

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



A table of contents for Irish Biblical Studies can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles ibs-01.php

LUKE'S REDESIGNING OF PAUL: CORINTHIAN DIVISION AND RECONCILIATION (1 CORINTHIANS 1-5) AS ONE COMPONENT OF JERUSALEM UNITY (ACTS 1-5)

Thomas L. Brodie

Cedara Theological Institute, Natal, South Africa

While P. Vielhauer¹ and E. Haenchen² regarded Luke's portrait of Paul (in Acts) as theologically incompatible with the true Paul (of the epistles), some recent work suggests that the distance between Luke and Paul is not so great. In 1989, M. D. Goulder indicated a close literary connection: Luke's text seems to reflect direct dependence on some of Paul's epistles, especially on 1 Corinthians.³ In 1993, J. C. Beker closed the theological gap, or at least explained it: Luke had 'redesigned' Paul in view of a later situation; 'within the overall perspective of Luke's salvation-history and the problems he needs to address, his portrayal of Paul becomes intelligible.'⁴

The purpose of this article is to corroborate these recent views - to provide further evidence of Luke's dependence on 1 Corinthians, and in doing so to cast some further light on the theological redesigning.

1. 'On the 'Paulinism' of Acts,' *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds. L. E. Keck & J. L. Martyn; London: SPCK, 1968) pp. 33-50.

2. The Acts of the Apostles (Oxford: Basis Blackwell, 1971) pp. 112-116.

3. Luke. A New Paradigm (JSNT Sup 20; Sheffield: Sheffield University, 1989) pp. 129-146.

4. 'Luke's Paul as the Legacy of Paul,' SBL 1993 Seminar Papers (ed. E. H. Lovering, Jr.; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993) pp. 511-519, esp. pp. 517, 519.

Given space limitations, the article limits itself to comparing 1 Corinthians 1-5 and Acts 1-5. Even for these chapters the comparison must be constricted - not a full analysis but an exploratory survey.

Objections: History and Theology

The idea of a literary link between Luke and some of Paul's epistles is not new,⁵ but it has remained stalled. One of the main reasons for this immobility is that the literary question has become entangled with questions of history and theology. Was Luke Paul's travelling companion? And do their theologies fit well together?. The answers, some said, were no - thus separating Luke and Paul.⁶ And so the literary question followed suit; Luke's writings were separated from those of Paul; it was presumed he did not know any of the epistles.

On closer inspection, however, the objections posed by history and theology are not so strong.

The decisive historical question here is not whether Luke was with Paul but whether he had access to any of Paul's epistles. One cannot presume that he did have such access. But - and this is important in the discussion - neither can one presume that he did not. In fact there is a problem with the hypothesis that Luke never saw any of the epistles. Luke was a *littérateur*; he dealt with writings and he carefully reviewed sources (Lk. 1,3). He was also an evangelist in contact with the works (or sources) of other evangelists. Above all, he was the chronicler of Jesus and Paul. Did he search out the written sources relating to Jesus but neglect those relating to Paul? In what corner was he marooned that he did not know of the epistles? In what literary impoverishment did this elegant writer live that he could not get a copy of any of them? There is no convincing

5. Apart from Goulder, *Luke*, see the review of the discussion in M. E. Enslin, 'Once Again, Luke and Paul,' *ZNW* 61 (1970) pp. 253-71.

6. For discussion, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (*I-IX*) (AB 28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981) pp. 47-51.

explanation for such lack of communication. Hypotheses of isolation do not fit easily into what is known of the evangelist and the early church.⁷

Equally unconvincing is the idea of theological incompatibility. There are indeed real differences between Paul and Luke. But, as said above, Beker's analysis indicates that Luke has redesigned Paul's theology. And L. T. Johnson's brief comparative study of 'salvation' tends to confirm the theological continuity between Paul and Luke.⁸

If history and theology no longer constitute decisive obstacles to a Luke-Paul literary relationship then it is appropriate that the possibility of such a relationship be reexamined.

Two Keys to Luke's Approach: Theological Redesigning and Literary (Rhetorical) Imitation

There are two ideas which go far in solving the puzzle of the Luke-Paul relationship - theological redesigning and literary imitation.

^{7.} The problem about the relation to Luke to the epistles touches another puzzle - that of the sources of Acts. Despite much research these sources have remained unidentified; see J. Dupont, *The Sources of the Acts. The Present Position* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964); Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 24-34, 81-90; E. Grässer, 'Acta-Forschung seit 1960', *ThR* 41 (1976) pp. 141-194, 259-290; 42 (1977) pp. 1-68, esp. 41 (1976) pp. 144-146, 186-194; G. Schneider, *Die Apostelgeschichte: Erster Teil: Einleitung. Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-8,40* (HTKNT 5/1; Freiburg: Herder, 1980) pp. 82-89. T. L. Brodie, 'Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40' *Bib* 67 (1986) pp. 41-67; H. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) pp. xxxvi-xl. Perhaps some epistles are part of the answer to the puzzle about sources.

^{8. &#}x27;The Social Dimensions of Soteria in Luke-Acts and Paul,' Lovering, SBL 1993 Sem Papers, pp. 520-536.

The idea of theological redesigning has been developing for several decades, particularly since redaction criticism began to show how the evangelists changed their sources and shaped their texts in order to develop their own distinctive theologies. Beker's proposal brings that idea a step further: could not Luke - who had reshaped the sources concerning Jesus - also redesign the theology of Paul? Beker is not talking about Paul's epistles (the written documents); only about Paul's theology. But Beker has sown a seed for rethinking the Luke-Paul connection; he has opened the way for a closer look at the two writers.

The idea of rhetorical imitation - the Greco-Roman practice of rewriting or redesigning existing texts⁹ - has also been developing slowly for some decades. First it emerged that Luke was both a writer in the Greco-Roman mold and also that he made extensive use of aspects of the Septuagint.¹⁰ Then the two ideas came together: Luke was using Greco-Roman methods on the Septuagint; he was imitating it.¹¹ Initially, the sense of Luke's imitative work was fairly

9. For summaries of the complex phenomenon of imitation, see R. McKeon, 'Literary Criticism and the Concept of Imitation in Antiquity,' *Modern Philology* 34 (1936) pp. 1-35; D. L. Clark, 'Imitation: Theory and Practice in Roman Rhetoric,' *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 37 pp. (1951) 11-22. On the classical texts, see T. M. Greene, *The Light in Troy. Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven/London: Yale University: 1982) pp. 54-80. For a general introduction to imitation and further bibliography, see T. L. Brodie, 'Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources,' *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature* (ed. C. H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984) pp. 17-46.

10. See Fitzmyer, Luke I-IX, pp. 107, 114-125.

11. E. Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) pp. 38-72, esp. 63-4; F.L. Horton, 'Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts', Perspectives on Luke-Acts (ed. C.H. Talbert; Danville, VA: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion, 1978) pp. 1-23, esp. 17-18. general - limited largely to genre, narrative techniques, vocabulary and style - but, under closer scrutiny, a picture has begun to emerge of a detailed process which systematically transformed whole passages.¹² If Luke redesigned OT writings and Paul's theology, could he not also redesign one of Paul's writings?

That Luke should use 1 Corinthians is understandable. Among all the NT epistles, its implied picture of a community is uniquely vibrant. And its ideas are foundational - 'part of the foundations of christian theology.'¹³ If Luke, in searching carefully for sources (Luke 1,3), wanted an authoritative sense of an early community, he could hardly do better than absorb 1 Corinthians. Goulder's evidence¹⁴ is an initial indication that that in fact is what Luke did.

