

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

CHAPTER V

The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles

I. Howard Marshall

[p.92]

According to the theology expressed in the Acts of the Apostles the fundamental place in salvation history is to be assigned to the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Although the opening chapter of Acts makes a chronological separation between the resurrection of Jesus and his farewell appearance to his disciples forty days later, it is one saving event, including resurrection, ascension and exaltation, which is in mind.

In affording this central place to the resurrection, Luke was fully in line with the thought of the early church as expressed elsewhere in the New Testament.¹ It is, therefore, surprising that no detailed attempt has been made to expound his theology of the resurrection, as reflected in Acts, and to inquire how far it is dependent upon tradition and how far it is peculiar to himself. Much attention has indeed been devoted to the wider problem of tradition and interpretation in the writings of Luke, but in the main our theme has been given only incidental treatment in such discussions.

Since most of the teaching in Acts about the resurrection occurs in the speech material, which is at present often regarded as a *Musterbeispiel* of Lucan creative activity, it may seem hopeless to expect to find primitive tradition about the resurrection. We must briefly examine this question before coming to grips with our subject.

I

Among the earliest contributions to New Testament study by the distinguished scholar in whose honour this volume is published was a slim monograph entitled *The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles*, which initiated the series of Tyndale New Testament Lectures (1942). The essay was notable for the conservative estimate which it reached regarding the historical verisimilitude of the speeches in Acts. The author concluded:

Reason has been shown to conclude that the speeches recorded by Luke are at least faithful epitomes, giving the gist of the arguments used. Even in summarizing the speeches, Luke would naturally introduce more or less of his

[p.93]

¹ For the resurrection as the central theme of NT theology see W. Künneth, *The Theology of the Resurrection* (London, 1965). Less *konsequent* is F. V. Filson, *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* (Nashville, 1956).

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

own style; but in point of fact it frequently seems to be less, not more. Taken all in all, each speech suits the speaker, the audience and the circumstances of delivery; and this, along with the other points we have considered, gives good ground, in my judgment, for believing these speeches to be, not inventions of the historian, but condensed accounts of speeches actually made, and therefore valuable and independent sources for the history and theology of the primitive Church.²

These conclusions were certainly not based on ignorance of the powerful arguments which have been urged against the primitive nature of the speeches. It is noteworthy that Professor Bruce choose as a representative statement of the opposite point of view not the well-known essay by H. J. Cadbury³ but rather (with prophetic insight) the available writings of M. Dibelius;⁴ he was thus able to refer to *Paulus auf dem Areopag* (Heidelberg, 1939), although it was not until 1949 that the celebrated essay on "The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography" (completed in 1944) was available to scholars.⁵

Since 1942 the prevailing tide of opinion has been strongly against the point of view adopted by Bruce.⁶ The arguments which have had most weight in the minds of subsequent scholars have been as follows:

(i) The analogy of ancient historiography suggests that Luke placed on the lips of his principal characters those sentiments which he considered most appropriate. He used the speeches primarily for literary purposes, and moulded them carefully to fit into their contexts.

(ii) The speeches uniformly bear the marks of Lucan style in vocabulary, style and composition; so thoroughly has Luke worked over any sources which he may have employed that it is virtually impossible to uncover them.

(iii) The speeches are based upon a common pattern and they supplement one another in filling out its various aspects. They contain a unified theology, and this theology is shown to be Luke's own by its occurrence elsewhere in his writings. Moreover, Luke's theology is not the theology of the early church but rather reflects the outlook of his own time. His purpose was not to give accurate historical reports of the primitive church but rather to give an interpretation in accordance with the needs of his own era. The speeches may be based on fragmentary traditions, but primarily they are sources for Luke's own theology.

Within the scope of the present article this case cannot be fully

[p.94]

considered, but the following points may be briefly noted as indicating that the evidence is not all on one side.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

³ "The Speeches in Acts", *BC V*, pp. 402-27; cf. F. F. Bruce, *op. cit.*, p. 13.

⁴ M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (London, 1937); cf. F. F. Bruce, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

⁵ The essay, originally published in 1949, reappeared in M. Dibelius, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte* (ed. H. Greeven, Göttingen, 1951); English translation: *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1956).

⁶ The research is chronicled in U. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1963²), pp. 7-31.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

(i) The problem of the analogy with other ancient historians was already taken up by Bruce in 1942; he observed that Thucydides' practice was one of "adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said". Thucydides, therefore, cannot be quoted as an example of intentional free composition.⁷ The real question, therefore, is how far Luke shared the attitude of Hellenistic historians like Josephus rather than the Thucydidean approach of Polybius.⁸ It is easy to exaggerate the unconcern of the Hellenistic historians about factual accuracy in the depiction of *Historie*.⁹ Luke's work must be considered on its own merits.

(ii) There is no doubt that Luke has thoroughly rewritten his sources in his own vocabulary and style.¹⁰ This means, on the one hand, that the presence of Lucan characteristics in a passage is in itself no proof that sources are not being used.

On the other hand, it means that the search for such primitive features as residual Semitisms is not very likely to be successful. This is in fact the case. The thorough study of M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford, 1965), did not produce a very impressive harvest of linguistic material. But this should not surprise us. One speech in Acts, that of Paul in ch. 22, is explicitly stated to have been delivered Ἑβραῖα διὰ διαλέκτω, and it is not characterized by Semitisms. If this speech is authentic, Luke has thoroughly removed the evidence of its Semitic origin from his translation or source; if it is his own composition, he has not striven for verisimilitude by imposing a Semitizing style appropriate to the situation. In either case, the search for Semitisms as a mark of primitive tradition is not likely to be fruitful elsewhere in Acts.¹¹

But is it necessary to find Semitisms in order to trace primitive material? The evidence continues to accumulate that Greek was one of the languages spoken in Palestine, and spoken by Jews.¹² It may well be that some of the speeches in Acts to Jewish audiences were originally spoken in Greek. In particular, the familiar argument from use of the LXX in the speeches to in authenticity loses much of its force.

