament passage of the early church is clearly shown by the numerous and widely distributed quotations from it in the New Testament. A. F. Kirkpatrick² lists 24 such quotations, from all three of the synoptics, Acts, four epistles of Paul, Hebrews, I Peter, and Revelation. No other Old Testament passage is comparable in this regard. Indeed, if one included all references to "the right hand of God" Kirkpatrick's list could be lengthened. Such wide distribution clearly suggests that the Psalm was used in the Jerusalem community from which Christianity spread.

A sort of negative confirmation of this is suggested by Strack and Billerbeck.³ They find that the

1. Oscar Cullmann, The Earliest Christian Confessions, pp. 23, 24, notes the special use of the title in exorcism as mentioned by Justin Martyr (c. 150) (Dialogues 35.1) cf. Phil. 3:10.

2. A. F. Kirkpatrick: The Book of Psalms, p. 665.

3. Strack & Billerbeck: op. cit., Band IV, p. 452 f. They note the psalm interpreted as referring to Abraham (the

oldest rabbinic literature we possess (from around 100 A.D.) carefully avoids interpreting this Psalm Messianically, referring it rather to Abraham. Now the psalm readily lends itself to Messianic interpretation. It is so firmly embedded in the New Testament that the origin of this interpretation must have been Jewish. It is impossible, they believe, that the identification was not made simply because of accident or that we have lost all record of it. And from about 250 A.D. on the Psalm is interpreted in Rabbinical circles as referring to the Messiah. The explanation, then, according to these authorities, lies in this: Psalm 110 was so much used by the early Jewish-Christian church that during the period of bitterest strife between the Church and the Jews the rabbis tried to take from the church what must have been its chief foundation in scripture and to apply Psalm 110 to Abraham. Only after the controversy had passed was the older interpretation restored. Thus there is again a witness to the importance of this Psalm in early Jewish-Christian Christology.

oldest meaning, traced back to 135 A.D.): "Sofort gab Gott das Priestertum dem Abraham, wie es heisst: Spruch Jehves an meinen Herrn (Abraham): Setze dich..." So also R. Nechemja (150 A.D. and R. Jaqob 280 A.D.). Justin Martyr (150 A.D.) said the Jews believed the psalm to refer to Hezekiah. R. Jehuda (390 A.D.) suggested David. Not till R. Juden (350 A.D.) in the name of R. Chama (260 A.D.) is this statement: "In der zukunft wird Gott den König, den Messias, zu seiner Rechten sitzen lassen, wie es heisst Ps. 110,1: "Spruch Jehves an Meinen Herrn: Setze dich zu meinen Rechten".

If, then, Luke is right in making Jesus' Lordship a part of even the first preaching, and if this concept was derived from the Old Testament, we must now ask what were the Old Testament connotations of the idea as applied to Jesus.

First of all, of course, following Psalm 110, we may believe that in calling Jesus "Lord" the early preachers meant that he was the promised king, that one who by a paradox understandable only to the believers was at the same time David's Son and David's Lord. He it was who, because of the special relationship in which he stood to God, would conquer, judge, and rule all the world forever. Thus construed, the title "Lord" belongs with the titles "Christ" and "Son of David" as signifying the promised Messianic king, so conceived that the concept merges, or nearly merges, with that of the Apocalyptic "Elect One". Yet as with the title "Christ", we must say of "Lord" that while all this is present, something more is meant.

For one thing, *κύριος* is of course the Septuagint word for Jahweh. Even though its use in Christology is with reference to the "Messiah" rather than "God" it was sure to serve as one more bridge to that ascription of full divinity to Jesus which we have seen everywhere latent in primitive Christology. In the mouth of Jewish monotheists this title is especially startling, since they refused to give it to anyone else, even to the emperor when their lives

were at stake.

But even in its original Old Testament sense the term had two definite implications. First, it meant that Jesus in his exaltation was peculiarly related to God.

The seat at the king's right hand was the place of honour (I Kings 2:19; Matt. 20:20; cf. Ps. 45:9; I Macc. 10:63). But more than mere honour is implied here. This king is to share Jehovah's throne, to be next to him in dignity, to be supported by all the force of His authority and power. The idea corresponds to the recognition of the king as Jehovah's son in Ps. 2:7. Somewhat similarly the king was said to 'sit on the throne of Jehovah' (I Chron. 29:23; cf. 28:5; II Cor. 13:8).¹

As Michel puts it, sitting at the right hand meant coregency (Mitregentschaft).²

Secondly, the title implied something as to the relationship of Christ to his people. "Lord" is the opposite of "slave".

Again and again the writers of the Psalms call themselves "slaves" of God. In these passages the word "slave" had assumed a religious connotation. A similar situation appears in the prophets. The New Testament epistles... often adopt the term "slave" as the correlative of Jesus' title "Lord". The usage implied that the followers of the Lord were his possession, His property, and indeed that was symbolized by the very ritual of Baptism. An inevitable consequence was that the disciple regarded himself as completely at the disposal of his Master. His will was spiritually merged in that of the living "Lord". He was pledged to deny himself. There was also involved the idea that the "slave" was under the protection, the guarantee of his Kyrios. Here we have a conception which com-

1. A. Kirkpatrick: op. cit., p. 666.

2. G. Kittle, ed: op. cit., Bund III, p. 1088.

pletely tallies with Old Testament thought.¹

Thus around the central concept of Jesus as the transcendent King promised in the Old Testament a broad and rich Christology quickly formed. Jesus was preached as the promised ruler: "Christ", "The Son of David", and "Lord".

An example of how this idea governed the interpretation of scripture by the early church is the quotation from Psalm 16 found in Acts 2:25. Though Rabbinical interpretation associated David's joy (Acts 2:26) with David's hope for the Messiah, the words following (... for thou wilt not leave my soul in Sheol...) were regarded as referring to David himself.² Christian exegesis was not bound by contemporary Jewish limits, it found Christ everywhere in the scripture.

2) Jesus was presented in Old Testament terms as the Messiah, Son of David, Lord. A second concept was based on the exegesis given in Deuteronomy 18:15,18 (Acts 3:22). With this "Prophet" concept we see how Messianic categories are left behind. This prophecy, therefore, deserves extended comment.

1. H. Kennedy: Vital Forces of the Early Church, p. 102.

2. W. Oesterly: The Psalms in The Jewish Church, p. 219.

According to Strack and Billerbeck the prophecy in Deuteronomy was seldom mentioned in the Rabbinic literature, and then not in a Messianic sense. It is true, however, that there are certain hints that the idea of a Joshua redivivus had a place in Jewish Messianic expectation. W. K. Lowther Clarke¹ develops the idea of a primitive "Joshua Christology" and cites two passages in Josephus' Antiquities.

Theudas persuaded a great part of the people to take their effects with them and follow him to the river Jordan: for he told them he was a prophet, and that he would, by his own command, divide the river, and afford them an easy passage over it. (Ant. XX, v.1; cf. Joshua 3)

(The prophet from Egypt)... advised the multitude of the common people to go along with him to the Mount of Olives... He would show them from thence how at his command the walls of Jerusalem would fall down. (Ant. XX, viii, 6.)

John 1:21 mentions this expectation as distinct from the Elias-hope (cf. John 7:40).

This concept of Jesus as "a prophet like unto Moses" therefore seems to fit very well into its Jerusalem setting. It is probably against this background that it is to be understood, rather than that of the Samaritan tradition found in fourth century literature, suggested by Jackson and Lake.²

Franklin W. Young³ in a recent article develops

1. W. Clarke: New Testament Problems, p. 47.

2. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. I, p. 400.

3. F. W. Young: "Jesus the Prophet", "A Re-Examination", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LXVIII, Pt. IV, pp. 285ff.

the idea that the title "Prophet" was in Jesus' day a Messianic one. In the Intertestamental period prophecy was thought to have ceased. (Ps. 74:9; Mal. 4:5,6; Zech. 13:6). The return of prophecy was regarded as confined to the Messianic age. No one claimed the title except those who claimed power to redeem Israel, like the false Messiahs mentioned by Josephus. Only John Hyrcanus earned it, as Saviour of Judah (Test. of Levi 8:14; Josephus: Jewish Wars, I, 2, vii; Test. of Benj. 9:2). "Prophet" is thus really a Messianic title, he maintains.

Probably to be associated with this is the concept of Jesus as the ἀρχηγός (Acts 3:15; 5:31; elsewhere only in Heb. 2:10; 12:2). In secular Greek this word often referred to a leader or hero of a state which he had founded and to which he often gave his name.¹ In the Septuagint the ἀρχηγός is usually a political or military leader, perhaps the head of some family. Though not applied to Joshua, the word is used of his subordinates. It is used of leaders in the book of Judges (e.g. Jud.

1. W. L. Knox in an article "The 'Divine Hero' Christology in the New Testament" (Harvard Theological Review, Vol. XLI, No. 4, pp. 229-249) points to parallels between primitive "hero Christology" and Greek and Roman hero myths, such as that of Heracles, the divine philosopher-martyr. It is his contention, however, not that the early Christology borrowed thought from Greek myths but simply that it expressed itself in language which had meaning for pagans. The present writer feels that the Old Testament parallels, described below, are a far more obvious source of the basic idea. As Knox points out, this type of thought soon was transcended by the concept of the cosmological Logos.

5:2,15, and of Jephtha, Jud. 11:6,11). Heads of families are so called (I Chron. 5:24). Philo applied the title even to Adam, Noah, Abraham, and God Himself. The concept of Jesus as ἀρχηγός τῆς ζωῆς we will discuss in connection with the resurrection, chapter VI below. But for its use unqualified, as in Acts 5:31, we must turn to this Old Testament meaning. Jesus is the head of the new community, the leader and protector of the Christian family, giving it his name and acting as its Lord and Saviour. A tracing of correspondence between Jesus and Joshua - the names are of course basically the same - survived to a time as late as the compiling of the book of testimonies incorporated by Justin Martyr (Dialogues 113, 340).

There is here, then, in this quotation in Acts 3:22, 23, a remarkable combination of Old Testament concepts, none of them strictly "Messianic", but all of them now regarded as finding fulfilment in Jesus.

First, Jesus is the new Moses, the one greater than Joshua, the ἀρχηγός, the captain of the new Israel, the chief of the family of God, the Saviour in the second great deliverance.

Secondly, He is the Prophet. As it was Moses' primary function to reveal God's will, so Jesus has brought the new revelation, that final revelation which is the sign of the Messianic age. The original meaning of the

prophecy, doubtless, was not that God was to raise up one particular great prophet but rather that the light of prophecy would never fail. Other nations might turn to soothsayers, but God would always give Israel prophets. Peter's exegesis, however, saw in Jesus the whole, the culmination of all prophecy, the embodiment of the whole line, lost for ages but now suddenly restored. In this connection Schultz points out that while the Prophet tends to have little place in the Messianic picture in most of the Old Testament,

In the second half of Isaiah, chapters 40-66, on the contrary, the figure of the prophet is given the utmost prominence, while the picture of the Davidic king becomes quite indistinct...¹

For reasons of convenience we are postponing the discussion of the highly important concept of Jesus as the "Servant of the Lord" until the next chapter. But if Acts 3:13,26 does contain allusions to the figure in Isaiah - as we shall argue in the next chapter - there is here an interesting correspondence to Schultz' observation.

Thirdly, "like unto Moses" implies a relationship between Jesus and the law. This is all the more startling, if, as seems likely, we really are here dealing with pre-Pauline thought. The quotation Peter gives seems to imply that as Moses has given at Sinai a revelation from God which is to be obeyed so the Prophet will bring an

1. H. Schultz: Old Testament Theology: Vol.II, p. 426.

equally binding revelation.

To him shall ye harken in all things, whatsoever he shall speak to you. And it shall be, that every soul that shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people. (Acts 3:22,23).

This is the particular way in which Jesus is explicitly likened to Moses. Obedience to Jesus becomes the requirement rather than obedience to the law of Moses. Not only as Davidic King but as Leader, Prophet, and Revealer of God's will, Jesus is the One foreshadowed in scripture.

3) Jesus is quite explicitly proclaimed the promised Davidic Messiah. He is explicitly called The Prophet like unto Moses. And, as we have seen, with these concepts are associated various ideas. But in addition to these two explicit concepts there are certain implicit and latent Old Testament ideas which deserve brief mention.

First, to Jesus are now applied certain titles and texts which originally referred to the people Israel. A clear illustration of this tendency is the quotation of Psalm 118:22 by Peter (Acts 4:11).

... 'the head of the corner' is more naturally explained to be the top-stone (Zech 4:7), not only bonding the walls together but completing the building. Israel is the 'head corner-stone'. The powers of the world flung it aside as useless, but God destined it for the most honourable and important place in the building of His kingdom in the world... The principle underlying this (New Testament) use of the words originally spoken of Israel is that Christ was the true representative of Israel, who undertook and fulfilled the mission in which Israel had failed.¹

1. A. Kirkpatrick: op. cit., p. 698.

That this Psalm was early applied to Jesus is suggested by the frequency of its appearance in the New Testament (Rom. 9:33; Eph. 2:20; Acts 4:11; I Peter 2:6-8; Mark 12:10). In all probability it was one of the proof-texts early found by the church. The title $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$, to be discussed in the next chapter, is perhaps also an example of a transference of a name from Israel to Christ. Oscar Gullmann has discussed at length this "principal of representation" wherein Christ becomes the supreme Representative of the redemptive activity of God which in the Old Testament was at times executed through the chosen people.¹

A second strain of Old Testament thought nowhere explicit but perhaps somewhat latent even in the Petrine sermons is the cultic element. Admittedly the signs here are faint. It is to Stephen rather than to Peter that one must turn for the background of such developments of the cultic idea as we see in Hebrews. Yet one may note especially that Jesus is called the Holy One, $\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ (Acts 3:14).² If $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\varsigma$ be taken as the equivalent of the Hebrew קדוש , then a glance at a concordance is all that is needed to make clear that we are here in the world

1. O. Gullmann: Christ and Time, p. 116, compare Gal. 3:16.

2. Compare Mark 1:24; John 6:69.

of Exodus, Leviticus, and Ezekiel. This is the word for cultic purity, separation from the world. Again, there is perhaps a suggestion of the cult in the title δ δίκαιος, implying piety, fulfilment of God's will. Indeed, it has been suggested that the reason Paul does not use this title is because of its legalistic implications (compare I John 2:1). Again, priests were anointed as well as kings, so the title "The Anointed One" need not be interpreted altogether narrowly. Anointing set the anointed person apart as the holy agent of the Holy God. And if Psalm 110 was indeed a favorite of the early church the words "Thou art a priest forever" may have been applied to Jesus almost from the beginning.

But the later doctrine of Jesus as the Great High Priest was to develop from more than just a few words and phrases, significant as they are. Rather these indicate the underlying assumption of the early church that somehow in Jesus that forgiveness of sins had been achieved, that atonement, toward which all the Old Testament cult strove. The forgiveness which was so essential to the message was the fulfilment of the Old Testament hope.

("To him all the prophets bear witness that every one who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name". Acts 10:43) How Jesus had brought atonement was a question which the sermons, at least in the short form we have them, did not attempt to answer. But that this was

fact, and the fulfilment of all scriptures, was confidently proclaimed.

In this connection one thinks of two passages offering interesting parallels. The first is the kerygma passage in I Corinthians 15:3 "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures". The other is the story of how on Easter day itself the risen Jesus taught the disciples on the road to Emmaus that it was in fulfilment of scripture that the One who was to redeem Israel must suffer and die. Such passages suggest that very very early the church connected the scripture, the work of atonement, and the mission of Jesus. Forgiveness of sin was connected with Jesus' death, as in the passage quoted above from Acts 10, but not always was the connection exclusively with the death of Jesus. His life and His resurrection also played their part.

The sermon in Acts 3 is interesting in this connection. It couples together a strange group of seemingly disconnected ideas. There is the prophecy of a Prophet like unto Moses (Acts 3:22; cf. Deut. 18:15,16). Coupled with it is the threat that some shall be destroyed from the people, ἐξὸλοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ. This phrase is not quoted from the Deuteronomic prophecy but rather suggests the language of Leviticus 23:29 and the description of the fate of those who do not join in the day of atonement. And in the same connection reference is

made to the covenant of Abraham and its promise. Perhaps one must not press the connection between the passage in Leviticus and Acts 3:23, but if there is such a connection then there is at least the suggestion that what the day of atonement once was designed to accomplish Jesus Himself did.

But the most important title in this connection is the title Servant, *παῖς*, used in the sermons of Jesus. We are reserving our extended discussion of this title until the next chapter, in connection with the earthly life and the death of Jesus. But if, as we shall argue there, the Christian Church really did, almost from the very beginning, see Jesus in terms of the One described in the second half of Isaiah, especially Isaiah 53, then it is clear indeed that the Church looked upon Jesus as the fulfilment of all that was highest in the ancient cult. He was seen as the Priest who offers Himself as the sacrificial Lamb for the sins of the world.

The first method of interpretation of the cross was offered by the sacrificial cultus of the Old Testament, which indeed was still a living and present fact for the Early Church... The Jewish sacrificial system is not specifically Biblical, but it is an element common to almost all religions. The specifically Old Testament element was the connection of the sacrificial system with the knowledge of the Holy God; that is why sacrifice was regarded as the means of atonement for the injury done by man to the Holiness of God... The atoning sacrifice represents the truth that something must happen, if there is to be peace between God and man, if the communion which has been broken by sin is to be restored... blood must actually flow, for man has forfeited his life by his rebellion against his Creator and Lord... It is highly probable that the picture of the vicarious suffering of the "Servant of the Lord" in Isa. 53

was the link between Christ's death on the Cross and the atoning sacrifice...¹

Of this we shall say more in the next chapter.

Perhaps what is really more significant than any of these hints as to the origin of the concept of Jesus as the Great High Priest is the point already noted that from the very beginning the church seems to have expected to find Christ everywhere in scripture. With this starting point the cultic element was bound to influence Christology soon.

The final matter to be noted among those Old Testament factors implicit rather than explicit in Peter's Christology is this. Peter's picture of Christ is profoundly influenced by the Old Testament picture of God. Of course this is in a sense implied in every line. It is the God of the Old Testament who worked mighty works through Jesus (Acts 2:22), who raised Jesus from the dead (Acts 2:24), whose Favored One, ὁσίος τοῦ θεοῦ, Jesus is (Acts 2:27). But here we have reference to the point, which we have had to note so often, that predicates which the Old Testament applied to God, Peter applies to Jesus. "Holy One", "Saviour", "Righteous One", "Lord", and "Judge" are all titles suggesting God himself. It is startling indeed to find such an array of divine titles now applied to a man. Even in Peter's sermons there is a kind of justification for the contention of G. A. P. Knight's

1. E. Brunner: The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption, pp. 283, 284.

From Moses to Paul that Jesus is thought of in the New Testament not so much in terms of the Old Testament Messiah as of the Old Testament God.

We conclude, therefore, that the period immediately following the first resurrection appearance of Jesus was one in which the early Christians came to a completely new understanding of the scripture (Luke 24:27,45). The primitive church could now preach Jesus in Old Testament terms. He was for them the promised Messiah of David's line, the Prophet like unto Moses, the Stone become the Head of the Corner, and much more. But as we see Jesus presented as the fulfilment of all the Old Testament we must not lose sight of the fact that this was the result of a new exegesis. Neither late Judaism's eschatology nor Old Testament Messianism exhaust primitive Christology. We must close this chapter, therefore, by noting certain alterations in the Old Testament hope.

First, the Messianic hope is interpreted in terms of the contemporary eschatology. Jesus is called the Davidic King, but the picture far transcends temporal monarchy. This point we have already developed in the preceding chapter.

Second, elements of Old Testament thought originally quite separate are now brought together around the figure of Jesus. Moses and David alike find their counterparts in Him. Predicates once ascribed to God or to Israel now

are ascribed to Christ. And, if we are right in the contention we shall make in the next chapter, here at the beginning of Christenitry the amazing new combination is made wherein Messiah and "Suffering Servant" are seen as one.

And finally, all the Old Testament hope is related to Jesus and the events of his life, death, resurrection, and exaltation. This, of course, is the great difference between Christology and Jewish Messianism. Whatever thought forms later apocalyptic and Old Testament writing provided, it is Jesus who remained at the center of the kerygma. That in the Old Testament hope which seemed not to apply to Him had to be ignored or rather re-interpreted so that it did apply to Him. It was He, not the Old Testament, that was preached. We must turn, therefore, for our next chapter, to an analysis of what Peter says of the historical events of the earthly life of Jesus of Nazareth.

The name "Jesus" found its way into primitive Christology not through any form of Jewish expectation but through an historical event.

"Jesus is the Messiah." This was clearly the foundation of the primitive Jewish-Christian Christology. The statement, however, remains equally fundamental to the first preaching when the emphasis is exactly reversed. "The Messiah is Jesus". This, quite as much, was the first proclamation. Of "the Messiah" everyone had heard. The utterly new factor was "Jesus".¹

Yet it was this new factor which was the really essential point of the proclamation. Where the old Messianic categories did not fit "Jesus" they were revised, reinterpreted, and indeed, even discarded. But the second term of the equation, "Jesus", continued essentially unchanged. Christology was permanently anchored to an historic person and to historic events.

We have examined the Jewish concepts with which these events were first described. This chapter and the two following will now discuss the place in Peter's preaching of these events themselves, these new elements which so transformed the ancient hope. This chapter will analyze Peter's presentation of the historic events of the life

1. see W. M. Grant: Ideals of the Early Church, p. 115; cf. G. Duncan: op. cit., p. 244.

and death of Jesus. The next chapter will discuss Peter's concept of the resurrection and exaltation. And the next chapter will examine his presentation of Jesus as a present Power.

We turn to Peter's picture of the life and death of the Nazarene.

1) First, we must notice Peter's clear presentation of the human nature and origins of Jesus.

One point in the primitive Christology is quite plain. Jesus was called $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$, a man (Acts 2:22). I Enoch is not always clear as to the nature of "the Elect One". He is "Son of Man", yet he is a being very much like an angel. Moreover, this book and other apocalyptic works make it very clear that contemporary Jewish thought had a well-developed angelology and demonology, with every imaginable kind of supernatural being with clearly defined station and function. It is all the more remarkable, therefore, that Peter uses here this unambiguous term. Jesus is a man among men.

This assertion is by no means confined to the use of the word $\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta\rho$. Though we have noted already words suggesting a certain bursting of the bonds of humanity Beyschlag is able to write at least almost correctly:

... Christ throughout (Peter's sermons) is distinguished from God and put in a relation of human dependence to Him. Jesus is what He is through God's will and free act... There is no expression which in any way goes beyond the idea

of a man entirely filled and moved by the Spirit of God.¹

We have seen expressions which seem to us to burst these bonds, yet the assertion of Jesus' humanity also is clear. Jesus is "approved by God" (Acts 2:22). His miracles are said to have been done by God through Him. He was able to do these things "for God was with him" (Acts 10:38).

In both instances the conception comes out clearly that Jesus was a man chosen and specially favored by God. There is not a word in all these discourses about a divine birth, no word of a coming down from heaven or of a 'Son of God' in a physical or supernatural sense.²

God and Jesus are clearly distinguished. Jesus is a man who lived in a definite place at a definite time, was seen by and known to his fellow men. Jesus' humanity is made clearest of all by the witness in every sermon to the fact of his death.

It is in this connection that two titles have their special significance. The first is the proper name "Jesus". It is true that Luke's gospel gives this name significance in relation to salvation. Yet, as we began by noting, it is not in relation to any form of Messianic expectation that the name finds its place here. "Jesus" is a common Palestinian name, one which appears in the Old Testament in various forms, including the familiar "Joshua". τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, this particular man, it is emphasized, is that which is preached (Acts 2:32).

The second title of similar import is ὁ Ναζωραῖος,

1. W. Beyschlag: New Testament Theology, p. 309.

the Nazarene (Acts 2:22). Following Cadbury¹ we take this title, which is never used independently, to mean simply "from Nazareth". Thus it is to be connected with the phrase Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ of Acts 10:38. Far from being a title of Messianic honor, it may have carried with it a certain reproach (Acts 6:14; 24:5; cf. John 1:46).

Jesus is preached as a man, from a certain town, and also born of a certain family. True, descent from David (Acts 2:30) was a part of the Messianic picture, yet this was a feature which, however honorable, places Jesus squarely within the human category. He was "of the fruit of his (David's) loins, according to the flesh". In this connection also may be noted the fact that Jesus is called "a prophet of your brethren" (Acts 3:22). His lineage was quite human.

On this one point, then, at least, the thought of the primitive church would seem to have been as clear as that of the later creeds. Jesus was "very man".

2) We turn now to Peter's picture of the earthly life of Jesus.

The place of the life of the historic Jesus in the thought of the primitive church has been the subject of much dispute among New Testament critics. Scholars of the

1. in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. V, p. 357.

older type, such as Harnack and Wernle, saw in the life and teaching of Jesus the essence of primitive Christianity. Wernle, for example, speaks of the later development of Christian thought as an altogether unfortunate perversion, wherein

Jewish eschatology, the Jewish belief in angels, even Jewish conceptions of God himself, pass over into the Christian Church more and more extensively, though at first without attracting attention.¹

The original Christianity, it is said, was enthusiasm for the historic person, Jesus. Quite the opposite view has become popular among scholars of a more modern school.