13. J. Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Corinthians* (NT Message 10; Dublin: Veritas, 1979) p. ix.

14. Luke. A New Paradigm, pp. 132-146.

^{12.} See, by T. L. Brodie, 'Not Q but Elijah: The Saving of the Centurion's Servant (Luke 7:1-10) as an Internalization of the Saving of the Widow and her Child (1 Kgs 17:1-16), IrBibStudies 14 (1992) pp. 54-71: 'Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an Imitatio of I Kings 17:17-24,' NTS 32 (1986) pp. 247-267; 'Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation,' Bib 64 (1983) pp. 457-485; 'The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1,1-2,6), Bib 70 (1989) pp. 96-109; 'Luke 9:57-62: A Systematic Adaptation of the Divine Challenge to Elijah (1 Kings 19),' SBL Seminar Papers 1989 (ed. D. J. Lull; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) pp. 237-245; 'Luke-Acts [esp. Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9-10] as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative,' New Views on Luke and Acts (ed. E. Richard; Collegeville: Liturgical, 1990) pp. 78-85; 'The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:8-13) as One Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6:9-14; 7:58a),' CBO 45 (1983) pp. 417-432.

The Texts: Introductory Comparison

The structure of Acts 1-5 is not clear; even if some scholars agree, as Haenchen and Conzelmann do, on simply listing the pericopes,¹⁵ the deeper questions of structure (and attendant meaning) remain unresolved. Yet recent narrative criticism, especially by R. C. Tannehill,¹⁶ has helped to show that these chapters have literary unity, part of the larger unity of Luke's work.

Likewise with 1 Corinthians. Notwthstanding the disputes about the integity of 1 Corinthians,¹⁷ the recent work of M. M. Mitchell¹⁸ has demonstrated that the whole epistle is a single work of literature. One may therefore treat each text (1 Corinthians 1-5; Acts 1-5) as a unity, or at least as integral parts of a larger unity.

To gain an initial sense of the relationship between 1 Corinthians 1-5 and Acts 1-5 the following outline summarizes the texts chapter by chapter (under five sections - a section for each chapter):

1 Corinthians 1-5Acts 1-51 Division, two wisdoms, God's Unity, two apostles, God's choice.Choice

2 Preaching, crucifixion, spirit Pentecost, Jesus, Spirit.

15. Compare Conzelmann's titles, Acts, passim, with those of Haenchen, Acts, pp. xi-xiii,

16. The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation. Vol. II: The Acts of the Apostles, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

17. For summaries of the discussion, see C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (2d ed; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1971) pp. 12-17; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) pp. 2-5.

18. Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation. An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993) esp. pp. 1-6..

The temple cure [you
builders]. No boasting; Christ restores all.
Peter and John: judged ignorant - yet confident and calm.

5 The man and the woman (a sexual sin).

Ananias and Sapphira (a possessions-related sin).

What emerges, therefore, in both texts, is a succession of chapters which, however inadequately, may be placed under five headings:

Unity; two ways and God's choice. Preaching Christ and the Spirit. The community and the building. Apostles under judgement. The sinful couple.

Such simplification does not do justice to the texts, yet it helps to clarify the stage before proceeding to a more detailed examination.

It is also useful, before examining details, to give an initial sense of how Luke, in reworking 1 Corinthians 1-5, uses theological redesigning, and literary adaptation.

First the theological redesigning. It may seem that the Jerusalem and Corinthian churches are poles apart - one riven by quarrels, the other a model of unity. But despite talk of divisions, 1 Corinthians is governed by 'the rhetoric of reconciliation,'¹⁹ in other words, by a desire for unity. Unity was one of Luke's interests,²⁰ and so he took the Pauline desire for unity and used it as one element in describing a unity that was exemplary. At the same time, since he was interested in showing continuity with Israel,²¹ he located that unity in Jerusalem.

19. Ibid.

20. Beker, Luke's Paul, pp. 514-515.

21. Ibid., pp. 516-517.

Further theological redesigning is seen with regard to the image of the building. When, in 1 Corinthians 3, Paul first speaks of the community as 'a building...temple' ($v\alpha \delta \varsigma$, 3,9-17), Luke likewise begins to associate the Jerusalem community with a temple (Acts 3,1-10; cf. 4,11, builders; 4,31 and 6,14, $\tau \delta \pi \omega \varsigma$, 'place/temple'). But the temple in Acts is one which suits Luke's interests - the Jerusalem ispóv. In other words, Luke incorporates the idea of the building/temple (including some of its details), but he adapts it to his own larger portrayal of the demise and replacement of the temple in Jerusalem.

Likewise, when the epistle suddenly switches to the sin of a man and a woman (the man with his father's wife, 1 Corinthians 5), Luke follows suit; he switches to an account of a sinful couple (Ananias and Sapphira, Acts 5,1-11). But while he incorporates many elements of 1 Corinthians 5, he adapts the central offence from sex to possessions, in other words, to one of his own interests. Otherwise he is just as severe with Ananias and Sapphira as Paul was in dealing with the incest.

With regard to broad literary strategies, Luke did not allow the epistle to dictate the shape of his own writing. Rather he adapted the epistle; he distilled its essence and used that essence as one component to enrich his picture of the early church.

Apart from distillation, Luke also made other changes, notably positivization and dramatization. Positivization is the turning of what seems negative in 1 Corinthians, especially its account of division, into something positive - the Jerusalem picture of unity. This is not a betrayal of 1 Corinthians. Rather he articulates what the epistle implied - unity is crucial. Luke takes that idea and fills it out.

Dramatization is a further aspect of filling out, of putting historical detail and color into the epistle. In some ways it is a process that is necessary. As scholars know too well, there is a huge vacuum in 1 Corinthians - a world of background which is largely missing, a community which Paul evokes but never clearly describes. Luke fills that gap. By using other sources, he provides his distillation of 1 Corinthians with a clear background (Jerusalem and its events) and his presentation of the community is orderly and relatively full. It is a procedure that corresponds broadly to what he

suggests in Lk. 1,3 - the idea of examining everything and giving an orderly acccount.

The Texts: A Closer Comparison

The subsequent analysis does not attempt to be complete. Its purpose rather is to highlight sufficient elements that the question of Luke's use of the epistle becomes worthy of attention. The analysis follows the general outline of the texts (see subsequent facing pages).

1. Prescript/Proemium (1 Cor. 1,1-3.13b-17; Acts 1,1-5)

Paul greets the Corinthians by speaking of his own call to be an apostle and their call to be holy (1 Cor. 1,1-3). Luke also begins by speaking of a call to apostleship and, implicitly, to holiness: 'Jesus chose the apostles in the Holy Spirit' (Acts 1,2). Thus Luke has the two ideas (apostleship and contact with the holy) but in a form which combines them and which highlights one of his central themes - the Holy Spirit.

Futher comparison brings out further points of contact:

1 Cor. 1,1-3.13-17.27-28

Paul, called to be an apostle ($\dot{\alpha}\pi \dot{0}\sigma\tau 0\lambda 0\zeta$),

to the church of God (ekklysia toû θ eoû)...

to those made holy ($\dot{\alpha}$ γι $\dot{\alpha}$ ζ ω) in...Jesus, called to be holy ($\ddot{\alpha}$ γιοι), from God the Father (θεοῦ πατρὸς).

