On the Difficulty of Molding a Rock:
The Negotiation of Peter's Reputation in Early Christian Memory[1]

Frederick S. Tappenden
McGill University

> [Strong social constructivists] see the past as precarious, its contents hostage to the conditions of the present. They set forth an atemporal conception of collective memory that relates things remembered to the beliefs, aspirations, and fears of the here and now. While well-grounded empirically, they offer a one-sided perspective. As [Michael] Schudson (1989) put it: "The present shapes our understanding of the past, yes. But this is half the truth, at best, and a particularly cynical half-truth, at that."
> (Schwartz 1991:222)

Like his apostolic counterparts, the reputation of Peter in the early centuries of the Christian movement is described best as "mixed." One need look no further than the undisputed Pauline epistles, the earliest Christian writings, to see that Peter is portrayed in both negative and positive ways. On the one hand, Paul portrays Peter as both the first to see the risen Christ (1 Cor 15:3) and as one of three "pillars" in the Jerusalem church (Gal 2:9). On the other hand, these positive descriptions are tempered by the image of Peter retained in Paul's account of the dispute at Antioch (Gal 2:11-14). Here, Peter is said to have stood condemned (2:11) for having detracted from inclusive table-fellowship with Gentiles (2:12); he is portrayed as one who acts out of fear

---

(2:12) and not in accordance with the gospel (2:14); he leads others in his hypocrisy (2:13) and thus warrants Paul's rebuke (2:14).

The reception of this early and quite difficult Petrine depiction was varied in early Christian literature (for recent discussions, see Leppä 2011:109-11; Mitchell 2012:220-21). Within the Petrine pseudepigrapha, for instance, the dispute at Antioch is never mentioned (Smith 1985:210), the only exception perhaps being the (now disputed) *Kerygmata Petrou*, which seeks to justify Peter's actions at Antioch in light of Matthew 16:17 (Ps.-Clem. H XVII 19). Other early Christians found in the Antioch incident evidence for Paul's superiority among the apostles—according to Tertullian, Marcion saw Paul's rebuke of Peter as a sign of the latter's ignorance (*Praescr* 23). Tertullian specifically disagreed with Marcion on this point, preferring to speak of Paul and Peter as complementing one another rather than representing any fixed opposition (*Praescr.* 23; see also Iren. *Haer*. 3.13.1). Three later receptions are also worth noting: 1) Eusebius (*Hist. eccl*. 1.12.2) reports Clement's insistence that the "Cephas" mentioned in Galatians 2:11 is not Peter but another disciple; 2) Jerome argues that, out of concern for the salvation of those who still held to the Law, Peter only pretended to side with those from James so as to allow Paul's rebuke to correct the hypocrisy of observing the Law (*Comm. Gal.* I.2.11–13, 14a); and, 3) Augustine, concerned with the truthfulness of the scriptures, understands Peter as genuinely erring and humbly receiving Paul's rebuke (*Ep.* 40.3-7 [esp. §5]; 82.4-30 [esp. §§8, 22]; see also 28.3-5).

These diverse texts attest to the difficulty that Galatians 2:11-14 produced for Peter's reputation in the early Christian movement. One textual tradition that is noticeably missing from the above overview is the canonical Acts of the Apostles. Despite the fact that both Peter and Paul dominate the Acts narrative, the Lukan author (hereafter referred to as "Luke" for

convenience) neither mentions the incident at Antioch nor gives any hint that a dispute ever existed between the two apostles. For many, the silence of Acts is construed as evidence either that Luke was *unaware* of Paul's letters or that he *freely reworked or replaced* the Pauline account. Addressing both of these interpretive tendencies, the present study argues that Luke was in fact aware of Galatians 2:11-14 and that he took conscious though restrained steps toward improving the image of Peter codified therein. That is to say, I hope to demonstrate that Paul's Epistle to the Galatians exerted pressure upon Luke such that the image of Peter in Acts was both *formed* in relation to and *informed* by the earlier Pauline letter.

Luke and the Epistles of Paul

I want to begin by putting my finger on the key historical—indeed, hermeneutical—issue this paper addresses: namely, the extent to which Luke both knew and made use of Paul's epistles. The silence of Acts on the incident at Antioch has not gone unnoticed in discussions of the relationship between the Pauline and Lukan writings. On the one hand, the Tübingen School of the nineteenth century took it for granted that Luke constructed much of his narrative from the Pauline epistles; accordingly, Luke's portrayal of Peter and Paul becomes a synthesis within F. C. Baur's dialectical reading of early Christian history. On the other hand, in contrast to Baur's polarization of early Christian diversity (Smith 1985:211; Bockmuehl 2010:62–68), the majority of twentieth century scholars expressly denied any connection between Luke's writings and the Pauline letters (e.g., Vielhauer [1950-51] 1966; Barrett 1976). As is often noted, Luke's Paul is not a letter writer, nor is there any mention of epistolary correspondences between Paul and any of the churches (the only possible exception is Acts 15:22-35, though Pervo [2006:54] rightly notes that here Paul does nothing more than accompany the letter carriers from Jerusalem). The

pervasiveness of this scholarly consensus still lingers today and is evinced in John Riches's (2008) commentary on the reception history of Galatians. Treating Acts as an early reception of the figure of Paul, Riches (2008:97) does not examine the extent to which Luke may have appropriated Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.

One could insist, of course, that Riches not be faulted on this point. The Lukan narrative is much more conciliatory than Paul's letters, and Luke not only contradicts the epistles at many points but also omits many details—theological or otherwise—that modern scholars might expect him to include. As always, the burden of proof lies with the exegete. Over the past century a minority of scholars have persistently judged Luke's knowledge of—and perhaps use of—Paul's letters in the positive (e.g., Enslin 1938; 1970; Knox 1966). Particularly important for many such scholars are the compelling historical considerations. So, for example, despite his conclusion that "no convincing case can be made for Luke's reliance on the letters of Paul," John Knox (1966:282-83) nonetheless asserts:

> How could he have escaped knowing them? . . . I agree with Enslin [1938:83] that it is all but incredible that such a man as Luke . . . should have been "totally unaware that this hero of his had ever written letters" and quite as hard to believe that he would have found it impossible, or even difficult, to get access to these letters if he had wanted to. Paul had been too central and too controversial a figure in his own time to have been forgotten so soon. Too many important churches owed their existence to him for his name not to have been held in reverence in many areas and his work remembered.

More recently, Lars Aejmelaeus (2011:56-57) articulates a similar point by appealing to four historical considerations drawn from Christoph Burchard (1970): 1) Paul's various letters are written to churches scattered across Asia Minor, Macedonia, Achaia, and Italy, and from the letters we can deduce Paul's presence in many other cities and regions across the Mediterranean; 2) from the letters we know that they were discussed and argued over, and even that Paul's letters were known by others outside his communities (2 Cor 10:9-11); 3) *1 Clement* provides evidence that at least 1 Corinthians was copied and circulated beyond Corinth, a practice that

may have happened for other letters too; and, 4) the deutero-Paulines indicate that Paul's letters were both known and imitated quite early on (certainly prior to Acts). Taken together, these points suggest to Aejmelaeus (2011:57) the forceful conclusion: "it is futile for the exegete to try 'to kick against the pricks': some kind of positive relationship between Luke's and Paul's texts becomes a necessary assumption."