The first understanding afforded by the standpoint of Formgeschichte is that there never was a "purely" historical witness to Jesus. Whatever was told of Jesus' words and deeds was always a testimony of faith as formulated for preaching and exhortation in order to convert unbelievers and confirm the faithful.²

In relation to this controversy the Petrine account of the life of Jesus becomes all the more interesting.

From the sermons of Peter we are able to gather something of what the early church regarded as essential in its preaching about the life and character of the historic Jesus.

a) They preached Jesus' human origin. He was a

1. P. Wernle: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II, p. 53.

2. W. Dibelius: From Tradition to Gospel, p. 295.

man, descended from David, and from the town of Nazareth. This we have discussed above.

b) Jesus is set in relation to John the Baptist (Acts 10:37). It is true that this is found among the Petrine sermons only in the sermon to Cornelius. However, it also has a place in the sermon attributed to Paul (Acts 13:25), suggesting that it was a standard part of the kerygma. Indeed the whole of the account of Jesus' life is fuller in the sermon to Cornelius than in the other Petrine sermons, presumably because it is assumed that the Jerusalem crowd is already familiar with this part of the message (Acts 2:22c).

It is not specifically stated that John baptized Jesus, though one may guess that this is the event lying behind the words. This is made clearer by the fact that it is associated with Jesus' being anointed by God "with the Holy Ghost and with power" (Acts 10:38). It would seem likely that the first preaching often contained an account of the events described in Mark 1:4-11. This fits well with the fact that all four gospels set this story at the beginning of their account of Jesus' ministry. Moreover the nature of the story is such that it is incredible that it should have arisen from anything other than an historical memory, since the church would never have invented a picture of its Lord undergoing baptism at the hands of another man.

The significance of the anointing is not clearly

developed. However, it is clear that it is this which enables Jesus to do the mighty works attributed to him. So important was the anointing that Jesus is known always as The Anointed One, the Christ. J. Weiss comments on this verse:

Thus originally the baptism in Jordan was the birth-hour of the Messiah.¹

At least Peter looks to this event as the beginning of Jesus' ministry. (It began from Galilee after the baptism which John preached - Acts 10:37.) Here Jesus was anointed. Only later was the anointment publicly proclaimed. So Saul and David were privately anointed to their kingly office, later publicly acclaimed kings.²

b) The prophetic character of Jesus' ministry is described. This is made especially clear in Acts 3:22. Here Jesus is called " a Prophet". He is compared to Moses, in that he also brought a revelation of God's will. Since he was prophet Jesus' words ought to have been heard and obeyed. All his sayings are regarded as absolutely binding. Failure to obey the words of the Prophet Jesus has put Israel in danger of destruction, even as did failure to obey the words of the prophets of Old. In Acts 10:36,37 we are told that through Jesus God sent a word to Israel proclaiming good tidings of peace. This association with "the

1. J. Weiss: Christ the Beginning of Dogma, p. 43.

2. For a fuller discussion of "Adoptionism" in primitive Christology see the next chapter.

word of the Lord" again assigns Jesus a strictly prophetic function. Moreover, it is the suggestion of Jackson and Lake's commentary here that Acts 10:38 may be an allusion to Isaiah 61:1 (cf. Luke 4:18,19). Here the anointing is the anointing to preach good tidings and to all the prophetic mission.

This picture of Jesus as a prophet found here in the earliest preaching is in several ways significant. For one thing it attests the historical interest of the early preaching. C. H. Dodd notes this in connection with the gospels.

It is not the least remarkable feature of the Gospels as historical documents that although they all - even Mark - are written under the influence of a 'high' Christology, yet they all - even John - represent Jesus as a teacher with his school of disciples.¹

And again it is interesting as a suggestion that the interest of the early Christology was not so exclusively soteriological as certain of the scholars of the Formgeschichte school would have us believe. If Jesus was from the first preached to be a Prophet who had brought a new "word of God", whose words were to be heard and obeyed, then it would appear that Jesus' ethical teaching must have had its place even in the earliest instruction. And finally this term "Prophet" is the most fruitful one for giving us idea of how the early church pictured the type

1. C. H. Dodd, in Diessmann and Bell: Mysterium Christi, p. 53.

of man its Lord was "in the days of his flesh".

c) Mention is made of Jesus' mighty works.

Jesus has been approved by God to the Jews δυνάμεις καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, by mighty works, wonders, and signs which God did through Him among the people, facts with which they themselves are said to be acquainted (Acts 2: 22). The sermon to Cornelius adds to the list of His activities that He did deeds of mercy and performed exorcisms (Acts 10:38). This sermon also gives us some picture of the location of these events. They began in Galilee. Jesus now wandered about, διῆλθεν. He also worked in Judea and Jerusalem. Here His ministry ended.

It is one of the lasting contributions of form criticism that it has shown how many of the stories about Jesus contained in our gospels still show signs of having been used as "paradigms" in sermons just such as this. For of course what we have here is but a highly condensed version of each sermon. This, like the other parts of the sermon, was surely usually lengthened by illustrations, "for the acts of power, miracles, and signs, remain mere words unless they receive life out of the narratives".¹ Dibelius lists as the most typical examples of stories whose form still show traces of their use in this type of preaching the following narratives from Mark.²

The Healing of the Paralytic	Mk. 2:1 f.
The Question of Fasting	2:18f.

1. M. Dibelius: From Tradition to Gospel, p. 25.

2. Ibid., p. 43.

The Rubbing of the Ears of Corn	2:23f.
The Healing of the Withered Hand	3:1 f.
The Relatives of Jesus	3:20f., 30f.
Blessing the Children	10:13f.
The Tribute Money	12:13f.
The Anointing in Bethany	14:3f.

And of course many other stories in our gospels doubtless had a place in the early sermons though they have come to us in different "forms".

Jesus' life, then, was from the very beginning preached to be an engagement in combat with the devil, accompanied by miracles, healings, and signs. God's power was revealed in both His words and His deeds. And to these deeds, even as to the resurrection, the first apostles called themselves witnesses. (Acts 10:39)

d) Some idea is given of Jesus' moral character.

As the Holy and Righteous One he is placed in sharp contrast to the murderer Barabas (Acts 3:14). As holy Jesus is pictured as one without the blemish of sin, pure in the cultic sense, able to stand before God. One must note the cleansing power of this holiness implied in Acts 3:12. As Righteous Jesus is said to be one who has peculiarly fulfilled the law. He is the beloved of God (Acts 2:27). He is the $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ (Acts 3:13, 26). Here and elsewhere one may perhaps discern a reference to the figure described in the second half of Isaiah. And He is one peculiarly anointed with the Spirit of God. All of these ideas, we may assume, were elaborated in the actual preaching, so that some such portrait of Jesus' character emerged as we find in the synoptic gospels.

e) Finally, in connection with the earthly life of Jesus as found in Peter's sermons, we must note the interpretation set upon this life by the primitive church.

By his deeds, it is stated, Jesus is shown to be a man "approved", ἀποδεδειγμένον, by God to them. This is an interesting word. A remarkable parallel may be found in Josephus' Antiquities, VI, xiv, 5. Here, at the command of his father, Solomon is thus "approved" as king by a public display, manifesting that he is his father's choice. Zadok and Nathan are commanded by David to take Solomon and

... and to anoint him with the holy oil and to make (ἀποδείξει) him king. Thus he charged Zadok the high priest and Nathan the prophet to do; and commanded them to follow Solomon through the midst of the city, and to sound the trumpets, and to wish aloud that Solomon the king may sit upon the royal throne forever that so all the people may know that he is ordained king by his father [ἀποδεδειγμένον αὐτὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς βασιλέα].

Thus in a sense we may say that Jesus' life and deeds are here interpreted in terms of a public proclamation by God that this man is His choice to be the Messianic king. In the acts of Jesus one could discern the announcement by God that this was the Christ, that "God was with him".

That the Messiah would be authenticated as such by miracles we may take to be an almost universal part of the Jewish Messianic expectation¹ (Matt. 11:4; 12:38; John 7:31, 10:41). But perhaps something more is implied here than simply that Jesus is the promised king.

1. E. Schurer: op. cit., Div. II, Vol. II, p. 164.

The genuinely ancient character of this type of teaching is attested by the simple correspondence with the Hebrew-Jewish conception of history and of divine revelation in history, according to which God makes Himself known, not through ideas as in the philosophy of Greece, but by mighty acts and by an outstretched arm. For Old Testament prophecy history is the real field of the self-manifestation. In the same manner primitive Christianity affirms that in the facts in which it had its origin the eternal God has put forth His power for the redemption of mankind. "God was with Jesus."¹

The exorcisms of Jesus are signs that in Him there is come the Kingdom of God (Lk. 11:20).

With regard, then, to this proclamation concerning the earthly life of Jesus we may conclude with the words of Principal Duncan:

If John the Baptist had been raised from the dead, they would not have proclaimed him as Messiah. The Resurrection of Jesus acquired for them its transcendent significance because it was the Resurrection of One whom even in His earthly life they had come to recognize as the Messiah... Their message therefore, was rooted in history. It was a testimony about Jesus.²

3) The fact about "the Jesus of history" to which most attention is given by Peter is the fact of Jesus' death.

It would appear that it is difficult to exaggerate the importance of Jesus' crucifixion in the early preaching. In spite of the fact that one might have expected the early church rather to gloss over the fact that its Lord had

1. W. Manson: Jesus the Messiah, p. 34.

2. G. Duncan: op. cit., p. 241.

been executed as a criminal, it is this which lies at the very center of the kerygma. Every one of the sermons mentions it (Acts 2:23; 3:15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:39), and it is in every passage suggesting the kerygma form, as a glance at the chart in the appendix will show. Moreover, it is this event alone concerning which details are given. A confirmation that Luke is accurate in this picture of the early preaching lies in the fact that form critics agree that it was the passion narrative which first became a connected unit in the church's account of the life of Jesus. From Mark's gospel on it has a place out of all proportion to the actual time-span of these events. Among the Petrine sermons some are too short to give any account of Jesus' life. But the crucifixion is always proclaimed. It would appear that from the beginning the cross stood at the center of the church's thought about Jesus.

First, we may note the account of the crucifixion given here. It is clearly located in Jerusalem. The Jews are said to be responsible for it, especially their leaders. It is recognized that the Romans carried it out. Pilate is specifically named as the official to whom the Jews delivered up Jesus. The Barabas incident is mentioned, with emphasis on Pilate's readiness to free Jesus and the demand of the crowd that they be given the murderer instead. It is made clear that Jesus is innocent of any crime. The

reason for his execution is given as the ignorance of the people. The manner of his death is made clear, that he was "hanged on a tree". And it is stated that the resurrection was on the third day. All of these facts, except the last, Peter assumed to be generally known.

These, then, are the historical facts. Following Professor J. S. Stewart we may note a kind of three-fold interpretation of these facts in the Petrine preaching.

"First, the cross was man's most flagrant crime."¹ It is made clear that Jesus was The Holy and Righteous One. He is sharply contrasted with the murderer Barabas. Yet the ignominy of his death is emphasized by the repeated phrase "hanged on a tree", reminiscent of Deut. 21:23 (cf. Gal. 3:13). The blame for the death of Jesus is laid squarely at the feet of the Jews. It is pointed out that though they did the crime in ignorance yet God had given them full opportunity to recognize who Jesus was. It is this crime above all, therefore, for which they are urged to repent. That this is Peter's meaning is clear from the response described in Acts 2:37. The cross brings conviction of sin.

Secondly,

From the very first the hand of God was seen. Behind the apparent tragedy, a divine purpose had been at work.²

1. J. Stewart: A Man in Christ, p. 228.

2. ibid., p. 229.

Jesus was delivered up "by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23). God's purpose here receives no clear explanation. But Peter is confident that the cross was part of God's plan. Christ's suffering is the fulfillment of that which had been prophesied by all the prophets (Acts 3:18).

Finally,

The third note connected the death of Christ with the forgiveness of sins. The way in which the cross brings pardon was largely undefined; but as to the fact itself, there was never any doubt whatever.¹

At first perhaps, the connection seems to be one simply of addition. It seems implied that Christ had to fulfill the prophecies of his suffering, and that now that that has been accomplished the way is clear for the blotting out of sins and the sending of times of refreshing (Acts 3:18,19). At least it would seem that Christ's death must have been interpreted as a necessary preliminary step to forgiveness. That no well worked out theory of the atonement is presented is perhaps another instance of Luke's historical accuracy.

And yet one is encouraged to look more deeply for this relationship. In I Cor. 15:3 Paul lists it as a formula which he himself received, presumably at his first instruction, that "Christ died for our sins according to

1. ibid., p. 230.

the Scriptures." Here, then, one finds in the oldest strata of Christian thought three ideas deliberately linked together: the cross, prophecy, and our sins. If, then, one searches the sermons of Peter for allusions to some passage of scripture that might fit this pattern, one idea inevitably suggests itself. Peter looked upon Jesus' death in terms of the "servant passages" of Isaiah.

Few questions with regard to these sermons have been so debated as this of the "Servant Christology". We here take the position that the Petrine sermons do contain a Christology which pictures Jesus as the Servant described in the second half of Isaiah, and that Luke is accurate in so recording the earliest thought. But such serious arguments exist to the contrary that it will be necessary to go into the whole question at some length.

It was the view of Johannes Weiss and certain others of the older commentators that the sermons in Acts displayed their genuine antiquity in their preservation of a "Servant Christology". Cadbury¹, however, has given this position a thorough and sceptical analysis, and Burkitt follows him, perhaps elaborating the counter arguments even more. The arguments against our having here a primitive "Servant Christology" are two fold.

1. in Jackson & Lake, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 384f.

First, it is argued that the identification of Jesus with the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah is never clearly made in the earlier books of the New Testament but only in the later books representing a more Greek-Christian point of view. After examining the various books for references to Jesus as $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, pais, or allusions to Isaiah 53, Burkitt writes:

On the one side (using Pais or referring to Isaiah 53) we have Luke, Hebrews, "I Peter", the editor of the First Gospel; on the other are Paul, "John", and the Apocalyptist, together with the silence of Mark and of anything that could be grouped under Q. That is to say, the writers who use the Greek Bible exclusively are on one side, while those who, like St. Paul, have access to Semitic forms and interpretations of the Old Testament are on the other.¹

The "Servant Christology", therefore, appears to be a late development.

Burkitt's second point is a kind of explanation of the first. The Septuagint translated the Hebrew עֶבֶד , ebed, "slave", by the somewhat softer Greek word $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$. The Greek word may be understood not simply in the harsh sense of "slave" but also in the more familiar and affectionate sense of "child". Burkitt feels that it is in this second sense that we are to understand the title as applied to Jesus, the first being too rude.

Now the earliest believers may very well have started with a "Low" Christology, but I do not think that any

1. F. Burkitt: Christian Beginnings, p. 38.

of them, whether Greek or Jew, ever thought of Jesus, their Master, as God's slave.¹

Only where the ambiguous term $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ could be used was Jesus associated with Isaiah 53.

Plausible as Burkitt's argument seems, it has been subjected to certain very damaging criticisms, by A. E. J. Rawlinson² and others.

First of all, it is by no means clear that Greek thought would be readier to receive the idea of Jesus as the $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ θεοῦ than would Semitic thought the idea of Jesus as the $\pi\eta\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\iota}\tilde{\iota}$? $\tau\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\iota}$. Rawlinson cites Robertson Smith's discussion of the servant idea in Semitic religion, where it is stated:

In short, both in the political and in the religious sphere, the designation 'abd, 'ebed, "servant", is strictly correlated with the verb 'abad, "to do service, homage, or religious worship", a word which, as we have already seen, is sufficiently elastic to cover the service which a son does for his father, as well as that which a master requires from his slave. Thus, when a man is named the servant of a god, the implication appears to be, not merely that he belongs to the community of which the god is king, but that he is especially devoted to his service and worship.¹

The word was a common compound in the names of priestly families. Moreover it may be noted that at least as early as the Targum of Jonathan Messiah and Servant were identi-

1. Ibid. p. 41.

fied in Aramaic thought, although the thought of the Messiah as suffering was carefully avoided. It would appear, therefore, that Burkitt's second argument, based on the difference of Greek and Semitic thought forms is quite wrong. If anything, the identification of Jesus with the "Servant" would appear to be easier on Palestinian than on Hellenistic soil.

Again it is by no means clear that the servant idea has no place in the earlier New Testament books. It is at least quite possible that there are a number of allusions to the servant passages of Isaiah in Mark (Mark 1:11; 8:31; 9:12b; 9:31; 10:33; and 10:45). If in these sayings Jesus is not given the title $\pi\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ still it would appear, as Professor Manson has pointed out,¹ that it is the Isaianic Servant's mission which forms the "predicate" of which Jesus is the "subject". It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Mark is definitely picturing Jesus as setting out to fulfill the mission of the Isaianic Servant. And, indeed, without this explanation Jesus' deliberate choice of the cross becomes all the more mysterious.

Moreover, it is by no means clear that Paul is unfamiliar with the idea of Jesus as "servant", though he does not make much use of it. Two explanations have been suggested for Paul's failure to develop the idea. One-

1. W. Manson: op. cit., pp. 110-113.

the exact opposite of Burkitt's view - is that while Semitic religious usage had no aversion to the word "Servant" the idea would be repulsive to Hellenists with Greek ideas of slavery. The other suggestion is that the Servant of Isaiah 53 is also The Righteous One, and Paul avoided any term so closely associated with the Torah. Whatever the explanation for Paul's failure to make more use of the Isaianic passages may be, it would at least seem likely that he was familiar with the identification of Jesus as "The Servant". Rom. 4:25, "who was delivered up for our trespasses..." seems an allusion to Isaiah 53 and may well be a kerygma-like formula quoted by Paul. I Cor. 15:3 associated Jesus death "in behalf of our sins" with an unnamed scripture passage, for which Isaiah 53 seems the simplest choice. There is a possible allusion to Isaiah 53:1 in the ῥῆμα which is to be believed, mentioned in Rom. 10:8,11, in a passage dealing with the primitive confession of the Church.

But the most striking instance in this connection in Paul - one to which too little attention has been given by those who would exclude the "servant" idea from Paul - is the use of the unambiguous word δούλος, doulos, "slave" in Philippians 2:7. This word cannot here mean "child". And it would seem clear that the allusion is to the Isaianic Servant. The exaltation of Phil. 2:10,11 suggests

Isaiah 45:23. Phil. 2:7,8 seem clearly to reflect this humility and suffering of the Servant in Is. 53:7,8. Jesus is here the "Suffering Servant".

Now this passage becomes all the more significant if one accepts the view that it is an early Christian hymn. This has been convincingly proposed by E. Lohmeyer.¹ It is argued that in thought and style this passage is unlike Paul. Indeed Lohmeyer finds here many expressions which are not good Greek (ungriechisch), and many Semitisms. He also notes a certain poetic structure to the phrases of the passage, suggestive of Semetic verse form. His conclusion is that we have here a composition in Greek by a man whose mother tongue was Semetic, or in other words, that it is a Jewish-Christian psalm. Lowther Clark² would go even further and find an Aramaic original. Martin Dibelius³ regards it also as an early Christian hymn and prints it beside Peter's sermon in Acts 10 as a typical example of the kerygma. And A. M. Hunter⁴ finds it an example of pre-Pauline theology. Following this interpretation, then, we find the unambiguous idea of Jesus as "Slave of God", the Servant described in Isaiah, to be a

1. E. Lohmeyer: Kyrios Jesus, p. 9.

2. L. Clarke: New Testament Problems, pp. 143-150.

3. M. Dibelius: The Message of Jesus, pp. 5, 131.

4. A. Hunter: op. cit., p. 47ff.

part of the thought of the primitive kerygma.

Finally it may be noted that the appearance of the Servent Christology in the various later New Testament writings noted by Burkitt (see above) suggests an early source for the idea. One can scarcely agree with Burkitt that Luke did not have access to Semitic forms of interpretation. And if Selwyn is right in associating I Peter at least with the tradition of the apostle then the "Servent Christology" may well have begun with Peter himself.

There are, then, sufficient reasons for believing that primitive thought may have seen Jesus as the Suffering Servent of Isaiah. We must now consider whether this type of Christology is found in the Petrine sermons.

This surely seems the simplest interpretation of the sermon in Acts 3. Here at the beginning (Acts 3:13) and at the end (Acts 3:26) Jesus is explicitly given the title $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ of God. Vincent Taylor answers Cadbury here:

Certainly the word $\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\rho\varsigma$ is used in the Old Testament of Moses, Jacob, Abraham, Job, Israel, David, and Zerubbabel, but the subject matter of Acts 3 and 4 renders it difficult to think that it is used of Jesus in this archaic sense, while the references to 'delivering up' (3:26) and 'glorifying' (3:13) strongly suggest Isaiah 53... Blessing also is associated with the gift of the Servent Jesus, and deliverance from iniquities (3:26). There can be little doubt that the usual interpretation is correct.¹

The titles "Righteous One" and "Holy One" used of Jesus in his suffering fit this picture well. Moreover, the anointing

1. V. Taylor: The Atonement in New Testament Teaching, note, p. 26.

of Acts 10:38 is most easily understood in relation to Isaiah 61:1-3. True, the phrase "pangs of death" (Acts 2:24) perhaps suggests an allusion to Psalm 114:3. Here a devout man is delivered from afflictions and death at the moment when all seems lost and cries "O Lord, truly I am thy servant. I am thy servant and the son of thy handmaid". (Ps. 114:16). But even here this servant is so like that of Isaiah as rather to confirm than to deny the general picture. And certainly the frequent statements that all was accomplished according to the scripture are most easily explained by reference to Isaiah 53.

Finally we may note that in Acts 8:27-40 the identification of Jesus with the "Servant" of Isaiah 53 is made with absolute clarity. This passage, which according to Harnack belongs to the same source as Acts 10 and possibly Acts 3, a source of the highest value, states very clearly that this identification was part of the early preaching. In the light of this passage, Luke's use of the "Servant" idea in his gospel, and the old liturgical quotation in Acts 4:24-30, we cannot doubt that Luke regards the "Servant Christology" as being of the most ancient sort.

We cannot but believe, therefore, that we have in the Petrine sermons positive traces of a primitive Christology which saw in Jesus' life and death a fulfilment of the prophecies of Isaiah concerning the Suffering Servant of the Lord.

If this be true, then we have unfolded before us in these Isaianic passages the primitive church's picture of Jesus' earthly life, His character, and His ministry. And in Isaiah 53:5 the first seeds of a theory of sacrificial atonement must have been found, a theory which was to be developed far more extensively by Paul and the writer of Hebrews.

We have seen the places assigned in the earliest Christological thought to earthly life and death of Jesus. We have seen that though various aspects of Jewish Messianism were used as tools by which to interpret Jesus, it was nevertheless His historical figure which stood at the center of Christological thought. We have seen that He was unambiguously proclaimed to have been a man. We have seen that a picture of His actions, His prophetic ministry and His character were a part of the first preaching. And we have seen the important place given to the cross in the earliest thought. All of this, we have suggested, was interpreted in the light of the "Servant" passages of Isaiah.

Yet important as the historic life and death of Jesus were to the early church, in a sense these events were regarded but as preludes to the truly great events which followed: the resurrection and the exaltation. It is to these that we must now turn.

CHAPTER VI JESUS AS EXALTED (IN THE SERMONS OF PETER)

The Christology of the Petrine sermons is essentially a resurrection Christology. At the center of the early church's thought about Jesus stood the concept of the resurrection and the exaltation.

Perhaps it is because they stem from a time so close to the events described that the Petrine sermons have this unique emphasis. By the time of the writing of the Gospel according to John it was possible to view Jesus' earthly ministry in a very different way. But for the first disciples there had occurred following Easter a complete change in the status of their Lord. He who had once lived humbly as a man among men, who had been a Servant, who had suffered the most ignominious death - this One had now suddenly been exalted to the right hand of God and been made by God to be both Lord and Christ. A. E. J. Rawlinson rightly comments on Acts 2:36, "Thus the verdict of man was reversed by the verdict of God..."¹ But there was more than a verdict. God had actually raised Jesus to an utterly new position.

1) What proofs did the early preachers offer that this exaltation had actually taken place?

Some commentators have found the key to the early

1. A. Rawlinson: op. cit., p. 31.

faith in the exaltation to be the primitive eschatological hope. It was this hope which enabled them to overcome the disappointment of the crucifixion.

Only by this thought of the Parousia, the belief in which was universal and dominant among the early Christians, could the Messiahship of Jesus be reconciled in the minds of Jewish Christians with the termination of his earthly career, which they were able to regard only as an ignominy and a failure.¹

"Proof text" for this interpretation is Acts 3:20, which seems to look upon the advent of the Christ as still a future event.

For faith in the Messiah was hope for the future. Jesus had not yet been Messiah. He had merely been a candidate for the office. Hence they spoke of the advent of the Messiah - not of his return.²

In our chapter on Jesus and the eschatological hopes of late Judaism we have already made clear our agreement with those who hold that hope of the parousia was of tremendous importance in the first preaching. But we must still ask on what this hope was based. For the Petrine sermons, like the rest of the New Testament, seem to spring not from a last desperate explanation but from a triumphant certainty.

In a sense the proclamation of the exaltation was

1. Orello Cone: The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations, p. 146.

2. Paul Wernle: The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 128, cf. A. Harnack: The Date of Acts, p. 107.

based on the church's experience of Jesus as a Living and present Power. It was the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost which brought the first Christian sermon, according to Acts, and it was the healing of the lame man which brought the second. These events were interpreted as giving public witness to the fact that Jesus had been exalted to the right hand of God. Of this we will say more in the next chapter.