[1,13-17: Were you baptized? I baptized...You were baptized...

έβαπτίσθητε...έβάπτισα...έβάπτισα...έβάπτισα...έβαπτίσθητε].

[1,27-28: God chose...chose...chose, ἐζελέξατο... ἐζελέξατο... ἐζελέξατο...

Acts 1,1-5

To Theophilus (θεό- φιλος, 'friend of God'),

about all Jesus did...commanding the apostles ($\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma\sigma\tau\dot{o}\lambda\sigma\iota$)

whom he chose (έξελέξατο) through the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα ἄγιον)...

saying...the kingdom of God ($\theta \in OO$)...the promise of the Father ($\pi \alpha \tau p \delta \varsigma$);

'John baptized...You will be baptized (ἐβάπτισεν...βαπτισθήσεσθε) in the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα ἄγιον)...'

1 Corinthians is just one component - a transformed component - in Luke's more elaborate and vivid account. The first touch of vividness is the address not to a whole church of God (1 Cor. 1,2) but - building on Lk. 1,1-4 - to an individual friend of God, Theophilus.

The rest of Luke's transformation shows a further tendency towards clarity and individuality. Where Paul had interwoven holiness with Jesus, and God with the Father ('made holy in Jesus;' 'from God the Father'), Luke adds distinctiveness and color. In place of two references to holiness ('make holy;' 'holy') he speaks twice of the Holy Spirit. Instead of 'Christ Jesus' he shows Jesus doing specific things. In place of 'God' he speaks of the more earth-related 'kingdom of God.' And in place of the general wish of 'grace and peace from...the Father' there is a specific 'promise of the Father' to be given in Jerusalem before many days. Luke has added individuality and action. He has dramatized Paul, and vividly.²²

Concerning the repeated mention of baptism ('I baptized...You were baptized,' 1 Cor. 1,13-17: 'John baptized...You will be baptized, Acts 1,5) it seems probable, given the context, that the references are connected. Apart from the linguistic affinity, both texts imply a contrast between a past ritual (Paul's previous baptizing; John's baptism) and a later process which is more spiritual (Paul's present evangelizing; baptism in the Spirit). But again Luke's contrast is clearer and more colorful.

l Corinthians 1 ends climactically with the idea of the divine choice: (God chose...chose [έξελέζατο... έξελέζατο ... έξελέζατο], 1,27-28). Acts 1 uses this not as a climax, but as a framework:

Acts 1,1-2: 'Jesus...chose (ἐζελέζατο) through the Holy Spirit.' Acts 1,24: 'Κύριε...show whom you have chosen (ἐζελέζατο).'

^{22.} For further details about Luke aim of being dramatic and graphic, see Brodie, 'Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio*,' p. 261.

2. You Have Received/ Will Receive Power from Above, While Awaiting the Revelation of Jesus (1 Cor. 1,4-9; Acts 1,6-11)

The Corinthians, says Paul, are both gifted and receptive: God gave them much, and, as well, they receptively await the revelation of Jesus.

Luke has the same two ideas (giftedness, and receptivity towards the revelation of Jesus) but in a more vivid context. The giftedness is from the Spirit (yet to come). And waiting for the revelation of Jesus is linked with the account (drawn from other sources) of the ascension:

The grace of Godis given to you; you are enriched in everything	Kyrie, in this time will you restore (Κύριε εἰ ἐν τῷ χρόνῳ τούτῳ). Not for you to know times, seasons, But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you,
- as the witness (μαρτύριον) of Christ was confirmed in you -	and you will be my witnesses (μάρτυρες)[Jesus ascends].
awaiting the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ,	Why gaze into heaven? This Jesus will come as you saw him going.
who will confirm you to the end (té $\lambda o \varsigma$), blameless in the day of the Lord ($ev \tau \eta$ $\eta \mu e \rho \alpha$ to v $\kappa v \rho i o v$).	

Luke adapts the reference to eschatological time ('the end...the day of the Lord'): he sets it at the beginning of his passage, in the vivid context of a specific discussion about restoring the kingdom to Israel. Furthermore, he adds a corrective - about trying to know the precise time.

Then he follows the flow of 1 Corinthians. The richness from God becomes the Spirit's power from above. The witness of Christ becomes the apostles' witnessing to Jesus. And, after the ascension, the awaiting of the revelation of Jesus becomes the memorable picture of the apostles who, instead of gazing after Jesus, accepted that he will return.

3. Unity: Desired (1 Cor. 1,10-13a), Achieved (Acts 1,12-15)

Paul now switches to the question of divisions and to the need for unity. Luke portrays unity as already achieved, and so at times his picture is the opposite of Paul's. There are three main elements:

Avoid divisions among brothers.Patient waiting (eleven names).Be of one mind.All of one mind.

Quarrelling (four names). Peter in the midst of the brothers.

Once allowance is made for the rearrangement - the interchange of the first and last elements - the texts follow one another closely:

I beseech you, brothers (ἀδελφοί) by the name (ὄνομα) of our Lord that all (πάντες) speak the same (τὸ αύτο)[with] no divisions in you (ἐν ὑμ \hat{v}).

Be joined together (fite $\kappa \alpha \tau \epsilon \rho \tau \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \sigma$) in the same mind ($\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \nu \sigma$) and the same purpose ($\epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \alpha \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \gamma \nu \omega \mu \eta$). For I was told brothers ($\delta \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \sigma$)...

that there are quarrels(ἕριδες) among you...[four names]

Peter...said in the midst ($\dot{\epsilon}\nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \phi$) of the brothers ($\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \phi$ í) - the crowd of names ($\dot{\sigma}\nu \dot{\sigma}\mu \sigma \tau \sigma$) in the place ($\dot{\epsilon}\pi \dot{\iota} \tau \dot{\sigma} \sigma \dot{\sigma}\tau \dot{\sigma}$) was about 120

All ($\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$) were persevering ($\hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu \pi \rho \sigma \sigma \kappa \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon \rho \sigma \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \varsigma$)) with one mind ($\hat{\delta} \mu \sigma \theta \nu \mu \alpha \delta \hat{\delta} \nu$) in prayer ($\tau \hat{\eta} \pi \rho \sigma \epsilon \nu \chi \hat{\eta}$) the women...brothers ($\dot{\alpha} \delta \epsilon \lambda \phi \sigma \hat{\iota}$)

In the upper room they were waiting (ήσαν καταμένοντες) [eleven names].

The final reference (quarrels), again moved to the top, is turned around - thus showing its positive side (patient waiting). The names likewise are turned around - not four which arouse division (Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Christ), but eleven, suggesting harmony (the eleven).²³

Luke then follows the rest of Paul's text closely, sometimes playing with the wording, and consistently adding vividness and detail. The idea, for instance, of all speaking the same ($\tau \circ \alpha \circ \tau \circ$, 1 Cor. 1,10) becomes part of the more vivid picture of all praying in the same place ($\epsilon \pi i$ $\tau \circ \alpha \circ \tau \circ$). And Luke elaborates: about one hundred and twenty people were present.

4. The Contrasting Wisdoms (1 Cor. 1,18-25) and the Contrasting Apostles (Acts 1,16-22)

Paul now speaks of contrasting wisdoms - the collapse of the false wisdom and the proclamation of the true (Christ - God's wisdom). In Acts, Peter also implies a contrast, a contrast not of wisdoms but of apostles - between the false apostle Judas who acted as guide ($\delta\delta\eta\gamma\sigma\varsigma$) to those who arrested Jesus (Acts 1,16-20), and the need to find a true apostle, someone who will be a genuine witness to Jesus (Acts 1,21-22).

