

MIRACLES

THE CREDIBILITY OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT ACCOUNTS



CRAIG S. KEENER

MIRACLES

THE CREDIBILITY OF
THE NEW TESTAMENT ACCOUNTS

VOLUME 1

CRAIG S. KEENER



BakerAcademic

a division of Baker Publishing Group
Grand Rapids, Michigan

© 2011 by Craig S. Keener

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Keener, Craig S., 1960–

Miracles : the credibility of the New Testament accounts / Craig S. Keener.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-0-8010-3952-2 (cloth)

1. Miracles. 2. Spiritual healing—Christianity. 3. Bible. N.T. Gospels—Evidences, authority, etc.

4. Bible. N.T. Acts—Evidences, authority, etc. I. Title.

BS2548.K44 2011

226.7'06—dc23

2011020926

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

VOLUME 1

Acknowledgments xv

Abbreviations xvii

Introduction 1

- The Origin of This Book
- The Subjects of This Book
- Limitations
- The Problem
- Closing Comments

Part 1: The Ancient Evidence 19

1. Opening Questions about Early Christian Miracle Claims 21

- Evidence for Jesus's Miracles
- Miracle Claims for Jesus's Early Movement
- Methodological Questions

2. Ancient Miracle Claims outside Christianity 35

- Gentile Greco-Roman Miracle Accounts
 - *Healing Sanctuaries*
 - *Pagan Miracle Workers*
- Early Jewish Miracle Workers
- An Authenticating Function of Miracles
- Conclusion

3. Comparison of Early Christian and Other Ancient Miracle Accounts 66

- Differences between Early Christian and Most Pagan Miracles
- Comparison of Early Christian and Jewish Miracle Accounts
 - *Rabbinic Miracles*
 - *Eve's Detailed Comparisons*
- Parallels and the Authenticity Question
 - *Healing Sages?*
 - *The Supernatural Element Not a Sufficient Parallel*
 - *Celestial Prodigies*
- Conclusion

Part 2: Are Miracles Possible? 83

4. Antisupernaturalism as an Authenticity Criterion? 85

- Ancient Skepticism toward Miracles
 - *Polybius's Critique of Sensationalist Historians*
 - *Signs in Critical Historians*
 - *Ancient Plausibility Structures*
- Modern Western Skepticism toward Supernatural Phenomena
 - *Our Cultural Limitations*
 - *Have We Privileged a Particular Western Worldview?*
- Conclusion

5. Hume and the Philosophic Questions 107

- What This Chapter Will Address
- The Nature of the Questions
- Hume's Argument from Nature
 - *Hume and the Philosophy of Science*
 - *Does Science Pronounce on Theology?*
 - *Hume, Violations of Natural Law, and Theism*
 - *Nature versus Hume*
 - *Hume's Antitheistic Starting Assumptions*
- Hume's Epistemology regarding Miracles
 - *Hume on Testimony*
 - *Consequences of Such Epistemic Demands for Other Disciplines*
 - *Hume versus Normal Logic regarding Witnesses*
 - *Rejecting Unusual and Rare Events?*
 - *The Theistic Factor*
 - *The Circularity of Hume's Approach*
 - *Other Noninductive Elements in Hume's Approach*
- Hume's Critics
- Conclusion

6. Developing Hume's Skepticism toward Miracles 171

- Consequences and Problems of the Humean Consensus
 - *Effects in Philosophy*
 - *Effects in Religion and Theology*
 - *A Sound Approach?*
 - *God Acting in the Natural World?*

- *God Acting in History?*
- *History and Theory*
- *The Religious Factor*
- *Incompatible Religions Claim Miracles?*
- *Disbelief in Miracles as a Dogmatic Assumption?*
- The Shift in the Western Worldview
 - *A Shift among Scholars*
 - *Do Modern People Believe in Miracles?*
- Conclusion

Part 3: Miracle Accounts beyond Antiquity 209

7. Majority World Perspectives 211

- Multicultural Miracle Claims and Ethnocentric Prejudices
 - *A Multicultural Approach*
 - *Cross-Cultural Readings*
 - *Ethnocentric Objections to Miracles*
 - *Hume's Explicit Ethnocentrism*
- Majority World Voices
 - *Learning from Other Cultures*
 - *Widespread Pentecostal Claims in the Majority World*
 - *Such Claims Not Limited to Pentecostals*
- Limitations in My Approach
 - *Studies of Extraordinary Claims in Non-Christian Movements*
 - *Limitations of Reports*
 - *The Use of Examples*
 - *Diverse Christian Supernatural Claims*
 - *One Theological Caveat*
- Conclusion

8. Examples from Asia 264

- Limitations of My Examples
- The Philippines
- Southeast Asia
- South Asia
 - *India*
 - *Interviews with Some Indian Ministers*
 - *Sri Lanka and Nepal*
- Indonesia
- South Korea
- The Pacific
- Healings and China
 - *Examples*
 - *Answering More Skeptical Perspectives*
 - *Visiting Some Chinese Pastors*
 - *One Example in 1930s China*
- Conclusion

9. Examples from Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean 309

- Examples in Africa
 - *Healing in Mainline Churches*
 - *Various Sample Claims from East and Central Africa*
 - *Various Sample Claims from West and Southern Africa*
 - *Examples in Nigeria*
 - *Examples in Mozambique*
 - *Congolese Evangelists*
 - *Papa Jacques's Experiences*
 - *Mama Jeanne and Others*
- Examples in Latin America and the Caribbean
 - *Various Cases from South America*
 - *Accounts from Cuba*
 - *Various Other Latin American and Caribbean Examples*
 - *Ecuador*
 - *Chile*
- Conclusion

10. Supernaturalism in Earlier Christian History 359

- Perspectives from the Premodern World
 - *The Patristic Era*
 - *The Medieval Period*
 - *The Reformers' Reaction*
- Perspectives from the Earlier Modern West
 - *Polemic against Miracles*
 - *Protestant Healing Reports in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*
 - *Lourdes and Roman Catholic Healing in the Nineteenth Century*
 - *Protestant Healing in the Nineteenth Century*
 - *Criticisms and Moderation*
 - *Gender and Healings*
- Supernaturalist Christian Claims in the Early Twentieth-Century West
 - *Dorothy Kerin*
 - *James Moore Hickson*
 - *Healings in Other Traditional Churches*
 - *Early Pentecostalism*
 - *Early Pentecostal Testimonies*
 - *Early Pentecostal Figures*
- Conclusion

11. Supernatural Claims in the Recent West 426

- Claims Are Now Common
- Samples of Individual Healing Reports
 - *One Modern Healing Narrative*
 - *Scientists, Journalists, and Doctors*
 - *Pentecostals and Other Churches*
 - *Examples from Interviews in My Circle*
 - *Anna's and Cindy's Stories*
 - *Accounts from Students and Colleagues*
 - *Yesenia's Story*

- Some Other Individual Healing Claims
- Western Healing Ministries in the Past Half Century
 - *Why Include Such Accounts?*
 - *T. L. Osborn*
 - *Kathryn Kuhlman*
 - *Doctors and Kuhlman*
 - *Father Ralph DiOrio*
 - *Some Less-Conspicuous Ministries*
- Various Examples from Roman Catholic Sources
- Third Wave and Other Recent Sources Emphasizing Healing
 - *Examples from the Vineyard Movement*
 - *Global Awakening and New Wine*
 - *Examples from Some Charismatic/Third Wave Churches*
- Listing Some Further Claims
- Conclusion

12. Blindness, Inability to Walk, Death, and Nature: Some Dramatic Reports 508

- Why This Chapter's Focus?
- Healing of Blindness
 - *Healings of Blindness in History*
 - *Contemporary Reports of Healings of Blindness in Africa*
 - *Contemporary Reports of Healings of Blindness in Asia*
 - *Contemporary Reports of Healings of Blindness in Latin America and the West*
- Healing of Those Unable to Walk
 - *Earlier Reports*
 - *Contemporary Reports of Healings in Africa and Asia*
 - *Contemporary Reports of Healings in the Western Hemisphere*
- Raising the Dead
 - *Biblical and Non-Christian Accounts*
 - *Alternative Explanations?*
 - *Earlier Accounts*
 - *Raising Accounts in Africa*
 - *Raising of My Wife's Sister*
 - *Mama Jeanne's Accounts*
 - *Other Accounts from Congo*
 - *Raising Accounts in Asia*
 - *Raising Accounts in the Philippines*
 - *Raising Accounts in Latin America and the West*
 - *Reports from Physicians*
- Nature Miracles
 - *Limits of Naturalistic Explanations*
 - *Limits of Ancient Analogies*
 - *Subsequent Analogies*
 - *Recent Analogies in Asia and the Pacific*
 - *Recent Analogies in Africa*
 - *Accounts in the Western Hemisphere*
- Conclusion

VOLUME 2

Part 4: Proposed Explanations 601

13. Nonsupernatural Causes 603

- Epistemological Premises
 - *Epistemic Agnosticism*
 - *Genuine Anomalies*
 - *The Demand for Analogies*
- Introducing Nonsupernatural Causes
 - *Fraud*
 - *Emotional Arousal*
- The Power of Faith
 - *Religious Practice and Health*
 - *Factors in Healthy Religious Practice*
 - *Psychosomatic Elements of Faith Cures*
 - *Psychosomatic Elements in Jesus's Ministry?*
 - *The Placebo Effect*
 - *Religion and Psychological Elements in Healing*
- Conclusion

14. Biased Standards? 645

- Reductionism?
- A Historic Bias against Faith?
 - *The Biased Vancouver Study*
 - *Similar Past Critiques of Other Public Healing Claims*
 - *Are Nonsupernatural Interpretations Always Better?*
- The Demand for Medically Certified Testimony
 - *Securing Medical Documentation*
 - *The Demand's Epistemological Premise*
 - *Use of Videotapes?*
- How to Sort the Evidence
 - *Critics of Lourdes*
 - *Rigorous Standards at Lourdes*
 - *Some Dramatic Cures at Lourdes*
 - *Rigorous Standards, Hostile Assumptions*
- Prejudice in the Academy?
 - *Prejudice against Religion and Meteorites*
 - *Philosophic Assumptions behind Scientific Paradigms*
 - *Uneven Criteria*
 - *Presuppositions and Burden of Proof*
- Other Complications
- Conclusion

15. More Extranormal Cases 712

- Considering Medical Documentation
 - *Some Medical Documentation*
 - *Implications of and Prospects for Medical Documentation*
- Partial and Gradual Healings

- Some Scholars' Testimonies, Explanations
 - *Philosophers' Interviews*
 - *Some Limited Eyewitness Experience*
 - *Closer Eyewitness Examples and Alternative Explanations*
- Interpreting the Evidence
 - *Is a Nontheistic Interpretation Necessary?*
 - *Suprahuman Explanations?*
 - *Dramatic Recoveries*
- Examples Nearer the Author
- Conclusion

Conclusion 761

Concluding Unscientific Postscript 766

Appendix A: Demons and Exorcism in Antiquity 769

- Ancient Views of Demons
 - *Daimones*
 - *Jewish Demonology*
- Possession
- Prophylaxis against Demons
- Exorcism

Appendix B: Spirit Possession and Exorcism in Societies Today 788

- Cross-Cultural Evidence for Possession Experiences
 - *Anthropological Reports of Possession Experiences*
 - *Cultural Elements of Possession Behavior*
 - *Some Special Forms of Possession Behaviors*
 - *Spirits, Sickness, and Seers*
- Exorcism in Recent Times
 - *Non-Christian Exorcism Practices*
 - *Christian Movements and Exorcisms*
 - *Perspectives on Exorcisms*
- Interpreting Spirit Possession
 - *Natural Elements and Western Academic Explanations*
 - *Diverse Approaches*
 - *Possession and Spirits*
 - *Western Psychiatrists and Belief in Genuine Spirits*
- Missiologists on Power Encounters
 - *Modern Examples of Power Encounters*
 - *Power Encounters That Persuade Religious Competitors*
 - *Some Personal and Family Experiences*
- Conclusion

Appendix C: Comparisons with Later Christian Hagiography 857

- Methodological Questions
- Various Tales
- Another Example: Takla Hâymânôt
- Conclusion

Appendix D: Ancient Approaches to Natural Law 867**Appendix E: Visions and Dreams 870**

- Ancient Dream Reports
- Visions and Dreams in Global Christianity

Bibliography of Secondary Sources 885**Interviews and Personal Correspondence Cited 1051****Index of Subjects 1057****Index of Authors, Interviewees, and Correspondents 1097****Index of Scripture 1147****Index of Other Ancient Sources 1153**

Introduction

Despite abundant popular interest in the subject of contemporary miracle claims, I am writing this book to fill a lacuna on an academic level especially for biblical studies. Many academic works have focused on important philosophic, exegetical, and recently historical issues, but at least in my discipline only a few have begun to take into account the relevance of the massive number of miracle claims proliferating around the world. The situation today is far different from when eighteenth-century philosopher David Hume claimed that miracles were contrary to human experience or even when modern reports resembling most miracle stories in the Gospels were unknown to most mid-twentieth-century Gospels scholars.