But undoubtedly the central factor in the apostle's assurance of the exaltation, the event which formed the basis of all New Testament Christology, was the event of the Resurrection. It was this which carried with it the conviction of Jesus' new status. It was this which stood at the heart of the kerygma. And therefore it is to the resurrection as found in Peter's sermons that we must turn now.

2) We shall here examine the Petrine doctrine of the resurrection.

First we must notice its centrality in the apostolic witness. Every sermon announces it (Acts 2:32; 3:15; 4:10; 5:31; and 10:40-42). Upon this fact the whole kerygma is based. Indeed Peter can describe himself and the apostles simply as witnesses to the resurrection (Acts 2:32; 3:15, cf. 1:22). That is to say in some sense the whole of the message of the early church could be summed up under the phrase "the Resurrection of Jesus Christ".

That Luke is accurate in making the resurrection the heart of the first witness to Jesus can no longer be doubted. Rom. 10:9 makes the resurrection a part of the primitive confession. The very language of this confession is echoed throughout the epistles (Rom. 4:25; 8:11; Gal. 1:1; II Cor. 4:14; I Peter 1:21; always with the verb $\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\omega$, not $\acute{\alpha}\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\eta\mu\iota$ and the prepositional phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$, not $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ ¹). The appended chart I shows the place of the resurrection in the kerygma passages. But more significant even than these sure traces in the oldest strata of our writings is the fact that not one line of the New Testament is written by a man who does not believe in the resurrection. This conviction is the foundation of the Christian Church.

Somewhat more difficult, however, is the question of the nature of the resurrection as conceived by the primitive church.

With regard to the sermons in Acts there can be no doubt that they preach a resurrection which is real, even materially real. Johannes Weiss comments on the concept of the resurrection implied by Peter's quotation from Psalm 16 (Acts 2:25-28):

The resurrection is not in these passages as with St. Paul, regarded as a clothing of the Risen One with a glorified body, but as the revivification, or to put it better, the conservation, of the very same body of flesh which was laid in the grave... That an author whose ideas otherwise are cast in such a Greek mould should reproduce it, shows that

1. See J. Stewart: A Man in Christ, p. 135.

the popular conceptions cannot have been so strange to him as we should have supposed.¹

Of course, however, the particular passage in question may possibly go back to an Aramaic original which quoted the Psalm from the Hebrew. And in this version there is not that reference to "corruption" found in the Septuagint. Still the concept of the resurrection is as Weiss describes it.

Thus we are told that the resurrection occurred on a particular day, the third (Acts 10:40). The risen Jesus is seen as visible to the apostles. He gives them commands. He even eats and drinks with these disciples. It is true that the risen Christ is said to have been thus manifested only to a few people, but this is explained in terms of the fact that they are the predestined witnesses of the resurrection. There is no suggestion that the resurrection is any the less material.

It is interesting that, unlike the account in Luke's gospel, the story of the women at the tomb is not even mentioned, and the emphasis is laid entirely on the collective experiences of the apostles. In this respect the sermons of Peter compare with the formula Paul received (I Cor. 15:5).

It may be objected that such details as that Jesus

1. J. Weiss: "Acts of the Apostles", Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, p. 27.

ate and drank with the disciples after the resurrection suggest a later form of the resurrection story. It may be answered at least that this materialistic concept seems Jewish rather than Greek. Moreover, from the very first the Church looked upon the Resurrection as an event of the greatest reality. It was more than the preaching of a hero's immortality or of visions and myths which repelled the Greeks at Athens (Acts 17:32), for these things the Greeks could readily accept. Nor were such stories sufficiently novel in Palestine to start a movement comparable to the Christian Church. As Sasse writes:

Thus the ordinary interpretations which could explain these Easter experiences as though the disciples had had visions of Christ in which the certainty was borne in upon them that their Master continued to live, and that they then drew the conclusion that he had risen from the dead, fall to the ground. They might well have attained to the certainty that Jesus continued to live with God without that overpowering Easter experience which shook the whole of their lives... In these experiences the assurance cannot have contained a universal truth, but an actual fact.¹

This recognition, however, leads us to a second point. Though the early preachers may well have presented the resurrection in a crudely materialistic fashion they also preached it as an event of cosmic significance and power. To this meaning which they found in the Easter event we must now turn.

The sermons of Peter give a sort of three-fold inter-

1. H. Sasse: op. cit., p. 99.

pretation to the resurrection.

First, the resurrection is regarded as the event which stands as the vindication of Jesus' ministry. It is by the resurrection, indeed, that God has reversed the decision of man. The Jews had delivered up Jesus to Pilate to be crucified and had demanded a murderer in preference to Him. But by the resurrection it is made clear that Jesus was God's Servant, the Holy and Just One. It is the resurrection vindication which Scripture foretold (Acts 4:11). By this event the true character of Jesus in his earthly ministry has been revealed. Thus the news of the resurrection "pricks men to the heart" (Acts 2:37; 5:33) with a new realization of what they have done.

But the resurrection is interpreted as announcing more than just what Jesus was. It announces what Jesus is, his new status, his exaltation to the right hand of God. In what Dodd regards as a quotation from a primitive creed Paul writes that by the resurrection Jesus was "declared to be the Son of God with power". (Rom. 1:4). The thought is almost exactly parallel to that of the sermons in Acts.

In this sense the resurrection is the proof of the exaltation. It is only after he has described the resurrection that Peter can announce:

Let all the House of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ... (Acts 2:36).

It is the resurrection which gives the sure knowledge, the guarantee. Or, as Acts 10:42 puts it, it is through this

event that the apostles received the command to preach Jesus in his new office as the eschatological Judge. Thus whatever the nature of the resurrection experiences they represented to the disciples far more than the reanimation of Jesus' body. It was the resurrection which demonstrated to them conclusively that Jesus was exalted to the right hand of God and that His new age had begun. "Prince", "Saviour", "Lord", "Christ", "Judge" - all these are titles primarily derived from the resurrection experience.

And thirdly, the resurrection is more than the proof of the exaltation, it is the path to the exaltation, the means by which it has been accomplished. "Exaltation" and "Resurrection" are not clearly distinguished. The one seems the inevitable accompaniment of the other (Acts 2:32, 33). The sermon in Acts 5 mentions only the exaltation, though obviously the resurrection is involved in the meaning. The two terms are thus in a sense synonymous. The resurrection appearances are that aspect of the event which can be described. The exaltation is never described. That Jesus has been exalted to God's right hand can only be triumphantly affirmed.

3) We turn, therefore, to the concept of the exaltation.

As we have just noted, the exaltation was not an event which the early church could describe. It could only affirm it. Yet this is not to say that the certainty of the

event was for Peter any the less real. A change of status amounting almost to a change of nature had taken place in Jesus. He who had been among men now is at the right hand of God. He who had been "Servant" has suddenly been made "Lord". This is the center of the message.

There is an interesting contrast here between Luke's own Christology and that of the sermons. Luke alone, in Acts 1, gives us an account of the ascension. Here the emphasis is on a visible event thought of in terms of the end of Jesus' earthly ministry. But the exaltation in the sermons is affirmed without any reference to an ascension, and the emphasis is not so much on the termination of Jesus' earthly career as on Jesus' new glorification.

This concept of the exaltation event seems to be without any known parallel. It is true that some have suggested that the idea might have come from the legendary exaltation of certain Greek Heroes. Thus Hercules at the last moment was carried to heaven, there to become a sort of God. However, in the pagan story Hercules accomplishes no comparable death and resurrection, there is involved no such glorious vindication, and Hercules is lifted to no comparably unique place in the polytheistic heaven. Moreover the whole belongs to the realm of myth, whereas the exaltation of Jesus is preached as having befallen an historic person. And finally we may note that the idea seems to have arisen in the church before Christianity can have been much influenced by Greek

ideas. Some of the above objections are even stronger to the proposed analogies drawn from Hebrew sources such as the assumptions of Enoch, Moses, and Elijah. In these there is no hint at all of a triumphant vindication reversing man's decision, of a death and resurrection, or of a status in the state of exaltation comparable to that of Christ. Rather these men according to their legends seem simply to change location from earth to heaven. This, as we have seen, is not the emphasis with regard to the exaltation of Jesus.

What, then, was the new status to which Jesus had been raised?

In a sense the answer to that question is as broad as this thesis. With the exception of "Jesus" and "The Nazarene", every title for Jesus which we have discussed or will discuss is bound up with the exaltation as indicating either that which was proved or that which was achieved by it. But the phrase especially associated with the exaltation is $\tau\eta\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (Acts 2:33, 34; 5:31), at (or by) the right hand of God. It is this, therefore, that we must note briefly here.

It is not always clear whether we have here a locative or a dative of means. The later interpretation fits well with the Midrashic texts which described how God created the world with his left hand but the heavens with his right and how it is with his right hand that God raises the righteous to live forever. Yet Jackson and Lake are probably right in interpreting the phrase as locative in

view of its association with Psalm 110, so fundamental to primitive Christology.¹

There are three implications of the phrase: First we may recall what has already been said concerning Psalm 110. The phrase carries with it all the highest in Messianic expectation. Secondly, the phrase implies a certain distinction from God. Jesus and God are side by side, but they are not merged. So even the later creeds sought to preserve the distinction of persons. And thirdly, the phrase implies a certain equality between Jesus and God. Jesus is now God's co-regent. Titles once applied to God alone are now applicable to Him. And functions once thought exclusively divine, such as the bestowal of forgiveness and of the Spirit, are now ascribed to Jesus. Thus Jesus now stands in a relationship to the believer comparable only to that of God Himself. But of this we must say more in the next chapter.

4) Before developing this last point more fully we must consider one final problem bound up with the exaltation, that of "Adoptionism" in these sermons.

It is Johannes Weiss who has best developed the adoptionistic implication of the Christology of the sermons in Acts, quite rightly contrasting this idea with later

1. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol IV, p. 25.

Christologies to show the primitive character of the Petrine sermons. Weiss lays great emphasis on Acts 2:36, "... God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified". "This", he writes, "is the principal extent proof passage for the earliest Christology."¹ Again he comments on Acts 10:38, "Thus originally the baptism in Jordan was the birth-hour of the Messiah."² The baptism becomes the anointing, and the resurrection the proclamation of that adoption. Or again, in connection with the Markan account of Jesus' baptism, Weiss writes, "No clearer expression could be given to the Old Christological view: a man is now raised to the dignity of a divine ruler."³

Weiss is here getting at an important truth. However, certain cautions must be noted.

For one thing, it is impossible to determine a particular time in Jesus' ministry at which this adoption may be said to have taken place. Jackson and Lake rightly comment in connection with the account of Jesus' baptism in Acts 10:38:

The speech has the early Christology of Mark, which represents Jesus as becoming Christ at the baptism. But in 2:36 Peter seems to suggest that Jesus became Christ at the Resurrection. Again in 3:12ff. Peter seems to avoid using the word Christ until in connection with the Passion and Resurrection. Finally, it is probable that Luke's own view was

1. J. Weiss: "Acts of the Apostles", Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, p. 27.

2. J. Weiss: Christ the Beginning of Dogma, p. 43.

3. ibid. p. 42.

that Jesus was born Christ, because he was conceived by the Holy Spirit. It is these divergent points of view which suggest, though they do not prove, that Luke was using at least one and probably more than one, source for the Petrine speeches in Acts.¹

Once Paul Wernle could seriously propose an orderly progression in which the church first thought of Jesus as becoming Christ at the parousia, then placed the emphasis on the resurrection, later looked upon the anointing at the baptism as the moment of adoption, next evolved a theory of the virgin birth, and finally preached pre-existence.

Actually this orderly progression, though beautifully logical, cannot be derived from any existing documents. Weiss' suggestion that Jesus became Christ at the baptism but was thus proclaimed only at the resurrection, just as there was an interval of time between David's anointing and his public acclamation, cannot be pressed. According to Acts 2:22 the deeds of Jesus' earthly life also proclaimed his Messiahship. In short, there simply is no clear pattern here.

The picture is rather that of the Primitive church's groping for forms and finding new meaning in various events. There is no well defined systematic dogma of "Adoptionism".

A second caution to be noted is that one may detect even in the sermons of Peter the seeds of what was later to become the creeds' doctrine of Christ's pre-existence. For one thing, Jesus was from the first proclaimed the eschatological Messiah. Pre-existence, or something very

1. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 120.

close to it, had already been posited of the "Elect One" of I Enoch, and this indeed was a logical outgrowth of eschatology. Again, Jesus is clearly presented as pre-destined. Every act of His is a fulfilment of scripture, and He Himself is the climax of the eternal plan of God. And third, one must note again the tendency to merge the titles and functions of Jesus with those of God, who is, of course, from everlasting. Even from the first the hand of God is seen in the acts of Jesus, "for God was with him", and His mighty works God did by Him.

A third caution is that which has been so well presented by A. E. J. Rawlinson in his note "On the Alleged 'Adoptionism' of Primitive Christianity".¹ Rawlinson points out that the later "Adoptionist" heresy concerned itself with the Greek concept of divine sonship in a more physical sense and is analogous to the myths current about certain Greek heroes. Actually, Messiahship was a matter of office and of function, not simply of inherent nature. The exaltation described in Peter's sermons brings for Jesus not a change of nature (human to divine) but a change of status (Servant to Lord). Again, the anointing was to a certain office, but it did not make Jesus more nor less divine. Jesus is not said to be a man who has become divine but a "Servant" who has become "Lord".

With these three cautions, however, one may accept the "adoptionist" interpretation of these sermons as correct.

1. A. E. J. Rawlinson: op. cit., pp. 265-269.

Jesus is certainly presented as a man, chosen and anointed by God, and now exalted to God's right hand. This presentation has close affinities with Mark, but as noted by Jackson and Lake (see above) it is in a certain contrast to Luke's own view. It is also somewhat different from the view of Paul, Matthew, John, or the later books of the New Testament, wherein the Virgin Birth and pre-existence find larger place. It is the oldest Christology.

And it is certainly true that in these sermons one finds a unique emphasis on the exaltation. Perhaps nowhere else in the New Testament, with the significant exception of Phil. 2:6-11, can one find such an emphasis on the sharp contrast between what Jesus was and what He now has become, and on the transition from the low estate to the high. The Petrine sermons, so we have said, preach uniquely an exaltation Christology.

We have examined the Petrine concept of the exaltation itself, the event which occurred. We must turn now to the idea of Jesus in His exaltation as He now exists, of Jesus as a living and present power.

CHAPTER VII JESUS AS A LIVING AND PRESENT POWER (IN THE SERMONS OF PETER)

As eschatological Judge of all the earth the primitive church spoke of Jesus in the future tense. As the Suffering Servant of the Lord they spoke of Jesus in the aorist tense. The exaltation was spoken of in the perfect tense, implying that He who had been raised continued at the right hand of God. But there was also involved in primitive Christology a present tense. Jesus was proclaimed to be present with His church as a living Power.

At the exaltation Jesus was lifted utterly above man to equality with God. This, however, did not make Him unapproachable through worship. Even more, it did not limit Jesus' approach to his disciples. The very fact that He was now at the right hand of God gave Jesus all the more access to men and all the more power with which to help them. Thus the earliest preaching witnesses to the church's tremendous consciousness of Jesus as a present Lord and Saviour.

1). First, Jesus is related to the Holy Spirit.

If Acts is to be believed, it was the experience of Pentecost which gave rise to the first public witness that Jesus was the Christ. Peter's first sermon embodies the Christology of an ecstasy. And it is directly to Jesus in his new position of exaltation that this ecstasy is

attributed.

Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath poured forth this, which ye see and hear. (Acts 2:33).

It is through Him that Joel's prophecy is fulfilled (Acts 2:16-21). The Holy Spirit is the supreme Witness to Jesus (Acts 5:32). And it is by Jesus, Himself the Anointed One, that the Holy Spirit is now offered to all (Acts 2:38; 5:32).

As Hopwood says:

Once more, the awareness of Jesus' nearness and presence with His disciples was encouraged by their experience of the Spirit... All that Jesus was, in life, in death, in resurrection triumph, in Messianic exaltation, was viewed as the inspiration of the Spirit. In turn, as the Spirit inspired the speech, the healings, the visions, and the varied expression of the primitive community, Jesus would be called vividly to mind. The Spirit was the "earnest" of the presence of Jesus in the midst of the community as well as the pledge of the final consummation of the divine Kingdom.¹

Even more, the Spirit was the power of Jesus now operative in the community for life, fellowship, strength, and witness. By it Jesus was present in all his exaltation, joy and power for the aid of those who were baptized in his name. "Christology" and present experience here became one.

2) The concept of Jesus as a living and present power is seen again in Peter's preaching concerning the power of the Name. If Jesus has not yet been revealed in the full Messianic power of the eschaton at least the name of the Messiah has been revealed. To this extent eschatology is "realized".

1. P. G. S. Hopwood: op. cit., p. 308.

This is the central theme of the sermon in Acts 3.

The object of this address is to emphasize the power of the name of Jesus. The miracle wrought by Peter and John is a conclusive proof that he is still a living power, able to bring not only a future deliverance, but a present salvation into the world.¹

This also is the theme of Peter's defence (Acts 4:8-12), and the Name is perhaps always implied in reference to baptism.

(Acts 3:38)

This, of course, is a thoroughly Oriental concept and suggests its Palestinian origin. All through the Old Testament one finds that names are significant. Moreover, he who knows another's name has a certain hold upon that person. Especially is this true concerning God. The supreme act of revelation to Moses is that in which God reveals to him the unutterable name, Jahweh (Exodus 6). Ever after this the Hebrew possesses the divine name and thus has a claim on God's salvation. Salvation is "in the name of Jahweh", for those who "call upon the name of Jahweh".

Now it is striking that this which was in the Old Testament exclusively associated with God is now applied to Jesus. True, this is but the carrying further of the trend which one may see beginning in the Similitudes of I Enoch.

And at that hour that Son of Man was named
 In the presence of the Lord of Spirits,
 And his name before the Head of Days.
 Yes, before the sun and the signs were created,
 Before the stars of the heaven were made,
 His name was named before the Lord of Spirits.
 He shall be a staff to the righteous whereon to
 stay themselves and not fall,

1. F. J. Foakes-Jackson: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 27.

And he shall be a light to the Gentiles,
 And the hope of those troubled in heart. (I Enoch
 48:2-4)

Here the name of the eschatological Judge is already assuming a cosmic significance comparable to that of God's. But nothing in the canonical Old Testament comes even this close to the habit of Peter's sermons of ascribing to the name of Jesus what once was reserved for the name of God.

The "name" of Jesus appears in four associations in the sermons of Peter. The first of these is the phrase "faith in his name" (Acts 3:16). Here the "name" is the object of trust and devotion. It is faith in the name which has brought the healing.

Thus the second association is that of the name with healing and exorcism (Acts 3:16; 4:10). If in Acts 2 the Spirit is said to be manifested by "tongues" and prophecy, in Acts 3 the power of the name is manifested by active deeds. It is made clear that it is not by any power of the disciples that the lame man is healed but by the power of Jesus' name. Strange to us as this idea seems it is probably really characteristic of the primitive Palestinian church. It may be noted that in Mark 9:38 there is no surprise that the use of Jesus' name has brought exorcism. The only objection is its unauthorized use. Silva New reports a Second Century synagogue ruling which forbade the use of the Name of Jesus to exorcise or heal. "It was effective, but it was wrong".¹ Thus the sermons see

1. in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. V, p. 121ff.

Jesus as still "the Great Physician". Cullmann also traces the use of the title "Lord" in an early formula for exorcism.¹

A third association of the name is with baptism (Acts 3:28). Here again one feels oneself on firmly historical ground. That baptism was the custom of the Christian Church from the beginning is not to be doubted. John 4:2 even states that the custom began before Jesus' death. Certainly it would appear that Paul was baptized, probably as early as 33 A.D. (I Cor. 12:13; cf. Acts 9:18). The Pauline epistles presuppose the custom as universal in the church (I Cor. 12:13). And I Corinthians also associates baptism with the name (I Cor. 1:13; 6:11). The gospels see Jesus as a second and far greater Baptist, baptizing not simply with water but with the Spirit (John 1:33; Mark 1:8).

But faith in the Name and baptism in the Name are terms which depend for their meaning on another (the fourth) association, that of forgiveness and salvation through the Name. "There is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved," Peter announces (Acts 4:12). We must therefore examine this concept of Jesus as Saviour.

3) The kerygma is the proclamation that Jesus is the Saviour of the world. And in this too Jesus is a present Power.

I. O. Cullmann: The Earliest Christian Confessions, p. 23ff
 Note the title $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma \tau\acute{\omega}\nu \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\omega\nu$.

Writing from the standpoint of form criticism Dibelius says:

Whatever was told of Jesus' words and deeds was always a testimony of faith as formulated for preaching and exhortation in order to convert unbelievers and confirm the faithful. What founded Christianity was not knowledge about a historical process, but the confidence that the content of the story was salvation...¹

Or from a different point of approach William Hatch finds that

... while recognizing that there were other reasons for the rapid spread of Christianity among Gentiles in the first century of our era, we should put the promise of salvation first and foremost. This was the essence of the primitive Christian message, and it was this more than anything else that attracted men and women to the new religion in great numbers.²

This is surely the picture of the early preaching which Luke gives us in Acts. Jesus is called Saviour (Acts 5:31) and through him salvation and forgiveness are offered in one form or another in every sermon recorded.

We have already seen in our discussion of Jesus and eschatology that this salvation was conceived of in eschatological terms. Jesus was the divinely appointed Judge, who was pictured as being about to come to visit God's judgment upon mankind. Thus it behoved men so to relate themselves to Him by faith and baptism that they would be among that elect group spared in the day of judgment and allowed to enter the Messianic kingdom.

1. M. Dibelius: From Tradition to Gospel, p. 295.

2. W. Hatch: "The Primitive Christian Message", Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LVIII, March 1939, p. 13.

However, there are in these sermons suggestions that Jesus' work as Saviour was not conceived as being entirely restricted to the future.

First, the gifts of the Spirit and of healing and exorcism and the present demands of baptism and of faith, discussed above, are bound up with this salvation.

Second, we may note that there is a present turning of Israel from her sins. Acts 3:26 and 5:31 seem to imply that Jesus has already begun or is now engaged in the work of giving repentance to the Jews and purifying the chosen people. And He has brought a new revelation of God's will which includes an already obligatory demand.

Third, it is by no means clear that the forgiveness spoken of in Acts 3:19, Acts 5:31, and Acts 10:43 is wholly a future experience. It is likely that Acts 3:19 refers to forgiveness in an eschatological era at the parousia, since the "times of refreshing" are probably best understood in this connection. Yet even here the certainty of forgiveness may be thought of as an experience realized in the present, and the other two verses suggest a present as well as a future forgiveness. Here is an interesting suggestion that something like the Pauline concept of "justification by faith" was present in the church before Paul. Indeed, though it was undoubtedly Paul who worked out the doctrine more explicitly, one may well believe Luke accurate even here. In Galatians 2 Paul assumes that Peter and the other leaders at Jerusalem are sympathetic to this point of view. The

pre-Pauline custom of baptism suggests it. And it is at least possible that this teaching of forgiveness through faith in Jesus rather than through the law was responsible for Paul's persecution of the early Church.

And finally, there is a suggestion that entrance into the covenant community of which Jesus is Lord is already in some sense an experience realized. Jesus is already "Saviour" in this sense of "Lord".

4) This concept of Jesus as living Lord of the Church deserves re-examination in this connection.

We have already expressed a certain disagreement with Wilhelm Bousset with regard to the title "Lord". It seems much simpler to derive its first use from Old Testament sources - notably Psalm 110- rather than from pagan cults. Yet one cannot overlook an element in early Christian thought of which Bousset has given us a scholarly reminder. It would appear that at least as far back as our earliest documents carry us Jesus was thought of as being the head of a community of worshippers to whom he stood in a special relationship symbolized by the title "Lord". Even if one denies any pagan influence here and derives the whole concept from the Old Testament it remains quite intelligible. As David and Solomon and their descendents were kings of the covenant people of old, so Jesus is proclaimed to be the new Anointed One, promised by the ancient covenant to those whom God has newly called.

It is interesting that the Petrine sermons and the early chapters of Acts generally make little or no use of

the word ἡ ἐκκλησία , the called, the Church. Here perhaps is a hint that these passages precede in their origin the extensive use of the term so common in the Pauline epistles.

Yet the concept of Jesus as the ruler of a community called by God is clearly present.

For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him. (Acts 2:38, cf. Is. 44:3)

And Acts 3:25 again associates Jesus with the ancient covenant with Israel through which they would become a blessing to all peoples.

His followers are related to Jesus by faith (Acts 3:16), by baptism in his name (Acts 3:38). Thus they already owe obedience to Him (Acts 3:22). And though this community is still thought of primarily in terms of the Hebrews there is already a suggestion that it is broader than this one race (Acts 3:25). Its bounds are now rather those of the Holy Spirit.