Both begin with the negative - the false wisdom and the false apostle. Here the process of adding elaboration and dramatic vividness reaches new intensity. Paul speaks of wisdom coming to nothing; Luke tells of how Judas the guide collapsed in a bloody outburst. Thus, Paul's general idea, of a bankrupt wisdom which collapses, finds graphic illustration in the account of the collapse of the impressive Judas - former apostle and guide to those who arrested Jesus (Acts 1,16-17). The fall of the wise has been illustrated by an account of the fall of someone who was knowledgeable.

Paul's text is no more than a starting point for Luke's distinctive account of Judas's fate, yet the epistle makes an important contribution. As well as providing the pivotal idea of a knowledge

^{23.} Paul's larger text (1,11-17) contains seven names, but the basic correspondence seems to be between the four and the eleven.

which is bankrupt or destructive, 1 Corinthians also furnishes a partial model for Luke's citation from scripture:

	'It was necessary to fulfill the scripture which the Holy Spirit
	foretold through the mouth of
	David
"For it is written (γέγραπται	For it is written (written
γάρ):	(γέγραπται γάρ) in the book of
	Psalms:
'I will destroy the wisdom of the	'Let his house become a
wise,	wilderness, and let no one live in
	it' (Ps. 69,25),
and the cleverness of the clever I	and, 'Let another take his
will set aside (Isa. 29,14)." "	office''' (Ps. 109,8).

In place of parallel poetry from Isaiah, Luke gives a more complex use of parallel poetry from David/the psalms, an adaptation which prepares the way for the heavy use of David and the psalms in Acts 2 (2,25-35). And in place of the abstract ideas concerning wisdom and cleverness, Luke finds quotations which are more vivid: instead of wisdom being destroyed (Isaiah), a house becomes a ruin, empty (Psalm 69); and instead of something (cleverness) being set aside (Isaiah), a picture of someone stepping in and taking over (Psalms 109). Again the images are vivid - the ruined house and the outsider's takeover.

These are the first explicit scriptural quotations in 1 Corinthians and Acts. Furthermore, 1 Corinthians and Acts are the only NT books which introduce their first scriptural quotation with $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \rho \alpha \pi \tau \alpha 1 \gamma \epsilon \rho$.

Having spoken of what is negative (the bankrupt wisdom; the doomed guide), both passages then go on to speak of what is positive - God's providence in 'our' preaching of Christ (1 Cor. 1,21-24; Acts 1,21-23). In slightly simplified form the texts are as follows:

It pleased (εὐδοκέω) God	It is [providentially] necessary $(\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath})$
to save through <u>our preaching</u> of	that someone become a <u>witness</u>
Christ	[=preacher] with us

- Christ as crucified and Christ - someone who was with Jesus as God's power and wisdom from the beginning until his ascension

Luke keeps the opening ideas: providence; our preaching/witnessing. But in the proclaiming of Christ he has made a considerable change: Christ is no longer described in general terms as crucified and as power/wisdom; instead he is Jesus, a specific human whose life can be outlined (beginning from John's baptism until his assumption). Crucifixion and power are still implied - but within the context of a more complete life of Jesus. The result, once again, is more elaborate and more vivid.

5. God Chooses the Less Impressive (1 Cor. 1,26-31; Acts 1,23-26)

Both texts now continue by telling how God chose unimpressive candidates - the ordinary Corinthians (1 Cor. 1,26-31) and the simply-named Matthias (chosen by lot, Acts 1,23-26).

Paul's description is ringing and repetitive, a multi-faceted contrast: 'Consider your call $(\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma)...$ Not many of you were worldly wise...[or] powerful...[or] well-born, but God chose (ἐξελέξατο) the foolish...the weak...the lowly...so that all humans $(\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\ \sigma\alpha\rho\xi)$ might not boast before God.'

Instead of a contrast with many facets (wise/powerful/wellborn - foolish/weak/lowly), Luke give a simple contrast between two candidates for apostleship:

-Joseph, called ($\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{e}\omega)$ Barsabbas, with the added name (épi- $\kappa\alpha\lambda\acute{e}\omega)$ Justus.

-Matthias.

Joseph's outward appearance (by name) was imposing; and by human standards it suggested being called. But it was the simplynamed Matthias whom God chose ($\xi \xi \epsilon \lambda \xi \xi \alpha \tau o$, Acts 1,24.26). Thus Paul's principle - that God's call does not follow worldly standards is illustrated in Matthias.

Furthermore, while Paul had said that all humans (literally, all flesh, $\pi \dot{\alpha} \alpha \alpha \sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$) should not boast before God, the prayer in Acts (1,24) gives a complementary truth: the Lord knows all human hearts ($\kappa \alpha \rho \delta \omega - \gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau \eta \zeta \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$). In other words, both Paul and Luke put humans in proper relationship to God. But Luke has probed more deeply, more internally; he has gone to the root of not boasting: all humans should not boast before God because God knows the very heart of all humans.

6. In Spirit and Power: Preaching God's Word (1 Cor. 2,1-5; Acts 2,1-21)

Paul now turns the focus from the Corinthians to himself and his preaching. In one way he seemed weak, and in preaching God he preached the cross. Yet there was nothing weak about his message; his word was 'in the showing of Spirit and power' (1 Cor. 2,4). In fact, this whole passage (2,1-5) has been entitled 'The Power of Paul's Preaching.²⁴

The next passage in Acts (2,1-21) might be entitled 'The Power of Peter's Preaching.' The Spirit descends in fire, and even though some see only drunkenness (a form of weakness?), yet when Peter preaches, quoting the great vision of Joel, he does so like Paul in Spirit and power.

Obviously the account of Peter's preaching is much more elaborate than the account of Paul's. For Luke, 1 Cor. 2,1-5 is little more than a starting-point; yet it helps to set the power-filled tone of Acts 2.

7. Announcing the Preordained Mystery of Crucifixion and Glory (1 Cor. 2,6-9; Acts 2,22-28)

Paul now turns from the power of his preaching to its content - the wisdom of God's preordained mystery, something unknown to those who crucified the Lord.

Luke takes this and follows it closely, but instead of separating the preordained mystery (or plan) from the crucifixion, he combines them: the preordained plan contains the crucifixion:

Both passages conclude by quoting scripture, but as earlier (1 Cor. 1,19; Acts 1,16.20), Luke switches from Isaiah to David's psalms and uses a more elaborate text:

^{24.} Murphy-O'Connor, 1 Corinthians, p. 17.

We speak a wisdom... (1 Cor. Hear these words: 2,6).

But we speak God's ($\theta \epsilon o \hat{v}$) wisdom, in mystery hidden ($\dot{\alpha}\pi o - \kappa \epsilon \kappa \rho \upsilon \mu \mu \epsilon \nu \eta \nu$) which God preordained before ($\pi \rho o \cdot \dot{\omega} \rho \iota \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{v} \delta \theta \epsilon \dot{v} \zeta \pi \rho \dot{v}$) the ages((2,7), ...which the rulers did not know; if they had known ($\check{\epsilon}\gamma \nu \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu ...\check{\epsilon}\gamma \nu o \sigma \alpha \nu$) they would not have crucified

(σταυρόω)

the Lord of glory (2,8).

