

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1978

The Speech of James in Acts 15

Ronald Jones

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, chap8med@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jones, Ronald, "The Speech of James in Acts 15" (1978). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 567.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/567>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

THE SPEECH OF JAMES IN ACTS 15

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Ronald William Jones

May 1978

Approved by:

Walter H. Chavens
Advisor

Frederick C. Brighton
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE TEXT OF JAMES' SPEECH	6
III. LUKAN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SPEECH	12
IV. THE QUOTATION FROM AMOS	23
V. THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SPEECH AND THE FIGURE OF JAMES	37
VI. THE THEOLOGY OF THE SPEECH	50
VII. CONCLUSIONS	61
BIBLIOGRAPHY	66

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The account of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 raises many questions, especially in respect to that speech which lies at the heart of the chapter. One wonders why James makes the final speech at this council, since he has not played an important role in the book of Acts, and since Peter has spoken earlier in the council. One wonders how much authority James has, including the question of whether the $\xi\gamma\omega\kappa\rho\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ in 15:19 means that James issues a decree or that he only offers an opinion.

As one considers the quotation from Amos in Acts 15:16-18, he discovers that the text in Acts 15 differs from the text in the Septuagint, and that the Old Testament Greek text, in turn, differs radically from the Hebrew text. An explanation for the differing readings may depend on Qumran materials and rabbinic literature, in both of which the quotation from Amos occurs in Messianic contexts.

The decree in Acts 15:20 also raises questions, since some commentators have argued for an original reading with two or three prohibitions instead of the four as given in the Eberhard Nestle text. One's conclusion about the number of prohibitions may help determine whether the account in Acts 15 is unified or whether it is a conflation of two separate events. The implication of the prohibitions is also a matter of discussion. Many commentators have viewed them as a concession to

Gentile-Christians which freed them from the Law. Yet it is entirely possible that James, in the case of these prohibitions, is completely consistent with the traditional picture of a man wholly dedicated to that Law.

The research for this study proved worthwhile in discovering possible answers for many of these concerns. Other significant benefits were derived from this study. The research helped the writer discover that Luke was not only a theologian but also a highly competent historian who has treated James fairly in this account. This discovery has enabled him to call into question the "authoritative" judgments of many commentators that the speeches in Acts, albeit reflecting possible traditions, are really little more than literary compositions of Luke. In turn, the research has enabled him to see James in a new light.

One source of frustration is that the writer had to limit his research in order to bring it within the confines of this study. For example, commentators have written entire essays on the text of Acts, yet this study has treated the text of the speech in relatively few pages. One very interesting question raised by some early readers remains unanswered: Why did James choose the passage from Amos to make his point about the conversion of the Gentiles? These same readers offered their own choices of passages which James might have used, but no one chose this particular quotation from Amos.

Sufficient material remains, however, for the study at hand. In order to address the problems raised by the speech of James, the study has attempted to proceed in a logical fashion, often building its conclusions one step at a time. Chapter II, therefore, deals with the text of the speech, analyzing the variant readings and giving particular

attention to the readings of Codex Bezae over against the more "neutral" texts.

Chapter III responds to the statements of commentators like Ernst Haenchen and Martin Dibelius that the speeches in Acts, no matter how much or little tradition may lie behind them, are in reality literary constructions of Luke. The chapter investigates the possible Lukan characteristics of the speech while stressing a concern for the historical reality which lies behind both the council and the speech of James.

Chapter IV discusses the Old Testament quotation from Amos used at Acts 15:16-17, considering its reading in the speech as well as in both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text. It also views the Messianic understanding of the Amos passage in rabbinic literature and in Qumran materials. Furthermore, it discusses the possible textual traditions which may explain the quotation in the Septuagint and in Acts 15.

Chapter V offers a brief discussion of authenticity and of the classical models for writers of history. The chapter then presents the traditional picture of James gleaned from the New Testament and early Christian sources and points out how the speech in Acts 15 is quite consistent with this picture. This chapter also helps form a conclusion about the unity of the account in Acts 15.

Apart from any discussion of authenticity, the speech serves the purpose of the author of the book of Acts. Chapter VI, therefore, discusses the meaning and the theology of the speech. 'James' offering of Scriptural support for the inclusion of Gentiles in the church and for the possibility of their becoming a people of God is of importance for Luke, which may explain his appreciation for this early church leader. This chapter also offers evidence to support the contention that James

did not avoid the question at hand, namely, the necessity of circumcision for Gentile-Christians, but that he reveals himself to be a resolute and consistent follower of the Law.

It may seem strange that a speech which lies at the heart of one of the most crucial chapters in Acts has received so little attention. The commentators, quite naturally, treat the speech within the context of the council. Those who write about the speeches in Acts often make passing reference to the speech of James. Yet there is a surprising lack of bibliographical or journal material about the speech of James itself.

Nevertheless, commentators have treated the speech and offered their conclusions. The major sources for this study include the commentaries of Frederick F. Bruce, Hans Conzelmann, Kirsopp Lake and Henry Cadbury, Ernst Haenchen and Gustav Staehlin. Major studies which have provided data for the research include the works of Martin Dibelius, Jacob Jervell, Barnabas Lindars, J. C. O'Neill and Martin Scharlemann. The works of Bruce Metzger and Eldon J. Epp were particularly helpful in an analysis of the text of James' speech. Henry J. Cadbury's The Making of Luke-Acts proved thought-provoking and helpful in the chapters on possible Lukan influences and authenticity. Chapter IV deals with the work of J. De Waard, while countering his arguments especially with the proposal of Birger Gerhardsson that in Acts 15:16-17 James expresses a midrash on the Amos text. Major reference works which have proved helpful are the commentary of Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck and the theological dictionary of Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. To cite these specific works, unfortunately, is to run the risk of omitting the names of equally valuable and helpful writers.

The following are the tentative conclusions of this study:

1. The "neutral" text is to be preferred to the "Western" text for the speech of James. Codex Bezae, the leading representative of the "Western" texts, may well reflect a bias.
2. Jeremiah 12:15 and Isaiah 45:21 have not influenced the Old Testament quotation at Acts 15:16-18.
3. The original reading of the decree in Acts 15:20 had four prohibitions.
4. That the speech, as it stands, may well reflect Luke's hand in no way calls into question the authenticity of the speech.
5. Comparisons between the speech of James and the Epistle of James are inconclusive; they do not of themselves support or subtract from the authenticity of the speech.
6. The most compelling conclusion for the quotation from Amos at Acts 15:16-17 may be that James offers a midrash on the Hebrew text.
7. Those commentators who do not continue their inquiry into the Amos quotation beyond its importance for Luke have missed its significance for the argument of James.
8. There is no classical model of history writing for Luke. Instead, he follows in a line of Old Testament writers for whom history is a confession of faith.
9. The speech of James reveals him to be a man of great authority in the early church, including the confidence to utter a decree which he expected the apostles and elders to follow.
10. The account in Acts 15 is unified. It is not a conflation of two separate events.
11. Luke is both an historian and a theologian. While he has his own interests, he has also treated James fairly.
12. James has provided the Scriptural evidence for Peter's contention that God had willed the conversion of the Gentiles.
13. While alluding repeatedly to the Old Testament in his words, one unique and surprising element in James' speech is his juxtaposition of $\epsilon\theta\eta\eta$ and $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$.
14. James is a resolute and consistent follower of the Law. He has not avoided the question about circumcision, but has rather yielded to neither party in the dispute and has required of both Jews and Gentiles that which the Law demands of each.

CHAPTER II

THE TEXT OF JAMES' SPEECH

Two major manuscript families are extant for the book of Acts: the "neutral" text, whose chief representatives are Alexandrinus, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and the "Western" text, represented primarily by Codex Bezae. Their differing readings necessitate a careful analysis of the variants which occur in James' speech.¹

The very first one demonstrates the diversity of the two main families. The substitution of ἀναστὰς Ἰάκωβος εἶπεν in Bezae for the ἀπεκρίθη Ἰάκωβος εἶπεν of other major manuscripts in Acts 15:13 is important in light of the Bezae reading at 15:7. This manuscript states that Peter ἀνέστησεν ἐν πνεύματι ² καὶ εἶπεν . The Bezae reading at 15:13 seems to be an attempt to make Luke's opening remarks about James and Peter similar, thereby lessening the importance of James with the reference to the Spirit in the context of Peter's speech.

The Bezae reading at 15:12 further illustrates the attempt to diminish the role of James. The manuscript adds συγκατατιθεμένων δὲ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τοῖς ὑπὸ τοῦ Πέτρου εἰρημένους , giving even more importance to the words of Peter and indicating a

¹See Bruce Metzger, The Text of the New Testament (New York: Oxford, 1968), both for a discussion of the textual families and for basic considerations in textual criticism.

²Some lesser manuscripts add ἀγίῳ .

possible bias.³ This possibility does not solve the problem of the textual divergence; yet the reading of Codex Bezae at 15:13 has more than simple narrative considerations behind it. The textual evidence favors the reading of the "neutral" tradition.

The οὕτως in place of τοῦτω in 15:15 offers an example of possible dittography. If one reads the text as it likely appeared in the early manuscripts, the omission of the initial tau and the double reading of the following sigma create the variant. The manuscript evidence favors τοῦτω .

The substitution of ἐπιστρέψω for ἀναστρέψω in 15:16 occurs in the context of the Old Testament quotation from Amos. The Septuagint reading of Amos 9:11 is ἀναστήσω , giving support to neither verb. The use of ἐπιστρέψω and its cognates seems to be a Lukan characteristic,⁴ and the generally acknowledged influence of Jeremiah 12:15 on the Old Testament quotation may explain its occurrence in Codex Bezae. The evidence, however, favors ἀναστρέψω .

The reading κατεστραπμένα in 15:16 follows the text of Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and a few others, while the weight of evidence favors the Septuagint reading, κατεσκαρμένα .⁵ The former reading is more difficult; the latter most likely amounts to a correction to make the reading agree with the Septuagint. The reading κατεστραπμένα

³Eldon J. Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, no. 3 in the Monograph Series of the Society for New Testament Studies, ed. Matthew Black (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), p. 104 passim.

⁴Cf., Acts 15:3 and 15:19.

⁵The reading of Vaticanus exhibits small differences in detail.

also appears in Alexandrinus as a corrected reading of Amos 9:11. Luke seems to follow the text as it later appears in this manuscript.⁶

The addition of δ in 15:17 is of little consequence. The evidence favors its omission.

The shortest reading in 15:18 is that of the Hesychian or Alexandrian group, $\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha} \alpha\pi' \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$. The Western texts, notably Bezae, have the variant $\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu \alpha\pi' \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \tau\tilde{\omega} \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omega$ $\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}$; the Byzantine texts offer the variant $\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha} \alpha\pi' \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu \tau\tilde{\omega} \theta\epsilon\tilde{\omega} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}$. The general principle that one should prefer the shorter reading applies here.⁷

The generally acknowledged influence of Isaiah and Jeremiah on the Amos quotation⁸ has little bearing on the determination of the variants in 15:16-18. The occurrence of $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\rho}\acute{\epsilon}\phi\omega$, $\delta \lambda\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma \mu\omicron\upsilon$, $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\omicron\mu\eta\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ and $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ in Jeremiah 12:15 provides some possible conceptual influence but no precise verbal parallels. Likewise, there is a similarity of expression between the $\kappa\alpha\iota\omega\nu \tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\alpha$ $\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha} \alpha\pi' \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$ at the end of the Lukan quotation and the $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha} \acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu \tau\alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\alpha \alpha\pi' \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ of Isaiah 45:21, but the $\gamma\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha} \alpha\pi' \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$ may be a Lukan expression rather than a recollection of Isaiah.⁹

⁶Cf. the additions of $\acute{\alpha}\nu$ and $\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu$ at Amos 9:11 and Acts 15:17.

⁷Metzger, pp. 161-63.

⁸E.g., Hans Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, II Auflage, VII in *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Tuebingen: Mohr, 1972), 92, with the added note that a collection of *Testimonia* may explain the combination.

⁹Infra, Chapter III.

The remaining variants occur in the prohibitions given at 15:20. The first is a minor reading. A compound verb in Greek may or may not repeat the verbal prefix as a separate preposition. In the New Testament, the verb ἀπέχω appears either with the repeated ἀπό or with a genitive of separation immediately following. Vaticanus, Sinaiticus and Bezae all favor the verb without the repeated preposition, giving that reading strong support.

The second prohibition, καὶ τῆς πορνείας, is omitted in P⁴⁵, although this papyrus includes the prohibition at 15:29. The Ethiopic versions omit the prohibition, but not in every case. Origen may omit the prohibition, as he does at 15:29, but his readings at 15:29 are also inconsistent. The evidence favors its inclusion.

