

The Journal of Theological Studies

JULY, 1923

NOTES AND STUDIES

STYLE AND AUTHORSHIP IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

IN the work on the Acts of the Apostles entitled *The Beginnings of Christianity* (vol. ii)¹—though it appears to be the intention of the Editors to allow for the expression of a diversity of views on various problems connected with the subject, and to leave readers to form their own opinion—a definite attitude is taken up in regard to one important question, namely, the value of *the evidence of style in respect to authorship* supplied by a comparison of the ‘we’ sections (Acts xvi 9–18; xx 4–16; xxi 1–18; xxvii 1–xxviii 16) with the remainder of the work and with our Third Gospel, to which in recent years so much attention has been drawn by Harnack’s *Lucas der Arzt* and subsequent works from his pen. On the historical and psychological problem whether, when the conception to be formed of St Paul’s character and teaching from the Acts is considered in relation to that furnished by his own Epistles, it seems possible that the former could have been given us by a personal disciple of the Apostle, we have in *Beginnings* two essays, one by Dr Emmet arguing ‘the case for’, another by Dr Windisch ‘the case against’, the traditional view. But we have no statement of the argument based on the ‘we’ sections by any one who is convinced that account must be taken of it along with other considerations in determining the question of authorship. The view of the two writers, to whom it is left to deal with the matter, is simply that the stylistic argument may be set aside as incapable of helping us to a conclusion. In certain paragraphs in *Beginnings* by Dr H. J. Cadbury (pp. 161–166) which the Editors have included in an Introduction largely by themselves, he calls it ‘a plausible but fallacious argument’ (p. 161), and maintains that ‘closely criticized, this argument appears fallacious, but in its method and principles rather than in the details’ (p. 162). And the Editors, though they offer no reasoned opinion of their own upon the evidence, clearly in the immediate sequel (p. 166 f) adopt his

¹ All the references in the present article are to vol. ii.

conclusion, and imply that henceforth that argument may be dismissed from consideration, and that for a decision as to whether the author of Acts was a personal disciple of Paul we must look virtually alone to a discussion of the general historical and psychological problem presented by a comparison of the Acts with the Epistles of St Paul. In accordance with this view Dr Emmet refrains from any reference to the stylistic argument in his 'case for the tradition'. Dr Windisch, on the other hand, does not shew complete confidence in Dr Cadbury's arguments, for he dwells on one stylistic question, viz. the 'abruptness' with which the first person plural is introduced in the passages of Acts named.¹ Moreover, his position is not that the stylistic argument is in itself a mistaken one, but that it is quite overpowered by arguments of another kind. He declares near the close of his essay (p. 344) 'that the so-called "lower criticism" is never able to solve such complicated problems or even to maintain itself against "higher criticism"'.

As I had myself long studied the subject of the authorship of Acts, and in particular after the appearance of *Lucas der Arzt* examined it with the greatest care, and had come to and published² a different conclusion from that of the writers in *Beginnings* whose opinions have been quoted, I have naturally desired to go over the ground again in order to see whether I was prepared to stand by what I had written. I confess that I approached it anew with some anxiety, realizing how hard it is to exclude any influence proceeding from what one may desire should be the result reached, and how consequently with the best will in the world one may have been prevented from judging with genuine independence, and I felt it necessary, therefore, to weigh again many considerations much pondered before. The fact, too, that Dr Cadbury and Dr Windisch have on their side a large body, and perhaps the majority, of critics still is enough to make one pause in adhering to the contrary view. Nevertheless, after examining what they have urged, I find it unconvincing, and it seems to me, and indeed I think it can hardly be denied, that it may be worth while that both the actual points at issue, and the questions of method involved in their decision, should be further discussed.

Dr Cadbury in one expression that he employs betrays some waver-

¹ pp. 329 ff.

² Perhaps as so much has been written on the subject, and as Professor Harnack is naturally now taken as the representative of the side favourable to the traditional view, I had no right to expect that any notice should be taken of, or even reference given to, my own work upon it in *Beginnings*. But it was not by any means a mere reproduction of Harnack. Though not nominally upon Acts, a discussion of problems connected with the Third Gospel necessarily involved that of Acts. See *Gospels as Historical Documents* pt. ii; *The Synoptic Gospels* pp. 240-322. It will be necessary for me to refer to this in the sequel.

ing. 'The comparative abundance of Lucan terms', he writes, 'in the "we" sections is not final proof that no source was being used' (p. 164). The word 'final' slipped in here, taken with his dismissal of the argument, suggests to one to ask whether he has sufficiently considered the nature of a vast amount of historical evidence. Probabilities not separately 'final' may, and often do, in combination produce conviction. The same query may be put to the Editors. I am not prepared to offer a 'final proof' on the subject of authorship, either by means of the 'stylistic' or the 'historical and psychological' argument, and I am convinced that it is not possible soundly to simplify the enquiry by eliminating either kind of evidence from the ultimate review of both in which our judgements should engage. From my own point of view it will be most convenient to consider first whether the arguments which the 'higher' criticism can produce render unsuitable any appeal to 'lower' criticism. I shall therefore turn now to Dr Windisch's article. I shall, however, defer the consideration of the remarks in that article on the 'abruptness' with which the 'we' sections are introduced in order that they may be taken along with Dr Cadbury's observations on the argument from style.

No student could suppose that the 'lower' criticism possesses so much interest as the 'higher', or that it can solve complicated problems 'of men's beliefs and actions in the past'. That is not its province. But it would be difficult, or rather impossible, to prove as a general proposition that 'lower criticism' must always give way to 'higher criticism'. Each may have a strength of its own in any particular instance. The probabilities as to the conclusions to be drawn from the one may support the other; or one may be indeterminate and leave the decision to the other; or they may be opposed, and in this case it may be the duty of the student to examine each, and endeavour to estimate the strength of each, afresh; or it may already appear clear that some alternative view can much more easily be accepted on one side than the other, so as to bring the two kinds of evidence into agreement. But we may dismiss the broad pronouncement in the words just now cited. As to the particular question of the authorship of the Acts, Dr Windisch's position virtually is that while the first person plural of the 'we' sections might be a fiction on the part of the author of the work, or (which he holds to be more probable) these sections can be regarded as extracts from a diary by a companion of St Paul, which the author of the whole has revised, as he has many other passages, on the other hand reasons may be given, founded on the purport of the Acts and a comparison of it with St Paul's Epistles, which are decisive against the view that the Acts could have been composed by a companion of the Apostle.

