The Asbury Journal 77/2: 416-444

DOI: 10.7252/Journal.02.2022F.13

Joy Vaughan

Bringing Evidence to the "Anti-magic" View: A Socio-rhetorical Interpretation of Acts 19:11-20

Abstract:
In Acts 19:11-20 two main events are set beside one another. The first event tells of the miracles performed by God through the hands of Paul. The second event is the story of the failed exorcism attempt by the sons of Sceva. This article argues that Luke's purpose in the juxtaposition of the two events is to clarify for the audience the difference between magic and miracle. Key evidence for this interpretation is found in the intertextual relationship between Luke's terminology and ancient magical literature. Additionally, the rhetorical feature of *synkrisis* (*encomium*/invective) further supports the thesis. Luke does not just resist syncretism. Even further, he writes an invective against the use of magical practices as an attempt to generate the same result as what God was doing through Paul's hands. This is supported by the effect on the original audience who responds by burning their magical books.

Keywords: socio-rhetorical, *synkrisis*, magic, sons of Sceva, intertextuality, Acts 19:11-20

Joy Vaughan (joy.vaughan@asbury.edu) is Assistant Professor of New Testament Studies at Asbury University. She is a 2020 graduate of Asbury Theological Seminary with a Ph. D. in New Testament Studies.

Introduction

Acts 19:11-16 provides a vivid picture of two main events. The first event is the telling of the miracles performed by God through the hands of Paul. The second event informs of the failed exorcism attempt by the sons of Sceva. Concerning the purpose of Luke's juxtaposition of these events, there are at least four interpretations held within scholarship. First, a majority of scholars take the stance that the pericope presents a direct contrast between magic and miracle, concluding that the name of Jesus ought not be employed in magical incantations.[1] Secondly, a widening of this view suggests that the text serves as a polemic against religious syncretism in general, summating that the author is not only speaking against the inclusion of magical practices but of the incorporation of any other pagan practices into Christianity (Klein 1969: 262-301). Thirdly, Martin Dibelius insists that vv. 14-16 represent "secular" verses within Acts that do not have any Christian interest. Dibelius takes a stance against the "anti-magic view" and asserts that the purpose of the text is for entertainment value (Dibelius 2004: 44). Further, Scott Shauf downplays the presence of magical elements within the pericope and places the main emphasis upon an issue of identity, namely, "the special status of Paul in God's activity in the world" (Shauf 2005: 322).

In reference to the "anti-magic" interpretation, relaying that Luke intends to convey the difference between magic and miracle to the audience, Scott Shauf, critiques the view by stating that commentators have often not constructed satisfactory arguments in support of the view. Shauf states, "… it is apparently supposed to be self-evident that Sceva's sons are to be seen as employing magic and that there is then a resulting contrast intended between the seven sons and Paul which corresponds to the opposing categories of miracles and magic" (2005: 116). In opposition to Shauf's analysis, I propose that unturned evidence exists in support of this view, especially with regard to the rhetorical nature of the pericope. As a response to Shauf's thesis, I will specifically draw upon evidence gleaned from three specific avenues including: 1) the presence of magic in antiquity, 2) the intertextuality of Acts 19:11-20 and magical writings, and 3) the rhetorical structure of *syncrisis* present within the text. When looking at Acts 19:11-20 from these three angles, it is possible to see that the contrast between magic and miracle is well-represented in the text itself. In other words, the evidence presented in this research will strongly support the

thesis that the main purpose of Acts 19:11-20 is to show God's power as superior to magical powers.

In order to demonstrate this thesis, I will first present a brief survey of the background of ancient magic in antiquity especially asking what it would have been like to step foot into ancient Ephesus. Secondly, I will exhibit the unique word base employed by Luke and argue that it is heavily influenced by the magical context and magical literature such as would have been in Ephesus. Thirdly, I will provide an analysis of the rhetorical structure of *syncrisis* within 19:11-16, which clarifies the purpose for the juxtaposition of the stories of Paul's miracles and the sons of Sceva's failed exorcism attempt. In each section, I will add further support to the view that Luke intends to set forward a direct contrast between magic and miracle for an audience who might have been unable to make a clear delineation on their own.[2]

The Prevalence of Syncretistic Magic in Antiquity and Recent Discoveries

Even though much work has been done to establish a description of magic in antiquity as a background for New Testament interpretation,[3] this viewpoint still sometimes faces opposition within scholarship.[4] Simply the use of the term has caused debate amongst scholars mostly due to the ambiguity involved in its definition.[5] The work of David Aune has sought to bring focus to this issue and to clarify what might be considered as "magic." For Aune, "magic is defined as that form of religious deviance whereby individual or social goals are sought by means alternate to those normally sanctioned by the dominant religious institution." Further, magic involves the "management of supernatural powers in such a way that results are virtually guaranteed."[6] Aune's definition acknowledges that religion and magic do no fall into wholly separate categories, and avoids the supposed idea that in the Greco-Roman world a realm of religion existed apart from the realm of magic.[7] Therefore, within any sociological context, the influence of magic upon other religious activities or vice versa is plausible. In support, Aune notes the continual influence that would have been made specifically in regards to Christianity. He states,

> Since Christianity began as a religious movement within Judaism and became institutionalized within the Greco-Roman world, one suspects that there was never a time when magical traditions did not exert strong influences upon it. (Aune 2008: 382)

In agreement, Moyer V. Hubbard recognizes its prevalence and describes magic/sorcery as "… the grimy underside of Greco-Roman religion" (Hubbard 2010: 32). He adds that its "ubiquitous presence in the first century is easily confirmed but rarely taken into account when exploring the socio-religious matrix of the fledging Jesus movement" (2010: 32). His key point is that the more attractive elements of antiquity such as its marble temples and Doric columns have overshadowed and obscured the "less romantic reality of curse tablets, talismans, and bizarre nocturnal rituals" (2010: 32).

Consequently, for Jews, this magical context is part of the reality of ancient times. Hubbard points out that Jewish fortunetellers and magicians were found as the subjects in ancient literature.[8] Further, Gideon Bohak has recognized the influence of the magical traditions that he argues were orally transmitted within the intertestamental period and not written down until approximately the third century (Bohak 2008: 138). Adding another influential background, Clinton E. Arnold brings forward the influence of the *Testament of Solomon* (chapter 18 gives the description of the practice of the invocation of an angel as the key to exorcism and the importance of knowing the name of the "precise angel who has the power to defeat the particular afflicting spirit") (Arnold 2012: 6), which he describes as a "Jewish shaman's diagnostic manual," as a key predecessor to the type of Jewish folk magic that presents itself in the actions of the sons of Sceva (2012: 6).

Another key factor at play comes with the Hellenization of the Jews, which not only contributed to the growing influence of magic but also to the burgeoning understanding of the involvement of spirits in human life. Moyer's assessment of this matter is worth quoting at length here.