The omission of the καὶ (τοῦ) πνικτοῦ is consistent throughout the Bezae readings of the prohibitions, including the additional appearances at Acts 15:29 and 21:25. This omission, coupled with the addition of the negative Golden Rule in 15:20 and 15:29 by the same text, omits the specifically ceremonial part of the decree but leaves an ethical emphasis.¹⁰ These changes enable Codex Bezae to present the decree not as a ritual order but as a short moral catechism listing the three chief sins: idolatry, murder and fornication.¹¹

These variants may also reveal the distance of Codex Bezae from the Judaizing viewpoint expressed at the council and from the ritual and

¹⁰Epp, p. 109.

¹¹Friedrich Hauck and Siegfried Schulz, "πνίγω," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 6:592-93. Vols. 1-4 are edited by Gerhard Kittel; Vols. 5-9, by Gerhard Friedrich.

ceremonial questions which occasioned the decree. Instead the manuscript suggests the newness in the beliefs and practices of the Christian group as compared with Judaism.¹² There is good reason to believe, however, that the omission of both prohibitions is a secondary phenomenon, and that the decree with four prohibitions is more likely to be the original reading.¹³

In summary, an investigation of the readings of the two major manuscript families reveals considerable divergence and an apparent bias on the part of Codex Bezae. A preliminary look at the Old Testament quotation in Acts 15:16-18 seems to remove any thoughts of possible influence from Isaiah or Jeremiah, compelling the researcher to look for possible solutions elsewhere. Most important, the manuscript evidence seems to support from the outset a reading of the decree with four prohibitions.

Further support for the reading with four prohibitions will appear in the discussion of the authenticity of the speech and of the

¹²Epp, p. 110.

¹³Robert Smith, Acts, in the Concordia Commentary (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970), pp. 234-35. For support of a reading with two prohibitions, see P. H. Menoud, "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin, 1-3 (Cambridge: University Press, 1963). In support of a reading with three prohibitions, see F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1926), vol. 3: The Text of Acts by J. H. Ropes, pp. 265-69. Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. from the 14th German edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn, trans. rev. by R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), p. 450, notes the refutation of both the Menoud thesis and the Ropes thesis by W. G. Kuemmel, "Die aelteste Form des Aposteldekrets," in Spiritus et Veritas: Festschrift fuer K. Kunsdin (n.p.: n.c., 1953).

figure of James in Chapter V. Prior to that discussion, however, the paper will consider possible Lukan characteristics of the speech and examine the Old Testament quotation from Amos.

CHAPTER III

LUKAN CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SPEECH

The previous chapter considered the text of James' speech as a preliminary step in solving some of the problems stated in the introductory chapter. With this step completed, we shall now look at the text again in an attempt to discover possible Lukan influences on the speech.

The work of critics like Ernst Haenchen¹ and Martin Dibelius² compels anyone dealing with the speeches in Acts to face the question of Lukan composition or redaction. Some interpreters reject the possibility of Luke's editorial work and view the speeches simply as those of the indicated speakers. This chapter will discuss the validity of the arguments raised in support of James. It will also discuss those aspects of the speech which appear to be Lukan, without calling into question the authenticity of the speech and without rejecting the role of Luke in its composition.

The introduction to the speech in 15:13 is decidedly Lukan. He begins with a classical Greek construction, an articular infinitive with

¹Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. from the 14th German edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn, rev. by R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971).

²Martin Dibelius, A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature (New York: Scribner, 1936); Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Heinrich Greeven, trans. Mary Ling (New York: Scribners, 1956).

the accusative subject.³ Of nine appearances in the New Testament of *παρά* with the articular infinitive and the accusative subject, Acts has six. They are equally divided between narratives and speeches.⁴ The use of the verb *συνάω* is also Lukan, with Luke and Acts each offering three of ten New Testament occurrences.⁵

The simpler rendering of the text at this point is that of the Revised Standard Version, "After they finished speaking;" but the Eberhard Nestle margin offers another possibility. The reference to Acts 12:17 points the reader to Peter's silencing the group with a motion of his hand. Silence in response to a similar gesture takes place at Acts 13:16.⁶

The possibility exists that James stood up and motioned to the assembly. This would necessitate the reading, "After they grew silent (in response to a motion of the hand)." The determining factor is the antecedent of *αὐτούς*. If one believes that to be Paul and Barnabas,⁷ then the reading of the Revised Standard Version is more logical. If one

³Luke has the majority of the instances of the articular infinitive in the New Testament. See W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, eds., A Concordance to the Greek New Testament, 4th ed., rev. by H. K. Moulton (Edinburgh: Clark, 1963), pp. 679-80.

⁴The occurrences in narrative contexts are at Acts 1:3, 15:13 and 20:1. Those in speeches are at Acts 7:4, 10:41 and 19:21.

⁵The other four are Pauline.

⁶The verb at Acts 13:16, *καταλείω*, is unique to Acts and appears in the context of speeches in this verse and at 12:17, 19:33 and 21:40. A related verb, *ἐκλείω*, occurs at 26:1.

⁷E.g., Frederick F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), p. 296.

believes the antecedent to be the assembly, then the possibility exists for the second reading and a motion of the hand by James.

James begins his speech with the same words which Peter had used, ἄνδρες ἄδελφοί . The use of the vocative ἀνὴρ in this kind of combination is limited in the New Testament to Acts. The noun is often further defined by an ethnic reference.⁸ The expression used in 15:13 is frequent in the speeches of Acts, including those of Peter, Stephen, Paul, questioning listeners, Moses, synagogue officials and James.⁹

Hans von Soden views ἄδελφός as "one of the religious titles of the people of Israel taken over by the Christian community." Like the preachers in the Jewish synagogues, the apostles address Jews as brothers and, in turn, are so addressed by them.¹⁰ This explains the limitation of this kind of address to Acts, since this book offers speeches addressed to Jewish synagogue assemblies.

The verb which James uses in 15:14 to refer to Peter's speech is ἐξηγήσασθαι . Of six occurrences of this verb in the New Testament, five are found in Luke-Acts.¹¹ In earlier Greek literature, the verb was a technical term for the exposition of poets or of laws, for the

⁸ Acts 1:11, 2:14, 2:22 passim.

⁹ For Peter, Acts 1:16, 2:29 and 15:7; for Stephen, 7:2; for Paul, nine times in Acts; for questioning listeners, 2:37; for Moses, in Stephen's speech at 7:26; for synagogue officials, in a quoted message to Paul at 13:15; and for James, 15:13.

¹⁰ Hans Freiherr von Soden, "ἄδελφός," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 1:145. Hereafter cited as TDNT. Jacob Jervell, Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), p. 50, expresses the view that Luke avoids the use of ἄδελφός for the Gentiles.

¹¹ Luke 24:35, Acts 10:8, 15:12, 15:14, 21:19; cf. John 1:18.

religious teaching of priests and for revelations from the gods.¹² Luke consistently uses the verb to speak of relating God's acts of revelation. Peter had recalled one act (ἐξηγήσατο), the Cornelius experience. Paul and Barnabas had reported (ἐξηγουμένων) the signs and wonders which God had performed among the Gentiles. Now James summarizes Peter's recounting of his experience with the same verb.

The verb which follows in 15:15, ἐπισκέπτομαι, is again markedly Lukan. Seven of eleven New Testament appearances are given in Luke-Acts.¹³ In Luke 1:68 Luke cites words of Zechariah: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited (ἐπεσκέψατο) and redeemed his people." This passage is noteworthy because its concern is with God's λαός, as at Acts 15:14.¹⁴

Although Chapter IV will consider in detail the Old Testament quotation at 15:16-17, the concluding words at 15:18 require attention at this point. Commentators differ on the question as to where the quotation ends. Some include 15:18 in the quotation, while others end the

¹²Friedrich Buechsel, "ἐξηγέσθαι," TDNT, 2:908. Thus Plato (*Leges* VII 802c) speaks of those who ἐξηγουμένους δὲ τὰ τοῦ νομοθέτου βουλήματα; Lysias (6.10) calls the priests of Eleusis the ones who made oral pronouncements (ἐξηγοῦνται) and who were the repositories of traditional customs.

¹³Luke 1:68, 1:78, 7:16; Acts 6:3, 7:23, 15:14, 15:36. The verb appears elsewhere in the Gospels only in Matthew (25:36 and 25:43) where the subject is man rather than God.

¹⁴A similar concern is evident at Luke 1:78 and 7:16. See Frederick F. Bruce, *Commentary on the Books of Acts*; in the *New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955), pp. 309-10.

citation after the ποίων ταῦτα.¹⁵ The final γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος certainly seems Lukan. The verbal adjective γνωστός occurs in Luke-Acts twelve out of fourteen times in the New Testament. Acts alone has the adjective ten times, including three in narratives and seven in speeches.¹⁶

The prepositional phrase at the end of 15:18 is unique to Luke in the New Testament.¹⁷ The noun αἰών appears with ἀπό only three times in the New Testament, once in Luke and twice in Acts. All three references deal with revelation in the past. According to 15:18 God had made the mission to the Gentiles known from earliest times. In Acts 3:21 Peter speaks of what God had spoken through His holy prophets ἀπ' αἰῶνος. In Luke 1:70 Zechariah proclaims in the Benedictus the deeds which God had performed for His people, "as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets ἀπ' αἰῶνος." The last reference is striking since this canticle and the opening words of James' speech have similar expressions.

¹⁵R. P. C. Hanson, The Acts in the Revised Standard Version, in the New Clarendon Bible (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), p. 162, lists three possibilities: the verse is a comment of James; it is a confused memory of a Scriptural tag; it is an appearance of an otherwise unknown gloss in the Greek text of Amos. Henry J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), p. 192 (note 24), supports the notion of Lukan composition and cites Acts 2:19, 8:21-23 and passim in the canticles for similar expansions of Old Testament quotations by Luke.

¹⁶The three narrative occurrences are at Acts 1:19, 9:42 and 19:17, all in the expression γνωστὸν ἔγενετο. The seven in speeches are at 2:14, 4:10, 13:38, 28:28 (all with the expression γνωστὸν ἔστω), 4:16, 15:18 and 28:22.

¹⁷The uniqueness of the expression supports the view that this tag is Luke's and not a reference to Isaiah 45:21. This weakens the arguments of Conzelmann (*Supra*, p. 8, note 8); Alfred Wikenhauser, Die Apostelgeschichte, Vierte Auflage, Band 5 in Regensburger Neues Testament, herausgegeben von Alfred Wikenhauser und Otto Kuss (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1961), p. 173; and Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), p. 35 (note 3).

Eighteen of the thirty-five instances given in the New Testament of the verb *ἐπιστρέφω* occur in Luke-Acts. The two in the words of the angel to Zechariah are noteworthy: "And he will turn (*ἐπιστρέψει*) many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God (*ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν*); and he will go before him . . . to turn (*ἐπιστρέψει*) the hearts of the fathers to the children . . . to make ready for the Lord a people (*κυρίῳ λαόν*) prepared" (Luke 1:16-17). James had already spoken in his speech of a people from the Gentiles for God's name; in Acts 15:19 he describes those Gentiles who turn to God.

A cognate of *ἐπιστρέφω* appeared earlier in Acts 15. In 15:3 Paul and Barnabas tell the Jewish-Christian churches in Phoenicia and Samaria about the *ἐπιστροφή* of the Gentiles. In Peter's speech (15:7) the faith response of the Gentiles seems equivalent to conversion. In 15:19 James speaks of the Gentiles being converted to God.¹⁸

The Old Testament figure of Moses (15:21) plays a significant role in Luke-Acts. The proper name appears twenty-nine times of seventy-nine occurrences in the New Testament. While there are references to the historical leader of Israel,¹⁹ the name also appears as part of the larger expression, Moses and the prophets.²⁰ In this verse, as elsewhere in Acts,²¹ Moses is personified as referring to a portion of Scripture.

¹⁸Georg Bertram, "*ἐπιστρέφω*," *TDNT*, 7:728.

¹⁹See especially, Stephen's speech in Acts 7.

²⁰Luke 16:29, 16:31, 24:27, Acts 26:22.

²¹Acts 3:22, 6:11, 21:21, 26:22; cf. 15:1,5.