The book's primary thesis is simply that eyewitnesses do offer miracle claims, a thesis simple enough but one sometimes neglected when some scholars approach accounts in the Gospels. The secondary thesis is that supernatural explanations, while not suitable in every case, should be welcome on the scholarly table along with other explanations often discussed. While addressing some historical and philosophic issues first (chs. 1–6), the heart of the book consists of stories from various parts of the world (chs. 7–12). With a research grant and a year or two to travel, I could have easily collected hundreds of further stories (perhaps to some busy readers' dismay). Some circles whose reports I was exploring invited me to witness their experiences firsthand; while this deeper investigation would have been ideal, my academic schedule and other factors have so far precluded my plan to do so. Though lacking these advantages, I trust that I have nevertheless included enough accounts to expound the book's primary point.

Statistics (cited alongside other evidence in ch. 7) reveal the pervasiveness of miracle claims, but with slightly more concrete accounts I seek to illustrate them to a lavish extent so that readers will have samples of many of the kinds of claims the wider statistics involve. I have included most of the accounts in chapters 7–11 without asking questions of causation, since all of them illustrate the primary point that eyewitnesses can claim miracles. I do so even though I find some of

the accounts more plausible and evidentially compelling for our secondary point than others, and by the end of writing the book I was more convinced of some explanations than when I began it. I thus take the accounts mostly at face value while recounting them, as is common in anthropological and other approaches, and turn to questions of possible interpretations especially in chapters 13–15.

The texture of the healing accounts is therefore at a more popular level than in the chapters involving interpretation, but this pattern fits discussions of popular religion, for which the primary sources are necessarily popular ones. Less academic readers will undoubtedly find the healing accounts later in the book more readable than the earlier chapters addressing comparative and philosophic issues, but given the book's academic purpose, I needed to address those introductory issues first. Others have addressed the philosophic questions far more thoroughly and competently than I have, but I must treat them at least briefly in this book to challenge the modern Western prejudices that many of us bring to non-Western or nonmodern accounts.

I acknowledge up front that my personal interest in writing this book includes challenging the prejudice of Western antisupernaturalist readings of the Gospels and Acts. I believe that antisupernaturalism has reigned as an inflexible Western academic premise long enough and that significant evidence now exists to challenge it. When many Western intellectuals still claim that miracles or any events most readily explained by supernatural causation cannot happen, simply as an unexamined premise, whereas hundreds of millions of people around the world claim to have witnessed just such events, some in indisputably dramatic ways, I believe that genuinely open-minded academicians should reexamine our presuppositions with an open mind. Although claims do not by themselves constitute proof, the world is different from when the views informing our presuppositions against all miracle claims formed. While eyewitness claims do not constitute indisputable proof, they do constitute evidence that may be considered rather than a priori dismissed.¹ I am much more convinced of this perspective now than when I began this book.

Despite conceding the above personal interest, my academic approach in this book is more nuanced, because the question on the academic level is more complex than I have just represented it. I am thus addressing the question of the plausibility of ancient miracle accounts on two levels. As noted above, my primary argument, based on substantial evidence, is that historians should not dismiss the possibility of eyewitness information in the miracle accounts in the Gospels or Acts, since large numbers of eyewitnesses can and do offer miracle claims, many of them quite comparable in character to the early Christian accounts. By the end of the book, I do not expect that any readers will dissent from my argument that vast numbers of eyewitnesses offer significant “paranormal” healing claims. Many scholars writing about early Christian miracles already accept this approach, but I hope that

1. For personal experience as a form of evidence in sociology, see Wuthnow, “Teaching,” 187; legal evidence and historiography also rely heavily on testimony. We address these questions more fully in chs. 5–7 and especially 14–15.

by bringing to the fore a greater abundance of evidence I will help to solidify this consensus more generally among NT scholars.

Before turning to my secondary argument, I should digress momentarily to note that when I use the term “paranormal,” I do not imply any connections with specifically psychic experiences, ghost apparitions, or the like, as many writers popularly do.² Instead I employ the term purely in its etymological sense as what differs from the norm of human experience, hence, not “ordinary.”³ I employ the term at points to avoid prejudicing the question as to whether supernatural or superhuman explanations are in order. I do not employ the term pervasively because for many people it has taken on the narrower connotations rather than the neutral usage I seek to imply. “Extraordinary” would be suitable except we are accustomed to employing that designation in a sometimes ordinary way. A more suitable replacement, which I have sometimes employed, might be “extranormal”: while a neologism is often unhelpful, it at least allows us to shape its usage.

My secondary and more controversial argument, engaging more debated philosophical approaches, is that we should not rule out the possibility of supernatural causation for some of these healing claims. Experts in some disciplines prescind from discussing these issues, which is their right, but this does not prevent other disciplines or scholars from exploring them. Supernatural causation is not the only possible explanation behind all the accounts, and it is a more compelling hypothesis in some cases than in others. Natural and supernatural factors (to use today’s common language) can coexist, but the greater the extent to which a questioner of supernatural causation leaves the burden of proof on the supernatural claim, the smaller the pool of data that remains to support supernatural causation. I nevertheless believe that many readers will be surprised at the nature of some of the more dramatic accounts today. Indeed, despite my original attempts to be “neutral” (and the possibility of remaining so had I restricted the book to merely including claims rather than seeking to explain a few of them), I eventually began arguing a thesis (namely this second one). As the depth of my conviction about genuinely supernatural events grew cumulatively in view of some of the evidence I was finding, the burden of proof shifted so far in my mind that it became disingenuous for me to try to appear to maintain personal neutrality on these points. It will not take a redaction critic to recognize that some parts of the book (e.g., much of ch. 12) reflect a more optimistic approach than others.

Some readers who agree with my first point about eyewitness miracle claims, with which I think disagreement will be difficult, may well demur from the second point that some of these claims are best explained by supernatural causation. I recognize at the outset that some traditional scholars (and perhaps some reviewers) will dismiss the latter claim even without reading or considering the evidence I offer.

2. Greeley, *Sociology*, 8, refers to “psychic, mystic, and contact with the dead experiences,” explicitly excluding connection with supernatural or miracle claims. A glossary links use of the term with terms like “telepathic” or “psychic.” These terms designate particular kinds of paranormal claims, not all kinds.

3. I.e., a dictionary defines it as inexplicable from the perspective of (current) scientific knowledge.

I believe that such a dismissal might actually illustrate the point that an inherited approach, originally appealing to the alleged lack of evidence that could support a contrary approach, is often used to dismiss uncritically and without examination any evidence subsequently offered. Nevertheless, I hope that today's climate is open enough for many scholars to approach the question with a more open mind. I am genuinely interested in both the primary and secondary points, but particular parts of the book will argue one point or the other. To avoid being too repetitious I will not always reiterate which argument I am addressing. Nevertheless, I will note it fairly often (e.g., reminding the reader at various points that I am not yet addressing the question of supernatural causation) to avoid confusing the questions and for the sake of those readers whose interest is drawn to particular parts of the book. Many examples simply illustrate the diversity of global healing claims; those most relevant to my secondary argument appear in chapters 12, 14, and particularly 15.

The Origin of This Book

Whether or not a reader concludes that the current form of this book is intelligently designed, from my historical standpoint it evolved accidentally, starting eight or ten years ago as a footnote in my commentary on Acts. Because some scholars have treated miracle claims in the Gospels and Acts as purely legendary on the premise that such events do not happen, I intended to challenge their instinctive dismissal of the possibility of such claims by referring to a few works that catalogued modern eyewitness claims of miracles. One may agree or disagree with the supernatural element in such claims, but it is extraordinarily naive to pretend that eyewitnesses, including sincere eyewitnesses, do not offer such claims. I intended to cite two or three major collections of such information, which I assumed would be readily accessible and easily located, since I was aware of hundreds of eyewitness miracle claims and cognizant of circles that could supply thousands more.

To my surprise, however, I failed to find many works academically cataloging such claims, and even fewer that offered medical documentation along with the many testimonies.⁴ Because I lack medical training, I defer the latter interest to those more qualified to provide it. Those who reject all modern evidence apart from such documentation will need to look mostly to other works produced by those more qualified to offer and evaluate it, and that is an important area where further discussion must turn.⁵ Despite the limited sources I found initially, however, I did decide to track down some more eyewitness healing claims that had

4. To my surprise, anthropologists had documented claims of paranormal cures and spirit possession in settings of traditional religion far more fully than theologians or missiologists had explored such claims among Christians. Nevertheless, the rapidly expanding academic focus on Pentecostalism and indigenous non-Western forms of Christianity seems to be effecting a shift, and some anthropologists now include Christian practice (e.g., Turner, *Healers*, 69–74, 105–7, 123, 128).

5. Catholic miracle dossiers have already demanded medical documentation in increasingly rigorous ways in recent centuries (see, e.g., Duffin, *Miracles*), but for reasons addressed later in the book, the usual

been published. Despite my initial embarrassment that many of those claims I first found appeared in popular sources, I eventually recognized that such sources are most comparable to what my historical quest involved: the Gospels and Acts offer popular claims, not medical documentation. Indeed, in the modern sense, medical documentation was impossible; even shrines of Asclepius did not provide the sorts of verification preferred today. Most important, popular sources are the sorts of primary sources that historiography works with when studying popular religion, including studies of people's beliefs about experiences they have construed as supernatural. While I could not reach most of these popular authors to check their own sources, in time far more information than I had initially anticipated came my way. Eventually I uncovered a wealth of eyewitness material and even some sources that offered some medical documentation.

My quest proved so interesting that it grew into one of the longest chapters in my commentary, with sufficient material for a book. (It was not by any means the focus of my commentary, representing perhaps only 3 percent of the manuscript, or 19 percent of the introduction, despite the significant proportion of Acts reporting miracles.) Recognizing that a much wider audience would be interested in this topic than would buy the entire commentary for the sake of that chapter, I began organizing and developing this material into a separate book, improving it and augmenting it with considerable additional material, while deleting a large proportion of the original chapter in the commentary and hundreds of sources from its original bibliography.

The present book would have been useful as part of my recent *Historical Jesus of the Gospels*. But because the present material also proved too large for that book and ranged methodologically significantly beyond it, I have instead designed it as something of a companion sequel to that book.⁶ Although miracle stories compose nearly one-third of Mark's Gospel, I could not lay the foundations to address them in *The Historical Jesus of the Gospels* without distracting attention from the less disputed questions that book addressed. Nevertheless, the issues are related. One of the foundational historic reasons for skepticism about the Gospels' basic content was the radical Enlightenment's rejection of miracle claims, which seemed thoroughly embedded in the Gospel narratives.⁷ This book, then, addresses a fundamental historical issue relevant for understanding the Gospels and Acts.

In contrast to my book about the historical Jesus, however, the question of miracles invites further exploration than the questions addressed by traditional historical-critical criteria may provide. By the standard historical criteria used for

means of medical inquiry prove difficult in addressing the current explosion of healing reports in the Majority World.

6. Keener, *Historical Jesus*. My "sequel" is with a different publisher because so much of this book relates to material in the commentary on Acts then being published by Hendrickson. Baker Academic subsequently acquired a number of titles from Hendrickson, including this book and the Acts commentary.

7. See Kelly, "Miracle," 46; for early examples, note the approaches of Karl Friedrich Bahrtdt (summarized in Schweitzer, *Quest*, 39–44; Brown, *Miracles*, 112–13), Karl Heinrich Venturini (summarized in Schweitzer, *Quest*, 44–45), and others in the "rational" phase (in Schweitzer, *Quest*, 27–67).

evaluating Jesus's sayings, we can affirm multiply attested miracles and (more easily) categories of miracles in Jesus's ministry. Most historical Jesus scholars thus concur that people approached Jesus as a healer. Scholars in many other disciplines, however, may ask questions of causation, whereas the culturally shaped parameters of much conventional historical Jesus scholarship bracket from consideration some potential answers (indeed, especially those answers offered by the early Christian writers themselves). Even many historical Jesus scholars who allow that people approached Jesus as a healer doubt many of the particular stories as outside the realm of what happens. Scholars often raise the question of historical analogy: Are the content of the miracle reports, in contrast to merely radical sayings or actions, the kinds of events known to occur?⁸ Aside from any theological question of whether Jesus and his first followers may have differed from others, the answer to this analogy question, surprisingly to many of us, is yes. That is, the kinds of miracle claims most frequently attested in the Gospels and Acts are also attested by many eyewitnesses today. Whether any miracle claim represents genuine divine or supernatural activity is a separate question that must be addressed separately, but events such as the immediate recovery of many people after a significant spiritual experience are too well attested to question.

At the same time, this book presupposes the more historiographic treatment of the narrative materials in the Gospels and Acts covered in my book about the historical Jesus. I thus take for granted here the value of these narratives for significant historical reconstruction and do not argue that point, because I have argued it elsewhere. Here I focus more broadly on questions regarding the philosophy of history and social analogies to the sorts of phenomena depicted in the Gospels and Acts. Some scholars who felt comfortable with my *Historical Jesus of the Gospels*, which largely works within already-accepted academic paradigms, will find this work more challenging. I am nevertheless hopeful that this work can provoke open dialogue on some issues that mainstream biblical scholarship has often avoided.