> It was not only the Gentile world that was befogged with spirits, fair and foul. Many Jews, too, perceived the cosmos to be brimming with supernatural beings, and for them, like their pagan counterparts, this was not an altogether pleasant reality. One of the most important developments in Judaism of the Hellenistic and Roman eras was the widespread belief that the hosts of heaven were actively involved in human affairs-individual and national. These angelic forces, however, were not all benevolent; indeed, much of the speculation of the surviving extrabiblical Jewish texts focuses on the activity of the evil angelic host. A stroll through this literature

> takes the reader into a dark and foreboding land, a world where humanity often appears as a defenseless and expendable pawn in a vast cosmic battle. (2010: 28)

Therefore, in Acts 19:11-20 the collision of both a Jewish belief in the presence of evil spirits and the concurrent belief in the potential of power obtained through magical practices collide. This pairing of beliefs is also found in other Jewish literature such as key parts of the Qumran literature.[9] Further, numerous amulets attest to the invocation of angels for power. Due to their syncretistic nature it is difficult to neatly place each amulet into Jewish, pagan, or Christian categories (2012: 15-17). Therefore, the main point of focus here has been well stated by Philip S. Alexander. He writes concerning the syncretistic nature of magic, "Magic is highly syncretistic: magicians were prepared to use names and formulae, whatever their source – Jewish, Christian, Egyptian or Persian. Eclecticism was pursued as a matter of deliberate policy: by invoking diverse 'gods' the magician increased his chances of tapping into a tradition of genuine magical power" (Alexander 1999: 1070).

Further, a relatively recently discovered inscription that pre-dates (dating to A.D. 20-50) most of the NT writings testifies to the syncretism present amongst magical practices and represents some of the same types of writings that are found in the magical papyri. For example, the majority of the names (including names of Jewish influence including "Iao"[10] and "Adonai") employed in an inscription (in which Vibia Paulina requests personal protection) are representative of the same names and patterns of invocations for power that are employed in the magical papyri.[11] J. R. Harrison concludes in agreement with Aune and A. D. Nock that these magical formulas were already present and had a defined shape during the NT era (Nock 1972: 176-94). He contends, "If this cameo inscription is representative, we can cautiously use the magical papyri as background in understanding the New Testament texts, without the charge of anachronism disqualifying their relevance at the outset" (Harrison 2012: 10). In other words, as Harrison asserts, "the syncretistic mixture of magical names of Jewish and Graeco-Roman deities in our cameo inscription perhaps provides us imaginative insight into the techniques employed by the Jewish exorcists at Ephesus" (2012: 13). In other words, the exorcists take a cue from the typical magical procedure and attempt to find power by employing a typical magical incantation in their attempt to exorcise the

demon-possessed. Thus, Acts 19:11-20 clearly reflects this type of activity presented in this early magical inscription. These elements of syncretism clarify how the behavior of the sons of Sceva might be categorized and also demonstrate the difficulty in understanding the difference between magic and miracle that is at hand in Acts 19.

A second recently discovered inscription also contributes to the understanding of magic in Ephesus and has relevance for the study of Acts 19:11-20. The description of the victory of Artemis over an evil sorcerer practicing malevolent magic is inscribed on a white marble slab, which dates to approximately AD 165. In this inscription, Artemis is portrayed as the city's leader who when she is put in a temple "will provide escape from (your) sufferings and will dissolve the man-destroying poison (or 'magic') of plague…" (2012: 37). Harrison notes that this passage is of importance for NT studies as it is the presence of Artemis that destroys the plague brought by magicians. Even though the role of magic within the cult of Artemis is greatly debated,[12] Harrison realizes that this inscription does provide insight into the reading of Acts 19:11-20. In convergence, in 19:12 it is the presence of the cloths brought to the sick and possessed in order to provide relief just as it is the presence of Artemis that brings relief. In this, Harrison astutely realizes the correctness in R. Strelan's observation that, "To a neutral observer, there would have been no difference between the 'miracles' of Paul and the 'power' of the exorcists or any magician. All operated through the power of a god or demon."[13]

Adding one more element of convergence, Graf's analysis of the inscription recognizes the presence of systems of patronage and benefaction within the ideology of the inscription. In particular, Artemis requires that those who experience relief give praise and worship Artemis (Graf 1992: 269-70). Although Acts 19:11-20 does not outline the requirement for patronage, vv. 17-20 summarize the fact that both Jews and Greeks gave patronage to God. They responded by honoring Jesus' name, confessing their evil deeds, and performing a costly act of burning their magical scrolls.

As noted above, the thesis of this paper asserts that 19:11-20 purposes to inform its audience of the difference between magic and miracle. What is clear from the above descriptions of the prevalence of the magical background in antiquity and also the magical background found in Ephesus is that, because of the depths of syncretism, one might have difficulty distinguishing between the activity of God through Paul as miracle and the demonstrations of power made by magicians. Luke is aware of this

environment and uses this comparison of the actions of Paul and the Sons of Sceva to make clarification.

The Intertextuality of Acts 19:11-20 and Ancient Magical Literature

In Acts 19:11-20 Luke's choice of popular magical terms provides a link to the sociological and historical situation in Ephesus. Garrett has specifically drawn attention to a list of terms within vv. 11-20 that are common in magical writings including ἐχορκιστής, ὀνομάζειν, ὁρκίζω, κατακυριεύσας, πρᾶξις, περίεργα, and βιβλός (Garrett 1989:98). Even though Garrett has given an already lengthy list, these are not the only words charged with magical overtones. I add that the terms δυνάμεις, ἀπαλλάσσω, κράτος, and even λόγος were commonly associated with magic. In addition, Garrett's writing does not always allow for a discussion of each term's usage within magical literature. In the following section, I will provide a detailed look concerning each term's usage. Where others have noted that certain terms reflect magical writings, I will synthesize their contributions as well. Each key word will be dealt with in the order of its usage within 19:11-20.

From the outset of the pericope, the forward position of the accusative of δυνάμεις in v. 10 realizes a syntactical emphasis placed upon the term.[14] Arnold has recognized the value placed upon δυνάμεις within the Hellenistic World by describing it as "one of the most common and characteristic terms in the language of pagan devotion" (Arnold 1992: 34). This emphasis is also well represented within the Greek Magical Papyri. In particular, as we have seen above, power can be acquired by naming great names of gods. For example, a charm claims one may wear a phylactery in order to be protected from demons, phantasms, suffering and sickness. The charm explains that the phylactery works because "… it is the name of power of the great god and [his] seal… (ἔστιν γὰρ δυνάμεως ὄνομα τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σφραγίς)." [15] The text continues by providing the name of the god in detail. The papyri do not attribute power to the name of a certain deity alone, but multiple deities. The underlying premise is that names of deities are named as a way to gain power.