The preposition *κατά* occurs twice in 15:21, the first time with the accusative as a distributive of place. Such a construction is not uncommon in Acts, as 2:46b, 5:42, 8:3 and 22:19 reveal. The phrase *κατά πόλιν* is limited in the New Testament to Luke-Acts with the single exception of Titus 1:5. The phrase occurs in Luke-Acts seven times.²²

The final word of James' speech is a form of the verb *ἀναγινώσκω*. This verb may recall the *κηρύσσειν* earlier in the verse and is here used specifically of the Scripture reading in the synagogue service. Acts 13:27 provides a parallel to the closing phrase of James' speech. Paul was there speaking at Pisidian Antioch and included the phrase, "the utterances of the prophets which are read every sabbath" (*τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας*).²³

The data demonstrate that the speech of James contains words and phrases which are not unfamiliar to Luke and which he has used in other contexts. This does not prove that James did not speak these words or that Luke created them. It raises the possibility that Luke used vocabulary most familiar to him in giving an abbreviated version of the speech. For example, Luke-Acts has five of the six New Testament occurrences of the verb *ἐξηγέσθαι*, seven of eleven of the verb *ἐπισκέπτεσθαι*, eighty-four of 141 of the noun *λαός*.

²²Luke 8:1,4,39, Acts 15:21,36, 20:23, 24:12. The phrase appears one additional time with the plural object at Luke 13:22.

²³Such reading was a normal part of the synagogue service, as Acts 13:15 and Luke 4:16-17 also demonstrate. See Hermann Strack und Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, Dritte Auflage (Muenchen: Beck, 1961), 4, Part 1, 153-88.

Lexical data are not conclusive, however. They may not even be very convincing when considered by themselves. One cannot always determine if a writer is using special vocabulary or if he could have used other words or expressions. Many of the terms used in the speech and elsewhere in Luke-Acts are not in sections where a synoptic comparison might shed light on the matter. One may say little more than that Luke used many of the words found in the speech more often than other writers.

Verbal expressions in the speech also find parallels in Luke-Acts. The ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί is a common greeting in the speeches of Acts. The close linking of the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι with the noun λαός may echo the canticle of Zechariah. The prepositional phrase in 15:18 is unique to Luke in the New Testament and is always found in the context of God's past revelation. The reference in 15:21 to the sabbath reading finds a close parallel in Paul's speech at Acts 13.

Those who reject the view of a single composer for the speeches in Acts attempt to support the authenticity of James' speech by comparisons with the epistle written under his name.²⁴ One is the ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἀκούσατε μου at 15:13 with the ἀκούσατε, ἀδελφοί μου ἀγαπητοί at James 2:5. The weakness of this argument is the imprecision of the parallel. James is not merely asking his audience to listen, but to listen to him.²⁵ The vocatives, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί

²⁴ See F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1933), "The Speeches in Acts" by Henry J. Cadbury, 5:411 and 414. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, pp. 296-97, cites J. B. Mayor's Commentary on the Epistle of James for "remarkable" similarities between the epistle and the speech.

²⁵ Infra, Chapter V for the authoritative implications of this construction.

and ἀδελφοί, are hardly parallel. The first is a common address in speeches, while the second is more common in the New Testament epistles as a term for members of the Christian community.

Another comparison is the use of the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι at 15:14 and James 1:27. The epistle does not speak of God's providential visitation, however, but of true religion. Another comparison is the reference to the calling of God's name over someone at Acts 15:17 and James 2:7. This might be the strongest argument, but the related expression occurs four other times in Acts. Those who support the connection with James have even gone outside the speech to note the exceptional use of the verb χαίρειν at Acts 15:23 and James 1:1. Yet χαίρειν is a common classical greeting at the beginning of a letter; one finds an additional use in the secular letter from Claudius Lysias to Felix at Acts 23:26.

Comparisons between the speech of James and the epistle of James do not of themselves support the authenticity of the speech. One may make at least as strong a case for Lukan composition on the basis of the examples cited. The data offered up to this point have demonstrated that the speech of James contains words and verbal combinations which are familiar to Luke and used by him in other contexts. Other factors may also reveal Lukan influence.

The speech of James recalls the words of the Septuagint, a matter of particular importance in the speeches in Acts.²⁶ Such a recollection of the Old Testament is an important element in the artistry

²⁶F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1922), "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," by William K. L. Clarke, 2:103.

of a man trying to remind his readers of the link between the new church and the old covenant. Such recollections serve as "pieces of literary scenery" to provide the proper setting and background for this speech and this council.²⁷

Similarities in the structure of the speeches in Acts also exist. Although James' speech does not fall into Eduard Schweizer's category of missionary sermons, one can note the presence in this context of the appeal for attention, the direct address and the Scriptural proof.²⁸

The data offered support the view that the speech of James as it stands in the book of Acts reflects Luke's hand. This does not negate the authenticity of the speech, a caution sounded even by those who view the speech as something of a Lukan composition or even creation. Henry Cadbury says quite simply, "It would be erroneous to suppose that no actual tradition was ever represented in the speeches."²⁹

Dibelius, commenting on some of the problems in a comparison of the accounts in Acts and Galatians, notes that the explanation would be simple if one could ignore the question of historicity and see the author's hand in the composition of the speech. But in a note he adds, "I should like to say, 'If we deny the historicity of these speeches,' but we cannot go so far." His reasons for the caution are that Luke may have

²⁷Hedley F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of the Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, 1(1950):27.

²⁸Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, eds., Studies in Luke-Acts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," by Eduard Schweizer, p. 211.

²⁹Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 187.

known individual occasions, may have had data on what was actually said and who said it, may even have been an eyewitness in some contexts.³⁰

In conclusion, therefore, one must take seriously Luke's role in the composition of the speech. One must take with equal seriousness the historical reality which lies behind the speech. The address of James reveals Luke as an artist of no small talent, as one who writes history as an involved witness, committed to proclaiming the restored tent of David.³¹ He also composes history in such a way as to preserve authentic echoes of the way in which James presented his argument at greater length to the Jerusalem Council. The latter is the subject of the fifth chapter. The next chapter will consider in detail the Amos quotation as given in verses 16 and 17.

³⁰Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 165 (note 55).

³¹C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, Number 24 in the Biblical Series of Facet Books, gen. ed. John Reumann (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), p. 39.

CHAPTER IV

THE QUOTATION FROM AMOS

The third chapter considered possible Lukan characteristics of the speech but postponed any consideration of the quotation from Amos as given at Acts 15:16-17. This Old Testament reference, which forms the center of James' speech, is one of the more fascinating portions of the apostle's presentation. The quotation from Amos 9:11-12 largely follows the Septuagint and makes a point not given in the usual Hebrew text. For many commentators, this use of the Greek text to supply Scriptural proof suggests the Lukan hand and forces one to seek a meaning corresponding to Lukan theology.¹ Yet Charles Torrey, followed by Frederick Bruce, posits that even the Hebrew text would suffice in the quotation, since the tabernacle of David, that is, the church of the Messiah, would gain possession of all nations.²

This chapter will discuss the quotation from Amos, examining both the Hebrew and the Greek texts as well as the quotation as given in

¹E.g., Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. from the 14th German edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn, rev. by R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), p. 448; and Gustav Staehlin, Die Apostelgeschichte, Zehnte Auflage, Fuenfte Band in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, Zweiter Band, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich (Goettinger: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1962), p. 204.

²Charles Torrey, The Composition and Date of Acts, No. 1 in Harvard Theological Studies, George Moore, et al., eds. (Cambridge: Harvard, 1916), p. 39; Frederick F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, in the New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955), p. 310.

Acts 15. The chapter will also consider the Messianic understanding of the Amos quotation and consider the arguments of those who look to the Qumran literature as a possible source for James' use of this quotation.

In the original setting, the prophet declared a message of doom upon all sinful nations, including Israel (Amos 9:7-10). The closing verses of the book, sometimes considered to be an addition from the exilic or early post-exilic period,³ constitute a prophecy of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom. The earlier oracles of the prophet had also referred to God's gracious dealings with His people.⁴ In this closing oracle, the point of the speaker is that God will restore the Davidic dynasty so that it may possess the remnant of Edom and of all the other nations.

The Septuagint, or that version of the Hebrew which would be the source of the extant reading,⁵ gives a different perspective. The direct object in the Masoretic text has become the subject; the remnant of Edom (דִּי־עֲדוֹם) has become the remnant of men (דִּי־אָדָם); and the verb has changed from וַיִּשָּׂא to וַיִּשְׁמַח. These changes shift the emphasis from the conquest of the ἔθνη to their conversion.

Additional changes occur between the Septuagint reading and the quotation at Acts 15:16-17. For the ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ of Amos, Acts has μετὰ ταῦτα. For the ἀναστήσω of Amos, Acts has ἀναστρέψω. The τὰ πεπτωκότες αὐτῆς of the Septuagint is omitted in Acts, and the location of the καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω is

³Bernhard W. Anderson, Understanding the Old Testament, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1957, 1966), p. 379.

⁴Cf. Amos 3:12, 5:3,4,6,14-15.

⁵Torrey, pp. 38-39.

changed. Acts has the variant *κατεστραπμένα* for the *κατεσκαρπμένα* of the Septuagint. For the repeated *ἀναστήσω* in Amos, again for the Hebrew *נִרְפָּא*, Acts now has *ἀνοικοδομήσω*. The *καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος* of Amos is omitted, a fact which has possibly influenced the reading at 15:18.⁶ Acts adds *ἀν* and *τὸν κύριον* in 15:17, following the Septuagint reading of Alexandrinus. Finally, Acts omits the *ὁ θεὸς ὁ* of the Septuagint.

Stylistically, both the Septuagint and the New Testament have four *ἀνά*-compounds which emphasize the theme of restoration and rebuilding. The *ἀναστρέφω* in Acts 15 is used in an intransitive sense, "return" (cf. Acts 5:22). Chapter 10 of 1 Maccabees offers parallels. In 10:52, Alexander sends a message to Ptolemy: "Since I have returned (*ἀνέ - στρέψα*) to my kingdom and have taken my seat on the throne of my fathers . . ." In 10:55, Ptolemy replies, "Happy was the day on which you returned (*ἐπέστρεψας*) to the land of your fathers and took your seat on the throne of their kingdom." In both references *ἀναστρέφω*, or the related verb, occurs in the context of return to rule and power, as in the Amos quotation at 15:16.

The second compound, *ἀνοικοδομέω*, appears in the New Testament only the two times in this verse and is used with reference to the rebuilding of David's tent. The verb denotes the eschatological restoration of the people of Israel, a process in which God is the

⁶F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1933), *The Acts of the Apostles, English Translation and Commentary*, by Kirsopp Lake and Henry Cadbury, 4:176.

subject and Israel or the community the object.⁷ Barnabas 16:4 uses the verb in reference to the restoration of the temple. There is also a related Greek inscription: $\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\epsilon\iota\chi\omega\nu\ \tau\omega\nu\ \pi\epsilon\pi\tau\omega\kappa\acute{o}\tau\omega\nu$
 $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\lambda\eta\theta\eta\ \acute{o}\pi\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\eta\theta\epsilon\iota$.⁸

The final $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha$ -compound, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\rho\theta\acute{\alpha}\omega$, also deals with the rebuilding and restoration of a fallen structure. The Septuagint provides parallels in a variant reading at 2 Sam. 7:26 and at 1 Chron. 17:24, where the verb is used in reference to the $\sigma\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ of David. The verb appears only three times in the New Testament, twice in Luke-Acts and once in Hebrews.

The $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\eta}\ \Delta\alpha\upsilon\acute{\iota}\delta$ of 15:16 refers to David's fallen dwelling as a poetic description of his ruined kingdom. Much discussion has been devoted to determining the meaning of $\sigma\kappa\eta\nu\acute{\eta}$ in this context.⁹ The Old Testament $\eta\kappa\kappa$, which it translates, is a booth of interwoven boughs which served as a rude or temporary dwelling.¹⁰ Wilhelm Michaelis

⁷Otto Michel, " $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\kappa\alpha\delta\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\omega$," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 5:139. Hereafter cited as TDNT.

⁸Quoted in William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, trans. and eds., A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. from Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen urchristlichen Literatur (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957), from Wilhelm Dittenberger, ed., Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum, 3rd ed. (Leipzig: Hirzelium, 1915), 454.12.

⁹H. Neil Richardson, "Skt (Amos 9:11): 'Booth' or 'Succoth'?", Journal of Biblical Literature, 92, 3 (September 1973):375-81, provides a summary of current thought and proposes the reading Succoth, viewing the city as a second base of operations during David's reign.

¹⁰Francis Brown, S. T. Driver and Charles Briggs, eds., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic, based on the lexicon of William Gesenius, trans. by Edward Robinson (Oxford: Clarendon, 1952).

does not believe that one is to think of a ruined palace or of a mean and dilapidated house in the reference at Amos 9:11, but rather of a finely matted structure in which the king lived and held audience when in camp.¹¹ Judg. 7:13 offers a parallel: ". . . a cake of barley bread tumbled into the camp of Midian, and came to the tent (σκηνῆς), and struck it so that it fell (ἔπεσεν), and turned it upside down, so that the tent lay flat (ἔπεσεν ἡ σκηνή)." ."