The Subjects of This Book

As noted above, I address two distinct issues in this book, though I treat only the first of these at significant length. I believe that this book will establish the first issue, a historical one, to most readers' satisfaction, regardless of their philosophic

8. For example, in my paper for the Historical Jesus session at SBL on Nov. 21, 2010 ("Comparative Studies"), I argued (in keeping with my *Historical Jesus* and "Otho") that in light of the character of ancient biographies of recent characters and the nature of disciples preserving tradition, we should expect substantial historical information to be preserved in them. One respondent to my paper gave the expected objection: the Gospels abound in supernatural claims. Once we distinguished reports from interpretation, however, both of us concurred that Jesus was known as a healer, that unusual events occur, and that Majority World reports today should be taken into account. I believe that such an agreement can undercut the objection to eyewitness material in the Gospels, without resolving questions of causation (on which we likely would have disagreed).

assumptions. This first argument is that the miracle reports in the Gospels and Acts are generally plausible historically and need not be incompatible with eyewitness tradition. Similar claims, often from convinced eyewitnesses, circulate widely today, and there are no a priori reasons to doubt that ancient eyewitnesses made analogous claims.

I do not expect this first argument to be particularly controversial, in view of the overwhelming evidence supporting it. Indeed, probably the majority of NT scholars today who focus on the issue of miracle claims do allow that eyewitnesses can attribute dramatic recoveries to supernatural causes. Nevertheless, many other scholars appear to remain unfamiliar with this subject, some still perpetuating the skepticism of an earlier generation on this point. Likewise, few have explored the question in detail, just as I had not, before attempting my “footnote”; I believe that this book will provide more copious documentation for this thesis than Western scholars have usually had conveniently available. Those who demur from my conclusions on my second point should at least find the book useful for its first point, although in the past some scholars have cultivated the habit of ignoring the scholarship of scholars who arrived at conclusions different from their own on any significant point.

The second issue challenges a commonly held worldview, so some of my academic readers may demur here, though I hope they will respect the legitimacy of my argument.⁹ This second point is that we are not obligated to begin with the a priori assumption that none of these events could involve intelligent, suprahuman causation. I must digress to point out that I often use the term “supernatural” because that is the modern question usually at issue, but for ancient audiences the question was more typically whether the cause was suprahuman. For Israelites, for example, only God was supranatural; hence, for them the primary issue was divine causation.¹⁰ Yet most ancient audiences, including Jews, Christians, and, later, Muslims, recognized other suprahuman beings in addition to God. Likewise, many cultures today do not accept the Western dichotomy between natural and supernatural.¹¹ In employing the designation “supernatural,” then, I am deferring to this extent to the terms of the modern debate.

9. I hope that those who are not persuaded will at least appreciate the valiant and academically legitimate nature of my attempt. Worldviews do not crumble easily, although I am convinced that thoroughgoing antisupernaturalism fails to explain the totality of our evidence. I myself value retaining abundant room for methodological naturalism in the appropriate spheres and cases. Happily, the current intellectual climate is in many disciplines much less committed to antisupernaturalism than it was a half-century ago.

10. Some other modern writers employ “supernatural” with the sense “superhuman” (e.g., Fitzgerald, “Miracles,” 49). Some cultures (e.g., in Tibet) lack specific vocabulary for “supernatural” because they treat experiences Westerners would treat as anomalous as simply part of the continuum of nature (McClenon, *Events*, 1).

11. The dichotomy between “natural” and “supernatural” is a modern Western one, imposed on most cultures only externally (see, e.g., Greenfield, *Spirits*, 156; more extensively, Saler, “Supernatural” [esp. 31–32], though he ultimately concludes that the category is a helpful one if employed heuristically [50–51]). Thus, for example, the Mande see spirits as “part of the natural environment, like a waterfall,

Some earlier modern theologians, including Rudolf Bultmann, insisted that “mature” modern people do not believe in miracles and that “no one can or does seriously maintain” such early Christian perspectives.¹² Bultmann, however, unwittingly excluded from the modern world the majority of the world’s population, as I shall illustrate, in a manner that current sensitivities would regard as inexcusably ethnocentric (although there is no reason to believe that he, unlike a scholar I will address later, did this deliberately). Bultmann’s assumptions about miracles have come under increasing criticism from other angles, and I intend to contribute to that criticism. Cardinal Ratzinger (now Pope Benedict XVI) was right to point out, in 1988, that Bultmann’s perspective was not a result of biblical scholarship *per se* but of a particular philosophic epistemology.¹³

My more important concern in this book is to persuade readers of my first, less controversial point, because this book is meant to be read with my work on historical tradition in the Gospels. The second point, however, a philosophic issue, will be important for readers also concerned with the meaning of what is reported in the Gospels and Acts, since the writers attribute these miracles to divine causation. Cases are argued with varying degrees of certainty, and I concede that my case for the second point cannot be persuasive with the same degree of academic assurance as would be possible if instead those arguing it were medical researchers equipped with extensive medical documentation. As I have emphasized, I am not qualified to contribute expertise in that area. I nevertheless think that, given the general canons of reliability for testimonial evidence, we have a greater degree of assurance regarding many extranormal healing claims than we have for many claims that we widely accept. Although I can understand some demurring on the matter of supernatural causation, as I once did, I am fully convinced that it remains the best explanation in a number of the reports that I will cite. While the evidence for some cases that I have collected is stronger than that for other cases (sometimes due to my own research limitations), I hope that scholars in my discipline will accept supernatural theism (a historic Jewish, Christian, and Islamic approach) as at least one academically acceptable explanatory option rather than presupposing its exclusion.

a person, or a tree” (McNaughton, *Blacksmiths*, 11). In the view of thinkers like Heim, *Transformation*, 173–99, even miracles are “natural” rather than supernatural, reflecting God’s activity through the natural order but in a special revelatory way. My usage thus defers to common rather than technical usage at this point.

12. “Mythology,” 4; see further *ibid.*, 5–9; cf. Max Weber’s designation of modernity as “disenchanted” (in Remus, *Healer*, 106). Bultmann allows that God acts existentially in ways communicated by mythical language (“Mythology,” 32; “Demythologizing,” 110), but uses the presence of miracles as a criterion of inauthenticity in Jewish texts (Bultmann, *Tradition*, 58). He denies that the historical continuum may be “interrupted” by supernatural interventions (e.g., “Exegesis,” 147; cf. “Demythologizing,” 122; Perrin, *Bultmann*, 86; Thiselton, *Horizons*, 292) and affirms as “myth” whatever involves supernatural forces (Bultmann, “Demythologizing,” 95; cf. “Mythology,” 9; observations on Bultmann’s approach in Perrin, *Bultmann*, 77; Poland, *Criticism*, 11; Richardson, *Age of Science*, 109). For one survey and critique of Bultmann’s approach to miracles, see Hay, “View.”

13. So Jaki, *Miracles and Physics*, 13.

The reader who keeps in mind these two objectives of the book should be able to discern when I am arguing more for one thesis or the other. For purposes of simplicity, it may be noted that I argue especially for the major thesis when recounting or covering miracle claims, especially in chapters 8–12, although I eventually focus on some accounts of more dramatic experiences (especially in chs. 12, 15) for the sake of their value to the second thesis. I argue for the second thesis and against its exclusion from the conversation especially where I challenge philosophic objections to genuinely supernatural causation (e.g., chs. 5–6 and 13–15); the cases I apply most explicitly to the secondary thesis appear in chapter 15. The chapters recounting miracle claims will naturally be easier to read; the philosophic and scientific material is important, however, for considering the secondary question in a Western academic context.

Limitations

Some points in this section reiterate information offered above, but they bear repetition here because it is important to note the book's limitations explicitly. This book is a prolegomenon to a study of one aspect of miracles in the Gospels and Acts, and not a study of those miracles themselves. Other scholars have analyzed the miracle stories one by one or by category (see, e.g., Leopold Sabourin, John Meier, Gerd Theissen, Paul Achtemeier, or Wendy Cotter, though not sharing with one another identical objectives, approaches, or conclusions).¹⁴ Detailed commentaries on the Gospels and Acts normally treat the individual miracle stories in detail, and I refer the interested reader to such studies. Because I have also treated many of the early Christian miracle stories in my commentaries on Matthew, John, and Acts,¹⁵ I will not distract readers from the central theses of this book by repeating those treatments here. Other writers, many of them cited in my notes, also have approached some of the historical context issues that I treat briefly in my opening chapters.

My concern is to focus instead on the more introductory question of the plausibility of eyewitness miracle reports, not to treat particular examples or even categories in the Gospels and Acts. That is, I am clearing some ground so scholars can address such subjects without many of them feeling compelled to start with the assumption that such reports must be historically inauthentic. The bulk of the book will therefore address the philosophy and history of the question, modern analogies, and so forth rather than NT texts themselves, just as books on NT background, for example, often focus more attention on information other than what is found in

14. Sabourin, *Miracles*; Meier, *Marginal Jew*, vol. 2; Theissen, *Miracle Stories*; Achtemeier, *Miracle Tradition*; Cotter, *Portrait*; see also Kee, *Miracle* and other works. Also, for various literary approaches, see, e.g., Wire, "Story"; idem, "Structure"; Funk, "Form"; theologically, Polhill, "Perspectives." For an extensive annotated bibliography (albeit from 1977), see Sabourin, *Miracles*, 237–71.

15. Keener, *Matthew*; idem, *John*; idem, *Acts*.

the NT itself. Some readers may feel that any book useful for NT scholarship must focus on NT passages even if it repeats the same ground that others (or the same author) have covered elsewhere. If so, we will have to live with our disagreement. I am seeking to expose most of my readers to more matters that may be new to them, and regard the potential applications to the question of NT reports here as fairly basic and self-evident (though I shall mention them periodically).

While I raise the question of supernatural causation, I am not assuming that is the best explanation for all miracle claims, and even less often the only plausible explanation for them. Some dramatic claims, however, for example, the instantaneous reversal of documented, long-term, organic blindness, do seem to me to welcome such discussion. Scholars writing within particular religious traditions will grant some activities to be extrahuman without necessarily viewing them positive; while I am not opposed in principle to exploring such distinctions, they are not the points at issue here (those points being the plausibility of eyewitness miracle claims and the limits of the inflexibly antisupernaturalist paradigm). Biblical theology is far less interested in the category of “supernatural” than in specifically divine causation, including through natural phenomena, even for some of what it calls signs;¹⁶ the supernatural question addressed in this book is thus one framed in this particular sense more by modern philosophy than by Scripture itself.

That is, my interest in this book is historical and metahistorical and generally does not develop some more traditional theological questions except where they overlap with those disciplines. The question of whether a deity or deities exist and do miracles certainly overlaps deeply with theological interests, but I will not engage most of the more detailed questions. Where scholars offer varying theological opinions on an issue that must be raised but not necessarily resolved, I will sometimes note these opinions without taking a firm position on them myself. I am not minimizing the value of biblical and theological studies on the subject, and I have written with these interests elsewhere. Nevertheless, such studies would constitute a different book and, given my current writing commitments, likely a different author. One theological concern I do have is that no one reading this book thinks that I suppose that spiritual cures happen invariably—they do not, and most of those who supplied testimonies for this book recognize that they do not. Naturally we could fill books with stories where such cures did not happen. I could include there, for example, the eight miscarriages that my wife and I have suffered. But there seems little point in arguing a case that virtually no one

16. For the mid-twentieth-century emphasis on “biblical theology as recital” of divine acts, see, e.g., Wright, *God Who Acts* (e.g., 64), though specifically miraculous features were often construed as of peripheral relevance, in keeping with the academic setting of the interpreters (Wright, “Prologue,” 25). Others have critiqued this movement for sidestepping questions concerning special divine acts in history (distinct from a deity working through natural causes; see the complaint in Dilley, “Act,” 67–73), contending that either modernists are right that God works only through natural processes or the biblical picture of miracles is also correct (*ibid.*, 73–80; cf. Wink, *Transformation*, 31). Miracle stories support the theological claim that God acts only if God in fact acted in the reported miracles (O’Connell, “Miracles,” 55). In Scripture, divine revelation consisted of both word and deed (Mussner, *Miracles*, 5–6).

questions. My interest in miracles is not triumphalistic, as if to play down biblical themes of suffering or justice that some writers contrast with study of miracles. I have addressed these themes elsewhere;¹⁷ they are simply not my focus here. In the theology of the Gospels, signs are foretastes of the kingdom, not its fullness.

There are also theological issues inevitably raised in the book that readers will answer in various ways, for example, healing through apparitions of saints (though I include only a very small proportion of these accounts). My primary interest in such cases is eyewitness claims of extraordinary spiritual cures, more than whether these cases involve saints, angels, God, other spirits, highly unusual natural causes, or a combination of factors. I do not come from a tradition that has ready explanations for such cases, and even if I did, my research into reports does not confer automatic expertise in their theological interpretation. It would be unfair in a book of this academic nature, however, to exclude such claims (especially when medical documentation often does accompany such claims). The subject of spiritual cures is a broad one inviting further exploration than my narrower focus will permit here.