In order that room might be held to remain still for a careful enquiry into and appreciation of the results of the 'lower' criticism, it would be necessary only to be convinced that 'the case against the tradition' in respect to the authorship of the Acts cannot be established with the clearness that Dr Windisch plainly thinks it can, on grounds of 'higher criticism'. In proof of this it might well seem sufficient for me to refer to the arguments of Harnack, and finally to Dr Emmet's article in *Beginnings*, in 'the case for the tradition' in which he evidently endeavours to feel the full force of the objections that have been brought against it, and to meet them adequately. But it is too soon to judge whether, or how far, critics in general have been affected by what Prof. Harnack has written on the subject. Dr Windisch may be taken as still a representative of the position reached on the authorship of the Acts by the majority, or at least by many critics, if by that term we are to understand those who cannot be suspected of being influenced at all by conservative opinions. In common with others he has receded far from the position of the original Tübingen School as to the dates of the New Testament books, many of which they placed in the middle of the second century, and the large number of Epistles bearing the name of St Paul which are to be included among his genuine writings. But he adheres substantially to the Tübingen view of the relation of the representation given in the Acts of St Paul's course of action and teaching to the conception of them which is to be derived from St Paul's Epistles, and infers that the Acts cannot be the work of a personal disciple of his. There is no more interesting and important question at the present time connected with the history of the Rise of Christianity, and it needs to be kept persistently before the minds of New Testament students in general in order that as sound and well established a judgement as possible may be formed thereon. That is my chief justification for recurring to the subject, though so much has been written upon it. Further Dr Windisch's essay on 'the case against the tradition' does not seem to have been submitted to Dr Emmet before he wrote; I have had the advantage of reading it with care, and so of being able to examine directly the arguments employed by him which satisfy himself and which he thinks should satisfy others. Moreover it seems to me that any one who attaches value to an argument for the authenticity of the Acts founded on the style and contents of the 'we' sections ought to shew that he is aware that he should not lean on this alone, or to an excessive extent, and that he has not neglected to take account of broader historical evidence. At the same time my treatment must be brief.

I. It must always be hard to place oneself at the right point of view in the study of the history of the distant past, and rightly to understand

the lines of action chosen by different men, not least by great men, especially in times of transition when there were many cross-currents and conflicting views. Probably there was never a time more difficult to understand in these respects than the Apostolic Age and the decades immediately succeeding it. Doubtless this is generally acknowledged, and yet it appears to some of us who recognize that on many subjects we have learnt much from Criticism, that it has gone seriously wrong on this one, largely from a lack of appreciation of the difficulties which it must have for modern minds. The object of Criticism from the first, and in a special manner that of the Tübingen School, was to form truer ideas of past history, but this school failed from seeking to impose upon the past a theory of history derived from contemporary philosophy. It would hardly have been possible to light upon a more wrong-headed method. Much has been learnt since then in regard to right method in the study of history, and New Testament criticism has not been uninfluenced by it, but there are still those, especially in this instance on the anti-traditional side, whose minds are not fully emancipated from a particular theory, with the result that they are diverted from attention to important pieces of evidence, and read interpretations into the documents, and draw inferences from them, which are really baseless, and argue about this or that characteristic in a way that assumes men to be always logical in their actions. A proper sense of the differences between those times and our own, and, indeed, also a truer knowledge of men in our own times, would be shewn in a more fresh and open-minded noting and following out of indications in the documents, which would lead to the attainment of truer insight and more of a right kind of historical imagination.

I turn to special points:

(1) *The position assigned in Acts to Peter at the Conference in Jerusalem.*

In *Beginnings* at p. 323, with reference to Peter's speech, xv 7-11, it is asked, 'Could a man who had known Paul have allowed Peter to claim that God had long before made him the *Apostle of the Gentiles*?' And again at p. 342, we read, 'He considered it important to shew that it was not Paul, but Peter, who was the first to receive the call to convert the Gentiles and that it was not Paul, but Peter, who was the first pioneer in the work. *It is difficult to attribute such a depreciation of Paul's position to a personal pupil*'. The italics are mine. Here, indeed, the voice of Tübingen is to be heard! But is it possible that, not merely a personal pupil, but any writer of the Acts could have intended to convey in his work this notion of Peter's position relatively to Paul? Between the visit to Cornelius and the Conference no instance is given of Peter's exercising his ministry to the Gentiles, while

after it he is never named. Is it not possible—is it not much more in accord with the tenor of the narrative as a whole—to suppose that the writer without any idea in his mind of rivalry between Peter and Paul, such as no truly Christian mind could entertain, desired to exhibit the strength of the foundation of that mission to the Gentiles in which Paul was engaged, in that within the Jewish-Christian body itself, through the mouth of the most eminent of the twelve, it had been acknowledged that in the sight of God there is no such distinction between ‘clean’ and ‘unclean’ as the Jews made, and that this disciple himself, on an occasion when opportunity offered, had been called to deliver the Gospel of salvation through Jesus Christ to a gathering of uncircumcised proselytes, though his own work had been among Jews as it plainly continued to be. This is all that is related. And if a personal disciple of Paul told it, he would have shewn that he had imbibed some of the spirit of his master who had exclaimed with regard to some who sought to pit himself and Cephas against one another, ‘Has Christ been divided?’

