

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and  
Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 1

## INTRODUCTION

It is thus the growth of his own understanding of himself that he pursues through his understanding of the other. Every hermeneutics is thus, explicitly or implicitly, self-understanding by means of understanding others.<sup>1</sup>

The significance that Ricœur assigns to the hermeneutical Other (in this case a reference to remoteness of culture and time) in the purpose of interpretation can be equally important for the understanding of community identity-formation. In the latter case, however, the Other refers to individuals and the communities that they make up. In other words, it seems that identity cannot fully be grasped without resorting to comparison with those who are different from ‘us’ and/or who often antagonise ‘us’. To be sure, other aspects are important in the forging of identity: memory, rituals, and texts, to mention some. Nevertheless, when asked to define our identity, it is telling that we often have to resort to comparisons with others in order to achieve clarity. Implied in this mode of definition is the idea of difference.<sup>2</sup> The *Oxford English Dictionary* could not escape bringing in the Other when defining identity. Its second entry on the word states: ‘The sameness of a person or thing at all times or in all circumstances;

<sup>1</sup> Paul Ricœur, *The Conflict of Interpretations: Essays in Hermeneutics*, trans. Kathleen McLaughlin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1974), p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> This view on the construction of community identity is similar to what Manuel Castells, *The Power of Identity* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997), p. 8, has recently called ‘Resistance Identity’, which is ‘generated by those actors that are in positions/conditions devalued and/or stigmatized by the logic of domination, thus building trenches of resistance and survival on the basis of principles different from, or opposed to, those permeating the institutions of society...’ See also David Lowenthal, ‘Identity, Heritage, and History’, in *Commemorations: The Politics of National Identity*, ed. John R. Gillis (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 46–54.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)2 *The speeches of outsiders in Acts*

the condition or fact that a person or thing is itself and not *something else*; individuality, personality.’

Equally, the biblical tradition is fond of bringing in the Other to aid in the construction of the identity of the people of God: ‘Do not defile yourselves in any of these ways, for by all these practices *the nations* I am casting out before you have defiled themselves’ (Lev. 18.24). The holiness of the Israelites, a quality that was supposed to be one of their defining traits, is partly defined by a contrast to the practices of the *other* nations. In the New Testament, Jesus inculcated in his disciples their distinctive identity by contrasting what was to be their measure for greatness (i.e. service) and comparing that to the measure used by the Other: ‘The kings of the Gentiles lord it over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. *But not so with you ...*’ (Lk. 22.25–6).

Identity in the biblical tradition is not just a question of distinct praxis; it is also a historical matter. That is to say, the people of God could understand who they were by reflecting on what they believed God to have done among them in the course of history as opposed to what he had done with the Other. Thus, Moses latches on to divine action done in time and space to highlight the identity of the Hebrews: ‘For how shall it be known that I have found favour in your sight, I and your people, unless you go with us? In this way, we shall be distinct, I and your people, from every people on the face of the earth’ (Ex. 33.16). It is perceiving the divine presence accompanying them (*not* the Other) that will assure Moses of his and the Israelites’ identity as the people of God. Similarly, the author of Ezra could discern God’s intentions in history by reflecting on what God was doing with the Other, in this case the foreign monarch Cyrus: ‘In the first year of King Cyrus of Persia, in order that the word of the Lord by the mouth of Jeremiah might be accomplished, the Lord stirred up the spirit of King Cyrus of Persia ...’ (Ezra 1.1). These observations lead me to hazard a generalisation: our perceptions of God’s actions in history vis-à-vis the Other are as crucial in constructing our *own* identity as are the actions we perceive God doing directly to ‘us’.