Jesus of Nazareth, a man designated by God ($\dot{\alpha}\pi o$ - $\delta\epsilon\delta\epsiloni\gamma\mu\epsilon'vov...\theta\epsilono0; 2,22)$, he, given up by the ordained plan ($\dot{\omega}\rho i\sigma\mu\epsilon'v\eta$) and foreknowledge of God ($\pi\rho o$ - $\gamma v\dot{\omega}\sigma\epsiloni\tau \tau o0$ $\theta\epsilon o0$)

you crucified (προσπήγνυμι))... (2,23), whom God raised...[from] death.

But as it is written (καθώς γέγραπται)

Eye ($\dot{\alpha}\varphi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\dot{\alpha}\zeta$) has not seen, nor ear ($\alpha\dot{\delta}\zeta$) heard, nor has it entered the heart ($\kappa\alpha\rho\delta(\alpha)$... what God has prepared for those who love him (cf. Isa. 64,4; 65,17), (2,9). Because $(\kappa\alpha\theta \delta\tau_1)$ he could not be held, for David says of him,

I saw the Lord...so my heart (καρδία) was glad, my tongue $(\gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\dot{\alpha})$ rejoiced, my flesh (σάρζ) will dwell in hope For you will not abandon my soul in Hades, or let your holy one see corruption. You have made known to me the ways of life ... You will make me full of joy with your face (Ps. 16,8-11), (2,24-28).

As often, Luke's picture is more vivid and detailed. Instead of speaking in a general way of crucifying the Lord of glory (1 Cor. 2,8), Luke tells of crucifying (literally, fastening or nailing) Jesus of Nazareth (Acts 2,23). And instead of a cryptic scripture about something that has not entered human senses (eye, ear, heart), Luke's scripture is much clearer: the senses or body (heart, tongue and flesh) are positively involved and the promise is spelled out.

In line with the tendency to be more clear and vivid, Luke also stresses what is positive and open. Where Paul had spoken of something hidden ($\dot{\alpha}\pi\sigma$ - κεκρυμμένην, 2.7). Luke refers to Jesus as manifested, designated (άπο-δεδειγμένον, Acts 2,22). And where Paul referred to the rulers who 'did not know' (2,8), Luke looks at another side of the same reality - at the God who did know (God's foreknowledge, Acts 2,23).

8. Knowing God's Mystery from the Inside - through the (Prophetic) Spirit (1 Cor. 2,10-16; Acts 2,29-36)

Before analyzing these passages (1 Cor. 2,10-16; Acts 2,29-36) it is useful to set their three main elements in outline: David foretold: God implied God revealed by the Spirit. resurrection. We received the Spirit. The risen Christ received the Spirit for us.

The Spirit knows Lord/Christ.

God ($\delta \theta \epsilon \delta \varsigma$)

Jesus is known as Lord/Christ.

The first main element is that of revealing or foretelling. Having spoken of God's preordained Christ-centered plan, it is necessary to explain how one knows about it. The answer, for both Paul and Luke, is revelation - revelation through the Spirit (Paul), and revelation through David (Luke). The relationship between the details of the texts is unusually complex: To us (ἡμιν)

David's tomb is among us (ev ήμῖν)...

revealed through the Spirit -So he, being a prophet, and the Spirit knows (olda). knowing (\hat{o} to α) that God (ὁ θεὸς) swore..., foretold [= revealed] Christ's resurrection

As Paul says, God revealed to us through the Spirit, and the Spirit knows (1 Cor. 2, 10-11). But Luke has filtered that simple idea (of a special knowing) through the history of David (his prophesying and his tomb, Acts 2,30-31). He has also added a reference to the resurrection. Again Luke's text is more specific, more colorful, more elaborate.

Both writers then refer explicitly to the next-main element the Spirit. Paul says 'we have received the Spirit from God' (2,12, $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\hat{\eta}_{\varsigma}...\tau\dot{o}$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\upsilon}\mu\alpha...\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\dot{\alpha}\beta\phi\mu\epsilon\nu...\dot{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\tau\sigma\hat{\upsilon}$ $\theta\epsilon\sigma\hat{\upsilon}$). Luke refers to the same phenomenon but he inserts the role of Christ as mediator, and refers to God as Father: 'We are witnesses...[Christ] having received the...Spirit from the Father, poured it out' (2,32-33, $\dot{\eta}\mu\epsilon\hat{\iota}\varsigma...\tau\sigma\hat{\upsilon}$ $\pi\nu\epsilon\hat{\upsilon}\mu\alpha\tau\sigma\varsigma...\lambda\alpha\beta\dot{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\rho\dot{\alpha}$ $\tau\sigma\hat{\upsilon}$ $\pi\alpha\tau\rho\dot{\varsigma}$).

Finally - the third element - Paul makes a contrast between the natural person and the spiritual person (1 Cor. 2,14-16), and Luke makes a more tangible contrast between David and Jesus (Acts 2,34-36). The essence of the contrast is between those who attain the things of God in a special way and those who do not. The natural person does not receive the [gifts] of the Spirit of God (1 Cor. 2,14), and David did not ascend to heaven (Acts 2,34). In other words, in different ways both these natural persons do not attain the gift of heaven.

The spiritual person, however, and Jesus, are both associated with a special knowledge. In the context of the spiritual person, Paul refers obscurely to knowing the mind of the Lord and having the mind of Christ ($\xi\gamma\nu\omega...\kappa\nu\rhoi\omega\nu...X\rhoi\sigma\tau\omega$, 2,15-16); and Luke gives the idea of knowing that Jesus is Lord and Christ ($\gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\tau\omega...\kappa\alpha\lambda$ $\kappa\omega\rhoi\omega\nu...\kappa\alpha\lambda$ Xpi $\sigma\tau\omega\nu$, 2,36). Thus both Paul and Luke use the terms 'Lord' and 'Christ' in tandem and in the context of knowing. But, as ever, Luke is clearer.

Overall (1 Cor. 2,10-16; Acts 2,29-36), each writer tells of the revelation of the Christian mystery. However, while Paul gives the theological kernel - the Spirit's revelation of the mysterious divine depths - Luke unpacks the mystery, as it were; he shows how the revelation occurs in the concrete dimensions of time and space, in the circumstances of David and Jesus and Jerusalem.

9. Turn to the Spirit and Become One (1 Cor. 3,1-9; Acts 2,37-47)

Both writers now change focus - from the central mystery to the disposition of the hearers. The Corinthians' disposition leaves much to be desired: essentially they are people not of spirit ($\pi \nu \epsilon \nu \mu \alpha \tau \kappa \kappa \delta \varsigma$) but of flesh ($\sigma \alpha \rho \kappa \nu \kappa \delta \varsigma$).

The disposition of Peter's hearers is more complex (and reflects further sources), but it contains the same underlying problem: they need to change their way of thinking and become more spiritual: 'Repent (μ ετανοέω)...and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (ἁγίου πνέυματος, 2,38). In other words, the need to be spiritual (Paul) has become the need to receive the Holy Spirit (Acts).

The issue is not purely internal. What is at stake is unity. The lack of spirit leads the Corinthians to divisive quarrelling. In Jerusalem, however, acceptance of the Spirit leads to radical sharing. in outline:

You are not sufficiently spiritual	Repent
you are σαρκικός ('of flesh;'	receive the Spirit (Acts 2,37-40).
3,1f).;	
The flesh leads the Corinthians	Baptism (Spirit) leads those who
to quarrelling (3,3-4).	respond to sharing (2,41-42).
The community is like a garden	The believers were together
where people are one,	sharing
where God gives increase (3,5-	and the Lord added to them
9).	(2,43-47).

