

SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

THE ROLE OF EPISODIC NARRATIVES IN ACTS 18:12-17

A RESEARCH PAPER SUBMITTED TO
DR. LORIN L. CRANFORD
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SEMINAR
NEW TESTAMENT CRITICAL METHODOLOGY 771

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

BY

TONY LATHAM

FORT WORTH, TEXAS

FEBRUARY 28, 1994

INTRODUCTION

The body of this paper is divided into two chapters. The first chapter explores the role of the episodic narratives in the book of Acts. The format for this chapter consists of an exploration of the meaning of episodic narrative and an application of that meaning to Acts 18:12-17. The purpose of shaping the chapter in this way was to place immediately before the reader both the description of the genre and its application in Acts. It was felt that this method would better secure the meaning of episodic narrative for the reader.

The second chapter exegetes Acts 18:12-17, one of the examples of an episodic narrative in Acts. Included in this exegesis is a proposed chiasmus for Acts 18:12-17. The proposal may or may not be convincing to the reader, but as the exegesis unfolds, the focus of the chiasmus seems certainly to be the focus of the story itself.

The commentary work for the exegesis of the passage afforded an insight into the "workings" of commentaries. Of those commentaries which considered the Gallio story a "true" story, that is one which historically took place, much of the

same kind of information was contained in them. Frequently, only minor word differences separated one commentary from another in the presentation of the material.

The commentaries that disallowed the historicity of the encounter between Paul and Gallio, at least the account of the story in its present shape, also shared the same kind of information.¹ It would be interesting to trace the "sources" of the commentaries' information to find the "original document(s)" forming the material used. But that was not the purpose of this paper.

Where there were significant differences of opinion related to the historicity of the text or of matters it presented, content notes were used to point to the problem and to the sources for further investigation. For example, it was not deemed the purpose of this paper to extensively consider the current debate on the dating of the edict of Claudius, or to try and settle the issue of whether one can or cannot appeal to the *religio illicita* as an issue for Christianity in Paul's time.

The issue of Lucan sources, though mentioned when neces-

¹See Craig L. Blomberg, "The Diversity of Literary Genres in the New Testament," chap. in New Testament Criticism & Interpretation, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1991), 514-15, who points to three "camps" for interpreting Acts: (1) A primarily British and North American evangelical camp which has "argued for a substantial measure of historicity," (2) a primarily German camp which has "given Luke very poor marks as a historian but has concentrated instead on theological concerns," and (3) a primarily American group which has classified "Acts as a historical novel."

sary to carry on the discussion of genre or to complete the exegesis, is not a focus of this paper. No discussion of a possible "Antiochian Source" or "We Source" or any other specific source was deemed necessary to focus on the episodic narratives.

The appendixes of this paper include a block diagram of the text, a semantic diagram, an analytical diagram, and an evaluation of an important textual variant at verse seventeen. Minor variants, which were associated only with the peculiarities of the Western text, were not included in the appendix along with the major textual question, but were mentioned in the footnotes. An additional two appendixes were added to remove significant, but lengthy material from footnotes. One provides a narrative paradigm and the other a chiasmus structure.

Unless otherwise indicated, all Scripture references are taken from the New International Version.

CHAPTER 1

THE ROLE OF EPISODIC NARRATIVES IN ACTS

Several concerns are wrapped together with an exploration of the role of episodic narratives in Acts. First, the nature of Acts itself is under investigation. Brevard Childs outlines the flow of that investigation as from the assured historical character of the book, to a largely literary creation with theological interests only, to a current protest "against all too facile literary theories which denigrate *a priori* the historical component of the tradition. . . ." ²

Second, the difficulty of pinpointing the larger genre of Acts affects the discussion of the more narrow genre of episodic narrative. The larger genre has been variously suggested as history, with numerous suggested subdivisions, such as general or universal history, historical monograph, or tragic history; or succession narrative of the philosopher and his school; or romance or novel, with historical novel as a subunit. ³

²Brevard S. Childs, Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 289.

³These suggestions are found in the article by Lawrence M. Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (Winter 1991): 648. Another list of suggested models for Luke's work appears in the article by

Third, the question of how to understand "episode" depends to some degree on whether it is defined under the genre of history, biography, or novel; and on whether the genre describes fiction or nonfiction. There does not seem to exist a consensus as to where episode belongs. David Aune, while describing the use of episodes, touches this problem at the point of history and novel, fiction and nonfiction:

The success of extended narrative fiction (epics, novels) and nonfiction (histories) depends on how well individual episodes are connected to form a unified composition. The three primary historical genres (historical monographs, general history, and antiquarian history) are all complex genres constructed of individual episodes.⁴

By the historical view, "the author of Acts researched and wrote his Christian history in the manner of a Greco-Roman historian: he consulted and selected sources which he shaped

Dennis R. MacDonald, "Apocryphal and Canonical Narratives about Paul," in Paul and the Legacies of Paul, ed. William S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 59 as follows: "In the case of canonical Acts, scholars have suggested that Luke modeled the work after philosophical biographies [Charles H. Talbert], didactic biographies [Vernon K. Robbins], hellenistic Jewish *antiquitates biblicae* [C. Perrot], or hellenistic historiography more generally [Martin Hengel, W. C. Van Unnik, J. P. Classen]. Others claim that Luke had no intention of writing a history; instead he adopted the form of a novel [S. P. and M. J. Schierling, Susan Praeder, R. J. Karris, Richard Pervo] or created the first *hagiographon* [Pierre Gibert]. Still others argue that Luke wrote with an eye to aretalogies of divine men which recounted their remarkable exploits [Helmut Koester]." See the bibliography for the listed works by MacDonald of each of these authors.

⁴David E. Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, Library of Early Christianity, ed. Wayne A. Meeks (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987), 90. Aune (90) says that "dramatic episodes lack extraneous detail and emphasize the mounting tension just before the resolution or denouement."

into an episodic account enlivened by speeches."⁵

On the other hand, Klaus Berger discusses episodic material under the larger title, "Evangelium und Biographie."

Within that category, Berger relates episodes to the

"*Binnenstruktur der Evangelien.*" He writes that

gibt es . . . gattungstypische Merkmale, die gegenüber der Großform nicht zu vernachlässigen sind: . . . c) *Episoden* nenne ich kleine, erzählerisch ganz unselbständige Erzählungen am Rande des Geschehens, die gleichwohl Wesentliches zum Ausdruck bringen: Mk 14,47 par Mt 26,51-54; Lk 22,50f.; Joh 18,10f. . . . Mk 14,51f.; Mt 27,19; Joh 19,21f. . . . ; Act 23,1-5 . . . ; Mk 15,35f. . . . ; Lk 9,51-56. . . .⁶

Richard Pervo involves a discussion of episodes in his understanding of the book of Acts as related generically to the ancient historical novel. Aune presents a summation of Pervo's research into the relationship of novel and episode:

Pervo finds 33 episodes in Acts (23 in Acts 13-28) that

⁵This is the observation of Susan Marie Praeder, "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel," in Society of Biblical Literature: 1981 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent H. Richards (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), 269, who herself compares Acts to the ancient novel. This article should be consulted for a thorough overview of the suggested relationship between Luke-Acts and the ancient novel. See Helmut Köster, Introduction to the New Testament, 2 vols. Hermeneia: Foundations and Facets, ed. Robert W. Funk (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 51, who observes that "the author no doubt intended to write a historical work. . . . [but] "what contradicts the author's intention to write history are some of the sources and materials that are available. . . ." Therefore, ". . . large parts of the book read like an apostolic romance, not a historical book." Köster believes that "with regard to its literary genre, Luke's Acts of the Apostles belongs in the immediate neighborhood of the apocryphal acts . . . (e.g., *Acts of John, Acts of Peter, Acts of Paul*)."

⁶Klaus Berger, Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984), 351-52.

feature miraculous and exciting last-minute escapes from various perils (e.g., 14:2-6; 16:16-40; 22:22-24). These episodes, with close analogies in ancient novels, fall into five categories: (1) arrests and imprisonments (3:1-4:31; 5:12-42); (2) persecution and martyrdom (21:27-22:29); (3) mob scenes (eleven, including 16:19-23; 18:12-17; 19:23-41); (4) trial stories (nine, including 4:5-22; 18:12-17; 25:6-12); (5) travel and shipwreck (e.g., 27:1-28:16). Pervo focuses on the *fictional* features of these and other elements in Acts and the links which they have with novelistic themes and motifs.⁷

Pervo is not alone in his investigation of the novel genre for Acts. Lawrence Wills, following Pervo, believes that

Acts is very similar to the Greek novels because it is an adventurous and episodic account of protagonists who travel widely by sea and land, are constantly buffeted by capricious events and yet are led inexorably to a happy and unified ending.⁸

According to Susan Praeder,

the plots of Luke and Acts correspond to the formal sequence characteristic of the plots of the ancient novels. The heroes of Luke-Acts and the heroes and heroines of the ancient novels participate in series of adventures issuing in penultimate scenes of trial or recognition.⁹

⁷Richard I. Pervo, Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), quoted in Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, 80. Aune (80) agrees with Pervo that "Acts is entertaining and edifying," but adds, "That Acts should be categorized as a *historical novel* with closer links to fiction . . . is doubtful."

⁸Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," 648-49.

⁹Praeder, "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel," 269. Praeder (283) notes that "there is a certain reluctance, even among critical scholars, to compare Luke-Acts to the ancient novels for fear, it seems, that if resemblances between the two are discovered, Luke-Acts will have to be declared fictional and Christianity's claims false. . . . Ancient novels contain historical as well as fictional events and

Stanley Stowers sets forth the case that Acts belongs to the romantic narrative genre because within this type literature, plot is significant and, according to Stowers, Acts contains a plot and movement toward fulfilling it. According to Stowers, the relationship between plot and episodes in the romantic narrative is as follows:

Typically the subplots of their episodes are tied together in a narrative framework based on the hero's travels. Episodes do not have the form of elaborated *chreiai* where story is subordinated to didactic rhetoric; instead story is everything.¹⁰

Aune widens the idea of episode to include the episodic narrative. In one sense, this broader look at episode helps in understanding how a specific episode can be discussed under the historical, biographical, or novel genre. In another sense, it shows why a specific definition of episode is difficult to establish. Something that seems to fit everywhere may lack the clear lines and unifying elements "that exhibit a coherent and recurring configuration of literary features involving form (including structure and style), content, and

existents, and even fictional genres allow for nonfictional subgenres." For Praeder (270) ". . . Luke-Acts belongs to a 'subgenre' of Christian ancient novels within the genre of the ancient novel and begs to be read subgenerically, that is to say, scripturally, theologically, and in the context of Christian community."

¹⁰Stanley K. Stowers, "Comment: *What does Unpauline Mean?*," in Paul and the Legacies of Paul, ed. William S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 76.

function."¹¹

For Aune, episodic narrative corresponds to the form-critical category of saga; and saga "is itself episodic and can incorporate such other literary forms as the tale, the novella, the legend, the history, the report, the fable, etiology, and myth."¹² Here, the problem can be more easily recognized. Is episodic narrative the episode itself, as used in the larger story? Or is episodic narrative a group of episodes placed together albeit with other literary forms.? Certainly, the title of this paper, "The Role of Episodic Narratives in Acts: Acts 18:12-17," would seem to indicate, with the plural use of narrative, that the first understanding is correct. But Aune's discussion of episodic narrative as related to saga seems to confuse the issue.