Identity and history, in fact, have been joined in the understanding of historiography from approximately the middle of the twentieth century. Contrary to the notion of history preached by positivists, in which the task of the historian was viewed as a labour of scientific, detached objectivity that would produce assuredly impartial results, more recent research has affirmed the inescapability of our subjectivity, even in such work as history writing: there is no such thing as ‘the

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

3

view from nowhere' and history is more than dry chronicling.<sup>3</sup> If the writing of history is done not just for the purpose of producing information, then there are additional motivating factors, among which is the construction of community identity by a fresh interpretation of the past. Paul Ricœur has called this 'poetic' history, where the foundational narratives of a group are exploited by the historian in order to provide self-definition for the community.<sup>4</sup>

Some students of the book of Acts, to the extent that they view the work as belonging to the genre of history, have also argued that its purpose was to provide self-definition for its readers.<sup>5</sup> For example, Gregory Sterling, by examining a number of ancient authors from Berossus to Josephus, suggests that he has uncovered a literary genre

<sup>3</sup> On the objectivity versus subjectivity question in historiography, see the excellent work of Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988). See also Arnaldo Momigliano, 'Historicism Revisited', in *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1977), pp. 365–73.

<sup>4</sup> Paul Ricœur, 'Philosophies critiques de l'histoire: Recherche, explication, écriture', in *Philosophical Problems Today*, vol. 1, ed. Guttorm Floistad (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994), pp. 139–201.

<sup>5</sup> The current project subscribes to the view of Acts as belonging to the category of the historical monograph in its scope, a Hebrew understanding of history in its conception of historiography, and Hellenistic history in *some* of its *topoi*. It is my view that in its totality Acts is far closer to Hellenistic Jewish histories, say, 1 and 2 Maccabees, than to classical (e.g. Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon) or Hellenistic historians (e.g. Polybius, Dionysius of Halicarnassus). This assertion will be further substantiated in chapter three. For Acts as a historical monograph, see Eckhard Plümacher, 'Die Apostelgeschichte als historische Monographie', in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Tradition, rédaction, théologie*, ed. Jacob Kremer (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), pp. 457–66; Darryl Palmer, 'Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph', in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, ed. Bruce Winter and Andrew Clarke (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), pp. 1–30. On the Hebrew historiography underpinning Acts, see Loveday Alexander, 'Marathon or Jericho? Reading Acts in Dialogue with Biblical and Greek Historiography', in *Auguries: The Jubilee Volume of the Sheffield Department of Biblical Studies*, ed. D.J.A. Clines and S.D. Moore (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 93–125; Brian S. Rosner, 'Acts and Biblical History', in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting*, pp. 65–82. On Acts' imitation of Hellenistic historiography (and novels) such as in prefaces, the use of letters, speeches, style, and *topoi*, see Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972). My assertion that Acts belongs to the historical genre does not imply that its contents are historically accurate: that decision must be made upon a close study of the author's performance. Thomas E. Phillips, 'The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus?' *CBR* 4 (2006): 365–96, suggests that today's dominant view of Acts with respect to its genre is the following: 'Is Acts history or fiction? In the eyes of most scholars, it is history – but not the kind of history that preludes [*sic*] fiction' (p. 385). Whether this is indeed a consensus is open to debate.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)4 *The speeches of outsiders in Acts*

which he calls ‘apologetic historiography’. He offers the following definition:

Apologetic historiography is the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group’s own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world.<sup>6</sup>

Sterling believes that Luke–Acts is an example of this genre. Whether he has actually uncovered a new genre rather than elements that were constitutive to an already existing one is not our issue here.<sup>7</sup> What is important to note is that at least in some quarters of ancient history authors wrote to aid their community in self-definition.<sup>8</sup> Insofar as Acts is viewed as history, it is possible that this was also one of its author’s purposes.<sup>9</sup>

At this point it is necessary to hark back to the words with which I began this chapter, namely, that in the construction and strengthening of a religious community’s identity it is not unusual for that community to resort to the Other: what it believes of God’s activities towards the outsider helps it to orient itself concerning what it believes to be *its* place in God’s plans. If it is agreed that in some sense Luke’s<sup>10</sup> aim in his two-volume work was the formation and reinforcing of a Christian community’s identity, it is then legitimate to ask what place he gives to the Other in his narrative.