Some details need more careful scrutiny. It is not clear, for instance, whether the idea of leaving the flesh is echoed in Peter's final appeal: 'Save yourselves from this perverse generation' ($\gamma \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \alpha$, 2,40).

What is essential in the opening verses (1 Cor. 3,1-2; Acts 2,37-40) is that both texts indicate the need for the hearers to leave their present disposition and to become more spiritual. For Luke, however, the prospect of becoming more spiritual is nearer; the hearers are ready to receive the Holy Spirit. Thus Luke manages, as usual, to be more positive.

Paul and Luke go on (1 Cor. 3,3-4; Acts 2,41-42) to show two sides of the same coin: lack of spirit ($\pi v \epsilon \hat{\upsilon} \mu \alpha$) leads to division (Paul); and receiving baptism (and the Spirit) leads to unity (Acts).

Then Paul becomes more positive. He likens the community to a garden (or cultivated field, 1 Cor. 3,5-9) where there is a spirit of service; one waters and another plants, and both together form a

unity ($\varepsilon v \varepsilon i \sigma i v$, 'they are one,' 3,8). Each does as God gives, and receives as God rewards.

Luke turns this horticultural unity into real life: having spoken of signs and wonders (indicators of God), he recount how 'all the believers were together $(\epsilon \pi i \tau \partial \alpha \vartheta \tau \partial)$ and had everything in common ($\kappa \circ \iota \nu \alpha$)...and they distributed according as anyone had need' (Acts 2,43-45).

For both, the increase comes from God (1 Cor. 3,6-7; Acts 2,41.47):

'But God increased...but God who increases...' (ηύξανεν...αὐζάνων).

Thus, while Paul protests that spirit and unity are absent (3,1-9), Luke describes a community where the Spirit and unity are powerfully present (Acts 2,37-47).

10. Jesus Christ as the Only Foundation of the Living Temple (1 Cor. 3,10-17; Acts 3,1-10; 4,11-12.16)

Paul now introduces new imagery: he compares the community to a building ($\partial k \partial \partial \mu \dot{\eta}$; $\dot{\epsilon}\pi$ - $\partial i \partial \partial \mu \dot{\epsilon}\omega$, 'build upon;' vado, 'temple). Within this building Jesus Christ is the foundation ($\theta\epsilon\mu\dot{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\sigma\nu$) - the one and only foundation that is laid.

Acts also switches to new images - first, the setting of the temple (iepòv) where Peter heals a lame man in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 3,1-10); and later (4,11-12) Peter's image of builders (oikoδoµéω). Within Peter's implied building Jesus Christ is, not the foundation, but the head of the corner ($\kappa \epsilon \varphi \alpha \lambda \eta \gamma \omega \nu i \alpha \varsigma$) - the one and only name that is given.

In more detail, the main texts are as follows:

1 Cor. 3,10-17

You are God's building. According to God's grace given $(\delta o \theta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \sigma \alpha \nu)$ to me...I laid the foundation $(\theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon \lambda \iota o \nu)$...Let each watch $(\beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon \tau \omega)$ how he builds. For no other foundation can anyone $(\check{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \sigma \iota \delta \epsilon \hat{\iota} \varsigma)$ lay except that laid $(\tau \delta \nu \kappa \epsilon i \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu)$, which is $(\check{\sigma} \varsigma \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu)$ Jesus Christ (*Insols X rist). Whoever builds on the foundation with

gold, silver, stones (χρυσύν, ἄργυρον, λ ίθους...) - their work will be made manifest (φανερὸν γενήσεται) (1 Cor. 3,10-13).

If the work built...on [the foundation] remains, [there will be] a reward. If anyone's work is burned...they will be saved ($\sigma\omega\theta\eta\sigma\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota$), but through fire (3,14-15)

You are God's temple $(v\alpha \partial \varsigma)$...If anyone destroys God's temple $(v\alpha \partial \varsigma)$...For the temple $(v\alpha \partial \varsigma)$ of God is holy (3,16-17).

Acts 3,1-8; 4,11-12.16

Now Peter and John went up to the temple $(i\epsilon\rho\delta\nu)$...And a lame man was...by the door of the temple $(i\epsilon\rho\delta\nu)$. Seeing Peter...about to enter the temple $(i\epsilon\rho\delta\nu)$, he asked for alms (3,1-3).

Peter said, 'Look ($\beta\lambda\epsilon\psi\sigma\nu$) at us...Silver and gold ($d\rho\gamma\phi\rho\sigma\nu$ kai $\chi\rho\sigma\sigma\sigma\nu$) I have not, but what I have I give ($\delta\delta\omega\mu\mu$) you. In the name of Jesus Christ ('In $\sigma\sigma\sigma\gamma$ X $\rho\sigma\sigma\sigma\gamma$) of Nazareth, walk.' And...he raised him, and his feet and ankles were made firm, and leaping up, he stood...(Act 3,4-8).

Peter to the sanhedrin: 'The stone $(\lambda i \theta o \varsigma)$ rejected by you builders ($\partial i \kappa o \delta \partial \mu \omega \nu$) has become the head ($\kappa \epsilon \phi \alpha \lambda \eta$) of the corner. And in no other ($\check{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \varphi$ où $\delta \epsilon \nu$) is there salvation, nor is there (où $\delta \epsilon$ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \ \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$) any other name given ($\tau \dot{o} \delta \epsilon \delta \partial \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \circ \nu$)...whereby we must be saved' ($\sigma o \theta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota$) (4,11-12).

Sanhedrin: 'That a notable sign has happened...is manifest ($\gamma \epsilon \gamma \circ \nu \epsilon \nu \ldots \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu, 4,16$).

Without attempting a full analysis, especially of the more debatable details, some central points stand out:

This is the first time that either 1 Corinthians or Acts focuses on a whole building. (In both cases the focusing is preceded, almost immediately, by a passing reference - to a building, 1 Cor. 3:9, to the temple, Acts 2,46). But then, suddenly, the references to a temple are multiple (1 Cor. 3,10-17; Acts 3,1.2.3.8.10).

The key idea behind the references to the temple is that the old stone building is giving way to a new temple formed of people. This is implied in Paul - at least insofar as he says that people form a temple (1 Cor. 3,16-17). And in Acts, where it emerges that the old temple is doomed (the old 'place,' τόρος see esp. Stephen, 6,13-14;

7,48-49) the focus of prayer shifts to the new community, to their 'place' ($\tau \circ \rho \circ \varsigma$, 4,31).

The idea of a shift from a physical building to people is seen particularly in Jesus. Within the diverse buldings envisaged by Paul and Peter, Jesus holds a key position: he is the foundation (1 Cor. 3,11); he is the head of the corner (Acts 4,11). In other words, instead of describing Jesus as the foundation (at the base), Luke gives a complementary image of leadership (at the top).

Yet Paul's idea of Jesus as the human foundation of a human temple is not lost in Acts. The healing of the lame man - while largely drawn from other sources - is described in a special way. Through 'the name of Jesus Christ' the man's feet and ankles ($\beta \acute{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon \iota \varsigma \propto \alpha \iota \sigma \phi \upsilon \delta \rho \acute{\alpha}$) were made firm ($\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \epsilon \acute{\omega} \omega$, 'to make firm/solid,' 3,6-7), a healing description which is unique in the NT, and one which - since it means that 'Jesus Christ' puts the man on his feet - corresponds to the idea that Jesus Christ becomes a person's foundation.