The question of the historical character of the Cornelius incident has not quite the same bearing on the authorship of the Acts as that of the intention with which it and the references to it are recorded, because it would seem to have been part of the material which the author of Acts collected for the history of the Church some little while before Paul came upon the scene. But it is held by Dr Windisch to have been unhistorical,¹ and the more unlikely on that ground to have been introduced by one who had been in contact with Paul.

One argument that is used for its want of historical character, and the only one upon which I will touch, is that Peter’s change of mind as to eating with Gentiles, of which Paul speaks Gal. ii 11 ff, was flatly contrary to the teaching of the Divine Revelation which Peter had received. Nevertheless, it is to be feared that it was an inconsistency not impossible for human nature, and in particular for men specially liable to feel the pressure of their surroundings. Peter had failed (we know) once before grievously in an ordeal of the kind; and we can imagine how, on the occasion at Antioch, he might have sought to justify himself to himself, as (for example) by the plea that the ministry to the Gentiles was not his own special work, and that for him for the most part it was more important not to cause scandal to the Jews.

(2) *The Paul of his own Epistles, and the Paul of the Acts.*

An examination of the practical line of conduct adopted by him in his relations with Jews and Gentiles cannot be wholly separated from his more formal teaching, but in the main for the purpose of discussion

¹ p. 341 f.

it may be so. We will, then, now compare the evidence of the Epistles and the Acts in regard to these two subjects.

(a) *Line of conduct.*

To the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain Jews; to them that are under the law as under the law, not being myself under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law as without law, not being without law to God, but under law to Christ, that I might gain them that are without law. 1 Cor. ix 20, 21.

See also the whole context, *vv.* 19-24, and *cp.* x 32-xi 1.

Among a few concessions which Dr Windisch makes early in his essay of arguments which he promises not to press, he includes (though he doubts whether he ought to do so) that which might be founded on the account in Acts of the circumcision of Timothy; and again, on that of Paul's conforming on his last visit to Jerusalem to a ceremonial observance, and in the latter connexion, he cites the first of the sentences above quoted and also 1 Cor. x 23, viii 1 ff; Rom. xiv (p. 320 f). He does not discuss them more generally; and yet assuredly the words quoted, and others like them, are not to be considered only in their bearing upon one or two incidents. There were many other occasions in which a natural application would be found for them. Indeed, they plainly lay down a rule of action which the Apostle intended should be that of his life generally.

One important example of his being guided by it was that, while he insisted in the strongest manner on Gentile Christians remaining uncircumcised, he did not call upon Jewish Christians to give up circumcision. Dr Windisch does not deny this, but it is important that the significance of this fact should be grasped. Unquestionably of Jewish Christians he did require an entirely altered view of the place of circumcision in their religious life. The remission of sins for them as well as for Gentiles could only be through Christ. But it would have been impossible for St Paul to declare that to the Jews he had become a Jew, and that he strove to avoid giving offence—to be *ἀπρόσκοπος*—to the Jews, if he had urged them to discontinue the practice itself. In that case such words could have had no meaning. Moreover in another passage he expressly says, 'Was any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised' (1 Cor. vii 18). One other consideration may well be added. When he wrote the Epistle to the Romans he was looking forward to a visit to Jerusalem which he intended to pay; he must have known enough of feeling in the holy city to be aware that such a visit would have been madness if he had been actually attacking the observance of circumcision by Jews themselves, and with it of the obedience to the law into which it was the initiation (Gal. v 3). In the Epistles belonging to the period

covered by the Acts he seems clearly to have thought of Jewish and Gentile believers as forming two bodies which, while allowed to differ from one another in some matters of practice, were yet to be united in the closest manner in feeling as sharing the same hope of salvation. This unity and the avoidance of everything that could hinder it were objects of his own deepest desire. This appears especially in the First Epistle to the Corinthians, but is not confined to this one.

If he even then had visions of a time—as we shall see appears to have been the case later—when circumcision would be abrogated even for the Jewish believer, and Jew and Gentile could be completely bound together in one Church of Christ, he trusted for their realization to the gradual effects upon all hearts of the preaching of Christ crucified and risen. From both Epistles and Acts it is evident that the one vital question in connexion with securing Gentile freedom and the whole validity of Christ's work was that of resistance to the circumcision of Gentile converts to Christianity as a religious ceremony.

I pass now to a small matter in comparison, but one about which in modern times there has been a great deal more controversy, the requirement made of Gentile converts at the conclusion of the Conference at Jerusalem as related in Acts xv. This 'decree' seems often to be thought of as part of a kind of bargain made between Paul and Barnabas on the one hand and the apostles and elders at Jerusalem on the other. If it was this, certainly that view of it is inconsistent with St Paul's statement in the Epistle to the Galatians (ii 10) that he and Barnabas were only required to 'remember the poor'. In Acts, however, not a word is said about any conditions which Paul had to accept, so that we may imagine what we please on that head. It is noticeable also that certain representatives of the Church at Jerusalem were sent with Paul and Barnabas on their mission, and naturally it would be specially their duty to deliver the 'decrees'. No doubt, however, Paul must, according to Acts, at least have acquiesced in their distribution by men in his company, and at Acts xvi 4 no distinction is made in regard to this between himself and others. I have no wish that the Western text of 'the decrees' should be substituted for the one to which we are more accustomed. I believe the latter to be the original one, and moreover the main difference between them consists in an addition in the Western, while one at least of the requirements which it is held that Paul could have had nothing to do with remains in this form. We are told that 'the decrees' were 'a food-law' and as such 'legalistic' and 'Jewish in tone' and therefore contrary to Paul's belief and teaching. But were they so in their object? There is nothing to shew that the apostles and elders at Jerusalem saw any value in them besides and beyond