The καταστραπένα in 15:16 is from καταστρέφω, providing a verbal contrast with the ἀναστρέφω in the first half of the verse. The verb has a negative sense and is used in the Septuagint especially for God's destructive work.¹² The variant κατασκαρπένα is from κατασκάπτω, which means to "tear down" or "raze to the ground." The literal translation of the former is "ruins"; of the latter, "the parts of it that had been torn down." Behind the readings lie the Hebrew words חָרַב and הִרְסָה . The first means a breach. The reading of the Masoretic text at this point is "repair their (feminine plural) breaches." The second means a ruin. The reading of the Masoretic text is "his (masculine singular) ruins." The critical apparatus to the Masoretic text notes the changes of the Septuagint to the feminine singular in both cases to agree with the antecedent חָרַבָּה .

In the second half of the quotation from Amos, one finds the unusual particle ὅτι in conjunction with ὅπως .¹³ Although rare in the

¹¹Wilhelm Michaelis, "σκηνή," TDNT, 7:370. See also "πίπτω," TDNT, 6:162.

¹²Georg Bertram, "καταστρέφω," TDNT, 7:716.

¹³Friedrich Blass and Albert DeBrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. from the German and rev. by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961),

New Testament, the added particle reflects the Septuagint reading of Alexandrinus. The verb ἐκζητέω has essentially the same meaning as the form without the prefix. In Old Testament usage one seeks the Lord in order to serve Him. To seek the Lord denotes specifically the attitude of the righteous as he seeks after God and is concerned about His grace.¹⁴

In the Hebrew text at Amos 9:12, the context of this verb speaks of the conquest of the surrounding nations by the restored Davidic dynasty. The verb שָׁרַף means to take possession of, especially by force. The verb often has the collateral idea of taking in the place of someone else. At 9:12 the verb is used with reference to a people who in some way become the heir of the other nations and so dispossess them.¹⁵ Even with the changes at Acts 15, the Jewish-Christian listener might well think of the Gentiles as the spiritual heirs of the Jews to whom the Christian mission now extends.

The substantive adjective κατάλοιπος is a New Testament hapax legomenon; yet the concept of the remnant is important for both Old and New Testament thought. The remnant has decisive significance within prophetic proclamation, as first seen in its developed form in Amos. The prophet first announces the complete destruction of the

369.5. The readings of Luke 2:35 and Rom. 3:4 refute De Zwann's statement that the use of ἄν after ὅπως is peculiar to Acts. His further statement that the connection of the two particles is a reflection of literary Greek does not take into account the reading of Amos 9:12 in Alexandrinus. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1922), "The Use of the Greek Language in Acts," by J. De Zwann, 2:33.

¹⁴ Heinrich Greeven, "ἐκζητέω," TDNT, 2:894.

¹⁵ Brown, Driver, Briggs, Hebrew and English Lexicon.

people of God (Amos 8, 9:1-5); then promises the salvation which God will grant the people (9:11-15); and finally proclaims the opportunity for the people to save its existence by undertaking to seek God (5:6,14; cf. 9:12).¹⁶ The speech of James includes the promise of restoration and the proclamation of the opportunity to seek God, but the remnant now includes the Gentiles.

Bruce suggests the possibility that the καί at Acts 15:17 is epexegetical, "that is to say . . .".¹⁷ Parallelism, intrinsic to Hebrew poetry, certainly allows for that possibility, thereby equating the remnant of men with all the Gentiles.

The verb ἐπικαλέω means to name or give a name. In the passive and in conjunction with ὄνομα, the expression reflects the Old Testament concept of calling one's name over another to designate the latter as the property of the former. The expression is often used of God's name and may indicate ownership of a person (Jer. 15:16), a people (Amos 9:12) or even of an ark or temple or city. The common Old Testament practice of naming God's name over a man involved the belief that the man became God's possession because God had revealed and made Himself known. The Hebrew formula denotes a relationship to property, including a protective relationship.¹⁸ In 2 Sam. 12:28, Joab is careful to wait until David is available to capture the city of Rabbah, lest the city be called by his name instead of David's and so place him in a protective relationship which would be in conflict with the role of the king.

¹⁶Volkmar Herntrich, "λεῖμμα," TDNT, 4:198.

¹⁷Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, p. 310.

¹⁸Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "ἐπικαλέω," TDNT, 3:498.

The Greek expression occurs elsewhere in Acts, in every case in a speech.¹⁹ There are no parallels in the Gospels, but James 2:7, Rom. 10:13 and 1 Cor. 1:2 have the expression. In a developing technical use in the New Testament, those over whom God's name has been called are the believers.²⁰ In James' speech, God's name is also called over the *ἐθνῶν*, once again expanding the scope of the early Christian mission.

The *λέγει κύριος* which follows is the common Septuagint rendering of the Hebrew expression *יְהוָה אֵלֵינוּ*. The noun *אֵלֵינוּ* means an utterance and is often used before divine names, especially before Jahweh. Jeremiah, to cite the extreme example, has the expression 162 times; Amos, fourteen. With this expression the prophet cites the divine word given through him.

The first portion of the Amos quotation (9:11a) is a notable Messianic passage. The Talmud uses the passage to explain why the Messiah was called the "Son of the Clouds," based on a word-play between *בֶּן נֶפֶשׁ* and *נֶפֶשׁ אֵלֵינוּ*.²¹ In the Midrash on Psalm 76, one asks when God would be known in Judah. The response is the moment when God will have raised that tent, as He had stated in Amos 9:11.²² Martin Scharlemann cites the Genesis Rabbah in support of the rabbinical

¹⁹Acts 2:21, 9:14, 9:21 and 22:16.

²⁰Max Wilcox, *The Semitisms of the Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), pp. 76-77. See Staehlin, p. 204, for the view that the calling of God's name is the proclamation of the Gospel.

²¹Sanhedrin 96b-97a. Isidore Epstein, ed., *The Babylonian Talmud* (London: Soncino, 1935), Sanhedrin II, 654.

²²Quoted in Hermann Strack und Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, Dritte Auflage (Muenchen: Beck, 1961), II, 728-29.

understanding of the universalistic thrust of the Amos passage. The latter part of his quotation, however, which deals specifically with the whole world becoming one bundle, is related not to Amos 9:11, but to Zeph. 3:9.²³

The messianic understanding of the passage is not limited to rabbinic literature, however. The conviction that Essene and Jewish-Christian communities were living in the end of days enabled them to refer the sayings of the Old Testament to events in their own history.²⁴ Amos 9:11 is such a saying. It appears both in the Damascus Document (CD 7.16) and in 4Q Florilegium, which is a midrash on 2 Sam. 7:10b-14.²⁵ The closer parallel to the reference in Acts 15 is at 4Q Florilegium; the reference at CD 7.9-20 is not the natural one.²⁶

Developing interest in the Qumran literature has brought about some fascinating conjectures regarding textual traditions. Most commentators note that the Hebrew text of Amos 9:11 is not suitable for the proof cited by James; yet Hans Conzelmann, for example, alerts his

²³ Martin Scharlemann, Stephen. A Singular Saint, No. 34 in Analecta Biblica (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), p. 157. Genesis Rabbah LXXXVIII, 7. H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, ed., Midrash Rabbah (London: Soncino, 1939), 2:819.

²⁴ Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, eds., Studies in Luke-Acts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls," by Joseph Fitzmyer, p. 251.

²⁵ Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), pp. 279-281. For the texts, see Johann Maier, Die Texte vom Toten Meer, Band I (Muenchen: Ernst Reinhardt, 1960), pp. 56, 185.

²⁶ Frederick F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Text (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), pp. 77-78.

reader to the rendering of the Amos passage in the Qumran literature as applying to the end-age.²⁷

Max Wilcox has noted that the second *āvā*-compound in Acts 15:16 differs from the Septuagint, while the Damascus Document has a Hebrew reading in agreement with Acts. The further coincidence of the Acts reading with 4Q Florilegium demonstrates that this is not an isolated phenomenon. That the balance of the quotation (after "which is fallen") is largely from the Septuagint may suggest that an originally circulating element has been adopted somewhat to a new context.²⁸

Since Luke's usual procedure is to derive his quotations from the Septuagint, Wilcox further notes that Luke more likely employs other sources where there is no clear agreement. Ten times in Acts, including 15:16a, deviations in the forms of quotations and allusions find support in the readings of certain other sources, notably the Targums and the Samaritan Pentateuch.²⁹

Burkitt partially refutes Wilcox's view in responding to Torrey's hypothesis of an Aramaic source for Acts 1-15. He takes Torrey to task for not having brought out the difficulty of regarding the Acts citation of the Amos passage as being based on anything but the Greek. The original Hebrew reading is attested to by both the Targum and the Peshitta.³⁰

²⁷Hans Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Zweite Auflage, Siebte Band in *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Tuebingen: Mohr, 1972), p. 92.

²⁸Wilcox, p. 49.

²⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 51-52. The extant Targums date from the second century A.D. and later.

³⁰F. C. Burkitt, "Professor Torrey on Acts," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 20 (1918-1919):327-28. That this is only partial refutation stems from the fact that this article antedates the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Perhaps the most extreme view is that of J. De Waard. He finds that a careful examination of Amos 9:11 in 4Q Florilegium and Acts 15 compels one to raise the question of a Vorlage. While the text of the Amos quotation in Acts differs from the Masoretic text and the Septuagint, it is "exactly identical with that of 4Q Flor."³¹ He finds it even more remarkable that the introductory formula in Acts has its Hebrew equivalent in 4Q Florilegium and not in CD 7.16, although Fitzmyer finds the parallel at CD 7.19.³²

In Acts 15:17, De Waard has to admit that the Amos quotation differs from the Masoretic text precisely where it agrees with the Septuagint, but he posits that the Septuagint could go back to a Vorlage which had the variants. His arguments for postulating a Vorlage and a common textual tradition are based on the commonality of readings between Acts 15:16 and 4Q Florilegium. The text of Acts does differ from the Septuagint in the אֲנִי-compounds. According to De Waard, the Acts quotation omits the adjunct of time and has the introductory כִּי in common with both 4Q Florilegium and the Damascus Document.³³

De Waard's conclusion is that the identity of the two readings "nullifies all triumphant exclamations that a reasoning by James according to the LXX must point to a composition by Luke," and that the

³¹J. De Waard, A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament, vol. 4 in Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, J. van der Ploeg, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), p. 25.

³²Fitzmyer, "Jewish Christianity," p. 252.

³³De Waard, pp. 25-26.

Septuagint obviously had a Hebrew Vorlage which differed from the Masoretic text.³⁴

Although there are other instances in the Dead Sea Scrolls of agreement with the Septuagint against the Masoretic text, there are several problems with De Waard's argument. The exact identity of which he speaks is limited to five words of the Qumran text and only seven from the Acts quotation. The proposed absence of the adjunct of time ignores the μετὰ ταῦτα , which may well be a rendering of the τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ of the Septuagint. Furthermore, the καί in Acts connects ἀναστρέψω and ἀνακηρύξω .

Other explanations are possible. For J. C. O'Neill, Amos 9:11a in the Acts quotation is not uniformly from the Septuagint but a free and independent translation from the Hebrew. It is unlikely that any Hebrew text behind the Greek is especially related to the Qumran texts.³⁵ Georg Bertram suggests a double translation of the Hebrew נִפְּחָה to solve the problem of the ἀνά -compounds.³⁶ Birger Gerhardsson, whose work the next chapter will consider in greater detail, proposes that the quotation at Acts 15 is a midrash by James on the Hebrew text.³⁷

The quotation of the Amos passage seems to enable Luke to make a point by way of the Greek text which is not possible with the Hebrew.

³⁴Ibid., pp. 79-80.

³⁵J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting, 2nd Ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), p. 123.

³⁶Bertram, "στρέψω ," TDNT, 7:715-16.

³⁷Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity, 22 in Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis (Upsala: Gleerup and Munksgaard, 1961), p. 260.

The rabbis and the Qumran community understood the passage in a messianic sense, yet they would not have included the Gentiles among the people of the Messiah. James may well have understood the passage to extend to the Gentiles; the next chapter will consider him in relation to this quotation.

In Luke's understanding, God promises that He will return and in the resurrection of Jesus establish and fulfill the promise given to David.³⁸ The ambiguous word "to raise up" seems to have helped the first Christians to interpret this prophecy of a Davidic Son of God as a reference to the resurrection,³⁹ certainly a matter of importance to Luke but also of equal significance for James.

This chapter has taken a closer look at the text of the Amos quotation in the Masoretic text, the Septuagint and Acts 15. The differences in readings have led some to posit a Hebrew Vorlage for the Septuagint reading. This chapter has critically examined the arguments of De Waard and offered other possible solutions. The passage was important for the rabbis and the Qumran community, since it supported Jewish pride and ethnocentricity.