The definitions of episode that follow, including Aune's own, seem to speak against a lengthy literary structure and, instead, support the idea of episode as a short, concise story or narrative; so "episodic narratives" best describes the use Acts makes of the episode.

Before narrowing the view of narrative to episodic narrative, it is worthwhile to remember that narrative material, whether historical, biographical, or novel contains paradigmatic elements. These have been described by Praeder as

¹¹Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, 13. This quote describes Aune's understanding of a *literary genre*.

¹²Ibid., 37.

"narrative meaning, textual message, textual means, contextual message, and contextual means."¹³ Each of these categories can be described or divided as follows:

The textual message is a narrative world of events, existence, sequence, structure, time, and space. The textual means is narration, the language, style, and situations or presence, voice, and perspective through which the narrator and narrative audience achieve expression. The contextual message is the experience and imagination which goes into or is gained by the author and audience in their respective acts of composition and reception. Creation and reading those respective acts of composition and reception, is the contextual means which enables the real author and the real audience to communicate through their implied counterparts, the implied author and the implied audience.¹⁴

As the literary form, content, and function of the episodic narrative are described in the remainder of this chapter, Acts 18:12-17 will be used for purposes of illustrating how the description (or definition) of episodic narrative relates to a biblical text.

The Form of the Episodic Narrative

The episodic narrative places lengthy historical happenings in a literary format that is concise and to the point. This narrative form both compresses the time element and telescopes the related events. The details of the account are

¹³Praeder, "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel," 271.

¹⁴Ibid., 271-72. Because of the space limitations of this paper, it is not possible to reproduce the details of Praeder's article. For an application to Luke-Acts of the information found in the paragraph of the paper's body, see pages 283-89 of the article. For an illustrative figure of the Narrative Paradigm, see appendix 5 of this paper.

minimized in number, but maximized in effect.¹⁵

Episodic narratives are not to be confused with summary narratives. The two may share characteristics, particularly a condensing of the details of the event, but they are not the same. The summary narrative provides a summary for previously related events. The episodic narrative summarizes or concisely presents the account of an event not yet related to the reader. A summary narrative is dependent upon the previous presentation of material as its source. A episodic narrative is descriptive of an event which is independent of any events previously related. This does not imply that the recounted episode lacks a literary connection to what comes before or after it in the text, only that it does not summarize such material. In fact, a reading of the material prior to the recounted episode may inform the reading of the episode itself. The rhetorical effect is such that the reader may both recall and associate previous material with the present epi-

¹⁵Lorin L. Cranford, Exegeting the New Testament: A Seminar Working Model with Expanded Research Bibliography, 2d rev. ed. (Fort Worth: Scripta Publishing Inc., 1991), 62-63. For additional information on episodic narrative, especially the dramatic episode, see Eckhard Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte, Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, ed. Karl Georg Kuhn, vol. 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 80-139. This work is a helpful resource in working with the book of Acts and its relationship to hellenistic writing. For an extensive summary of this work in English, see Schuyler Brown, "Précis of Eckhard Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller," in Society of Biblical Literature: 1974 Seminar Papers, ed. George MacRae, vol. 2 (Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974), 103-13.

sode.¹⁶

Episodic narrative relates events within the general context of the narrative genre. Tannehill points out that events within the framework of the overall narrative may be out of chronological order. They may provide "previews of coming events and reviews of past events, often in a way that interprets these events from some perspective."¹⁷ Certainly for the reader of the Gallio court scene, there is an awareness that one day Paul will appeal to Caesar, the highest authority of Roman government. This scene might be taken as a foreshadowing of that journey which will be related to the reader as the conclusion of Acts.

The account of Acts 18:12-17 is illustrative of the characteristic elements of the episodic narrative. From attack, to court, to charge, to countercharge, to expulsion, to reaction must have taken a great deal of time. Yet, the account is both brief, as to passage of time, and concise, as to the connectiveness of related events. The heart of the episode is clearly found in the court dialogue between the Jews and Gallio. It is through reported dialogue, filled with the air of confrontation, that the message of the episode is

¹⁶Cranford, Exegeting the New Testament, 62-63.

¹⁷Robert C. Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story," Journal of Biblical Literature 104 (March 1985): 69-85.
This observation applies to the episodic narrative in a general way as a part of the overall narrative methodology. Tannehill does not specifically relate this description to episodic narrative.

delivered to the reader.

With all of its conciseness, the natural order or sequence of events is still reported accurately. The account is believable. In Acts 18:12-17, the reader finds at least two elements of the story which evoke trust in the "history" of the story precisely because they are unexpected. The first is Paul's failure at self-defence. It is Gallio who furnishes the interior speech that carries the day against the Jewish accusers of Paul. In Acts the reader has grown accustomed to Paul speaking for himself; but in this scene Paul is silenced by Gallio.

The second element is the beating of Sosthenes, and Gallio's lack of response to it, that is recorded as the exit scene from the story. The chaos of this part of the story has yet to be successfully cleared up by scholarship. Textual evidence indicates that earlier generations, passing along the story, also suffered some confusion as to what exactly happened in the last scene.

The Content of the Episodic Narrative

The episodic narrative usually included action and/or speech as its content. Martin Hengel observes that the ancient historian attached great importance "to typical episodes and programme-like speeches, which were composed in a realively free way; there was no concern to avoid tendentious-

ness or powerful value judgments."¹⁸

The speech could be direct or indirect, with direct speech more productive in involving the reader/listener in the story, by enlivening it. The direct speech was composed of commands, advice, appeals or announcements. By means of direct speech the readers were enabled to understand either why a person did what they did or were provided an explanation for the present action or some coming action on the part of the speech maker.

The speeches themselves were meant to convey either what was actually said or to present in a rhetorical fashion what might have been suitable for the character speaking in his/her situation.¹⁹ The possibilities open to Luke when recording direct speech were four in number: (1) interview those involved in the event and record in substance what was said; (2) remember from his own involvement and record in substance the speech as recalled; (3) freely improvise speeches appropriate

¹⁸Martin Hengel, Earliest Christianity: Containing Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity; Property and Riches in the Early Church, trans. John Bowden (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1986), 14. Hengel (36) calls the genre of Acts "a very special kind of 'historical monograph', a special history which describes the missionary development of a young religious movement in connection with two prominent personalities, Peter and Paul."

¹⁹Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, 11-12, suggests that Luke followed the practice of the ancient historians in composing speeches which are directed toward the reader to describe a "Wendepunkten" in the story. The book of Acts also shows the many forms of "dem literarischen Anspruch ihres Verfassers." Also Luke "seine Darstellung gelegentlich durch die Verwendung von Bildungselementen stofflicher Art auszus schmücken sucht."

to the event and those involved; and (4) research the event or recall it and write with free composition.²⁰

Where did Luke obtain the information for the episodes he records in Acts? Gerd Luedemann suggests that Luke groups his accounts of Paul's missionary service around available information from the various locations of Paul's ministry. Furthermore, Luedemann states, "Luke usually groups together into one passage whatever local traditions were available to him about a given locality."²¹

Conzelmann raises the question of the nature of any sources Luke may have used: Were they extensive, offering an original connected account or were they individual traditions?

²⁰Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, 91-125. The four choices for Luke in writing a direct speech are expanded from three options listed by Aune. Aune does not separate interview and recall; but these are two different ways to approach the material. Köster, Introduction to the New Testament, 51, suggests that "it cannot be assumed that these speeches are based upon any sources; rather, the composition of such speeches by the author fits the custom of Greek history writing."

²¹Gerd Lüdemann, Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology, foreword by John Knox, trans. F. Stanley Jones (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 158. It should be noted that Lüdemann uses this basic understanding of how Luke placed his material together to deny the historicity of the chapter as it now stands. He sees at least two Pauline visits spoken of in this one chapter (159). He also rejects on the basis of "Luke's apologetic tendency" the historicity of the trial of Paul before Gallio: "Thus, redaction-historical and literary reasons stand against the generally held opinion that there was a trial of Paul before Gallio in Corinth that resulted from a conspiracy of the Jews (160)." Lüdemann continues, "It is most likely that Luke had a tradition in which one of Paul's visits to Corinth was connected with the person of Gallio and that Luke then developed this tradition--in accord with his theology--into the episode of a nontrial of Paul before Gallio (160)."

Conzelmann confesses to being unable to answer his own question; but he does affirm that "in any case he [Luke] did not invent his individual stories, he merely put them into narrative form and connected them." Daniel Schwartz refers to Acts as "*schematic* in that it organizes events not, or not always, according to their historical order but rather according to their meaning for the story as the author wishes to present it."²²

According to Aune's research related to the construction of historical writing that contained dramatic episodes and speeches, these were usually included after the writing of rough drafts, in the final stage of composition. Aune adds: "This was probably Luke's procedure in Acts."²³ There is some textual evidence to support the idea that Luke included the story of Paul on trial before Gallio after having fashioned the earlier part of the chapter. Clearly verse 11, "And he stayed a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them," could serve as a concluding verse to Paul's Corinthian

²²Hans Conzelmann, Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel, ed. Eldon Jay Epp with Christopher R. Matthews, Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible, ed. Helmut Koester and others (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), xxxviii. Conzelmann (153) refers to this story as an "apologetic paradigm." Daniel R. Schwartz, "The End of the Line: Paul in the Canonical Book of Acts," in Paul and the Legacies of Paul, ed. William S. Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 5.

²³Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, 127.

ministry. Instead, the episode of Paul before Gallio is inserted between verses 11 and 18 and these two verses form an *inclusio* for the episode.

Although Acts 18:12-17 is a brief passage, it contains a statement by the Jews to Gallio (v. 13) and a response from Gallio (vv. 14-15). Both are reported as direct speech. The use of ὄτι in verse 13 serves in the same sense as quotation marks, to mark off the statement of the Jewish charge. While Gallio's response is introduced with εἶπεν ὁ Γαλλίωv (v. 14). How did Luke secure this information? There is no indication Luke was present, so he likely learned of the incident from Paul or another source. Gerd Luedemann bases his understanding of Acts 18:1-17 on his belief that Luke had a list of locations or "stations embellished with various episodes and that this source derived from a companion of Paul."²⁴

As mentioned above, the use of an episode, in-and-of-itself, does not guarantee the larger work containing it to be fact or fiction. What applies to the larger work, applies to the episode. It can be fictionalized from start to finish or adequately represent factual happenings, within the confines of its given form of brevity and conciseness.

Because the story is framed by two verses (vv. 11,18) that would if placed together, without the intervening verses (vv. 12-17), produce the omission of part or all of one verse or the other, it seems clear that Luke's story first existed

²⁴Lüdemann, Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles, 156.

as a separate piece of traditional material. The episode was added to the surrounding context for rhetorical effect.