their promoting charity, and they could not have secured that Gentile converts should observe them for any other reason. Would not that have satisfied Paul? About one of them he has occasion to write to the Corinthians (1 Cor. x 14 ff), viz. that of abstinence from food that has been offered to idols. He himself would have been shocked if there was any actual, conscious association with an idol and idol-worship; but to quiet the anxieties of the over-scrupulous he lays down the rule that they need not make particular enquiries about all that was sold in the market, or set before them on the tables of heathen hosts who had invited them. He does not refer to 'things strangled and to blood'. Whether these were, or were not, cases of any practical importance in Corinth we do not know. But he enunciates a principle which would have served for guidance in regard to them also. Matters of eating and drinking were, he declares, indifferent. That might be taken in two ways; but here, from the context in which he bids these Gentile Christians avoid all offence, it is evident that what he means by it is that such a matter is not one which it is right and wise to choose for fighting the battle of freedom upon. Would it be strange that one who held this view, and who said that 'to the Jews he became a Jew', and made it his aim to give no offence to Jews, should make the concession in regard to 'the decrees' that the Acts attributes to him? And if it is unthinkable, may we be told of some other ways in which he would shape his conduct in a manner consistent with such words? It is true that in 1 Corinthians he does not mention 'the decrees' or refer to the act of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem. But it would be natural that as time went on and as the Gospel was carried farther from Jerusalem, into lands where there were fewer Jews than in districts of Asia Minor, the formal promulgation of 'the decrees' should be dropped; and in any case Paul would undoubtedly prefer to appeal to a principle rather than to authority, except the highest.

It must still be noticed that according to Dr Windisch, if there had been those Jerusalem 'decrees' Paul must have mentioned them, because it would have been such an effective answer to his opponents (p. 325 f). To me it seems very unlikely that he should have mentioned them, chiefly because it might have been interpreted as a recognition of the apostles and elders at Jerusalem, and he was above all determined, as the tenor of the Epistle shews, to maintain that he exercised his ministry by Divine commission. It was enough that there had been an agreement as to provinces of work.

(b) *St Paul's teaching.*

It may well be difficult to perceive what is most distinctive and important in a great man's thought and teaching and character while he is still alive or shortly afterwards, and it is doubtful whether even

those who stand nearest necessarily grasp it. It is likely to be the more so, the newer and more original and more profound it is. St Paul connected some of his most characteristic conceptions with insistence upon the freedom from the yoke of the Jewish law of Gentile converts to the Christian Faith. Strange to say fifteen hundred years later circumstances spiritually and morally in some ways analogous, and the presence of minds that may have been in a measure akin to his and therefore peculiarly receptive, led to certain of his great thoughts becoming one of the great forces at work in the whole Reformation movement of the sixteenth century, in a degree that they never had been before. And this has had an effect upon the estimate of Paul's teaching even in modern times which has been partly distorting. Paul has been looked at often too much through Lutheran spectacles. Features which attracted special attention in the sixteenth century have too exclusively attracted attention; his own view of the significance of Judaism and its continuing influence upon him, his primary conviction of the power of a risen and living Christ, and the relations to one another in him of different elements, have not been sufficiently regarded.

In Paul's own day and the decades immediately following the obvious practical result of his teaching in securing the admission of Gentiles to the Christian Church without passing through the gate of Judaism must have been thankfully remembered; but when once this victory had been won, or was in prospect, the need for reproducing his teaching about the true view to be taken of the Jewish law would rapidly come to be less felt, while the task of disconnecting from it the inculcation of those principles of permanent importance which he had bound up with it would not be an easy one. That influences of this kind did operate upon the minds of Apostolic Fathers and early Christian Apologists to bring about a change from St Paul's point of view would now be admitted. It is not clear to me that they might not have told even upon personal disciples of his in the last twenty years of the first century to which I should attribute the composition of the Acts.¹

But we ought also to ask what place Paul himself gave to that distinctive teaching. He could eagerly contend for his own position about the relations of the Law and the Gospel, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, when roused to it. Again in 2 Cor. iii 3—iv 6 and v 17, he sets forth most nobly the superiority of the New Covenant to the Old, and points out what the effect of it must be as regards the ministers of the New, while at xi 22 ff he is driven to assert himself against Judaizing, or Jewish, opponents. He also thought well, when after prolonged

¹ See *Gospels as Historical Documents* p. 275, where date of Third Gospel is given; Acts of course followed.

labours in Northern Syria and Asia Minor and Greece he was looking forward to paying a visit to Jerusalem, to address to the Church at the great seat of Empire a comprehensive, reasoned exposition of the whole subject. Once more, in a still later Epistle, that to the Philippians, he warns the Church at Philippi against 'the Concision'. And yet, when we recall a very familiar passage in 1 Cor. xv 1-11—one of which Dr Windisch takes no account—it must appear that relatively to his ministry as a whole there was something exceptional in those other cases. In that passage he gives a statement of the contents of the Gospel which he 'delivered', which his converts 'received' from him and in which 'they stood'. In this there is not a word about the Law, and he declares it to have had for its subject Jesus Christ crucified and risen 'according to the Scriptures', and to be the same as that which was preached by 'the twelve'.

I must remark, too, that Dr Windisch shews a disposition to obliterate, to a far greater degree than can be justified, the line of distinction in St Paul's mind between those Judaizers who were his special antagonists and the elder apostles and their disciples on the one hand, and that on the other between those antagonists and the mass of Jews.¹ Not only the passage from 1 Cor. xv but not a few others might be cited to shew the love which he cherished for all true Jewish-Christian believers; and if his special antagonists professed on occasion to represent the Church at Jerusalem, as at Antioch when Peter failed (Gal. ii 11), there is nothing at least to shew that they had a right to do so. At the same time it is evident that the Judaizers in Galatia were not mere Jews. They pretended in some sort to be Christians, and herein lay the danger of their gaining influence over Paul's Gentile converts. It is natural to compare those denounced at Philippi with the mischief-makers in Galatia, and in the Philippian Church, too, they seem plainly to have been men who had worked their way into the Christian body.