Despite these historical considerations, demarcating Luke's reception of Paul is a complex historical and hermeneutical task. The evidence customarily amassed spans both the Gospel and Acts and is usually of the following six kinds:[2] 1) scattered and usually small instances of verbal agreement, where Luke demonstrates familiarity with Paul's letters as aural/written texts (e.g., the parallels between Galatians and Acts examined in Leppä 2011); 2) scattered and usually small instances of conceptual and/or contextual alignment (e.g., see Pervo's [2006:70-73] comparison of the Ananias and Sapphira narrative [Acts 5:1-11] with Paul's instructions concerning the immoral brother in Corinth [1 Cor 5:3-5]); 3) overlap between the content and scope of Pauline geography and company as sketched in both the letters and Acts (Enslin 1938:84-86, 89-90; Pervo 2006:96-100, 102-04); 4) instance where events noted by Paul are plausibly construed as occasioning Luke's narrative depictions (e.g., the account of Paul being lowered through a Damascus window in a basket [2 Cor 11:32-33 and Acts 9:23-25]; see Aejmelaeus 2011:65-69; Pervo 2006:60-64); 5) instances where Luke can be seen to adopt and interpret Paul's thought (e.g., the notion of justification by faith as discussed in Pervo 2006:58-60); and, 6) instances where the Paul of Acts speaks as the epistolary Paul writes (e.g., Paul's farewell speech in Miletus [Acts 20:17-35]; see Aejmelaeus 2011:69-71; Pervo 2006:111-33). Part of the problem, as Richard Pervo (2006:136) admits, is that much of this evidence takes the form of nothing more than small bundles of scattered sticks, of which one should always be

---

[2] The most thorough and recent examination of the evidence is Pervo (2006:51-147).

"suspicious . . . [of arguments that] create a forest by accumulating twigs." The present study takes heed of Pervo's sober warning, but perhaps the problem lies not in the nature of the evidence but rather in the methods employed in assessing the source- and reception-critical relationship between the Lukan narrative and the Pauline epistles. That is to say, what we are facing may not be a problem of textual paucity, but rather of narrowly construed theoretical predispositions.

Lars Aejmelaeus (2011:62, 74) suggests the relationship between the Lukan and Pauline writings can only be determined via "detailed textual comparison," which he later demarcates as "literary-critical and reception-critical examinations." This may well be true, but giving theoretical definition to what constitutes credible data is surely a contested point. Such credible data is often narrowly construed as concrete linguistic or textual evidence (i.e., the presence of word/phrase X in two or more traditions); so, for example, Heikki Leppä (2011:92 and 95) points to instances of "verbal agreement" as the "fingerprint[s] of Paul" in the text of Acts. Similarly, many of the scattered twigs that Pervo (2006:51-147) points to are instances of linguistic agreement between Luke and Paul. While Pervo's (2006:135-36) overall argument is compelling, many of his individual conclusions lack the robust character that critical scholarship demands (as he himself seems aware). In this light, Paul Elbert (2006:226) rightly points to the need for "the construction of a credible text-critical hypothesis or a serious *wissenschaftliche Exegese*, hopefully satisfying methodologically rigorous criteria," though even he understands such an enterprise largely in relation to near-verbatim correlation. The present study suggests that this methodological program would benefit greatly from the expansion of theoretical horizons (and so also methodological tools) to envision not only ways in which written texts interlace, but also ways in which authors and audiences obtain and engage such texts.

One important expansion of our theoretical horizon is to focus on what Thomas Brodie (2001:104 n. 1) calls the "literary aspect" of a text, which he insists is "more tangible and verifiable [than either history or theology]." Helpfully pointing to three criteria for determining literary dependence,[3] Brodie (2001:109) insists this "literary aspect" includes "similarities of theme, motif, plot/action, detail (including linguistic details), order, and completeness." Brodie is here moving in the right direction in as much as he offers a broader framework within which to assess how texts interlace one another. Nonetheless, attendance to literary dimensions does not go far enough. At issue are the problems that emerge when a text is divorced from reading contexts that are not historically and culturally grounded. On the one hand, "meaning" is not just a matter of literary devices (themes, motifs, plot, etc.) but is always actualized by real human subjects reading texts within real social contexts and historical situations. Accordingly, it is problematic to assert that a text's literary dimensions can be identified independent of such reading contexts (whether those be ancient or modern contexts). On the other hand, and more to the focus of this study, is the importance of recognizing that texts often assert influence upon other texts. That is to say, established traditions exist not only as part of the intertextual web of meaning but actually serve to give shape and form to the web itself (at least for authors and perhaps also their targeted readers).[4] Though a text's meaning is never limited to the author and/or any one reading community—a point that is in step with the poststructuralist foundations of intertextuality proper (Hatina 1999)—texts are meaningfully indebted to established traditions that exert social and cultural influence from inception to composition to reception. Accordingly,

---

[3] Brodie's (2001:105-10) three criteria for determining literary dependence are 1) external plausibility, (2) similarities significant beyond the range of coincidence, and (3) intelligible differences. In Brodie's estimation, all three are reasonably met in identifying Luke's knowledge and use of the Pauline epistles.

[4] Much depends on one's methodological focus. For this study, I am interested in the extent to which Luke functions as a reputational entrepreneur that is aware of texts such as Paul's letters and the Gospel of Mark. Quite consciously, then, I do not explore the various ways the Lukan narratives are themselves read by later communities.

Brodie's literary aspects must be supplemented with a greater attention to social and cultural factors (what he seems to bracket out as "historical" and therefore more conjectural).

In attempting to expand our models of textual reception, the present study draws on theoretical concerns related to collective memory and reputation construction, models that provide resources for grounding the narrative worlds of written texts within differing reading communities. More specifically, I will explore how Galatians 2:11-14 functions as a *lieux de mémoire*—a site of memory—that exerts superpersonal effects on the present to such a degree that reputational entrepreneurs[5] (such as Luke) are not able simply to "rewrite" the past but rather forced to creatively interact with it, thus putting forth commemorative images that stand alongside of, and worked together with, their already established counterparts. In my view, this theoretical apparatus yields a richer and more robust understanding of reception-critical dynamics than models that focus solely on textual and/or literary correlations. This is because textual reception is envisioned as a matter of collective memory whereby reputational entrepreneurs encode and construct memories in relation to both established pasts and changing presents. I am not insisting that the scope of a text's meaning be limited to intentionally encoded structures, but rather suggesting that textual dependence—in this case, Luke's knowledge and use of Paul's letters—requires a more robust framework than merely identifying textual citations and literary correspondence.