Although the episode does "stick out" at this place, by virtue, in part, of its literary framing between verses 11 and 18, this is not to say that it is without connection to the preceding material.

The problem the Jews have had in Rome with emperor Claudius (18:2; cf. 18:16), the persuasive preaching and teaching of Paul (18:4; cf. 18:13), the turn to the Gentiles who will give him a hearing (18:6; cf. 18:14-15), the identification of Paul with those who worship God (18:7; cf. 18:13), the mention of a synagogue ruler (18:8; cf. 18:17), the command of the Lord to Paul that he not fear and that he not be silent (18:9; cf. 18:14), and the vision from the Lord that Paul would not be "attacked and harmed," (18:10; cf. 18:14-16) are all pieces of the literary cloth that battle against considering verses 12-18 a completely disjunctive episode. The above extensive list of preceding "flavorings" of the Gallio episode are not meant to imply that Luke created a story "out of thin air"; but rather, that the independent story was given interdependent dimensions by the final author, Luke.²⁵

²⁵Dixon Slingerland, "Acts 18:1-18, The Gallio Inscription, and Absolute Pauline Chronology," Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (Fall 1991): 441-42, rejects the historicity of the account with the following statement: "Acts 18:1-18 is a carefully focused narrative the principal elements of which were created or borrowed and organized in terms of theological and political rather than historical-chronological purposes." See also Alfred F. Loisy, Les Actes des Apôtres (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920), 698,

To take but one of the several "flavorings" and follow it into the episodic narrative, consider how the command of the Lord to Paul that he speak (v. 9, imperative) is handled in the recounting of the court scene before Gallio. Since it is important to Luke's purpose that Gallio speak, representing Rome, it would not be effective to cast Gallio's speech onto Paul. Elsewhere in Acts at court or trial scenes, Paul does provide his own defence (23:1-6; 24:10-21,24-25; 25:8-11; 26:1-29); but at this place if Paul were to say, "Most excellent Gallio, I am not guilty of any misdemeanor or serious crime," Luke's point for the story would be lost. Yet, Paul has been commanded to speak. How then to explain his silence? Could this not be the very purpose of Luke's note: μέλλοντος δὲ τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα (v. 14a)? By including this prelude to Gallio's speech, Luke has cleared Paul, as it were, of any charge of either fear or silence.

The Function of the Episodic Narrative

The episodic narrative functions to encourage the reader to participate emotionally in the story. This function is in part fulfilled by unifying the episode around plot and action and, by sometimes providing material of biographical interest.

who denies the historicity of this account before Gallio and the earlier account before Sergius Paulus (Acts 13:6-12): "Aucun de ces deux personnages n'aurait été cité par le rédacteur s'ils n'appartenaient l'un et l'autre à l'histoire; mais il ne s'ensuit pas que les incidents où on les fait figurer, les propos qui leur sont attribués, soient historiques."

Just as the use of actions and direct speech formed the writing of history for the ancients, both elements may appear in the individual episodes of that history.²⁶ The reader is pulled into the story, and "the story" functions to continue the reader through the larger story. Eckhard Plümacher points out that for Luke

den dramatischen Episodenstil auch dann anwenden konnte, wenn es sich einmal nicht direkt darum handelte, politische und apologetische Thesen oder theologische Ideen aus ihrer unanschaulichen Abstraktion zu lösen und mittels dieses Stils in anschaulicher und effektvoller Darstellung im Geschehen konkret werden zu lassen.²⁷

The episode, though independent at some point from its present context, now serves the function of unity. Thus, the presence of episodic narrative in Acts does not imply the narrative nature of Acts lacks unity. Tannehill's thesis that "the episodes receive their meaning through their function within the larger whole" needs to be kept in mind and tested for validity.²⁸ Lawrence Wills posits a narrative movement in Acts, for what he refers to as "the episodic and adventurous

²⁶Aune, The New Testament in Its Literary Environment, 37-91.

²⁷Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, 110.

²⁸Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story," 69. Agreement that there is an overriding purpose for Luke-Acts does not, however, mean there is agreement about that purpose. Tannehill (69) says that "the episodes in Luke-Acts are part of a unitary story because they are related to a unifying purpose, the βουλή τοῦ θεοῦ, to which the writing refers with some frequency (Luke 7:30, Acts 2:23, 4:28, 5:38-39, 13:36, 20:27)."

nature of the work," which consists of an organizing principle built around "a repeating cycle of three dramatic moments: positive missionary activity, opposition and constriction, and release and expansion."²⁹

There is evidence in the arrangement and in the wording of the episode in Acts 18:12-17 to indicate that Luke has shaped this episode to fit the other scenes of the chapter, as is shown in the exegesis to follow; yet the charge of the Jews and the decision of Gallio show signs of careful reflection of what might have been said in the setting described.³⁰ In the Jewish charge, ἀναπείθει is used only here in the New Testament. The response of Gallio includes the word ῥαδιούργημα, which is no where else found in this same form in the New Testament. Additionally, Gallio's speech uses several Greek words or phrases in a judicial sense: ἀνεσχόμεν, ὄψεσθε αὐτοί, and κριτῆς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι.³¹ This does not prove, of course, that Luke did not himself summarize or freely improvise the court scene dialogue. It does seem to indicate, however, that Luke had some concern to mediate

²⁹Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," 639.

³⁰Conzelmann, Acts of the Apostles, 153, remarks: "Since this account is not an official record of the trial, one should not ask which law the accusing Jews had in mind, the Jewish (which enjoyed the protection of the Roman government; the singular form τὸν θεόν, 'God,' is cited in favor of this view--but the account has been written by Luke, and he certainly knows Jews would have spoken about God only in the singular) or the Roman."

³¹See the discussion of these words in the exegesis of the passage.

reality, not write fiction *per se*.

The material of Acts 18:9-11 has an important function to play as an interlude between the rising opposition to Paul's ministry by the Jews and his appearance before Gallio in the episodic narrative. John Polhill describes the form of these verses as "that of a divine commissioning narrative in which God or his angel appears to a human agent, gives a task to be performed, and gives an assurance of his presence."³² The vision enables Paul to remain in Corinth for an extensive ministry, his first long-term missionary ministry on his journeys.³³

The vision also sets the stage for the episodic narrative of the trial before Gallio which follows. The Lord confirms for Paul that there are many in Corinth who will respond to the message. The trial scene before Gallio functions to enable the reader of Acts to understand how Paul's ministry at Corinth received a boost from an unexpected source. This is not to imply that Gallio is pictured as a Christian sympathizer in the court scene. However, the reader is given a clue in verse 18 ("Paul stayed on in Corinth for some time") that the outcome of the trial enabled Paul to extend his ministry in Corinth. This is in contrast to the earlier evangelistic, church planting ministries on his missionary

³²John B. Polhill, *Acts*, vol. 26, The New American Commentary, ed. David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992), 386.

³³Ibid.

travels, which lasted only days or weeks before opposition forced him to move to other places. Tannehill understands the connection as follows:

In the vision scene the Lord intervenes both to require and (through divine protection) allow a change in the pattern of events that has been common to this point in Paul's mission. There is to be no quick mission and rapid escape.³⁴

Charles Talbert understands verses 9-17 as a "prophecy-fulfillment schema" which includes a two part prophecy made to Paul in the night vision. Paul will have freedom to speak; and he will be protected from harm (vv. 9-10). The fulfillment of the first promise comes in the statement of the length of Paul's ministry (v. 11) and of the second promise in the outcome of his forced trial before Gallio.³⁵ While this pattern may have some validity to it, it can lead to a mistaken understanding of the purpose of the Gallio episode, if one only sees it as a story to indicate how God kept Paul from harm. Certainly, this is not how the episode functions at this place. In fact, Talbert himself understands the Gallio story as much more significant than the second element of a promise-fulfillment schema. The episode indicates to the reader that Roman government did not see Christianity as separate from Judaism. In the context of chapter 18, it is

³⁴Robert C. Tannehill, The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation, vol. 2: The Acts of the Apostles (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 224.

³⁵Charles H. Talbert, Acts, Knox Preaching Guides, ed. John H. Hayes (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984), 78.

used by Luke to emphasize that the removal of Paul's preaching ministry from the synagogue to the house of Titius Justus (v. 7) was not an indication that Christianity was now institutionally separate from Judaism.³⁶

CHAPTER 2

³⁶Ibid., 79-80.

AN EXEGESIS OF ACTS 18:12-17

Translation

18:12 When Gallio was proconsul of Achaia, the Jews together attacked Paul and brought him before Gallio's court. **18:13** They charged: "This man is persuading the people to worship God in ways that are against the law." **18:14** Just as Paul was about to speak, Gallio said to the Jews, "If, indeed, you Jews this were a charge of crime or fraudulent deception, I would with reason listen patiently to you. **18:15** But since this is a controversial charge concerning language and names and your own law, see to it yourselves. I do not wish to be judge of such matters." **18:16** So he ejected them from his court. **18:17** Then they all took hold of Sosthenes, the leader in the synagogue, and began to beat him before the court. But Gallio showed no concern for any of this.

Expositional Outline

- I. Scene 1: The Jews brought Paul to Gallio's court (18:12-13)
- II. Scene 2: Gallio responded to the charge against Paul (18:14-16)
- III. Scene 3: The way the trial concluded (18:17)

Introduction

Pesch identifies four scenes in Acts 18:1-17 which form the chapter. The first scene is found in verses 1-4. Paul establishes a teaching ministry with the synagogue as a base and may have been allowed to serve as "die Lehrvorträge in der Synagoge." The second scene, verses 5-8, describes a short, but intensive ministry to the Jews that ended with Paul in the house of Titus Justus. The third scene, verses 9-11, points to the one year and six month ministry of Paul and the growth of the Christian community in Corinth. The fourth scene is

verses 12-17, the court scene before Gallio.¹

These four scenes are not, however, without narrative links. Robert Tannehill observes that, following the introductory verses of scene one, "the materials are shaped into three varieties of type-scenes highlighting three important pronouncements (by Paul, v. 6; by the Lord, vv. 9-10; and by Gallio, vv. 14-15).²

**The Jews brought Paul to
Gallio's court (18:12-13)**

The declaration of Paul in Acts 18:6 that he would from now on go to the Gentiles (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη πορεύσομαι) gains added strength from the story of his arraignment before Gallio, which was forced by a united attack of the Jews (κατεπέστησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Παύλῳ).³ The text

¹Rudolf Pesch, Die Apostelgeschichte, vol. 5, part 2 (Acts 13-28), Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, ed. Josef Blank and others (Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1986), 150-51. Gerd Lüdemann, Das frühe Christentum nach den Tradition der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987), 207, says "Traditionselemente in diesem Abschnitt sind die Notiz vom „Prozeß“ vor Gallio und der Name des Synagogenvorstehers Sosthenes. Wie die Tradition ausgesehen hat, aufgrund derer Lukas den (Nicht-)Prozeß vor Gallio schuf, ist schwierig zu beantworten; doch möchte ich meinen Vorschlag wiederholen, daß Lukas eine Tradition vorfand, die einen Besuch Pauli in Korinth mit der Person des Gallio zusammenbrachte, und diese dann--im Sinne seiner Theologie--zur Episode eines Nicht-Prozesses gegen Paulus vor Gallio komponierte."