To turn now to the Acts: the statement in 1 Cor. xv is in perfect agreement with what the author of that work represents Paul as telling Agrippa that the substance and character of his preaching had been (xxvi 22 f). In the account, however, given us in Acts of the early discourse by Paul in the Synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia the relation of the Gospel to the Law is presented in a manner which is said not to be Pauline. Dr Windisch, in common with many adherents of the Tübingen point of view in the matter before him, interprets the declaration that through Jesus 'is proclaimed unto you' (the Jews whom

¹ See pp. 307 n. 1, 333, 339. The first of these runs: 'By limiting themselves to the Four Epistles the Tübingen School gave up a very important piece of evidence, and one which is still important—the great anti-Jewish or anti-Judaistic polemic of Paul in Phil. iii.' I refer especially to the use of the two terms 'anti-Jewish' and 'anti-Judaistic' as alternatives.

St Paul was addressing) 'remission of sins, and by him every one that believeth is justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the Law of Moses',¹ as meaning that 'Faith seems to be a supplement of strict observance of the Law' (p. 337). That is to say, it is taken to be implied in 'all things' that 'some things' were and continued to be otherwise provided for. But to say the least, the words seized upon may equally well signify that the method of justification now made known was complete in itself, while that which for the Jew had preceded was incomplete, which is an altogether different idea, and this will appear to be the only natural meaning when the words 'by him *every one that believeth*' are allowed their proper value. These could only mean that one and the same way of salvation was being opened to every true believer, whether from among Jews (lax or strict), or proselytes of the gate, or Gentiles. And no writer of Acts, whoever he might be, could have imagined that a message delivered in such terms was to be differently understood as to its scope by different classes of persons, as according to Dr Windisch and those whom he follows must be supposed to have been intended. The immediate sequel (*vv.* 40-49) is entirely inconsistent with any such view. Nor is a single remark of his from any other context quoted to that effect. It should be noted also that at the conclusion of the address to the Jews they are warned that if they do not embrace the offer made them they will be rejecting a gift that is incalculably precious; and that just afterwards it is described as 'eternal life'. The rebellion against the Will of God which this involves, and consequent retribution, are again insisted upon at the close of the Acts. And the appearance of this view of the action of the Jewish people first near the opening of the account of the Apostle's ministry, and then so far as this book is concerned, at its close, may fairly be taken as indicative of what were the ruling ideas in the mind of the author. In it there is not a little that resembles the thought in certain portions of the Epistle to the Romans. The compensating consideration that finally 'all Israel should be saved', which appears in the latter, is not, it is true, introduced in Acts, but this difference does not at least make Acts a more 'neutral' document, one less unfavourable to the Jew.

I have still to observe that one incident related in the Acts will appear in a somewhat different light from that in which Dr Windisch regards it when the character of the opponents referred to in St Paul's Epistles is more justly viewed. As we have seen, the party of 'the Concision' ought not to be identified with the Pharisees. Not only is there no ground for thinking that the Pharisees as a body organized the opposition to St Paul, but they could not have done so, because his

¹ Acts xiii 39.

chief opponents were Jews and something more; they pretended to be Christians. The inconsistency, if there is one, of the claim to be 'a Pharisee the son of a Pharisee' attributed to Paul in Acts is with the denunciations of 'Scribes and Pharisees' by Jesus Himself recorded by the author of Acts in the Third Gospel, and not with any use of the term by Paul himself in his Epistles. But the probability is that in the second half of the first century the very designation 'Pharisee' for one belonging to a certain sect had not become synonymous with externalism in religion and hypocrisy, as it has commonly for us through the reading of the Gospels. There would, therefore, not be any such violent contrast, as Dr Windisch supposes, between Paul's use of it in this passage of Acts and (so far as we know) at other times. To say that he is represented as doing it 'to save his life' is of course obvious exaggeration, or rather misrepresentation. Dr Windisch forgets that the ruling body among the Jews were the chief priests who were of the Sadducean party, and, moreover, that the Roman Government alone had the power of life and death. By creating a commotion he in fact endangered his life (cf. Acts xxiv 21). It does not seem to me that it would have been altogether 'out of character' for St Paul, or that it would have been dishonourable, that he should have used his old connexion with the Pharisaic party and the measure of sympathy that he had with them still, in order to win a hearing for his great doctrine of the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Our comparison so far has (with one exception, that of a passage in the Epistle to the Philippians) only been between the Acts and Epistles written before Paul's Roman captivity. But there was a development in his teaching, to which a reference has been made, and which is specially illustrated by the Epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians; and in the former of these Luke was with the Apostle, and may very likely have been his amanuensis. There are in the Address to the Ephesian elders (Acts xx 28, 32) slight indications of the same vein of thought as that more fully followed out in those Epistles. Must there have been a fuller presentation of it in the Acts if the writer had been closely associated with St Paul, even at the time when those Epistles were composed? It seems conceivable that such an one may have felt himself unequal to it, when many years afterwards he set himself to write the Acts. He had great literary gifts of his own, but men of diverse mental characteristics may well have been drawn to become even intimate disciples of St Paul.

There is yet another possibility. The point in the history at which the Acts terminates is a strange one to have been chosen for the end of the whole work. The author may have intended to add yet a third part and have been prevented, e. g. by death. It would be altogether unwise to

build upon this hypothesis, but it is equally so to build upon its not having been his intention. If we had had a third *logos* it might clearly have made a good deal of difference in judging of general features represented in the narrative as we have it in the Acts as they stand. I am not greatly impressed with Dr Windisch's charges of 'omissions' of what a companion of the Apostle must have told about him and about himself. He was writing an account of the appearance and spread of the Christian Faith in the world, and in the latter half of this St Paul was the principal human actor; but he was not writing a biography of St Paul, or a study of his teaching. He was, also, as was the habit in antiquity, and one for which there was good reason, writing a short book. It would have been a bulky one if it had included all that Dr Windisch says it ought to have included. Lastly, it was designed for those who were outside at least of the inner circle of Christians. But apart from these considerations, the objections as to omissions might have been largely met by comprehensive references, after the writer's manner, put into St Paul's mouth, or otherwise, in a third part.