The statement is certainly significant for Luke, who sees in the Greek reading a reference to the resurrection of Jesus and to an expanded mission to the Gentiles. Many commentators, in fact, do not continue their inquiry into the quotation from Amos beyond the point of its

³⁸Bertram, "σπέρμα," pp. 716-17.

³⁹Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn, eds., Studies in Luke-Acts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), "The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background," by Eduard Schweizer, p. 190.

CHAPTER V

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE SPEECH AND THE FIGURE OF JAMES

In dealing with any of the speeches in the book of Acts, one confronts the question of authenticity. There are several ways to raise the question, each with its own validity. Did the speaker actually say what the book reports him to have said? Did the speaker actually make a speech in this context? Did the author insert a speech into the narrative, or is he including it on the basis of first or second-hand information?

When one has treated possible Lukan characteristics of the speech of James and considered the Amos quotation, one must either conclude that the speech is no more than a Lukan composition or look for reflections in the speech of the historical figure and situation about which Luke reports. This chapter will discuss the problem of authenticity, consider the picture of James as presented in the New Testament, attempt to discover how the speech in Acts 15 fits that traditional picture and draw some conclusions about the authenticity of the speech.

In the case of Luke, the question of authenticity requires an awareness of the practice and method of the historians of his era. Commentators on either side of the question of authenticity quote the words of Thucydides, who appears to be a classical model for writers of history:

With reference to the speeches in this history, some were delivered before the war began, others while it was going on; some I heard myself, others I got from various quarters; it was in all cases difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory, so my habit has been to make the speakers say what was in my opinion demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said.¹

Depending on how one interprets these words, Thucydides either made up the speeches to suit the occasion or--based on some type of information--recorded what the speaker may actually have said.

Other Graeco-Roman historians were not so conscientious, however. Tacitus, the Roman historian who postdates Luke, gives a speech for Claudius which an inscription has proved to be false. The differing attitudes among writers of history led Henry J. Cadbury to state that the prevailing custom among ancient historians was to insert speeches of the leading characters into the narrative.² This conclusion still does not answer the question of authenticity.

Other commentators proceed with more caution. In a criticism of Martin Dibelius, Roy B. Ward notes that if Thucydides was in any way a model for Luke, then one could rightly expect the speeches in Acts to express, at a minimum, "the general sense of what they really said."³ T. Francis Glasson notes that both Thucydides and Luke were writing about contemporary events, that both had likely heard reports on speeches

¹Quoted in Frederick F. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (London: Tyndale, 1942), p. 6. For the Greek text, see Thomas Arnold, ed., Thucydides. The History of the Peloponnesian War, vol. 1, 3rd Edition, in Bibliotheca Classica, George Long et al., eds. (London: Whittaker, 1847), pp. 22-23.

²Henry J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), p. 184.

³Roy B. Ward, "The Speeches of Acts in Recent Study," Restoration Quarterly 4 (1960):191.

at which they had not been present and had probably based others on personal recollection. In any case, there would be obvious traces of the author's style and no ipsissima verba.⁴

Cadbury counters with the statement that the ancient writers and readers considered the speeches more an editorial and dramatic comment than a reflection of any historical tradition:⁵

Neither the form of direct quotation nor the appropriateness of the words to the speaker and his occasion proves that the writer had any actual knowledge of what was said, or indeed that a speech was delivered at all.

Most commentators who look to classical models for Luke agree that the speeches are too short to reflect actual circumstances; that they are too similar in structure--and often style--to allow for any differentiation of speaker or occasion; and that, in context, they often reveal a later standpoint. In reading these data, Dibelius concludes that the speeches were an invention of the author.⁶ Floyd V. Filson, on the other hand, concludes that Luke was relying on genuine tradition or on his memory.⁷

⁴T. Francis Glasson, "The Speeches in Acts and Thucydides," Expository Times, 76 (1964-1965):165.

⁵Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, pp. 185-86.

⁶Martin Dibelius, A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature (New York: Scribner, 1936), p. 262. In his later work, Dibelius modified his view to allow for "authentic" motifs in the speeches, yet the author's own purposes still prevailed. Cf. Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. by Heinrich Graeven, trans. by Mary Ling (New York: Scribners, 1956), pp. 183-85. See also John T. Townsend, "The Speeches in Acts," Anglican Theological Review, 42 (1960): 150-51.

⁷Floyd V. Filson, Three Crucial Decades. Studies in the Book of Acts (Richmond: Knox, 1963), pp. 21-22.

Ward attempts to sum up the seeming impasse. While the contention that the speeches must be "free compositions of the author" is without foundation, it is also impossible to prove scientifically that they are reliable. If one compares Luke to classical and contemporary Greek models and to Roman and Jewish historians, one comes to the frustrating realization that this comparison leaves no clear-cut model.⁸

Finally, there is no evidence that Luke was influenced by classical historians.⁹ He did, however, follow in a line of Old Testament writers of history, men who were convinced that they already knew the truth about God and His relation to man. These historians wrote as persons who had already reached their conclusion and who needed only to illustrate and bear witness to it. In other words, Luke followed a line of historians who wrote history as a confession of faith.¹⁰

In any discussion of authenticity, one must consider the picture of James presented in the New Testament. There are relatively few references to him. He did not accept Jesus before His crucifixion (John 7:5), but received a special appearance of the risen Lord, even before the other apostles (1 Cor. 15:7; cf. Gal. 1:19¹¹). He took part with the disciples in prayer following the ascension (Acts 1:14). Peter mentions

⁸Ward, pp. 193 and 198.

⁹See Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 183, for the view that Luke must have read the historians, but that there is still no clear-cut model.

¹⁰C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study, No. 24 in the Biblical Series of Facet Books, John Reumann, gen. ed. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970), p. 18.

¹¹The natural meaning of the Galatians passage is that James was considered an apostle, undoubtedly because of the resurrection appearance to him.

him before the others (Acts 12:17), and Luke places him at the head of the Jerusalem church (Acts 21:18). Paul also names him before Peter among the Jerusalem authorities and calls him a pillar (Gal. 2:9). In the setting of the Apostolic Council, he speaks the final word (Acts 15:13-21).

The picture in these few references is that of a leader in the Jerusalem church. Eusebius and others in the early church support this leadership role. The question is whether the speech of James, with its possible Lukan characteristics, also reflects his leadership.

Luke's introduction to the speech may immediately demonstrate James' authority. The verb ἀποκρίνω may mean "to answer," although there is no immediate question or speech to which James responds. It may mean "to begin," in accordance with the Hebrew verb תָּחַל.¹² Yet the verb may have a stronger meaning, paralleled by the Latin responsa for legal decisions.¹³ This would mean that Luke views James as making a strong, authoritative statement from the outset. The difficulty with this view is that the removal of the verb from Codex Bezae, cited as an explanation for this understanding, is more easily explained in terms of 15:7.¹⁴

Portions of the speech reflect James' authority, however. The ἀκούσατέ μου of 15:13 occurs in the New Testament only here and at

¹²Friedrich Buechsel, "ἀποκρίνω," TDNT, 3:944-45.

¹³F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols. (London: Macmillan, 1933), The Acts of the Apostles, English Translation and Commentary, by Kirsopp Lake and Henry Cadbury, 4:175.

¹⁴F. J. A. Hort, Christian Ecclesia (London and New York: Macmillan, 1900), views the verb as a reply to the words of the Jewish party during the dispute of 15:7.

Mark 7:14 (cf. Acts 22:1). Perhaps the closest parallel occurs in the Transfiguration accounts,¹⁵ in which the Father speaks from heaven and says of His Son, "Hear him (αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε)." In these references there is the imperative of ἀκούω, followed by the personal object of that listening. James' words direct the attention of the listeners to himself as one speaking with divine authority.¹⁶

The phrase which may give the most significant insight into the role of James in the Jerusalem Council and his authority at that council is the ἐγὼ κρίνω of 15:19. The verb κρίνω may mean "to judge," "to think" or "to consider;" it may have the stronger force of reaching a decision. In Acts the verb occurs seven other times with the infinitive¹⁷ and three other times with the expressed subject ἐγὼ.¹⁸ Acts 15:19 is the only place in Acts where κρίνω appears with both ἐγὼ and the infinitive.

Friedrich Buechsel notes that the verb is found most commonly in legal contexts and that the Septuagint uses the verb for predominantly legal words.¹⁹ The question at 15:19 is whether James is using a legal term, thereby expressing his authority and announcing his decision to the Council, or whether he is merely expressing a personal opinion.

¹⁵Luke 9:35 and parallels.

¹⁶See Gustav Staehlin, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, Zehnte Auflage, no. 5 in *Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, Zweiter Band, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich (Goettigen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1962), p. 203, and Robert H. Smith, *Acts*, in the *Concordia Commentary* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1970), p. 232.

¹⁷Acts 3:13, 4:19, 16:15, 20:16, 21:25, 25:25 and 27:1.

¹⁸Acts 7:7, 23:6 (v.l.) and 24:21.

¹⁹Buechsel, "κρίνω," *TDNT*, 3:922-23.

The early church fathers may have sensed the former meaning in this verse and softened the phrase. Irenaeus, for example, has "propterea ego secundum me iudico . . .," while Ephraem has "et de hoc (quantum stat in potentia mea) confirmo verba Shmavonis. . . ." ²⁰ This softening of the phrase fits the pattern of other textual alterations in the Western texts to elevate the role of Peter and to reduce the importance of James. ²¹

Buechsel translates $\kappa\rho\iota\upsilon\omega$ in this context as "to think" and compares it with 2 Cor. 5:14. ²² Moulton-Milligan gives the verb at 15:19 this weakened sense, equates it practically with $\nu\omicron\pi\iota\lambda\omega$ and cites Acts 13:46, 16:15 and 26:8 as parallels. ²³ Of the passages cited, however, only 16:15 has $\kappa\rho\iota\upsilon\omega$ with the infinitive, and that is in a statement in which Lydia appeals to those who have spiritual authority.

Hort states emphatically that these words cannot reasonably be understood as an authoritative judgment pronounced independently by James. He believes that the context, particularly the statement at 15:22 about the actual decision, makes that interpretation morally

²⁰Quoted in Eldon J. Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, no. 3 in the Monograph Series of the Society for New Testament Studies, Matthew Black, ed. (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), p. 104.

²¹Lake and Cadbury, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 177.

²²Buechsel, " $\kappa\rho\iota\upsilon\omega$," pp. 922-23. The verb at 2 Cor. 5:14 is used with a direct object, not with an infinitive.

²³J. H. Moulton and George Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), p. 360.

impossible.²⁴ The decision in 15:22 is not to issue a decree, however, but to send a delegation.²⁵

The evidence suggests that James used this expression in the stronger, more authoritative sense.²⁶ The majority of the occurrences of *κρίνω* and the infinitive in Acts appear in contexts establishing authority. Acts 3:13 tells of the decision of Pilate to release Jesus. In 4:19 Peter and John call upon the Sanhedrin to make a decision. Acts 16:15, as noted above, is the appeal of Lydia to spiritual authorities. Acts 21:25 is the repetition of the Apostolic Decree. Acts 25:25 gives the decision of Festus to send Paul to Rome to be tried by the emperor. The two occurrences in Acts 20:16 and 27:1 appear in narratives, while the previous five are all in speeches or direct quotations.²⁷

The evidence strongly supports the view that James in fact expresses a decree in 15:19.²⁸ To be sure, the apostles and elders send this decree to the brothers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia under their own titles. This does not negate the role of James in the Apostolic

²⁴Hort, p. 80.

²⁵Jacob Jervell, Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), p. 203.

²⁶Commentators who have at least suggested the stronger sense of the verb include Lake and Cadbury, p. 177; R. P. D. Hanson, The Acts in the Revised Standard Version, in the New Clarendon Bible (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967), p. 162; and G. H. C. Macgregor, The Acts of the Apostles, in vol. 9 of The Interpreter's Bible, ed. by George Buttrick et al. (New York: Abingdon, 1954), p. 203.

²⁷For further support for this understanding of the speech, see the proclamation of the prefect Flavius Sulpicius Similis in the Oxyrynchus Papyrus 237, VIII, 30, and the decree of Hadrian recorded in the Aegyptische Urkunden 1074, 4, 8. In the latter, *κρίνω* appears with a series of negative infinitives following.

²⁸Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity (Uppsala: Gleerup and Munksgaard, 1961), p. 252, compares the assembly to a Jewish-rabbinic tribunal and supports a decision for James.

Council nor the fact that he expressed his authority as leader of the Jerusalem church in pronouncing the decree.

The picture of James offered by the New Testament references and by the early church fathers remains quite consistent if he actually issued a decree. James was an authoritative leader in the church, one who could express his decision and who could expect the church to support it. The speech also presents other data which support this possibility.