Building upon a number of recent studies, my working assumption from the outset is that Luke was both aware of and used Paul's letters—esp. Galatians—in formulating the Lukan narrative (see esp. Leppä 2002; 2011; Pervo 2006; Marguerat 2009; Liljeström 2011). Evidence for this assumption will be presented and evaluated as I progress through Acts 10-11 and 15. It is

---

[5] The term "reputational entrepreneur" is adopted in part from Barry Schwartz (2000:67) but more so from Gary Alan Fine (2001:11-13).

important to note that much of the data examined in this paper has already been well documented elsewhere. Of particular note is the work of William O. Walker Jr. (1985; 1998), who focuses primarily on the image of Paul as conveyed in the Acts narrative. Working with an eye toward second-century disputes about Paul, Walker argues that Luke uses the *Peter* figure in an effort to rehabilitate the image of *Paul*. Not only does Walker (1985:16–17; 1998:82, 85) reject out-of-hand the possibility that Luke is rehabilitating Peter's image, he also places an undue emphasis upon the formative power of the present. Indeed, the two go hand in hand in Walker's analysis; he portrays Luke's commemorative efforts as conditioned largely by the social pressures of the second century while accounting little for the (in)formative power of established traditions. It is on these points—the rehabilitation of Paul rather than Peter, and the primacy of the present—that the present study stands as a necessary counterpoint to Walker.

While it cannot be denied that the image of Paul was contested in the second century, Peter's image was just as much in need of revision; indeed, it is not Paul but Peter who, in Galatians 2:11-14, causes division and hypocrisy while also being implicated in a quasi anti-Gentile ideology (themes that stand in sharp contrast to Luke's *Tendenz*). By focusing on the reputation of Peter rather than Paul, this study explores the extent to which the past is not just *rewritten* but rather creatively *retained* and *re-presented*. The need for this approach is clearly demonstrated by again quoting Pervo (2006:52; emphasis added), who insists "Luke's appropriation of Paul demonstrates that he did not employ primary sources to discover 'what actually happened,' but *as aids in imposing his own construction of the past.*" For Pervo, and Walker too, the past is malleable, flexible, and subservient to the social pressures and demands of the present. Within this strong constructivist framework, Luke adapts and alters his sources with very little restraint from those sources. As a counterpoint, the present study examines how

Luke not only reworks his source texts but also how those very source texts impose certain restrictions and limitations on what Luke is able to do.

In light of the foregoing, I argue in this study that Luke portrays Peter in such a way as to mnemonically negotiate an apostolic reputation that had already been established and codified in Paul's letter to the Galatians. Accordingly, the following analysis serves as a case study that addresses the broader hermeneutical issues that surround Luke's use of Paul's letters. I contend that collective memory theory provides a framework within which to envision alternative ways— ways that both include and move beyond textual citations and literary correspondence—in which Luke can be seen to creatively make use of Paul's letters. The following analysis will elaborate this point by specifically highlighting commemorative reputations and the dynamism of mnemonic construction and negotiation, both of which are discussed with respect to Luke's use of the Gospel of Mark and Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.

Reputational Stability, Mnemonic Tension, and the Lukan Peter

To introduce the question of commemorative reputations more fully, it will be helpful first to examine Luke's attitude toward his sources in light of collective memory theory. We are fortunate in that we can examine how Luke uses one of his undisputed sources—namely, the Gospel of Mark—specifically with respect to the portrayal of Peter therein. Of particular interest is the relationship between these texts when examined not from a source-critical perspective (that is, Luke's appropriation and/or alteration of the Markan *text*) but rather from a reputational point of view. Put another way, the present study is interested in the relative descriptions of Peter in these two texts, in the alterations and/or retentions that characterize his commemoration, and in

the contours that define his figure. Accordingly, the examination of both the Markan and Lukan

Peters will bring into clearer focus the way Luke negotiates already established reputations.

Peter in the Gospel of Mark

How societies or sub-cultural communities both perceive and remember significant figures is

directly related to the way such communities engage their present world. Sociologist Gary Fine

(2001) notes that the reputations of historical figures provide communities a shared public space

wherein to discuss issues of pressing concern. "[E]ven when we recognize the thinness of our

knowledge of these figures, their celebrity [or reputation] serves to connect us to each other and

provides us with an unthreatening space to converse about vital social matters" (Fine 2001:4). In

this way, the reputations of key figures take on superpersonal dimensions such that historical

personalities are commemorated not necessarily for their own sake but because their image

enables the commemorative community to engage the present world.

In an important respect, this is the kind of commemorative activity that seems to be

taking place in the Gospel of Mark, where Peter functions as a figure with whom the Markan

audience can identify. This is particularly evident in the many positive and negative depictions of

the apostle in the Markan narrative, which several scholars have taken as a sign of Peter's

"every-person" image (Best 1981:12; Ehrman 2006:21; Cassidy 2007:115-17; contra Weeden

1971; Smith 1985:162-90). There can be little doubt that Peter is a prominent figure in Mark—he

is the first disciple called by Jesus (along with his brother; 1:16-18), he is listed first in the group

of the twelve (3:13-19), and his voice is heard more often than any other disciple (8:29; 9:5;

10:28; 11:21; 14:29-31, 66–72). Nonetheless, the image of Peter in Mark is also met with

strikingly negative depictions—Peter is rebuked by Jesus and even addressed as "Satan" (8:27-

31), he falls asleep in the garden of Gethsemane (14:32-42), and he denies Jesus three times after insisting that he will not do so (14:26-31, 53–72). These positive and negative depictions point to what Timothy Wiarda (1999:34) calls the "distinctive" rather than "static" characterization of Peter in the Gospel of Mark. Accordingly, the Markan narrative seems to commemorate Peter as a kind of "every-person," a figure with whom the Markan audience can identify and in whom they can find themselves. This portrayal comes into clearer focus at those points in the narrative where Peter's words and/or actions direct the audience's attention toward social and political realities that appear to be sources of stress to the Markan community. Two examples will suffice to illustrate this phenomenon.

Peter's pedestrian, "every-person" image is expressly clear in the Markan account of Peter's confession (8:27-33). In this passage, Jesus' identity is brought to the fore through the depiction of Peter as a Galilean with a particular understanding of what the messiah would be like (namely, someone who would overthrow, rather than suffer at the hands of, Rome). Peter is here seen as a person caught-up in the midst of those messianic expectations that likely pressured the Markan community itself in the midst of the Jewish Revolt of 66–70 CE (for the Markan context, see Marcus 1992; 2000:25-39). Against Peter's misperception, Jesus' messianic identity is laid bare; Peter the "every-person" functions as a cultural symbol through whom the Markan community can grapple with the notion of a suffering messiah within the context of heightened socio-political conflict.

Peter's "every-person" image can also be seen in the account of Peter's denial (Mark 14:26-72), especially when examined in conjunction with the larger Markan theme of persecution (see 4:16-17; 13:9-13; esp. 13:19). The prevalence of this latter theme points beyond the literary world to suggest a social reality stressing the Markan community. While Jesus is

presented as the model *par excellence* of one who endures trials (Marcus 2000:29), it is Peter (and the disciples) who typifies the opposite position. This is seen particularly in Jesus' prophetic pronouncement that the disciples will desert him (14:26-31), to which Peter responds twice with exorbitant zeal, "even if all become deserters, I will not" (14:29). By emphasizing Peter's zeal, the Markan gospel commemorates an apostle who, despite his good intentions, succumbs to the pressures of desertion. Peter's "every-person" image thus enables the community to grapple with the socio-religious reality of persecution; indeed, just as Jesus prophesied the disciples' desertion (14:26-31), so he predicted the Markan community's impinging persecution (13:9-13). Accordingly, Peter stands as a cultural symbol for the community, and his reputation as one who denied Christ becomes a kind of social space for conversing about what it means to remain faithful to Christ amidst trials. The commemoration of Peter enables the Markan audience to evaluate their own response so as to ensure that they, unlike Peter, will not be overcome with good intentions and no action (see 14:32-42, esp. 37-38). The Markan Peter is remembered not as an idyllic disciple who is to be emulated, but as an example of how one ought not to act. Peter embodies discipleship gone awry.