It should go without saying in an academic work that when I make common cause with some authors or fields of study for the purposes at hand, I am not expressing agreement with them on all other points. I do not concur with all the views or methods of all those whose accounts I include, but out of academic fairness wish to avoid excluding significant voices. My exegetical or theological views need not be read between the lines of this book; they appear instead in what I have written on those subjects. It should go equally without saying that when I criticize authors, like Bultmann and those who hold his reticence to affirm visibly supernatural claims, I am not thereby criticizing all their insights or publications. To take an extreme example, when I treat respectfully a shaman's indigenous explanation for an event, the reader should not infer that I would agree with all of the shaman's worldview. In challenging some traditional Western paradigms as inadequate, I am not personally embracing all possible alternative paradigms or dismissing everything that Western academicians, of whom I am one, have argued. On this issue I could make common cause with claimants from various religions and nonreligious perspectives, although I have restricted my examples primarily to the Christian ones I am best connected to locate and best equipped to explore.

Other scholars have approached many remarkable recoveries from a variety of valuable angles, such as the vital contributions of psychoimmunology; while I do not believe that such approaches cover every incident we narrate, I allow that they are instructive in many cases.¹⁸ Because my objectives in this work differ from

17. On suffering, e.g., Keener, *Spirit*, 69–71; idem, *Revelation*, passim; on justice, e.g., Usry and Keener, *Religion*, 83–139. Against some critics' assumptions, writers who address themes like healing or the Spirit need not neglect other ones (see, e.g., Mittelstadt, *Spirit*).

18. I do not personally regard such cases as incompatible with divine causation, though on a general level they would not need to offer evidence for this intelligent causation unless perhaps one argues from design, whether that of divine design more directly or through evolutionary teleology or both, depending

those of most of these scholars' publications, however, I have not chosen to focus as much on this approach, but my approach should not be construed as contradicting it. Each such approach has its legitimate role and its objective.

This book is inevitably only a sample of what could be written on its subject. Further research might offer more controlled studies (helpful especially for the more skeptical); more follow-up interviews with and consulting the medical records of persons claimed by various written sources to be healed; and so forth. Such valuable research requires different kinds of research resources and qualifications than those currently available to me. My discipline is historical study of early Christianity, but this book has required a multidisciplinary approach drawing on, among other disciplines, anthropology, modern church history, and, farthest from my primary competence, the philosophy of science; ideally, this subject could be better addressed with medical expertise, which I have already confessed is beyond my competence.

I also lack the recording equipment (with exceptions in one setting) to meet optimum archival standards for oral history interviews, though I know how to ask necessary questions and am confident that my notes meet the standards traditionally used by many journalists.¹⁹ Others can build on what current writers have done and can press beyond it, as later works should normally do, providing further research than I include here.²⁰ Ideally such works can provide distinctions along a continuum including verified (to a high degree of probability) to probable to possible to clearly false (deceptive or erroneous) claims.²¹ My limitations in these other areas offer another reason why other work on the subject must carry matters beyond where I have been able to carry them.

In addition to those limitations, I have no research team, no research assistants, and no research funds; nor have I had sabbaticals to pursue this research, though I am grateful to my institution for their gracious load reduction and to the library for enormous help, especially in securing my numerous interlibrary loan requests. I do urge others to develop this research further than I have been able to do, and I suspect that doctors working in Majority World hospitals might be most ideally

on one's interpretive grid. I have not followed the distinction between "healing" and "cure" found in some of these works, not because I find such distinctions illegitimate but because they are less germane to my focus.

19. At least, based on my experiences with interviews with cautious journalists; I am not considering here the less careful interviewers. One journalist whose work I cite several times in this book notes an occasion where, receiving an unexpected source of information, he "took notes on the back of my wedding invitation" (Wakefield, *Miracle*, 85); admittedly, I found myself in a few such situations. If one dismisses interviews on cure experiences as mere "hearsay," while affirming those of journalists and anthropologists on (usually) other topics, it seems not the genre of oral reports but the content of cures (that many construe supernaturally) to which one objects. That is, one is eliminating evidence for a position to which one objects.

20. Missiology dissertations and other works are better suited for such studies than the research of a NT scholar who in this book has often had to stretch beyond his primary areas of competence. We are not accustomed to interviewing live mortal witnesses. Anthropologists have developed religious healing research into a lively field, and research on global Christian healing is rapidly becoming a discipline as well (see Brown, "Afterword," 372).

21. For the importance of degrees of probability in epistemology, see Polanyi, *Knowledge*, 31–32.

situated to develop aspects that I could not. I trust, however, that this work will provide one of the useful foundations for such subsequent research.

The abundance of testimonies demonstrates widespread belief that God does miracles today; many of these will be seen as of ambiguous value in an argument supporting a belief in supernatural causation, but some of them do, I believe, provide compelling support for that thesis, especially where multiple independent witnesses confirm extranormal experiences. Some readers may dismiss all testimony lacking medical documentation; although in some cases medical documentation is available, even medical documentation can be faked or its interpretation disputed, so ultimately any testimony can be discredited if one's skepticism about miracles is thoroughgoing. In some cases, further investigation may weaken the reliability of a few of my sources and my sources' sources; in a larger number of cases, the recoveries that some witnesses attribute to divine intervention also have natural parallels. If one does not, however, simply adopt the ill-formulated arguments of Hume and his successors, I believe that the weight of some of the accounts in this book should invite readers to seriously consider extranormal causation.

Some will dismiss as uncritical any narration of miracle accounts without individual disclaimers. Disclaimers are not needed for the book's primary purpose, however, and I cite only some of the accounts explicitly in support of the second. Moreover, one might ask why openness to the possibility that some events are miraculous is more uncritical than their a priori dismissal. This question seems particularly pertinent for scholars whose dismissal is dogmatic and lacks self-critical reflection about the historical origin and formation of their own beliefs.

A book reflects its own time; the shifting paradigms that make this book possible at this moment will probably eventually make it unnecessary, and other questions about claimed extrahuman activity, including distinguishing the nature of different claims, will become more crucial.²² When others build on works like this one in more sophisticated ways, the present book may seem basic. But if a book has a time, I believe that now is this book's time. It was initially ready for the original publisher in early 2009, but due to delays in the process (and ultimately its acquisition, along with many of that publisher's other works, by Baker Academic), I have had some additional time to work on it. While my journalistic side was initially not pleased with the various delays (I felt I had an urgent "scoop"), my academic side has concluded that the additional time has made this a stronger, more nuanced, and ultimately more enduring work.

22. That is, modernist rejection of miracle accounts could give way to postmodern equation of the value of all such accounts. On a theological level, such an equation can privilege relativist worldviews (say, polytheistic ones) over exclusivist ones (say, monotheistic ones) simply by presupposing relativism. (Hume, *History of Religion*, 48–51, viewed polytheism as far more tolerant than monotheism; cf. comments about Hume's approach in Smith, "Introduction," 15.) They may also privilege subjective interpretation of personal experience over objective scientific evaluation of the nature of a recovery, a privileging that if applied to medical science could hinder research. That such discussions are not the point of this book does not mean that they will not merit discussion.

Because it is important for the reader to know a writer's perspectives, I reiterate that my current personal conviction is that some of these events do involve suprahuman causation. That has not, however, always been my perspective, and I do not write this book from the assumption that all readers share my perspective. A writer's perspective cannot but influence how she approaches the philosophic question of suprahuman causation, though I think that a theistic bias is not more of a bias than an atheistic one, such as I once held. (Though a small minority of theists demur, the vast majority of theists do affirm at least the possibility of miracles; and being open to such a possibility is hardly more of a bias than being closed to it.) In any case, no one can deny that massive numbers of people today offer miracle claims, however scholars choose to interpret them.

The Problem

Richard Bauckham has recently offered a compelling argument for considerable eyewitness material in the Gospels.²³ Whether or not one agrees with all his conclusions (I myself am skeptical, for example, that the Gospels often designate the individual sources of their eyewitness tradition),²⁴ one question that his valuable argument raises is an academic tradition of skepticism toward miracles appearing in genuine eyewitness narrative. Some scholars have simply ruled out miracle reports a priori, an approach that affects one's reading of documents (particularly Mark) in which they dominate many narratives.

Some scholars who grant that the Gospels are biographies or that Acts is a historical monograph containing much accurate historical information nevertheless find the miracle reports in those same narratives problematic. This apparent inconsistency in approach stems not from a change in genre but from philosophic assumptions about what is possible for intelligent people in other cultures and eras to believe that they have seen.²⁵

The Gospels and Acts claim that eyewitnesses and participants saw what they and the writers believed were miracles. Some of these claims appear even in material where the narrator claims to be present (Acts 20:9–12; 28:8–9).²⁶ Scholars can

23. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*.

24. Cf. some observations in Tuckett, "Review"; Keener, "Review of Bauckham."

25. This is the sort of skepticism noted but not endorsed in Talbert, *Acts*, 248; Achtemeier, *Miracle Tradition*, 136–37; cf. Clark, "Miracles and Law," 23, noting some on a more popular level who simply dismiss the Gospels because of miracle accounts. Others, who grant the reports but question only the early Christian writers' interpretation, work from philosophic assumptions about what is possible that differ from those of early Christians; in practice, they tend to accept reports about healings and exorcisms that they can explain psychosomatically but are more skeptical of, say, the much fewer number of nature miracles and raisings in the Gospels.

26. Most scholars attribute Luke's "we" material to an eyewitness, many to Luke himself; see, e.g., Dupont, *Sources*, 164–65; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 103; Rackham, *Acts*, xv–xvii; Packer, *Acts*, 3; Neil, *Acts*, 22–23; Barclay, *Acts*, 6; Munck, *Acts*, xliii; Thornton, *Zeuge* (as cited in Campbell, *We Passages*, 8); Arrington, *Acts*, xxxii; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 66, 82; Fusco, "Sezioni-noi"; Hanson, *Acts*, 21–24; Spencer, *Philip*, 249;

explain most such incidents in either naturalistic or supernatural terms, depending on their assumptions, but reducing them to novelistic flourishes or legendary accretions²⁷ requires reading them in a manner different from the rest of these works' narratives.²⁸

Studying the historical question requires us to examine non-Christian miracle accounts from the Gospels' era. The ancient accounts provide a sort of literary context for how the first audiences of the Gospels and Acts heard such accounts, but on many particular points the analogies are limited, and broader analogies from human experience bring into question the need to postulate direct dependence. We also must take account of the historic context of ancient and modern philosophic skepticism toward miracles, because such contexts shape our cultural a priori toward the accounts, as well as help explain why we often lump all supernatural claims together, when they are often quite diverse. Afterward and at greater length we must confront the question of how modern Western readers can relate to such claims; I will suggest that many other cultures and some religious subcultures within our culture provide better paradigms for a sympathetic reading of the Gospels' claims than our dominant Western academic paradigms do.²⁹

Historians in antiquity often include miraculous elements in their works, as earlier in much of ancient Israel's historiography,³⁰ so acknowledging the presence of such claims does not shift the presumed genre of the Gospels and Acts away from ancient biography or historiography. Yet the Gospels and Acts report signs more often, given the amount of space available, than typical extant historians from their period. Still, they do so in a proportion comparable to certain sections of Israelite narratives, and perhaps with a lower concentration than parts of the Elijah-Elisha cycle.³¹

Hemer, *Acts in History*, 312–34; Martin, *Foundations*, 2:67–68; Hengel and Schwemer, *Between Damascus and Antioch*, 7; Barnett, *Birth*, 190–92; deSilva, *Introduction*, 299; González, *Acts*, 4; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 22–23. Many scholars do demur, so I refer the reader to the much fuller discussion in Keener, *Acts*, at Acts 16:10.

27. As is usually the case for the nonhistorical, later apocryphal gospels and acts. On the novelistic character of these works, see, e.g., Aune, *Environment*, 151–52; Lalleman, "Apocryphal Acts," 67; Rebenich, "Historical Prose," 307–8; Bauckham, "Acts of Paul"; Keylock, "Distinctness," 210; Krasser, "Reading," 554; Hofmann, "Novels: Christian," 846–48; Perkins, "World."

28. I address the genre and character of these works more generally in my book on research about the historical Jesus and my commentary on Acts. I will not repeat those arguments here, since they are of comparable length to this book. See Keener, *Historical Jesus*, chs. 5–8; idem, *Acts*, introduction, chs. 2–8; "Assumptions"; "Biographies"; cf. also idem, *Matthew*, 8–14, 16–36; idem, *John*, 11–34, 57–65.

29. E.g., Roschke, "Healing," emphasizes that African culture has better foundations for understanding healings and exorcisms than Western culture does. Jenkins, "Reading," 72, notes that "African and Asian readers can identify strongly" with biblical perspectives on healing, apocalyptic, and spiritual realities, which feel more relevant in their contexts than to typical Westerners.