Thus, within the context of the old temple, a new foundation emerges - Jesus Christ, who not only establishes the man on his feet, but who, through him, attracts 'all the people' (3,9). The building of the new temple is under way.

11. From Disavowing Wisdom to Having Everything (1 Cor. 3,18-23; Acts 3,11-26, Peter's Speech in Solomon's Portico)

Paul's next words (3,18-23) may seem paradoxical. In effect he says: No false wisdom or boasting (3,18-21a); but everything is yours (3,21b-23). It is almost like saying: You have nought, you have all.

The all is vast: 'All ($\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$) is yours - Paul, Apollos, Cephas, the world, life, death, things present, things to come; all ($\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha$) is yours, and you are Christ's, and Christ is God's.'

The two parts of Paul's paradox would appear to have provided one small component for Peter's speech (Acts 3,11-26). As the miracle-working Peter stands in Solomon's portico his first step is negative - to disavow any special power or holiness (3,11-12). Here, as in Paul, there is no false wisdom or boasting.

But then, having thus reduced himself, he gives a speech which in various ways encompasses everything - everything from Abraham, Isaac and Jacob to the prophets' idea of 'the restoration of all $(\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha)$ ' (3,13-21). 'And,' concludes Peter, 'you are the children of the prophets...It was for you God raised up his servant and sent him to bless you...' (3,25-26). As Paul would say, all is yours.

12. If Apostles Are Faithful Witnesses, Human Judgement Does Not Count (1 Cor. 4,1-5; Acts 4,1-9)

Paul now speaks of the role of apostolic leaders (1 Cor. 4,1-5). If they are faithful servants (innpérng, 'servant,' but with the technical meaning of 'official witness'²⁵) it does not matter how they are judged humanly. What counts then is faithful witness, not human judgement.

In Acts 4,1-9 that same idea is one component in a vivid drama. Peter and John (two of them, thus constituting witness) teach the people about Jesus' resurrection, and the people believe (4,1-4). But then the apostles are brought before an imposing court - rulers, elders, scribes, high priests (4,5-6) and they are subjected to critical judgement (4,7-9). The clear implication, however, despite the weight of the assembled critics, is that the apostles are not guilty. They have been faithful witnesses, and ultimately this human judging does not count.

The word used here for judging, $\dot{\alpha}v\alpha\kappa\rho i\omega\sigma$, occurs ten times in 1 Corinthians, including three times in the present passage (1 Cor. 4,3-4). The only other NT occurences are in Luke-Acts - including the present passage (Acts 4,9, the first occurence in Acts).

13. The Plight of the Apostles (before Seeming Rulers): Mentally Foolish-looking and Physically Vulnerable (1 Cor. 4,6-13; Acts 4,13-22)

In face of the Corinthians, who seem to think they possess the eschatological kingdom ('You have come to your kingdom,' 4,8), Paul describes the plight of the apostles: 'God placed us apostles

25. Ibid., p. 29.

last...We are fools...weak...without honor' ($\mu \omega \rho \omega$) ... $\dot{\alpha}\sigma \theta \epsilon v \epsilon \hat{\iota} \varsigma$... $\dot{\alpha}\tau \iota \mu \omega \iota$, 4,9-10). And there is also physical danger: 'We are hungry...beaten...defamed' (4,11.13). Yet the apostles do not whine or cower: 'We bless...we endure...we speak positively' (4,12-13).

Many of the central elements of Paul's description of the apostles occur in adapted form in Luke's picture of Peter and John as they face the sanhedrin. While the sanhedrin has the appearance of power, the apostles seem unimpressive; they look 'unlearned and ignorant' ($\dot{\alpha}\gamma\rho\dot{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\sigma\dot{\alpha}$ καὶ ἰδιῶται, 4,13). They are also physically vulnerable. The sanhedrin threaten ($\dot{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega$, 4,17) them, and even though they decide for the moment not to punish (κολάζω, 4,21) them, it is clear they are in danger. Yet the apostles are neither offensive or cringing. Instead they speak with confidence (παρρησία, 4,13) and calm integrity (4,19-20).

14. ?? A Sharp Change to a Gentler (Household?) Setting (1 Cor. 4,14-21; Acts 4,23-37)

At the end of 1 Corinthians 4 Paul changes tone. He becomes gentle, speaking like a father to children and telling of significant visits - the sending of the beloved Timothy, and his own visit. (His own visit, however, which depends on God, keeps a suggestion of explosive power).

It is not clear, at least not to the present writer, what, if any, is the connection between Paul's sudden gentleness and the next passage in Acts - the description of community solidarity, both at prayer and in action:

Suddenly Paul speaks gently ?? Back at home: community to the Corinthians - as a solidarity in prayer and father to children (1 Cor. action (Acts 4,23-37). .4,14-21).

Rather than insist on connecting these passages, it seems better to accept that they are not connected, or at least to leave the question open.

15. The Sin of the Couple: Remove the Evildoerl Powerful Judgement by an Apostle Who Was

Physically Absent from the Crime (1 Corinthians 5; Acts 5,1-11)

Now the tone changes again, drastically, and this time the affinity between the scenes is striking. Paul is suddenly dealing with a man's incestuous relationship with a woman (1 Corinthians 5), and Peter is suddenly dealing with a man and woman who are cheating (Ananias and Sapphira, Acts 5,1-11). The cheating, however, is not sexual, as in Corinth, but has to do with one of Luke's central interests - possessions. Luke indebtedness to 1 Corinthians 5 - apart from his widely-accepted use of the OT - is confirmed by several connecting details:

The picture of a couple (a man and a woman/wife) is not as common as it may seem. This is the first time that either 1 Corinthians or Acts refers to a couple or uses the singular $\gamma \upsilon v \eta$, 'woman/wife.' Furthermore, in both cases the couple are deeply offensive to the community.

The initial condemnation (by Paul and Peter) is done, in diverse ways, from a distance. Paul, 'absent in body, but present in spirit ($\pi v \epsilon \hat{\upsilon} \mu \alpha$), has already pronounced judgement, as if present' (1 Cor. 5,3). And when Peter meets first Ananias and then Sapphira it is clear, though he was absent from the actual crime, that he already knew the crime, that in some sense he was present in spirit (Acts 5,3.8-9). In other words, Luke has adapted the ideas of ready condemnation and being present in spirit to suit the case of Ananias and Sapphira. In fact, it is precisely on the basis of offending the Spirit ($\pi v \epsilon \hat{\upsilon} \mu \alpha$) that Peter condemns (5,3.9). Again Luke has moved from the idea of spirit to that of the Holy Spirit.

The punishment is lethal: 'the destruction of the flesh' (1 Cor. 5,5); death (Acts 5,5.10).

Satan is involved - in destroying the flesh (1 Cor. 5,5); in filling the heart with lying (Acts 5,3). Thus Satan's role in Acts is brought into line with Satan's role in Luke (Lk. 22,3, the misleading of Judas).

The evil ones are removed away from the community. Twice Paul speaks of removing the evil one (1 Cor. 5,2.13; cf. Deut. 13,6) and twice Luke gives a dramatic account of the sinners being removed, first Ananias and then Sapphira (Acts 5,6.9-10).