I maintain then that the question whether the position, theologically and in knowledge of facts, of the writer of the Acts is or is not consistent with his having been a personal disciple of St Paul, is an obscure and difficult one, and that the 'higher' criticism cannot be held to have decided it in the negative. For all that has been thus advanced it remains, to say the least, open, and we must therefore be all the more anxious to hear and to consider with care what the 'lower' criticism may have to say in order that we may ascertain whether it too leaves it open, or has any weighty deliverance to make in favour of authorship.

As one class of arguments with regard to the authorship has been brought before us by examining Dr Windisch's article, so the other will be by examining Dr Cadbury's paragraphs, which have been above referred to, and afterwards by one more glance at Dr Windisch's article.

II. Let me for the sake of any readers who are not familiar with the subject state broadly the proposition held by those students of it, who, in common with Harnack, take the sections of Acts where the first person plural appears in the meaning which, I think I may fairly say, is that which on the surface they bear. It is that the man who here employs the first person was the same who put together the Third Gospel and then the Acts and combined them; in other words, the author of this whole as a whole, who also revised in greater or less degrees what he quoted from documents, or it may be in some cases from information orally supplied to him. Supposing him to have been influenced in his style by information orally received, i. e. in a measure to have allowed reporters to speak through his own mouth, the difference from his own

proper style would probably still not be so marked, as where he had such a document as Mark or the Logia lying before him. There would generally be at least somewhat more scope and need for the writer in the former case than in the latter. But the oral informants must have been of different types. In the Gospel, where he had not Mark or the Logia, or possibly some other document, the authority on which the author-editor would have been dependent would have been early Palestinian Christians. So for the history of the early days of the Church in Jerusalem, Palestine, and adjacent parts. Subsequently, even before he had joined St Paul's company, or when not a member of it, the informants, or many of them, would be men who had received an education at least somewhat more similar to his own, while the account to be given of the facts would also more freely shape itself in his own mind. A division may perhaps best be made at Acts xi 19, though it cannot be an altogether strict one. Lastly, the author-editor was present in Paul's company for a considerable time himself; the so-called 'we' sections belong to those portions of the Third Gospel and the Acts, in which his specialities of style are most apparent, so much so as to afford strong ground for believing that the 'we' is no fiction, and also that it has not slipped in with extracts in which it occurred.

I find three arguments urged against this view in Dr Cadbury's paragraphs. Two of them appear to me to have no force, and I will notice them first, and, roughly speaking, I shall be following the order in which he brings them forward. 1. He argues that Harnack reasons inconsistently and erroneously in regard to the origin of Luke, chapters i and ii, and he infers that the method of counting peculiarities of style is not adapted for determining whether a particular portion is derived from a source or not. But the evidence may be wrongly judged in one case and yet rightly in others. The portion of the Gospel, Harnack's view of which is here criticized by Dr Cadbury, is one in respect to which the origin is peculiarly difficult to determine, and on which there would be a good deal of difference of opinion even among those who would be in full agreement as to the general proposition which I have stated above. The question at issue between them and other students relates to certain sections of which this is not one. An inference from it to the method employed in general can have no force. At most it is an argument *ad hominem*, never a satisfactory sort of argument.

I am sure that critics generally will not agree with Dr Cadbury that the 'Lucan' writings are 'throughout homogeneous'. That would mean that everywhere the author-editor is revising and that to approximately the same degree. It would have been practically impossible that he should have given us the well-compacted work he has if he had attempted to fit sources to one another everywhere without supplying

anything himself; and critics, whether they satisfy themselves that the 'we' sections were extracts or not, will not give up the endeavour to distinguish between parts of the Lucan writings in which a source was employed and others, or the employment to a large extent of the method here condemned by Dr Cadbury in doing so. Dr McGiffert informs us (p. 388) that in another volume of *Beginnings* there is to be a chapter on the sources. Whoever is chosen to write this chapter will certainly be much embarrassed if he is required wholly to discard this method.

2. On Harnack's remarking that, in spite of all revision of Mark by Luke, the vocabulary of Mark is still apparent through the Lucan editing, Dr Cadbury observes that 'an actual count of the occurrence in Lucan writings of words impartially chosen as characteristic of Mark shews that these occur as often or oftener in the parts of Luke and Acts not derived from Mark' as in those parallel to Mark (p. 163 bottom). It is implied of course again that the linguistic test is useless. From a note it appears that the list of words here referred to as 'impartially chosen as characteristic of Mark' is framed from Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae* pp. 9 ff and Swete's *St Mark* p. xliii. Of the lists by these two writers Swete's is the shorter and yet contains some words not in Hawkins's. It may be presumed that Dr Cadbury has in his own list combined with Swete's those not in his but in Hawkins's. The lists of Swete and Hawkins have been framed on different plans. The latter has told us quite definitely how he proceeded. He took as 'characteristic' 'the words and phrases which occur at least three times in Mark, and which either (a) are not found at all in Matthew or Luke, or (b) occur in Mark more often than in Matthew and Luke together'. It should be observed that the one characteristic feature in Mark's use, to which attention is thus certain to be directed, is frequency of occurrence, and that (so far as it goes) is a genuine point, because it brings out the fact that Mark's vocabulary, as that of an unpractised writer, was a limited one. On the other hand, there is a clear tendency to efface this particular feature in Lucan parallels to Mark, the editor having been one who disliked so many repetitions, while on the other hand, if the words or phrases were in themselves common and classical ones, there was no reason why they should not appear in good numbers in other parts of the Third Gospel and in Acts. Several of the words occurring in Hawkins's list belong to this category. They are not such as would ever be employed on their own account (i. e. unless possibly from frequency of repetition) to detect a source. This is enough to dispose of the phenomenon on which Dr Cadbury lays stress.