Further, spells themselves did not possess power. Power came from the gods named within the spells. For example, a charm intended to sever a relationship between two men (either friendship or love) or between a husband and wife attributed power to the god Typhon saying, "Strong Typhon, very powerful one, perform your mighty acts" (ἰσχυρὲ Τυφῶν, μεγαλοδύναμε, τὰς σὰς δυνάμεις ἀποτέλει).[16] The spells thus served as a tool

to entreat the gods to share their power. For instance, one might find success or an answer in prayer by wrapping his or her body as a corpse, facing the sun and praying. The prayers sometimes included the petition for power, "O grant me power, I beg, and give to me this favor, so that, whensoever I tell one of the gods to come, he is seen coming…" (δυνάμωσον, ἱκετῶ, δός τε μοι ταύτην τὴν χάριν, ἵν', ὅταν τινὰ αὐτῶντῶν θεῶν φράσω μολεῖν).[17]

Otto Schmitz characterizes this ideology of power found in antiquity into two main streams. In the magical papyri, Hellenistic thought, and among many of the Diaspora Jews, power was viewed as a "substance." This view of power contrasts with the view of God's power held throughout the OT. In the OT, God used his power for his will and also gave power to his servants who had faith in him for the specific purpose of furthering his will.[18] Acts 19:11-20 expresses both views of power. Paul is portrayed as an agent of God furthering God's work and the sons of Sceva attempt to name Jesus' name in order to solicit his power in exorcism. Right from the beginning of the episode, the author sets forward the topic that is at hand, namely, power. The discourse continues by engaging the reader in the effects of the demonstration of the power of God in Paul's ministry and the attempt by the sons of Sceva to entreat God's power by calling upon the name of Jesus.

In order to further realize the meaning of the term δυνάμεις, Luke qualifies it by the use of a negated aorist adjectival participle (οὐ τάς τυχούσας) which adds a descriptive element to the type of powers evident in Paul's ministry.[19] Hans Conzelmann has identified this phrase as a Hellenistic idiom referring to something out of the ordinary (Conzelmann 1987: 163). English translations often render the phrase as "unusual." The usage does not deny that exceptions may occur but rather is suggestive that they are not of the ordinary. However, the verb τυγχάνω is not prominent in NT usage nor in magical writings. Further, the presence of the noun form τύχη is entirely absent from the NT corpus. In relation to magical writings, one might consider that NT writers avoided use of the noun because of the well-known presence of the god named τύχη. Betz summarizes the intense impact that the concept fate has upon those who based their religion upon the magical papyri.

> The people whose religion is reflected in the papyri agree that humanity is inescapably at the whim of the forces of the universe. Religion is nothing but taking seriously this dependency on the forces of the universe.

> Whether the gods are old or new, whether they come from Egypt, Greek, Jewish, or Christian traditions, religion is regarded as nothing but the awareness of and reaction against our dependency on the unfathomable scramble of energies coming out of the universe. In this energy jungle, human life can only be experienced as a jungle, too. People's successes and failures appear to be only the result of Chance (Tyche). Individuals seem to be nothing but marionettes at the end of power lines, pulled here and there without their knowledge by invisible forces. (Betz 1992: xlvii)

Bearing in mind this context, one may consider that Luke was not only referring to the "extraordinary" nature of the powers but also to their nature as not by chance representing a more common semantic range of meaning for the term. A reader from the Greco-Roman world could understand that it was not by chance, but by the power of God that miracles were done through Paul's hands. In support, other occurrences of δυνάμεις throughout Acts testify that the δυνάμεις belongs to God and is his work. For example, Acts 2:22 demonstrates that Jesus was approved by God by δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καί σημείοις.[20]

Next, in the description of the healings in 19:12, Roy Kotansky classifies the verb ἀπαλλάσσω as one of the most routine verbs for healing in the magical literature (Kotansky 1995: 244 n.3).[21] He also points out that within the NT this is the only instance of the usage of ἀπαλλάσσω for healing disease. Other occurrences are found in Luke 12:58 (used as "to settle a matter with an adversary")[22] and Heb 2:15 ("to set free from a controlling state or entity");[23] however, they represent differing semantic ranges of meaning. Calling attention to the cloths that were used for healing, Kotansky identifies these as amulets that contained no inscriptions.[24] This thesis is supported by the use of συδάρια ("linen cloth") as an important element in certain magical formulas.[25] Support is also found through the reference to burning books in vv. 18-19 within the direct context of the pericope. Kotansky concludes,

> Although the Ephesus episode does not mention the use of inscribed amulets, the specific reference to the burning of magical books in the immediate context of Acts 19:18-19 implies a close kinship between the ritual acts of the itinerant Jews and the Pauline amuletic kerchiefs, on the one hand, and the sorts of exorcisms and magical acts recorded in the magic literature, on the other. (1995: 245)

What becomes clear from Kotansky's thesis is that those employing the cloths may have had great difficulty distinguishing between God's power demonstrated through the cloths and the use of cloth in general within magical incantations.

Further, the Jewish men are referred to as exorcists (ἐξορκιστῶν). Many spells and formulas are contained within the papyri for use in exorcism employing the verb ἐξορκίζω. The etymology of the term as analyzed by Kotansky reveals that the noun form ἐξορκιστής is a budding term since there are no attestations of this form until the second century CE. The term relays the type of activity that the exorcists engage in, namely, they seek to adjure demons and cast them out. Kotansky also notes the new semantic range of meaning for ὁρκίζω ("adjure"). The term's etymology shows that the ancient usage, occurring as early as the fifth century BCE (ἐξορκίζω), relayed the concept of an oath sworn amongst two groups.[26] In a world attuned to spiritual beings, the use of language responded to the need for specific terminology.

In addition, the similarity between the formula used by the Jewish exorcists to exorcise the demons and the formula within the magical papyri is also at play in this pericope. [27] The practice of adjuring by the use of names (involving ὁρκίζω and ὀνομα) is well established. The widespread use of ὁρκίζω recalls the use adjuration of differing objects towards a desired means. In one example, the underlying premise for naming names is directly stated, namely, that by naming the name of the god, one might then possess the power of that god to facilitate their adjuration. This "commendable love charm" reads,

> I adjure you by the great god / who is over the vault of heaven… Hear me, greatest god, on this very day (on this night), so that you may inflame her heart, and let her love me because I have in my possession the power of the great god, whose name it is impossible / for anyone to speak, except me alone because I possess his power…[28]

This thought is also pervasive throughout the exorcism spells. The technique of the adjuration involved not only the naming of the god as a way to assert power, but also a detailed listing of the characteristics of the god as a way to vamp up his reputation in order to cause the desired outcome.[29]

Providing more key evidence, one of the charms accredited to Pibechis, a renowned Egyptian magician, specifically employs the name of

Jesus in exorcism: "I conjure you by the god of the Hebrews, Jesus… (οὗτος· ὁρχίζω σε χατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν Ἑβραίων Ἰησοῦ…)."[30] One is told to write the spell on a tin and hang it on the one being exorcised and recite this specific adjuration that involved the name of Jesus and further characteristics that alluded to the God of Israel. The phylactery notes adjuration by:

> … the one who appeared to Osrael, in a shining pillar and a cloud by day… by the seal which Solomon placed on the tongue of Jeremiah… by god, light-bearing, unconquerable, who knows what is in the heart of every living behind, the one who formed of dust the race of humans… by the great god SABAOTH, through whom the Jordan River drew back and the Red Sea, / which Israel crossed…[31]

Even though these terms represent the common terminology for pagan exorcists, they do not represent the terminology found within exorcisms performed by Jesus. Garret draws attention to this distinction noting that Jesus does not adjure demons. Rather, Jesus "commands" or in third person narrative accounts "rebukes" demons.[32] Again, Luke's terminology choice recalls familiarity with the magical tradition.