It is in this connection that we must note the phrase τὸν ἀρχηγὸν τῆς ζωῆς (Acts 3:15). Rackham comments:

... by his resurrection Jesus won his third Name, the Prince of Life. The word Prince or Author (1) means he who goes first or Leader; and Jesus was the first begotten of the dead'... (2) The leader is generally the Captain or Prince which is the ordinary meaning of the Greek word in the Old Testament; and Christ by his victory over death was declared to be the Prince of Life, the victorious Captain who 'brought to nought him that had the power of death' and 'brought life and immortality to light.'¹

The ἀρχηγός was in Greek literature often also the hero and

1. R. Rackham: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 52.

the founder of a community over which he ruled and to which he gave his name. Thus Jesus appears as the founder of the resurrection community, and its Lord.

It is thus that Jesus can make an absolute demand upon the apostles that will leave them with but one purpose in life. They are His witnesses, the heralds of the King (Acts 10:42). This is the presupposition of the kerygma.

In this connection we may note Bousset's linguistic suggestion that the Aramaic word for Lord always appears in some such compound as Maran, our Lord. Thus, if we are right in associating the title with Psalm 110, it is my Lord who is spoken of. The Lordship of Jesus is a personal one, over persons. In a sense they possess Him, and He possesses them. For the called people of the covenant Jesus is already the Anointed King, the Prince, their Lord, the Lord of the Church.

5) Finally, therefore, we must note that Jesus as a Living and Present Power stands in a relationship to his followers comparable only to that of God.

We have already noted that Jesus was unambiguously called "a man" and that even in his exaltation he was clearly distinguished from The Father. Yet we have also had occasion to note from time to time predicates ascribed to Jesus which formerly were ascribed only to God. It is Jehweh who in the Old Testament is Lord, Judge, and Saviour. And especially in this present relationship which we have des-

cribed in this chapter does it appear that Jesus stands over against the believer in a capacity for practical purposes divine. As Denny rightly says:

But these (forgiveness and the Holy Spirit) are supremely gifts of God, and we do not appreciate truly the place of Christ in the apostles' faith until we see that where salvation is concerned He stands upon God's side, confronting men. The most vivid expression is given to this in Acts 2:33... There can be no doubt that in this passage Peter looks upon Jesus in his exaltation as forming with God His Father one divine causality at work through the Spirit for the salvation of men... His relationship to those experiences which constitute Christian life is that of being their Author, the Divine Source from which they come; He is not to Christian faith a Christian, but all Christians owe their being, as such, to Him.¹

Even in the "low" Christology of the primitive church one sees in its recognition of Jesus as a living and present Power a path which was to lead inevitably to the full heights of John's affirmation that "the Word was God" (John 1:1).

1. J. Denny: Jesus and the Gospel, p. 19.

CHAPTER VIII THE CHRISTOLOGY OF STEPHEN'S PREACHING

It is at least possible to maintain that our record of the speech of Stephen is the oldest written document preserved for us in the New Testament.

It is true that a quite opposite view has been held by competent critics. Soltau¹, for example, has argued that the speech's affinities with Alexandrian thought imply that it must have come from a comparatively late date. Few have followed Soltau on this point, however, for several reasons. For one thing, the allegories of Stephen's address may spring from Palestinian Rabbinic typology rather than from Alexandrian. For another thing, it is difficult to explain how a document coming from Alexandria, so far from its setting, can have been mistaken by Luke for Stephen's work. And finally, most important of all, Stephen was in all probability a Hellenist and may quite well have come from Alexandria himself, like Apollos, or at least have been familiar with Alexandrian exegesis such as Philo was making popular. Indeed, he is explicitly associated with the synagogue of the Alexandrians (Acts 6:9). Affinities with Alexandria therefore do not deny the sermon to Stephen.

A second objection to its antiquity has been raised

1. W. Soltau: "Die Herkunft der Reden in der Apostelgeschichte", Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1903, p. 128.

by Johannes Weiss, who, comparing Stephen's address with Stoic diatribes against "temples made with hands", writes:

The author of the speech will... characterize Stephen as a Jew who from the Scriptures has reached the conviction that the true religion does not stand or fall with the Temple-Cult. The narrator by so doing characterizes himself and the circle in which he moves as being at all events far from Jerusalem and emancipated from the legalistic tradition.¹

Most scholars, however, have found Stephen's attitude toward the law to point in exactly the opposite direction. Cadbury and Lake, who rarely seem biased toward the conservative point of view, remark of Stephen's legalism:

On the contrary, the underlying contention of Stephen seems to be that the Law was the word of God, which ought to be observed but was not. In this respect his attitude seems closer to that of Jesus than to that of Paul. But the point is hardly brought out emphatically, and the absence of any allusion to the Judaistic controversy seems to exclude any theory which would make the speech the composition of one who had lived through that controversy in the company of Paul, and was writing with a view to the situation of the Christian Church of the period... The general character of the speech seems to fit in very well with the theory that it represents either a good tradition as to what Stephen really did say, or at least what a very early Christian, not of the Pauline school, would have wished him to say.²

Thus the great majority of commentators have rejected arguments to the contrary and have taken the speech attributed to Stephen as at the very least being based on some ancient document.

1. J. Weiss: History of Primitive Christianity, Vol. I, p. 169.

2. In Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 69.

There are a number of reasons, in addition to those suggested above, which have led the critics to this view.

First, the speech is disproportionately long.

The fulness with which it is reported is out of all proportion to the scale of the book. It is difficult to believe that Luke, with his fine sense of literary fitness, would have encumbered his narrative with this long dissertation unless it had come down to him in some genuine source which he was anxious to preserve.¹

Again, it is noted that the speech is not clearly related to its narrative context. Now Luke was capable of recounting a defense speech smoothly, concisely, and with obvious point, as those attributed to Paul show. Yet the relevance of Stephen's defence to the charges said to have been made against him has puzzled commentators for centuries. Erasmus is said to have commented,

Many things in this speech have not very much pertinency to the matter which Stephen undertook.²

And there is the oft quoted remark of John Calvin,

Stephen responsio prima specie absurda et inepta videri posset.

There seems no simple explanation as to why an author like Luke would have included the apparently irrelevant Old Testament resume' except that he found it as an ancient tradition as to Stephen's type of thought. Indeed, it would seem quite possible that the speech was originally not so much meant to represent Stephen's defence at his trial as

1. E. F. Scott: The Beginnings of Christianity, p. 225.

2. quoted by P.J. Gloag: Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 255.

simply an embodiment of Stephen's ideas as expressed in his debates with the Hellenists.

Not only is the speech poorly related to its setting in the narrative, its argument is obscure and difficult to interpret. We shall note below what diversity of interpretation the best trained scholars have given it. E. F. Scott writes:

We have the impression, as we try to make out its drift, that it represents a mode of Christian apologetic which in Luke's day had already become unintelligible.¹

To say the least, it lacks Luke's accustomed clarity.

Moreover, its thought is neither Lucan nor Pauline. We have noted above the comment of Cadbury and Lake about the contrast of Stephen's attitude toward the law to that of later writers. From a somewhat different line of approach Wilfred Knox, comparing the sermon of Paul (Acts 13) with that of Stephen finds a similar contrast.

Stephen's speech appears to reflect the same feeling of the impossibility of converting the Gentile world to Judaism which we find in Paul. But it follows a quite different line of argument in rejecting the Torah; it is not that it has been fulfilled and superseded in the Gospel but that from the beginning the Jewish nation has rejected the spirit in favour of the letter... To us Stephen's view and Paul's are quite incompatible; but to Jewish writers consistency meant little. Both Paul and Stephen held that Christ had put an end to the Torah. So long as they agreed on the main fact, the arguments by which they proved it were of secondary importance.²

1. E. F. Scott: op. cit., p. 226.

2. W. Knox: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 72.

Goguel¹ somewhat similarly notes that one of Luke's favorite ideas is that Christianity is simply the fulfilment of Judaism. He is careful to show Peter, John, and Paul as worshipping in the Temple as the most pious Jews. Yet Stephen's speech almost equates the temple with idolatry. Such an idea may well have come from Luke's source, not from Luke himself.

Again, the technique of argument through typology, rabbinical if not Alexandrian, is certainly not Lucan and is a method which Paul used but sparingly.

Indeed it may be said that the speech of Stephen is unique in the whole of the New Testament. Its closest affinities are with the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the parallels which may be drawn here argue rather for an early date for the epistle than for a late date for the address.² The speech seems in every way admirably suited for the utterance of an early Hellenist Christian faced with the problems besetting the Palestinian church. There seems every reason, therefore, to assume that it goes back to a real memory of Stephen himself.

That a record of Stephen's thought should have been preserved is significant, but it perhaps is not surprising. For there are at least hints that Stephen was in some sense a father of the Christian world mission. First, it

1. M. Goguel: Introduction au Nouveau Testament, Tome III, p. 361.

2. For extended discussion of this matter see W. Manson: The Epistle to the Hebrews, especially pp. 162-167.

is generally agreed that Stephen was himself a Hellenist. He bears a Greek name. He is one of the seven chosen in Acts 6 to see after Hellenist widows. His opponents were Hellenists (Acts 6:9), probably because he himself was a Hellenist. And the possible affinities of his thought with that of Philo suggest the Hellenistic outlook. Thus Stephen emerges as a leader of the earliest Christian group who thought in terms of a world outlook. Again, it is stated that it was at the persecution following the death of Stephen that the Christian world mission really began. (Acts 8:15). Yet the apostles themselves seem to have been able to remain in Jerusalem (Acts 8:14). The implication would seem to be that the persecution was primarily of the Hellenist followers of Stephen, and it was these followers of Stephen who were the first real missionaries. That the thought of the speech attributed to him lends itself to this understanding we shall note at length below. Here we simply note that it seems possible that Stephen was in reality a figure of the greatest importance in the history of the Christian Church and that therefore one may understand how a record of his thought was preserved and later bodily incorporated into Acts.

A survey of the history of the interpretation of Stephen's speech shows a bewildering diversity. St. Chrysostom laid the emphasis on its showing that the covenant and the promises were before the law, and the sacrifices

and the law were before the temple. Calvin also found the theme to be grace as against the temple cult. Olshausen thought the principle themes to be Stephen's effort to reassure his judges that he believed the Old Testament and to show how the Jews had always rejected God's ambassadors. Baur summarized Stephen's message in the much quoted sentence:

Great and extraordinary as were the benefits which God from the beginning imparted to the people, equally ungrateful in return and antagonistic to the divine designs was from the first the disposition of that people.¹

Zoller emphasized the temple as the theme of the address. Thiersch and Baumgarten interpreted it Christologically by means of a sometimes fanciful typology. Lezchler found the key in the thought of the glory of God, revealed when and where God wills. Meyer laid emphasis on the repeated resistance of Israel to God's messengers. Maurice Jones related the address to the two charges made against Stephen, blasphemy and contempt of the law.

Most modern commentators tend to find a combination of these themes. It was perhaps the commentator Luger who first developed this view. According to this the speech of Stephen is often understood as having three themes. First, the law is something added to the promise, the promise having come first. Second, God is not confined to a

1. quoted by H. Meyer: Handbook to The Acts of the Apostles, note, p. 187, from which much of the above summary is taken.

holy land or a holy temple. And third, the Jews have always rejected their saviours. These themes are not discussed one after another but within each other on the thread of sacred history. They recur throughout the address.

The final answer to the question of the proper analysis of Stephen's speech is a matter which lies outside the scope of this paper. Probably the answer is to be found along the line of the recurring themes suggested above. But one must not so miss the point as does Foskes-Jackson. He, noting these prophet-like themes, suggests that the speech may be a pre-Christian prophetic diatribe.¹ Quite to the contrary, it will now be proposed here that basically the sermon of Stephen is to be understood as springing from Stephen's Christology and that the key to its meaning lies in Stephen's witness to Jesus Christ.

R. J. Knowling is probably much nearer the truth in his Christological interpretation of Stephen's speech. Noting that the charge against Stephen was that "this Jesus of Nazareth" threatened to destroy the temple and the law (Acts 6:14), he argues that Stephen's speech is actually a defence of Christ.

Thus the whole speech becomes a proof of the Messiahship of Jesus as against those who appealed to the authority of Moses, and saw in Jesus a two-fold cause of offence: (1) that He was rejected by his people and crucified; (2) that He had treated with impiety that which they held most sacred- the law and the temple....²

-
1. F. J. Foskes-Jackson: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 68.
 2. R. J. Knowling: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 205.

That there are Christological implications in Stephen's address has indeed been recognized by many commentators, in a sense by all. Yet as a source for determining the nature of the primitive Christology Stephen's sermon has not received the attention which it merits.¹ It will be our task to examine the Christology of this ancient document now. And we shall do so in the light of the pattern already derived from the Petrine sermons.

1) First, we may consider Stephen's concept of Jesus as the fulfilment of the eschatological hope of late Judaism.

It is a point which has perhaps received insufficient attention from the commentators on Stephen's address that the statement which actually brings about Stephen's martyrdom, and which thus may be called the climax of our account, is not an attack on the temple or even on the Jews. It is the cry of Stephen, obviously referring to Jesus, in which he bestows upon his Master the title "Son of Man".

Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God. (Acts 7:56).

Because it is the only occasion in all the New Testament in which the phrase "Son of Man" is used of Jesus by someone other than Himself this phrase is especially noteworthy. It seems impossible to remove it on critical grounds. It is unquestionably in the text. True, it is

1. The very recent book on The Epistle to the Hebrews (1951) by Prof. Wm. Manson may be said to be the pioneer work in this field, and much of what we now propose is suggested by our notes on these Baird Lectures.

possible that the account of Stephen's death has come to us in two accounts. Jackson and Lake rather hesitantly suggest that Acts 7:54-58a may be one source and Acts 7:58b-60 another.¹ If so, however, this but strengthens the view that Luke in his account is dependent upon sources, and that here he considered both too valuable to omit. Moreover, as Jackson and Lake say, if one must choose here, the first source, which contains the "Son of Man" reference, is more likely older, since it is historically more probable that Stephen was lynched, as this source seems to indicate, than that he was executed by the Sanhedren in violation of Roman law, as suggested by the other source. Others have found the phrase simply a reflection of Jesus' words (Luke 22:69) at His trial or of the words of James at his trial (Josephus Antiquities, XX: ix,1). This, however, is at best a conjecture without evidence. At most it implies only that Luke may here have modified the full force of Stephen's apocalyptic utterance as he did that of his Markan source in the Gospel. On the opposite side is the strong evidence that Luke is using a source or sources going back to a real memory of the event. And it is certainly not likely that Luke would here deliberately introduce a phrase which he and all other New Testament writers carefully avoid except in the mouth of Jesus. Moreover this cry of Stephen's is not introduced as an afterthought. Rather it is the event which precipitates the crisis. It is the climax of the story,

1. Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. II, p. 149.

not an addition, as the story is given us. This is the blasphemy against God (Acts 6:11) which brings his death. And finally it must be noted that the phrase "Son of Man" is so firmly rooted in the gospel narratives that nothing is more likely than that it was a part of the primitive Christology. So Bousset¹ and others have clearly shown. Unintelligible to Greek ears, it quickly passed out of general use, remained only as a half-understood self-designation of Jesus in the stories told about Him. That it has been here introduced by Luke, therefore, is scarcely likely. Rather it would appear that we have here, in this admittedly primitive document, one of the few traces of the title from the earliest type of Christology.

Scholars differ widely as to the meaning of the phrase "Son of Man" on the lips of Jesus. However, there can be little doubt on one point as to its meaning here. It is the Son of Man in the eschatological sense of the apocalypses that Stephen sees. This is made clear by his statement that he sees the heavens opened and by the placing of Jesus at the right hand of God. Whatever else the phrase may have meant for Stephen, the particular aspect emphasized by these words is clearly the eschatological.

Of the relationship of primitive Christology to such works of apocalyptic literature as I Enoch we have already spoken. The phrase "Son of Man" thus used is but one more

1. W. Bousset: Kyrios Christos, Chap. 1.

indication that the early church thought of Jesus as the fulfilment of this hope.

The phrase, however, in this context suggests a tie with an even more important apocalyptic work, the book of Daniel. Here is our earliest account of the "Son of Man".

I saw in the night-visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. (Dan. 7:13,14)

Here the Son of Man is found with God in heaven. He is a king with great authority. He is in a position of glory (so important a theme in Stephen's address). His kingdom is eternal. And especially it is emphasized that it is universal. All peoples, nations, and languages are to serve the "Son of Man".

We have already seen evidence suggesting that Stephen's thought lay behind the Christian world mission. It would appear to be a quite possible interpretation that it was Stephen who, seizing upon this phrase, first wrought out the implications of this Christology in its universal aspects. Thus interpreted Stephen's speech is seen to spring from his transcendent Christology.

With this as the key one may examine certain recurring themes of the address.

First, Stephen sees Christ as transcending the holy land. The emphasis in the long account of the story of

Abraham is on his wanderings. The revelation of the God of Glory - glory we shall note associated with Jesus - is not in Palestine but in Mesopotamia. In seeking a land for a possession Abraham's career is one of frustration. Egypt is the scene of God's great deliverance, and that does not come for 400 years. As Cadbury and Lake put it:

As Paul argues that the promise was anterior to the Law, and might therefore continue when the law was abrogated, so Stephen argues about the possession of the land.¹

The point here to be emphasized is that this new exegesis of scripture springs from Stephen's consciousness of the universality of the rule of Jesus, the Son of Man.

Even more pointedly, Stephen sees Jesus as transcending the holy temple. It is this which forms the chief charge against Stephen. The false witnesses state that Stephen has said that Jesus will destroy the temple (Acts 6:14). That Jesus must have made some statement of this sort Himself cannot be doubted (Luke 21:5,6; Mark 14:58; John 2:19). The controversy of Stephen with the temple and its cult is thus to be understood as basically Christological. The common interpretation given to Stephen's attack on the temple is that he is arguing for a "spiritual" rather than a "material" religion. This is of course in a sense quite true. But there is something more than a mere spiritualization of the temple here. The attack on holy land and holy temple is to

1. in Jackson and Lake: op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 72.

be understood in relation to Stephen's alleged statement that Jesus would destroy the temple, and also in relation to Stephen's concept of the glory of God.

This theme in Stephen's sermon deserves attention. Stephen begins with a title for God found only here in all the New Testament ὁ Θεὸς τῆς δόξης , The God of the Glory. This glory is to be associated with the Shekinah, with the tabernacling of God with men. This is God's great desire, to dwell with man. Thus His glory does appear to Abraham. Again with Moses this tabernacling was accomplished at the burning bush. But Israel "took up the tabernacle of Molech". Again in David the divine plan stood on the brink of fulfilment. Acts 7:46,47 may well be an allusion to II Samuel 7, regarded as a Messianic passage, and to Psalm 132, a Messianic psalm. The temple failed in its purpose. Now, at the climax of history comes the rejection of Jesus. But Stephen's vision of the Son of Man includes a vision of the glory of God (Acts 7:55). It is the implication of this passage that it is in the Son of Man that the purpose of God to dwell with men is accomplished. Stephen's "blasphemy" of the temple, therefore, may imply something more than a prophetic understanding of the spiritual nature of worship. Rather it is the belief that in the coming of the foreshadowed Messiah there has occurred an eschatological event which has accomplished that which the temple failed to do. The return of the Son of Man will indeed bring the "destruction" of the

temple. For in that event will occur the real tabernacling of God with men.

In this combination of universal outlook with the thought of a prophet like Moses (Acts 7:37) one cannot but recall the prophecy of the Testament of Benjamin:

And the temple of God shall be your portion... and the last temple shall be more glorious than the first. And the twelve tribes shall be gathered there, and all the Gentiles, until the Most High shall send forth His salvation in the visitation of an only-begotten prophet. (Test. of Benj. 9:2, omitting what Charles regards as Christian interpolations.)

Here is Stephen's message, that in Jesus this is fulfilled in that the day of the old temple is passed when God's glory has tabernacled in the coming of the Son of Man.

A third transcendence of the Son of Man is that He has reached beyond the limitations of the law. This, it is true, is not quite so clear. How strong a break Stephen made with legalism is an uncertain point. Both sets of charges, however, include the accusation that Stephen has spoken against the law (Acts 6:11,13,14). In the speech itself the law is spoken of in the highest terms as *λόγια ἑσώματα*, living oracles (Acts 7:38). The Pauline break with legalism seems not yet to have occurred. What lies behind the charges, however, may well be a view comparable to that taken by Stephen toward the temple. The law is regarded as having failed in its purpose simply in that Israel rejected the law. But in the coming of the Son of Man, a prophet like unto Moses (Acts 7:37) God's purpose is fulfilled, and thus the law is transcended. All peoples, nations, and languages,

shall serve in His dominion.

It would seem that Wilfred Knox has put the matter too simply:

Stephen was filled with zeal to proclaim to all the world the necessity of faith and repentance as the means of salvation in the day when Jesus would appear to judge mankind. To preach this with any hope of success it was necessary to preach the Gospel without the encumbrance of the Law; and he hoped to fire the Hellenist synagogues with his own enthusiasm. Consequently he proceeded to preach in them the imminence of the coming of Jesus.¹

Yet there would appear to be excellent ground for supposing at least this - that Stephen had caught a new vision of the implications of Jesus as the Son of Man of universal dominion and that in his eschatological Christology lies the key both to the understanding of his address and to the origin of the Christian world mission. It is probable that Prof. Manson has the key when he writes:

Whereas the Jewish nationalists were holding to the permanence of their national privilege, and even the Hebrew Christians... were... idealizing the national institutions of the past... sheltering under the eaves of the Holy Place, Stephen saw that the Messiah was of the universe.²

2) We turn now to Stephen's concept of Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament.

This of course we have already been discussing. In the title Son of Man the pseudepigraphic apocalypses and the

1. W. Knox: St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem, p. 40.

2. W. Manson: Op. cit., p. 31, 32.

canonical books join. And we have already been at some pains to show that it is as the fulfilment of what the events of the Old Testament had failed to accomplish that Stephen understood Jesus. To Stephen all the course of Hebrew history leads up to Jesus Christ. Adequately to proclaim Jesus he must begin with Abraham and the promise. All of the past is but preparation for Him. Like Peter, Stephen sees Jesus as the Christ not because he fulfils this or that particular line of prophecy but because He is the fulfilment of the complete Old Testament hope.

This, in a sense, we have already shown above. But there is another, more detailed, use to which Stephen puts the Old Testament scripture. As the temple foreshadowed something yet to come, so Stephen sees the leaders of the Old Testament people as types of the coming Messiah. This concept must be examined now.

To what extent may one interpret Stephen's speech allegorically? Perhaps no final answer may ever be given to this question. Certain of the older German commentators carried the method to absurd extremes. Yet almost all critics today agree that some element of typology is present in the document.

For one thing, critics have noted marked affinities between Stephen's thoughts and that of Philo. The much discussed deviations from the Old Testament as we have it are a case in point. For example Stephen places the call of

Abraham in Mesopotamia, not Haran. Tereh's death is said to have occurred before he left Haran. The period of bondage is given as 400, not 430 years. The number of those who went down to Egypt is given as seventy-five. The education of Moses, not found in the Old Testament, is recounted, together with the statement that Moses was exceedingly fair. It is the desire to deliver Israel which prompts Moses' murder of the Egyptian. Angels give the law. Now these ideas of Stephen do not come from the Old Testament, at least as we possess it. But they can all be paralleled from the works of Philo and writers of the Alexandrian school. Moreover, Stephen's emphasis on the transcendence of God suggests Alexandrian influence. If this be true it is quite possible that Stephen is interpreting the Old Testament allegorically, finding there types of the Messiah. The Alexandrian character of Stephen's speech has been convincingly defended by these and other grounds by such thorough scholars as B. W. Bacon and R. B. Rackham.¹

Even if one rejects the proposed affinities with Philo as a starting point for interpretation, Rabbinic practice such as occasionally appears in Paul (Gal. 4:24) furnishes a parallel. At the very least one fixed point remains: Stephen does find Moses in some sense a type of Christ, as his quotation plainly shows (Acts 7:37). Again, the tirade in Acts 7:51,52 seems clearly to point to a comparison be-

1. R. B. Rackham: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 99ff.

tween the rejection of the prophets and the rejection of Jesus. And this type of interpretation succeeds in finding purpose for a great deal in the sermon which otherwise seems inexplicable. Thus understood, Stephen's Christology becomes considerably clearer.

To take a questionable example, Stephen's eschatological emphasis on the second coming of Jesus may be traced through the sermon. As Cadbury and Lake say,

It is natural to seek some reason for the apparently irrelevant distinction between first and second meetings of Joseph and his brethren. Since Joseph, like Moses, appears to be a type of the rejected but welcome deliverer Jesus, it is possible that the author is thinking of the first and second 'comings' of Jesus—a common contrast in early patristic literature (cf. Hebrews 9:28). Notice too that Moses also wrought deliverance not on his first appearance when he was rejected (vss 23-29) but forty years later (30ff).¹

To these examples of doublings might be added that Moses has to have a successor, Joshua, that the tabernacle is replaced by the temple, and that David is followed by Solomon. The suggestion above certainly helps explain the purpose of certain otherwise rather pointless details. Stephen has been preaching the second coming which he finds typified in scripture.

In all probability Joseph is presented as a type of Christ. He appears a first time to his brethren, but they sell him into Egypt. However, God is with him and delivers him, so that he is exalted to the rulership. Joseph now saves those of his race at a second manifestation. Again

1. in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 73.

there is an implied portrait of Christ.