The fourth chapter of this study discussed the problem of the Amos quotation. De Waard tried to save the speech for James by positing a Hebrew Vorlage for the quotation.²⁹ Robert H. Smith noted that there is no contradiction of the basic intent of the Amos passage in the shift from the conquest imagery in the Hebrew to the universalistic imagery in the Greek.³⁰ Bruce noted that the Greek text would be kinder to the visitors from Antioch, and that nearly all the Old Testament quotations in the epistle of James are from the Septuagint.³¹

If there was a Hebrew Vorlage, James might well have used it, but no such Vorlage exists at present.³² The contention that there is no shift in the basic intent of the Amos passage from the Hebrew to the

²⁹J. De Waard, A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament, vol. 4 in Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, J. van der Ploeg, ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), p. 25 passim.

³⁰Smith, pp. 232-33.

³¹Frederick F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953), p. 298.

³²Martin H. Scharlemann, Stephen: A Singular Saint, no. 34 in Analecta Biblica (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), p. 158, cautions that James may have been familiar with some Aramaic version of this text which resembled that of the Septuagint (LXX) or may have become familiar with the LXX in the course of time.

Greek seems to ignore the shift in imagery. That James' use of the Greek text would have been kinder to the visitors from Antioch overlooks the fact that James is addressing the Jewish-Christian assembly in Jerusalem and that his use of the name "Symeon" may reveal him to be speaking Aramaic. The simpler explanation for the Greek text in 15:16-17 is that Luke has introduced the specific quotation at this point.

Yet one must offer this explanation with caution. James, for example, may here offer a midrash on the actual text,³³ applying words from Amos to the resurrection of Jesus because of the special post-resurrection appearance to him. If he had uttered such a midrash, the high respect for such interpretations by religious leaders would have guaranteed a transmission surprisingly accurate.³⁴ There is no reason to propose that Luke, who was personally concerned to follow "all things closely" in his written account (Luke 1:1-4), would be any less concerned about transmitting the authoritative word spoken by James.

Even if Luke introduced the Greek quotation into the context, this does not negate one very likely phenomenon. As a man known for his fidelity to the Mosaic law, James would have appealed to the Scripture in support of his contention. In the quotation he very likely appealed to the scroll of the minor prophets. In the decree he appealed

³³Gerhardsson, p. 260. A midrash is an interpretation of Scripture with application to a particular situation.

³⁴The eleventh chapter of Gerhardsson's work deals extensively with the theory and practice of the transmission of the oral Torah, a discussion which he later applies to the Jerusalem Council. Ibid., pp. 122-170.

to the law of Moses, specifically those portions of Leviticus 17-18 addressed to the Gentiles.³⁵

The latter observation leads to another likely conclusion. The speech presents James as a man totally consistent in his approach to the Law.³⁶ From a Jewish-Christian he demanded that adherence to the Law required of all Jews.³⁷ His encounter with Paul in Acts 21 demonstrates this aspect of his fidelity. From a Gentile-Christian he demanded that adherence to the Law required by Leviticus 17-18 of the "stranger at the gate." Fascinatingly enough, the order of the prohibitions in the official decree of 15:29 corresponds with the order in Leviticus.³⁸

This observation helps form a conclusion about the supposedly conflated nature of the account in Acts 15. According to Joseph Fitzmyer, the conflation is widely admitted today, and Luke has likely telescoped two incidents which were really distinct in subject and time: namely, a

³⁵Rabbinic scholars included the four prohibitions in the list of seven Noachian commandments, which each stranger at the gate was expected to observe in order not to offend the religious sensibilities of the Jewish people. See Hermann Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash, Dritte Auflage (Muenchen: Beck, 1961), 3:37-38. See also 2:721-22.

³⁶Neal Flanagan, The Acts of the Apostles, 2nd Ed., no. 3 in the New Testament Reading Guide (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1964), p. 78, notes the importance of James in a discussion of the status of the Law for the Gentiles, since he himself was a conscientious observer against whom no rabbi could find fault.

³⁷Filson, pp. 79-81.

³⁸The condemnation of heathen offerings, Lev. 17:8; the prohibition against blood, 17:10-14; the prohibition against things strangled, 17:13; and the prohibition against incestuous marriages, 18:6-18. So Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. from the 14th German edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn, trans. rev. by R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), p. 469, following the earlier work of H. Waitz.

consideration of the necessity of circumcision and a separate discussion of dietary regulations. He bases this conclusion on three factors:

(1) the composite nature of the chapter; (2) the problem in identifying Symeon; and (3) the lack of harmony between Peter's and James' speeches.³⁹

The inquiry into sources has led to no helpful conclusions.⁴⁰ The next chapter will deal with the identification of Symeon, the conclusion being that James speaks quite specifically of Peter. As to the lack of harmony between the speeches, this study has noted throughout that James is providing Scriptural testimony for Peter's contention about the admission of Gentiles into the church.

Other data support the fact that the account in Acts 15 is the report of a single council. Chapter II previously proposed and cited evidence for an original reading of the decree with four prohibitions. As just noted, the order of the prohibitions in the official decree corresponds with their order in Leviticus 17-18. The prohibitions are also precisely those directed to the "stranger at the gate." These data--coupled with the consistent picture of James in respect to the Law--strongly support the conclusion that the account in Acts 15 is a report of a single council, not a conflation of two separate meetings.

In this understanding of the speech and of the council, 15:21 fits more easily into the context of the speech. James is aware that the Gentiles who were turning to God could hear the requirements of the Law

³⁹Joseph Fitzmyer, "A Life of Paul," in The Jerome Biblical Commentary, ed. by Raymond E. Brown, et al. (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968), 2:220. See also Fitzmyer, "Acts of the Apostles," Jerome Biblical Commentary, 2:194.

⁴⁰For a review of the literature, see Jacques Dupont, The Sources of the Acts, trans. by Kathleen Pond (New York: Herder and Herder, 1964).

directed toward them in the synagogues, where the Law was read each sabbath.

In summary, James was an authoritative leader. He rightfully announced a decree that was in complete accordance with the Law. He would have and did appeal to the Scripture, both to the Law and to the Prophets. He quoted from Amos--perhaps in the form of a midrash on that text--to support the earlier report of Peter. He asked the Gentile-Christians to observe only that which was required of them. As a man to whom the risen Lord had appeared, it is not inconceivable that he would have interpreted Amos 9:11 in terms of the resurrection.

This chapter set out to consider the authenticity of the speech. It has attempted to treat with equal seriousness the speech within the historical context of the Jerusalem council as well as the role of Luke as a historian in reporting the speech. Luke works as a historian, subject to his own interests and concerns. He has treated James fairly and accurately.

This chapter also brought together data which support the view that the account of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 is about a single occasion, not a conflation of separated events. Working from this conclusion, and from the determination that James is totally consistent with respect to the Law, one can properly turn to the theology of the speech. That is the aim of the next chapter.

CHAPTER VI

THE THEOLOGY OF THE SPEECH

So far this study has dealt with the text of James' speech, isolated those items which may reflect Luke's hand, discussed the Old Testament quotation, considered the role of James in the early church and determined that the speech reflects the traditional picture of this man. There still remains the important task of discovering the theology of the speech.

James recalls the earlier speech of Peter in the Jerusalem Council,¹ which had referred to the conversion of Cornelius. James' words give Scriptural evidence for the statement of Peter: God had not only willed the conversion of the Gentile centurion, but had led Peter to be the instrument of that conversion.²

This was of utmost importance for Luke. Paul and Barnabas were not proclaiming anything unique in their report about the signs and wonders which God had worked among the Gentiles. They were adding to a

¹Gustav Staehlin, Die Apostelgeschichte, Zehnte Auflage, no. 5 in Das Neue Testament Deutsch, herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich (Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Rupprecht, 1962), pp. 203-204, notes that James almost ignores the intervening words of Paul and Barnabas and directs himself to the meaning of the Cornelius event. For F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, in the New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955), p. 309, the oversight may have been political.

²For Hans Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, Zweite Auflage, no. 7 in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament (Tuebingen: Mohr, 1972), p. 92, the speech of James places the case in the mouth of two "witnesses."

mission work begun at God's will and command by the early leader of the apostles. Nor were they conducting a ministry in isolation from the Jerusalem church and the Jewish-Christians who worshipped there. Rather, they were continuing a ministry begun by the early leader of that church and by one who was himself a Jewish-Christian.

No one could refuse the call of God, even when that led to something or someone considered unclean in traditional Jewish thought. Peter could not reject the vision which prepared him for going to the house of Cornelius. He could not ignore the experience which showed that the Holy Spirit had worked in the heart of some Gentiles. When Peter stood before the Jerusalem Council and told of that experience, James in turn appealed to Moses and the prophets to demonstrate that God had intended the conversion of the Gentiles without their first having to accept Judaism.³

In Lukan thought the ministry to the Gentiles did not constitute a break from the religion of the people of Israel. It was God's will, revealed by the prophets, that such a mission and ministry take place. It was His will that His chosen people should carry out such a mission. Paul and Barnabas had done just that; yet Peter had done it even before them.

Continuity with Old Testament revelation was as crucial for Luke as it was for James. From a theological perspective, it was important for him to show that the differing views of Christianity and Judaism in respect to the law did not break the continuity of salvation history. From a political perspective, any break with Judaism endangered the

³Cf. Jacob Jervell, Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), pp. 143-44.

religious tolerance which Rome offered.⁴ Judaism was a religio licita; if the Christian movement was a sect which had broken away from the synagogue, then it stood in danger of full-scale persecution from Rome. Luke's point was that Christianity was a legitimate form of Judaism and that the Gentile mission was part of the prophetic witness from the Old Testament.⁵

Luke's concern for continuity with the Old Testament helps explain his appreciation for the role of James at the Council. According to tradition, James was a Jew par excellence.⁶ His respect for and observance of the Law was widely known. In the most dramatic moment of the Jerusalem Council, he is completely true to his Judaism. When he speaks of the Gentiles, he asks them to observe those portions of the Law which had been directed to them in Leviticus 17-18. In Luke's portrayal, the brother of the Lord is consistent.

In his opening statement (15:14), James refers to Peter as Symeon. This does not appear to be accidental, although the original name of the apostle is written this way only here and at 2 Peter 1:1. James speaks

⁴Ernst Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, trans. from the 14th German edition by Bernhard Noble and Gerald Shinn, trans. rev. by R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), p. 100.

⁵Henry J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), p. 306.

⁶See especially Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, II, XXIII, 2, 4 and 20, for references to James as δυνατός of δυνατότατος. For an extended treatment of James, see Eusebius, The Ecclesiastical History, trans. by Kirsopp Lake, in the Loeb Classical Library (New York: Putnam's Sons, 1926), 1:169-79.

to Jewish-Christians in the Jerusalem church and uses the Hebrew name rather than the Greek spelling.⁷

The *πρῶτον* in the same verse may have no more significance than to indicate that the Cornelius experience was the first time that God had looked to the Gentiles for a people.⁸ On the other hand, there are repeated statements in Acts that salvation came first to the Jews, then to the Gentiles.⁹ If one views 15:14 together with the Amos passage in 15:16-17, and if one sees the fulfillment of that prophecy both in the accession of Jews to the church and in the Gentile's seeking of the Lord, then one may conclude that James here takes a position similar to that of Paul (see Rom. 1:16).¹⁰

James uses two verbs in 15:14 which are used also in the Old Testament with reference to God's people. The verb *ἐπισκέπτομαι* (Hebrew *תִּרְצֵ*) is at times used of God's gracious visitation in bringing salvation to His people. Ruth 1:6 uses the verb in reference to the *λαός*: *ἐπέσκεπται ὁ κύριος τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ* (cf. Ex. 4:31). The verb *λαμβάνω* (Hebrew *לָקַח*) also appears in the

⁷For Haenchen, pp. 74-75, the use of *Συραίων* may indicate that James spoke in Aramaic. If this is true, however, one must explain the supposed rendering of the Amos quotation from the LXX. Friedrich Blass and Albert DeBrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, trans. from the German and rev. by Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961), 53.2d notes that Semitic names are at times not Grecized if used of a New Testament person in a formal manner, but the occurrence here seems more intentional than the formal setting of the assembly would require.

⁸See Guenther Bornkamm, *Paul*, trans. by D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper and Row, 1971), p. 36, and contrast J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting*, 2nd ed. (London: S.P.C.K., 1970), p. 122.

⁹Acts 3:26, 13:46, 18:6, 26:20.

¹⁰Martin Scharlemann, *Stephen: A Singular Saint*, no. 34 in *Analecta Biblica* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968), pp. 157-58.