Continuing on, the term πρᾶχις occurs numerous times throughout the magical papyri denoting a "rite" or "ritual." For example, "This is the prayer of encounter of the rite which is recited to Helios… (Ἔστι δὲ ἡ σύστασις τῆς πράξεως ἥδε πρὸς Ἥλιον γιν[ομένη] 'ἥσυχον ἐν στομάτεσσι πάντες κατερύκετε φ[ωνήν)"[33] or, "This is the ritual using the name that encompasses all things" (ἔστιν δὲ ἡ πρᾶξις τοῦ τὰ πάντα περιέχοντος ὀνόματος).[34] Barrett educes the use of πρᾶξις in *PGM IV*. 1227 which states "excellent rite for driving out demons (πρᾶξις γενναία ἐκβάλλουσα δαίμονας)."[35] Bock concludes that within this setting the term ought to be translated as "magical spells" or "magical acts" rather than "deeds" conveying the people's turning away from magical activity (Bock 2008: 604). Therefore, within magical writings πρᾶξις is representative of a more specific range of meaning than its standard gloss conveys.

The term περίεργα is also reflective of magical terminology. M. W. Bates lays out an argument for a magical understanding of the term and translates the term as "the dark arts." More specifically, he establishes the word's presence in second-order magical discourse (Bates 2011: 412). Barrett also recognizes the term's significance within a magical realm and

translates the term as "things better left alone, not meddled with" (Barrett 1998: 2:912). Scholarship has more often noticed the magical use of this term.[36]

Also present in the pericope is the discussion of the books (βιβλός) that are burned. The papyri themselves attest to a great presence of magical books in antiquity. Books were written to teach others important spells. For instance, a spell for "acquiring an assistant" states, "I have dispatched this book so that you may learn thoroughly (ἀπέπεμψα τήνδε τὴν βίβλον, ἵν' ἐκμάθῃς)."[37] Barrett adds that the books would with "no doubt" resemble the Greek Magical Papyri published by Preisendanz. He also reminds of the familiarity of the term Ἐφέσια γράμματα within the period in order to point out Ephesus was stereotyped for their possession of such literature (1998:913).

Further, λόγος is the specific term used for "spell" or "formula" in the Greek Magical Papyri. A few examples include: 1) *PGM X*. 11 ([Λό]γος λεγόμενος translated as "Spell that is spoken");[38] 2) *PGM I*. 51 (λόγος πείθειν θεοὺς translated as "god-given spells");[39] and 3) *PGM 1*. 149 (λόγος Σελήνῃ / translated as "spell to Selene").[40] In relation to Acts 19:20 the magical overtones associated with this term has caused an alteration in the author's normal way of depicting a summary statement. Whereas Acts 6:7a and 12:24 talk of the spread of ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, the author of Luke-Acts modifies the phrase to ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου. Because of the large amount of magical terminology within the pericope, the author chooses terms that would avoid a misunderstanding of which god he was talking about.

In addition, the other summary statements in Acts do not use the phrase κατά κράτος. A form of this phrase is found in the Magical Papyri three times as part of magical adjuration: 1) "… because I adjure you by the strong and inexorable Destiny… (ὁτι σε ἐξορκίζω κατὰ τῆς κραταιᾶς καὶ ἀ αραιτήτοὺ Ανάγκης);[41] 2) "… because I adjure you by the strong and great names…" (… ὁτι σε ἐξορκίζω κατὰ τῆς κραταιᾶς καὶ μεγάλων ὀνομάτων…)[42]; and 3) "… I adjure you by the strong Destiny… (ὁτι σε ἐξορκίζω κατὰ τῆς κραταιᾶς καὶ Ἀνάγκης).[43] Not only does this phrase recall magical terminology, it also has "marked" word order since prepositional phrases do not normally begin Greek clauses. This syntactical arrangement signals an intended emphasis. Klutz adds that this emphasis suggests that both the failed exorcism attempt and the growth of the word of the Lord were a result of the Lord's power (Klutz 1999: 269).

Further, varied terminology is represented by the replacement of ἐπληθύνετο ("was being multiplied") with the use of the verb ἰσχύω. Beverly Gaventa has also noticed this "ironic twist" in comparison with the other summary statements pointing out the connection with the repetition of the same verb in v. 16 recalling the power the demons have over the seven exorcists (Gaventa 2003: 268). Adding from an intertextual perspective, Garrett adds that the terminology within the verse clearly reflects Luke 11:21-22 in which the strong man (ὁ ἰσχυρὸς) has control of his own possessions (1989: 93). The demons overpower the sons of Sceva since they have no authority by which to overpower the strong one; thus, the demon has the ability to remain in charge of the situation.

In summary, terminology common in the Greek Magical Papyri are tightly woven throughout 19:11-20. While some connections may present stronger cases than others (representing more likely allusions), the link between Luke's choice of terms attests to his familiarity with popular magical practices within society at large. This magical background has the capacity to explain why eight of these terms (ἀπαλλάσσω, ἐχορκιστής, ὀνομάζω, ὁρκίζω, κατακυριεύσας, πρᾶξις, περίεργα, κράτος) occur only one time in Acts within Acts 19. It is clear that at the word level, Luke chose a word base that would link the ancient audiences to this magical setting. Luke's use of terms as in combination with the magical setting at Ephesus helps to realize the fact that a person living in this environment would have had difficulty distinguishing between magical and miracle.

While for the most part this evidence at the word level has been more often noticed in support of the "anti-magic" view, I intend to contribute further evidence through an analysis of the rhetorical nature of 19:11-20. Before analyzing the rhetorical value of the pericope, I will review the status of rhetorical criticism within the book of Acts and note why many have hesitated to study the narrative portions of Acts, such as this one, for their rhetorical value.

The Rhetorical Structure of Acts 19:11-16: *Syncrisis*

Many biblical scholars have worked to establish the presence of rhetoric within Acts. In addition, scholars have drawn the conclusion that genre of Greco-Roman historiography bore the marks of other genres. Ben Witherington III stresses the fact that from Aristotle on, the influence of other literary traditions and rhetorical devices on history writing was clear. He adds that even at the time of the first century A.D. historical writings often

"owed more to declamation and Greco-Roman rhetoric than to careful historical study of sources and consulting of witnesses" (Witherington 1998: 40).