But the clearest typology is that of Moses as a type of Christ (Acts 7:37). How detailed the parallel is, is debatable. It is possible but quite uncertain, for example, that the account of Moses' being hidden as a child (Acts 7:20,21) alludes to a primitive infancy story about Jesus, such as we hear in Matthew 2:13-18. But that Moses is presented as a type of the Messiah as a rejected saviour is an interpretation accepted by almost all.

The figure of Moses plays a large part in the thought of Philo. He writes,

Moses enjoyed intercourse with the Father and Creator of all, and was held worthy of the same appellation, for he was called God and King of all his people.¹

Perhaps something of this attitude is reflected here.

First we may notice that Moses is especially chosen by God. This selection is emphasized by the six-fold repetition of $\delta\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Acts 7:36,37,38,40), and is made explicit in the question of Acts 7:35, "Who made thee a ruler and a Judge?" The words which follow, "Him hath God sent to be both a ruler and a deliverer" strongly suggests Peter's statement in Acts 2:36. The answer to the question, of course, is that God has appointed Moses, and the same is implied concerning Jesus.

This passage applies to Moses titles which we have already seen to be characteristic of primitive Christology,

1. quoted from Vita Moses by A. Hausrath: A History of New Testament Times, Vol. I, p. 189.

e.g. the title "Judge", *δικαστῆς*. The title "ruler" *ἄρχων*, is comparable to the *ἀρχηγός* of Peter's sermon. The title "Prophet" is also one which we have discussed in connection with Peter's preaching, though there is perhaps here the added connotation of prophetic protest against formalism characteristic of Stephen's thought. That Moses gives "living oracles" is paralleled by the thought already noted with regard to Jesus that He had given words which ought to have been obeyed. And again we have the bringing of salvation, *σωτηρία*, (Acts 7:25), comparable to Peter's proclamation. It is also possible that the picture of Moses as "mighty in words and works", *δυνατός ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις* (Acts 7:22) is typological and comparable to Peter's statements about Jesus' words and deeds. So close are all of these ideas to the Petrine Christology that one can scarcely doubt that we are here on the same ground, having a second and really independent witness to the antiquity of these ideas in Christological thought.

In addition to these ideas so much like those of Peter there are certain new ones. For example, Moses, and thus by implication Jesus, is called the *λυτρωτήν*, the Redeemer or Deliverer (Acts 7:35). This word goes back to the Hebrew $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{גָּאַל} \\ \text{גָּאַל} \end{array} \right\}$, *gaal*, redeem. The classic example of the secular use of the word is its application to Boaz in the book of Ruth. Here it implies redemption by an interested kinsman who pays a price. Thus the Greek word is associated with ransom.

Somewhat similarly Moses appears as a mediator between God and man. It is to him that the law is given. He in turn gives it to the people. Again it may be that there is a suggestion of the mediatorial function of Jesus.

Thus, like Peter, Stephen sees the prophets as "them that showed before the coming of the Righteous One" (Acts 7:52). Explicitly and typologically all of the Old Testament is seen as a witness to Jesus Christ.

3) As to the earthly life of Jesus Stephen says little. He, like Peter, thinks of Jesus as having been a prophet (Acts 7:37). There is in Stephen's thought and in the charges brought against him perhaps some reflection of Jesus' prophet-like attack on the abuses of the temple cult. In the analogy to Moses it is implied that Jesus gave men living oracles and a true worship. There may be a hint at an infancy story in the account of Moses' infancy (Acts 7:20), though this is uncertain. Moses' mighty words and deeds are probably symbolic (Acts 7:22) of those signs which Peter saw as heralding Jesus' Messiahship. The title clearly applied to Jesus "The Righteous One" (Acts 7:52), as we have seen used by Peter, suggests not only Jesus' Messiahship but also something of his earthly character. And in Acts 7:60 there is perhaps a reflection of Jesus' words of forgiveness on the cross.

But again, as was the case with Peter, it is Jesus' death which is for Stephen the supremely important fact about Jesus' earthly life. As suggested above, the title

λυτρωτήν may suggest the redemptive character of Jesus' death. The clearest point in Stephen's typology is that he sees the rejection of Moses, of Joseph, and of the prophets as paralleled in the crucifixion. This is the climax for Stephen of Israel's long history of rebellion. Whatever else is implied about the life of the historic Jesus the fact of His rejection and death is the one completely dominant in this address.

Thus his account of the historical Jesus is essentially that of the sermons of Peter.

4) As in the sermons of Peter Jesus is pictured as now exalted to the right hand of God.

It is true that Stephen here gives no account of the resurrection. Perhaps this was not regarded by Stephen as here necessary, since he was here seeking to defend from scripture a view which his audience of course knew he accepted. He may simply have considered an account of the resurrection as of the earthly life of Jesus as irrelevant to the issue immediately at hand. On the other hand it is more likely that we are to understand Stephen's address as having been interrupted and that a more explicit statement was to have been given of that which had already been implied. The exaltation of Joseph (Acts 7:10) is probably intended as typical of Jesus' exaltation.

At any rate it was his cry concerning Jesus exaltation which precipitated the final onslaught. Like Peter, Stephen pictures Jesus as at the right hand of God, associated with all the glory of God. Jesus is now the heavenly "Son

of Men", who is to come again as Judge and Saviour. It was this "blesphemous" Christology with all its implications which brought the martyrdom of Stephen.

5) And finally, Stephen, like Peter, sees Jesus as a living and present power.

Stephen associates Jesus with the Holy Spirit, at least in that the Jewish resistance to Jesus is interpreted as resistance to the Holy Spirit (Acts 7:51). This is to be compared with the view already suggested that Stephen sees the sending of Jesus as the climax of God's eternal purpose to tabernacle with men. For the followers of Jesus this purpose is now in a sense accomplished.

Even more significant is Stephen's climactic cry in Acts 7:56. Here the risen Jesus appears in all his glory as visible to Stephen. At Stephen's hour of need Jesus is seen standing at the right hand of God. It has been suggested by various commentators that there is significance in the picture of Jesus as standing rather than sitting at God's right hand. Perhaps it implies that Jesus has risen to defend his martyr or perhaps to receive him. Thus He is ἐκ δεξιῶν ἐπιῶντα τοῦ Θεοῦ, as though perhaps moving toward Stephen. At least there is suggested clearly in the vision Jesus' concern in the earthly event and His power to participate from on high.

Again there is the highly significant prayer of Stephen (Acts 7:59,60). It is true that this lies in what may be the later strata of the narrative. Yet this dating is largely conjectural, and it is quite possible that we have here in this ancient document a witness to the fact that Jesus

was the object of prayer even in the earliest times.

There is a certain truth in the caution expressed by Cadbury and Lake here:

Is this an example of prayer to Jesus, as to God? I think that clearly it is not. It belongs as Luke himself indicates, to the 'Son of Man' Christology. In the vision of Stephen the Son of Man is at the right hand of God, where all the Apocalyptic tradition of the Jews would place him... If Stephen saw the Son of Man, what was more natural than to ask him for help? But the Son of Man was not God, and in this very narrative is distinguished from God. Even if the word 'Maran' were used by Stephen or by the other disciples, it must be clearly remembered that for the history of thought, rather than of words, the important point is that Maran does not imply divinity, though *κύριος* at least frequently does so.¹

These commentators are quite right that one must not conclude that the figure of Jesus is here merged with that of God. But the first sentences above are puzzling. While Jesus was indeed distinguished from God in the way stated it is clear that if our story is accurate we do have here exactly "an example of prayer to Jesus, as to God". Whether Jesus was otherwise regarded as God or not is not the issue. There is here certainly prayer. Stephen is on his knees crying to a heavenly Being, seen in a position of equality with God. If the margin of Nestle's text is right in making this an allusion to Psalm 31:6 we have here an exalted picture of Jesus indeed:

In thee, Lord, do I put my trust...
 Be thou my strong rock
 For a house of defence to save me...
 For thou art my strength.
 Into thy hands I commit my spirit.
 Thou hast redeemed me, O Lord God of Truth.

1. in Jackson and Lake; op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 86.

As in the sermons of Peter the picture of Jesus as a living and present power is that of One who stands over against men in a relationship comparable only to that of God Himself.

And finally, one must not overlook the obvious fact that Stephen sees Jesus as Lord of life and death. Whether the prayer with its calling upon Jesus as Lord is historical or not there can be no doubt that Stephen pictured in the oldest form as the first martyr. Jesus' demand upon him is felt to be absolute. With a vision of the risen Christ Stephen faces death fearlessly. Whatever the word of the title given Jesus it is clear that Stephen regarded Him as Lord.

Thus interpreted, Stephen's defence is seen to have a Christological basis from beginning to end. His attack on the temple and the prerogatives of the Jews springs not simply from a prophet-like insight into the spiritual nature of religion but from his conviction that an eschatological event of universal significance has occurred in Jesus Christ. His view of Old Testament history is that it presents a purpose of God which has been fulfilled only at last in Him. His review of scripture is not simply historical but typological, finding Jesus in its pages. It is as a witness to Jesus that he is on trial. And it is as a martyr to Jesus that he dies. The unifying factor in an otherwise puzzling document is the transcendent Christology of Stephen.

And although it comes from what must certainly be a different source and although it is expressed in so completely different a form the Christology of Stephen is found to be

remarkably similar to that which we have found in the sermons of Peter. Stephen has worked out certain implications of Christology which are not developed in the Petrine sermons. Yet in basic outline and often in very detail we find here the Christology of Peter's sermons. Stephen thus becomes a second and independent witness that this is indeed the Christology of the primitive Church.

We are here confining ourselves to a discussion of only the first of the sermons attributed to Paul, that in Acts 13. Though we shall have occasion to refer to the address found in Acts 17 for comparison, nevertheless with this sermon at Athens the gospel may be said to have entered upon a new stage, that of its presentation to the Gentile world in terms of Greek culture. The subsequent speeches in Acts attributed to Paul are presented as being of a very personal nature, for the most part his personal defenses. It is our desire in this thesis to reconstruct the Christology of the primitive preaching in its original Jewish environment. Only Acts 13 among the speeches in Acts attributed to Paul is presented as a typical example of Paul's kerygma in what must have been its earliest setting.

The sermon in the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia is exactly this type of work. Luke, by making it the first recorded sermon of Paul and by reporting it at some length, indicates evidently that this sermon is to be understood as typical of Paul's preaching in the Jewish synagogue. And repeatedly he tells us that it was Paul's custom to begin his mission work here. It seems quite probable that Christianity did indeed spread in its early days by means of the synagogues of the Diaspora, and as our only example of this type of preaching the sermon in Acts 13 is especially interesting.

Several more or less valid reasons have been proposed for doubting that the sermon goes back to any real memory of the Apostle Paul. First it is pointed out that Paul's sermon is hardly distinguishable from those of Peter. In structure, in thought, and even in detail it seems simply one more in the series of nearly identical specimens of the kerygma. Paul even used the same Old Testament quotations that Peter cites.

Again it is said that the sermon seems to be modelled after that of Stephen. Each presents a long account of Old Testament history as a preparation for Jesus. It is even suggested that the Pauline speech is a poor imitation, not quite knowing how to use this Old Testament material.

The sermon is said to betray its Lucan authorship in Lucan phrases, Lucan ideas, and a Lucan style.

And finally it is said that certain phrases and ideas are unpauline. The account of the resurrection, for example, is that it is the fulfilment of "the promise made unto the fathers". The entire emphasis in the account of the appearances after the resurrection is on those to the apostles who had been with Jesus in Galilee, with no mention of that to Paul. The tone of the address is regarded as too conciliatory and pleasant, not the fiery style of Galatians. The cross seems to have too little place. And it is said that Paul's doctrine of justification is misunderstood.

There is a certain truth in each of these arguments, a truth of value for our investigation. However, in spite

of these difficulties it seems probable that the sermon in Acts 13 does go back to a real memory of the kerygma of Paul.

It is quite true that the sermon of Paul is basically like that of Peter. This is highly significant. We have seen that there is excellent reason to believe that the sermons of Peter come from a genuinely Palestinian tradition. If from a Hellenist source we have here a witness that this is also the form of the kerygma in the early days of the Hellenist mission we may look upon this as additional proof that we have in these sermons a true picture of primitive preaching. That Peter and Paul are recorded as preaching in such a similar way is double witness to the fact that this is the character of the earliest sermons. This is not to underestimate certain remarkable differences, which will be noted fully below. But that Paul's preaching is pictured as being like Peter's is exactly what we should expect from the undoubtedly authentic testimony of Paul himself (I Cor. 15:11). The kerygma was common to all.

Again it is true that Paul's sermon is like Stephen's. Stephen is a Hellenist addressing a Jewish audience. In what we may suppose to be a conventional type of introduction he reviews the Old Testament history. We shall see that Paul's review is very different from that of Stephen. But Paul also is a Hellenist addressing a Jewish audience. As Dibelius points out¹ this review of Hebrew history is

1. M. Dibelius: Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte, p. 35.

exactly the sort of thing we would expect in a typical synagogue service. Paul begins quite harmlessly in response to an invitation to give a *λόγος παρακλήσεως*, a word of exhortation. He simply uses it as a preparation for the kerygma. The similarity to the ancient Jewish Stephen-document but attests the accuracy of the picture.

It is true, however, that one cannot deny certain Lucan elements in the style and vocabulary of the sermon. Assuming that our record comes from the editor of Acts, who was himself one who had frequently heard Paul, this is not surprising. And we have seen that Luke was quite capable of carefully reproducing sources, such as Mark, yet phrasing his sources in his own language.

The un-Pauline elements in the thought of the sermon are admittedly the greatest problem. These are probably sufficient to suggest that there is a considerable element of the conventional as well as of the Pauline in this sermon, making it perhaps the more significant for insight into the general nature of the earliest preaching. Yet even these differences are capable of explanation. Paul would surely not oppose the idea that the resurrection was the fulfilment of the ancient promise. If he does not mention the resurrection appearance to himself here neither does he do so always in his epistles, and Luke has already given us accounts enough of this event. As to tone, Paul, who claims to have been all things to all men, surely would appeal

before he would denounce. The cross does have a real place in the sermon. And we shall see that the reference to justification confirms rather than negates the idea that we have here a real memory of Paul. Finally, we are largely dependent upon this passage to tell us what Paul's preaching was like. The epistles are written to Christians. This sermon is a first appeal to non-Christians. It is difficult to find any standard to set against Acts 13 by which to prove it un-Pauline as an evangelistic sermon.

On the other hand there are remarkable indications that the sermon really is Pauline, based on a real recollection of his preaching as heard by Luke.

Let us take the parallels to this sermon which may be found in just one Pauline epistle. If one holds to the South Galatian theory then the epistle to the Galatians was written to churches which included this one at Antioch in Pisidia. We may therefore expect some similarity of thought here. Maurice Jones lists the following parallels:¹ (a) Israel's history is seen as a preparation for Christ, a "schoolmaster" (Gal. 3:24). (b) Israel is pictured as a Son cared for (Acts 13:7; Gal. 4:1-7). (c) This theme of Sonship also is applied to Christ (Acts 13:33; Gal. 4:4. In Galatians "Son" occurs 13 times, "child" 4). (d) Rejection has its place, illustrated by Canaan and Saul in Acts and by Hagar in Galatians. (e) Certain words are strikingly paralleled, e.g. πληρώω (Acts 13:25; Gal. 4:4), ξύλον (Acts 13:29; Gal. 3:13), δικαίωω (Acts 13:39; Gal. 8 times). (f) The history of Israel is seen as the

story of God's grace. (g) And certain narrative parallels may be noted. For example, Gal. 3:1,2 tell of his preaching, and Gal. 4:14 suggests the success of his work. Thus it would seem that the sermon is not without certain Pauline elements.

If one is willing to make any allowance at all for Lucan and conventional elements in the sermon without assuming that it cannot therefore be based on a recollection of Paul, then the sermon appears as an excellent picture of what Paul must have said. As Foakes-Jackson puts it:

At whatever date Acts was written, the book gives an astonishingly convincing picture of the gospel as Paul presented it in his earliest recorded utterance.¹

We turn, therefore, to the Christology of this sermon, confident that it will provide a reasonably accurate picture of the presentation of Jesus in Paul's synagogue preaching. We shall follow the pattern already used in our analysis of the speeches of Peter and Stephen.

1) The concept of Jesus as the fulfilment of the eschatological hope of late Judaism plays only a small part in the sermon in Acts 13. The concept of Jesus as One now concealed in heaven with God who is to come to judge the world at the resurrection is nowhere explicitly stated.

This is surprising in the light of the high place accorded this idea in the Christology of the addresses already studied. There are, perhaps, certain explanations.

1. F. J. Foakes-Jackson: op. cit., p. 118.

Perhaps this is simply a case of an unconscious alteration by Luke of the original message. Luke himself appears to have been relatively uninterested in futuristic eschatology, a fact which makes his preservation of this type of thought in the sermons of Peter and Stephen all the more remarkable. Again it is possible that Luke felt this aspect of the early preaching had already been sufficiently presented in Acts and that here the total scheme of the book required another emphasis. It is also possible that Paul's preaching had fewer affinities with Jewish apocalyptic than the Thessalonian epistles would lead one to believe. The sermon may on this point be an accurate presentation of what Paul said on at least one occasion.

However, there are in Acts indications that Paul did preach Jesus as the coming Judge. The conclusion of the sermon in Acts 13 is dominated by the concept of a coming judgment. Jesus Himself is not named as the judge, but He is surely related to this event. Jesus' resurrection is the sign that the time of fulfilment is come (Acts 13:33). And in the face of this coming judgment the proclamation of the gospel is the proclamation of forgiveness and justification through Jesus (Acts 13:38). The elect community now had its assurance of salvation only through its relationship to Him. Not Hebrew lineage but faith in the Messiah is the essential thing in this new election which brings forgiveness at the immanent day of the wonderful work (Acts 13:41). If none of

the familiar titles of Jewish apocalyptic are ascribed to Jesus at least this background of ideas is similar.

And comparison with Acts 17:22-31, the sermon at Athens, makes the whole matter clearer. Here we are plainly told by Paul that God has now ceased to overlook sin and has commanded all men to repent

Inasmuch as he hath appointed a day in which he will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom he hath ordained; whereof he hath given assurance unto all men, in that he hath raised him from the dead. (Acts 17:31).

It is made quite clear that this is "resurrection", ἀνάστασις, in terms of Jewish apocalyptic, not the Greek idea of "immortality", ἀθανασία, since it is exactly this point which is said to have proved impossible for the Greek philosophers to accept. It would seem clear here that Paul is pictured as presenting Jesus as the coming Judge at the expected Day of Jahweh.

Thus we take it that the sermons attributed to Paul simply add their witness to those attributed to Peter and Stephen that the primitive church preached Jesus as Messiah in terms comparable to those of the Messianism of late Judaism's apocalyptic.

2) It is in its presentation of Jesus as the fulfillment of the Old Testament that Acts 13 makes its greatest contribution.

No sermon is more insistent upon the fact that Jesus' coming was foretold in scripture. Those who crucified Jesus did so out of ignorance of the scripture and yet were thereby

fulfilling scripture (Acts 13:27,29). The resurrection, like the death, was the fulfilment of prophecy (Acts 13:32,33,34). The coming judgment is that foretold in the Old Testament (Acts 13:40ff). The whole proclamation of salvation is that of a promise fulfilled.

But not only is this general truth repeatedly stated and supported by specific quotations, the whole of Old Testament history is pictured as leading to Jesus. As Percy Gardner puts it, "He raises a ladder from the Old Testament to the promised Saviour".¹

Paul begins his sermon in what we may regard as the typical manner of a synagogue "word of exhortation". Indeed it seems quite possible that the sermon is based on the readings of the Jewish lectionary for a particular sabbath. This theory was proposed by Bengel and developed by Baumgarten.² R. G. Finch³, approaching the matter from the standpoint of the Jewish lectionary, comes to the same conclusion. Three rare verbs are found in Paul's introduction: ὑψωσεν (Acts 13:17, cf. Isaiah 1:1,2), ἐτροποφόρησεν (Acts 13:18, cf. Deut. 1:31) and κατεκληρουόμησεν (Acts 13:19, cf. Deut. 1:38). The reference to the judges (Acts 13:20) is unique

1. Percy Gardner: in Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 398.

2. M. Baumgarten: The Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 414.

3. R. G. Finch: The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament, p. 87.

in all the New Testament but could have been suggested by Isaiah 1:26 and Paul's theme fits well with these passages. Now Deuteronomy 1 and Isaiah 1:19 are the two readings listed for a sabbath in the autumn of the third year of the cycle. According to Finch 47 A.D., the year Jackson and Lake believe to be that of Paul's visit to Antioch in Pisidia, is such a year. Even if one cannot press this date there is here at least a real suggestion that Paul's sermon is based on an actual synagogue scene in which these two passages were read.

First it may be noted that the sending of Jesus is presented as the climax of God's redeeming action in history. The accent on his account of Hebrew history is on a series of verbs. God chose Israel, exalted the people, led them forth, bare them as a nursing-father, destroyed nations before them, gave them a land, gave them Judges, and raised up David as king. The climax of this account is that this God has now raised up a Saviour, Jesus. He is the ultimate embodiment of God's saving action in history.

Moreover, a recurring theme is that of Fatherhood and Sonship. God chose "our fathers", Paul begins. If one accepts the reading preferred by the revisers and by Ropes Acts 13:18 adds that "as a nursing-father bare he them in the wilderness". Whether one reads ἐτροποφόρησεν or ἐτροφοφόρησεν (probably better) here there is probably a reflection in this verse of Deut. 1:31. According to Ropes¹ there is Septuagint backing for either

1. J. Ropes: op. cit., p. 120.

reading. "Jehovah thy God bare thee as a man doth bear his son". Jesus is said to be of the "seed" of David. The promise made to the "fathers" has been fulfilled to the "children" (Acts 13:32,33). The passage in Deuteronomy tells how the fathers were rejected but the children were allowed to enter the promised land. The first chapter of Isaiah, which we have seen may be alluded to, begins with the divine lament "I have nourished and brought up children...". Acts 13:23 is probably an allusion to II Sam. 7:12ff., where God promises to be a Father to David's kingly Son. And the climax of the sermon is the application to Jesus of the quotation from Psalm 2:7, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee" (Acts 13:33).

This is the first appearance in the sermons in Acts of the idea that Jesus is the Son of God. It is to be noted that it is derived here strictly from Old Testament usages and carries with it here no apparent connotations either of physical sonship or of Greek mythology. Rather, two Old Testament ideas seem attached to the term.

First, it is used of Jesus to present him as the Davidic Messiah. This is clearly implied in the reference made to the promise concerning David's seed (Acts 13:23), almost certainly reflecting the "Messianic" passage II Sam. 7:12ff. Here the covenant promise is made,

... I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he shall be my son... (II Sam. 7:13,14)

God's lovingkindness, the $\tau\theta\pi$, the covenant love, will not depart from this seed of David. And the identification

is made explicit in the quotation from the "Messianic" Psalm 2. This Psalm lays emphasis on the universality of the dominion of the king. The nations become his inheritance. Kirkpatrick looks upon it as originally a Psalm for the coronation of a king, and comments on Paul's use of it (Acts 13:33 and Rom. 1:4):

The recognition of Christ's eternal sonship in the Resurrection corresponds to the recognition of the king's adoptive sonship in the rite of anointing.¹

Thus David is set forth as uniquely the prototype of Christ. He is associated with the covenant promise, is raised up by God, and is acclaimed by God as a man after God's own heart. Jesus is the promised Messiah of David's line.

In this context, however, there would appear to be a deeper meaning in the idea of Jesus' sonship. We have seen that the loving care of the father-son relationship is a recurring theme of the address. God has been a father to Israel. Israel has been a disobedient son. The application of the term "Son" to Jesus would seem to be one more example of this kind of use of terms which originally referred in the Old Testament to Israel itself. There is here at least the implication that Jesus is the fulfilment of this Old Testament relationship. He is beloved as a son, as Israel was beloved. But while Israel has been disobedient Jesus has fulfilled all filial duty. Thus He is peculiarly the Son of the Father.

The question has been seriously raised whether the application of this title to Jesus really occurred in primi-

1. A. F. Kirkpatrick: *op. cit.*, p. 10.

tive Christianity. Acts, it is true, uses it in no sermons until this one with its Hellenistic background. There are excellent reasons, however, for thinking that it was in general use perhaps even before the Gentile mission. A "Q" passage makes Jesus use the title of Himself (Matt. 11:25-27; Lk. 10:21,22). So also does Mark (Mk. 13:32; 12:1-12). In Mark God thus acclaims Jesus (Mk. 1:11; 9:7), and so also do demons (Mk. 3:11; 5:7). And the centurion's cry is the climax of the gospel (Mk 15:39). Mark also associates the title with Psalm 2. Paul uses the title 17 times, including the kerygma formula Rom. 1:3. And Jesus' teaching undoubtedly concerned itself with the Fatherhood of God.

Even against its Jewish background there are suggestions that the title meant something more than Messiah. Indeed, Billerbeck indicates that the Talmud tended to avoid using the title of the Messiah except where the text required it. Oesterley^e quotes from Midrash T a subtle argument whereby the intensely monotheistic Jewish exegesis sought to avoid the implications of Psalm 2:7.