30. See, e.g., Krasser, "Reading," 554; Plümacher, *Geschichte*, 33–84.

31. Our sources do differ some among themselves; for example, Luke-Acts emphasizes signs in a manner more unambiguously positive than the way they appear in Mark or John and as more central than in Paul's letters. The difference in the latter case, however, may be one of genre (see 2 Cor 12:12); thus James clearly expects miracles (Jas 5:14–16), but one would not be aware of this expectation without a single paragraph

While many or most ancient historians mentioned extranormal phenomena, rarely did they dwell on them as the Gospels and Acts do. Yet this difference is likely especially because most other extant historians were writing about political or social events, not the early history of a miracle worker and a “charismatic” movement known in that period for its signs. And, as we will argue, there is little reason to doubt that the first Christians, like some revival movements since that time, believed that signs were occurring among them and that they could offer first-, second-, or thirdhand testimony to such events.

This book addresses especially the general possibility of events such as those narrated in the Gospels and Acts. That is, one may affirm that events like these can occur or even grant that they may sometimes occur supernaturally, but this does not mean that every purported case of an extranormal phenomenon in history happened, still less that it happened supernaturally. I am not trying to resolve every case of a miracle claim in the Gospels and Acts. In principle, oral sources could blur or exaggerate details over time, and even in directly eyewitness material authors presumably shaped the story to sharpen it for literary purposes, as historians normally did with their material. Those wishing to debate such issues must do so passage by passage or based on the general reliability of the tradition, and as already noted, I have engaged both the majority of those accounts and the issue of the tradition’s reliability elsewhere in *Historical Jesus* and more fully in my commentaries on Matthew, John, and Acts.³² Here, however, I am addressing the larger starting question: Do we need to treat the miracles differently than, that is, as less authentic than, the rest of the narratives in which they occur?

Closing Comments

As noted above, the main focus of the book is to persuade readers skeptical of NT miracle accounts that such accounts can stem from eyewitnesses and potentially report phenomena that happened. I believe that the evidence in this book, uneven as some of it is, is more than sufficient to sustain this claim. That some superhuman being, such as God, sometimes causes some such phenomena is a theological claim, and while I hope to challenge bias against this claim and demonstrate its plausibility, I assume that some of my readers ready to follow the first (historical) argument may demur at the second (theological) one. I nevertheless offer this argument, as well, in the expectation that a number of readers will find the evidence sufficient to agree and that many others will find it sufficient at least to allow for the possibility or to acknowledge that scholars can make a good case for it. The

in which he raises the issue. Paul raises the issue more often than James, though over a longer course of letters. Early Christian narratives, however, include more signs (esp. the Gospels; cf. even Rev 11:5–6).

32. Especially Keener, *Acts*, introduction, chs. 2–9; also idem, *Historical Jesus*, passim; idem, *Matthew*, 8–14, 16–36; idem, *John*, 11–34, 57–65.

material I use to illustrate both arguments can also help provide modern readers a more sympathetic way to hear these texts with the wonder with which most of the earliest auditors would have invested them.

Craig Keener
December 2009

The Ancient Evidence

There is a general consensus among scholars of early Christianity that Jesus was a miracle worker. Claims of miracles were common in antiquity, but these claims took different forms. Most people sought divine help at healing sanctuaries; public individual miracle workers were not nearly so common in this period, and those who did perform wonders rarely specialized in healings. Nevertheless, comparisons with the latter category help us understand better both how Jesus and his early followers could have been understood by their contemporaries and how they would have stood out in ways that appeared distinctive.

I will address these introductory questions only briefly, compared with the attention I will give to later questions in the book. That is because these subjects are familiar to both scholars and students of early Christianity and have been addressed at length elsewhere. This introductory discussion is important, however, because it helps set the groundwork for later questions in the book. Such questions will include: Granted that Jesus was viewed as a miracle worker, is it plausible in principle for specific claims about miracles to derive from eyewitnesses? In considering explanations for these miracles, what range of options should be open to consideration? Should supernatural as well as natural causes be entertained as possibilities?

Opening Questions about Early Christian Miracle Claims

Thus, from the standpoint of the gospels, the mighty deeds of Jesus, healings and exorcisms alike, were the product of the power which flowed through him as a holy man. His powers were charismatic, the result of his having become a channel for the power of the other realm, that which Jesus and his contemporaries also called Spirit. —Marcus Borg¹

I hold, in summary, that Jesus, as a magician and miracle worker, was a very problematic and controversial phenomenon not only for his enemies but even for his friends. —John Dominic Crossan²

A powerful healer of the physically and mentally sick, . . . he was . . . unconditionally given over to the rescue, not of communities, but of persons in need. —Geza Vermes³

[Jesus] probably saw his miracles as indications that the new age was at hand. *He shared the evangelists' view that he fulfilled the hopes of the prophets*—or at least that these hopes were about to be fulfilled. —E. P. Sanders (emphasis his)⁴

[Jesus's] healings and exorcisms were an intrinsic part of his proclamation of the kingdom (or rule) of God. The mighty deeds and the proclamation must go together; neither can be understood without the other. —Craig Evans⁵

Historians offer historical reconstructions on the basis of testimony, sometimes artifacts, and frequently additional critical evaluation based on context, intrinsic probability, and the weighing of evidence. Two issues thus confront

1. Borg, *Vision*, 67.

2. Crossan, *Historical Jesus*, 311.

3. Vermes, *Religion*, 206.

4. Sanders, *Figure*, 168.

5. Evans, *Fabricating Jesus*, 141.

a historian's discussion of miracles in early Christianity. First, the nature of the evidence involves some testimony but no first-century artifacts. Second, the probability argument must engage the long-standing albeit declining Western philosophic assumption that miracles do not occur, or at least must be evaluated with a bar of skepticism so high that no individual miracle claim could ever be accepted as valid.

This second issue does not always translate into a denial that witnesses claimed to see phenomena that could be interpreted in such terms, but it has sometimes had this effect. I will return to this philosophic question in chapters 5–6, and the analogy argument based on it in chapters 7–12, but focus at present on the question regarding the nature of the evidence.

Evidence for Jesus's Miracles

Although limited in kind (i.e., no artifacts), the available evidence for Jesus as a miracle worker is substantial. Although the evidence is limited concerning most particular miracles, all of the many ancient sources that comment on the issue agree that Jesus and his early followers performed miracles: Q, Mark, special material in Matthew and Luke, John, Acts, the Epistles, Revelation, and non-Christian testimony from both Jewish and pagan sources.⁶ If anyone were to object that Q includes only one complete narrative about a miracle (Matt 8:5–13//Luke 7:1–10; not including miracle summaries, in Matt 11:5//Luke 7:22; Matt 12:28//Luke 11:19), it is noteworthy that this narrative comprises perhaps half or all the narrative usually assigned to Q.⁷ Jesus's summary of his miracle working in Matt 11:5//Luke 7:22 clearly indicates that he believed himself a miracle worker.⁸ Moreover, given the extreme unlikelihood of Jesus's later followers making up obscure sites of his ministry like Chorazin or using the early name Beth-

6. For Paul, see Rom 15:19; 1 Cor 12:8–10; 2 Cor 12:12; Gal 3:5; for Revelation, Rev 11:6 (cf. Rev 11:18; 19:10). Although skeptical observers may be most impressed by the non-Christian evidence, the Gospel traditions take us closer to the events than other extant sources do. I have elsewhere argued my case in greater detail for the enormous wealth of genuine information about Jesus available in these sources (see Keener, *Historical Jesus*). Noting the wide range of sources, many appeal to multiple attestation to support the picture of Jesus as miracle worker (e.g., Sabourin, *Miracles*, 69; Boobyer, "Miracles," 40–41; Rowland, *Origins*, 146–47; Sanday, "Miracles," 63–64).

7. See Robinson, "Challenge," 321. I personally allow several more possible narratives for Q (Matt 4:1–11//Luke 4:1–12; Matt 8:5–13//Luke 7:1–10). I believe that it probably also includes the narrative construction behind Mark 3:22–30, because the parallels in Matt 12:22–32, 43–45//Luke 11:14–26 include additional overlapping material [Matt 12:28; Luke 11:20] that Mark may have deleted; but these could stem from oral tradition other than Q). Yet all of these Q accounts include a supernatural element. Eve, *Healer*, 84–91, doubts the Q hypothesis and therefore leans primarily on Mark alone (thus focusing on Mark's theological application of miracle stories in 92–117); this approach has invited some criticism (e.g., Hagerland, "Review"), though a significant minority of strong scholars today share Eve's skepticism about Q (e.g., Goodacre and Perrin, *Questioning*).

8. Dunn, *Remembered*, 671, rightly notes that one need doubt this belief no more than Paul's belief that he was empowered with signs in Rom 15:19.

saida, the Q material in Matt 11:21//Luke 10:13 is widely regarded as bedrock tradition,⁹ yet it refers to these Galilean villages being judged for not responding radically to Jesus's extraordinary miracles among them.¹⁰ Moreover, Mark would hardly have invented the idea that Jesus could not heal where faith was lacking (Mark 6:5).¹¹

Most scholars today working on the subject thus accept the claim that Jesus was a healer and exorcist.¹² The evidence is stronger for this claim than for most other specific historical claims that we could make about Jesus or earliest Christianity. Scholars often note that miracles characterized Jesus's historical activity no less than his teaching and prophetic activities did.¹³ So central are miracle reports to the Gospels that one could remove them only if one regarded the Gospels as

9. See Mussner, *Miracles*, 19–22; Charlesworth, "Sketch," 97; Burkitt, *Sources*, 14; Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 49–52; Witherington, *Christology*, 166; Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 183; cf. Adinolfi, "Lago"; Arav and Rousseau, "Bethsaïde"; pace Bultmann, *Tradition*, 112.

10. See Mussner, *Miracles*, 19–20. Mussner (31–36) appeals to the criterion of dissimilarity to defend Jesus's healing of lepers, placing it in the conflict tradition; so also Jesus's healings on the Sabbath (38); but today Jesus's miracles are less controversial than the conflict tradition, which I address in *Historical Jesus*, ch. 16.

11. So also Funk et al., *Acts of Jesus*, 85; Montefiore, *Gospels*, 1:119. It may be that Jesus often required faith not because he depended on it but because he wanted at least some present who would understand the point of the signs (Robinson, "Challenge," 326). Even Matthew, who may emphasize other elements, does not downplay miracles (Heil, "Aspects," passim, e.g., 276); cf. discussions of miracles in Mark (e.g., Lamarche, "Miracles"), Matthew (elsewhere, e.g., Légasse, "Miracles"), Luke (e.g., George, "Miracle"), and John (e.g., Léon-Dufour, "Miracles"; Johns and Miller, "Signs"; Charlier, "Notion"); Mark's miracle stories are probably older tradition (Best, "Miracles," 540). Although now more than four decades old, see the list of sixty-two articles published before 1962 on Jesus's miracles in Metzger, *Index*, 18–21 (some important samples are Scherer, "Miracles de Jésus"; Chadwick, "Miracles"; Young, "Value"; Dellling, "Verständnis"; Foster, "Miracles"; Ropes, "Aspects").

12. For summaries of this consensus, see Blackburn, "Miracles," 362; Eve, *Miracles*, 16–17; Welch, "Miracles," 360; Green, "Healing," 758; Licona and Van der Watt, "Historians and Miracles," 2; Dunn, *Remembered*, 670; Hultgren, "Stories," 134–35; Davies, *Healer*, 44; Eddy and Beilby, "Introduction," 38; Twelftree, "Message," 2518–19; cf. Evans, "Prophet," 1228–29; also the statement of the same consensus just over a century ago, in Wilson, "Miracles," 13. Some scholars settle for "plausibility" (e.g., Remus, *Healer*, 113). Ehrman, *Prophet*, 197–200, notes that scholars can accept Jesus as an exorcist and healer without passing judgment on whether he acted supernaturally. Various scholars (e.g., Hunter, *Work*, 86; Blessing, "Healing," 186) point out that even Bultmann accepted Jesus as healer and exorcist (citing *Word*, 124, 172). Some have argued that even particular descriptions in the Gospels appear reliable (Mansour, Mehio-Sibai, Walsh et al., "Jesus and Eye," summarized in Kub, "Miracles," 1273–74; see also Wilkinson, *Healing*, e.g., 122, against Bultmann).