<sup>6</sup> Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke–Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> Criticisms of Sterling, particularly with the question of genre, may be found in Palmer, ‘Acts and the Ancient Historical Monograph’, pp. 15–18.

<sup>8</sup> As Erich Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998) has demonstrated, Jewish historical writings from the Hellenistic period also attempted to strengthen the identity of its Jewish readers.

<sup>9</sup> See Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the ‘Acts of the Apostles’*, trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 34: ‘The closest categorization [of Acts] is a historiography with an apologetic aim, which permits Christianity both to understand and to speak itself. Its status as a narrative of beginnings assures the Lucan work a clear identity function.’ See also Todd Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004), pp. 223–61.

<sup>10</sup> I use ‘Luke’ to refer to the author of the Gospel that bears that name as well as the author of the Acts of the Apostles. A connection with Luke ‘the beloved physician’ of Col. 4.14 is not implied.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)

### 1.1 The speeches of outsiders in Acts: uncharted territory

Luke, in fact, devotes a considerable amount of space to outsiders in Acts.<sup>11</sup> This is readily visible if we focus on their speeches.<sup>12</sup> These are the speeches of Gamaliel, Gallio, Demetrius, the Ephesian Town Clerk, Claudius Lysias (written speech), Tertullus, and Festus.<sup>13</sup> That is, a total of seven speeches. It may come as a surprise that Peter and Paul's speeches – to mention the two principal characters of Acts – amount to eight and nine respectively.<sup>14</sup> This comparison may appear to be misleading since we are contrasting *individuals* (Peter and Paul) with a *group* (non-Christians). Nevertheless, a plausible case will be made in this project to the effect that Luke – although admirably portraying the individualities of each speaker – presents the group of outsiders as a single character.

If the amount of speeches uttered by outsiders is almost equal in number to those spoken by the principal characters of Acts, then it is legitimate to ask why their speeches, as a group, have never been given substantial treatment. Studies on the speeches of Peter abound. Equally, an enormous number of works on Paul's speeches has been produced. The speeches of these two characters have also been united under the label of 'mission speeches' and examined as such.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The term 'outsider' is used in this work to refer to those characters in Acts who do not hold to the theological point of view of the implied author. As such, other terms such as 'opponents' and 'non-Christians' may be appropriate in some contexts. The posture of these characters towards the Jesus movement varies from those who *actively* oppose the community (e.g. Demetrius the silversmith, Tertullus), and may thus unquestioningly be labelled 'opponents', to those who, while not in principle 'friendly' toward the Christians, nevertheless do not seek their suppression (e.g. Gallio, Claudius Lysias). Their common denominator is a lack of allegiance to the theology of the implied author.

<sup>12</sup> I have followed Marion Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1994), p. 20, in defining a speech as 'a deliberately formulated address made to a group of listeners'.

<sup>13</sup> There are further examples of direct speech by outsiders: the owners of the slave-girl in Philippi (16.20–1), the unconverted Jews in Thessalonica (17.6–7), and the Roman Jews (28.21–2). It appears that Luke has cast the words of these outsiders in direct speech primarily to provide variation to his narrative. Consequently, I have excluded these 'speeches' from my examination.

<sup>14</sup> Peter: 1.16–25; 2.14–26; 3.12–26; 4.8–12; 5.29–32; 10.34–43; 11.5–17; 15.7–11. Paul: 13.16–41; 14.15–17; 17.22–31; 20.17–35; 22.3–21; 24.10–21; 26.2–29; 27.21–6; 28.17–20.