"It is as when a master, desirous of giving comfort and encouragement to his servant, says Thou art as dear to me as a son!" Further, the words: "This day have I begotten thee", are explained by saying that after the period of woes and persecutions, which is to precede the Messianic era, is over, God will make a new Creation.¹

The title would appear therefore to have been used by the early church in the sense of the Jewish title Messiah and

1. W. Oesterley: The Psalms in the Jewish Church, p. 210.

yet at the same time to have implied a certain departure from Jewish practice. It was regarded as that larger title bestowed upon Jesus by God Himself (Mk. 1:11). With it went the connotations of Jesus' own teachings about Fatherhood and Sonship in the relationship of God and man. It was what Professor Manson has called "the higher and Christian equivalent of the Jewish term".¹ The use in Acts 13 exactly conforms to this practice.

Thus Paul finds the whole of the Christian message to be the fulfilment of the Old Testament promise (Acts 13:32). In this he follows the same line of thought as Peter and Stephen. Yet while formally his use of the Old Testament is closer to Stephen's, in meaning he seems closer to Peter. He sees the Old Testament as filled rather with promise than with frustration. He uses no typology, except that in a sense David is a type of Christ.

David is set forth as the one unique prototype of Christ, inasmuch as he is not only raised up by God Himself, but is raised up to be king, and has witness borne to him also by God. With him is also associated the "promise" originally made to Abraham, and now renewed to David, and confined to his line.²

But this is not the complex typology of Stephen. On the other hand, the sermons of Peter present no comparable survey of the course of Old Testament history leading to Jesus. But

1. W. Manson: Jesus the Messiah, p. 104.

2. M. Jones: op. cit., p. 46.

unique as is its manner of presentation the sermon agrees with the others in that primary essential, that Jesus is the fulfilment of all the ancient hope.

3) Paul's picture of the historical events of Jesus' earthly life and death is similar to that of Peter. But there are certain significant additions.

Of especial interest is the long account of John the Baptist. (Acts 13:24,25). This is puzzling in the light of the absence of any mention of John in the Pauline epistles. The explanation may lie in the indications that followers of John were already spread over the Greco-Roman world (Acts 18:25; 19:3). Indeed there are hints that the followers of John formed at times a group which in a sense competed with the Christian church. One may well imagine, therefore, that the earliest preaching of the mission to the Gentiles found it necessary to relate Jesus to John. The emphasis here is entirely on two things, John's raising of the problem of sin, to which Jesus is presented as the answer, and John's own assertion of the superiority of Jesus. Two facts confirm the importance of John in the first preaching. Peter mentions John in addressing the Gentile Cornelius (Acts 10:37). And the story of John and Jesus' baptism stands at the beginning of all four gospels so as to suggest that it was everywhere regarded as an event of crucial importance in Jesus' life.

The account of Jesus' death is almost exactly paralleled in the sermons of Peter, except that Paul adds the statement that Jesus was buried (Acts 13:29, cf. I Cor. 15:4).

But the most significantly Pauline element here is the brief suggestion of the Pauline doctrine of justification. (Acts 13:39) As in the sermons of Peter, forgiveness is not brought into clear relationship with the cross, yet we may suppose the connection implied, certainly in the case of Paul. The verse in question is subject to two interpretations. Windisch interprets it to mean that faith in Christ becomes a supplement to the law. The law accomplished justification for some things, but faith in Jesus is needed for the rest. Thus he sees the verse as a misunderstanding of Paul. However, Cadbury and Lake in the same series¹ present the opposite view more convincingly, that the true translation implies "forgiveness for everything, which the law never offered". As they point out, it is impossible to resist the belief that this is a real attempt to summarize the genuinely Pauline doctrine. The verb δικάσιω is the unmistakable mark. The emphasis here is on the fact that it is Jesus who offers this acquittal. This of course is a highly condensed statement of what must have been a large part of Paul's preaching.

4) The exaltation of Jesus receives a position of prominence quite as it does in the Petrine sermons.

With regard to the resurrection the picture is essentially the same as that in the sermons of Peter. Two points are especially to be noted. First, it is stated that Jesus was laid in the tomb, then rose. Of course it is true that

1. in Jackson & Lake: op. cit., Vol. IV, p. 157.

there is no mention of the empty tomb, but there is no way to avoid the implication here that Paul is presenting the resurrection in material terms. The second point is the emphasis on the apostolic witness to the resurrection. Jesus was seen by those who came up with him from Galilee. I Cor. 15:3 affords an interesting parallel.

As to the exaltation, the most notable feature of the sermon is its use of the same primitive adoption formula found in Mark 1:11. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that Paul is here pictured as preaching that Jesus became the Son of God at the resurrection (cf. Rom. 1:3). The phrase "This day have I begotten Thee" makes this all the more emphatic. The emphasis is on the resurrection as the moment of public adoption, as in Paul's epistle (Rom 1:3), rather than on the baptism, as in Mark. But essentially this is the same idea we have encountered in the Petrine sermons and subject to the same cautions noted there.

5) Finally, the concept of Jesus as a Living and Present Power is centered around the proclamation of Jesus as Saviour.

This is clearly the theme of Paul's sermon. The history of Israel is the history of God's saving action. But that action has not brought permanent salvation. Repeatedly, it is emphasized that the previous blessings were limited by time. The wilderness period was forty years, the land was given for 450 years, Saul ruled forty years, and David served his generation. But with this Jesus is contrasted. David, after serving his generation died and saw corruption, but

Jesus rose and is now present and living, and thus the bringer of an eternal salvation such as neither king nor law could produce. All these were but symbols of the promise, the covenant. But in Jesus the "sure mercies of David" are now poured forth.

And this salvation is clearly seen in terms of forgiveness, of justification. The note of the need for repentance is introduced with the mention of John's preaching. It is immediately followed by the account of the coming of Jesus, called "the word of this salvation" (Acts 13:26). Jesus is introduced with the title "Saviour" (Acts 13:23).

This salvation of course must be understood in terms of the future judgement concerning which Paul gives warning (Acts 13:40). Yet it is to be noted that Paul speaks of justification in the present indicative, *δικαιοῦνται*. All who now believe are now forgiven. As Saviour, Jesus enters into the present experience of those who believe in Him.

CHAPTER X LATER NEW TESTAMENT DEVELOPMENTS OF THE PRIMITIVE
CHRISTOLOGY

The collection of ideas about Jesus preached by the early church has been seen to contain not one simple systematic Christology but a bewildering mixture of ideas. These seemingly contradictory concepts were welded together not by logic but by the revealing events of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and by the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost. This fusion produced the kerygma, outlined for us in the early chapters of Acts. The development of the various aspects of the kerygma, we shall maintain, now produced the various books of the New Testament.

The tracing of the development of the whole New Testament Christology is obviously a task which lies beyond the scope of this thesis. We are concerned only with the beginnings as indicated by a few particular passages in Acts. But we do here trace certain connections and suggest an outline on which such a history of New Testament Christology might be constructed. It is our contention that the primitive witness to Christ which we have outlined may be compared to the axle of the New Testament wheel, of which the various books of the New Testament are the radiating spokes. From the center we have described radiate the works of the various writers, each one carrying further in one direction one aspect of the central ideas. For example, we have seen that the

primitive preaching proclaimed Jesus to be the fulfilment of the eschatological hope of late Judaism, as described in the apocalyptic writings. From this beginning, as seen in our sermons, developed the kind of thought which produced The Revelation. The kerygma preached Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament. An example of an extended development of this idea is the Epistle to the Hebrews. The memory of Jesus as a man on earth is seen in the synoptics. The epistles of Paul are one example of the development of thought with regard to the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus. And the Gospel of John shows how the church came to understand Jesus as a present and living Power.

Yet precisely because primitive Christology had the complexity which we have ascribed to it the above analysis can not stand thus simply without qualification. For example, though the futuristic eschatological element is the dominant one in Revelation, it is also basic in Hebrews, in the synoptics, and in the writings of Paul, and it cannot be forgotten even in John. This is because it was present in the primitive preaching. On the other hand, neither does The Revelation ever entirely lose sight of the other aspects of primitive Christology. All of the spokes are firmly fastened to the axle at the center. The Christologies of the various parts of the New Testament can now be seen as developing from the sort of Christology we have found in the sermons in Acts.

1) The first aspect of primitive Christology that we have described is the concept of Jesus as the fulfilment of the Messianic hope of late Judaism. The obvious example of the development of this idea is The Revelation, the Apocalypse ascribed to John.

That the author of this apocalypse has turned directly to earlier apocalypses for the forms in which to express his thought about Jesus can scarcely be doubted. The Christ who appears in Rev. 1 is more nearly that of Enoch 37-71 than that of any other known source. Direct dependence of the author upon any of the sermons described in Acts cannot of course be demonstrated. But we can note here that "John" is clearly carrying forward the trend of thought found in the early preaching outlined in Chapter III of this thesis.

We have suggested that the title $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ found in the primitive preaching is a link with pre-Christian apocalyptic. It is significant that while this title has been used so much for Jesus by the time of the writing of the earliest books of the New Testament that it has almost simply become another proper name yet the Apocalypse of John does contain two of the few New Testament passages where it is still clearly a title. And here, as we have interpreted it in Peter's sermons, it is of a cosmic Being at least almost "equal in power and glory" with God. The two examples are in Rev. 11:15... $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ η $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\alpha$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ $\eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$... and Rev. 12:10 ... $\acute{\alpha}$ $\rho\tau\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ η $\sigma\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ η $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$

ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ Χριστοῦ
αὐτοῦ

... Though the other title discussed in Chapter III of this thesis ὁ δίκαιος does not occur as such in The Revelation, yet the picture of Christ in Rev. 19:11 is exactly in line with the idea there developed.

The second eschatological element in the sermons of Peter described in chapter III is that Christ is pictured as a heavenly Being now concealed high at the right hand of God awaiting the final cosmic event. This is the Christ also of The Revelation. Indeed the very title of the book makes this clear, ΑΠΟΚΑΛΥΨΙΣ, the unveiling, the revelation of the concealed Messiah. Jesus is now in heaven at the right hand of God, Rev. 5:6,7 (compare Acts 2:34; 3:21). He awaits the final cosmic judgment, Rev. 19:11ff.

The Christ of Revelation is still that One whose manifestation brings the "restoration of all things" (Acts 3:21). Very much this same cycle seems implied in Rev. 21:5,6.

The Christ of Revelation is the judge of all the earth. True, in Revelation as in the sermons, God is often himself the judge, this being also true in I Enoch. But the figure of Revelation 19:11 ff. is apparently the Messiah, (associated again with the "Word") as in Acts 10:42.

The salvation offered by the Christ of Revelation is much like that described in Chapter III. The "Word" of Rev. 19 ff. smites "the nations", saving the people of God.

And, last among the eschatological features noted in

Chapter III to be characteristic of the Christology of the sermons of Peter, the Messiah is brought into close relationship to the Spirit. As the outpouring of the Spirit of prophecy (Acts 2:17) brought the first Christian sermon so it is the Spirit which in the Apocalypse reveals Christ (Rev. 1:10). The whole book is a prophecy resulting from the Spirit. And the voice of this Spirit and the voice of Christ now seem to be one and the same (Rev. 1:10; 2:7,11,17, etc.).

Thus in each of the six points where the sermons in Acts seem to reflect such works as I Enoch Revelation has continued and in most cases has expanded the thought. The parallels are of course by no means enough to suggest dependence of Revelation upon Acts. But it does appear that if the sermons in Acts reflect a bit of the thought of the earlier apocalypses Revelation reflects a great deal of this thought. And this development has followed the lines laid down in the first preaching. Revelation has taken one aspect of the kerygma and has developed it, adding little or nothing to the others. Thus the result is to place almost the whole emphasis on the future coming of Christ as the conquering Judge and thus actually to alter the nature of Christology.

At the same time it must be noted that the Apocalypse of John, presenting a Christology of the most narrowly eschatological type to be found in the New Testament, still cannot entirely lose contact with its broader base in the primitive preaching. Jesus is not only the Eschatological Christ,

an apocalyptic figure, He is still also the fulfilment of the canonical Old Testament hope and He is still the one who lived and died on earth and rose again. It is striking that this book so frequently speaks of Jesus as "The Lamb" (Rev. 5:6,13; 7:9, etc.) It is by reference to His death and resurrection that Christ must introduce Himself (Rev. 1:16). And through the Spirit He now speaks to and encourages John. "Futuristic" eschatology has not entirely forgotten "realized" eschatology.

Again it must be noted that this apocalyptic element found in the first preaching is not forgotten by the other New Testament writers. Mark 13 - with its notable use of the title "Christ" in the eschatological sense in verses 21 and 22 - witnesses to the place of this type of Christology in the synoptics. The thought of I Thessalonians 4:13ff. underlies many another passage in the writings of Paul. And even in John (14:3) the future hope is still certainly present, even though the thought of Jesus as a present Power has pushed eschatology into the background, or at least altered to a great extent its form. "Sublimated" eschatology has largely replaced the "Futuristic", though traces of the future hope still clearly remain. To John the incarnation has already brought the glories of the last age.

One final point of extreme importance must be noted with regard to the New Testament development of the idea of Christ as the fulfilment of the eschatological hope of late Judaism. In Revelation that tendency, which we noted

had clearly begun in the primitive preaching, to ascribe to Christ attributes and powers heretofore ascribed only to God is carried well along the path begun in the early sermons. Moffatt, describing the Christ who appears in Revelation 1, writes thus:

The whole conception of the messiah in the Apocalypse resembles that outlined in Enoch (Similitudes, xxvii-lxxi) where he also possesses pre-existence as Son of man (xlvi), sits on his throne of glory (slvii. 3) for judgment, rules all men (lxvii. 6), and slays the wicked with the word of his mouth (lxii.2): but this particular transference to the messiah (i. 14, 17, 18, 118, xxii.12,13), of what is in Daniel predicated of God as the world judge, seems to form a specifically N. T. idea, unmediated even in Enoch (xlvi. I)....1

If the doctrine of the incarnation was not explicit in the preaching of Peter it may be seen as an inevitable result of the Christological thought his sermons did contain.

2) The second great element in the Christology of the primitive preaching has been seen to be the presentation of Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament Messianic hope.

No book stands out quite so clearly as a development of this idea as does The Revelation as an expansion of the apocalyptic type of eschatology. Every book of the New Testament is filled with the thought of the Old. Paul, for example, must set Jesus in relationship to the Old Testament circumcision. Matthew must show Jesus as the giver of the new and higher law. But no book is more concerned with this

1. J. Moffat, The Revelation of St. John the Divine, in The Expositors Greek New Testament, Vol. V, p. 344.

particular problem nor shows more interesting affinities in this matter with the sermons in Acts than The Epistle to the Hebrews. We take it, therefore, as an illustration of one type of development of the original idea.

None would doubt that it is a primary task of this epistle to show the relationship of Jesus to the Old Testament canonical scriptures. This is not simply to say that it contains some twenty-six extended quotations from these writings. Every line breathes this intent. Jesus must be related to every part of the revealing past; Abraham, Moses, the prophets, the tabernacle, the priesthood, the angels, the law, the covenant, and especially the God of the Old Testament Himself. The more clearly is this true if one follows, as we do, the view traditionally held and recently convincingly restated, that the book is written to a group of Jewish Christians who are in danger of slipping back into Judaism.¹

In Chapter IV of this thesis it was pointed out that in its simplest terms the primitive preaching related Jesus to the canonical Old Testament by identifying Him with the Davidic Messiah believed to be promised there. Jesus was described in Old Testament categories as "Christ", the anointed king, and the "Lord" of Psalm 110. This identi-

1. See W. Manson: The Epistle to the Hebrews

fication no longer needs to be proclaimed. It is implied in every line and may be regarded as belonging to those "elementary doctrines" (Hebrews 6:1) now not needing repetition. The thought of Jesus as the Son of David seems almost forgotten. The originally Messianic title which is of most vital interest to the writer of Hebrews is the title "Son of God".

We have seen this title used of Jesus in the sermon attributed to Paul, discussed in chapter IX of this thesis. Here we found it to be derived from Old Testament Messianic category, but hinting at something more, especially the peculiar love of God. In Hebrews the title has been retained, but its meaning is now clearly far deeper than that of Davidic Messiahship. As Professor Manson says:

The doctrine of the Person of Christ in the Epistle thus shows a definitely Jewish Messianic basis and starting-point, but it reaches far beyond this. In the ancient Hebrew kingdom... the king of Israel, as the head of the elect people of God, was the visible representative and pledge to the nation of the divine blessing, and an instrument of the saving and sanctifying virtue, energy, and presence of God in its life. He was, as such, invested with quasi-divine titles and honours as the anointed 'Son' of God... In later Judaism, however, the title 'Son of God' was allowed to drop out... Now in Christianity the conception of the Messiah as the Son of God has come back, but on a higher level of revelation, and with immeasurable new force and depth of meaning, through the person, character, and relation to God the Father, of Jesus. God has spoken to us in a Son.¹

The title has developed meaning far beyond its origin. As

1. ibid. pp. 89, 90.

Son, Jesus transcends all angels and all prophets. He is now the predestined inheritor of all things.

That similar expansions of the use of the "Messianic" Psalm 110 have occurred we shall note below.

The second Old Testament concept applied to Jesus in the sermons of Peter was seen to be the idea of the promised "prophet like unto Moses" whose word is to be obeyed, perhaps related to the title $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ and to some primitive "Joshua Christology". We noted some repetition of this idea in the sermon of Stephen, with a wider use of Old Testament characters as types of Christ. Here again one may find both repetition of the original idea and large expansions of it.

The $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ concept named but not developed in Acts is now developed, especially in Hebrews 2:10-18.

Jesus is conceived as the Leader or Protagonist who, going in front or at the head of His redeemed host, beats down the forces opposed to them, and so becomes the Founder or Inaugurator of their 'salvation'. This conception comes into clear light at the heart of the passage, where it is said that the purpose underlying the assumption by the Son of God of the children's blood and flesh was that he might 'defeat' the devil, who exercised his sovereignty in death, and by that stroke release all those who, like slaves, were cowed and bent low throughout their earthly existence beneath 'the fear of death'.¹

This is far more than a primitive "Joshua Christology". Yet Jesus is still, though in a higher sense, both the second Moses (Heb. 3:2ff) and the second Joshua (Heb. 4:8 etc).

1. ibid. p. 103

Peter saw Jesus as a prophet like Moses, whose word was to be obeyed. Stephen saw Jesus as having transcended the law. Hebrews now sees Him as the Son, infinitely far above both the prophets who spoke God's word and the angels who gave the law (Compare Stephen in Acts 7:30,38.). He is Himself the final word.

We noted that Peter saw Jesus as the promised Davidic Messiah and as the prophet like unto Moses. But finally we saw that he applied to Jesus certain Old Testament ideas which had previously little or no connection with the Messianic hope. Among these we noted a few words with predominantly cultic connotations. We have seen that the key to Stephen's address is that his eschatological Christology broke the bonds of the Jewish cultus. It is here most clearly that Hebrews stands in direct line of succession.

It is the paradox of the Christology of Hebrews that it thinks of Christ so completely in Old Testament terms and yet at the same time as so completely above Old Testament terms. All scripture speaks of Christ. Yet Christ is above all scripture. No longer does the simple identification of Jesus with the promised Messiah suffice (if ever it did). The writer has become aware of the tension between eschatology and cultus. He has found a kind of solution to the problem in the Greek philosophical concept of the two worlds: the visible but unreal world, and the heavenly. The whole of the Old Testament gives us the visible shadowing of that eternal and perfect world. In Jesus Christ that foreshadowed reality has invaded the realm of time.

Thus Jesus is at the same time the one toward whom Moses, Abraham, the priesthood, and the tabernacle point, yet He is beyond them all. With Him all sacrifices end, for He is the perfect and heavenly oblation. The law (10:1) is but the shadow of the reality He has brought. The catalogue of heroes (chap. 11) points to Him. And especially is He the Great High Priest.

In all of this the one great parallel in the New Testament is the sermon of Stephen with its typology and peculiar eschatology. This is not to say, of course, that Stephen has thus fully developed this doctrine of the two worlds. But Hebrews is working out the problem of which Stephen had become aware, and along those lines of thought for which Stephen died. The eschatological Christ is above the Old Testament cultus, yet He is the fulfilment of it. Tabernacle, law, and land all point to Him, yet He transcends them all. The whole of the Old Testament is at the same time a revelation of God yet also an unsatisfied seeking for God. But in Jesus the true glory has at last tabernacled with men.

To Hebrews, of course, the great idea here to receive particular development is that of Jesus as the Great High Priest. And it is significant that its starting point is exactly that Psalm which the sermons in Acts presents as the favorite of the early preachers, Psalm 110. This is the great text for the exhortation to the Hebrews. Precisely as the book advances its most unique idea it bases itself most carefully upon its origins. And the confessional formula of Jesus as Priest is regarded as one already accepted

throughout the church long before the epistle was written (Heb. 3:1). The trans-cultic implications of primitive Christianity are regarded as a part of the early Christian world mission. What was implicit in the preaching of Peter and affirmed in the preaching of Stephen is now developed fully in the epistle to the Hebrews. And in Him priest and sacrifice have become one.

One final note here is that again more and more that which once referred only to God now refers to Jesus Christ. But this is now clearly more than the attributing of a few quotations to the Messiah originally intended to refer to Jehweh. This, of course, takes place (Heb. 1:6, 10, etc.). But there is something more. Moses already knew "the reproach of Christ" (Heb. 11:26). The pre-incarnate Christ Himself speaks in Psalm 90:6-8 as quoted in Hebrews 10:5-7. Thus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever, is actually present in the Old Testament, the Son with the Father. In Him eternity invades time.

3) Obviously it is the synoptic gospels that best show the development of the early preaching of the concept of Jesus as a man who had lived and died on earth.

It is our contention that the gospels are to be understood as an outgrowth of this primitive idea. Here we are clearly taking sides on a controversial issue. It has been argued that the synoptic gospels, coming as they do much later than either the early sermons or the epistles of Paul,

are to be explained in a quite different way. They are, it is said, the product of the disappointment of the early church with regard to the parousia. When Jesus did not actually return in glory the church began to glorify His first coming. As it became apparent that life must go on in this age they turned to His life and teachings for guidance. Thus the synoptics were born. We have maintained, however, that the memory of the events of the earthly life of Jesus had a real place in the preaching of the church even from the very beginning, being held side by side with the eschatological hope. This was the subject of Chapter Five. If this be, then the gospels are to be understood as a natural development of one aspect of the early preaching, not as simply a new return to the historic Jesus after the false hope of futuristic eschatology.

Prof. C. H. Dodd has done an excellent work in showing the relationship of Mark, the oldest of our canonical gospels, to the kerygma form as he derives it from the sermons in Acts and certain passages in Paul. In the second chapter of his The Apostolic Preaching and Its Development he shows how Mark is a "gospel" precisely because it so closely follows the pattern of the earliest preaching of the good news. We would simply refer to this splendid discussion of the general point and then go on to that particular field which is the subject of this thesis, namely: the Christology.

In Chapter Five it was noted first of all that the sermons clearly stated Jesus' human nature and origins. In them and now in the gospels he is shown to be $\alpha\nu\eta\rho$, man. The oldest gospel, like the sermons in Acts, has no

account of the birth of Jesus, but begins, like Acts 10, with his Baptism. The two accounts which do give miraculous birth stories still make clear his human birth of Mary. In them, however, Jesus is shown also to be the physical Son of God. The name Jesus and the association with Nazareth, mentioned in Acts, are clear in the gospels. The idea that Jesus is a descendent of David is so old by the time of the writing of the synoptics that already two different tables of genealogy have been drawn up to prove it. These tables and the miraculous birth stories are the chief additions which the gospel writers make on these points.

The second matter discussed in Chapter Five was the place of the events of the earthly life of Jesus. It is of course here that the gospel writers have made their most valuable contribution. But all of their additions may be seen to be in line with the trend of the early preaching.

For example, Jesus is again set in relation to John the Baptist. All four gospels make his baptism by John the beginning of his ministry. It is the starting point for Mark and John and the point at which Matthew and Luke come together after differing birth narratives. This relationship is clarified and expanded far beyond the statement in Acts 10:37,38. It is the common essential ground. It may be noted here that the "adoptionism" of Mark is very close to the "adoptionism" we have discussed in the sermons.

Jesus is presented still as a prophet. Indeed the

form critics find the basis of much material to be primitive "pronouncement stories" told to present some wise saying of the Master Teacher. But He is now more than a prophet. He gives the new law in Matthew, one transcending that of Moses. And for John Jesus Christ is not simply the giver of this new word, He is Himself The Word.

The events of his life are still seen primarily as a series of "mighty works" displaying the authority of the Son of God. Here again the form critics have rendered great service by showing how the gospels contain much material still showing the marks of use as sermon illustrations in the early preaching. We have listed some of these on page 154. Later interests may have altered the form of many stories, using them to display the techniques of healing, moral lessons through allegory, etc. But the oldest strata still show the primitive interest in the manifestation of Jesus' authority in mighty works, and on the thread of this idea the gospel writers have strung together much of their material. (Compare Matt. 8:27)

It was noted that the sermons proclaimed the moral character of Jesus. Perhaps it would be well for more modern scholars to follow the lead of Dr. Hugh Martin who writes of Luke's Portrait of Jesus, and sees the stories of the gospel cumulatively building up to a portrait of the character of the man.

But, finally, if the kerygma was more concerned with the event of Jesus' death than with any other historical fact about Jesus this is exactly the point which the gospels have followed in the most direct line of development. Mark has been called "a passion narrative with a long introduction". The form critics agree that the passion narrative is the oldest connected narrative portion of these writings. Here only can we trace day by day the connection of events in Jesus' life. Around the central fact of the kerygma detailed stories have clustered. Of these the gospels are formed.