13. See, e.g., Twelftree, "Miracles"; idem, *Miracle Worker*; idem, "Message," 2520–24; Richardson, *Apologetics*, 170–71. Deists removing supernatural and other objectionable elements in the Gospels could delete "nearly half their text" (Woodward, *Miracles*, 18, on Jefferson, on whose approach see also Brown, *Thought*, 280). The "Third Quest" is more respectful toward the Gospels' miracle tradition than the so-called first and second quests were (Meier, "Third Quest"). Scholars who treat Jesus as prophet and miracle worker appear to remain in the mainstream (see, e.g., Meier, "Quest"; Tan, *Zion Traditions*, 237; Flusser, "Love," 154; Theissen and Merz, *Guide*, 113, 281–315; Kee, "Quests"; Robinson, "Challenge," 321; Pikaza, "Jesús histórico"; Rusecki, "Kryteria"); this paradigm is not intrinsically opposed to Jesus as sage (Van Oyen, "Criteria"; see Evans, "Prophet"; Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 2, 34), just as sages and mystics were not incompatible (Sterling, *Ancestral Philosophy*, 99–113). Burton Mack's skepticism (*Myth*, 76) may be exceptional.

preserving barely any genuine information about Jesus.¹⁴ Indeed, it is estimated that more than 31 percent of the verses in Mark's Gospel involve miracles in some way,¹⁵ or some 40 percent of his narrative!¹⁶ Very few critics would deny the presence of any miracles in the earliest material about Jesus.¹⁷

If followers would preserve Jesus's teachings, how much more might they, and especially those who experienced recoveries, spread reports about his extraordinary acts of power?¹⁸ Because miracle claims attach to a relatively small number of figures in antiquity (itinerant or not), there is little reason to suppose that Jesus would have developed a reputation as a wonder worker if he did not engage in such activities.¹⁹ Jesus's ministry to the afflicted also coheres with his care for the marginalized in contrast to his frequent conflicts with the elite.²⁰ As historical Jesus scholars Gerd Theissen and Annette Merz put it, "Just as the kingdom of God stands at the centre of Jesus's preaching, so healings and exorcisms form the centre of his activity."²¹

14. Pittenger, "Miracles 1," 106 (believing that the Gospels provide a valuable "if 'impressionistic' picture" of the Jesus known by the disciples); Robinson, "Challenge," 321–22; Betz, *Jesus*, 60; cf. also Eder, *Wundertäter* (as cited in Sabourin, *Miracles*, 245); Dod, "Healer," 169 (noting, e.g., the summary of Jesus's ministry in Luke 13:32); Brockingham, "Miracles," 495; Wright, "Miracles," 189; Kallas, *Significance*, 112–13; O'Connell, "Miracles," 59; Polkinghorne, *Reality*, 74. Pittenger does not insist that the miracles are genuinely supernatural by the standards of today's science ("Miracles 1," 107), and he rejects, for example, the accounts of the virgin birth, which he compares with a "fairy-tale" ("Miracles 2," 147–48). Even Schleiermacher, who approached the miracle accounts largely rationally, concludes from their role in the Gospels that they were significant in Jesus's ministry (Loos, *Miracles*, 17). For the centrality of exorcisms in the early sources, see, e.g., Mills, *Agents* (esp. summary on 136); for the centrality of healing for Jesus's mission in Luke-Acts, see Green, "Daughter of Abraham," 654.

15. Robinson, "Challenge," 321; for Mark's heavy emphasis on miracles, see, e.g., Van Wyk and Viljoen, "Benaderings"; for his heavy emphasis on exorcism, see Finger and Swartley, "Bondage," 19 (highlighting Mark 3:20–28; cf. Matt 12:28/Luke 11:20). Eve, *Healer*, 118–19, who depends primarily on Mark (92–117), offers arguments that Mark genuinely reflects historical tradition that Jesus was a miracle worker: one does not normally write even a novel about a historical character that diverges completely from the person's known portrait (118–19), and the sorts of events matter more than individual cases (119).

16. Wilkinson, *Health*, 19; idem, *Healing*, 65. Recounting miracles requires nearly half the verses in Mark's first ten chapters (Placher, *Mark*, 76).

17. On this consensus, see Boobyer, "Miracles," 40–41. Some accept most of the healing accounts (e.g., Heard, *Introduction*, 40).

18. Wright, "Seminar," 114 (suggesting that the reports would rapidly assume a standard form, as they were told and retold).

19. Theissen and Merz, *Guide*, 113. Miracles are also not widely attached to messianic figures or to the majority of prophets. Using criteria of coherence and dissimilarity, Eve, *Miracles*, 386, argues for the authenticity of Jesus's distinctive ministry of healing and exorcism.

20. Liberation theologians have rightly emphasized Jesus's concern for the poor and marginalized; though emphasized by Luke (e.g., Green, "Good News," esp. 66–69, 71–72), it appears throughout Gospel tradition; for healing for the marginalized in Mark, see discussion in, e.g., Gaiser, "Touch." Perhaps of relevance to the topic of this book, some see a growing confluence between liberation theology and the interest of progressive sectors of global Pentecostalism in empowering the poor in this world (Cox, "Foreword," xix; cf. Brown, "Introduction," 12; Oblau, "Healing," 321, 324), though other sectors are sometimes myopic regarding structural issues (Brown, "Introduction," 10; cf. the mixed message of Word of Faith teaching in Sánchez Walsh, "Santidad," 151–54, 163–66).

21. Theissen and Merz, *Guide*, 281 (see more fully 281–315).

Among non-Christian sources, the rabbis²² and Celsus are clear that Jesus performed miracles, although both sources are hostile to these miracles. (Many of these later non-Christian sources attribute the miraculous works to sorcery, which probably constitutes the earliest anti-Christian explanation for Christian miracles.²³) This unanimity is striking given the conversely unanimous silence in Christian, Jewish, and even Mandaean tradition concerning any miracles of respected prophetic figures like John the Baptist.²⁴ None of the ancient sources respond to claims of Jesus's miracles by trying to deny them.

More important, the first-century Jewish historian Josephus apparently claims that Jesus was a miracle worker.²⁵ Jewish historian Geza Vermes, a noted expert on Jesus's era, has argued that this miracle claim in Josephus is authentic, based on Josephus's style.²⁶ In this report Josephus calls Jesus a wise man who also "worked startling deeds,"²⁷ a designation that Josephus also applies to miracles associated with the prophet Elisha.²⁸

It is thus not surprising that most scholars publishing historical research about Jesus today grant that Jesus was a miracle worker, regardless of their varying philosophical assumptions about divine activity in miracle claims. For example, E. P. Sanders regards it as an "almost indisputable" historical fact that "Jesus was a Galilean who preached and healed."²⁹ Using traditional historical-critical tools,

22. Yamauchi, "Magic," 90–91, cites *b. Sanh.* 43a; *tos. Hul.* 2:22–23; cf. Loos, *Miracles*, 156–67; Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 79; Mussner, *Miracles*, 23; Rowland, *Origins*, 306; Hruby, "Perspectives Rabbiniques," 94.

23. Cf. *b. Sanh.* 107b; in paganism, Cook, *Interpretation*, 36–39, 138. Although rabbinic sources do not recite the charge before the late second century (Flusser, *Judaism*, 635), Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 166, rightly notes that the charge concerning Jesus must be early; "Why answer a charge that was not levelled?" (see Matt 12:24; cf. John 8:48; Mussner, *Miracles*, 23).

24. See Stauffer, *Jesus*, 10–11; the Mandaean and Islamic evidence he cites, however, is too late for actual relevance. For Jesus as a worker of miracles (attributed by his detractors to magic) in Islam, see, e.g., Qur'an 5.110; 61.6; from the ninth century (the earliest surviving texts), in Thomas, "Miracles," 221–22; later Islamic discussion, e.g., in Rahman, "Interpretation" (though Islam is careful to portray them as divine miracles and Jesus acting only as a prophet—Zebiri, "Understanding"). Christian influence may have contributed to the rise of miracles associated with Muhammad (Sahas, "Formation"). Still, even a few Muslim thinkers, though not ruling out miracles, had some ideas similar to those of Hume (see Tegharian, "Al-Ghazali"). The issue never arises clearly in Paul, except with respect to his own miracle working, though cf. Wenham, "Story," 307–8.

25. Josephus *Ant.* 18.63.

26. Vermes, "Notice"; idem, *Jesus the Jew*, 79; see also Meier, *Marginal Jew*, 2:621; Theissen and Merz, *Guide*, 74 (arguing that Josephus seeks to report about Jesus with the same neutrality he used concerning John and James); Voorst, *Jesus*, 102; Montefiore, *Miracles*, 99.

27. Παράδοξα; cf. Luke 5:26. The Slavonic version develops this claim but is much more questionable (Gruson, "Josephé").

28. *Ant.* 9.182. Josephus often employs this term in more neutral ways (e.g., *Ant.* 2.91; 6.290; 8.130, 317; 12.87; 13.140; 15.261; 16.343; *War* 1.518; 4.238, 354; 6.102; *Ag. Ap.* 1.53; perhaps *Ant.* 14.455) but often refers to activity surprising because of divine or preternatural elements (*Ant.* 2.223, 267, 285, 295, 345; 3.1, 14, 30, 38; 5.28; 9.14, 58, 60, 182; 10.235; 15.379; cf. 2.347; 5.125; 6.171; 10.28; 13.282; perhaps 12.63; faked divine action in *Ag. Ap.* 2.114). Yet the present instance is most valuable, for the comparison with another prophet is most revealing (note also *Ant.* 9.58–60, also referring to Elisha).

29. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism*, 11. Certainly the Gospels portray Jesus's miracles as "an essential part of that ministry" (Filson, *History*, 105). Some point to Sanders disclaiming the reality of supernatural

John Meier finds many of Jesus's reported miracles authentic.³⁰ Raymond Brown notes that "scholars have come to realize that one cannot dismiss Jesus's miracles simply on modern rationalist grounds, for the oldest traditions show him as a healer."³¹ Otto Betz regards it as "certain" that Jesus was a healer, arguing "even from the Jewish polemic which called him a sorcerer."³² The miracles, he notes, are central to the Gospels, and without them, most of the other data in the Gospels are inexplicable.³³ Even Morton Smith, among the recent scholars most skeptical toward the Gospel tradition, argues that miracle working is the most authentic part of the Jesus tradition,³⁴ though he explains it along the magical lines urged by Jesus's early detractors.³⁵

These observations do not resolve the question of individual miracle stories in the Gospels,³⁶ but they do challenge one basic assumption that has often lodged the burden of proof against them: against some traditional assumptions, one cannot dismiss particular stories on the basis that Jesus did not perform miracles.³⁷ One need not, therefore, attribute stories about Jesus's miracles purely to legendary accretions.³⁸ Nor should one expect that the church's later Christology led them to

intervention for historiographic study (Martin, "Historians on Miracles," 414–15), but that caveat differs from the claim that Jesus was not a healer.

30. *Marginal Jew*, 2:678–772; for historical evidence supporting Jesus as a miracle worker, see *Marginal Jew*, 2:617–45; see also Twelftree, *Miracle Worker*; Blomberg, *Gospels*, 127–36. Eve, "Meier," however, is less positive toward the criterion of multiple attestation. Martin, "Historians on Miracles," 417, understands Meier as arguing that historians ought not to decide for or against the possibility of miracles, an approach that would inadvertently close off the possibility of accepting evidence for one.

31. Brown, *Death*, 143–44.

32. Betz, *Jesus*, 58.

33. *Ibid.*, 60.

34. Smith, *Magician*, 16. There are both Jewish and Greek parallels, but not regarding roughly contemporary teachers or philosophers; characters of the distant past, such as Enoch and Noah in *1 Enoch*, were special candidates for traditional embroidery. Even Bultmann, who emphasized later Hellenistic miracle additions to the tradition, recognizes that Palestinian Jewish Christians told stories of Jesus's marvels, but he heavily emphasized Hellenistic analogies (McGinley, *Form-Criticism*, 67).

35. Neusner, in "Foreword," xxvii, and *New Testament*, 5, 173, offers perhaps the harshest critique of Smith's magical thesis. Some recent scholars have accused Smith of forging an "ancient" gospel source ("Secret Mark"; see Jeffery, *Secret Gospel*; Carlson, *Hoax*; for varying views, see, e.g., Hedrick, "Stalemate"; Stroumsa, "Testimony"; Ehrman, "Response"), but his magician thesis has been judged wanting for reasons specific to that thesis.

36. See, e.g., the concerns expressed by Lincoln, *John*, 41–42 (who questions the historical authenticity of some miracles narrated in the Fourth Gospel but distinguishes these questions from belief in Jesus's resurrection or his ability to heal); Boobyer, "Miracles," 45–47; Hunter, *Work*, 86. Many scholars recognize that Jesus performed miracles yet profess agnosticism about the authenticity of most *specific* miracle accounts (R. H. Fuller and Alan Richardson, summarized in Maher, "Writings," 167). In the sixteenth century, John Locke acknowledged that the probability of particular miracle claims might be in question but argued that the cumulative weight of multiple testimony to miracles surrounding one person increased the overall probability exponentially (Burns, *Debate*, 68–69).

37. Against Bultmann and other predecessors, the majority of historical Jesus scholars today (e.g., Morna Hooker, E. P. Sanders, and most of the Third Quest) argue that whoever is making a case (whether for or against a tradition) bears the burden of proof (see esp. Winter, "Burden of Proof").