²Tannehill, The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts, 221.

³Bruce M. Metzger, ed., A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, corr. ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1975), 463, makes the following textual observation at verse 12: "After Ἰουδαῖοι the Western text (D it^h and partly syr^h with *) continues with the more colorful account συναλλάγησαντες

does not make clear what amount of force may have been used against Paul to bring about his appearance before Gallio. Paul may have agreed to the trial of his own free will following the confrontation.⁴

The overall treatment of the Jews in the book of Acts is the subject of much scholarly discussion. Two basic views are commonly shared in answer to this problem, with many variations. The first view argues for a break between Paul and Judaism that encompassed both leaders and people. One example of this view is found in the works of Slingerland. He argues that the phrase οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (13:45,50; 14:2; 17:5, 13; 18:12; 21:11; 21:27; 23:12,20; 24:9, and 25:7) in the pauline portion of Acts is always "used in the context of Jewish abuse of Paul." In the end the Jew is shut out and the Gentile is in.

In contrast, the second view, as expressed by David Tiede among others, recognizes the problem of the relationship of Gentile Christianity and Judaism as pictured in Acts, but concludes that "God is never done with Israel in any of the scriptural, intertestamental or New Testament documents, and Luke-Acts is no exception."⁵

μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐπὶ τὸν Παῦλον, καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας ἤγαγον αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν ἀνθύπατον (D has ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα), καταβοῶντες καὶ λέγοντες. . . ."

⁴I. Howard Marshall, The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980), 297.

⁵Dixon Slingerland, "The Composition of Acts: Some Redaction-Critical Observations," Journal of the American Academy of Religion 56 (Spring 1988): 99. He notes (100) that

One solution to the problem, not belonging to either of the two views, but trying to soften what seems a rather harsh treatment toward the Jews, is the suggestion that a redactor reworked earlier material at a time when the split between Christianity and Judaism was complete and the redactor added the strong anti-Jewish element.⁶ This view, however, does not solve the problem since the "redacted" Acts is the canonical

with the exception of Acts 9:23, οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι does "not appear in the pre-pauline materials"; contra, David L. Tiede, "'Glory to Thy People Israel!': Luke-Acts and the Jews," in Society of Biblical Literature: 1986 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 151; and Robert C. Tannehill, "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts," in Society of Biblical Literature: 1986 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 130-41; see also, Jack T. Sanders, "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts," in Society of Biblical Literature: 1986 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 110-29, who concludes his understanding of Luke's view of the Jews with the words, "'The Jews' are the villains, not the victims" (129); idem, "The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts," in Society of Biblical Literature: 1982 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982), 467-483; see also, Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," 652, who ties both the pro-gentile view and the anti-semitic view together: "The negative depiction of the Jews and the apology in respect to the Roman state go together, as opposite sides of the same coin. They are not to be pursued as separate themes in the redaction criticism of Luke-Acts, but express a coordinated impulse: to define the deconstruction of one relationship and the construction of another."

⁶This is the view of Loisy, Les Actes des Apôtres, 104-121. But notice that Loisy (939) suggests that the conclusion of Acts shows the Jews to no longer belong to the true religion: ". . . l'on n'en doit pas conclure que le christianisme soit une religion étrangère au judaïsme ou même antijuive. C'est, si on l'ose dire, la vraie religion juive. Il y a seulement que les Juifs, par un inconcevable aveuglement, qui d'ailleurs est bien dans la logique de leur histoire, ainsi que l'a montré le discours d'Etienne, et que l'on voit annoncé par la bouche du prophète Isaïe, ont repoussé le don de Dieu."

Acts.

Luke displays historical accuracy in identifying Achaia as a senatorial province governed by a proconsul. This status had only been returned to this province in A.D. 44. Earlier in its history, from 27 B.C. to A.D. 15, it had also been a senatorial province.⁷

The location of the court scene is identified as τὸ βῆμα (18:12,16). The development of this word seems to have been from the seat where the judge sat ("judgment seat" KJV), to the general surroundings of that seat ("court" NIV, NEB, TEV), to the magistrate ("before the tribunal" RSV, JB). Richard Longenecker describes the "Bema" at Corinth as "a large, raised platform that stood in the agora (marketplace) in front of the residence of the proconsul and served as a forum where he tried cases."⁸

Date of the Trial

The story of Paul's trial before Gallio offers an opportunity to date a part of Paul's ministry with some degree of

⁷Richard N. Longenecker, The Acts of the Apostles, vol. 9: John-Acts, The Expositor's Bible Commentary with the New International Version of the Holy Bible, ed. Frank E. Gaebelin, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981), 485.

⁸This is the progression of meaning recorded in F. J. Foaks Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles, vol. 14, trans. and commentary by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury (London: Macmillan and Co., limited, 1933), 227. Also, information was taken from Longenecker, The Acts of the Apostles, 486.

certainty.⁹ Gallio was originally named Marcus Annaeus Novatus. He was the older brother of Seneca, the philosopher. When his family came to Rome, he was adopted by Lucius Junius Gallio, a rhetorician, and accepted his name, Gallio. He became proconsul of Achaia under Claudius. An inscription at Delphi contains a reference by Claudius to Gallio as proconsul of Achaia. This inscription can be dated somewhat accurately since it mentions that Claudius was in his twelfth year of tribunal power, which would be January 25, 52 to January 24, 53.

The time of Gallio's service as proconsul can be dated as beginning at about July 1, 51. Usually the term of service was for one year; but sometimes a one year extension was given. Assuming Gallio served two years, he would have served at least through June, 53. If, at the least, he served only one year, then he was in Corinth from July 51 through June 52. Since Paul was tried before him at Corinth, we can be sure that Paul's eighteen months ministry in Corinth placed him there sometime from 51-52.

⁹Not all agree with this certainty. Dixon Slingerland, "Acts 18:1-18, The Gallio Inscription, and Absolute Pauline Chronology," Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (Fall 1991): 449, states: "In sum, contrary to one of scholarship's most longstanding consensuses, it is not possible to establish narrow absolute dates within Pauline chronology on the basis of the relationship between Acts 18:1-18 and the Gallio inscription." But for detailed information of the dating of Gallio's proconsulate, see Adolf Deissmann, St. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History, trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan (New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912), 235-260.

Chapter 18:2 also describes the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Claudius. This is generally believed to have happened in Claudius's ninth year, which would be January 25, 49 to January 24, 50. If, as seems likely from the setting of Acts 18, Paul had already spent some time at Corinth before the arrival of Gallio as proconsul, a probable date can be given for his Corinthian ministry as taking place sometime between the winter of 49/50 and the spring of 52.¹⁰

As for the actual date of Paul's trial before Gallio, it cannot be specifically determined. However, many scholars think that the Jews probably brought Paul before Gallio not long after Gallio began his proconsular duties.¹¹ This was the Jews' effort to test the new political waters. Therefore the trial would have taken place in the summer of 51.¹²

¹⁰The date of this expulsion notice by Claudius is questioned by some today. For a full explanation see Lüdemann, Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles, 162-77, who concludes (170): "Our analysis of the extant sources for the edict concerning the Jews has yielded a great degree of probability for the following result: The edict of Claudius concerning the Jews that is reflected in Acts 18:2 was issued in the year 41." Contra Lüdemann, see Slingerland, "Acts 18:1-17 and Luedemann's Pauline Chronology," 686-690.

¹¹Contra, see Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 227, who say "The phrase must not be pressed to mean 'at the beginning of his proconsulate.' The probability that the trial of Paul came at the beginning of his period of office is not based on the language, but merely on the presumption (admittedly not very strong) that the Jews are more likely to have tried an experiment with a new proconsul."

¹²The historical information contained in the above paragraphs is common to many sources. However, the sources used for this compilation were the following: F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary (London: Tyndale Press, 1952), 346; Ernest

The Purpose of the Trial

According to F. F. Bruce, Luke's inclusion of this episode from the life of Paul "is of high relevance to the apologetic motive of his history."¹³ This seems true. John Polhill observes that

the Gallio episode is almost paradigmatic for Paul's appearances before Roman officials in Acts. None of them found him guilty of having broken any Roman law.¹⁴

Schwartz claims that there were two features to Luke's apologetic. The first feature focuses on the "claim that the Jews

Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, trans. Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, supervised by Hugh Anderson, rev. trans. R. McL. Wilson (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971), 536-38; and Frank Stagg, The Book of Acts: The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955), 188-89.

¹³F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts, rev., The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. F. F. Bruce (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988), 354. Longenecker, The Acts of the Apostles, 486, suggests that Luke makes this account "the apex from an apologetic perspective of all that took place on Paul's second missionary journey."

¹⁴Polhill, Acts, 388. Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, 84-85, indicates "an dieser Stelle formuliert Lk jenes Programm der staatlichen Unzuständigkeit nicht in einer abstrakten Darlegung, sondern in einer plastischen Szene, und das, ohne sich diesmal in der erzählerischen Zwangslage zu befinden, durch Spannung und szenische Lebendigkeit ersetzen zu müssen, was an sachlicher Auskunft fehlt." Gallio is pictured as rejecting authority "für religiöse ζητήματα." Plümacher describes the purpose of Luke's style as follows: ". . . : nicht blaß und abstrakt, sondern in einer anschaulichen Szene lebendig gemacht, bringt Lk jeweils seine These dem Leser zu Bewußtsein. Auch, daß Gallio sich nun an dieses Votum hält, behauptet Lk nicht einfach, sondern stellt es wiederum dramatisch dar (V 17)."

drove Paul away,"¹⁵ and the second on Rome. Schwartz states that "Acts is concerned to show its readers that the Christian religion posed no threat to Rome and that Christians had, on the contrary, always honored Rome and been respected and protected by it."¹⁶

Luke stresses the fact that Gallio did not consider the charges against Paul as the kind of charges that should be brought before a Roman proconsul. By information internal to the episodic narrative, it seems clear that the charge leveled against Paul concerned his message (v. 15-ὁ λόγος) and not disruptive action.¹⁷ This was not the kind of case that Gallio was interested in trying; and he let the Jewish leaders know this in no uncertain terms. There is an element of irony in the conclusion of the trial, since disruptive action resulted from the trial itself. But Gallio refused to respond to the turmoil. One possible literary reason for including the episode at Gallio's court may be the element of surprise that comes with Gallio's rejection of the Jews' charge against Paul.¹⁸ In Acts 18:10 Paul is advised through the night vision

¹⁵On three occasions in Acts (13:46; 18:6; 28:26-28) Paul turns away from the Jews to the Gentiles because of a stubborn resistance on the part of the Jews to the gospel.

¹⁶Schwartz, "The End of the Line," 11-13.

¹⁷Longenecker, The Acts of the Apostles, 484. Polhill, Acts, 388, thinks there is a possibility that "words" refers to the Scriptures. If so, Gallio refused to judge matters relating to the scripture, the Messiah, the Torah.