Yet in all of this we must repeat that interest in "the historical Jesus" has by no means supplanted all other interest in the gospels. If one aspect of the early preaching has been developed, the broader base has not been forgotten. Eschatology is still a dominant theme. And it would appear that all three types of eschatology named by Prof. Dodd are present: "futuristic", "realized", and "sublimated". Old Testament concepts, apocalyptic, Messianic, and others, are applied to Jesus. The baptism and birth stories have not displaced the exaltation and the resurrection stories, however much this may be the trend. One wishes for the lost ending of Mark, here, wondering what account he gave of the resurrection. Perhaps Mark contained a promise of the continual presence of Christ. At any rate Matthew does. The foundation of synoptic Christology lies in the kerygma.

4) As an example of one who built his Christology

upon the significance of the events of the resurrection and the exaltation of Jesus Paul serves well. True, the whole New Testament Christology is based on the resurrection. But none emphasizes the resurrection and exaltation more than Paul.

Indeed it is the kerygma of Acts which forms a kind of "missing link" between the memory of the historic Jesus and the "advanced" concept of Christ found in Colos^sians. One of the basic problems of Pauline study has been the difference between Paul's epistles and the synoptic gospels. It is said that Paul seems to have no interest in the historic Jesus and the events of his earthly life but is concerned only with the significance of the death and resurrection of the Son of God. Now this has been much over-emphasized. Much recent thought has tended to show that Paul was by no means ignorant of Jesus' earthly life.¹ Again, Albert Schweitzer has proposed as the key to Paul's thought "thoroughgoing eschatology". Yet when all possible has been said here Paul is neither another Mark nor another John the writer of the Apocalypse. And where Paul is most concerned with eschatology the concept of the resurrection as the primary eschatological event is most apparent (eg. I Cor.15).

It is the resurrection, together, of course, with

1. see H.A.A. Kennedy: The Theology of the Epistles, pp.53ff, J. Stewart: A Man in Christ, pp. 286 ff.

the cross, which is central in the thought of Paul. This part of the message of the kerygma, was the essential message for him. "And if Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain" (I. Cor. 15:14). It was his own experience of the risen Christ which had made him a preacher (Gal. 1:15; I Cor. 9:1; Eph. 3:3). If he writes of Christ as the Redeemer from the bondage of the law it is based on the resurrection (Rom. 1:4; Gal. 1:15). It is the resurrection which is the primary eschatological event (I Cor. 15:20). And over and over he speaks of it in language that reflects the kerygma. (See the chart in the Appendix and the discussion of $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \nu\epsilon\kappa\rho\acute{\omega}\nu$ on page 173).

All of the things found in chapter IV to be characteristic of the earliest preaching of the resurrection are in some sense paralleled in Paul. As noted above, the resurrection continues to be the central fact of the message. It is the proof and the means of the exaltation (Rom. 1:4; Philippians 2:9). It is a historic event (I Cor. 15:4). In the resurrection God vindicated the earthly life of his Son by divine action (I Cor. 15:15; I Thess. 1:10). It is the great statement by God of Jesus' present status as the Christ, in which He was "declared to be the Son of God" (Rom. 1:4). It is the guarantee of the eschatological hope (I Thes. 4:14; I Cor. 15:20).

This, then, was his starting point: the early preaching of Jesus as the risen and exalted Christ. How

Paul built upon this is the subject for a thesis on the Christology of Paul. We might note three great trends in Pauline thought.

For one thing, Paul was called upon to show the relationship between the preaching of the resurrection and the preaching of the final judgment. The subject arose in questions addressed to Paul by the churches of Thessalonica and Corinth. In I Thessalonians Paul establishes a relationship between the believer's resurrection and that of Jesus: "For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with him" (I Thes. 4:14). Because of his resurrection we wait for the "Son from heaven" (I Thes. 1:10). In I Cor. 15:20,21 Jesus is seen as "the first fruits of them that slept", the man by whom came the resurrection of the dead. In the resurrection Paul found the bridge by which to connect the concept of the eschatological Christ with the other and seemingly incompatible concepts of the first Christian preaching. The risen Christ is the pre-existent "Man from Heaven".

Again Paul must deal with the relationship to Christ of all the Old Testament. Especially it was Paul's task to work out the implications of Christ's relationship to the law. Here again it was the concept of the risen Christ which enabled him to preach Christ as the Great Redeemer. The Christ who conquered death conquered sin and all the powers of darkness. (Compare Rom. 6; Eph. 2:1-6; Col. 2:12-14.) Death is associated with the law through sin, but

the believer is given new and eternal life through the conquest of death by the resurrection of the Redeemer.

In these two matters Paul is developing the implications of matters involved in the kerygma among the Jews. But in such a work as Colossians he is beginning to deal with questions of a newer kind. Here he must answer in terms of Greek thought. But again in presenting Jesus as "the image of the invisible God" (Col. 1:15), pre-existent and the agent of creation (Col. 1:17), "in whom dwelleth all the fullness of the godhead bodily" (Col. 2:9), Paul is careful to relate all that he is saying to the original gospel (Col. 1:23-29). The Old Testament concept of pre-existent Wisdom, the heresy of a kind of incipient gnosticism, or the competition of pagan mystery cults might drive Paul to new phrases and new ideas. But it is the resurrection of Christ which reveals all mysteries.

5) The fifth element we noted in the primitive Christology was the thought of Jesus as a present and living power. The most obvious example of the development of this idea is the Gospel According to John.

The first element of this thought of the continuing presence and power of Jesus found in the sermons was noted to be the relationship proclaimed between Jesus and the Spirit. Though found in all the gospels this idea is primarily the key to the thought of John. As Clement of Alexandria wrote long ago (quoted in Eusebius' History, Book VI, chapter 14):

John last of all, having perceived that the corporeal had been portrayed in the other gospels, at the instigation of his friends produced a spiritual gospel.

This is made clear in the frequent references to the Spirit. Jesus is the second Baptist, baptizing with the Spirit (John 1:33), His own ministry beginning when the Spirit descends upon Him. The new birth which He gives is of the Spirit (John 3:5ff). This Spirit is the essential of worship (John 4:23ff). His words are "spirit" (John 6:63). He offers to all the water of life through the outpouring of the Spirit (John 7:38,39). And the great promise for the future which is made by the Christ of John's gospel is that the Spirit will come (John 14:17; 15:26; and 16:13). The climax of the gospel is the breathing into the disciples by Christ of the Holy Spirit (John 20:22).

But the "spiritual" nature of the gospel goes far deeper than the brief list of references suggests. The whole time center of the gospel has been altered. And now, though the humanity of Christ is dogmatically affirmed, the whole of the earthly life of Jesus is seen, to a degree far beyond that of the other gospels, through eyes enlightened by the Spirit through the resurrection. Pre-resurrection events are seen to show resurrection glory and thus to have spiritual meaning higher than history. Christ comes from the Father and returns to the Father. Eternity invades time.

The concept of "the name" noted in chapter VII to be for the early church a sign of the presence and power of Jesus, continues to be fundamental to John. The whole purpose of the book is stated to be that the reader might believe,

thus "have life in his name". (John 20:31). The name is now no longer so much associated with healings and exorcisms. It is in the name of the living Christ that believers receive new life (John 1:12).

The salvation brought by Jesus is now clearly a present experience. He is the Saviour not so much in terms of some future judgment (for in Him judgment has already come, John 9:39; 12:31) but in that He brings rebirth (John 3:3), living water (John 7:38), new and more abundant life (John 10:10) here and now for eternity.

And thus the concept of Jesus' present Lordship over the community develops into a faith in full mystical union between the believer and his Lord. The relationship of "Lord" and "Servant" is transcended, becoming that of Friend to friend (John 15:15). And deeper yet, the living Christ is now related to the community by a continual abiding, He in them and they in Him (John 15:4). Obedience, love, and faith bring a relationship of mystical height and depth only hinted at in Acts.

Yet thus far what has been described is a logical outgrowth of the first Christian preaching, a developing of one cluster of ideas found (as noted in Chapter VII) in the earliest Christology. We now must note two special factors in the Christology of John.

First, John deals in a particular way with the relationship between the concept of Jesus as a living and present power (Chapter VII) and Jesus as the Apocalyptic

Messiah (Chapter III). The tension between the present and the future is a problem with which he deals in three ways.

John does not completely abandon future expectation. It is possible to overemphasize the place of "realized" or "sublimated" eschatology in his gospel. Such passages as John 5:28,29; 6:39, 40, 44, 54; and 14:3 show the original future hope still has a place. Jesus is still the One whose coming as the eschaton is eagerly awaited.

But the second coming which John emphasizes is now the coming of the Holy Spirit. The synoptics all insert an apocalyptic discourse just before the passion narrative (Matt. 24; Mark 13; Luke 21). But John records rather a discourse where the predominant promise is that of the coming of the Paraclete (John 14:25; 15:26; 16:13, etc.). Jesus is the one who sends the Holy Spirit. Thus, even though the world does not see Him, the disciples know that He is already come (John 14:19).

And in a third way John resolves the tension between present and future elements in Christology. With the aid of the Spirit and standing on this side of the resurrection John is able to see the events of the earthly life of Jesus in a new and continuing glory. And thus he sees in the "first coming" of Jesus the events of the eschaton already begun. In Him judgment (John 9:39; 12:31), resurrection (John 11:25), and eternal life (John 5:24; 6:63; 17:3) have already come and are now present. "Sublimated" and "realized" eschatology have to a large degree replaced the futuristic eschatology. He is the resurrection and the life.

The second special factor in the Christology of John is of course the relating of Christology to the Greek concept of the Logos. With the prologue of John's Gospel Christology has entered a new phase. While remaining true to its heritage in Jewish thought (as in Proverbs 8), the preaching of Christ is now expressed in language with meaning clearer to all the Gentile world. The primitive Semitic Christological statements are now on their way to being formulated in Greek creeds.

This brief survey of the development of the New Testament Christology has shown that beginning with the collection of ideas preached at the beginning Christology appears to have developed along three lines.

First, particular strands of the primitive Christology were extended and developed. For example, the author of the Apocalypse developed more fully the idea of Jesus as the fulfilment of the Messianic Hope of the apocalyptic writings of late Judaism. The writers of the synoptic gospels concentrated on the thought of Jesus as a man on earth. This is not to say that the writers abandoned the other ideas of Christology. Mark is proclaiming Jesus to be the Son of God. But it was the particular task of the various writers to develop one or another of the aspects of the early preaching.

The second tendency is for New Testament writers to seek to resolve the tensions between various seemingly conflicting ideas about Jesus held in the primitive community.

For example, John seeks to harmonize the thought of Jesus as the eschatological Messiah with that of His continuing presence and of his earthly life. The author of Hebrews works out his own synthesis between the eschatological transcendence of Christ and the Old Testament hope. Paul must relate the Crucified and Risen One to the Old Testament law.

And the third factor to be noted is that primitive Christology soon came into contact with Greek ideas which it could use to its advantage, at the same time expressing itself and enriching itself by means of Greek thought. Here we leave far behind the scope of this thesis.

In each of these processes one result was inevitable. That which was latent in the first preaching was now made explicit. Jesus was to be proclaimed "very man and very God."

In the introduction to this thesis the problem with which we were to deal was stated to be this: "We seek to determine whether or not the early chapters of Acts really can be trusted in their picture of the earliest Christian witness. And we seek to determine what this witness was, with regard to one point of theology, Christology."

We are now in a position to give our answer to these two questions.

To the first question the answer which we give is "Yes". It is true that the text of Acts is in dispute. It is true that Acts was probably written more than fifty years after Pentecost. It is true that scholarly men have argued that the writer cannot have been a companion of Paul nor have known intimately the leaders of the primitive church. Yet we have found reason to believe that his report is accurate and that it is full enough that we can learn from it much of what we have wanted to know.

The argument has proceeded along these lines:

The examination of the text showed that at even a very early time the producer of the "D" text felt it necessary to "heighten" the Christology of the original text. For him phrases which are the essence of the proclamation of the original have become standard formulae used almost without thought. Even at an early day the Christology of the sermons in Acts was already old.

Second, our survey of the general question of the authorship and accuracy of Acts led to the following conclusions: that Acts was written by a man who was in dozens of points where we may check him an accurate historian both in general pictures and in details; he knew a great deal about Paul and probably had first hand knowledge of Paul's preaching; the "we sections" show him to have been a companion of the earliest preachers and a man who had visited the Jerusalem church; and he was indeed probably the Luke of Philemon verse 24 and thus one engaged in the primitive witness himself. We have reason to believe that he could and would record the earliest preaching accurately.

Third, it has been demonstrated that our author, whom we have found to be probably Luke, did write as a historian using genuinely historical sources, including in all probability certain Palestinian sources which betray in their vividness, detail, and language their primitive origin. Our sermons may be presumed to come from sources both Palestinian and early.

Fourth, a critical study of the sermons themselves gives reason to believe them to be an accurate record of the earliest preaching. We know from his gospel that Luke adhered closely to his sources in recording speeches. The speeches in Acts do show certain marks of individuality fitting the characters of those to whom they are attributed. Their language and their unity with his Palestinian sources suggest

their primitive origin. Their thought at a number of points can be shown to be strictly Jewish-Christian. And, most important of all, C. H. Dodd and others have shown - and we have endeavored to expand this demonstration - that these sermons fit perfectly into the kerygma form as outlined by Paul himself as being pre-Pauline.

And finally we have examined critically every idea of the Christology outlined in these sermons and we have found in every case that the best source for these ideas is indeed either the background of Jewish Messianic expectation, the canonical scripture, or the events of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus together with the ecstatic experiences out of which the first witness came. Such titles as "Lord", "Servant", and "Son" have been found to need no Greek explanation but rather to bear clear traces of Jewish-Christian origin. At every point where we have been able to test them Christological ideas of these sermons have fitted perfectly their setting in the primitive church, sometimes contrasting with later ideas.

For these reasons we are prepared to give a categorical answer to our first question. The sermons recorded in the first thirteen chapters of Acts are a source of the highest historical value for determining the nature of primitive Christology. The Christology they present is that of the dawn of the Church, the church in its earliest Palestinian days before Greco-Roman thought had altered Christology. We may go to these sermons with confidence

that they give us if not stenographic reports at least brief descriptions of the very ideas which Peter and the other first preachers preached. At the far end of that dark tunnel between the cross and the epistles they shed a genuine light.

Having thus examined our source critically and found it of real historical value we have inquired what kind of Christology it shows the primitive church to have had. We are now ready to summarize our answer.

Frankly, with respect to many of the popular ideas with regard to primitive Christology our conclusion has been quite negative. If our argument has been right then many others have been wrong, falling into the error of attempting to trace the history of Christology as a progress from "lower" to "higher" or from the simple to the complex and failing to appreciate the "height" and the complexity of the earliest witness.

For example, Adolf Harnack, like Wellhausen and others, tends toward the view that it was Paul who perverted Christianity from a gospel of Jesus' teachings about human relations to a dogma that Jesus was divine. The original "Christology" was simply that Jesus was the man who had proclaimed the kingdom.

Under the influence of the Messianic dogmas, and led by the impression which Christ made, Paul became the author of the speculative idea that not only was God in Christ, but that Christ himself was possessed of a peculiar nature of a heavenly kind.¹

11 A. Harnack: What is Christianity, p. 188.

Actually, the fact as it has appeared in this study seems to be that we cannot find a time in the history of the church when the Risen Christ was not looked upon as a Divine Being. We cannot go back to a time when His disciples looked upon Him simply as their teacher. From the very beginning He was proclaimed to be the Heavenly Son of Man in terms of the most transcendent eschatology. From the very beginning He was assigned attributes heretofore reserved strictly to God. This is not to say that Peter at Pentecost stated clearly "Jesus is God". It is to say that when the later Greek concepts of the pleroma and the logos of God were applied to Jesus this was not simply an innovation. Paul and John give expression in Greek form to ideas implicit in the earliest preaching.

On the other hand, our study has not confirmed the opinions of those at the opposite extreme. It tends to be the view of certain critics of the "form critical school", such as Dibelius and Bultmann, that the earliest Christology had no interest in the humanity of Christ except to affirm His saving death. This utter preoccupation with the "spiritual" to the neglect of the "historical" Jesus cannot really be found in Acts. Granted that the cross was the supreme event of Jesus' life for the early preaching, still that preaching also contained an account of His works and teachings. This of course is not to forget that the form critics are aware to some extent of this. It is, however, to warn that the importance of the "Jesus of History" was greater to the early church than some have recognized. Jesus was preached to have been a Man on Earth, in life as well as death, and this was not unimportant in primitive Christology. In a

sense Dibelius is quite right in saying that "there never was a 'purely' historical witness to Jesus". But the first witness did not neglect the Jesus of History.

Again, we have been forced to disagree with Bousset and others in their contention that the primitive Christology was simply the proclamation that Jesus was the eschatological "Son of Man". That He was so proclaimed from the first we have seen to be true. But even in the beginning apocalyptic expectation was modified, and it was held also in conjunction with other and very different ideas. Jesus was also a present Power. He was still the man they had known on earth. To make primitive Christology exclusively eschatological is to fall into the trap of over-simplification.

And so, too, our study has been unable to find a clear and simple "adoptionist Christology", such as was described by Johannes Weiss and has been widely held since to have been the original idea. True, in pages 180 - 184 we have found that there is a real body of truth in the adoptionist idea. But we cannot say that it was systematically and consistently held. Other and contrasting ideas were also present, such as the association of Jesus was the pre-existent Son of Man and the meaning seen in His earthly life. And the change which took place in Jesus was one of status, from "Servant" to "Lord", not of nature, from "Man" to "God".

In rejecting these four theories, and others, with regard to the nature of the earliest Christology we are not casting aside all these men have taught. Rather the truth seems to be that all of these elements had a place: escha-

tology, humanity, divinity, adoption, and many more. The fact is that primitive Christology has proved to be a more complex doctrine than has been previously suspected.

Actually what we have found primitive Christology to have been is this: a richly varied collection of often rather ^rcontesting ideas about Jesus, welded together not so much by logical system as by the ecstatic experiences of the time. As far back as we can explore we find the primitive church expressing its faith in Jesus in terms derived partly from eschatological expectation, partly from the Old Testament canon, partly from its clear memory of Jesus' earthly life, and partly from the experiences of the resurrection and the repeated outpourings of the Spirit.

From the beginning Jesus was preached to be the Messiah of apocalyptic expectation, described in terms quite similar to those used of the Son of Man in I Enoch. Within the limits described we have found the "eschatological school" to be right. Jesus was seen to be a transcendent, supernatural Being, One whose coming had brought all of history to its final stage. He was proclaimed to be Himself the focal point of the whole divine plan. The risen Christ was preached as the Spirit-filled agent of God's cosmic judgment and blessing, now concealed on high with God in glory, and soon to return for the final cataclysmic event. He was called "Christ", "The Righteous One", the cosmic Judge of all, and the Saviour of the penitent elect, now sitting on the throne of the universe and soon to come to

judge the world.

But the primary source of ideas used by the early church for the interpretation of Jesus was the canon of the Old Testament, that literature itself being radically re-interpreted in the light of the coming of Christ. Jesus was described in terms of the transcendent king of Old Testament expectation, the Son of David who was at the same time David's Lord, the Christ who was the embodiment of all the hope of Hebrew history and yet much more, the One peculiarly related to Israel's God and possessing divine authority. He was called the ἀρχηγός, a kind of second Moses and second Joshua, founding and leading a new community of the redeemed, voicing a new and final revelation of God's will, embodying the culmination of the prophetic office. He was indeed Himself the personal representative of all the Hebrew Nation's history and mission and the Fulfilment and Fulfiller of all its previously unfulfilled hope and destiny. He was the truly Holy, the Anointed One of its priestly cult, at the same time Priest and Sacrifice. And indeed He was repeatedly described in terms not simply of the Old Testament Messiah but of the Old Testament God.

And yet in all of this Jesus was preached to have been a man on earth, the memory of whose human life still was essential to the primitive Christology. His human nature and origin were clearly affirmed. His baptism, His teachings, His "mighty works", and His moral character were described. His miraculous healings and exorcisms were seen

as signs of His glory, yet they did not conceal His humanity. His baptism by John was seen as a sign of special anointing by the Holy Spirit. He is placed squarely in the prophetic tradition, as its Culmination and Fulfilment. And especially the death of Jesus was seen to have rich meaning. In His earthly life and death Jesus showed Himself to be the "Servant" described in the second half of Isaiah. Thus Jesus' death could be understood as a sign that He was the Atoning Sacrifice, the Lamb. The human earthly life of Jesus was not simply an embarrassing intrusion into the message to be explained away or ignored. It was an essential part of the good news, a highly important element of the Christology.

A unique emphasis on the exaltation of Jesus, lost in much of later thought though still traceable in the orthodox creeds, was characteristic of primitive Christology. Christology was expressed in dynamic statements centering on an event. The resurrection, with its utter surprise, was still fresh in the minds of the church, a material and spiritual fact. This was the central fact of Christology. He who had died as Servant had been raised as Lord. The resurrection meant not simply the immortality of Jesus. It was at the same time the vindication of His earthly life and the proclamation of His divine status, His being at the right hand of God. This was not to say that Jesus' nature was changed, from human to divine, as in Greek mythology. But it was affirmed that in a cataclysmic event Jesus' status was altered, so that He who had been a man on earth, the Servant, was now Lord (in the sense of Psalm 110), in a not yet

clearly defined sense distinct from yet equal to God, at God's right hand.

And, finally, primitive Christology saw in Jesus a Living and Present Power. In the present tense the early church could speak of Jesus as related - in a relationship it did not clearly define - to the Holy Spirit. Through Him that Spirit was poured out upon the church in ecstasy and power. His name was sufficient to produce miracles of healing and exorcism. He was the present agent of the divine forgiveness and salvation. He was the Head of the church, the object of its devotion, its personal and present Lord. He was in deed if not yet in name really its God.

Thus, then, is the primitive Christology, a bewildering mixture of almost conflicting ideas, welded together not by a simple logical system but by history and ecstasy, expressed in the language of Palestinian thought, but based on the events of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

With this as our starting point we have found the progress of the development of Christology to have followed a somewhat different pattern from many of those commonly proposed. Without maintaining that the church began with an explicit statement of the deity of Christ comparable to the Trinitarian formula, we have not found that the development of Christology can be likened to an ascending line, beginning with the thought of Jesus as a good man and rising the heights of the concept of Jesus as God. We have been

unable clearly to trace Wernle's progress "backward", with Jesus first thought of as Messiah at His second coming, then as Messiah at His resurrection, then at His baptism, then at His Virgin Birth, and finally from His eternal pre-existence. We have not found Paul to be the inventor of Christological thought. Nor yet have we found Christology to have been born, like Aphrodite, full grown from the first.

Rather it has appeared that the Christologies of the various writers of the New Testament represent in a sense radiations from the center of the primitive Christology as we have described it. The various New Testament works may be compared to the spokes of a wheel, each going in a slightly different direction out from the center of the primitive kerygma. The apocalypse develops the thought of Jesus as the Eschatological Messiah. Hebrews siezes upon certain aspects of the thought of Jesus as the fulfilment of the Old Testament hope. The gospels expand the picture of Jesus as a man on earth. The Pauline epistles are, among other things, one example of how the concept of the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus found meaning. And the Johannine writings develop the Christological implications of the doctrine of Jesus as a Living and Present Power. Each writer developed some part of the primitive Christology - or sometimes more than one part - yet none lost completely their hold upon the whole of the original concept.

Two other processes are to be noted. New Testament writers endeavored to work out syntheses of the various often sharply contrasting ideas of the first preaching about

Jesus. Thus, for example, John worked out in a distinctive way the tension between the eschatological and the present elements in Christology. The author of Hebrews sought to show the relationship between the Christ of transcendent eschatology and the Christ who fulfilled the hope expressed in the Old Testament canon.

And the effort to express Christological ideas in terms of Greek thought, the fusion of Hebrew and Greek concepts such as the addition of the Logos idea, brought Christology ultimately to the pronouncements of the classic creeds, still normative for Catholic Christology. Yet even these creeds bear striking resemblance to the original kerygma Christology which we have described.

"What think ye of Christ, whose son is he?" This, we began by saying, is for the Christian the essential question. In a religion founded on certain historical events historical research plays its part in answering the question. If what has been said thus far is true then there are two implications which must be noted in conclusion.

The first is a reflection backward from the primitive Christology to the historic Jesus. We have seen what the earliest - and thus from the historical standpoint presumably the best - witnesses said of Him. Ultimately then this Christology must be thought of as coming in a very real sense from Jesus Himself. Is it saying too much

to suggest that much of so rich a cluster of thoughts must go back behind the imagination of Peter to the self-revelation of the historic Christ?

And the final word is a reflection forward. We have seen what Jesus meant to the early church. Does this remain in some sense His meaning for today? Is He indeed the One whose power transcends the atomic bomb, whose judgment falls on the Hitlers and the Stalins of the modern world and may yet fall upon America? Is He still the fulfilment of the purest desires of modern men? Is He yet the true Man among men? Does His triumphant resurrection have meaning for our tired world? Is He still present and alive, a Power?