(iii) There is evidence that at least some of the speech material in Acts is based on tradition. Thus U. Wilckens admits that a traditional pattern,

[p.95]

attested elsewhere in the New Testament, is to be found in the speeches to Gentile audiences in Acts 14 and 17.¹³ He also argues, however, that the different form of speech found earlier in Acts and addressed to Jewish audiences cannot be shown to be traditional by comparison

⁷ T. F. Glasson, "The Speeches in Acts and Thucydides", *ExpT* 76 (1964-65), p. 165; R. M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (London, 1963), p. 141.

⁸ W. Barclay, "Great Themes of the New Testament IV. Acts 2:14-40" *ExpT* 70 (1958-59), pp. 196-99.

⁹ A. W. Mosley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World", *NTS* 12 (1965-66), pp. 10-26; H. Weiss, "History and a Gospel", *Nov Test* 10 (1968), pp. 81-94; G. W. Barker, W. L. Lane and J. R. Michaels, *The New Testament Speaks* (New York, 1969), p. 306.

¹⁰ B. M. F. van Iersel, "Der Sohn" in *den synoptischen Jesusworten* (Leiden, 1964²), pp. 32-51.

¹¹ Compare the lack of Semitisms in Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, which was originally composed in Aramaic.

¹² R. H. Gundry, *The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel* (Leiden, 1967), pp.174-78; J. N. Sevenster, *Do you know Greek?* (Leiden, 1968).

¹³ U. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-91.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

with other New Testament evidence, and holds that in this case the *argumentum e silentio* is a convincing one.

One critic at least has not been persuaded by Wilckens' reasoning about the earlier speeches,¹⁴ and there is certainly a good case against it. The fact that Luke did use traditional material in Acts 14 and 17 would suggest that he also used similar material in other parts of Acts. In fact the pattern of the earlier speeches is very like that of the later ones,¹⁵ and suggests that Luke was drawing on traditional material throughout.

At one point the search for traditional material has been particularly rewarding. This concerns the use of the Old Testament in the speeches in Acts. There is sufficient evidence for claiming that the patterns of exegesis found in the speeches are often of a primitive nature.¹⁶

One speech is not discussed at all by Wilckens, that by Stephen in Acts 7. Because of what he calls "its special character" he leaves it aside.¹⁷ It is, however, precisely this "special character" which makes it the Achilles' heel of his theory, for there is good reason to believe that a rather specialized tradition has been utilized in the composition of this speech.¹⁸ These various pieces of evidence all suggest that the search for primitive tradition in the speeches in Acts may well be more fruitful than is generally assumed. Although the analogy between the Gospel of Luke and Acts should be used with caution, the evidence of the Gospel confirms our tentative conclusion that Luke was making use of existing sources rather than freely inventing material.¹⁹ We have, therefore, some incentive for reconsidering the particular question of the place of the resurrection in the speeches in Acts in order to see how far the theology of Luke is based on tradition.

[p.96]

II

The first question which must be raised concerns the centrality of the resurrection in the preaching and apologetic in Acts.

In two main passages Luke relates that the early church laid stress on the resurrection in debate with the Jews. Acts 23:7 f. refers to the well-known dispute between the Pharisees and

¹⁴ J. Dupont, *Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1967), pp. 133-55 (originally published in *RB* 69 (1962), pp. 37-60). See also J. Rohde, *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists* (London, 1969), pp. 215-17.

¹⁵ Among the many synopses and discussions see especially E. Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts", in L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (ed.), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville, 1966), pp. 208-16; also published in German in *Theologische Zeitschrift* 13 (1957), pp. 1-11, and in E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica* (Zürich, 1963), pp. 418-28.

¹⁶ J. W. Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen, 1953); E. Lövestam, *Son and Saviour* (Lund, 1961); M. Wilcox, *op. cit.*; J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (Leiden, 1965); J. W. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form", *NTS* 14 (1967-68), pp.96-111. A forthcoming publication by G. Stanton will give evidence for a pre-Lucan tradition in Acts 10:36-43.

¹⁷ J. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, p. 30, n. 5; for an attempt to fit the speech into Luke's theology see J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts* (London, 1961), ch. 3.

¹⁸ Cf. M. Scharlemann, *Stephen: A Singular Saint* (Rome, 1968).

¹⁹ I. H. Marshall, "Tradition and Theology in Luke," *Tyndale Bulletin* 20 (1969), pp. 56-75.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

the Sadducees, the former accepting the fact of the general resurrection and the latter denying it. According to Luke the question of the resurrection of Jesus could be regarded as a particular aspect of the general question of the resurrection of the dead. As he puts it elsewhere, the apostles preached "in Jesus the resurrection from the dead" (Acts 4:2). The main opposition came from the Sadducees (Acts 4:1 f.), but the Pharisees (or some of them) were less ready to condemn the Christians unheard (Acts 5:33 ff.). Representatives of both parties, however, were converted to the faith (Acts 6:7; 15:5). In a second main passage the issue is put by attributing to Paul the claim that both he and the Jews shared a belief in "a resurrection of both the just and the unjust" (Acts 24:15, 21).

The description of this method of apologetic is often regarded as historically inaccurate and motivated by Lucan theological considerations. "What Paul says about his faith is in keeping with the Lucan conception; the general resurrection is the link between (real) Judaism and Christianity. The Jews must consequently see that their faith comes to fulfilment in Christianity."²⁰ It follows that the Sadducees are not real Jews. Luke misrepresents their position by claiming that they were pure sceptics, whereas in fact their denial of the resurrection was the result of their restriction of religious authority to the Torah.