To suggest that the Markan Peter is an "every-person" is not to obscure his characterization into a general, universalized archetype or trope, but rather to insist that the figure of Peter performs a social function within the world of the Markan community. The Markan Peter is not *just* a normal disciple; rather, *because of* his normality, Peter rises above the story world of the narrative and becomes a cultural symbol in the real world of the Markan community. Peter's reputation as an "every-person" thus enables the Markan audience to grapple with those issues that characterize their present social world.

Peter in the Lukan Narrative

In an important respect, the past is always recalled and refashioned in relation to the social

impulses of the present (Halbwachs [1952] 1992). This does not mean, however, that the past is

entirely rewritten with each new remembrance. Barry Schwartz (1991) compellingly argues that

mnemonic images established in *lieux de mémoire* function as cultural voices that shape the

mnemonic activity of the present as much as social impulses do. Examining the commemoration

of George Washington in post-Civil War America, Schwartz demonstrates that the memory of

Washington was in a state of mnemonic tension in the later nineteenth century. The older, stable

image of an "idealized" hero lost cultural resonance in a post-war society that focused more on

"realism" and a desire to "know what George Washington 'was really like' in his everyday life"

(Schwartz 1991:226). Schwartz demonstrates that, while the image of Washington changed so as

to speak appropriately to the present, the older image was never lost in the process.

> Post-Civil War America spoke about Washington in two languages. The new language evoked images of a democratic Washington, an ordinary man acquainted with hardship, warm in his affections, and approachable. The older language evoked images of a pre-democratic Washington—a hero unconquerable and incorruptible, dignified and remote. *As postwar Americans contemplated the new Washington, they never forgot his original image or rejected what it stood for*. (1991:229, emphasis added)

Far from being a passive object that is continually re-written, the past is a dynamic voice that

exerts pressure on the present, simultaneously forming and informing one's recollections. As

Schwartz stresses, mnemonic stability is as much a part of the commemorative process as

mnemonic alteration.

In various ways, the Markan image of Peter functioned as a stable *lieu de mémoire* that

the later synoptic writers were forced to negotiate rather than simply replace. Matthew, for

instance, retains virtually every Markan episode in which Peter appears while also retaining (and

enhancing) the basic positive–negative structure of Peter's reputation.[6] Similarly, though Luke's

Gospel reflects a freer commemorative approach,[7] it would be wrong to assert that Luke has

completely recast the figure of Peter. Indeed, in a number of instances it seems clear that the

prior Markan depiction of Peter restrained Luke's mnemonic liberties. Again, two examples will

suffice to illustrate this trend.

The Lukan versions of the Transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36) and the Mount of Olives

(22:39-46) provide interesting test cases. In the former passage, Luke highlights Peter's "every-

person" image by noting that Peter, James, and John were very tired (Luke 9:32); the reference is

unique to the Lukan version and seems to function in relation to the parallel reference to

drowsiness in the Mount of Olives pericope of 22:39-46 (//Mark 14:32-42). In the latter episode,

whereas Mark remembers *only* Peter, James, and John as falling asleep while Jesus is praying,

Luke instead insists that *all* twelve disciples were present on the mount, and that they *all* fell

asleep (thus, Peter is not singled out). Removing the emphasis solely from Peter and placing it

instead on the twelve as a group, Luke omits the Markan stress upon Peter's weaknesses.

Interestingly, however, Luke has not forgotten the memory of *Peter's* drowsiness, though he has

transplanted it into his account of the transfiguration. Here, the Lukan Peter is not overcome by

fatigue; rather, Peter is remembered as one who, in the midst of a revelatory moment, perseveres

through exhaustion and is rewarded for it (a point that Luke makes explicit in 9:32). Contra the

---

[6] The sole exception is Mark 1:35-39, which Matthew has not carried over into his Gospel. See also Mark 5:31, 35-43; 11:20-26; 13:3-5; 16:7, all of which Matthew incorporates without specific reference to Peter. At the same time, Matthew adds Peter to one Markan narrative in which he is not found (Matt 14:22-33//Mark 6:45-52), infuses Peter (to varying degrees) into two Q sayings (Matt 15:14//Q 6:39; Matt 18:21//Q 17:4), and includes one reference to Peter not found elsewhere in the Synoptics (Matt 17:24-27). The overall structure of Peter's image in Matthew is again centred around positives and negatives, though now heightened—e.g., positive: Peter as the foundation of the *ekklēsia* (Matt 16:17-19); negative: rather than narrating the post-resurrection redemption of Peter, Matthew instead leaves the apostle as an apostate who "went out and wept bitterly" (Matt 26:75).

[7] This is most clearly seen in passages such as Jesus' visit to Peter's house (which Luke places before the calling of Peter [4:38-41, contra Mark 1:29-34//Matt 8:14-17]), the calling of Peter (where Luke presents a new and different account [5:1-11, contra Mark 1:16-18//Matt 4:18-20]), Jesus' rebuke of Peter (which Luke completely omits [9:18-27, contra Mark 8:27–9:1//Matt 16:13-28]), and Peter's post-resurrection activities (where Luke diverges from both Mark and Matthew and accords more with Paul [cp. Luke 24:34 with 1 Cor 15:5).

Markan narrative, the Lukan Peter is memorable not *because* his weaknesses are something with which to be identified, but rather because of his ability to persevere through such weaknesses and exhibit an ideal response to Jesus.

A similar mnemonic process may be observed in the Lukan accounts of Peter's confession and later denial. On the one hand, Luke completely omits Jesus' rebuke of Peter (see Luke 9:18-20); of all the Markan texts that present Peter in a difficult light, the direct association with Satan was doubtless one of the more troublesome. Yet Luke has not totally abandoned this adversarial association, though he has refocused it. In Luke's account of Peter's denial, Jesus specifically attributes the apostle's betrayal to the work of Satan (22:31), and Jesus further prays that Peter's faith will not fail (22:32). Here, Luke downplays Peter's inability to persevere by implicating the adversarial figure as the cause behind the apostle's denial. Just as with Peter's drowsiness, Luke has not so much omitted the difficult aspects of Peter's reputation as he has redirected them toward a more positive, idyllic understanding of the apostle. Thus, Luke displays a high degree of mnemonic freedom within the constraints of a stabilized reputation.