Swete does not give his list as complete, but as illustrative of a two-fold feature in Mark, '(1) the relatively frequent use of certain charac-

teristic words ; (2) the use of certain ordinary words in an uncommon and sometimes enigmatic sense'. It is evident that Swete did not determine what was to be regarded as 'characteristic' merely by frequency of use, but that he has had in view something special which is more or less common in Mark's application or grammatical use of the words, and such on examination we find to be the case. Such clearly must be the words and phrases which Harnack has in view when he speaks of 'the vocabulary of Mark' as 'apparent through the Lucan editing'. And it would always be mainly in such peculiar uses that traces of the use of a source would be discovered or suspected. It is not to the purpose that other uses too are found scattered through other parts of the Lucan writings, all of which have been thrown together by Dr Cadbury in raising an objection. Let me take as an example the word *ἐξουσία*, which occurs in Swete's list but not in Hawkins's. Dr Swete was evidently struck with the fact that in Mark it is used seven times of our Lord's authority felt in His preaching and shewn in His healing the sick, &c., and three times for a similar authority bestowed on His disciples, and not in any other application. This was a term and an application of it that 'Luke' liked, and he uses it in seven parallels to Mark. In other parts of his Gospel there is no strict parallel, the nearest is the power of treading upon serpents, and there are besides three other uses of a spiritual kind, viz. of the power of Satan offered to Jesus in the Temptation, the power that can cast into hell, the power of darkness. It occurs, besides in the Gospel, five times in ordinary civil senses. In the Acts, the closest parallel to the Marcan use is the request of Simon Magus for a communication to him of Peter's authority, and we have also the power of God and of Satan. There are besides five instances of its denoting civil or ecclesiastical authority or human right. In order to illustrate the study of sources aright it would be necessary to make distinctions, in the case of the other words in Swete's list between applications, &c., made of them, and also in the case of some in Hawkins's ; while several of the latter (as has been pointed out) could hardly, if at all, be suitable in that connexion.

It is an interesting and important point that, of the non-classical words or meanings to be found in these lists of Swete and Hawkins of Marcan characteristics, all that occur in Acts [*ἀκάθαρτον πνεῦμα, ἔκθαμβος, κράβατος, συζητεῖν* (in sense of 'disputing')] are to be found in the first nine chapters. We have *πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον* also at Lk. xi 24, which is parallel to Mt. xii 43, and may therefore be derived from the Logia.

That a certain similarity in form of speech between Luke's informants in respect to the early Church at Jerusalem and Mark should be discernible, even though the use of a written source could not be traced, is what one might expect, and it is to be noticed not only in the use of

words mentioned above, but in a special manner in the accounts of miracles and the impression made by them, Acts v 12-16; ix 32-35. This is in full accord with the view of Luke's work stated.

I have discussed this question of vocabulary, as Dr Cadbury does, in regard to the detection of sources. But before passing on from the present heading I would observe that, though this is a subject akin to and involved in that before us, it is not the same, but might rather be said to be the obverse of it. For we have to determine whether one who has revised a source in certain parts is in certain other parts writing fully in his own person, being the man who has put together the whole, and to judge of this a different massing of evidence and a wider review of it are required. There would be a distinct claim to this effect if the first person plural in certain sections belongs to this editor of the whole. That is now the question to be directly considered.

3. It is admitted that 'Lucan' characteristics are very abundant in the 'we' sections; but are they so clearly more abundant here than in some passages of the Third Gospel where he was plainly the reviser of Mark, as to shew that he was something more than a reviser here, and so to help to prove that the first person plural does include the editor of the work as a whole? Or might the latter have been, for all that the style shews, here too simply a reviser, and the passages be extracts from some other work, say a diary of travel? The latter view was maintained by Schürer in reply to his colleague Harnack when *Lucas der Arzt* appeared¹; and it is maintained also by Dr Cadbury, and not a few others. Here we come to the real point at issue, and it is not one easy of decision. It is a question of degree, upon which it is a difficult matter to form an opinion. But I cannot regard Dr Cadbury's treatment of it as shewing that he had in reality tested Harnack's conclusions by the facts, or as helping us to do so. He writes: 'Sometimes at least, even in copying Mark, the Lucan characteristics are almost as abundant as in the "we" passages. One illustration may here be sufficient'. He then recalls Harnack's remarks on the account of the shipwreck in Acts xxvii, and his invitation to his readers 'to consider only the first three verses'. Dr Cadbury thereupon compares the account of a storm on the Lake of Galilee (Lk. viii 22-24) in which Luke's source (Mk. iv 35-39) is also 'recast' to the extent of containing one more Lucan peculiarity than the three verses in Acts on which Harnack comments. But these verses in Acts are an *example* of what is approximately true—somewhat more it may be, or somewhat less in different verses—*of the whole of the 'we' sections*. Herein lies the point of the argument. In order that we might be able to infer anything safely from Luke's parallels with Mark as to his notion of the revision

¹ See *Theol. Lit.-Zeit.* 1906, no. 14.

he thought well to carry out, it would be necessary to ascertain the relation in which the account of the storm in Lk. viii stands to the remainder of his revision of Mark, and of this Dr Cadbury tells us nothing. In point of fact this brief account of the storm is the solitary instance of a Marcan narrative being revised by Luke to anything approximating the extent that this one is,¹ and it does not appear strange that one who had been such a traveller by sea as the diarist of the 'we' sections had been, should, when he came to the storm on the lake, have described it in his own manner. We have besides, indeed, instances of the prominence of Lucan style in portions of verses, or for a verse or two, at the *transitions* from one narrative to another, or in a general description of the situation, or in a favourite reflexion of Luke's at the conclusion of the narration of an incident taken from Mark (e. g. Lk. v 12, 15, 16, 17; ix 6, 10, 11; xviii 35, 36; xix 47, 48; xxii 1, 2). Occasionally, though much more rarely, such a verse occurs in the course of a narrative, especially when an explanation seems to be required. In such cases he naturally felt more free to express himself in his own manner. Not infrequently, it would seem, his motive at these points was that he regarded Mark's form as crude and inartistic. We also meet fairly often with instances not to be clearly so classed of a couple of verses standing together, in which there are two or three Lucan peculiarities apiece, while yet in the contexts they are much more scarce.