This estimate of Luke's narrative is very hard to accept. The existence of the dispute between the Pharisees and Sadducees over the resurrection is amply attested,²¹ and Luke correctly records it.²² That the resurrection of both the righteous and the unrighteous to stand before the judgment seat of God was a common Christian belief is also certain.²³ The situation with

[p.97]

regard to Judaism is less certain because the discussions do not always make it clear whether the reference is to the raising up of the dead to face judgment or to the raising up of the righteous to eternal life. But development of belief in a final judgment was incompatible with the maintenance of the view that the unrighteous would simply be left to perish in Sheol or Gehenna, and consequently it is probable that Christian belief about the general resurrection reflected Jewish belief.²⁴ E. Haenchen's view that the Pharisees did not believe in the

²⁰ H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (HNT, Tübingen, 1963), p. 129; cf. p. 133; E Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Meyer, Göttingen, 1959¹²), pp. 570 f.

²¹ Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1.3 f.; *Bel.* 2.8.14; Aboth R. Nathan 5; Sanhedrin 90b; Tanchuma 3a; Berakoth 9.5; cf. Sanhedrin 10.1; see Strack-Billerbeck I, pp. 885 f.; 893 f.; IV I, p. 344; *TWNT* VII pp. 46 f. (R. Meyer).

²² Note, however, that Luke's statement that the Sadducees denied the existence of angels and spirits has been challenged. It is not confirmed by Jewish sources, and E. Haenchen (*op. cit.*, p. 567 n. 1) observes that the Torah refers to angels. R. Meyer (*TWNT* VII, p. 54) suggests that the Sadducees and early Christians may have rejected popular superstitious demonology.

²³ All men will face the future judgment: Jn. 5:28 f.; Rev. 20:12-15; cf. Rom. 2:5-16; 2 Cor. 5:10; 2 Tim. 4:1. For the raising up of the unrighteous see Lk. 10:12-15 (=Matt. 10:15; 11:20-24); Lk. 11:31 f. (=Matt. 12:41 f.). The phrase "the resurrection of the just" (Lk. 14:14) refers to resurrection into the life of the world to come (Lk. 20:35; cf. Jn. 5:29) and does not exclude the thought of the resurrection of the unrighteous for judgment.

²⁴ For the resurrection of both the righteous and the unrighteous see Dan. 12:2; I Enoch 22; 51; T. Benjamin 10; 2 Esd. 7:32, 37; 2 Baruch 42:7; 50:2; Sibylline Oracles 4:180-92; Apocalypse of Moses 41 (Strack-Billerbeck IV 2, pp. 1167-72). In the Rabbinic evidence note especially P. Aboth 4:22 and T. Sanhedrin 13:3 f. The conclusion of W. Bousset and H. Gressmann (*Die Religion des Judentums* [Tübingen, 1966⁴], pp. 269-74) that belief in the resurrection only of the righteous was more common does not take the Rabbinic evidence into account. See Strack-Billerbeck IV 2, pp. 1172-98.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

resurrection of the unrighteous²⁵ rests upon the testimony of Josephus, but P. Billerbeck has shown that this testimony is of doubtful value.²⁶

The argument which is attributed to Paul in this context is quite fitting. In the early Jewish Christian church a person might become a Christian and remain a Pharisee, but a Sadducee would need to change his whole theological position.²⁷ There was, therefore, nothing inconsistent about a claim that Christian belief was in effect the fulfilment of Judaism (Acts 28:20).²⁸ Moreover, the link between the general resurrection and the resurrection of Jesus is one which Paul certainly made in another context, namely in 1 Corinthians 15, where he argued both that denial of the general resurrection logically involves denial of the resurrection of Christ and hence of the whole Christian faith, and also (conversely) that the historical fact of the resurrection of Christ establishes the fact of the general resurrection.

So far as the representation of the attitudes of the Pharisees and Sadducees, is concerned, there is no reason to question Luke's account. The support given by the Pharisees to the Christians is paralleled by the way in which the Pharisees appear among both the supporters and the opponents of Jesus in the Gospel, both in Luke's sources and in the final redaction. The Gospel also makes it clear that Luke was well aware of the reason for the scepticism of the Sadducees (Lk. 20: 27-40, especially 37), and has not misrepresented their position.

Finally, the later Acts is dated, the less likely it becomes that Luke should have invented this motif. For after A.D. 70 the Sadducees ceased to be of any importance in Jewish politics and theology,²⁹ and it is most unlikely that

[p.98]

Luke would have deliberately bothered to draw attention to a group which was irrelevant to Christian-Jewish relationships. The indications are that in stressing the importance of the resurrection Luke was reflecting the actualities of debate with the Jews in the early church.

III

According to Luke Paul's missionary preaching could be summed up as "explaining and proving that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer and to rise from the dead, and saying, 'This Jesus, whom I proclaim to you, is the Christ'" (Acts 17:3). This indicates that one main purpose of the preaching of the resurrection was to make the apologetic points that the Messiah expected by the Jews would do certain things prophesied in the Old Testament, that Jesus had done these things, and that therefore he was the Christ. It has, however, been maintained that this type of argument was possible only at a later date. According to J. C.

²⁵ E. Haenchen, *op. cit.*, p. 583 n.1.

²⁶ Strack-Billerbeck IV 2, pp. 1172 ff., 1188 f. Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism* (Cambridge, Mass., 1932), II, pp. 317 f.

²⁷ F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London, 1951), p. 411; *The Book of the Acts* (London, 1954), pp. 452 f. According to C. K. Barrett, "Paul remained in many respects not merely a Jew but a Pharisee and a Rabbi;" nevertheless, he "had in fact ceased to be a practising Jew" (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [London, 1968], pp. 211, 240).

²⁸ See, for example, F. F. Bruce, *The Apostolic Defence of the Gospel* (London, 1959), ch. 1.

²⁹ Strack-Billerbeck IV 2, pp. 343 f.; *TWNT* VII, pp. 45 f. (R. Meyer).