Both of the examples just noted suggest that Luke recognizes and accepts the Markan text as a stable *lieu de mémoire*. In composing his Gospel, though Luke gravitates toward an idyllic depiction of Peter, he must do so in ways that are clearly restrained by the prior Markan account. Accordingly, where Mark remembers Peter as an *"every-person" who exemplifies discipleship gone awry*, Luke remembers Peter as *an "every-person" who, in the midst of weakness, models exemplary intentions and actions*. Here, the characteristics and nuances of Peter's reputation in Luke's Gospel are (in)formed by the prior tradition.

That Luke's commemoratives liberties were restrained by the Markan precedent can be further seen in Luke's second volume, where the image of Peter is exclusively positive and

explicitly tends toward the idyllic. Only in Acts does an image of Peter emerge that is absent of embarrassment, unintelligence, and apostasy (contra even to Luke's Gospel). The Peter of Acts is a decisive and steadfast leader (e.g., Acts 1:15-26) whose oratory skills bring many to faith (e.g., Acts 2:14-42; 3:11–4:4) and who is dramatically empowered by the Spirit (e.g., Acts 3:1-10; 5:15; 9:36-42). Perhaps the most noteworthy difference between the Peter of Acts and the Peter of Luke's Gospel has to do with the frame in which the apostle is cast: the Peter of Acts is characterized by his exceedingly Jesus-esque qualities. Far from being a mere literary device, the various Peter–Jesus parallels that extend across the Lukan narrative function as the mnemonic frame within which Peter is keyed.[8] Though the Peter of Luke's Gospel is mnemonically framed vis-à-vis the Markan Peter, the Peter of Acts is mnemonically framed vis-à-vis the Lukan Jesus (Baker 2011:119). To this end, Peter is remembered as a charismatic leader who functions as the prominent voice and actor of the church in an extremely Jesus-esque way.

Overall, then, compared to Luke's Gospel, Acts betrays a compositional situation that appears less restrained by stabilized *lieu de mémoire*, or at least by sites of memory that depicted Peter negatively. While the question of sources for Acts remains shrouded in historical fog, even those who propose an underlying tradition for Luke's Petrine material insist that such a source likely regarded Peter quite favourably (e.g., Pervo 2009:13). Evidence will be considered below that suggests at least some of Peter's image in Acts is constructed in relation to a stabilized *lieu de mémoire* that is more negative; nevertheless, the larger contours of Peter's reputation in Acts reflects a more positive outlook which, even if dependent on a prior source, certainly reflects

---

[8] On intra-textual Lukan parallels between Jesus and Peter, Paul, and other apostolic figures, see (for example) Praeder 1984. By way of specific examples, Luke Timothy Johnson (1992:71-72) notes that Peter's acts of healing parallel Jesus' in many key respects (e.g., cp. Luke 5:17-26 with Acts 3:1-10); this is especially evident in the accounts of Jarius' daughter and Tabitha (Luke 8:40-56 and Acts 9:36-43 respectively). Similarly, Peter's exit from the narrative in Acts 12:1-17 is especially evocative of Jesus' resurrection appearances in Luke 24 (Pervo 2009:307-12). More to the topical focus of the present study is the correlation of Jesus eating with sinners in Luke 15:1-3 and Peter eating with Gentiles in Acts 11:3 (Leppä 2011:97).

Luke's own positive perception of Peter. Even across the Lukan narrative, the Peter of the Gospel stands in contrast to the Peter of Acts; generally speaking, the former is mnemonically negotiated while the latter mnemonically idyllic.

In summary, the preceding analysis has suggested that, though Luke has a much more positive perspective on the figure of Peter than Mark, his commemorative practices were nonetheless constrained by the image of the apostle codified in the earlier Markan text. Luke could not just forget certain aspects of Peter's image (e.g., drowsiness, association with Satan, and the "every-person" image), though he could rearticulate these features so as to fit his own commemorative climate. In this way, the Markan narrative functioned as a stable *lieu de mémoire* for Luke, one that both *formed* and *informed* the general image of Peter that Luke was able to put forth. In essence, Luke was confronted with two divergent mnemonic expressions: the stable though difficult Markan image of Peter, on the one hand, and the contemporary and positive image of Peter that ultimately found expression in Acts, on the other. The portrayal of Peter in Luke's Gospel stands in the tension between these two extremes and shows Luke negotiating Peter's reputation so as to accommodate both images.

Reputational Rehabilitation in Acts 10–11, 15

As just noted, the image of Peter in Acts is exceedingly positive and primarily static; Peter is portrayed as an idyllic figure who speaks and acts decisively, insightfully, and authoritatively. While this image persists across the majority of the Acts narrative, depictions of Peter's interactions with Gentiles is another matter. In these episodes, Peter undergoes a transformation: though initially hesitant toward ethnic intermixing within the communities of *the Way*, by Acts 15 Peter ultimately stands at the vanguard of the Gentile mission. Though this aspect of Peter's image remains overwhelmingly positive, the contours of his relationship to Gentiles is by far the

most dynamic aspect of Luke's reputational entrepreneurship. This shift in focus, where Peter's image seems negotiated toward the idyllic, suggests that Luke may be working in relation to a more stabilized *lieu de mémoire*. In the following I consider three aspects of Acts 10-11 and 15 that suggests Galatians 2:11-14 functioned as just such a memory site. Put differently, in Acts we find a commemorative image of Peter that was both *formed* in relation to and *informed* by Paul's earlier Epistle to the Galatians.

Geography and Memory: The Itinerant Peter

Perhaps the most subtle aspect of the Lukan (re-)commemoration of Peter relates to the geographical locales with which the apostle is associated. Luke isolates Peter's itinerant ministry to the geographical area of Roman Palestine, primarily Jerusalem (Acts 1–9, 11, 15) but also Samaria (8:14-24), Lydda (9:32-25), Joppa (9:36-43), Caesarea (10:1-48), and a few unnamed Samarian and Judean locales (8:25; 9:32). This picture stands in sharp contrast to the presentation of Peter's travels in other early Christian sources. Paul and a few other traditions connect Peter with both Corinth (1 Cor 1:12; 3:22; see also 9:5) and Antioch of Syria (Gal 2:11-14; cp. Ignatius, *Romans* 4.1-3; Origen, *Hom. Luc.* 6.4; and perhaps the Gospel of Matthew [possibly composed in Antioch]). Additionally, several sources from the late-first century onward connect Peter with Rome (1 Pet 5:13; Papias, frag. 21.2 [Holmes 2007]; *Acts of Peter* 30–41, see also John 21:18–19; *1 Clem* 5.1-7; *2 Clem* 5.1-4) and even the northern and central regions of Asia Minor (1 Pet 1:1). Determining the extent of Peter's presence and activity in these regions is difficult. What is certain, as Markus Bockmuehl (2010:77) rightly notes, is that most of the New Testament sites associated with Peter (e.g., Galilee, Jerusalem, Caesarea) do not seem to have retained or produced any form of localized Petrine traditions/memories; the only

exceptions are Syria and Rome, neither of which cohere with Luke's emphasis on Roman Palestine. Within this broader commemorative landscape, Luke presents a geographically truncated image of Peter.