While scholars have examined much of Acts in light of rhetorical criticism, the methodology has only rigorously been applied to certain portions of the book, especially its speeches. Through a careful analysis of these speeches, scholars have recognized Luke's awareness of the tradition found in rhetorical handbooks. In contrast, Parsons has noted a reluctance to probe the narrative sections of Acts for their rhetorical value. This hesitancy is connected to the notion that traditional rhetorical handbooks such as those of Cicero and Quintilian are directed towards declamation or speech writing rather than the composition of narrative. However, the exercises of Aelius Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius the Sophist, and Nicolaus the Sophist do demonstrate how to compose narrative in an effective rhetorical manner (Kennedy 2003: xiii). For example, the preface of Theon states:

> There is no secret about how these exercises are very useful for those acquiring the faculty of rhetoric. One who has expressed a diêgêsis (narration) and a mythos (fable) in a fine and varied way will also compose a history well and what is specifically called "narrative" (*diêgêma*) in hypothesis – historical writing is nothing other than a combination of narrations – and one who can refute or confirm these is not far behind those speaking hypothesis… and we amplify and disparage and we do other things that would be too long to mention here. (2003: 4)

In addition, George A. Kennedy notes that the term *Di*êgêma within the context of Progymnasmatic use had become a term to indicate a type of exercise in narrative (2003: 4).

As the exercises of the *Progmynasmata* do not preclude an analysis of the narrative portion of Acts through the lens of rhetorical criticism, I propose that vv. 11-16 are presented in the form of a *syncrisis*. A definition of the *syncrisis* will follow in order to demonstrate that 19:11-16 adheres to the ancient descriptions of this rhetorical structure.

A Definition of Syncrisis (According to Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius and Nicolaus)

In his *Exercises*, Theon defines a *syncrisis* as the "setting the better or worse side by side" (2003: 52). Theon allows for both persons and things

to be included in this arrangement. The goal is to show which matter or person is superior through analysis of actions and good characteristics. Comparisons are to be of matters that are alike in the case when doubt exists as to which has superiority. A *syncrisis* specifically works to realize the superiority of deeds that are successful versus those that are unsuccessful. Common components include a comparison or contrast of 1) the birth, education, offices held, reputation, and the condition of the body of the persons; 2) the actions of the persons giving preference to the one who did well (brought benefit rather than harm); and 3) the resulting advantages in order to decipher which is better. This can be done in two ways including "one-to-one comparisons" (comparison of the bravest man with the bravest woman) or a comparison of things as whole (a comparison between the genus of brave men and brave women) (2003: 52–54).

In his *Preliminary Exercises*, Hemogenes broadened Theon's view of a *syncrisi*s allowing for comparison between similar and dissimilar items, lesser to greater, or greater to lesser. *Syncrisis* may be used within an invective to amplify the misdeeds. In an *encomion* the good may be amplified. For Hermogenes, a *syncrisis* begins with "encomiastic topics." Also, in the comparison of activities it should be made known who took up the activity first (2003: 83–84). Aphthonius the Sophist also allowed for the arrangement of greater, lesser, or equal items with one another: "As a whole, *syncrisis* is a double *encomion* or <a double> invective or a speech made up out of *encomion* <and invective>" (2003: 114).

Nicolaus the Sophist classified a *syncrisis* as an exercise belonging to *encomion*, but still allowed its use in other forms of rhetoric. When *syncrisis* is used by itself, its function is evaluation. He adds that the goal is to practice "… for invention of prooemia and composition of narrations in which we mention the merits as though giving a narrative, and for the forcefulness of debates in which we try to show that things are like or greater, and for the emotion of epilogues in which we bring the hypothesis to a close" (2003: 165–66). In light of these definitions, the desired outcome of a *syncrisis* is to evaluate two items either in comparison or contrast to one another.

Further, Christopher Forbes' analysis of the use of *syncrisis* in the Greco-Roman world validates its use as beyond just a rhetorical training exercise, but as "a living feature of literary culture" (Forbes 2003: 138). He adds that ancient authors often employed a comparative model and, in addition to the author's already discussed, he adds that Aristotle, Cicero,

Philo, Dionyssius of Halicarnassus, and Menander Rhetor of Laodicea also discussed the rhetorical exercise. His key argument is that a chronological study of these contributors provides sufficient evidence to support that there was a "wide range of discussion on the topic" in the ancient context (2003:138). Specifically, Nicolaus gives the reason why in some cases the *syncrisis* had been left out of progynasmatic exercises. He explains that the *syncrisis*, even when used as part of another exercise must not lose its place as an exercise itself.

> Some have not included what is called *syncrisis* (comparison) among *progymnasmata* at all, on that ground that there has been enough practice of it in common-places when we were making a scrutiny of something that was then being judged in relation to other wrongs, and in *encomia*, where we were trying to show the greatness of what was being praised by setting it next to something else; others have wanted it to be one of the *progymnasmata* but yet put it before *encomium*. Neither of these groups deserves praise; for it is not the case, when *syncrisis* has been taken up as a part (of a larger discourse such as common-place or *encomion*), that it was necessary for that reason for it to be no longer considered as constituting a whole (2003: 162).

Nicolaus therefore recognizes the *syncrisis* as part of other rhetorical techniques, but insists that it's use as a whole is also appropriate.

In light of the above evidence, is it highly likely that Luke was familiar with rhetorical devices including the *syncrisis*. Luke's prologue (Luke 1:1-4) to his two-part work highlights his preparedness to write in a highly educated fashion. Witherington draws out this characteristic of Luke when he writes,

> … Luke is telling us on the one hand that he intends to write history in the tradition of a Thucydides or a Polybius, a tradition that involved detailed consulting of sources and eyewitnesses, but on the other he intends to write in as rhetorically effective a manner as is possible, as demonstrated by the eloquence of this very sentence (Luke 1:1-4), which some have said is the finest Greek rhetorical prose in the entire NT. (Witherington 2009: 35)

As a result, the evidence weighs in favor for Luke as a rhetorically capable writer who is familiar with the rhetorical structures prevalent in the ancient

times. Now, we will turn to analyze the elements of micro rhetoric found in Acts 19:11-16.

Acts 19:11-16: A Syncrisis

The presence of the rhetorical structure of *syncrisis* is not foreign to the book of Acts. In his commentary, Mikeal C. Parsons notes several examples throughout Acts including Acts 2:29-36 (double *encomium*) (Parsons 2008: 46), Acts 3:13-15 (*encomium*/invective contrast) (2008: 60), Acts 4:36-37 (*encomium*/invective contrast) (2008: 72), Acts 7 (*encomium*/ invective contrast) (2008: 89, 107), and Acts 18:24-19:7 (*encomium*/ invective contrast) (2008: 268). However, in his detailed listing of the use of the structure throughout Acts, Parsons does not include Acts 19:11-16.

Moreover, Acts 19:11-16 does meet the outlined characteristics of a typical *syncrisis*. At the outset, the two events, the miracles of Paul and the exorcism attempt of the Jewish magicians, are placed beside one another on equal terms. Through one-to-one comparison both parties are "doing" (use of ποιέω) similar activities. The initial comparison would allow for the estimation that since both were doing the same that they would have equal results. Both are on equal grounds and by taking into account Theon's definition of *syncrisis* there is a possibility that doubt existed as to which was actually superior.

Activity #1

1. Δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τυχούσας ὁ θεὸς ἐποίει διὰ τῶν χειρῶν Παυλοῦ
2. God was performing extraordinary miracles through the hands of Paul

Activity #2

1. ἦσαν δε τινος Σκευᾶ Ἰουδαίου ἀρχιερέως ἑπτὰ υἱοὶ τοῦτο ποιοῦντες.
2. Seven sons of one Sceva, a Jewish chief priest, were doing this (attempting to cast out an evil spirit).