The narrative among the Lucan parallels to Mark, comparable in length to the three shorter 'we' sections, in which the hand of the reviser is most continuously apparent—closest after that of the storm though very considerably less so—is its sequel, Lk. viii 26–39, concerning Jesus in the land of the Gerasenes. Let us compare this in respect to Lucan characteristics with those sections (Acts xvi 9–18; xx 4–16; xxi 1–18). I confine myself to these three because I have myself minutely studied them and commented upon them²; but I have good ground for thinking that the evidence of peculiar style is not any weaker in the fourth and longest 'we' section.

Before, however, I state my results in numerical form, which is the only way in which they can be concisely stated, let me make one or two remarks on such enumerations. It may seem that these observations are unnecessary. Perhaps they should be, and yet I think it may be well to define the conditions on which trustworthy results may be expected from the kind of criticism here implied, and to encourage the hope that if these are respected trustworthy results may be obtained. At the best, numbers can only furnish rough notions here. Each item

¹ For the justification of this and the following statements see *Gospels as Historical Documents* pp. 278–290.

² See *ib.* pp. 255–259 and pp. 312–322.

in a number needs special study in order that one may convince oneself that it is a peculiarity and so deserves a place; and each item has a value in illustrating style, which is by no means the same as that of other items. Moreover, though in endeavouring to estimate the significance of an individual item the number of times that it occurs in a particular writer has to be noted, other considerations in regard to its form and use may be more important than mere frequency of occurrence. At the same time, in any considerable number of items mistakes and legitimate differences of impression on opposite sides are likely to counterbalance one another; while if the preponderance of peculiarities in one of two passages over the other is a decided one, though the impressions of various students might lead to different estimates, the difference would probably not be so great as to alter the broad character of the result. I would add that I ask only that the facts may be carefully examined and impartially judged, and the considerations that have influenced me in my comments on different passages and my conclusions tested thereby.

I find then that in the narrative parallel to Mark which, with one exception of three verses, is most revised, there is on an average a little over one Lucan peculiarity to each verse. On the other hand in the 'we' section, of the three named above, in which there are fewest peculiarities, namely, Acts xxi 1-18, there are on an average twice as many; in xx 4-16, four times, and in xvi 9-18 nearly five times as many. They are spread through the passages and are far from being all of one kind. It appears, then, that examination of 'Luke's' procedure in his treatment of the Gospel of Mark does not justify the opinion that the 'we' sections are extracts which have been revised by him. On the contrary, a study of his parallels with Mark serves to shew that he did not make it part of his plan when using a source, so to introduce into it characteristics of style and to communicate to it his own manner as would have been necessary in order to make the 'we' sections stylistically what they are in relation to the Lucan writings as a whole. Schürer has, indeed, suggested that a diarist used here may have belonged to the same literary circle as the editor, so that what we have in point of style is the combined effect of two such writers, and Dr Cadbury has followed him in this. But this is of course a mere hypothesis, and not free from improbability. It would be remarkable that the editor should find extracts which, as regards their whole purport and character, fit in so well with the whole plan of his work. Moreover, if such extracts resembled in style his own manner of writing, the editor would be all the less likely to feel that any alterations were necessary, and small discrepancies would probably remain.

We are struck, indeed, with a certain abruptness in the appearances of

the first person plural, and this at first sight seems in favour of the theory of extracts. Dr Windisch argues that it is a sign of such an origin,¹ and Dr Cadbury suggests that the first person may have been left in by the editor owing to his sense of its effectiveness. Harnack, on the other hand, thinks that to the writer it would seem less abrupt than it does to us, if he was the person who used 'I' at the beginning of his roll, and if he was, or assumed himself to be, known to 'Theophilus' and regarded himself all through as addressing him. I am disposed to agree in this with Harnack. Here, too, a study of 'Luke's' revision of Mark has something to teach us.² He bestowed special pains upon his introductions to narratives taken from Mark, and was the last man to bring in extracts in a haphazard fashion.

On purely stylistic grounds it would be easier on the whole to suppose that while the editor-reviser was himself in these passages, and in a large part at least of the latter portion of Acts, the author, he had, if he was not a companion of the Apostle, here resorted to fiction. It would still be strange that, if he considered this legitimate, he should not have made more than he does in his work of such fiction, by drawing attention to his representations as to the persons present. I must add that, though historical writers in the ancient world had in some respects a different standard from our own as to what historical truth required, as in the matter of putting speeches into the mouths of prominent actors in a scene where no reports existed, I am not aware that it has been shewn by the Editors of *Beginnings* (pp. 7 ff) or any one else that it was considered to be proper technique to adopt a device such as it is thought that 'Luke' may have done in these passages of Acts.³ It would also have to be considered, and that even on grounds of true scientific criticism, whether the effect of the Christian religion in quickening his sense of truth would not have stood in the way. These, however, are distinct questions.

My object in this paper has been to insist that there is substantial evidence in the style of the 'we' sections, that they are not extracts from another source which have been revised and inserted, and to urge that if for clear reasons (the clearness of which I have, however, disputed) it should appear to any one that the stylistic evidence of the sections indicated must be discarded, he should at least seek to realize adequately the difficulties involved in doing so.

V. H. STANTON.

¹ pp. 329 ff.

² See above, p. 379.

³ This subject is admirably treated in an article in the *JOURNAL* for April 1923, by F. H. Colson, pp. 300 ff, 'Notes on St Luke's Preface'.