Septuagint with reference to the *λαός*. In Ex. 6:7 God speaks of His promise to take (*λήρψομαι*) Israel as His people (*λαόν*). In Deut. 4:20 Moses speaks of the historical fact of God having taken (*ἔλαβεν*) Israel out of Egypt to be His people (*λαόν*).

Even though Peter had alluded to the possibility of Gentile conversion, the juxtaposition of the terms *ἔθνη* and *λαός* in James' speech undoubtedly startled the Jewish listener.¹¹ The *ἔθνη* were those considered to be outside God's plan of salvation as revealed to Israel. The *λαός*, on the other hand, were those chosen by God who thereby fell under the protection of His covenant.

According to this speech, God chose a *λαός* from the *ἔθνη*. Epp notes that *λαός* in Acts refers to the Jewish people with the exception of this passage and 18:10.¹² This heightens the uniqueness of the phrasing. That the Gentiles are to share in salvation is not confined to this passage.¹³ That they are to become a *λαός* is surprising.¹⁴

Karl Ludwig Schmidt argues that *ἔθνη* at 15:14 is a case in which *λαός* and *ἔθνη* are used interchangeably. He cites John 11:50,

¹¹Already in the eighteenth century, Johann Bengel had called this juxtaposition an "egregium paradoxon." Other commentators have carried forward this view.

¹²Eldon J. Epp, The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts, no. 3 in the Monograph Series of the Society for New Testament Studies, ed. Matthew Black (Cambridge: University Press, 1966), p. 76. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 164, states that the use of *λαός* in Acts for both Israel and the Christian community indicates the identity of the two. This overstates the case; the anarthrous occurrences in the two passages cited by Epp are exceptions to the general usage. In terms of the speech, one need not sense an identity of the two, but the fact that the *ἔθνη* are now added to the *λαός*.

¹³Acts 11:1, 18, 14:27, 15:3, 7.

¹⁴See Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts, pp. 309-10.

Acts 4:25,27 and Rom. 15:11 in support of his view.¹⁵ Yet his conclusion contradicts the implications of this verse in the context of the Council. Peter spoke about God's appearance to one of the ἔθνη, not to one of the λαὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ. James pursues that thought.

Schmidt's parallels are imprecise, however, John 11:50 has τὸ ἔθνος instead of the more technical plural form. The two references in Acts 4 have the plural λαοί in quotations from Old Testament poetry, where their parallelism with ἔθνη does not support the juxtaposition in 15:14. Rom. 5:11 also has the plural λαοί in a non-technical sense. Interestingly, Schmidt later adds a section on the technical use in Acts of ἔθνη of the Gentiles as distinguished from both Jews and Christians.¹⁶

In James' understanding, the "people from the Gentiles" takes its place by implication with the people of Israel. Jervell agrees with this view and notes that the speech does not suggest the exclusion of Israel.¹⁷ Wikenhauser views the Gentile believers as a second people, created in addition to the Jewish believers who made up the first.¹⁸ By way of contrast, Williams views this people as a new Israel in the place

¹⁵Karl Ludwig Schmidt, "ἔθνος," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Friedrich, trans. and ed. Geoffrey Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 2:369. Vols. 1-4 are edited by Gerhard Kittel; Vols. 5-9, by Gerhard Friedrich. Hereafter cited as TDNT.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Jervell, p. 56. Cf. p. 72.

¹⁸Alfred Wikenhauser, Die Apostelgeschichte, Vierte Auflage, Band 5 in Regensburger Neues Testament, herausgegeben von Alfred Wikenhauser und Otto Kuss (Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1961), p. 172.

of the old.¹⁹ Strathmann views the new people as taking its place along with Israel but on a different basis.²⁰ Beyer believes that God created a new people from the Gentiles following Israel's rejection.²¹ Yet in the Council, James is addressing Jewish-Christians and citing Scriptural evidence for the inclusion of the Gentiles along with the traditional λαός τοῦ Θεοῦ .

According to James, God had set about to win from the Gentiles a people for His name.²² No precise parallel occurs, but in the Septuagint God had spoken of the people as His chosen ones.²³ The expression τὸ ὄνομα occurs as a parallel several times in the Old Testament, with particular reference to an ὄνομα for God's name. This expression assured the people of God's presence in their midst even though He was enthroned in the heavens.²⁴

Peter called on his experience with Cornelius in his speech; James appeals to Scripture. In 15:15 James notes that the words of the

¹⁹C. S. C. Williams, A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, in Black's New Testament Commentaries, Henry Chadwick, gen. ed. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957), p. 182.

²⁰H. Strathmann, "λαός," TDNT, 4:54.

²¹Hermann W. Beyer, "ἐπισκέπτομαι," TDNT, 2:605.

²²Nils Dahl, "'A People for His Name' (Acts xv.14)," New Testament Studies, 4 (1957-1958):323-24 notes the parallel expressions at Ezek. 36:24,28 and Zech. 2:15 and posits that the meaning of Acts 15:14-20 is clear if 15:14 is based on the Zechariah passage.

²³Deut. 7:6, 14:2, Ex. 19:5, 23:22. Dahl, p. 320, also notes that the precise parallel to "a people for His name" is found neither in the Septuagint nor in the Hebrew text. He believes this expression to be a standard idiom of the Old Palestinian Targum. Against this view, and in support of the view that 15:14 is an example of Lukan biblical style, cf. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 92.

²⁴E.g., 1 Kings 3:2, 5:17,19, 8:17,20 and 2 Chron. 6:7,8,9. See Hans Bietenhard, "ὄνομα," TDNT, 5:256-57.

prophets agree with the observation of Peter's previous speech.²⁵ The expression οἱ λόγοι τῶν προφητῶν may seem somewhat strange in this context, since the Old Testament quotation is most likely from Amos alone. The plural λόγοι is technically accurate if one views the quotation as a conflation of Amos, Jeremiah and Isaiah.²⁶ The noun προφῆται may mean the prophets as a group or as a division of Scripture.²⁷ Here it probably signifies the minor prophets. The latter meaning is supported by Acts 7:43 for Amos and 13:40 for Habbakuk.²⁸

The quotation from Amos provides the Scriptural proof for the call to the Gentiles. The concluding tag affirms that the Lord had made this call known from earliest times. This means that the mission to the Gentiles and their role in salvation was not new, but that God had revealed both long ago.

James begins his concluding comments with an inferential διό . There is some discussion about the connection between this conjunction and what has preceded it. Haenchen believes that the διό -clause is

²⁵William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, "συμφωνέω," A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. from Walter Bauer, Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen urchristlichen Literatur (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957), p. 788, offers a useful translation of this half-verse: "With this (i.e. with God's call to the Gentiles) the words of the prophets agree."

²⁶Barnabas Lindars, New Testament Apologetic (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961), p. 35, note 3, views the conflation as important in linking Acts 15 with the universalistic prophecies of II Isaiah. For a discussion of the limited influence of either Isaiah or Jeremiah on the quotation, *Supra*, Chapter II.

²⁷As a group, Acts 7:52, 10:43; as a division of Scripture, Acts 13:15, 24:14.

²⁸Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 326.

genuinely connected with the Amos quotation, if one understands that the Gentiles ought not be deterred by the law in seeking God.²⁹ Chapter V has proposed, however, that James in fact expects the Gentiles to observe that Law addressed to them. This conclusion weakens the arguments of Conzelmann, who states that God's people is to be free from the law, and of O'Neill, who views the decree as a working arrangement which included Gentile abstinence from the law.³⁰

Haenchen appears to be more accurate when he notes that the Gentiles were relieved of the burden of circumcision and other traditional prescriptions and prohibitions.³¹ The verb *παρνωχλέω* in 15:19 supports this view. Although it is a New Testament *hapax legomenon*, the verb appears frequently in classical and later Greek writers as well as in the Septuagint. James viewed the sheer multiplicity of the Law as an overburdening of the Gentiles, but he requires the observance of those prohibitions which the Old Testament addressed to the stranger at the gate.

This understanding of the four prohibitions simplifies the difficulties encountered with 15:21. It is unnecessary to list all the proposals for the meaning of the verse. Dibelius offers as the simplest solution the possibility that the verse is a marginal gloss.³² Even

²⁹Haenchen, p. 448.

³⁰Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, p. 214. O'Neill, p. 113.

³¹Haenchen, p. 449. See also F. J. Foakes-Jackson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 5 of *Moffatt's New Testament Commentary* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931), p. 140.

³²Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. Heinrich Greeven, trans. Mary Ling (New York: Scribners, 1956), p. 92.

simpler is the view that this verse follows in sequence the decree given in 15:20. James rightly expected that the Gentiles would and should observe those commandments addressed to them in Leviticus 17-18, for they would hear them as they attended the synagogue services in the various cities.³³

Acts alone mentions synagogues at Damascus, Salamis on the isle of Cyprus, Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Thessalonica, Berea, Athens, Corinth and Ephesus.³⁴ The implication of 15:21 is that this Jewish place of meeting was the location at which Gentile-Christians could hear the Law being read and come to an understanding of the prohibitions given at 15:20.³⁵

In this understanding of the speech, the decree of James is not a compromise between the Jewish and Gentile groups,³⁶ nor a concession to the Gentiles.³⁷ The prohibitions are not simply matters of expediency;³⁸ nor does the decree avoid a solution to the question of Gentile

³³Haenchen, p. 450.

³⁴Acts 9:2, 13:5,14, 14:1, 17:1,10,17, 18:4,19.

³⁵O'Neill, p. 82; Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts, p. 312.

³⁶Against Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (London: Tyndale, 1942), pp. 19-20; Neal Flanagan, The Acts of the Apostles, 2nd Edition, no. 5 in the New Testament Reading Guide (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1964), p. 79.

³⁷Against Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 92; Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, p. 97; Haenchen, p. 449; Friedrich Hauck and Siegfried Schulz, "παρεμία ." TDNT, 6:592.

³⁸Against Hort, Christian Ecclesia (London & New York: Macmillan, 1900), pp. 70-71.

obedience to the Law.³⁹ Jewish-Christians must obey that Law addressed to them, including circumcision. Gentile-Christians must obey that Law addressed to them and must avoid meat offered to idols, immorality, things strangled and blood. Observance of these prohibitions by Gentile-Christians would enable the two groups to live together as one church.

This chapter set out to discover the meaning and theology of James' speech. James provided Scriptural evidence for the earlier contention of Peter; namely that God had in fact led him to be the instrument for the conversion of a Gentile. God had even revealed the possibility of Gentile conversion in the Old Testament, a point supported by James' citation of the quotation from Amos.

The speech is replete with Old Testament allusions. The verbs ἐπισκέπτομαι and λαμβάνω were both used in the Septuagint with respect to God's λαός. The four prohibitions are directed to the "stranger at the gate" in Leviticus 17-18. Yet James no doubt startled his listeners when he spoke of an ἐξ ἔθνων λαός, a Gentile people which takes its place with the people of Israel.

A question about circumcision and the law had precipitated the Council. In the decree which he addressed to the apostles and elders, James revealed himself to be quite consistent in respect to the Law. He yielded to neither party in the dispute, but required of Jew and Gentile exactly that which the Law required of each. Gentile observance of that which Leviticus 17-18 required of them would protect the religious sensibilities of the Jewish people and enable the two groups to live and work together as one church.

³⁹Against Johannes Munck, The Acts of the Apostles, rev. by William Albright and C. S. Mann, vol. 31 in The Anchor Bible (Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), p. 140.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

The major chapters of this study have considered the text of James' speech, discussed its possible Lukan characteristics, looked at the quotation from Amos in Acts 15:16-17, touched upon the matter of authenticity, determined that the data offered in the speech are consistent with the traditional picture of James and investigated the meaning and theology of the speech. This chapter will draw together the conclusions of the study and suggest areas for further research.

An analysis of the text demonstrated the differing readings of the two major manuscript families: the so-called "neutral" text, represented by Alexandrinus, Vaticanus and Sinaiticus; and the "Western" text, whose chief representative is Codex Bezae. An investigation of the readings revealed an apparent bias on the part of Bezae, particularly in respect to elevating the role of Peter at the council and diminishing the role of James. A preliminary consideration of the quotation from Amos removed the suggestion of possible influence from either Isaiah or Jeremiah, necessitating a search for possible solutions elsewhere. The analysis of the text finally supported a reading of the decree in 15:20 with four prohibitions.

The work of critics like Ernst Haenchen and Martin Dibelius required an investigation of possible redaction or composition on the

part of Luke. Chapter III noted that the framework of the speech is decidedly Lukan. It then went on to present data demonstrating that words and larger phrases appear in the speech which Luke has used elsewhere. The difficulty in reaching firm conclusions at this point is that no synoptic comparisons are available to demonstrate whether Luke uses special vocabulary or if he could have used other words or expressions. Some commentators have tried to support the authenticity of the speech by comparing it to the Epistle of James. Yet the arguments which they use may serve equally well in support of Lukan composition or redaction. Other factors in the speech may also reveal Lukan influences; namely, the recollection of the words of the Septuagint and the similarities between the components of this speech and the components of the missionary sermons.