It is perhaps not insignificant that Luke explicitly keeps Peter away from Antioch, despite the fact this Syrian city is otherwise prominent in the Acts narrative (Acts 11:19-26; 13:1-3; 14:26–15:2, 22-35; 18:22-23). Of particular note is the cryptic reference to Peter's exit from the narrative (save chapter 15:1-21): "then he left and went to another place" (12:17). Despite overtones that point to Peter's martyrdom and parallels with the resurrection appearances of Luke 24 (Pervo 2009:307-12), Luke seems to offer here a not-so-subtle nod toward Peter's non-Judean ministry without stressing its content in any great detail. Seen within the theoretical framework adopted in this essay, it is plausible to suggest that Luke was compelled by his source text (i.e., Gal 2:11-14) to create room for an Antiochan Petrine ministry, while at the same time taking steps to reframe that very source text. Put another way, Luke may have been uncomfortable with Paul's account of Peter's actions in Antioch (Gal 2:11-14), but nevertheless felt compelled to create narrative space in which to accommodate Peter's Syrian ministry. To this end, it is not insignificant that Luke does not explicitly deny Peter's presence in Antioch, as if to refute any Petrine connection with that city; rather, Luke leaves the issue open-ended. Based on the assessment of Luke's use of Mark offered earlier, this is precisely the way Luke both acknowledges and adapts stable *lieux de mémoire*; just as Luke was unable wholly to rewrite the Markan portrayal of Peter, neither is he able wholly to replace the Petrine image codified in Galatians.

Transformation and Memory: The Inclusive Peter

If Luke's geography creates a mnemonic world in which Peter's actions at Antioch are implicitly

granted without being explicitly emphasized, the account of Peter's interaction with Cornelius

(Acts 10:1–11:18) completely reframes the image of Peter enshrined in Galatians 2:11-14. Here,

the commemorative artistry of Acts comes into clearer focus, as Luke functions as a reputational

entrepreneur in the most acute sense. This reframing is achieved largely through the

establishment of various Peter/Paul parallels that exist not within the narrative world of Acts

(though these are important, too; see Praeder 1984), but rather between the literary worlds of

both Acts and Galatians—that is, Luke creates *cross*-textual parallels that complement and stand

alongside the various *intra*-textual Peter/Paul parallels within the Acts narrative. By keying

Peter's interaction with Cornelius into a (specifically) Galatian image of Paul, Luke evokes

certain aspects of the epistolary Paul as a frame for Peter's reputation.[9] Considering the narrative

of Acts 10–11 in light of Galatians 2, three observations are particularly significant.

First, in both Acts 10 and Galatians 2 Peter is portrayed as having undergone a

transformation on issues of Jewish–Gentile interaction in the *ekklēsia*. While the Galatian Peter

undergoes a negative transformation from inclusivist to exclusivist, the Lukan Peter undergoes

the opposite alteration. Contrary to Galatians, Luke portrays Peter as one who was once inclined

toward the Law but comes to embrace the open call of the gospel to all humanity. Similar to Paul

in Galatians (Gal 2:6; 3:27-28), the Peter of Acts insists that God does not show partiality nor

distinguish between Jew and Gentile (Acts 10:28, 34-35). In this cross-textual parallel, it is more

Peter's image than Paul's that is altered; the former apostle is brought into closer alignment with

---

[9] The cross-textual and intra-textual layers of Acts are rich, as the Peter figure is framed not only in relation to the Lukan Jesus (as noted earlier) but also in relation to both the Lukan and the epistolary Pauls. For Luke, the three figures of Jesus, Peter, and Paul mnemonically interlace each other in ways that extend beyond the narrative world of Luke-Acts and thus require grounding within an oral/aural-performative context in which the Lukan and Pauline writings are read along side one another.

the latter, thus alleviating any sense of the difficulty between Peter's reputation at Antioch and Luke's broader inclusivist themes.

Second, both Paul and Luke link issues of mixed table-fellowship and divine revelation to what they take as the ideal apostolic image. Though the exact nature of the Antioch dispute is not clear from Galatians 2:11-14, Paul mentions the incident because it stands, in his view, as a microcosm of the situation in Galatia. The main issue for Paul is not so much the observance of the Torah (either at Antioch or in Galatia) as the concern that ethnic particulars not divide the inclusive *ekklēsia*. A similar concern is also found in Acts, where Luke also focuses on the issue of mixed table-fellowship. Similar to Paul, Luke is less concerned with the legality of ethnic intermixing and instead frames dietary restrictions as a metaphor for Jewish–Gentile interaction in the *ekklēsia*. This point is underscored in Acts 10, where even though the divine voice to Peter insists on the cleanliness of all *food* (10:9-16), the Lukan author makes clear that *ethnic distinctions* are actually in view (10:27-29). The key concern for both Luke and Paul, then, is ethnic intermixing within the *ekklēsia*, and for both authors the Peter figure stands squarely in the middle of this social issue. Most important, and perhaps not by coincidence, both Luke and Paul further cohere in their insistence that issues of Jewish-Gentile intermixing functioned as the catalyst for Peter's transformation. According to Paul, Peter undergoes a negative transformation because he adheres to the requests of those from James (Gal 2:12), therefore concerning himself with human rather than divine approval (cp. Gal 1:10). Luke, on the other hand, directly links Peter's positive transformation to a divine revelation. Rather than dubiously retreating from ethnically mixed company (as in Galatians), the Peter of Acts receives divine visions and acts upon them (Acts 10). In this way, just as Paul received his non-discriminatory gospel by means of divine revelation (Gal 1:11-12), so too does Peter (Acts 10:9-16). Not only are the two

apostles brought into cross-textual alignment such that they jointly proclaim an inclusive gospel that is rooted in divine revelation, but they do so in a way that specifically rehabilitates the contours of Peter's image as codified in Galatians.

Finally, in a number of ways the Peter of Acts stands as the mirror image of the Peter of Galatians. The mirror metaphor is apt; though reversed, the Lukan Peter is identical to its Galatian counterpart. Where Paul presents Peter as more concerned with human rather divine approval, Luke portrays Peter as conversely more concerned with Christ's revelation than with the opinions of those in Jerusalem (see esp. Acts 11:1-18). Similarly, where Paul portrays Peter as a fickle apostle who retreats from Gentiles, Luke remembers him as confidently entering Cornelius's house "without raising an objection" (10:29; also 10:20). More significantly, where Paul remembers Peter "not acting . . . in accordance with the truth of the gospel" (Gal 2:14), Luke remembers him as the authoritative advocate of the gospel to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7). Of particular note is the gospel that Peter proclaims: by stressing themes such as the "forgiveness of sins" (10:43), "faith" (10:43; 15:9), and "salvation through grace" (15:11), scholars have long recognized that Peter's message has a markedly Pauline flavour (that is, an *epistolary*— specifically *Galatian*—Pauline flavour; see, e.g., Weizsäcker 1894:1.211-12; Walker 1985:12; 1998:78-85; Pervo 2006:92; Lëppa 2002:119–25). Here, then, the Peter of Acts is cross-textually keyed into the Paul of Galatians, a conflation that rehabilitates Peter's earlier and more difficult image while also underscoring Luke's vision of Peter and Paul as joint co-workers in the Gentile mission.