<sup>15</sup> The literature on Peter's speeches is too vast to cite in detail. I refer the reader to Hans F. Bayer, 'The Preaching of Peter in Acts', in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*, ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), pp. 257–74, where a substantial amount of literature on Peter's speeches is

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)6 *The speeches of outsiders in Acts*

Nevertheless, the speeches of opponents, as a group, have been neglected. One suspects that this is due to the fact that the majority of studies on the speeches have focused on extracting, from the speeches, either the *kerygma* of the early church or (in most cases) the theology of Luke, or both: and what better place to mine for these than the speeches of the principal spokesmen of the primitive church.<sup>16</sup> These are no doubt important and valuable studies. But I ask: can we not learn about the theology of Luke by looking at the speeches that he assigns to outsiders? Is our understanding of his theology to be gleaned solely from the words of the apostolic group? Here we may employ an analogy with another book, chosen rather randomly: is not our grasp of the thought of the author of 1 Maccabees made firmer by looking not only at the words of the Hasmoneans, but also at the words which he assigns to Antiochus IV? In fact, our understanding of the worldview of the author of 1 Maccabees would be much poorer if we neglected, in our construction of it, his characterisation of the outsider Antiochus IV. To use another analogy, this time from Pauline studies, it is interesting to note that considerable effort has been made in attempting to detect, from Paul's statements, the identity and views of his opponents. Jerry L. Sumney can state: 'Few topics continually attract the attention of scholars and affect the interpretation of Pauline letters and early Christianity as much as the question of Paul's opponents.'<sup>17</sup> One of the reasons why scholars invest extensive energy in this quest is their belief that the arguments and theology of Paul would be made clearer if they could build a profile of his enemies. In other words, it is believed that identifying Paul's opponents can help us recover the apostle's own ideology.

It is thus puzzling that New Testament scholarship has yet to explore the implications of Acts' presentation of the opponents of the Jesus movement, even though – whether depicted justly or not – the words and actions of the opponents are allowed to be heard and seen 'directly', something that cannot be said of the Pauline epistles,

documented. The literature on Paul's speeches is even larger. A good starting place is G. Walter Hansen, 'The Preaching and Defence of Paul', in *Witness to the Gospel*, pp. 295–324. Erich Grässer's survey, *Forschungen zur Apostelgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), pp. 99–115, although published recently, is severely outdated and limited with respect to studies on Paul's speeches. For the mission speeches, see Ulrich Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, 3rd edn (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974).

<sup>16</sup> In addition, many studies have concentrated on the historicity of the speeches. See further chapter two.

<sup>17</sup> Jerry L. Sumney, '*Servants of Satan*', '*False Brothers*' and Other Opponents of Paul (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), p. 13.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

7

where the reader can only, as it were, listen to one side of the conversation.<sup>18</sup> The current project argues that, by using the speeches of outsiders in Acts as a lens, much can be learned, not only about their function in the narrative, but also about the theology/historiography of Luke, his purposes in composing Luke–Acts, and its generic orientation. The present work attempts to shed light on these issues by means of the hitherto unexplored path of the speeches of outsiders.

Prior to bringing this section to a close, it is important to anticipate – and attempt to refute – an argument that would challenge the legitimacy of the above enterprise. It may be objected that the introduction of speeches of outsiders is simply in keeping with the procedure of classical and Hellenistic historians. That is to say, historians included *both* sides of an argument by presenting speeches from the different competing parties.<sup>19</sup> This was done, at least in theory, to vouchsafe against partiality: by presenting both sides of the argument a measure of objectivity and non-partisanship was introduced, two defining features of ancient *historia*.<sup>20</sup> The inclusion of the speech of the outsider (assuming that the historian did have a preferred point of view) was *de rigueur*. It could thus be argued that, in including the speeches of outsiders in Acts, Luke was not investing them with any special significance. Rather, he was just performing his duty as a conscientious historian. Therefore, a study of these speeches would yield a meagre harvest.