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

O'Neill "Luke's usage consistently implies that Χριστός was a Jewish title with a fixed and definite meaning, and that it was possible to conduct an argument with Jews as to whether Jesus did or did not meet the specified requirements." But, he holds, the development of a fixed concept of the "Messiah" belongs to a later date; consequently Luke is reading back a post-70 type of argument into the earlier period.³⁰

"Messiah" is admittedly not an Old Testament title, but there was an expectation of a future deliverer whom the Jews believed to be prophesied in various ways in the Old Testament. Further, there is not a great deal of evidence in Judaism for the use of the title "Messiah" to designate the coming deliverer.³¹ Christians at a later date could and did misrepresent Jewish beliefs on this matter.³² However, there is sufficient evidence of interest in Messianic prophecy and of the use of the title in the period which concerns us.³³

What is of greater importance is that the argument attributed by Luke to Paul must have developed much earlier in the church than O'Neill allows. In 1 Corinthians 15:3 ff. Paul quotes an early piece of tradition concerning the death, burial and resurrection of Christ.³⁴ The interesting point is that the statements in this passage are made about *Christ*, not about

[p.99]

Jesus. The statement thus *assumes* that Jesus is the Christ, and therefore predicates of him various experiences which are regarded as being in accordance with the Scriptures. In other words, this piece of tradition presupposes that at an earlier stage the identification of Jesus with the Christ had been made, so that in 1 Corinthians 15:3 ff. it was possible to assume the equation of Jesus with the Christ.³⁵ Hence 1 Corinthians 15 presupposes the argument set out in Acts 17:3. Since "Christ" is very probably an original part of this tradition and not a Pauline addition,³⁶ the identification must have been made at a very early stage. Whether by accident or design, Luke has correctly reflected this early stage in Christian theology.³⁷ The formulation of the message is Luke's own,³⁸ but the essential content of it is primitive.³⁹

³⁰ J. C. O'Neill, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-29; quotation from p. 122.

³¹ O'Neill cites G. F. Moore in BC I, pp. 346-62. For more recent surveys see F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (Göttingen, 1964²), pp. 133-58; M. de Jonge, "The use of the word 'anointed' in the time of Jesus," *Nov Test* 8 (1966), pp. 132-48; A.J. B. Higgins, "The Priestly Messiah," *NTS* 13 (1966-67), pp. 211-39.

³² A. J. B. Higgins, "Jewish Messianic Belief in Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*," *NovTest* 9 (1967), pp. 298-305.

³³ F. Hahn, *ibid.*

³⁴ My attention was drawn to the relevance of this passage (and of 1 Pet. 1:11) to the present problem by F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 325.

³⁵ It is not certain whether Χριστός is here a name or a title (for the latter see F. Hahn, *op. cit.*, 207-14).

³⁶ W. Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (London, 1966), pp. 38-44 (8a-g).

³⁷ The same argument is presupposed in 1 Pet. 1:11 where it is stated that the prophets predicted the sufferings of Christ and the consequent glory; it is not clear whether the word "Christ" here means "the Messiah" or simply "Jesus", but in any case the identification of Jesus as the Messiah is presupposed.

³⁸ The verse is full of Lucanisms: διανοίγω, παρατίθκμι, δεῖ, ἀνίστημι, καταγγέλλω. For the mixture of indirect and direct speech see I. H. Marshall, "Luke xvi. 8 - Who commended the Unjust Steward?", *JTS N.S.* 19 (1968), pp. 617-19.

³⁹ The use of δεῖ is found in the Son of man sayings, and is equivalent to the appeal to Scripture in other texts (cf. F. Hahn, *op. cit.*, p. 216 n. 3); παθεῖν, though common in Luke is not a Lucanism (F. Hahn, *op. cit.*, p. 217 n. 1). On the use of ἀνίστημι see below.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

It thus emerges that the process of applying the title of "Messiah" to the expected eschatological deliverer took place earlier than O'Neill allows. It is likely that the decisive steps in this direction were made by the Christians themselves, and that it was their use of the title of "Messiah" of Jesus which forced the Jews into defining their own ideas and adopting the title as one with a fixed content.

IV

But what about the actual Old Testament proofs used to show that the Messiah must rise from the dead? In his comprehensive study U. Wilckens allows that the use of Scripture in this way is primitive, but holds that some of the texts actually used in Acts do not necessarily reflect primitive usage. Thus the use of Psalms 2:7 and 118:22 is traditional, but the use of Psalm 16:8-11 and Isaiah 55:3 is not attested in the early tradition.⁴⁰

The key stone in Wilcken's argument is obviously the use of Psalm 16, since this *testimonium* plays a major part in both Acts 2:25-31 and Acts 13:35-37. In an interesting argument B. Lindars has submitted that the wording of Psalm 16 has affected the whole structure of Acts 2:24-36 and that Luke himself was unaware of this fact; consequently we have here

[p.100]

"the survival of a very primitive argument for the Messiahship of Jesus".⁴¹ Lindars makes the following points:

(i) Psalm 16:8-11, when taken literally, must apply to the Messiah, since it could not apply to David himself. Since, however, Jesus rose from the dead, thus fulfilling literally the wording of the Psalm, it follows that he must be the Messiah (Acts 2:25-36). What is interesting, according to Lindars, is that no reference is made to the Davidic descent of Jesus as a proof that he is the Messiah. This is said to be a primitive form of argument.

(ii) The odd phrase "loosing the pangs of death" in Acts 2:24 is said to be due to the speaker's understanding of Psalm 18:4 ("The cords of death encompassed me") in terms of Psalm 16:6 ("The lines have fallen for me in pleasant places"). Luke himself did not realize that Psalm 16:6 was here being used as a commentary on Psalm 18, since the exegetical link was made on the basis of the Hebrew text.

(iii) The reference to the exaltation of Jesus in the speech (Acts 2:33) is usually understood to be based on Psalm 110:1, which is quoted in the succeeding verse. Lindars suggests, however, that the author started from "the pleasures at God's right hand" of Psalm 16:11 and annotated this phrase by means of Psalm 110:1 and Psalm 68:19 to refer to the exaltation of Jesus and the pouring out of the Spirit.

Although this exegesis gives a remarkable unity to the passage, it is doubtful whether it can be sustained throughout. In particular, the explanation of Acts 2:24 is not convincing. In effect

⁴⁰ U. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, pp. 140-42.