Only through the development of the *syncrisis* does the reader realize that the two do not end on equal terms. Therefore, the *syncrisis* can be classified as an *encomium*/invective type. The actions of God through Paul are shown to be good/successful while the actions of the Jewish exorcists are depicted as being bad/unsuccessful. Particularly, both events present key features of the use of *syncrisis* within the *Progymnasmata* including a

presentation of the reputation or family of the main characters, their actions and a description of the results of their action.

Activity #1

1. **Reputation:** Paul is an agent of God (v. 11).
2. **Action:** God was doing extraordinary miracles through the hands of Paul (v. 11).
3. **Result:** This action produced a positive/successful result and brought benefit to others. The sick were healed, and the evil spirits cast out (v. 12).

Activity #2

1. **Reputation:** The Jewish exorcists' "good birth" is referred to: They are the sons of Sceva, the Jewish chief priest (v. 13). However, the reputation is quickly narrowed. The evil spirit knew both Jesus and Paul but does not know them (v. 15-16). (The reputation of Jesus and Paul is actually affirmed in this statement).[44]
2. **Action:** They attempt to employ the name of Jesus in order to cast out a spirit (v. 13).
3. **Result:** The actions of the Jewish exorcists produce a disastrous/unsuccessful result. They are the recipients of harm and shame. They are beaten, stripped, and cast out of the house (v. 16).

The presence of a *syncrisis* intrinsically expresses the relationship between these two events indicating that one must read the events in light of the other. Paul's success is clearly attributed to the work of God. The results were praiseworthy as many were healed and demons were exorcised. On the other hand, the sons of Sceva experienced severe humiliation and are shamed. First, the reputation is degraded by the demon as he denies an awareness of their identity and in an ironic twist affirms the identity of Jesus and Paul. Further, they are stripped naked and beaten by the man possessed by the demon spirit.

Klutz shows that this story ought to remind us of the Lukan account of Jesus' encounter with the Gerasene demoniac since, "… whereas Jesus overpowers an entire legion of demons on his own (Luke 8:30-33) and transforms the naked demoniac into a clothed disciple (Luke 8:27, 35) the seven itinerants cannot manage a solitary demon, despite their numerical

advantage, or even prevent the fiend from wounding them and tearing their clothes off" (Klutz 1999: 273). At the heart of the *syncrisis*, Paul is praised as an agent of the power of God while the sons of Sceva are disgraced and powerless over the demon. Therefore, even though the sons of Sceva attempt to do the same type of activity that God had demonstrated through Paul, the two do not end up on equal terms.

Ultimate Result: Effect of the *Syncrisis* in Antiquity (vv. 17-20):
Result #1: After this event became known to the Jews and Greeks in Ephesus, they became afraid, and Jesus' name was magnified (v 17).
Result #2: Believers confessed their evil deeds; those who practiced sorcery publicly destroyed their valuable books. (vv. 18-19).
Final result: The word of the Lord was spreading and having power.

In vv. 17-20 Luke takes the time to narrate the effect of the juxtaposition of the two activities compared in the *syncrisis*.[45] In other uses of the *syncrisis* as identified by Parsons, Luke also narrates the effect the comparison had upon its first audience.[46] Following the comparison of the two compared events, Luke depicts that when the failed exorcism attempt had become known, believers confessed their deeds and involvement in magical activity, which led to the destruction of their valuable property. Therefore, what the original audience gleaned from the event was that their magical possessions were powerless in comparison to the power of God demonstrated through Paul.

Conclusion

In summary, when comparing the actions of the Paul and the sons of Sceva, the *syncrisis* reveals the heart of the comparison as between the action in activity #1 (God was doing extraordinary miracles through the hands of Paul (v. 11)) and the action in activity #2 (The sons of Sceva attempt to employ the name of Jesus in order to cast out a spirit (v. 13)). In light of the magical terminology present within the pericope and the ancient magical setting, all indicators point to the fact that Luke did not write an invective against syncretism in general, but he wrote an invective against those who attempted to employ magical practices to generate the same results as what God was doing through the hands of Paul. Luke's narration of the effect upon the original audience, namely, the burning of books,

supports this invective against magic. As a result, Luke's juxtaposition of the two events is indicative of the audience's inability to initially understand the differentiation between miracle as the work of God through the hands of Paul and magic as the invocation of powerful names to attain power. After the *syncrisis* which includes an *encomium* for Paul and an invective against the sons of Sceva, this matter is clarified for the audience.

End Notes

[1] One of the most detailed arguments for this view is found in Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 1989), 89-99. Many other scholars have also concluded that the pericope serves to make a distinction being between magic and miracles: C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 907-12; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2004), 604; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1987), 163; Craig S. Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, Vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2014), 2843; Gerhard Krodel, *Acts* (Minneapolis: Ausburg, 1986), 362-63; Hans-Josef Klauck, *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 97-102; I. H. Marshall, *Acts* (TNCT; Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1980), 328-31; William Neil. *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Oliphants, 1973), 205; John Pohill, *Acts* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 400-6; Paul W. Walasky, *Acts* (Westminster Bible Companion; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 178-80; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 576-83. For a more in-depth listing of the proponents of the "anti-magic" view, see Scott Shauf, *Theology as History, History as Theology: Paul in Ephesus in Acts 19* (New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 116-17.

[2] Space will not allow for an analysis of how this pericope contributes to the overall narrative of Acts. See Garrett who argues that Acts 19:10-20 contributes to the "ongoing Christian triumph over Satan, and, consequently, over magic." She notes that this pericope's contribution to the theme of the defeat of Satan has often been overlooked because of the emphasis upon the unknown identity of the sons of Sceva as well as textual issues in comparison with the Western text. Garrett states, "… commentators have failed to ask important interpretive questions, such as how the demon's vocal and physical response in vv. 15-16 relates to Luke's understanding of exorcism… ; and why observers could have regarded the apparent victory of a demon as a defeat of magic." Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil*, 90.

[3] For a bibliography of sources see Daniel Ogden, *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook* (New York: Oxford, 2009), 341-51.

[4] Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil*, 1-2 notes that much opposition has existed concerning the study of the magical background of the New Testament due to the belief that to gain an understanding of magical practices is considered unacceptable for Christians. She also notes that many readers have become embarrassed by the NT accounts as "Christians' actions seem hardly to differ from those of the 'magicians.'"