Conclusion

The connections listed here vary from strong to weak, and it is important, when assessing literary dependence, not to insist on what is weak. Insistence on what is weak - whether by someone presenting the evidence or someone opposing it - distracts from the crucial question: is there evidence which is strong, evidence which goes beyond the probability of coincidence?

In this case there is strong evidence. First, there is the extrinsic plausibility: Luke, as someone interested in sources, in the early church and in Paul, could have sought access to a copy of 1 Corinthians.

Secondly, there are the consistent similarities - from themes and images to linguistic details. Some are small, some are weak or debatable, but others are strong. And the similarities are present both in volume and in order (they are spread over most of five chapters, and almost in exactly the same order).

Similarity of order is significant. If five random elements are arranged independently by two prople, the chance that the elements will be in the same order is less than one in a hundred. If there are ten such elements the chance is less than one in a million. The number of random elements in the same order in 1 Corinthians 1-5 and Acts 1-5 is debatable, but whatever the details, the overall factor of similar order is striking.

Thirdly, there is the intelligibility and consistency of the differences. The basic idea of transforming an existing text - however alien to modern procedure - finds plausibility in the context of theological redesigning and literary imitation. And the actual differences between the texts are not a meaningless muddle. Rather, they follow steady patterns - adaptation to Luke's central interests, and a persistent procedure of making Paul's text more full, more dramatic, and more vivid.

In the end there are two possible explanations of the data either an extraordinary series of coincidences, or, more simply, that Luke the *littérateur* used a literary method. The chronicler of the church and of Paul used one of Paul's epistles to a church.

Corinthians 1-5 and Acts 1-5 A General Outline Gifted From Above; Waiting for the Revelation of Christ (1 Cor. 1,1-9; Acts 1,1-11)

1	Prescript:	Prologue:
	Paul, calledan apostle of Jesus	To Theophilus ('Friend of
		God'):
	to the church of God	Jesus chose the apostles
	called to be holy	in the Holy Spirit
	Gracefrom God the Father	Await the promise from the
	(1 Cor. 1,1-3.13b-17).	Father (Acts 1,1-5).
		Baptisms: a clear contrast (1,5).
2	You are enriched in everything	Not for you to know times,
	awaiting the revelation of Jesus	seasons;
	to the end in the day of the Lord	you will receive power.
	(1,4-9).	,
		Assuration This Teams will

Ascension...This Jesus will come (1,6-11).

Unity; the Two Wisdoms/Apostles and God's Call of the Unimpressive (1 Cor. 1.10-31; Acts 1.12-26)

	(1 001. 1,10 51, 1	
3	Avoid divisions among brothers.	Patient waiting (eleven names).
	Be of one mind.	All of one mind.
	Quarrelling (four names).	Peter in the midst of the
	(1,10 - 13a).	brothers. (1,12-15).
	Baptism: implied contrast (1,13-	
	17).	
4	The two wisdoms - false and	Two apostles (false and true):
	true:	
	false wisdom is destroyed.	the false, Judas, has collapsed.
	true wisdom proclaims Christ.	the true will witness to Jesus.
	(1,18-25).	(1,16-22).
5	God chose the unimpressive	God chooses Matthias - not
	(1,26-31).	the impressive Joseph (1,23-
	(-;).	26).
		207.

The Powerful	Preaching	of Christ	and the Spirit

	(1 comunuis 2, 11013 2, 1 50)		
6	The power of Paul's preaching $(2,1-5)$.	Pentecost and Peter's preaching (2,1-21).	
7		Hear about Jesus, preordained	
	of the crucifixion of the Lord -and God's unspeakable promise (2,6-9).	to crucifixion and resurrection - and the promise of not seeing corruption (2,22-28).	
8	God revealed the Spirit.	Prophetic David foretold resurrection - whence the Spirit.	
	The Spirit knows the Lord/Christ	Jesus is known as Lord/Christ	
	(2,10-16).	(2,29-36).	

Flesh Leads to Quarrels, Spirit Leads to Unity

(1 Cor. 3,1-9; Acts 2,37-39)

	(, , , ,
9	You are of flesh, not spiritual.	Repentreceive the Spirit.
	The flesh leads to quarrelling.	Baptism (Spirit) leads to
		sharing.
	The community: a garden where	The believers were together
	people are one;	sharing;
	God gives increase (3,1-9).	the Lord added to them (2,37-
		47).
	The Building/Temple - with Jo	esus as Foundation/Head
	(1 Cor. 3,10-23	
10	10The community as a building	
	with Jesus as foundation;	
		Jesus becomes a man's
	No foundation other than that	
	laid;	Peter: 'stonebuildershead
	on top - gold, silver, stones.	no name other than that
	on top - gold, silver, stolles.	given.'
	The work will become manifest.	The 'rebuilding' of the man
		-
	You are God's temple.	becomes manifest (3,1-10; 4,10-
	(3,10-17).	12.16).

Apostles Under Judgement (1 Corinthians 4: Acts 4)

	(1 Corinthians 4; Acts 4)			
11	No claiming of false wisdom	In Solomon's portico: Peter		
	no boasting.	disavows any special power or		
		holiness.		
	Yet all is yours: the world, life,	Speech: The prophets told of the		
	death, all is yours/Christ's	restoration of all in Christ; you		
	/God's (3,18-23).	are the prophets' children (3,11-		
		26).		
12	Apostles are to be faithful	Peter and John preach Christ		
	witnesses of Christ;	and induce faith;		
	human judgement does not	they are brought to human		
	count	judgement		
	(4,1-5).	(the sanhedrin, 4,1-10).		
13	The plight of the apostles	The plight of Peter and John		
	(before pretentious Corinthians):	(before the sanhedrin):		
	'foolsweakwithout honor;'			
	physically buffetedunsettled.	'unlearned and ignorant;'		
	Yet blessing, enduring, positive	threatened with punishment.		
	(4,6-13).	Yet confident, calm, clear		
		(4,13-22).		
14	Paul's sudden gentleness	.?? The community at home		
	(4,14-21).	(4,23-37).		
	The Man and the Woman: Remov	ve the Evil from Among You		
(1 Corinthians 5; Acts 5,1-11)				
15.	The sexual sin of the	The possessions-related sin		
	man and the woman.	of Ananias and Sapphira.		
	Paul, absent in body but present	Peter, absent from the sin,		
	in spirit, condemns.	condemns as if he had been		
		present.		
	Satan's role (destroys flesh).	Satan's role (poisons heart).		
	Destroy the sinner's flesh.	Ananias and Sapphira die.		
	Let him be removed from you.	They carry out Ananias.		
	Remove this evil from among	They carry out Sapphira.		

you. (1 Corinthians 5). (5,1-11).

Abstract

Despite assertions that Paul and Luke are theological incompatible, recent work claims that Luke redesigned Paul's theology (J.C.Beker) and used some Pauline epistles, especially 1 Corinthians (M.D.Goulder).

This paper gives data which support these claims. Luke's description of the Jerusalem church (Acts 1-5) consists to a significant extent of a redesigning of Paul's description of the divided Corinthian church (1 Corinthians 1-5). Luke has used what was implicit in Paul - an ideal of unity - as one component of his account of the early church. Luke's direct literary dependence on 1 Corinthians is indicated by: external plausibility; persistent similarities - of theme, detail, and order; and by the intelligibility of the differences.

T. Brodie