⁴¹ B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London, 1961), pp. 38-45.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

Lindars is here offering an explanation of the use of ὠδῖνας. But the real crux in the verse is rather the use of λύσας, and the correct solution of it is to be found in F. Field's translation as "to bring to an end". Further, there is a similar use of the Psalm in 1QH 3:28.⁴² This suggests a different reason for anchoring this part of the speech in early tradition.

That Luke has taken over the use of Psalm 16 from tradition is also maintained by T. Holtz, who holds that, although the quotation in Acts 2:25-28 is from Luke himself, the allusion in verse 31 which (according to Holtz) has a different textual form comes from primitive material.⁴³ More weight, however, should probably be attached to the exegetical links of Psalm 16 with other Old Testament material in Acts 13, a fact which suggests that Luke is here making use of tradition.⁴⁴ The use of Isaiah 55:3 (the other *testimonium* attributed by Wilckens to Luke) in this latter passage falls within this same circle of ideas, and its meaning in this context is sufficiently obscure to make it likely that it is a primitive testimony taken over by Luke rather than his own contribution to the

[p.101]

argument.⁴⁵ The case, therefore, for seeing tradition here rather than Lucan theology, is not strong, but it is adequate.⁴⁶

V

If the place of the resurrection and the use of Scripture to interpret it in Acts are primitive, the same is also true of the christology which is related to it. To be sure, this is not generally acknowledged. A brief but influential article by H. Braun advocated the thesis that the resurrection of Jesus is presented in a distinctly subordinationist manner in Acts compared with the earlier material in the New Testament.⁴⁷ This thesis was taken up by U. Wilckens who argued that Luke speaks of Jesus being raised from the dead by God (*Auferweckung*), but in the "passion summaries" the Son of man rises from the dead (*Auferstehung*) by his own power. Luke prefers the active form ἐγείρω to express the initiative of God, and in his rendering of the passion summaries he understands the action to be that of God rather than of the Son of man.⁴⁸ This thesis falls down when examined in detail.

(i) It is not the case that Luke has a predilection for ἐγείρω instead of ἀνίστημι. He uses ἐγείρω 18 times in the Gospel and 12 times in Acts. Of these 3 uses in Luke (active form) and

⁴² For details see M. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, pp. 46-48.

⁴³ T. Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104. Berlin, 1968), pp. 48-51.

⁴⁴ T. Holtz, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-53.

⁴⁵ E. Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*; J. Dupont, *Etudes sur les Actes des Apôtres*, pp. 337-59 (originally in *RB* 68 [1961], pp. 91-114); T. Holtz, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-45.

⁴⁶ H. Conzelmann (*Die Mitte der Zeit* [Tübingen, 1964⁵], pp. 188 f.) and others regard the 'stress' on σάρξ in Acts 2:31 as a Hellenistic motif due to Luke (cf. Lk. 24:39 f.). But since Luke here avoids the dualism of soul and flesh which Ps. 16:9 f. might have suggested, by *not* taking up ψυχή from the quotation (verse 27), it is more likely perhaps that σάρξ is here simply a designation of the whole person (cf. E. Schweizer, *TWNT* VII, p. 124).

⁴⁷ H. Braun, "Zur Terminologie der Acta von der Auferstehung Jesu," *ThLZ* 77 (1952), cols. 533-36.

⁴⁸ U. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-40. For the terminological distinction see E. Lohmeyer, *Das Evangelium des Markus* (Meyer, Göttingen, 1959¹⁵), p. 167.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

6 uses in Acts (passive form) refer to Jesus.⁴⁹ The verb ἀνίστημι is used intransitively of the resurrection of Jesus 4 times in Luke and twice in Acts, and transitively (with God as subject) 5 times in Acts.⁵⁰ There is no preference for ἐγείρω here.⁵¹

(ii) In any case, the use of ἐγείρω with reference to Jesus is firmly planted in early usage, both in the active and passive forms.⁵² The intransitive

[p.102]

use of ἀνίστημι is also traditional.⁵³ The new feature, which does require explanation, is the use of the active form ἀνίστημι in Acts.

(iii) Since Wilckens has not shown that Luke *prefers* ἐγείρω, there is no need to ask with him why Luke continued to use ἀνίστημι as well. Nevertheless, his argument must be followed through. He holds that Luke took over ἀνίστημι from the passion summaries, where the intransitive form was used to describe the *self-raising* of the Son of man, in contrast to the general view of the early church that the resurrection was *God's* act.⁵⁴ But this theory cannot be upheld.⁵⁵

In Mark itself the intransitive form which is found in the passion summaries is also used of persons raised from the dead by Jesus⁵⁶ and of persons raised by God at the final resurrection;⁵⁷ the same is true throughout the New Testament.⁵⁸ Similarly, the ἀναστασις can be used indifferently of the resurrection of men and of Jesus.⁵⁹ Now there is never any suggestion that men can raise themselves from the dead. In Jewish thought it is *God* who raises the dead.⁶⁰ Since the same intransitive form of the verb is used of men and of Jesus, it follows that the choice of this verb in the passion summaries is no ground for supposing that these texts regard the Son of man as raising himself from the dead. Only in the Johannine

⁴⁹ ἐγείρω is used (1) of raising men from the dead: Lk. 7:14, 22; 8:54; 9:7; (2) of the final resurrection: Lk. 20:37; Acts 26: 8; (3) (active) of Jesus: Acts 3:15; 4:10; 5:30; 10:40; 13:30, 37; (4) (passive) of Jesus: Lk. 9:22; 24:6, 34.

⁵⁰ ἀνίστημι is used (1) transitively, of Jesus: Acts 2:24, 32; 13:33, 34; 17:31 (*not* Acts 3:26; Acts 9:41 also does not refer to resurrection); (2) intransitively, of men being raised from the dead: Lk. 8:55 9:8, 19; Acts 9:40; (3) intransitively, of the final resurrection: Lk. 11:32 (4) intransitively, of Jesus: Lk. 16:31; 18:33; 24:7, 46; Acts 10:41; 17:3.