38. Dibelius, *Tradition*, 70–103, treats some of the miracle stories (the "tales") thus; so also Bultmann, *Tradition*, 227; cf. Bultmann's willingness to compare even "Fairy stories" and "folk-songs" (*ibid.*, 6; cf.,

invent many accounts of Jesus's miracles;³⁹ it may have influenced their interpretation and shaping of the accounts,⁴⁰ but there was little reason to invent miracles for christological reasons. We lack substantial contemporary evidence that Jewish people expected a miracle-working messiah, and nonmessianic figures like Paul were also believed to be miracle workers (2 Cor 12:12). Rather than Christology causing miracle claims to be invented, claims already circulating about Jesus's miracles, once combined with other claims about Jesus, undoubtedly contributed to apologetic for a higher Christology.⁴¹ Some of the offending "Christology," moreover, could apply to Jesus as a great eschatological prophet or ruler, roles not without analogies among contemporary figures.⁴²

The form of miracle stories typically proves less distinctive than their content.⁴³ Granted, comparison with other ancient accounts reveals a number of common motifs, sometimes suggesting that familiar forms of narration may have helped shape how stories were recounted.⁴⁴ At the same time, with regard to the basic

e.g., 229, 236). Below I address the form-critical and (in subsequent chapters) comparative questions they raise, but only quite briefly, because others have addressed them far more extensively (e.g., McGinley, *Form-Criticism*; Eve, *Miracles*). Cotter shows that the narrative function of miracle stories in the Gospels differ starkly from even the ancient narratives with which Dibelius and Bultmann compared them (*Portrait*, 3–4). As I shall note later in the book, even the miracle accounts in the Gospels that some scholars most readily classified as "tales" (esp. nature miracles) have some parallels in eyewitness narratives today.

39. Cf. Bultmann, *Tradition*, 219, 226. Rudolf Pesch treated christological interest in a Gospel account as a mark of inauthenticity, rather than allowing for later shaping of authentic tradition (see the summary in Maher, "Writings," 169–70).

40. For the Gospel writers shaping their materials in light of the literary context in which they embed them, see, e.g., Léon-Dufour, "Fonction," 329–31.

41. Maher, "Writings," 173. Bultmann, *Tradition*, 229, is able to marshal only the barest evidence for a miracle-working messianic expectation (some of it out of context).

42. See Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 238–67, 523–40. Even some sorts of higher "christological" elements may be earlier than exegetes have often supposed; see Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ*, passim; Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 268–82, 540–49.

43. Cf., e.g., the conclusions of McGinley, *Form-Criticism*, 63–64, 153; formal observations in 76–95; criticism of Bultmann's anachronistic categories in Cotter, *Portrait*, 1–2. Some formal observations (e.g., in Funk, "Form," 90–94) seem less profound when we consider not just narrative structures more generally but also the elements expected in ancient healings and other pre-narrative characteristics (though Funk's careful analysis, distilled on 89, is noteworthy; see the helpful collection of motifs and observations about their basic organization in Léon-Dufour, "Fonction," 295–305). Robinson, "Challenge," 322, rightly concurs with Jeremiah's critique of Dibelius's mostly arbitrary distinction between paradigms and novellen (as in Dibelius, *Tradition*, 70–103; some accounts appear more elaborate, but we know of no "class of 'storytellers'" alongside the eyewitnesses), for all Dibelius's insights in some of his other form-critical work. For further critique of Dibelius's subjective speculation here, see McGinley, *Form-Criticism*, 48–59 (esp. 56–59); on narrower grounds, Wikenhauser, *Introduction*, 264. George Ladd attributed to Henry Cadbury (with whom he studied) the observation that a genuine miracle story would necessarily have the same form as a fabricated one (D'Elia, *Place*, 26). Scholars classify Gospel miracle stories in various ways; for one fairly simple approach, see Léon-Dufour, "Fonction," 306–13; for an older article (in Metzger, *Index*, 20), see Jordan, "Classification."

44. For common motifs, see especially Kahl, *Miracle Stories*, passim. One distinctive feature of miracle stories about Jesus is the emphasis on his rejection (*ibid.*, 236–37). For subsequent forms, see, e.g., Stephens, *Healings*, 69–70; in some Asian churches (but far more abstract and generalized than in the Gospels), cf. Oblau, "Healing," 322; for some transculturally frequent elements, see Duffin, *Miracles*, 168.

narration of information, there are only so many ways to recount a miracle: most fundamentally, one expects at the least a statement of the problem and its cure, and a storyteller wishing to emphasize the miracle worker would naturally recount, by knowledge or presumably legitimate inference, the audience's astonishment. Thus the most basic format of a miracle story is, as one would expect, a description of the circumstances of the healing, the healing itself, and its confirmation or effects on the audience.⁴⁵ A number of the modern miracle stories recounted later in the book take on particular forms because of space constraints and the first two necessary, basic elements; while I have structured those accounts, however, every one of them derives from "tradition" (my interviews with or reading of sources, a significant number of them eyewitnesses or the persons cured).⁴⁶ My point in offering this observation is that one cannot make ready inferences about the historical authenticity of accounts based solely on their form.

Addressing the historical claim (my primary purpose here) does not mean that other literary approaches to Jesus's miracles are unimportant. It may, however, point to an aspect of the Gospels' theology with which modern Western readers sometimes find themselves uncomfortable. Jesus presumably intended his miracles as prophetic symbolic actions, hence with some metaphoric significance from the start;⁴⁷ commentators are right to find even more figurative significance on the level of the narratives in which we have these accounts. In my commentaries, I often take note of this significance,⁴⁸ and one could easily devote an entire book to this discussion were that one's focus.

Yet for all their symbolic import, sometimes even as a sort of acted parables, they are introduced as straightforward narratives of events, differently from how

45. Aune, *Environment*, 50. For people marveling after miracles, see, e.g., Philostratus *Vit. Apoll.* passim. In the opening story of Luke, for example, note fear (Luke 1:12, 64–65), astonishment (Luke 1:12, 29), praise (Luke 1:42), and joy (Luke 1:58). The audience response may characterize a conventional way to report the story but would not be surprising in most cultures (cf., e.g., Hickson, *Heal*, 120–21, 129).

46. Including converts unaware of earlier forms. In some cases the third element also appears, though often today in terms of the doctors' amazement (see esp. observations in Duffin, *Miracles*, 116–17, 142–43, 185). Onlookers' amazement in instant healings may be taken for granted, whereas modern hearers are more interested in medical observations (because these are what establish a miracle for many modern critics). Yet I have no reason to doubt that most reports of surprise (from doctors or others) are authentic (even if sometimes worded more dramatically than necessary), since anomalies by definition diverge from the norm. (Of course, not all claimed cures are genuinely anomalous, and for this reason and others doctors' views of recoveries, based on a wider sampling of cases, may differ from patients'.) I have condensed accounts and the third element is less relevant to my purpose for reciting them.

47. Baum, "Heilungswunder," strikes the right balance; cf. also Robinson, "Challenge," 330–31; Davey, "Healing," 61; O'Connell, "Miracles," 54; Van den Berghe, "Wonderverhalen"; Ellenburg, "Review," 176, 180; symbolic significance of the feedings in Barton, "Feedings," 113; certainly John finds additional significance in his signs (see, e.g., Kim, "Significance"). On the reliability of miracle reports, see earlier Sabourin, "Powers." Those who correctly emphasize the layers of interpretation in extant sources about miracles also often recognize historical material behind them (e.g., Pilch, "Understanding Miracles," 1211). Earlier redaction critics, however, were often excessive in their speculation about layers (cf. Fuller, *Miracles*; criticisms in, e.g., Van Cangh, "Sources").

48. E.g., Keener, *Matthew*, 258–73 passim (e.g., 273), 288–91, 301–7.

Jesus's parables are introduced.⁴⁹ Modern interpreters who find exclusively non-physical spiritual significance in these accounts, sometimes allegorizing them more than other narratives,⁵⁰ may read our cultural expectations into the accounts. We do not play down the physical dimensions of healing claims with regard to shrines of Asclepius, for example; why do we limit the theology in narratives about Jesus to what feels comfortable to us as antisupernaturalists, or even as dualists emphasizing only the soul? Accounts in shrines of Asclepius seem designed to encourage faith for further cures, and Christians in much of the Majority World read the Gospels' accounts of miracles in much the same way.⁵¹ My interest here is historical, but it may also have some implications for how we can broaden our reading of these texts.

Miracle Claims for Jesus's Early Movement

If such extranormal experiences characterized the public activity of Jesus, there is no reason to doubt that they could have also characterized the activities of those viewed as his successors. Perhaps Jesus even deliberately trained his disciples as his successors, as teachers normally trained their disciples to be, expecting them to be able to perform the same activity that he did (cf. Mark 9:18–19, 28–29; 11:23; Luke 9:40–41; 17:6). Indeed, the majority of the signs claimed in Acts, as in the Gospels, are healings and exorcisms⁵²—precisely the claims Christian sources in later centuries also offered from contemporary eyewitnesses.⁵³

The writers of the Gospels plainly do not include all the miracle stories available to them; often they summarize (in the Gospels, e.g., Mark 1:34; 3:10; 6:5, 56; for “Q” see Matt 11:5//Luke 7:22). Likewise in Acts, Luke cannot be reporting all of Paul's miracles, which Paul's letters indicate pervaded his public ministry (cf. Rom 15:19; 2 Cor 12:12).⁵⁴ In fact, given Paul's claims that such signs characterized his

49. Noted already in Everts, “Exorcist,” 360.

50. Note criticism in Judge, *First Christians*, 416–23 (esp. 416). The practice of deriving only spiritual applications from accounts of Jesus's healings has a long history, including in eighteenth-century cessationist Protestantism (see Kidd, “Healing,” 166). Some Majority World interpreters today, both on popular and scholarly levels, complain about this Western approach (e.g., Tari, *Wind*, 56; cf. Yung, *Quest*, 7; see further ch. 7); cf. also Catholic charismatics in Roelofs, “Thought,” 227.

51. Granted, some readers (e.g., more intuitively oriented persons) identify more readily with narrative characters in healing narratives than others do (see one study in Village, “Influence”).

52. In contrast to, say, commanding bedbugs to leave, as in *Acts John* 60–61. I leave aside discussion of Mark 16:17–18, which most scholars, including myself, regard as a later addition; see Metzger, *Text*, 226–29; idem, *Textual Commentary*, 122–26; though cf. the contrary case in Farmer, *Verses*, on external (3–75) and internal (79–103) grounds.

53. I treat these later in the book. The explanation for those claims will vary in part according to one's view of nature, but that is a theological and philosophical matter, not a question of historical data per se. Contemporary examples illustrate that people may believe that they have witnessed such phenomena (see discussion below).

54. See Caird, *Apostolic Age*, 64; Williams, *Miracle Stories*, 6–9; and, at length, Jervell, “Paul in Acts: Theology”; and esp. idem, *Unknown Paul*, 77–95 (*pace* Bruno Bauer's sometimes uncontested 1850 claim).

evangelizing of new areas, we have greater reason to believe instead that Luke selects only a few incidents and periods in Paul's life in which to describe miracles, from a much broader base of tradition available to him. Against scholars who attribute Luke's emphasis on the miraculous to legend and his fixation on marvels,⁵⁵ a more complete narrative of Paul's ministry might have included more reports than Luke does. Like Jesus, Paul was a miracle worker, although this activity may not have characterized all periods of his ministry equally.

Thus, whereas Luke does not describe miracles in Corinth, Paul reports them as a dramatic and observable part of his ministry there (2 Cor 12:12). Whereas Luke mentions miracles in merely several locations, Paul seems to believe that they occurred virtually wherever he preached (Rom 15:18–19).⁵⁶ That Paul appeals to his audiences' eyewitness knowledge that miracles occurred through his ministry (2 Cor 12:12; cf. Gal 3:5) argues against deliberate fabrication on his part; he genuinely believed that miracles were occurring through his ministry, and that his audiences in locations like Corinth would have agreed with him.

If one responds that, against Acts, most of the signs Paul himself claims might have been effected psychosomatically or coincidentally, one could provide the same response for most of those that Luke reports about Paul.⁵⁷ That is, whatever one's philosophic approach, one need not question the historical claims that such recoveries occurred. Luke associates no nature miracles with Paul. But one should note that the expectations of both Luke and Paul concerning signs (Rom 15:19) seem to have exceeded those of their non-Christian contemporaries,⁵⁸ with the possible exceptions of any signs prophets or magicians underlying the later depictions of Apollonius of Tyana and others like him.⁵⁹ That Paul anticipated noticeable

Schmithals's denial (without evidence) of the normal biblical sense of "signs and wonders and miracles" in 2 Cor 12:12 should not be seriously entertained (see Borgen, "Paul to Luke," 175–76, noting also that a meaning intelligible to the "super-apostles" is necessary here; cf. extrabiblical miracle terminology, much of it interchangeable, addressed in Remus, "Terminology," 535–51). Unlike later apologists using signs to validate Christianity in general, Paul often had to validate his own (see Kelhoffer, "Paul and Justin").

55. E.g., Scott, *Literature*, 101. Many scholars treat many miracle stories in Acts as edited legends or reworked pagan stories (see, e.g., Kanda, "Form," passim, e.g., 547, 550–51).