[5] D. F. Aberle, "Religio-Magical Phenomena and Power, Prediction and Control," *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 22 (1966): 221-30. Many anthropologists have come to use the term "religio-magical" in order to express that there is no clear concise distinction that can be made between magic and religion, and that magic's interrelation with religion cannot be dismissed. See David Aune, *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 371. Aune summarizes two key trends amongst anthropologists: 1) Under the leadership of Evans-Pritchard universal definitions of "religio-magical" phenomena are avoided and are analyzed at the level of empirical studies within specific cultures (cf. E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *Nuer Religion* [Oxford: Claredon, 1965], 95); 2) M. and R. Wax and K. E. Rosengreen work to compare magic and religion with science and technology theoretically. Cf. M. and R. Wax, "The Notion of Magic," *Current Anthropology* 4 (1963): 495-518, and K. E. Rosengren, "Malinowski's Magic: The Riddle of the Empty Cell," *Current Anthropology* 17 (1976): 667-85. Notable is the developed idea that the relationship between magic and religion cannot be easily severed (as opposed to the theoretical separation especially promoted by Wax). See also Alan F. Segal, "Hellenistic Magic: Some Questions of Definitions" in *Studies in Gnostic and Hellenistic Religions* (eds. R. Van den Broek and M.J. Vermaseren; Leiden: Brill, 1981), 349-75.

[6] Aune, *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity*, 376-77. Aune 1) emphasizes the near impossibility of categorizing magic and religion into separate socio-cultural classifications, 2) avoids the pejorative usage of the term "magic", and 3) pinpoints that magic is found within religious traditions and is not religion (it is a species of religion and not the genus of religion itself).

[7] This definition is given largely in response to the view of magic held before World War I that religion and magic were clearly distinguishable from religion. NT scholars after World War II began to employ the distinction and defined magic as a mark of the beginning stage of a person's religious growth or as a form of perverted religion. What followed was the trend to discredit magic as a form of religion. See Aune, *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity*, 371-2.

[8] Hubbard, *Christianity in the Greco-Roman World,* 32n.63 points out the discussions of Jewish magicians and sorcerers in Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 3.3-4; Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.542-47; Lucian, *Gout*. 171-73; Origen, *Cels.* 1.26.

[9] Hubbard, *Christianity in the Greco-Roman World*, 28. See also Arnold, "Sceva, Solomon, and Shamanism," 14-15 for a more detailed

description of 11Q11, 4Q560, 4Q510 and 4Q511 as Qumran magical handbooks.

[10] The Greek transliteration of the tetragrammaton.

[11] J. R. Harrison, "Magic" in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek and Other Inscriptions and Papyri published between 1988 and 1992* (ed. S. R. Llewelyn, J. R. Harrison, and E. J. Bridge; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), 10-12. Harrison concludes that this inscription is not from the world of Jewish magic, as it lacks "indications of Jewish monotheism . . . any reference to the angelic world, or to the Old Testament scriptures." Even though this argument from silence might have some probability of correctness, one must also remember the depth of the syncretism that was often present in these magical contexts. Nevertheless, Harrison does appropriately recognize that the inscription sheds light on the fact that magical formulas such as this one had been formulated at an early date.

[12] See Harrison, "Artemis triumphs over a Sorcerer's Evil Art," 39-45 for summary of the debate between C. E. Arnold and R. Strelan.

[13] See R. Strelan, *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus* (Berlin/ New York, 1996), 259 as cited in Harrison, "Artemis triumphs over a Sorcerer's Evil Art," 46.

[14] The same emphasis is seen in the phrase Χάριν δὲ οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν in Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 18. 2:214-15.

[15] *PGM VII*. 583. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri*, 134.

[16] *PGM XII*. 375. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri*, 166. Other examples include PGM II 117-124, PGM III 565, and many others.

[17] PGM IV 197-199. Betz, *The Greek Magical Papyri*, 41.

[18] See Otto Schmitz, "Der Begriff δύναμις bei Paulus," in *Festgabe für Adolf Deissman* (Tübingen: Mohr 1927), 139-67 as summarized by Arnold, *Ephesians Power and Magic*, 36.

[19] Only one other instance of the use of the negated participle form of τυγχάνω is found in the NT. In Acts 28:2 the participle is used to give description to the type of hospitality shown to Paul on the Island of Malta. The verb form is found in ten other instances. These occurrences can be categorized into three groupings. Seven times the verb is used transitively taking its object in the genitive case (Luke 20:35; Acts 24:2, 26:22, 27:3; 2 Tim 2:10; Heb 11:35). The objects received by this verb are received as a gift rather than earned (for example: God's help, salvation, peace, Christ's priestly ministry). Two times the verb is used within an optative clause (1 Cor. 14:10, 15:37). One instance of an adverbial participle occurs (Heb 8:16). Overall, τυγχάνω is used with a nuance of probability in mind.

[20] See also 3:12-13; 4:7-8; 6:8; 8:10-13; 10:38 in which δυνάμεις is ultimately attributed to God's work.

[21] Witherington also notes that the term frequents within the medical writings in antiquity (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 580).

[22] BDAG, 96.

[23] BDAG, 96.

[24] Roy Kotansky, "Incantations and Prayers for Salvation on Inscribed Greek Amulets," in *Magika Hiera: Greek Magic and Religion* (eds. C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 108-10.

[25] Roy Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 244. See the usage of σουδάρια in *PGM* VII. 826; XXXVI, 269 and the use of σινδών, σινδόνιον, and σινδονιάζειν in *PGM* II. 162 III. 294, 706; IV. 88, 171, 175, 429, 1861, 3095; V. 217; XIII. 98. With this in mind Kotansky concludes "… there is little to detract from the prospect that the cloths, once used effectively, would have been deployed again and again. These magically-charged reliquaries would have no doubt been reapplied with the necessary prayers or incantations: the young Christian community at Ephesus, it seems, adhered tenaciously to their magical beliefs, in some cases for up to two years after conversion (Acts 19:10)." It is not until the failure of the exorcists that the believing ones burn their treasured books.

[26] Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 249. See 249-277 for a thorough discussion of the term's use within Greek Magical Papyri.

[27] Kotansky, "Greek Exorcistic Amulets," 245. For Kotansky, the accuracy with which the spell has been preserved speaks to the historical plausibility of the formula as well as the author's remembering of the trend by Jewish exorcists to use the name of Jesus in their incantation. A. Harnack, *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, vol. 1 (trans. J. Moffat; London: Williams and Norgate, 1908), 119-21. Harnack adds that it was even admitted that "at a very early period pagan exorcists appropriated the names of the patriarchs (cp. Orig., *Cels*. I. xxii.), of Solomon, and even of Jesus Christ… even Jewish exorcists soon began to introduce the name of Jesus in their incantations." See Harnack for evidence showing church's response which involved making a clear distinction between exorcists using of the name of Christ, magicians, pagan sorcerers, and others.

[28] *PGM* LXI. 23-26. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 291.

[29] See *PGM II* 125 as an example.

[30] *PGM* IV. 3015. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 96.

[31] *PGM* IV. 3015-3084. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 96-97.

[32] Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil*, 92. See Luke 4:35, 39, 41; 8:24, 29; 9:42, 55 and Acts 16:18 for the use of ἐπιτιμάω and παραννέλλω.

[33] *PGM* III. 192. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 23.

[34] *PGM* XIII. 343. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 182.

[35] Barrett, *Acts*, 912. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri,* 62.

[36] See BDAG, 800.

[37] *PGM* I. 52.

[38] Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 149. This example represents a common way to refer to a written spell and recurs several times throughout the papyri.