In summary, there are a number of important cross-textual Peter/Paul parallels that emerge when Acts and Galatians are read together. These parallels complement those embedded within the Acts narrative itself (again, see Praeder 1984) and create a mnemonic framework in

which the Lukan Peter is keyed into the epistolary Paul, thus bringing the two figures into closer alignment. As noted earlier, however, these commemorative activities are fashioned in such a way that the Lukan Peter stands as the mirror image of its Galatian counterpart. Both the contours of the Lukan Peter and the specifics of his transformation find their catalyst in Galatians 2:11-14. Similar to Luke's use of the Gospel of Mark, the commemoration of Peter in Acts is both restrained and informed by the Pauline text.

Advocacy and Memory: The Steadfast Peter

Luke's image of Peter as one who embodies the inclusive nature of the gospel is most explicit in the portrayal of Peter as the defender and advocate of the Gentile mission. These roles are explicitly attributed to Peter in Acts 11, and it is perhaps not coincidental that this chapter includes explicit textual evidence—in the form of verbal agreement—for Luke's use of Galatians 2:11-14. Heikki Leppä (2011:94-98; cf. 2002:35-61) points particularly to the combination of the terms οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς (Acts 11:2; cp. Gal 2:12), συνεσθίω (Acts 11:3; cp. Gal 2:12), and ἀκροβυστία (Acts 11:3; cp. Gal 2:7) as concrete source-critical evidence for what he calls the "quite clear fingerprint[s] of Paul" (2011:95). Just as in Galatians, Peter is confronted by a group of circumcised Jerusalemites (οἱ ἐκ περιτομῆς) who take issue with his participation in mixed table-fellowship. In contrast to Galatians, however, Luke sets Peter apart from his Jerusalem counterparts: he who went to the Gentiles without "discrimination" (διακρίνω; Acts 10:20; 11:12; see also 15:9) is now "criticized" (διακρίνω; 11:2) for having done so. As noted earlier, the Peter of Acts does not submit to the wishes of these circumcised believers but rather withstands their criticism and insists upon the importance of the Gentile mission (11:1-18). Ultimately, all of Paul's criticisms of Peter in Galatians 2:11-14 are answered in Acts 10–11 and 15, as Peter

becomes the exemplified inclusivist who, in the face of human pressures, remains faithful to the revelation of Christ.

This point becomes clearer in Acts 15:1-21, where Luke has Peter make a surprise return to the narrative for the sole purpose of defending Paul's Gentile mission at the Jerusalem Council. Here Luke's efforts as a reputational entrepreneur are laid bare, as not only Peter but also James and even Barnabas—those most negatively portrayed in Galatians 2:11-14—are brought into the evangelist's rehabilitative crosshairs. In a key passage, Acts 15:7-21, Peter's voice silences the otherwise lively debate of the council (15:7) and becomes the foundation upon which James's decision is constructed (15:14). Though Paul also plays an explicit role here (15:12), Luke places the bulk of the council's decision on Peter and James. Moreover, the content of Peter's address is particularly worth noting. While Paul rebukes Peter for having compelled the Gentiles to "live like Jews" (ἰουδαΐζω; Gal 2:14), in Acts Peter explicitly insists that the council not "put on the neck of the disciples a yoke that neither our fathers nor we have been able to bear" (15:10). Here again, Luke's commemorative activities are restrained by the earlier tradition: though the prior Pauline depiction set the agenda of Peter's reputation, Luke turns the negative elements on their head and thus commemorates a more favourable, inclusivist Petrine image.

In summary, the preceding analysis has suggested that Luke takes specific steps toward rehabilitating the image of Peter that had been codified in Paul's account of the incident at Antioch in Galatians 2. Just as Luke's Gospel was unable to dispense completely with the Markan Peter, so Acts was unable to ignore the image of Peter codified in Galatians 2:11-14. In light of his exceedingly positive outlook on Peter, Luke faced the challenge of explaining how an idyllic hero of the faith could also be a dis-unifying hypocrite (as per Paul's account). Luke

achieves such reputational rehabilitation by creatively refashioning all the difficult contours of Peter's image codified in Galatians. While Paul's Epistle to the Galatians does much to diminish the reputation of Peter, Luke's Acts does much to revive it.

Conclusions and Implications

This study has taken its point of departure from Barry Schwartz's insistence on the stability of memory. I have argued that Schwartz's theorem helpfully illuminates certain aspects of Luke's commemorative artistry while also providing a theoretical framework that brings to light certain ways in which Luke can be seen to draw on the Pauline epistles. To summarize my main point: Luke did not construct an image of Peter independent from previous commemorative expressions but rather sought to negotiate his much more positive Petrine image with the more negative images that had already been established in various *lieux de mémoire* (namely, the Gospel of Mark and Paul's Epistle to the Galatians). This points to what Schwartz calls, in the introduction to this volume, the "path dependency" of memory: texts are "affected not only by their social contexts but also by previous representations of their contents" (p. 16). Accordingly, it is not enough to simply insist that Luke, working under the impulses of the early second century, sought to rehabilitate Paul's image by freely shaping Peter's (so Walker 1985; 1998). Such an assertion places undue emphasis on the formative power of the present without giving proper attention to the carrying power of the past. This is not to deny any commemorative rehabilitation of Paul's image, though it is to acknowledge Luke's acute interest in the Petrine image and his practice of constructing that image in ways that are mnemonically indebted to established memory sites.

To insist that Peter's image was in need of repair is to presume that Luke understood the Pauline account of the incident at Antioch to have gained enough cultural cachet as to warrant reframing. This assertion is surely a contested point, one that raises the question of the status of Paul's letters—at least Galatians—at the time of Luke's writing. The findings reported here invite us to consider with renewed eyes not only the extent to which Paul's letters were known in the early second century (e.g., see Pervo 2010:23-61) but also Luke's attitude toward such writings. As a corollary to the "path dependency" of memory, the stress that many New Testament scholars place on points of *difference* or even *antagonism* between Luke and Paul seem potentially misguided. So, for example, Leppä (2011:101) argues that "Luke criticizes Gal 2" so as to "correct" Paul's account of the incident at Antioch such that Acts is "almost directly antithetical" to Galatians. On the one hand, there can be little doubt that Luke is at least partially opposing his Pauline source—such is the nature of reputational *rehabilitation*. On the other hand, Luke need not be construed with such an antithetical predisposition. Returning to Schwartz (1991), the key point to stress is the recognition that divergent mnemonic reputations can exist simultaneously. Pointing to the multifarious nature of collective memory, Schwartz (1991: 234, see also 226) insists that strong social constructivists err by "underestimat[ing] the present's carrying power. They fail to see that the same present can sustain different memories and that different presents can sustain the same memory." When applied to Peter's reputation, and specifically with an eye on Luke's attitude toward the Pauline epistles, Luke may not be replacing or even contradicting Galatians so much as offering a contemporary and relevant account that stands *alongside* Galatians. Indeed, the fact that Peter is keyed into the Galatian Paul suggests Luke sees Galatians not as a text to be refuted but rather *retained*, even if it requires *reframing*. To this end, despite Pervo's (2006:94-96, 138) insistence that Luke seeks to

"submerge" or "refute Galatians 2, or at least some implications of it," he more constructively points to Acts as a "hermeneutical key" for Paul's epistles. Schwartz's theorem of the stability of *lieux de mémoire* provides a compelling theoretical context in which to explore Acts as an interpretive framework for, rather than definitive correction of, Paul's letters.