56. Nor does Luke invent the cases that he reports. Despite the opportunity to parallel Paul's experience in a storm with Jesus, who stilled one (Luke 8:24–25), Luke does not bring a miraculous end to the storm, though he does recount that all miraculously survived it (Acts 27:24–26, 44, in "we" material). This is in spite of his work's heavy emphasis on paralleling characters (e.g., Ehrhardt, *Acts*, 12–13; Boismard and Lamouille, *Actes*, 2:26; O'Toole, "Parallels between Jesus and Disciples"; Verheyden, "Unity"; Malina and Pilch, *Acts*, 181–84; recently and in significant detail, Clark, *Parallel Lives*).

57. Skeptical observers and those who claim healing often differ over whether supernatural causes are at work (though some do not completely rule out the alternate explanation, e.g., *Science Digest* contributing editor William Nolen in "Woman," 36–37, addressing accurate prediction of the spontaneous remission of a tumor).

58. At least, of those about whom reports remain extant. Signs workers drew dramatic attention, but usually only elite writings have survived, meaning that names in philosophic schools, which were propagated by their followers, are better attested; Jesus's movement as a genuine one founded by a miracle-working sage is distinctive.

59. Most of the extant evidence for Apollonius is significantly later (see below); Josephus's sign prophets are from a more relevant period but do not perform healings or, as far as Josephus is concerned, even their promised sign. For a cross-cultural approach to folk healers, see Pilch, "Sickness," 193–94.

miraculous phenomena in the Christian communities (1 Cor 12:9–10, 28–30; Gal 3:5) distinguishes those communities from other synagogues and religious associations in antiquity (such associations contrasted with, say, temples of Asclepius, where healings were expected).⁶⁰

Granted, accounts of unusual phenomena could grow over time; even a third-generation oral tradition with exact attributions could report dramatically paranormal events such as apparitions,⁶¹ some of which may have grown with time. But only a few scholars date Luke this much later than Paul,⁶² and certainly on the view of authorship argued in my commentary on Acts⁶³ a three-generation duration of transmission will not do as an explanation for Luke's accounts in Acts. The same should be noted for the Gospels: Mark is replete with miracle stories and probably appears within four decades of Jesus's crucifixion.⁶⁴ Contrary to assumptions that miracle stories would always grow in time, other Gospels' use of Mark shows that abbreviation was as common as development.⁶⁵ Although expansion sometimes added details for good storytelling,⁶⁶ ancient rhetorical practices reveal that often even these developments could appeal to common sense or other oral traditions.⁶⁷ Writing within the lifetime of some witnesses and those who knew

60. For healing deities and aretologies, see, e.g., Stambaugh and Balch, *Environment*, 43; Grant, *Gods*, 54. But as I have noted, these differ from human agents of healings such as we find in the Gospels, Acts, and Philostratus's accounts of Apollonius.

61. Eunapius *Lives* 459–60. Eunapius (b. ca. 345 C.E.) idealizes Neoplatonists “to compete with the biographies of Christian saints” (Matthews, “Eunapius,” 569) and hence does not provide strong background for our period.

62. See Keener, *Acts*, introduction, ch. 10; for surveys of views from those who date Acts later yet recognize that the large majority of scholars date Acts in the first century, see Pervo, *Dating Acts*, 359–63; Tyson, “Dates”; idem, *Marcion*, ix.

63. Treated in Keener, *Acts*, introduction, ch. 11; see also my excursus on the “we narratives” at Acts 16:10 in that commentary.

64. I tend to prefer a date for Mark ca. 64 (with, e.g., Bruce, “Date,” 78, citing consensus), less than three and a half decades after the crucifixion; soon after 66 the warning to flee to the mountains (Mark 13:14) became irrelevant (Bruce, “Date,” 80–81); for a fit after Nero's persecution, see Senior, “Swords.” Nevertheless, dating the Gospels unfortunately includes a substantial amount of guesswork. For 65–70, which may be the majority position, see, e.g., Anderson, *Mark*, 26; Aune, *Dictionary of Rhetoric*, 289 (citing “critical consensus”); pre-70, Hengel, *Mark*, 20. As Allison, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 16–17, notes, those who date it after 70 date it not long after (for shortly after 70, see, e.g., Juel, *Messiah and Temple*, 212; Theissen, *Gospels in Context*, 261–62; even Smith, *Magician*, 11, dates it no later than 75). A smaller number prefer even substantially earlier dates (cf., e.g., Kennedy, “Source Criticism,” 134–35, citing external evidence).

65. See discussion in Léon-Dufour, “Fonction,” 324–26; in the Gospel tradition generally, see Sanders, *Tendencies*, 19, 46–87, 88–189, 272 (effectively refuting Bultmann); cf. Stein, “Criteria,” 238–40; Frye, “Analogies in Literatures,” 283–84. This pattern holds true in the second century and later: the church told the original stories less rather than more (Achtmeier, *Miracle Tradition*, 178, 215, 217, followed by Hultgren, “Stories,” 134).

66. Cf., e.g., Plutarch *Alex*. 70.3.

67. For rhetorical elaboration without changing meaning, see, e.g., *Rhet. Alex.* 22, 1434b.8–11; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Lit. Comp.* 9; Theon *Progymn.* 4.37–42, 80–82; Longinus *Subl.* 11.1; Hermogenes *Progymn.* 3. On Chreia, 7; Aphthonius *Progymn.* 3. On Chreia, 23S, 4R; 4. On Maxim, 9–10; cf. Menander Rhetor 2.3, 379.2–4. For supplementing from other sources, see, e.g., Pliny *Nat. pref.* 17; Eunapius *Lives* 494; Kennedy, “Source Criticism,” 138–39; Aune, *Environment*, 65. Mediterranean storytellers regularly drew on a wider range of tradition than they specify; for example, though countless allusions in Homer (e.g.,

them, Mark's portrait of Jesus as miracle worker makes sense only if those who knew him believed him to be such.⁶⁸

Seeking to distinguish earlier tradition from Luke's editing in the miracles Luke recounts in Acts, Benjamin Williams compares Luke's editing of miracles in Mark. By this method he identifies consistent redactional patterns relevant to Luke's portrayal of miracles.⁶⁹ Williams's approach should follow in a general way from the logical premise that Luke would value historical tradition in his second volume (a historical monograph) no less than in his first (on its own terms a biography).⁷⁰ Williams concludes that, for example, Luke both retains the substance of Mark's accounts and feels free to compose audience reactions of astonishment, fear, and so forth if Mark lacks these (though one might well infer the likelihood of such reactions from human nature). Luke especially adds acclamations of praise to God.⁷¹ He nowhere adds discourses to his miracle stories, though he could abbreviate, "improve the vocabulary, or even omit discourses altogether."⁷² The essential substance of the miracles themselves remains unchanged.

One might object that the nature of Luke's sources in the second volume could differ from those in the Gospels. Probably there is at least some difference; in contrast to many of his sources in the Gospel, many of his sources in Acts were probably oral, altering the character of the "editing."⁷³ At the same time, we might

Od. 12.69–72) were developed later, they are often so incomplete by themselves that it is clear that Homer alludes to commonly known fuller stories that he does not record. I treat these issues more fully in Keener, *Historical Jesus*, 126–61, 459–82 passim.

68. See Ellens, "Miracles and Process," 1–2.

69. Williams, *Miracle Stories*, 13, 35–54. For example (52), Luke exercises the greatest redactional liberty in reformulating the conclusion of Markan miracles; Luke reshapes Markan crowd reactions thoroughly (e.g., in Luke 5:15, 26; 6:11; 8:47), allowing overlap with Mark only in "individual words." Their readily memorable form makes miracle stories one of early Christian tradition's most recognizable narrative forms (Williams, 15). Still, Weissenrieder, *Images*, 336–37, suggests that there may be differences between the approach to healing in the Gospel and Acts; cf. also Kanda, "Form" (e.g., 230, 534, 547, though in my opinion overstated). Some might reflect the difference between Jesus as bearer of numinous power and his followers; others may reflect the new Diaspora milieu in Acts. Early Jewish writers redacted biblical miracle accounts to varying degrees (Koskenniemi, *Miracle-Workers*, 300).

70. On the Gospels as biography, see, e.g., Talbert, *Gospel*, passim; Aune, *Environment*, 46–76; Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth*, 117–36; Burrige, *Gospels*, 109–239; idem, "People," 121–22; idem, "Biography, Ancient"; Frickenschmidt, *Evangelium als Biographie*; Keener, *Matthew*, 16–24; idem, *John*, 11–37; idem, *Historical Jesus*, 73–84; Ytterbrink, *Biography*; on Acts as some form of ancient historiography, see, e.g., Palmer, "Monograph" (1992); idem, "Monograph" (1993); Johnson, *Acts*, 3–7; idem, "Luke-Acts," 406; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 127; Balch, "ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΩΝ," 141–42, 149–54 (political history); idem, "Genre," passim, especially 11–19; idem, "Gospels (forms)," 948–49; Marguerat, *Histoire*, 49 (although noting overlap with biography); idem, "Pionnier"; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 77–78; Flichy, "État des recherches," 28–32; further discussion in the introduction to Keener, *Acts*. On ancient biography of recent characters including substantial historical information, see, e.g., idem, "Otho."

71. Williams, *Miracle Stories*, 53.

72. *Ibid.*, 54.

73. The exact wording of discourse was probably also fluid in oral traditions behind any written accounts even in the Gospels, with the exception of some carefully remembered sayings of Jesus (see, e.g., Dunn, *New Perspective*, 112 [with 110], 118, 122; cf. Bauckham, *Eyewitnesses*, 333–34; Eddy and Boyd, *Legend*, 275–85). On the special question of speech material, see Keener, *Acts*, introduction, ch. 8.

expect Luke's historical interests in the second volume to remain analogous to those in the first⁷⁴ and hence expect him, as Williams argues, to continue to shape rather than begin to fabricate his miracle stories in his second volume.⁷⁵

More tellingly, whatever we might lose from the nature of Luke's sources in his second volume, we gain more. Some of his miracle reports appear in eyewitness material much closer to Luke than his Gospel sources were. That is, claims of what we might call extranormal activity, including healings and one raising, appear in his "we" narratives, usually attributed at least to an eyewitness source or (for many scholars) even to Luke as an eyewitness (Acts 20:9–12; 21:11; 27:21–26; 28:3–6, 8–9).⁷⁶ Luke is clearly convinced that miracles occur; Paul is likewise convinced that they happened through his ministry (Rom 15:19; 2 Cor 12:12). Modern scholars are also usually convinced that Jesus and many early Christians (e.g., second-century exorcists) were believed to perform miracles. If Jesus and his first followers believed that they experienced healing miracles firsthand, they witnessed recoveries that they believed to be divinely extranormal in character. How can modern hearers relate to these claims?

Methodological Questions

From a modern perspective this evidence raises two kinds of questions. First, although early Christian literature emphasizes an abundance of miracle workers not attested to this degree in other first-century movements, miracle claims in other settings were abundant in antiquity. How do the bulk of the Christian claims compare with analogous claims? Should all be explained psychosomatically, as deception, as misinterpretation, or in other nonsupernatural terms? Are some claims likelier than others, and in which circles? Must every claim be explained in the same manner?

Second, if modernist assumptions are incompatible with supernatural claims, does that conflict therefore justify ruling out a priori the possibility of such activity? Or should we consider the other alternative, reevaluating some assumptions of modernity, and thus leave open at least the possibility of nonnatural (in this

74. If anything, the second volume's character is more often regarded as ancient historiography than the first, and ancient historiography, despite its differences from its modern namesake, does involve historical interest (see Keener, *Historical Jesus*, ch. 7).

75. Because some forms of miracle stories, particularly exorcisms and a form of raising the dead story, characterized their Middle Eastern origin more than Hellenism (Williams, *Miracle Stories*, 22–26, 32), he hopes to identify the period in the Jewish missionary movement's expansion into the Hellenistic world from which some characteristics derive (32–33). Far from being primarily late forms, "the bulk of these stories mirror the needs and convictions of Christians in the first three or four decades of the new movement, during which they essentially took shape" (168).

76. See, e.g., Nock, *Essays*, 827; Dupont, *Sources*, 164–65; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 103; Thornton, *Zeuge*; Jervell, *Apostelgeschichte*, 66, 82; Fusco, "Sezioni-noi"; Hanson, *Acts*, 21–24; Hemer, *Acts in History*, 312–34; Barnett, *Birth*, 190–92; Cadbury, "We in Luke-Acts"; Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, 135–37; and sources mentioned in the note in the introduction to this book.

case, most often theistic) explanations? Whatever answers I give to the second set of questions will not satisfy everyone, but I will not have addressed the historical question fully without at least raising them. The veracity of the events aside, the question of explanatory models remains a legitimate subject of historical inquiry, and causation, albeit especially human causation, is a common historical concern. Nevertheless, for purely historical purposes, in the final analysis, the question of whether or not eyewitnesses claimed such phenomena does not depend on the explanations or models proposed for these phenomena. Thus, although the question of whether events happened may overlap with the question of causation (most theistic believers, certainly, treat them together), in principle I allow for these questions to be treated separately. This book focuses especially on the former question but will also repeat and offer a challenge to rethink the nature of the second one.