Research does not speak the final word. "What think ye of Christ."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, Joseph A. The Acts of the Apostles. London: James Nisbet, 1857. 462 pp.
- Andrews, H. T. "The Title KURIOS As Applied to Jesus," The Expositor, 8th Series, XV (1918), 207-21.
- Bacon, B. N. The Apostolic Age. New York: The Century Co., 1925. 423 pp.
- Barnes, Albert. Notes, Explanatory and Practical, on the Acts of the Apostles. London: Thomas Ward, 1841. 410 pp.
- Barnes, E. W. The Rise of Christianity. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948. 356 pp.
- Baumgarten, M. The Acts of the Apostles on the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age. Translated by A. J. W. Morrison. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1854. 2 vols.
- Bell, G. K. A. and Deissmann, D. Adolf, editors. Mysterium Christi. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930. 286 pp.
- Bernard, J. H. The Gospel According to St. John (International Critical Commentary). New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1929.
- Bettenson, Henry. Documents of the Christian Church. Oxford: University Press, 1947. 457 pp.
- Beyschlag, Willibald. New Testament Theology. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1899. 419 pp.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Oxford: University Press, 1946. 250 pp.
- Blass, Friedrich. Philology of the Gospels. London: MacMillan, 1898. 250 pp.
- Bousset, Wilhelm. Kyrios Christos. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921. 394 pp.
- Bristol, L. O. "Primitive Christian Preaching and the Epistle to the Hebrews," The Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII, Part II (June 1949), 89-97.
- Brunner, Emil. The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption. Translated by Olive Wyon. London: Lutterworth Press, 1952. 386 pp.
- Burkitt, F. C. "Agnostos Theos," The Journal of Theological Studies, XV (1914), 455-65.
- Burkitt, F. C. Christian Beginnings. London: University of London Press, 1924. 152 pp.

- Cadbury, H. J. The Making of Luke-Acts. London: MacMillan, 1927. 385 pp.
- Case, Shirley J., editor. Studies in Early Christianity. New York: The Century Co., 1928. 467 pp.
- Charles, R. H., editor. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1913. 2 vols.
- Chase, F. H. The Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles. London: MacMillan, 1902. 314 pp.
- Clarke, W. K. Lowther. New Testament Problems. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929. 222 pp.
- Colson, F. H. "Notes on St. Luke's Preface," The Journal of Theological Studies, XXIV (1923), 300-09.
- Cone, Orello. The Gospel and Its Earliest Interpretations. London: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1893. 413 pp.
- Cullmann, Oscar. Christ and Time, the Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History. Translated by Floyd V. Filson. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1950. 253 pp.
- Cullman, Oscar. The Earliest Christian Confessions. Translated by J. K. S. Reid. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- Deissmann, D. Adolf, and Bell, G. K. A. Mysterium Christi. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1930. 286 pp.
- Denney, James. Jesus and the Gospel. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1908. 418 pp.
- Dewick, E. C. Primitive Christian Eschatology. Cambridge: University Press, 1912. 416 pp.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated from 2nd edition of Die Formgeschichte des Evangelium by B. L. Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1934. 311 pp.
- Dibelius, Martin. Gospel Criticism and Christology. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1933. 104 pp.
- Dibelius, Martin. The Message of Jesus. Translated by F. C. Grant. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1939. 192 pp.
- Dibelius, Martin. Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte und die Antike Geschichtschreibung. Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1949.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet and Co., 1952.

- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1936.
- Drummond, J. The Jewish Messiah. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1877.
- Duff, Archibald. "The Rise of the Title 'Messiah'," The Expositor, 8th Series, XXV (1923).
- Duncan, G. S. Jesus, Son of Man. London: Nisbet and Co., 1948. 290 pp.
- Easton, Burton Scott. Christ in the Gospels. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1930. 210 pp.
- Finch, R. G. The Synagogue Lectionary and the New Testament. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1939. 108 pp.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles. 2nd edition. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1948. 239 pp.
- Gardner, Percy. "The Speeches of St. Paul in Acts," in H. B. Swete, ed., Cambridge Biblical Essays. London: MacMillan, 1909. Pp. 379-419.
- Gloag, Paton J. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Vol. I. Edinburg: T and T Clark, 1870. 439 pp.
- Goguel, Maurice. "Introduction au Nouveau Testament," Tome III of Le Livre des Actes. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1922. 376 pp.
- Goodspeed, Edgar J. An Introduction to the New Testament. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937. 362 pp.
- Granbery, J. C. Outline of New Testament Christology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1909. 127 pp.
- Grant, W. M. Ideals of the Early Church. London: James Clarke, 1923. 192 pp.
- Harnack, Adolf. The Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels. London: Williams and Norgate, 1911. 162 pp.
- Harnack, Adolf. Luke the Physician. New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1907. 231 pp.
- Harnack, Adolf; What is Christianity? Translated by Thomas Bailey Saunders. London: Williams and Norgate, 1904.
- Harris, Rendel; Testimonies. Part I. Cambridge: University Press, 1916. 130 pp.
- Hastings, James, editor. A Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1906-08. 2 vols.

- Hatch, William H. P. "The Primitive Christian Message," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII, Part I (March 1939), 1-13.
- Hausrath, Adolf. A History of the New Testament Times. London: William and Norgate, 1895. 4 vols.
- Hawkins, Sir J. C. Horace Synopticas. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1899. 180 pp.
- Hebert, A. G. The Throne of David. London: Faber and Faber, 1948. 277 pp.
- Holdsworth, W. W. The Christ of the Gospels. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1911. 251 pp.
- Hopwood, P. G. S. The Religious Experience of the Primitive Church. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1936. 387 pp.
- Hoskyns, Sir Edwyn and Davey, Noel. The Riddle of the New Testament. London: Faber and Faber, 1939. 238 pp.
- Hunt, B. P. W. Strather. Primitive Gospel Sources. New York: Philosophical Library, 1951.
- Hunter, A. M. Paul and His Predecessors. London: Nicholson and Watson, 1940. 150 pp.
- Hunter, A. M. The Unity of the New Testament. 3rd ed. London: Student Christian Movement Press, 1946. 111 pp.
- Jackson, Foakes and Lake, Kirsopp. The Beginnings of Christianity, The Acts of the Apostles. London: Macmillan, 1920-42. 5 vols.
- Jebb, R. C. "The Speeches of Thucydides," in E. Abbott, ed., Hellenica, 2nd ed. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1898. Pp. 244-95.
- Jones, Maurice. St. Paul the Orator. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1910. 297 pp.
- Jones, Maurice. "The Significance of St. Stephen," The Expositor, 8th Series, XIII (1917), 161-78.
- Josephus, Flavius. The Works of Flavius Josephus. Translated by William Whitston. London: Sims and McIntyre, 1844. 880 pp.
- Jowett, Benjamin. Thucydides Translated into English. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 2 vols.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. The Theology of the Epistles. London: Duckworth, 1919.
- Kennedy, H. A. A. Vital Forces of the Early Church. London: Student Christian Movement, 1920. 160 pp.

- Kenyon, Sir Frederic. The Western Text in the Gospels and Acts. London: Humphrey Milford, 1938. 31 pp.
- Kirkpatrick, A. F. The Book of Psalms. Cambridge: University Press, 1930.
- Kittle, Gerhard, editor. Theologisches Worterbuch Zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1933-38. 3 vols.
- Klausner, Joseph. From Jesus to Paul. New York: MacMillan, 1943. 624 pp.
- Knight, George A. F. From Moses to Paul. London: Lutterworth Press, 1949.
- Knowling, R. J. "The Acts of the Apostles," in The Expositor's Greek New Testament. Vol. II. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Erdmans, (ndg).
- Knox, Wilfred L. The Acts of the Apostles. Cambridge: University Press, 1948. 120 pp.
- Knox, Wilfred L. St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem. Cambridge: University Press, 1925. 396 pp.
- Knox, Wilfred L. Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity. London: Oxford University Press, 1944. 108 pp.
- Leckler, G. V. The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times; Their Diversity and Unity in Life and Doctrine. Vol. I. Translated from 3rd edition by A. J. K. Davidson. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1886. 366 pp.
- Lightfoot, J. B. St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. London: MacMillan, 1876. 384 pp.
- Lightfoot, R. H. Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1938. 166 pp.
- Lock, W. "The Christology of the Earlier Chapters of the Acts of the Apostles," The Expositor, 4th Series, IV (1891), 178-90.
- Lohmeyer, E. Kyrios Jesus. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1928.
- McGiffert, A. C. A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1897. 679 pp.
- McNeile, A. H. An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1927. 476 pp.
- McNeile, A. H. New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's. Cambridge: University Press, 1923. 320 pp.
- Manson, William The Epistle to the Hebrews. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951. 207 pp.

- Manson, William Jesus the Messiah. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943.
- Meyer, Edward. Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, Dritter Band, Die Apostelgeschichte und die Anfänge des Christentums. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung Nachfolger, 1923. 660 pp.
- Meyer, Heinrich A. W. Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Acts of the Apostles. Vol I. Translated from the 4th edition by Paton J. Gloag. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1877. 316 pp.
- Moffatt, James. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1918.
- Moulton, W. F. and Geden, A. S., editors. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1906. 1034 pp.
- Norden, Edward, Agnostos Theos. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1923. 410 pp.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. and Robinson, T. H. A History of Israel. Vol. II. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1932-48. 500 pp.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. The Psalms in the Jewish Church. London: Skeffington and Son, 1910. 267 pp.
- Pflediderer, Otto. The Early Christian Conception of Christ. New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1905. 170 pp.
- Rackham, R. B. "The Acts of the Apostles," in Westminster Commentaries. 9th ed. London: Methuen and Co., 1922. 524 pp.
- Ramsay, Sir William M. "Are There Two Lucan Texts of Acts?," The Expositor, 5th Series, VII (1897), 460-71.
- Ramsay, Sir William M. The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1915. 427 pp.
- Ramsay, Sir William M. St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen. 3rd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897. 402 pp.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J. The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926. 288 pp.
- Sasse, Hermann. "Kupios," paper of the Conference of German and English Theologians held at Wartburg, August 11-18, 1928, Theology, XVII, No. 97 (1928), 223-29.
- Schiedel, P. W. "The Acts of the Apostles," in T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, editors, Encyclopaedia Biblica. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1899. 4 vols.

- Schultz, Hermann. Old Testament Theology. Vol. II. Translated from the 4th edition by J. A. Patterson. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1898. 470 pp.
- Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. 2nd ed., Vol. II. Translated by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1885. 326 pp.
- Scott, Ernest F. The Beginnings of the Church. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1914. 279 pp.
- Scott, Ernest F. The Literature of the New Testament. New York: Columbia University Press, 1932.
- Scott, Ernest F. The Varieties of New Testament Religion. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1947. 310 pp.
- Selwyn, E. G. The First Epistle of Peter. London: MacMillan, 1949.
- Smith, W. Robertson. The Religion of the Semites. Adam and Charles Black, 1907.
- Sotau, W. "Die Herkunft der Reden in der Apostelgeschichte," in E. Preuschen, ed., Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. Vol. IV. 1903. Pp. 128-84.
- Stanton, V. H. The Jewish and the Christian Messiah. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1886. 399 pp.
- Stanton, V. H. "Style and Authorship in the Acts of the Apostles," The Journal of Theological Studies, XXIV (1923), 361-81.
- Stewart, James S. A Faith to Proclaim. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1953. 160 pp.
- Stewart, James S. A Man in Christ, the Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Stier, Rudolf. The Words of the Apostles. Translated from the 2nd edition by G. H. Venables. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1869. 515 pp.
- Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar Zum Neuen Testaments aus Talmud and Midrasch. München: Beck, 1922-28. 4 vols. in 5.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: MacMillan, 1930. 616 pp.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Atonement in New Testament Teaching. London: Epworth Press, 1941. 319 pp.
- Taylor, Vincent. "The Lucan Authorship of the Third Gospel and Acts," The Expositor, 9th Series, IV, 282-91.

- Torrey, C. C. The Composition and Date of Acts. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916. 72 pp.
- Weiss, Bernard. A Manual of Introduction to the New Testament. Vol. II. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1888. 426 pp.
- Weiss, Johannes. Christ, the Beginnings of Dogma. Translated by V. D. Davis. London: Philip Green, 1911. 160 pp.
- Weiss, Johannes. The History of Primitive Christianity. Completed by Rudolf Knopf, translation edited by F. C. Grant. London: MacMillan, 1937. 2 vols.
- Weizsäcker, Carol von. The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. London: Translated from 2nd edition by James Millar. London: Williams and Norgate, 1894. 2 vols.
- Wendland, Paul. Die Urechristlichen Literaturformen. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1912. 357 pp.
- Wernle, Paul. The Beginnings of Christianity. Translated by G. A. Bienemann. London: Williams and Norgate, 1904. 2 vols.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. Die Apostelgeschichte und Ihr Geschichtswert. Munster: Aschendorffschen Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1921. 440 pp.
- Wilder, Amos N. "Variant Traditions of the Resurrection in Acts," The Journal of Biblical Literature, LXII, Part IV (Dec. 1943), 307-12.
- Young, F. W. "Jesus the Prophet," The Journal of Biblical Literature, LXVIII, Part IV (Dec. 1949).

APPENDIX I

A Chart of the Uses of the Verb κηρύσσω

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Who Preached</u>	<u>What is Preached</u>	<u>Remarks</u>
Matt. 3:1	John the Baptist	Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.	
Matt. 4:17	Jesus	Repent for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.	
Matt. 4:23	Jesus	The gospel of the Kingdom	
Matt. 9:35	Jesus	The gospel of the Kingdom	
Matt. 10:7	Disciples	The Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.	
Matt. 10:27	Disciples	What ye hear (from Jesus).	Content of above.
Matt. 11:1	Jesus		
Matt. 24:14	Disciples	The gospel of the kingdom.	Then shall the end come.
Matt. 26:13	Disciples	This gospel and deed of woman who anointed Jesus	
Mark 1:4	John the Baptist	The baptism of repentance for remission of sins.	
Mark 1:7	John the Baptist	Saying there cometh one mightier than I	
Mark 1:14	Jesus	The gospel of the kingdom of God.	
Mark 1:38	Jesus		For therefore can I forth.
Mark 1:39	Jesus		
Mark 1:45	leper	Apparently how Jesus had healed him.	
Mark 3:14	disciples		Ordained for this purpose.
Mark 5:20	demoniac	How great things Jesus had done for him.	
Mark 6:12	disciples	That men should repent.	
Mark 7:36	deaf man	Apparently how Jesus had healed him.	
Mark 13:10	disciples	The gospel.	Eschatological passage.
Mark 14:9	disciples	The gospel plus deed of woman who anointed.	
Mark 16:15	disciples	The gospel.	
Mark 20	disciples		
Luke 3:3	John the Baptist	The baptism of repentance into remission of sins.	
Luke 4:18	Jesus	The gospel to the poor. Deliverance to capture. Recovery of sight to blind.	Jesus reads from Isaiah.

Luke 4:44	Jesus		Note Kingdom of God, Verse 43.
Luke 8:1	Jesus	The Kingdom of God.	
Luke 8:39	demoniac	How great things Jesus had done for him.	
Luke 9:12	disciples	The Kingdom of God.	
Luke 12:3		What ye have heard in closets.	Secrets are revealed
Luke 24:47	disciples	Repentance and remission of sins.	
Acts 8:5	Philip	Christ.	
Acts 9:20	Paul	Jesus .	
Acts 10:37	John	Baptism.	
Acts 10:42	disciples	That it is he which was ordained of God to be the quick and dead.	
Acts 15:21	Jews	Moses.	
Acts 19:13	Paul	Jesus.	
Acts 20:25	Paul	The Kingdom of God.	
Acts 28:31	Paul	The Kingdom of God.	
Romans 2:21	Jew	Not to steal.	
Romans 10:8	Paul and others	The word of faith.	Apparently vs. 9 that Jesus is Lord and resurrection.
Romans 10:14		Apparently the Lord vs. 13.	
Romans 10:15		Apparently the Lord vs. 13.	
I. Cor. 1:23	Paul and others	Christ crucified.	
I Cor. 9:27	Paul	Apparently moral self-control.	
I Cor. 15:11	Paul and others	Apparently death for sins and resurrection of Jesus.	vs.2
I Cor. 15:12	Paul and others	Christ that he rose from the dead.	
II Cor. 1:19	Paul and others	Jesus Christ. the Son of God.	
II Cor. 4:5	Paul and others.	Christ Jesus the Lord.	
II Cor. 11:4	one that cometh.	Another Jesus.	
Gal. 2:2	Paul	Gospel.	
Gal. 5:11	Paul	Circumcision.	Hypothetical, Being refuted
Phil. 1:15	Some	Christ of envy or good will.	
Col. 1:23	Paul and others.	Gospel.	
I. Thes. 2:9	Paul and others.	Gospel of God.	
I Tim. 3:16		God.	
II Tim. 4:2	Timothy	The word.	
I Peter 3:19	Christ		To spirits in prison
Rev. 5:2	Angel	Who is worthy to open the book.	

PhraseIs Preached

"The Kingdom"	11 (/1)times
"Repentance and forgiveness"	6 (/1)times
"Jesus Christ"	7 times (deeds or sayings of Jesus) / 2 times (Jesus Himself or the Lord or Christ)
"Gospel"	10 times
"Resurrection"	3 times

APPENDIX II

This is the kerygma as outlined by C. H. Dodd in his book The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. The chart is found in the appendix of his work.

THE APOSTOLIC PREACHING

THE KERYGMA ACCORDING TO THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES					THE KERYGMA ACCORDING TO PAUL			
ACTS II. 14-39	ACTS III. 13-26	ACTS IV. 10-12	ACTS V. 30-32	ACTS X. 36-43	ACTS XIII. 17-41	GAL. AND THESS.	I COR.	ROMANS
<p>This is that which hath been spoken by the prophet (citation of Joel ii. 28-32).</p> <p>(David) knowing that God had sworn that of the fruit of his loins he would set one on his throne . . .</p> <p>Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God unto you by mighty works and wonders and signs, which God did by him in the midst of you.</p>	<p>The things which God foreshowed by the mouth of all the prophets, that his Christ should suffer, he thus fulfilled . . . Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel and them that followed told of these days.</p> <p>The God of our fathers hath glorified his servant Jesus.</p>			<p>The word which he sent unto the children of Israel, preaching the gospel of peace by Jesus Christ.</p> <p>. . . beginning from Galilee, after the baptism that John preached, even Jesus of Nazareth, how that God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and with power; who went about doing good, and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, because God was with him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did both in the country of the Jews and in Jerusalem.</p>	<p>We bring you good tidings of the promise made unto the fathers, how that God hath fulfilled the same unto our children.</p> <p>[Election and divine governance of Israel, to the reign of David.] Of this man's seed hath God according to promise brought unto Israel a Saviour, Jesus.</p> <p>When John had before his coming first preached the baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel, and . . . said . . . Behold there cometh one after me, the shoes of whose feet I am not worthy to unloose.</p>		<p>I make known unto you the Gospel which I preached unto you.</p>	<p>The Gospel of God which he promised afore by his prophets in the Holy Scriptures (i. 1-2).</p> <p>Concerning his Son, who was from the seed of David according to the flesh (i. 3).</p>
<p>Him being delivered up by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye by the hands of lawless men did crucify and slay.</p>	<p>Whom ye delivered up, and denied before the face of Pilate, when he was determined to release him; but ye denied the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of Life.</p>	<p>Jesus Christ of Nazareth whom ye crucified.</p>	<p>The God of our fathers raised up Jesus, whom ye slew, hanging him on a tree.</p>	<p>Whom they slew, hanging him on a tree.</p>	<p>They that dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor the voices of the prophets, fulfilled them by condemning him. And though they found no cause of death in him, yet asked they of Pilate that he should be slain.</p> <p>And when they had fulfilled all things that were written of him, they took him down from the tree and laid him in a tomb.</p>	<p>. . . before whose eyes Jesus Christ was openly set forth crucified (Gal. iii. 1).</p> <p>. . . our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us out of this present evil age (Gal. i. 3-4).</p>	<p>I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures;</p> <p>and that he was buried;</p>	<p>It is Christ Jesus that died.</p>
<p>Whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death (according to Ps. xvi. 8-11).</p> <p>This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses.</p> <p>God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified.</p>	<p>Whom God raised from the dead, whereof we are witnesses.</p>	<p>Whom God raised from the dead.</p>		<p>Him God raised up the third day, and gave him to be manifest, not to all the people, but unto witnesses that were chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead.</p>	<p>But God raised him from the dead, and he was seen for many days of them that came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses unto the people. (According to Ps. ii. 7, Is. lv. 3, Ps. xvi. 10.)</p>		<p>and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures; and that he appeared to Cephas; then to the twelve; then he appeared to above 500 brethren at once . . . then to James; then to all the apostles (xv. 1-7).</p>	<p>. . . yea, rather, that was raised from the dead (viii. 34).</p>
<p>Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath poured forth this which ye see and hear (according to Ps. cx.).</p>	<p>. . . that he may send the Christ who hath been appointed for you, even Jesus, whom the heaven must receive until the times of restoration of all things (reference to prophecy).</p>	<p>He is the Stone which was set at nought by you builders, which was made head of the corner (Ps. cxviii. 22).</p>	<p>Him did God exalt at his right hand, to be a Prince and a Saviour. (We are witnesses of these things) and so is the Holy Spirit which God hath given to them that obey him.</p>	<p>And he charged us to preach unto the people, and to testify, that this is he which is ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.</p>		<p>[God sent forth the Spirit of His Son into our hearts (Gal. iv. 6)].</p> <p>. . . to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come (I Thess. i. 10).</p>		<p>. . . in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men, according to my Gospel, by Jesus Christ (ii. 16).</p>
<p>Repent ye and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins.</p>	<p>Repent ye therefore and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out (citation of Deut. xviii. 15 and other prophecies).</p>	<p>In none other is there salvation, for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved.</p>	<p>for to give repentance to Israel and remission of sins.</p>	<p>To him bear all the prophets witness, that through his name every one that believeth shall receive remission of sins.</p>	<p>Be it known unto you therefore that through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins, and by him every one that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses. (Citation of Hab. i. 5.)</p>			<p>The word of faith which we preach . . . if thou shalt confess with thy mouth Jesus as Lord, and shalt believe in thy heart that God raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved (x. 8-9).</p>

APPENDIX III

A. G. Hebert, in his book The Throne of David, pp. 128- 129, illustrates the dependence of the kerygma as outlined by C. H. Dodd, upon the Old Testament, by reconstructing a kind of typical early sermon entirely from Old Testament quotations found in the sermons in the early chapters of Acts. It is as follows:

(A) The God of Israel

The God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, the God of our Fathers (Acts 3:13; Exod. 3:6), who made the heaven and the earth and the sea and all that in them is (Acts 4:24; Exod. 20:11), who of old led our fathers forth out of Egypt with a high arm (Acts 13:17; Exod. 6:6), and suffered their manners in the wilderness, and when He had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan gave them their land for an inheritance (Acts 13:19; Deut. 1:31; 7:1),

(B) Fulfilment of His Messianic Promises

has fulfilled the promises made to our fathers (Acts 13:35), by sending a word of salvation (Acts 10:36; 13:26; Ps. 107:24), preaching good tidings of peace (Acts 10:36; Isa. 52:7), for you and all that are afar off, even as many as He shall call (Acts 2:39; Isa. 57:19), that so in Abraham's seed all the families of the earth might be blessed (Acts 3:25; Gen. 22:18), through His church which He has set for a light of the Gentiles (Acts 13:47; Isa. 44:6)

(for God is no respecter of persons) Acts 10:34; Deut. 10:17),

(C) In Jesus, of the seed of David

through Jesus, of the seed of David, that man after God's own heart (Acts 13:22; I Sam. 13:14), to whom holy and sure blessings were promised (Acts 13:34; Isa. 55:3),

to whom God swore that of the fruit of his loins He would set one upon His throne (Acts 2:30; 2 Sam. 7:12; Ps. 132:11),

(D) Who Jesus is

Jesus, the LORD'S Messiah (Acts 4:26; Ps. 2:2); anointed with the Holy Ghost (Acts 10:38; Isa. 61:1); the Prophet, like unto Moses, to whom the People were solemnly warned to hearken (Acts 13:22; Deut. 18:15); the Servant of the LORD (Acts 3:13,26; 4:26; 13:27; Isa. 42, etc.),

(E) His Crucifixion

led as a sheep to the slaughter, dumb as a lamb before his shearer (Acts 8:32- 33; Isa. 53:7); for against him the Gentiles raged, and the rulers were gathered together (Acts 4:25-26; Ps. 2:1,2),

and pronounced Him accursed, hanging Him upon a tree
(Acts 10:39; Deut. 21:22),
(and so have all the prophets said, that the Messiah should
suffer) (Acts 3:18);

(F) His Resurrection

but God did not suffer His Holy One to see corruption (Acts
2:25-8; 13:35; Ps. 16:8-11),
and called Him 'My Son' (Acts 13:33; Ps. 2:7),
and made the Stone set at nought by the builders to be the
head of the corner (Acts 4:11; Ps. 118:22),

(G) His Ascension

and has made Him to sit at His right hand (Acts 2:35; Ps.
110:1).

(H) The outpouring of the Spirit of the LORD

Therefore is the Messianic gift of the Spirit poured out on
all flesh (Acts 2:17-21; Joel 2:28-32).

(I) Warning to those who hear

Beware, then lest ye despise the Gospel-message, and wonder,
and perish; for this is the work of God (Acts 13:41; Hab. 1:5).