¹⁸Adrian Nicholas Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament (Oxford: At the Clarendon Press,

with the Lord that "no one is going to attack and harm you, because I have many people in this city" (v. 10-διότι ἐγὼ εἶμι μετὰ σοῦ καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεται σοὶ τοῦ κακῶσαί σε διότι λαός ἐστί μοι πολὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ). Almost immediately after that statement, Paul is attacked and brought for judgement before Gallio, whose guilty verdict, no doubt, would eventuate in some kind of harm for Paul. This circumstance seems to go against the promise. Instead, the reader discovers that one of the people the Lord has in the city is the proconsul of Achaia, Gallio. The only verdict delivered that day is against the Jews: they are found guilty of bringing unworthy charges before a Roman court. Paul, the Christian, is set free.

The Charge made against Paul

After the Jews captured Paul, compelling him to attend Gallio's court, it was necessary that they present a formal charge against Paul. The impression gained from this event is that local Sanhedrins in the Diaspora had no "formally recognized right to force obedience upon their own adherents."¹⁹ The nature of the charge brought against Paul probably reflected a Jewish attempt to broaden their accusation beyond Hebraic law to include the breaking of Roman law: ἤγαγον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα λέγοντες ὅτι Παρὰ τὸν νόμον ἀναπέθει οὗτος τοὺς

1963), 99, remarks that "the narrative of Acts makes the absence of any specific malefaction the ground on which the proconsul refuses to take cognizance." For understanding this as "promise-fulfillment" see the discussion in chapter one.

¹⁹Ibid., 100.

ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν (18:12b-13). By identifying the group Paul sought to persuade as τοὺς ἀνθρώπους rather than τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, the Jewish leaders hoped to have Paul found guilty of breaking Roman law.²⁰

Although now disputed by some, the foundation of the charge made by the Jews against Paul probably rests in some way with the idea that he and his companions were preaching a *religio illicita*.²¹ This would be in contrast to a religion with the status of *collegium licitum*. Under this status a religious society could form and operate legally under Roman law. The Jewish communities and synagogues around the Roman empire were covered by this legal status. This may have been what the Jews hoped Gallio would render as his judgement: Judaism is legal; but Christianity is not Judaism and is

²⁰Ibid., 100-101. See, William John Conybeare and J. S. Howson, The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, 2 vols. in 1 vol (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906), 418-19, who believe that the Jews "accused St. Paul of violating their own law. They seem to have thought, if this violation of Jewish law could be proved, that St. Paul would become amenable to the criminal law of the empire; or, perhaps, they hoped . . . that he would be given up into their hands for punishment."

²¹F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text, 345. Polhill, Acts, 388, n. 122, however, makes the observation that "appeal to the concept of *religio licita* is somewhat precarious, the view that the Romans kept a list of accepted foreign religions and that the Jews were attempting to divorce themselves from Christians, thus making the latter an officially unrecognized religion. No first-century evidence exists that the Romans kept such a list. . . ." Also see, Conzelmann, Acts of the Apostles, 153, who states: "This concept which is used without hesitation in modern literature was unknown to him, because there was no such conception."

therefore illegal.²² As for Luke's intention, Conzelmann suggests that

Here the legal situation from the standpoint of the Roman state is defined in a way that Luke would like to suggest as the ideal for Roman practice: the state should not become involved in controversies within the Jewish community involving Christians--the disputes lie outside the jurisdiction of Roman law.²³

Already from Acts 16:20-21 the reader is aware that Paul and Silas were imprisoned by Roman authorities because of a charge that they proclaimed customs which Romans could neither accept nor practice: Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι ἐκταράσσουσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν, Ἰουδαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες καὶ καταγγέλλουσιν ἔθνη ἃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν παραδέχασθαι οὐδὲ ποιεῖν Ῥωμαίοις οὖσιν (16:20b-21). It may be that the Jewish leaders were hoping to convince Gallio that Roman best interests were involved with the trial of Paul. If so, they were unsuccessful. Gallio rejected their charge against Paul, possibly picking up ὁ νόμος (v. 13) from their charge and interpreting it as ὁ νόμος καθ' ὑμᾶς (v. 15).²⁴

Sherwin-White does discuss the possibility that the charge the Jews brought against Paul may have been based on

²²Bruce, The Book of Acts, 353.

²³Conzelmann, Acts of the Apostles, 153.

²⁴Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law, 102. Sherwin-White (102) observes that "his [Gallio's] final words, κριτῆς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι, are the precise answer of a Roman magistrate refusing to exercise his *arbitrium iudicantis* ['free formulation of charges and penalties,' 17] within a matter *extra ordinem* ['"outside the List,"' 14]."

the "edicts of Claudius which guaranteed them the quiet enjoyment of their native customs throughout the Diaspora."²⁵ That such an attack against Paul might be made would fit the general context of the chapter. The Jews at Corinth opposed Paul to the point that he had decided to focus his ministry on the Gentiles (v.6-τὰ ἔθνη), leaving the synagogue as the primary scene of his Corinthian ministry: διελέγετο δὲ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον κ.τ.λ. (v.4). The ministry of Paul seems to have convinced Crispus, a synagogue ruler, and his family to believe in the Lord (v. 8). The success of Paul might well be the underlying cause for the action of the Jews. As Sherwin-White says, ". . . they might hope to invoke the proconsul's authority against a fellow Jew who interfered, as Paul certainly was interfering, with the quiet practice of their customs."²⁶

The actual charge against Paul accuses him of using a misleading, seducing kind of persuasive speech (ἀναπείθει) to compel people to follow his understanding of how to worship God.²⁷ It was against Roman law to proselyte Roman citizens, but the law did not apply to non-citizens. Apparently, the Jews hoped somehow to persuade Gallio that Paul's speech was

²⁵Ibid., 102.

²⁶Ibid., 102-3.

²⁷ἀναπείθω occurs only here in the New Testament. For its meaning as seducing or misleading speech, see F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text, 347. Acts 18:4 uses the verb πείθω to describe Paul's purpose in proclamation.

incendiary and dangerous to the *pax Romana*.²⁸ If that was their plan, they failed in their purpose.

**Gallio responded to the charge
against Paul (18:14-16)**

Whatever the Jews hoped to accomplish in bringing Paul before Gallio, the course of the trial led in opposite directions. Of course, the episodic narrative describing the account contains only the briefest summary of what actually took place. But precisely because the account is telescoped, every recorded word and action gains in significance for the reader. Finding the heart of the story may shed important light on Luke's purpose for including it at this point in his account of Paul's ministry.

**A Proposed Chiastic Structure
for Acts 18:12-17**

The proposed chiastic structure for the entire episodic narrative may help drive home Luke's point in telling this story.²⁹ If the chiastic structure has any validity, it focuses

²⁸Jackson and Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, 227.

²⁹This chiastic structure was developed by the writer of this paper. If the structure does have validity, the emphasis of Gallio's answer comes to the front of the story: This crime, of which you are accusing this man Paul, is no crime at all by Roman law. Even if the chiastic structure is somewhat forced, the same general conclusions can be reached, apart from agreeing to a chiastic form. Interestingly, Donald R. Miesner, "The Circumferential Speeches of Luke-Acts: Patterns and Purpose," in *Society of Biblical Literature: 1978 Seminar Papers*, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier, vol. 2 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978), 223-37, has discovered what he believes to be chiastic structures in Paul's two speeches at Rome (Acts

the attention on Gallio's clear statement that the message of Paul is not a violation of any Roman law. In short, there is nothing Gallio finds illegal about Paul's activities as far as Rome is concerned.

The turning point of the encounter between the Jews, their supposed victim, Paul, and Gallio, the judge is a critical part of the story. The reader/hearer anticipates the outcome of this meeting. Paul, the hero, is in trouble again with the Jews. Will Paul once again be driven from a city? Or will he be beat with a rod and thrown in jail? In but a moment's time, the answer comes; but it does not come by some defense on Paul's part. It comes, rather, from unexpected quarters; even though the reader has already come to expect from Luke's handling of the material that the Roman government will not condemn Paul.

The following chiasitic structure represents one way to picture the episodic narrative of Acts 18:12-17.

- A. **Gallio** was proconsul of Achaia (18:12)
- B. The Jews made a **united attack** against Paul (18:12b)
- C. The Jews brought Paul **to court** (18:12c)
- D. The Jews **presented a charge** against Paul

28:17-20; 25-29) before the Jews. The first chiasmus (Acts 28:17-20) has as its center point, verse 18: "because I was not guilty of any crime deserving death." Removing the last phrase, "deserving death," the verdict is the same as the statement of Gallio that he does not find Paul guilty of any crime against the state. These possible chiasms were discovered after the writer had developed his own chiasmus for Acts 18:12-17. See appendix 6 for the suggested chiasmus of Acts 28:17-20.

(18:13)

E. Gallio described a legitimate charge
(18:14)

D'. Gallio **refused the charge** presented by the
Jews (18:15)

C'. Gallio ejected the Jews **from the court** (18:16)

B'. The Greeks (and/or Jews) made a **united attack** against
Sosthenes (18:17a)

A'. **Gallio** showed no concern for the Jews (18:17b)³⁰

If this chiasmic arrangement has merit, it would indicate that Gallio, a Roman official, could find no legitimate charge against Paul under Roman law.³¹ This emphasis of innocence under Roman law may be (in its context in Acts 18) a rebuke of the Jews in general, whom Claudius had ordered earlier to leave Rome (18:2). The Jews were found guilty of some offense against Rome by Claudius; Paul, the Christian, was found innocent of any offense before Gallio, a Roman proconsul.

The context of Acts 18 adds another insight to the court scene. The word Paul received from the Lord in a night vision counseled against fear of the Jews and for Paul to continue his proclamation (v.9-εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος ἐν νυκτὶ δι' ὀράματος

³⁰The center piece of the chiasmus is the part of the speech of Gallio. It is possible that the center should include both parts of Gallio's rebuke. The form would remain the same, A B C D E D' C' B' A', but E would be expanded to include the words of Gallio up to, "settle the matter yourselves. I will not be a judge of such things" (18:15b). Either way, the heart of the story remains with Gallio's words, not with the charge of the Jews, nor with the beating of Sosthenes.

³¹Ibid., 100, states that "it is within the competence of the judge to decide whether to accept a novel charge or not."

τῷ Παύλῳ, Μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσης). The message Paul was proclaiming was, "Jesus is Christ" (v. 5-συνείχετο τῷ λόγῳ ὁ Παῦλος διαμαρτυρούμενος τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν). But in the context of the court scene it is Gallio who speaks to the Jews, while Paul is silenced by the interruption (v. 14-δὲ μέλλοντος τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα εἶπεν ὁ Γαλλίων πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους).

If the chiastic structure can be trusted, *it is clear why Paul cannot speak and why Gallio must speak.*³² The point this episode makes is one that only a Roman government official can creditably make: the Roman government takes no offense with the message Paul is proclaiming. Luke apparently feels that this point of declared innocence by a Roman government official is important enough that he risks the presentation of Paul's silence in near proximity to the Lord's command that Paul go on speaking, as indeed, Paul was about to do.