⁵¹ Only at Lk. 9:22 has Luke altered an original ἀνίστημι to ἐγείρω (cf. Matt. 16:21). B. Lindars, *op. cit.*, p. 65, speaks of Luke's preference for the root ἀνίστημι.

⁵² Active: Rom 4:24; 8:11 *bis*; 10:9; 1 Cor 6:14; 15:15 *bis*; 2 Cor 1:9; 4:14; Gal 1:1; Eph 1:20; Col: 2.12; 1 Thes. 1:10; 1 Pet. 1:21; Passive: Matt. 16:21 (=Lk. 9:22); 17:9, 23; 20:19; 20:32 (=Mk 14:28); 27:63, 64; 28:6, 7 (=Mk. 16:6=Lk. 24:6); Lk. 24:34; Jn. 2:22; 21:14; Rom. 4:25; 6:4, 9; 7:4; 8:34; 1 Cor. 15:4, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20; 2 Cor. 5:15; 2 Tim. 2:8.

⁵³ Mk. 8:31; 9:9, 10, 31; 10:34 (=Lk. 18:33); Lk. 16:31; 24:7, 46; Jn. 20:9; 1 Thes. 4:14.

⁵⁴ Cf. F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel*, p. 49; H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (London, 1965), pp. 185 f.

⁵⁵ Cf. H. Conzelmann, *RGG*³ I, cols. 698 f.; G. Dellling in C. F. D. Moule (ed), *The Significance of the Message of the Resurrection for Faith in Jesus Christ* (London, 1968), p. 90. n. 33.

⁵⁶ Mk. 5:42 (=Lk. 8:55); cf. Acts 9:40; Eph. 5:14 (metaphorical).

⁵⁷ Mk. 12:23, 25 (note τὴν δόναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ); Matt. 12:41 (=Lk. 11:32); cf. Lk. 9:8, 19; Jn. 11:23 f.; 1 Thes. 4:16.

⁵⁸ See the references in the two previous notes.

⁵⁹ A. Oepke, *TWNT* 1, p. 372. (The translation in *TDNT* 1, p. 372, needs correction.)

⁶⁰ E.g. Shemoneh Esreh 2.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

tradition is Jesus said to have power to lay down his life and to take it up again — and this power is the gift of the Father.⁶¹ The fact that Paul can use both types of formulation is not, as Wilckens holds, a sign of tension in his thinking, but rather a further indication that the thesis is false.

It might be argued against our view of the passion summaries that their phraseology is influenced by Hosea 6:2 (LXX) which speaks of "rising up" on the third day. But here there is no suggestion that the people rise up by their own power; the context makes it clear that an act of God is meant, and the MT in fact has "he will raise us up".

In fact we should expect the passion summaries to speak of God raising up the Son of man. C. F. D. Moule has drawn attention to the situation of the Son of man as one who is vindicated by God,⁶² and this fact should warn us against the tendency to ascribe too great a degree of independent authority to the Son of man.

[p.103]

Our argument is confirmed, finally, by the editorial work of Matthew and Luke. Wilckens draws attention to the way in which Matthew substitutes the passive of ἐγείρω for Mark's ἀνίστημι (Matt. 16:21; 17:9, 23; 20:19), but draws the wrong inference from it. Study of Matthew's usage reveals that he dislikes ἀνίστημι and avoids it.⁶³ He is not therefore changing the meaning of the passion summaries, as Wilckens holds, but expressing them in his own vocabulary, and possibly clarifying them. As for Luke, the fact that he does not alter the verb used in Mark 10:34 (Luke 18:33) shows that he regarded the two types of expression as synonyms.

(iv) We conclude that Luke's stress in Acts on the raising of Jesus by God is fully consistent with the teaching of the rest of the early church. The only new feature is the active use of ἀνίστημι. with God as subject, and there does not seem to be any other motive for this use than a desire for literary variation. There is certainly no reason to suppose that its use reflects an especially subordinationist tendency on the part of Luke compared with the rest of the early church; on the contrary the belief that it was God who raised Christ was well nigh universal in the early church.⁶⁴ Consequently, at this point also Acts faithfully mirrors the teaching of the early church.

VI

It is well known that Luke does not make particularly strong links between the death of Jesus and the offer of salvation in the preaching of the gospel. "The death of Jesus has no saving

⁶¹ A. Oepke, *TDNT* 1, pp. 370 f.; II, p. 335 (Jn. 2:19, 21; 10:17 f.).

⁶² C. F. D. Moule, "From Defendant to Judge — and Deliverer," in *The Phenomenon of the New Testament* (London, 1967), pp. 82-99, especially pp. 87-90. (Originally in *Bulletin of the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas* 3 [1952], pp.40-53).

⁶³ Matthew uses the verb only 4 times (compare Mark: 17 times; Luke: 26 times). In 9:9 and 26:62 the verb is taken over from Mark, in 12:41 from Q, and in 22:24 from the LXX; elsewhere Matthew does not take over the word from his sources.

⁶⁴ Luke does not imply that Jesus was "adopted" as Messiah by means of the resurrection.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

significance, and consequently Luke's christology completely lacks any soteriological content."⁶⁵ If this verdict is justified, there would be a decisive difference between the theology of Luke and that of the primitive church.

For Luke the blessings of salvation consist in the reception of forgiveness and the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). The latter gift is dependent upon the fact that Jesus has been exalted (Acts 2:33), and the former is offered "through his name" (Acts 10:43). Both blessings are thus dependent upon the fact of the resurrection.