[39] Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 4.

[40] Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 7.

[41] *PGMXXXVI*. 341. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 277.

[42] *PGMXXXVI*. 347. Betz, *Greek Magical Papyri*, 277.

[43] *PGMXLV*. 33.

[44] See Clair Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 203 who tracks Luke's theme of calling on the name of Jesus for salvation through examples of those who call on his name and abuses of his name.

[45] Following the *syncrisis* in 2:29-36, an *encomium* of David and Jesus, Luke follows up by narrating its effect, which is strikingly comparable to the effect of the *syncrisis* in 19:11-17 (specifically in comparison is the presence of fear and getting rid of possessions). Thirdly, Acts 19:5 indicates that baptism in the name of Jesus followed.

[46] In three other *syncrisis* identified by Parsons, Luke also narrates the effect the comparison had upon its first audience. Following the *syncrisis* in 2:29-36 which is an *encomium* of David and Jesus, Luke follows up by narrating its effect which is strikingly comparable to the effect of the *syncrisis* in 19:11-17 (specifically in comparison is the presence of fear and getting rid of possessions). Thirdly, Acts 19:5 indicates that baptism in the name of Jesus followed.

Works Cited

Aberle, D. F.
1966 "Religio-Magical Phenomena and Power, Prediction and Control." *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology*, 22, no. 3: 221-30.

Alexander, Philip S.
1999 "Jewish Elements in Gnosticism and Magic (c. CE70- CE 270). Pages 1052-1078 in W. Horbury, W.D. Davies, and J. Sturdy, *The Cambridge History of Judaism: The Early Roman Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arnold, Clinton E.
2012 "Sceva, Solomon, and Shamanism: The Jewish Roots of the Problem at Colossae." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 55: 7-26.

1992 *Ephesians-Power and Magic: The Concept of Power in Ephesians in Light of Its Historical Setting.* Grand Rapids: Baker.

Aune, David
2008 *Apocalypticism, Prophecy, and Magic in Early Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bates, M. W.
2011 "Why do the seven Sons of Sceva fail?: Exorcism, Magic, and Oath enforcement in Acts 19:13-17." *Revue Biblique* 118: 408-21.

Barret, C. K.
1998 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles.* 2 vols. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1994.

Betz, Hans Dieter
1992 *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation*. Vol. 1. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Bock, Darrell L.
2008 *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Bohak, Gideon
2008 *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Conzelmann, Hans
1987 *Acts*. Hermeneia Commentary Series. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Dibelius, Martin
2004 *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Dio Chrysostom
1939 *Discourses 12-30.* Translated by J.W. Cohoon. Loeb Classical Library. 5 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Evans-Pritchard, E. E.
1965 *Nuer Religion.* Oxford: Claredon Press.

Forbes, Christopher
2003 "Paul and Rhetorical Comparison." Pages 134-71 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.

Garret, Susan R.
1989 *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts
2003 *Acts*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.

Gill, David W. J. and Conrad Gempf, eds.
1994 *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*. Vol. 2. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Graf, Fritz
1992 "An Oracle against Pestilence from a Western Anatolian Town." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 92: 267-92.

Harnack, A.
1908 *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centurires*. Vol. 1. Translated by J. Moffat. London: Williams and Norgate.

Harrison, J. R.
2012 "Magic." Pages 10-15 in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek and Other Inscriptions and Papyri published between 1988 and 1992*. Edited by S. R. Llewelyn, J. R. Harrison, and E. J. Bridge; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

2012 "Artemis triumphs over a Sorcerer's Evil Art," Pages 37-47 in *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek and Other Inscriptions and Papyri published between 1988 and 1992.* Edited by S. R. Llewelyn, J. R. Harrison, and E. J. Bridge; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hubbard, Moyer V.
2010 *Christianity in the Greco-Roman World*. Hendrickson.

Keener, Craig S.
2014 *Acts 15:1-23:25: An Exegetical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Kennedy, George A.
2003 *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric: Writing in the Greco-Roman World*. Translated by George A. Kennedy. Atlanta: SBL.

Kistemaker, Simon J.
1990 *Exposition of the Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.

Klauck, Hans-Josef
2003 *Magic and Paganism in Early Christianity: The World of the Acts of the Apostles*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Klein, Günter
1969 "Der Synkretismus als theologisches Problem in der ältesten christlichen Apologetik." Pages 262-301 in *Rekonstruction und Interpretation: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*. Beiträge zur evangelische Theologie 50. Munich: Kaiser.

Klutz, Todd
1999 "Naked and Wounded: Foregrounding, Relevance and Situation in Acts 19:13-20." Pages 258-79 in *Discourse Analysis in the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Jeffrey T. Reed. Sheffield: Sheffield.

Kotansky, Roy
1991 "Greek Exorcistic Amulets." Pages 243-77 in *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*. Edited by Marvin Meyer and Paul Mirecki. Leiden: Brill.

1991 "Incantations and Prayers for Salvation on Inscribed Greek Amulets," Pages 107-137 in *Magika Hiera: Greek Magic and Religion*. Edited by C. A. Faraone and D. Obbink. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Krodel, Gerhard
1986 *Acts*. Minneapolis: Ausburg.

Marshall, I. H.
1980 *Acts*. TNCT. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press.

Marshall, I. H. and David Peterson, eds.
1998 *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Neil, William
1973 *The Acts of the Apostles*. London: Oliphants.

Nock, A. D.
1972 "Greek Magical Papyri." Pages 176-94 in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World.* New York: Oxford.

Ogden, Daniel
2009 *Magic, Witchcraft, and Ghosts in the Greek and Roman Worlds: A Sourcebook* New York: Oxford.

Parsons, Mikeal C.
2008 *Acts*. Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker.

Pohill, John B.
1992 *Acts*. New American Commentary. Nashville: Broadman.

Preisendanz, Karl, Erich Diehl, and Samson Eitrem, eds.
1977 Papyri Graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri. Vol. 3 Indexes. 3 vols. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Commentare. Leipzig: B. C. Teubner.

Rosengren, K. E.
1976 "Malinowski's Magic: The Riddle of the Empty Cell," *Current Anthropology* 17: 667-85.

Rothschild, Clair
2004 *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Segal, Alan F.
1981 "Hellenistic Magic: Some Questions of Definitions." Pages 349-75 in *Studies in Gnostic and Hellenistic Religions.* Edited by R. Van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren. Leiden: Brill.

Schmitz, Otto
1927 "Der Begriff δύναμις bei Paulus." Pages 139-167 in *Festgabe für* Adolf Deissman. Tübingen: Mohr.

Shauf, Scott
2005 *Theology as History, History as Theology: Paul in Ephesus in Acts 19*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Walasky, Paul W.
1998 *Acts*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox.

Wax, Murray and Rosalie
1963 "The Notion of Magic." *Current Anthropology* 4: 495-518.

Witherington III, Ben.
2009 *New Testament Rhetoric: An Introductory Guide to the Art of Persuasion in and of the New Testament*. Eugene, OR: Cascade Books.

1998 *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.