An Analysis of the Response of Gallio

If the Jews had intended to test the new proconsul of Achaia to try and gain some ground for their insistence that Paul was not conducting his ministry within the framework of

³²In keeping with the characteristic of brevity, common to the episodic narrative, the answer of Gallio is brief. However, William Mitchell Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896), 258, observes: "It is clear that Gallio's short speech represents the conclusion of a series of inquiries, for the accusation, as it is quoted, does not refer to words or names, but only to the Law."

Roman law, their ploy failed. As the words of the episode go, there is some confusion as to exactly whose law Paul was declared to have broken, Roman or Jewish. Frank Stagg is probably right in suggesting that the ambiguity belongs to the story:

These Jews certainly held Paul's preaching to be contrary to Jewish law; and if it could be declared outside Judaism, it would be as an 'unlawful religion,' against Roman law.³³

At any rate, Gallio left no doubt as to how he perceived their charge against Paul. He refused jurisdiction over the matter. Pesch makes the following observation concerning the reaction of Gallio to the charge:

Gallio hat vielmehr durchschaut, daß es um »Streitfragen« (vgl. zu 15,2) betreffs der Lehre der Juden, ihrer Personen (wie den Streti um Jesu Messianität) oder ihres »Gesetzes« (vgl. 13) überhaupt geht; deshalb sollen sie ihre Angelegenheiten, die den römischen Staat nicht tangieren, selbst regeln.³⁴

Bruce recognizes that this verdict by Gallio likely carried impact beyond his own province and that had the verdict gone against Paul "the progress of Christianity during the next decade or so could have been attended by much greater difficulties than were actually experienced."³⁵

In answering the Jews, Gallio mentions "τά ὀνόματα." As part of his answer to the Jews, Gallio says he will not judge *περὶ . . . ὀνομάτων* (18:15). Could this be a veiled reference

³³Stagg, The Book of Acts, 191.

³⁴Pesch, Die Apostelgeschichte, 151.

³⁵Bruce, The Book of Acts, 352.

to Paul's proclamation of Jesus as the Christ? Acts 18:5 declared that Paul was testifying that Jesus was the Christ. In Corinth, the title ὁ Χριστός when applied to Jesus formed a basic dividing line between Jews who believed and those who blasphemed (Acts 18:5-8). In the earlier proclamation of the church, as Luke records it in Acts 2:36, Peter declares ὅτι καὶ κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. The results were that about three thousand people were added to their number (Acts 2:41). But in Corinth, calling Jesus the Christ is pictured as causing a great disturbance among the Jews.

If Suetonius's account, in the Life of Claudius, of the problem in Rome which had resulted in the expulsion of the Jews (ca. A.D. 49) from that city is correct, the disturbance among the Jews was "instigated by one 'Chrestus.'"³⁶ At any rate, the disturbance in Corinth certainly seems to have had something to do with ὁ Χριστός.

This should not be surprising since at least two Jews from Rome had made their way to Corinth as a direct result of the expulsion notice of Claudius, Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:2). Since their conversion is not described, it is possible that they were already Christians while in Rome. They would, no doubt, come to Corinth with fresh memories of the recent expulsion and of its cause. The name of Jesus Christ

³⁶Stagg, The Book of Acts, 188. Stagg (188) adds that "the majority of scholars understand this to be a reference to Christ, with the usual misspelling of the name by Roman writers; this is probably true, but cannot be established."

became a powder keg in Corinth among the Jews who lived there; and, as perhaps in Rome(?), the attention of the Roman government soon turned to the disturbance. However, at Corinth Gallio had no intention of getting involved with the Jews over "names." So, Gallio refused both to get involved in judgment over the matter brought before him (v. 15) and to give the issue his attention (v. 17).

What crimes would Gallio be willing to adjudicate? The word ἀδίκημα can be translated with the idea of crime; but this includes "open or violent wrong-doing."³⁷ The word ῥαδιούργημα occurs only here in the New Testament. However, a similar word ῥαδιούργια is found in Acts 13:10. In that context, Paul uses the word to describe the character of the Jewish sorcerer and false prophet, Bar-Jesus, as deceptive and fraudulent. The negative connotations of the word are clear. The idea of fraud or deception accompanies the word.³⁸

The response of Gallio includes a positive statement that declares his willingness to listen patiently (ἀνέχομαι) to charges that effect the public good, as would be his reasonable (κατὰ λόγον) duty.³⁹ However, the second class conditional sentence used in this first part of Gallio's response indicates a condition contrary to fact. The Jews are not

³⁷Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 227.

³⁸Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text, 349.

³⁹Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 227-28.

bringing a legitimate charge against Paul before the proconsular (18:14). The second part of Gallio's response is a first class conditional sentence which indicates a true to fact response. The charge brought against Paul is a Jewish matter and not a Roman matter.⁴⁰ Gallio's refusal to entertain the charge of the Jews involves throwing the charge back upon them to settle. The phrase ὄψεσθε αὐτοί is a colloquial use of the future indicative. At one and the same time it relinquishes personal responsibility for an action and places that responsibility on another.⁴¹

The way the trial concluded (18:17)

The difficulty of establishing the group (πάντες) that struck Sosthenes has long been noted. Two textual variations exist which seek to clarify the identity of the group. One claims the Greeks were the attackers (πάντες οἱ Ἕλληνες); the other claims the Jews beat him (πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι).⁴²

The question must be asked, Why would either group desire

⁴⁰Simon J. Kistenmaker, New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990), 660. Pesch, Die Apostelgeschichte, 151, writes: "In direkter Rede sind zwei Konditionalsätze wiedergegeben; im ersten ist ein irrealer Fall, im zweiten der reale Fall besprochen."

⁴¹Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 228.

⁴²For an evaluation of the textual evidence see Appendix 4. For the view that no trial took place, see Lüdemann, Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles, 161, who says: "It is likely that Luke developed this tradition into a 'nontrial,' where the Jews spoke against Paul before Gallio, and that he exemplified the punishment of the Jews by the having the ruler of the synagogue, Sosthenes, beaten."

to wound the synagogue ruler? In a circular fashion, the answer to the "why" question depends on the choice of the group inflicting the wounds. If the Greeks attacked the synagogue ruler, it is likely because anti-semitic feelings flared-up at the conclusion of the failed case of the Jews before Gallio. Gallio's not-to-kind expulsion of the Jews from his court may have been the only excuse needed by some to turn on the Jews.⁴³ Bruce interprets

τούτων (v. 17) as an indication that Gallio did not care for "the easily roused quarrels between Greeks and Jews, and the Jews' complaints about matters affecting their own law."⁴⁴

But if the Jews attacked Sosthenes, the explanation would almost certainly have to rest on some sense of retribution toward him for a case poorly presented before Gallio. Sherwin-White suggests the possibility that the sympathies of Sosthenes rested with Christians and "that the beating was that of the formal 'thirty-nine blows,' administered by the authority of the local Sanhedrin, which had taken Gallio at his word."⁴⁵

⁴³Stagg, The Book of Acts, 191.

⁴⁴Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text, 348.

⁴⁵Sherwin-White, Roman Society and Roman Law, 104. Contra, see Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveler, 259, who suggests that the Greeks did the beating and that "the fact that Sosthenes (whether the same or another) joined with Paul in writing to the Corinthians, I 1, caused an early misapprehension of the scene. It was understood that Gallio, after deciding against the Jews, allowed them to console themselves by beating a Christian; and the word 'Greeks' is omitted in the great MSS. under the influence of this

It must be admitted in the end that the antagonists in the skirmish are no longer clear. Some have even suggested that Jews and Greeks together battered Sosthenes.⁴⁶ The support for this position seems lacking.

Who was Sosthenes? The word ἀρχισυνάγωγος used to describe his role in the synagogue at Corinth (18:17) is the same word used earlier in the chapter to describe the role of Crispus (18:8). However, the text specifically says that Crispus became a believer, along with his family. Sosthenes may have served jointly with Crispus as a leader or ruler of the synagogue or he may have taken the place of Crispus following the conversion of Crispus to Christ. The word ἀρχισυνάγωγος does not imply the one and only ruler of the synagogue, so either view is possible.⁴⁷

The connection between this Sosthenes and the Sosthenes of 1 Corinthians 1:1, who is identified by Paul as a Christian brother, has long been debated. Are the two, one and the same? Many acknowledge it as a possibility, but recognize

mistake."

⁴⁶This is the position adopted by Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 228: "Possibly Sosthenes was beaten by both parties--by the Jews for mismanaging the case, and by the Greeks on general principles." This view seems to avoid the issue and lacks compelling logic. The idea that Gallio ordered his court lictors to clear the court is mentioned by Kistenmaker, New Testament Commentary, 660, as one sometimes proposed to solve the problem of the missing subject of the "all." However, he notes (660) that "the adjective *all* is jarring to the context if it relates to two or three lictors."

⁴⁷Longenecker, The Acts of the Apostles, 486.

that sure proof is not likely to be found. If they are the same, then Sosthenes may have leaned toward the Christian faith before the court scene or he may have converted to the Christian way following this episode.⁴⁸

The presence of the summary verse at Acts 18:11 (Ἐκάθισεν δὲ ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ μῆνας ἕξ διδάσκων ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) indicating Paul's year and a half ministry is somewhat surprising, as Acts 18:18 also contains a brief summarizing statement of the time of Paul's ministry in Corinth (Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος ἔτι προσμείνας ἡμέρας ἰκανὰς κ.τ.λ.). The court scene before Gallio is highlighted by its intrusion between these two summarizing type statements. Luke made a purposeful point to place the story of Paul before Gallio at this place.⁴⁹ Verification of Paul's decision to go the Gentiles may be yet another purpose for the placement of the episode of the court scene at this place by Luke. The Gentiles have not decided against the Christian message.

E. Haenchen understands the purpose of the mention of Paul's continuing ministry in verse 18 as a way to indicate to

⁴⁸Those acknowledging the possibility of the two men being the same man include Jackson and Lake, The Beginnings of Christianity, 228; Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, 348; Longenecker, The Acts of the Apostles, 486-87; Polhill, Acts, 389; among others.

⁴⁹Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, 85, states: ". . . : Wie schon das Stück 25,13-26,32 im Zusammenhang der Darstellung des paulinischen Prozesses jede Verbindung mit dem Kontext vermissen ließ, so würde auch hier ein Fehlen von 18,12-17 kaum eine Lücke im Ablauf des Berichteten hinterlassen. . . ."

"the reader that he leaves the scene not under compulsion but as a victor, and at the same time leads into the following narrative."⁵⁰

⁵⁰Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles, 538.

Conclusion

This significance of this episode cannot be fully understood apart from the context of chapter 18. Chapter 18 must be read in the context of the book of Acts as a whole. The book of Acts must be read with the gospel of Luke, and Luke with the other gospels, especially the synoptics, and so on. This is to say that an episodic narrative should not be ignored or demeaned based on its "episodic" nature.

The tendency to "read over" stories like that found in Acts 18:12-17, in order to get to better preaching material, is understandable on a surface reading of the text. It is clear that Luke includes this story as an example of the Jewish rejection of the messenger of the Lord Jesus Christ. Such rejection will have its price.