This description of salvation is primitive in content. The phrase "forgiveness of sins" (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν) is especially characteristic of Luke and, by contrast, is rare in Paul (Eph. 1:7; Col. 1:14). But the appearance of a contrast is somewhat deceptive, since other equivalent phrases were in use; "justification" is the Pauline synonym.⁶⁶

[p.104]

Luke's "theory" of the objective means of salvation is found in Acts 10:43: "To him all the prophets bear witness that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name." At first sight this is a strange statement. Prophecies of forgiveness by the Messiah are hard to find, and the allusion to "all the prophets" seems highly exaggerated (cf. Lk. 24:27). The solution to the problem lies in two statements. First, in the Old Testament forgiveness is associated with the name of Yahweh, "the Lord". It is the prerogative of God; those who seek the Lord find that he will abundantly pardon them (Isa. 55:6 f.).⁶⁷ Second, the effect of the resurrection is that Jesus is exalted and receives the title of Lord (Acts 2:36). The conclusion is obvious: by virtue of his exaltation Jesus has received the prerogative of God the Lord to dispense forgiveness of sins (cf. perhaps Stephen's prayer, Acts 7:60). What is asserted of God in "all the prophets" can now be asserted of the exalted Jesus.⁶⁸

The soteriological theory of Acts, according to which Jesus as the exalted Lord offers salvation, is not peculiar to Luke. It is to be found in Paul in Romans 10:9-13 and perhaps 4:24 f., both of which probably contain pre-Pauline material. We may perhaps also trace it in the pre-Pauline "hymn" in Philippians 2:6-11, where there is the same silence regarding the atoning character of the death of Jesus and the same stress on his exaltation to be the Lord. Of a similar character is the brief "hymn" in 1 Timothy 3:16.⁶⁹ Although there is no explicit mention of forgiveness in these passages, they undoubtedly testify to the exaltation of Jesus to be the Lord who bestows salvation on men; it is possible that they reflect the worship of the

⁶⁵ U. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, pp. 216 f.

⁶⁶ For ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν see Matt. 26:28; Mk. 1:4; cf. Heb. 9:22; 10:18; for ἀφίημι see Rom. 4:7; 1 Jn. 1:9; 2:12. Note Paul's use of πάρεσις (Rom. 3:25) and χαρίζομαι (Eph 4:32; Col. 2:13; 3:13).

⁶⁷ Cf. Isa. 33:24; Jer. 31:34; 36:3 (negatively, 18:23); Ezek. 36:25; Dan. 9:19; Amos 7:2; also Exod. 34:7; Num. 14:18; 1 Ki. 8:34; *et al.* The fact of Yahweh's forgiveness is thus to be found in "all the prophets" and indeed throughout the Old Testament.

⁶⁸ Even before his exaltation Jesus had authority to forgive sins (Lk. 5:17-26 = Mk. 2:1-12; Lk. 7:36-50); it is in keeping with this fact that Luke calls Jesus ὁ Κῆριος in his Gospel narrative.

⁶⁹ Cf. E. Schweizer, "Two New Testament Creeds compared. 1 Cor. 15:3-5 and 1 Tim. 3:16," in W. Klassen and G. F. Snyder, *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (London, 1962), pp. 166-77. [Compare R. H. Gundry's essay in the present volume pp. 203-222, Ed.]

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

church rather than its evangelistic message.⁷⁰ What the hymns implicitly affirm is expressed openly in Acts: the exaltation of Jesus is the means of forgiveness.

What, then, is the place of the death of Jesus in the thought of Luke? Luke, to be sure, does not use the Suffering Servant concept (with which he is familiar) to express the character of the death of Jesus as a vicarious atonement. The same, however, is true of Paul who makes little use of this category of interpretation. What must be stressed is that there is no reason to suppose that Luke has deliberately suppressed references to the atonement which he found in his sources.⁷¹ Such passages as Luke 22:19-20 (the

[p.105]

longer text), Acts 20:28 and the references to Jesus "hanging on a tree" (Acts 5:30; 10:40; cf. 13:29) are sufficient proof that Luke accepted the theory of Jesus' death as a means of atonement.⁷² Luke is quite clear that the death of Jesus took place by the deliberate plan of God — it was not a human "accident" which God then turned to good account — and sees that it occupied a vital place in the divine plan of salvation. Nevertheless, he does not go out of his way to emphasize its soteriological character.

The question therefore arises whether Luke is in fact preserving a strand of primitive teaching in which salvation and forgiveness were closely linked with the person of Jesus as the exalted Lord who had been given divine authority to save men.⁷³ At an early stage in the tradition it would have been natural to see the resurrection as the divine legitimation of Jesus and his establishment as Lord with authority to save men. The earliest Christian confession was 'Jesus is Lord', and his position was based upon his resurrection (Rom. 1:3 f.; cf. Rom. 10:9; 1 Thess. 1:9 f.). The gospel tradition also shows plainly that the saving activity of Jesus and his authority to forgive existed before his death on the cross. It is tempting to see in Acts a further testimony to a time when the resurrection itself was seen as the saving event. From an early date, however, the death of Jesus was closely associated with his resurrection as the saving event (Rom. 4:25; Cor. 15:3-5). It is highly improbable that Luke should have "advanced" beyond this synthesis by denying or playing down the significance of the cross, and it is much more likely that he reflects an earlier stage when especial stress was laid on the resurrection. Thus Acts provides a further example of the "humiliation and exaltation" pattern found throughout early church theology.⁷⁴

VII

⁷⁰ I. H. Marshall, "The Christ-Hymn in Philippians 2:5-11," *Tyndale Bulletin* 19 (1968), pp. 104-27, especially pp. 124 f.

⁷¹ Luke's omission of Mk. 10:45 is due to his following another source in the parallel passage (Lk. 22:27); see especially H. Schürmann, "Lk. 22, 19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung". *Bib* 32 (1951), pp. 366-92, 522-41, especially p. 523.

⁷² L. Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Exeter, n.d.), ch. 3.

⁷³ Cf. the view of L. Cerfaux mentioned by U. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, pp. 77, n. 3.