On this point of theoretical contexts, one further implication of this study concerns the nature of what we identify as "credible data" when examining Luke's potential knowledge and use of Paul's letters. The foregoing has proceeded from the conviction that one must not unduly prioritize certain kinds of knowledge over others. That is to say, while instances of verbal agreement and literary correspondence are important in evaluating Luke's use of Paul, such data is only mistakenly self-evident and must be self-critically evaluated within explicit theoretical frameworks. With respect to the Peter figure, I have demonstrated that *both* verbal agreement *and* literary correspondence are reception-critically meaningful when they are placed *within* the dynamic context of mnemonic construction and negotiation. This underscores the importance— and potentiality—of exploring alternative ways of envisioning and identifying Luke's use of Paul. In addition to Luke's commemorative sensibilities and the (in)formative nature of mnemonic construction and negotiation, I have elsewhere (Tappenden 2012) examined the potential of cognitive linguistics for shedding light on ritual meals in both Luke and Paul. A further avenue to explore, which extends out of footnote 9 above, would be the consideration of oral/aural performance as the context in which the Lukan and Pauline writings were read alongside one another. For now, this study has demonstrated that the social dynamics of collective memory offer a promising theoretical framework in which to evaluate Luke's use of his sources, one that I have here established on the grounds of Luke's use of Mark and further elaborated as a way of illuminating Luke's use of Galatians. By focusing on Luke's reputational

entreprenurship, I hope this study has contributed to our understanding of how Luke's use of

Paul's epistles can be plausibly construed in new and credible ways.

Works Cited

Aejmelaeus, Lars. 2011. The Pauline Letters as Source Material in Luke-Acts. Pages 54–75 in *The Early Reception of Paul*. Edited by Kenneth Liljeström. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 99. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society.

Baker, Coleman. 2011. *Identity, Memory, and Narrative in Early Christianity: Peter, Paul, and Recategorization in the Book of Acts*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick.

Barrett, C. K. 1976. Acts and the Pauline Corpus. *ExpT* 88:2–5.

Best, Ernest. 1981. *Following Jesus: Discipleship in the Gospel of Mark*. JSNTSup 4. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Bockmuehl, Markus. 2010. *The Remembered Peter: In Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*. WUNT 262. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Brodie, Thomas L. 2001. Towards Tracing the Gospels' Literary Indebtedness to the Epistles. Pages 104–16 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by Dennis R. MacDonald. Studies in Antiquity and Christianity. Harrisburg, PA.: Trinity Press International.

Burchard, Christoph. 1970. *Der Dreizehnte Zeuge*. FRLANT 103. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Cassidy, Richard J. 2007. *Four Times Peter: Portrayals of Peter in the Four Gospels and at Philippi*. Interfaces. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

Ehrman, Bart. 2006. *Peter, Paul, and Mary Magdalene: The Followers of Jesus in History and Legend*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Elbert, Paul. 2006. Possible Literary Links between Luke-Acts and Pauline Letters Regarding Spirit-Language. Pages 226–54 in *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations of Theory and Practice*. Edited by Thomas L. Brodie, Dennis R. MacDonald, and Stanley E. Porter. New Testament Monographs 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.

Enslin, Morton S. 1938. Luke and Paul. *JAOS* 58:81–91.

———. 1970. Once Again, Luke and Paul. *ZNTW* 61:253–71.

Fine, Gary Alan. 2001. *Difficult Reputations: Collective Memories of the Evil, Inept, and Controversial*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hatina, Thomas R. 1999. Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is there a Relationship? *BibInt* 7:28–43.

Holmes, Michael W. 2007. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles*. SacPag 5. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press.

Knox, John. 1966. Acts and the Pauline Letter Corpus. Pages 279–87 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert, Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale University*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Leppä, Heikki. 2002. Luke's Critical Use of Galatians. Ph.D. diss., University of Helsinki.

———. 2011. Luke's Selective Use of Gal 1 and 2. Pages 91–124 in *The Early Reception of Paul*. Edited by Kenneth Liljeström. Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 99. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society.

Liljeström, Kenneth. *The Early Reception of Paul.* Publication of the Finish Exegetical Society 99. Helsinki: Finish Exegetical Society.

Marcus, Joel. 1992. The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark. *JBL* 111:441–62.

———. 2006.Crucifixion as Parodic Exaltation. *JBL* 125:73–87.

Marguerat, Daniel, ed. 2009. *Réception du Paulinisme dans les Actes des apôtres / Reception of Paulinism in the Acts of the Apostles*. BETL 229. Leuven: Peeters.

Mitchell, Margaret. 2012. Peter's "Hypocrisy" and Paul's: Two "Hypocrites" at the Foundation of Earliest Christianity. *NTS* 58:231–34.

Pervo, Richard I. 2006. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge.

———. 2009. *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

———. 2010. *The Making of Paul: Constructions of the Apostle in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Praeder, Susan Marie. 1984. Jesus–Paul, Peter–Paul, and Jesus–Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Response. Pages 23–39 in *SBL Seminar Papers, 1984*. SBL Seminar Papers 23. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press.

Riches, John. 2008. *Galatians through the Centuries*. Blackwell Bible Commentaries. Oxford: Blackwell.

Schwartz, Barry. 1991. Social Change and Collective Memory: e Democratization of George Washington. *American Sociological Review* 56:221–26.

———. 2000. *Abraham Lincoln and the Forge of National Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Smith, Terence V. 1985. *Petrine Controversies in Early Christianity: Attitudes Towards Peter in Christian Writings of the First Two Centuries*. WUNT 2/15. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Tappenden, Frederick S. 2012. Luke and Paul in Dialogue: Ritual Meals and Risen Bodies as Instances of Embodied Cognition. Pages 203–28 in *Resurrection of the Dead: Biblical Traditions in Dialogue*. Edited by Geert Van Oyen and Tom Shepherd. BETL 249. Leuven: Peeters.

Vielhauer, Philipp. 1966. On the "Paulinism" of Acts. Translated by William. C. Robinson Jr., and Victor Paul Furnish. Pages 33–50 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert, Buckingham Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation at Yale University*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Walker, William O., Jr. 1985. Acts and the Pauline Corpus Reconsidered. *JSNT* 24:3–23.

———. 1998. Acts and the Pauline Corpus Revisited: Peter's Speech at the Jerusalem Conference. Pages 77–86 in *Literary Studies in Luke–Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson*. Edited by Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press.

Weizsäcker, Carl. 1894. *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*. Translated by James Millar. 2 vols. London: Williams & Norgate.

Weeden, Theodore J. 1971. *Mark: Traditions in Conflict*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Wiarda, Timothy. 1999. Peter as Peter in the Gospel of Mark. *NTS* 45:19–37.