Eckhard Plümacher makes an important point concerning the presence of this story in the chapter: Luke could have selected "dem Stil der undramatischen, argumentierenden Abhandlung;" but instead he presented his message "im Stil dramatischer."⁵¹

Whether a final decision is ever reached on the relationship of Luke-Acts to ancient history, biography, or novel, the stories still have the power to speak in dramatic ways.

⁵¹Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller, 86.

APPENDIX 1

BLOCK DIAGRAM

- 18:12** δὲ
(1) Γαλλίωνος ἀνθυπάτου ὄντος τῆς Ἀχαΐας
κατεπέστησαν ὁμοθυμαδὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τῷ Παύλῳ
καὶ
(2) ἤγαγον αὐτὸν
ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα
- 18:13** λέγοντες ὅτι Παρὰ τὸν νόμον
(3) ἀναπείθει οὗτος τοὺς ἀνθρώπους σέβεσθαι τὸν θεόν.
- 18:14** δὲ
(4) μέλλοντος τοῦ Παύλου ἀνοίγειν τὸ στόμα
εἶπεν ὁ Γαλλίων
πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους,
(5) Εἰ μὲν ἦν ἀδίκημά τι
ἢ
ῥαδιούργημα πονηρόν,
ὦ Ἰουδαῖοι,
κατὰ λόγον ἂν
(6) ἀνεσχόμεν ὑμῶν,
- 18:15** δὲ
(7) εἰ ζητήματά ἐστιν
περὶ λόγου
καὶ
ὀνομάτων
καὶ
νόμου τοῦ καθ' ὑμᾶς,
(8) ὄψεσθε αὐτοί·
(9) κριτῆς ἐγὼ τούτων οὐ βούλομαι εἶναι.
- 18:16** καὶ
(10) ἀπήλασεν αὐτοὺς
ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος.
- 18:17** δὲ
(11) ἐπιλαβόμενοι πάντες Σωσθένην τὸν ἀρχισυνάγωγον
ἔτυπον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος·
καὶ
(12) οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίῳι ἔμελεν.

APPENDIX 2

SEMANTIC DIAGRAM OF ACTS 18:12-17

Links	Con	Funct	Ten	P	#	Vb	Subj	Other
	δὲ	(1) Dc	2A	3	P	οἱ	Ἰουδαῖοι	
	+1.)))))))Q							
	+A.)1	καὶ	(2) Dc	2A	3	P	οἱ	Ἰουδαῖοι
+I.)))))))1	.2.)))))))Q							
*	*	---	(3) Dc	P	3	S	οὗτος	
*	.B.)))))))Q							
*	δὲ	(4) Dc	2A	3	S	ὁ	Γαλλίων	
*	+1.)))))))Q							
*	*	---	(5) Dc	Ipf	3	S	(αὐτό)	
*	+A.)))))))32.)))))))Q							
*	*	---	(6) Dc	Ipf	1	S	(ἐγώ)	
*	*	.3.)))))))Q						
*	*	δὲ	(7) Dc	P	3	S	(αὐτό)	
*	+a.)))))))Q							
*	*	*	καὶ					
*	+1.)3b.)))))))Q							
*	*	*	καὶ					
/II.)3B.)1	.c.)))))))Q							
*	*	---	(8) Dc	F	2	P	(ὕμεις)	
*	.2.)))))))Q							
*	*	---	(9) Dc	P	1	P	ἐγώ	
*	+1.)))))))Q							
*	.C.)))))))1	καὶ	(10)Dc	1A	3	P	(αὐτός)	
*	*	.2.)))))))Q						
*	δὲ	(11)Dc	Ipf	3	P	πάντες		
*	+A.)))))))Q							
.III.)))))))1	καὶ	(12)Dc	Ipf	3	S	οὐδὲν		
	.B.)))))))Q							

APPENDIX 3

EXEGETICAL OUTLINE

- I. The Jews brought Paul to Gallio's court (18:12-13)
 - A. The Jews arranged to bring Paul to Court (18:12)
 - 1. The Jews attacked Paul
 - 2. The Jews brought Paul to court
 - B. The Jews brought a charge against Paul (18:13)
- II. Gallio responded to the charge against Paul (18:14-16)
 - A. Gallio established his willingness to judge a worthy charge (18:14)
 - 1. Gallio spoke instead of Paul
 - 2. Gallio described a worthy charge
 - 3. Gallio agreed to listen to a worthy charge
 - B. Gallio declared his unwillingness to judge a charge of interest to Jews only (18:15)
 - 1. Gallio described an unworthy charge
 - a) He refused to judge a charge concerning only words of the Jews
 - b) He refused to judge a charge concerning only names of the Jews
 - c) He refused to judge a charge concerning only the law of the Jews
 - 2. Gallio described their charge as concern only to Jews
 - C. Gallio reacted to their unworthy Jewish charge (18:15b-16)
 - 1. Gallio rejected jurisdiction over the charge (18:15b)
 - 2. Gallio ejected the Jews from his court (18:16)
- III. The way the trial concluded (18:17)
 - A. The Greeks (and/or Jews) attacked Sosthenes in front of Gallio
 - B. Gallio paid no attention to the attack

APPENDIX 4

THE TEXTUAL VARIANT OF ACTS 18:17

PASSAGE: 18:17 ἐπιλαβόμενοι δὲ πάντες¹ Σωσθένην τὸν ἀρχισυνάγωγον τυπτον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος· καὶ οὐδὲν τούτων τῷ Γαλλίῳ ἐμελεν.

APPARATUS USED: The Greek New Testament, 3d ed. corr., ed. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce Metzger, and Allen Wikgren (Stuttgart, Germany: United Bible Societies, 1983).

EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

1. Date. Reading 1 has the overall earliest support with three witnesses as early as the fourth century (N B cop^{bo}), another witness fourth or fifth (vg), and a fifth witness in the fifth century (A). Reading 2, however, has a possible third century witness (cop^{sa}); but the rest of the earliest witnesses are fifth and sixth century (D E it^{d,e,h} syr^p arm eth geo). The remainder of the witnesses for this reading are later than the sixth century, with the majority being in the ninth, tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries. Reading 3 is found in one tenth and one eleventh century witness. A slight edge would go to reading 1.

2. Geographical Distribution. There is no doubt at this point, reading 2 has the widest geographical distribution. Reading 1 indicates no support in the Western geographical area.

3. Textual Relationships. The Alexandrian text is usually considered to be the most faithful in preserving the original reading. Reading 1 has the strongest Alexandrian witnesses; but reading 2 has one strong witness in cop^{sa}. Reading 2 is dominant in the Western text. While this text type can be traced back to the second century, it has a tendency to manipulate the text through paraphrase. For Acts, the Western text represents a special problem: it provides a reading of Acts that is nearly ten percent longer than the text considered more original. At this point, then, it is difficult to assess the value of the numerous Western readings for the second reading. The Byzantine text lacks reliability in securing the original reading because of the obvious textual changes designed to smooth the reading of the Greek text. The Unclassi-

fied texts, especially the versions, indicate that at a fairly early date the second reading was well known. However, the vulgate reading followed reading 1. Reading 3 does not enter into consideration at this point. Between reading 1 and 2 the evidence leads to no sure conclusion. However, given the problem of the Western text in the book of Acts, reading 1 appears to be supported by manuscripts more often associated with original readings.

CLASSIFICATION OF WITNESSES

¹ Variant Byzantine Readings	Alexandrian	Western	Unclassified
1. πάντες	P ⁷⁴ K A B cop ^{bo}		629 vg
2. πάντες 1241 οἱ Ἕλληνας	33 1739 cop ^{sa}	D E 614 it ^{ar,d,e,gig,h} Ephraem	Ψ 88 104 181 326 436 630 945 1505 2495 syr ^{p,h} arm eth geo 1877 2127 2492 Byz
3. πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι			36 453

EVALUATION OF THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE

A. *Transcriptional Probabilities.*

1. Shorter/Longer Reading. Reading 1 is the shorter reading and leaves the word πάντες without clear referential meaning. It is easy to understand why a scribe would add words of clarification specifying who were included in the group. However, there is the possibility of an error of the eye which might have resulted in οἱ Ἕλληνας being accidentally omitted. Both πάντες and οἱ Ἕλληνας end in ες. A careless scribe might have mistaken the ες for the ending of Ἕλληνας, then written the following word Σωσθένην, not realizing a word had been omitted. This doesn't seem likely since both οἱ and Ἕλληνας would be missing, but it remains a slight possibility since the article would be written with Ἕλληνας, almost without thinking.

2. Reading Different from Parallel. There is no parallel account of this episode.

3. More Difficult Reading. The more difficult reading is the shorter reading. Without a clear indication of the group included in πάντες, the reader is left wondering who beat Sosthenes. Was it Greeks who may have witnessed the harsh rebuke afforded the Jewish leaders by Gallio and, then, taken advantage of the moment to express their prejudice against the Jews? Or was it the Jews themselves who were following Gallio's order to "see to it themselves" (18:15) by inflicting wounds on Sosthenes, who had apparently in some way mishandled the case? To this day the answer is not clear. It is easy to see how a scribe could add the words "the Greeks" to the word "all" precisely to clarify what happened at the conclusion of the chaotic case against Paul. So, not only did Gallio eject the Jews from his court, but the Greeks manhandled their leader as an additional evidence of the Gentiles' prejudice against the Jews.

4. Reading Which Best Explains Origin of Other(s). It is difficult to understand why the words οἱ Ἕλληνες would have been omitted if they were part of the original text. These words serve to clarify the scene being described. On the other hand, it is easy to understand why a scribe may have decided to add clarity to a confusing scene. As mentioned earlier, there is the slim possibility that a scribe mistook the ending of πάντες for the ending of Ἕλληνες and accidentally omitted "the Greeks" from the text. However, the reading that best explains the other readings in reading 1.

B. *Intrinsic Probabilities*

An evaluation of this account is found in chapter two of the body of the paper. It is observed there that support is found from modern scholarship for both positions: "all the Greeks" and "all the Jews." It should be noted, however, that those who believe the attackers of Sosthenes were Jews do so not because of textual readings which say πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. These readings are admittedly late in date. Rather, those who think the Jews themselves were involved in the altercation do so by interpreting the πάντες as referring to the Jews.

What did Luke actually write? The probability is that Luke actually wrote πάντες (reading 1) without adding either οἱ Ἕλληνες (reading 2) οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (reading 3). The Western text, in its role as expander and clarifier of the text, placed the words οἱ Ἕλληνες (reading 2) in the text. Since this reading seems to solve the problem left hanging by Luke's πάντες (reading 1), it spread by the hands of those who copied and passed on the text.

However, the question "What did Luke mean by what he wrote?" is much more difficult to answer; for reading 1 can still be interpreted as meaning "the Greeks" or "the Jews." The solution to meaning has to come from different directions than a simple appeal to the text at hand.