⁷⁴ E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship* (London, 1960); H.-T. Wrege, *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt* (Tübingen, 1968), pp. 179 f.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

So important an event as the resurrection must rest on firm historical attestation. This is supplied in Acts by the witnesses who claimed to have seen the risen Jesus. But is Luke's view of the witnesses taken over from tradition or is it his own creation? We do not need to spend time in debate with H. Braun who holds that Luke has substituted for the earlier accounts of appearances to individual witnesses a set of generalizing statements about the appearances to the Twelve.⁷⁵ In reality, the "form" of a resurrection story is peculiar to the gospels. Apart from the special case of the appearance to Paul (not one of the Twelve!), the New Testament contains no narratives of resurrection appearances outside the Gospels; they belonged to the special category of "Gospel tradition" which is not handled

[p.106]

outside the Gospels.⁷⁶ Having recorded the appearances to individuals in his Gospel, Luke confined himself to general references in Acts (cf. Paul's procedure in 1 Cor. 15).

U. Wilckens goes further and urges that Luke had a special theory of the witnesses: the men to whom Jesus appeared and gave a special commission were those who had accompanied him from Galilee to Jerusalem, in particular the Twelve, and they had the special *heilsgeschichtlich* function of handing down the message of salvation to the people.⁷⁷

This theory is an exaggeration of the facts. In reality the Lucan concept is close to that of Paul. For Paul, an apostle is one who has seen the risen Lord, who has had a special call from God to preach, and whose ministry is attested by the fact of his converts (1 Cor. 9:1 f.; Gal. 1:15 f.). But these are precisely the qualifications listed by Luke (Acts 10:41 f.; 13:31), with the one addition that Luke is said to hold that the witnesses must have been companions of Jesus from the time of his work in Galilee.

Much has been made of this extra qualification, according to which Paul is said to be denied the status of an apostle. Paul, however, distinguishes between the Twelve and the larger, inclusive group of "all the apostles" (1 Cor. 15: 5, 7), and does not reckon himself among the former. It is also significant that he distinguishes between the Jewish mission carried on by Peter and the Jerusalem church and the Gentile mission carried on by himself and his companions.⁷⁸

In Acts Paul is not one of the Twelve, but he and Barnabas are called apostles in Acts 14:14, and it is too easy a solution of the difficulty to say that Luke has here taken over a source, perhaps absentmindedly. Further, a broad distinction can be made between the mission of the Twelve and their associates to "the people", i.e. Israel (Acts 13:24, 31), and that of Paul to the Gentiles (Acts 9:15; 22:21; 26:17). Thus the picture is similar to that in Paul's own writings.

The lines, however, must not be drawn too sharply. W. Schmithals undoubtedly exaggerates when he claims that Paul did not preach to the Jews. Paul's own evidence⁷⁹ is supplemented

⁷⁵ H. Braun, *op. cit.* (see p. 101 above).

⁷⁶ We accept in part the suggestion of H. Riesenfeld (*The Gospel Tradition and its Beginnings* [London, 1957]) that the Gospel tradition was a "holy Word", handed down in particular forms and channels.

⁷⁷ U. Wilckens, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-50.

⁷⁸ Cf. W. Schmithals, *Paul and James* (London, 1965).

⁷⁹ See C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 211.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

by the evidence of Acts (26:22 f.; cf 9:27-29; 24:21; 26:17, 20), where he is a *witness* to the Jews.

This leads H. Strathmann to assert that Luke is inconsistent in his use of the word, since Paul was not a witness in the sense of Acts 1:22;⁸⁰ but it is rather the case that Strathmann has overstressed the importance for Luke of the necessity of witness to the earthly ministry of Jesus. The centre of the gospel was rather the resurrection, and Paul was a witness to this.

[p.107]

Luke and Paul, then, are in basic agreement. Two differences, however, must be observed. The first is that the word "witness" is characteristic of Acts; Paul uses the verb of his own preaching only in 1 Corinthians 15:15, and he does not describe himself as a μάρτυς.⁸¹ The difference is largely one of terminology. The second difference lies in Luke's stress on "from Galilee", which is unknown to Paul. It seems probable that for Luke witness to "the people" had to be carried on by those who could testify both to the earthly ministry of Jesus and to his resurrection; since Paul was primarily concerned with preaching outside Palestine where there was less stress on the earthly life of Jesus in the preaching, Luke's narrower concept of witness did not concern him.

Luke, therefore, in reality is close to Paul in his concept of apostleship and witness. For both writers testimony to the resurrection by those who were witnesses to the risen Jesus was an essential ingredient in the preaching of the early church.⁸² It may fairly be claimed that Luke is here following tradition.

VIII

The result of our study is to show that Luke's presentation of the resurrection in Acts is firmly based on tradition. Our task has been the modest one of finding evidence for tradition. It has not extended to inquiring in any detail how far Luke may have modified that tradition. But sufficient has been said to show that Luke's dependence on tradition is greater than is sometimes asserted. The main lines of his presentation of the resurrection can all be attested as dependent on primitive theology, and consequently some limits can be set to his redactional activity. It has become clear that *Redaktionsgeschichte* must not be carried on independently of source criticism and *Traditionsgeschichte*, lest one be tempted to exaggerate the claims of either partner.

Theologically, we have established the important place of the resurrection in the early church as the decisive act whereby in accordance with prophecy God exalted his Son to be the Lord and revealed him to chosen witnesses in order that they might preach the good news of forgiveness in his name.

⁸⁰ H. Strathmann, *TDNT* IV, pp. 474-514, especially pp. 492-94.

⁸¹ See also 1 Cor. 1:6; 2:1; 2 Thess. 1:10.

⁸² T.F. Glasson, "The Kerygma: Is our Version Correct?", *HJ* 51 (1952-53), pp. 129-32.

I. Howard Marshall, "The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," W. Ward Gasque & Ralph P. Martin, eds., *Apostolic History and the Gospel. Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F.F. Bruce*. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1970. Hbk. ISBN: 085364098X. pp.92-107.

© 1970 The Paternoster Press. Reproduced by kind permission of the publisher.

Converted to PDF by Robert I Bradshaw in February 2005.

<http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/>