Chapter III concluded that the speech of James, as it stands in Acts, reflects Luke's hand. Yet this in no way casts doubt on the authenticity of the speech, a caution sounded by such critics as Henry J. Cadbury and Martin Dibelius. In short, one must view with equal seriousness both the role of Luke in the composition of the speech and the historical reality which Luke reports.

Chapter IV considered the quotation from Amos, where the use of the Greek text--at least for many commentators--immediately betrays the Lukan hand. Others have posited a Hebrew Vorlage to explain the difference between the reading of the Masoretic text and the reading of the Septuagint. The eventual conclusion of this study was that James may have offered a midrash on the Hebrew text.

The chapter also noted the importance of the passage both for the Qumran community and for the rabbis. The Hebrew reading supported

Jewish pride and ethnocentricity. Although both the Qumran community and the rabbis viewed the passage in a messianic sense, neither group would have included the Gentiles within the scope of the Messiah's activity. Yet James did precisely that in his citation of the passage. One may certainly appreciate the importance of this quotation for Luke, in light of his concern for the Gentile mission. Unfortunately, many commentators have not gone beyond its importance for the evangelist in order to consider the importance of the quotation for James.

Chapter V first considered the matter of authenticity and the attempts to discover a classical model for Luke. There is no evidence that Luke was influenced by classical historians; he did, however, follow in a line of Old Testament historians for whom history was a confession of faith. The evidence presented in the chapter also supported the view that James was a leader in the Jerusalem church with the authority both to pronounce a decree and to expect the apostles and elders to follow it. Of greatest significance in this regard is the *ἐγὼ κρίνω* of 15:19.

The picture of James offered by the New Testament and by the early church fathers is quite consistent if James actually pronounced a decree. It is also consistent with the picture of James that he appealed to Scripture in support of his position. He appealed to the prophets in his citation from Amos and to the Law of Moses in his enumeration of the four prohibitions.

His consistency further appeared in the fact that James expected of both Jew and Gentile exactly what the Law required of each. His encounter with Paul in Acts 21 demonstrated his attitude toward the Jewish-Christian keeping of the Law. His four prohibitions, drawn from those portions of Leviticus 17-18 directed to the "stranger at the gate,"

demonstrated his concern that Gentile-Christians keep that Law addressed to them.

This observation helped form a conclusion about the supposedly conflated nature of the account in Acts 15. Chapter V offered counter-arguments to the three factors cited in support of conflation: (1) the supposedly composite nature of the chapter; (2) the supposed problem in identifying Symeon; and (3) the supposed lack of harmony between Peter's and James' speeches. In addition to counter-arguments, however, the chapter also cited evidence in support of a unified council session: (1) the original reading of the decree with four prohibitions; (2) the correspondence of the order of the prohibitions as given in the official decree with their order in Leviticus 17-18; (3) the fact that these prohibitions are those directed to the "stranger at the gate"; and (4) the consistent picture of James in respect to the Law.

Chapter VI turned to the theology and meaning of the speech. James provided Scriptural evidence for the earlier contention of Peter regarding the reception of Gentiles into the church. Not only did James provide Scriptural evidence, but he also filled his speech with Old Testament allusions to heighten his argument that God had willed Gentile conversion already in the Old Testament. Even these Old Testament allusions, however, could not have prepared his listeners for the shock of the juxtaposition of $\epsilon\theta\eta\eta$ and $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$ in his speech. James allowed for a Gentile people which takes its place along with the traditional $\lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$; $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$.

James did not avoid the question which had precipitated the Council. Where others had demanded circumcision for the Gentiles, James demanded only that observance of the Law he required of them. He yielded

to neither party in the dispute. Jewish-Christians were to observe the Law directed to them, including circumcision. Gentile-Christians were to observe the Law directed to the "stranger at the gate," thereby enabling the two groups to be one church.

Given these conclusions, there are areas for further study. Perhaps the most important is a reconsideration of Acts 15 over against Galatians 2. In recent years commentators have generally viewed Paul as the historian and Luke as the theologian. This study has demonstrated that Luke is primarily a historian, necessitating a reconsideration of Paul as a theologian in respect to his account.

The figure of James is also a topic for expansion. The New Testament reveals very little about him; yet this study has proposed that he made perhaps the most significant decree in enabling the growth of a church composed of both Jews and Gentiles. He certainly deserves more appreciation than is usually given him. This may even necessitate some modification of the traditional view of Peter.

If one can sense the Lukan hand in the composition of this speech, yet make a strong case for its authenticity, another area for further study is the composition and content of the remaining speeches in Acts. Many commentators in recent years have shown the possible Lukan influences without making serious cases for authenticity. To allow for nothing more than vague traditions behind the speeches may be to do both the speaker, James of Jerusalem, and Luke, the evangelist, a grave disservice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. General Reference Works

- Arndt, William F., and Gingrich, F. Wilbur, trans. and eds. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated from Bauer, Walter, Griechisch-Deutsches Woerterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der uebrigen urchristlichen Literatur. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957.
- Blass, Friedrich, and Debrunner, Albert. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated from the German and revised by Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961.
- Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R. and Briggs, Charles, eds. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament with an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic. Based on the lexicon of William Gesenius, translated by Edward Robinson. Oxford: Clarendon, 1952.
- Epstein, Isidore, ed. The Babylonian Talmud: Sanhedrin II. London: Soncino, 1935.
- Freedman, H., and Simon, Maurice, eds. Midrash Rabbah. Vol. 2. London: Soncino, 1939.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, Henry. A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Friedrich, Gerhard, eds. Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. 9 vols. Translated from the German and edited by Geoffrey Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1974.
- Kittel, Rudolf, ed. Biblia Hebraica. 7th Edition. Stuttgart: Wuerttembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937, 1962.
- Liddell, Henry G., and Scott, Robert. A Greek-English Lexicon. New Edition revised by Henry Stuart Jones and Roderick McKenzie et al. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1940.
- Maier, Johann. Die Texte vom Toten Meer. Vol. 1. Muenchen: Ernst Reinhardt, 1960.

- Mandelkern, Solomon. Veteris Testamenti Concordantiae Hebraicae atque Chaldaicae. Editio Altera. Lipsiae: Margolin, 1925.
- May, Herbert G., and Metzger, Bruce M., eds. The Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrypha. Revised Standard Version. New York: Oxford, 1965.
- Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, George. The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Moulton, W. F., and Geden, A. S., eds. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th Edition. Revised by H. K. Moulton. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.
- Nestle, Eberhard, ed. Novum Testamentum Graece. Revised and edited by Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland. 25th Edition. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. II Volumina. Editio Septima. Stuttgart: Wuertembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Strack, Hermann, und Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash. Sechs Baender. Dritte Auflage. Muenchen: Beck, 1961.

II. Major Works

- Anderson, Bernard W. Understanding the Old Testament. 2nd Edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Arnold, Thomas, ed. Thucydides. The History of the Peloponnesian War. Vol. 1. 3rd Edition. In Bibliotheca Classica. Edited by George Long et al. London: Whittaker, 1847.
- Barrett, C. K. Luke the Historian in Recent Study. Biblical Series of Facet Books. No. 24. Edited by John Reumann et al. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970.
- Bornkamm, Guenther. Paul. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper and Row, 1971.
- Bruce, Frederick F. The Acts of the Apostles. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.
- _____. Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Text. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- _____. Commentary on the Book of Acts. In New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.

_____. The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles. London: Tyndale, 1942.

Cadbury, Henry J. The Making of Luke-Acts. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Conzelmann, Hans. Die Apostelgeschichte. Zweite Auflage. Sieben in Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tuebingen: Mohr, 1972.

De Waard, J. A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament. Vol. 4 in Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah. Edited by J. van der Ploeg. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966.

Dibelius, Martin. A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature. New York: Scribner, 1936.

_____. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. Translated by Mary Ling. New York: Scribners, 1956.

Dupont, Jacques. The Source of the Acts. Translated by Kathleen Rond. New York: Herder and Herder, 1964.

Epp, Eldon J. The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts. Monograph Series of the Society for New Testament Studies, No. 3. Edited by Matthew Black. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1966.

Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History. Vol. 1. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. In the Loeb Classical Library. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1926.

Filson, Floyd V. Three Crucial Decades. Studies in the Book of Acts. Richmond: Knox, 1963.

Flanagan, Neal. The Acts of the Apostles. 2nd Edition. New Testament Reading Guide, No. 5. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1964.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 5 of Moffatt's New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1931.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, Kirsopp, eds. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1933. Vol. 4 The Acts of the Apostles, English Translation and Commentary by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury.

_____. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1926. Vol. 3. The Text of Acts by J. H. Ropes.

Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript. Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity. Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. No. 22 in Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis. Uppsala: Gleerup and Munksgaard, 1961.

- Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles. Translated from the 14th German Edition by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn. Translation revised by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Hanson, R. P. C. The Acts in the Revised Standard Version. In the New Clarendon Bible. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.
- Hort, F. J. A. Christian Ecclesia. London and New York: Macmillan, 1900.
- Jervell, Jacob. Luke and the People of God. A New Look at Luke-Acts. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- Keck, Leander E., and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. Studies in Luke-Acts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966.
- Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic. The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Macregor, G. H. C. The Acts of the Apostles. In Vol. 9 of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George Buttrick et al. New York: Abingdon, 1954.
- Menoud, P. H. "The Western Text and the Theology of Acts," Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin, 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1963.
- Metzger, Bruce M. The Text of the New Testament. Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. 2nd Edition. New York: Oxford, 1968.
- Munck, Johannes. The Acts of the Apostles. Revised by William Albright and C. S. Mann. Vol. 31 in The Anchor Bible. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.
- O'Neill, J. C. The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting. 2nd Edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1970.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. Stephen. A Singular Saint. Analecta Biblica, No. 34. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968.
- Smith, Robert H. Acts. In the Concordia Commentary. St. Louis: Concordia, 1970.
- Staehlin, Gustav. Die Apostelgeschichte. Zehnte Auflage. Fuenf in Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Zweiter Band. Herausgegeben von Paul Althaus und Gerhard Friedrich. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1962.
- Torrey, Charles C. The Composition and Date of Acts. Harvard Theological Studies, No. 1. Edited by George Moore et al. Cambridge: Harvard University, 1916.

Wikenhauser, Alfred. Die Apostelgeschichte. Vierte Auflage. Band Fuenf in Regensburger Neues Testament. Herausgegeben von Alfred Wikenhauser und Otto Kuss. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet, 1961.

Wilcox, Max. The Semitisms of Acts. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. In Black's New Testament Commentaries. Edited by Henry Chadwick et al. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1957.

III. Articles

Brown, Raymond et al, eds. Jerome Biblical Commentary. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. "Acts of the Apostles," by Richard J. Dillon in vol. 2, pp. 165-214.

_____. Jerome Biblical Commentary. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968. "A Life of Paul," by Joseph Fitzmyer in vol. 2, pp. 215-222.

Burkitt, F. C. "Professor Torrey on Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, 20 (1918-1919):320-329.

Dahl, N. A. "'A People for His Name' (Acts xv.14)," New Testament Studies, 4 (1957-1958):319-327.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, Kirsopp, eds. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1933. "The Speeches in Acts," by Henry J. Cadbury, in vol. 5, pp. 402-27.

_____. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1922. "The Use of the Greek Language in Acts," by J. De Zwann, in vol. 2, pp. 30-65.

_____. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1922. "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," by William K. L. Clarke, in vol. 2, pp. 66-105.

Glasson, T. Francis. "The Speeches in Acts and Thucydides," Expository Times, 76 (1964-1965):165.

Keck, Leander E. and Martyn, J. Louis, eds. Studies in Luke-Acts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966. "The Concept of the Davidic 'Son of God' in Acts and Its Old Testament Background," by Eduard Schweizer. Pp. 186-93.

_____. Studies in Luke-Acts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966. "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," by Eduard Schweizer. Pp. 208-16.

_____. Studies in Luke-Acts. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls," by Joseph Fitzmyer, Pp. 233-57.

Richardson, H. Neil. "Skt (Amos 9:11): 'Booth' or 'Succoth'?", Journal of Biblical Literature, 92, 3 (September 1973):375-381.

Sparks, Hedley F. D. "The Semitisms of the Acts," Journal of Theological Studies, New Series, 1 (1950):16-28.

Townsend, John R. "The Speeches in Acts," Anglican Theological Review, 42 (1960):150-59.

Ward, Roy B. "The Speeches of Acts in Recent Study," Restoration Quarterly, 4 (1960): 189-98.