CONCLUSION

The external and internal evidence seems to slightly favor the first reading. It has a slight edge in date and textual relationships; but not in geographical distribution. Reading 1 is the shortest reading and the most difficult. It also best explains the origin of the other two readings. There is no reason to think Luke could not have written the simple πάντες (reading 1). F. F. Bruce, however, comments concerning reading 2 that it is "a correct gloss."⁵² The reader is left, then, to determine the composition of the group referred to by πάντες.⁵³

⁵²Bruce, The Book of Acts, 351, n. 34.

⁵³Metzger, ed., A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, 463, selected the first reading for inclusion in the text, but gave it only a {C}. The following comment is made: "In order to identify the 'all' who seized and beat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, the Western and later ecclesiastical texts . . . add the identifying words, 'the Greeks,' i.e. the Gentile community." Ramsay, St. Paul the Traveller, 259, observes that "the text of the inferior MSS. which substitutes a lifelike and characteristic scene for one that is utterly foolish, must undoubtedly be preferred."

APPENDIX 5

THE NARRATIVE PARADIGM

The following figure is taken from Praeder, "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel," 272.

THE NARRATIVE PARADIGM

	TEXT		CONTEXT	
	+))))))))))))))))))))))0))))))))))))))))))))))))))			
	*Narrative world-	*	Experience and	*
	* Events	*	Imagination	*
	* Existence	*		*
	* Sequence	*		*
MESSAGE	* Structure	*		*
	* Time	*		*
	* Space	*		*
	/))))))))))))))))))))))3))))))))))))))))))))))))))1			
	*Narration-	*	Creation and Reading-	*
	* Narrator	*	Real Author	*
MEANS	* Narrative Audience	*	Implied Author	*
	* Language	*	Real Audience	*
	* Style	*	Implied Audience	*
	* Situations-	*		*
	* Presence	*		*
	* Voice	*		*
	* Perspective	*		*
	*	*		*
	.))))))))))))))))))))))2))))))))))))))))))))))))))-			
	NARRATIVE MEANING			

APPENDIX 6

A PROPOSED CHIASMUS FOR ACTS 28:17-31

This chiastic structure was proposed by Donald R. Miesner and is reproduced in his format and words.⁵⁴

I	17	A	After three days <u>he called together</u> (συγκαλέσασθαι) the local leaders <u>of the Jews</u> . And when they had gathered, <u>he said to them</u> , "Brethren,
		B	<u>though I had done nothing against the</u> <u>people or the customs of our fathers,</u>
		C	yet <u>I was delivered prisoner</u> from Jerusalem <u>into the hands of the Romans</u> .
	18	D	When they had examined me, <u>they</u> <u>wished to set me at liberty,</u>
		E	(διὰ . . . αἰτίας) there was no reason for the death penalty in my case.
	19	D'	But when <u>the Jews objected</u> ,
		C'	<u>I was compelled</u> to appeal <u>to Caesar--</u>
		B'	<u>though I had no charge to bring against my</u> <u>nation.</u>

⁵⁴Miesner, "The Circumferential Speeches of Luke-Acts," 229. This chiasmus represents only one of Miesner's proposals for chiastic structures in Luke 4:28-5:11 and Acts 28:17-31. Readers interested in chiastic structures in Luke-Acts should see this article.

20 A' (διὰ . . . αἰτίαν) For this reason therefore I have asked (παρεκάλεσα) to see you and to speak with you, since it is because of the hope of Israel that I am bound with this chain.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Works on Literary Genre

- Aune, David E. The New Testament in Its Literary Environment. Library of Early Christianity, ed. by Wayne A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1987.
- Berger, Klaus. Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments. Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984.
- Blomberg, Craig L. "The Diversity of Literary Genres in the New Testament." Chap. in New Testament Criticism & Interpretation, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery, 506-32. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1991.
- Brown, Schuyler. "Précis of Eckhard Plümacher, Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1974 Seminar Papers, ed. George MacRae, Vol. 2:103-13. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974.
- Gibert, Pierre. "L'invention d'un genre littéraire." Lumière et Vie 30 (1981): 19-33.
- Horsley, G. H. R. "Speeches and Dialogue in Acts." New Testament Studies 32 (October 1986): 609-614.
- Jackson, F. J. Foaks and Kirsopp Lake, eds. The Beginnings of Christianity, Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 14. Translation and commentary by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan and Co., limited, 1933.
- Karris, R. J. "Windows and Mirrors: Literary Criticism and Luke's *Sitz im Leben*." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1979 Seminar Papers, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier, Vol. 1: 47-58. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979.

- Köster, Helmut. Einführung in das Neue Testament: Im Rahmen der Religionsgeschichte und Kulturgeschichte der hellenistischen und römischen Zeit. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Miesner, Donald R. "The Circumferential Speeches of Luke-Acts: Patterns and Purpose." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1978 Seminar Papers, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier, Vol. 2: 223-237. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Pervo, Richard. "The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles." Ph.D diss., Harvard University, 1979.
- Plümacher, Eckhard. Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments, ed. Karl Georg Kuhn, vol. 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Praeder, Susan Marie. "Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1981 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent H. Richards, 269-292. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "Prefaces in Greco-Roman Biography and Luke-Acts." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1978 Seminar Papers, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier, Vol. 2: 193-207. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1978.
- Schierling, S. P. and M. J. Schierling. "The Influence of the Ancient Romances on Acts of the Apostles." Classical Bulletin 54 (1978): 81-88.
- Slingerland, Dixon. "The Composition of Acts: Some Redaction-Critical Observations." Journal of the American Academy of Religion 56 (Spring 1988): 99-113.
- Talbert, Charles H. Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts, Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series no 20. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974.
- Tannehill, Robert C. The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation. Vol. 2: The Acts of the Apostles. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Unnik, W. C. Van. "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography." In Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie. Ed. Jacob Kremer, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 48, 37-60. Paris-Gembloux: Leuven University Press, 1979.

Works on Luke and/or Acts

- Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary. London: Tyndale Press, 1952.
- Bruce, F. F. The Book of Acts. rev. The New International Commentary on the New Testament, ed. F. F. Bruce. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1988.
- Classen, J. P. "Lukas als Kerkhistorikus." Noderuits Gereformeerde Teologiese Tydskrif 21 (1980): 217-24
- Conzelmann, Hans. Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Edited by Eldon Jay Epp with Christopher R. Matthews. Hermeneia--A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible. Edited by Helmut Koester, Harold W. Attridge, Adela Yarbro Collins, Eldon Jay Epp, and James M. Robinson. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Gager, John. "Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts." Harvard Theological Review 79 (1986): 91-99.
- Haenchen, Ernest. The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary. Translated by Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, supervised by Hugh Anderson. Rev. translation by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1971.
- Hengel, Martin. Earliest Christianity: Containing Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity; Property and Riches in the Early Church. Trans. John Bowden. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1986.
- Hengel, Martin. Zur urchristlichen Geschichtsschreibung. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1979.
- Kistenmaker, Simon J. New Testament Commentary: Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1990.
- Köster, Helmut. Introduction to the New Testament. 2 Vols. Hermeneia: Foundations and Facets, ed. Robert W. Funk. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.
- Loisy, Alfred F. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920.
- Longenecker, Richard N. The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. 9: John-Acts. The Expositor's Bible Commentary with the New International Version of the Holy Bible, ed.

- Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1981.
- Lowe, Malcolm. "Real and Imagined Anti-Jewish Elements in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts." Journal of Ecumenical Studies 24 (Spring 1987): 267-284.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. Das frühe Christentum nach den Tradition der Apostelgeschichte: Ein Kommentar. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1987.
- Marshall, I. Howard. The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1980.
- Munck, Johannes. Acts of the Apostles. The Anchor Bible. Revised by William F. Albright and C. S. Mann. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1967.
- Perrot, C. "Les Actes des Apôtres." In L'annonce de l'évangile, ed. X. Léon-Dufour and C. Perrot, 239-95. Paris, 1976.
- Pesch, Rudolf. Die Apostelgeschichte. Vol. 5, Part 2 (Acts 13-28). Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Josef Blank, Rudolf Schnackenburg, Eduard Schweizer, and Ulrich Wilchens. Zürich: Benziger Verlag, 1986.
- Polhill, John B. Acts. Vol. 26, The New American Commentary, ed. David S. Dockery. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992.
- Rackham, Richard Belward. The Acts of the Apostles: An Exposition. London: Methuen & Co., 1901.
- Sanders, Jack T. "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1986 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards, 110-29. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Sanders, Jack T. "The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1982 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards, 467-483. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1982.
- Schwartz, Daniel R. "The End of the Line: Paul in the Canonical Book of Acts." In Paul and the Legacies of Paul, ed. William S. Babcock, 3-24. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.
- Sherwin-White, Adrian Nicholas. Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1963.

- Slingerland, Dixon. "Acts 18:1-17 and Luedemann's Pauline Chronology." Journal of Biblical Literature 109 (Winter 1990): 686-690.
- Slingerland, Dixon. "Acts 18:1-18, The Gallio Inscription, and Absolute Pauline Chronology." Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (Fall 1991): 439-449.
- Stagg, Frank. The Book of Acts: The Early Struggle for an Unhindered Gospel. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1955.
- Talbert, Charles H. Acts. Knox Preaching Guides. Edited by John H. Hayes. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.
- Tannehill, Robert C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." Journal of Biblical Literature 104 (March 1985): 69-85.
- Tannehill, Robert C. "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1986 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards, 130-41. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Tiede, David L. "'Glory to Thy People Israel!': Luke-Acts and the Jews." In Society of Biblical Literature: 1986 Seminar Papers, ed. Kent Harold Richards, 142-51. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts." New Testament Studies 30 (October 1984): 574-583.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred. Die Apostelgeschichte: Übersetzt und erklärt. Vol. 5. Regensburger Neues Testament. Edited by Alfred Wikenhauser and Otto Kuss. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet, 1961.
- Wills, Lawrence M. "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts." Journal of Biblical Literature 110 (Winter 1991): 631-654.

Works on the Apostle Paul

- Conybeare, William John and J. S. Howson. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul. 2 Vols. in 1 Vol. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1906.
- Dallmann, William. Paul: Life and Letters. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1929.
- Deissmann, Adolf. St. Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History. Trans. Lionel R. M. Strachan. New York: Hodder and Stoughton, 1912.

Lüdemann, Gerd. Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology. Foreword by John Knox. Translated by F. Stanley Jones. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

MacDonald, Dennis R. "Apocryphal and Canonical Narratives about Paul." In Paul and the Legacies of Paul, ed. William S. Babcock, 55-70. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Ramsay, William Mitchell. St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1896.

General Works

Babcock, William S., ed. Paul and the Legacies of Paul. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Bauernfeind, Otto. Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte. Introduction by Martin Hengel. Edited by Volker Metelmann. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, ed. Martin Hengel, Otfried Hofius, and Otto Michel. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.

Childs, Brevard S. Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Cranford, Lorin L. Exegeting the New Testament: A Seminar Working Model with Expanded Research Bibliography. 2d rev. ed. Fort Worth: Scripta Publishing Inc., 1991.

The Greek New Testament. 3d ed. cor. Ed. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Marini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1983.

Metzger, Bruce M., ed. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. cor. ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1975.