The above objection, however, would be unsustainable for the following reason: with the exception of the pair of speeches by Tertullus and Paul, Luke does not place the speeches of outsiders *side by side* with the speeches of insiders so as to contrast with the latter's arguments.<sup>21</sup> That is to say, Luke allows the speeches of outsiders to stand on their own, thus suggesting that they are vital components in the configuration of his opus. Not only is this a clue that

<sup>18</sup> For my suggestions of why the voice of the opponent has been neglected in Acts, see chapter two.

<sup>19</sup> Many examples could be given, but one may point to two cases in Thucydides, since he mastered this technique: Corinthians versus Athenians (1.68–78) among many others; and, between individuals, Archidamus versus Sthenelaidas (1.80–6).

<sup>20</sup> See Charles W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983), pp. 62–3.

<sup>21</sup> The opposite is also the case on occasion: Christians are accused, but Luke does not allow them, by the medium of speech, to answer the charges. See Loveday Alexander, 'The Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text', in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*, ed. Mark Edwards *et al.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 33–8.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)8 *The speeches of outsiders in Acts*

Luke may not be operating strictly within the guidelines of Greco-Roman historians, but it also highlights the necessity of viewing the outsiders' speeches as important elements in Luke's presentation.

**1.2 Method**

In keeping with my previous assertion as to the historiographic orientation of Acts, the current project operates under the conviction that the contents of Acts were meant to have referential function. Put differently, the readers expected that the story told would go beyond the 'closed world' of the text to events that purportedly took place in the real world.<sup>22</sup> As such, it will be necessary to be abreast of the historical, religious, and social dynamics of the milieu encoded in the text. Consequently, more 'traditional' historically oriented disciplines such as inscriptions and literary parallels will be employed. In addition, since the object of my study is in the medium of narrative and speeches, two other methods will be used.

## 1.2.1 Narrative criticism

The terms above often serve as a catchall phrase to designate a literary method that can include an author-centred (expressive), text-centred (objective), or reader-centred (pragmatic) orientation.<sup>23</sup> It is thus necessary to locate my method with further exactitude.

One helpful way to give precision to my approach is by visualising a spectrum with composition criticism on the left end of the scale and deconstruction at the other end. Between these two poles, moving left to right, are methods such as narrative criticism, structuralism, phenomenological criticism (e.g. Wolfgang Iser), interpretative communities (e.g. Stanley Fish), and deconstruction (e.g. Jacques Derrida).<sup>24</sup> My approach would fall between composition criticism and narrative criticism. I flesh out this position below.

Composition criticism emerged from redaction criticism. Its break with redaction criticism came in its desire to read the *entire* narrative, not just the variations with the other Synoptics (which in any case was

<sup>22</sup> Again, this is not a verdict on the veracity of Acts: it simply attempts to guard against certain excesses of narrative criticism. See further above.

<sup>23</sup> See Daniel Marguerat and Yvan Bourquin, *Pour lire les récits bibliques: Initiation à l'analyse narrative*, 3rd edn (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2004), pp. 8–18.

<sup>24</sup> I am indebted to Mark A. Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 16, for this taxonomy.



Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Osvaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

9

not an issue with respect to Acts). Continuity with redaction criticism rested in its insistence that the biblical narrative be used as a vehicle of the author's theology.<sup>25</sup> Narrative criticism, on the other hand, focused on the *story*, with theology being a secondary aim. Stephen Moore states the difference very well:

For composition critics, the meaning resides in the text's theological (or ideational) content. This content is separable in principle from the narrative form; narrative is the vehicle of theology. Narrative criticism, in contrast, is a *formalist* criticism; the meaning of the biblical text is located in the details of the structure. What the text says cannot legitimately be extrapolated from how it is said.<sup>26</sup>

In practice, although many New Testament scholars have been placed under the banner of narrative criticism, their approach actually falls somewhere between composition criticism and narrative criticism. David P. Moessner, for example, states the following concerning his method: '[A]ny investigation of its [the Central Section of Luke] theology must first inquire about the intrinsic narrative configuration of the section itself as well as its relation to the full narrative shape of Luke–Acts'.<sup>27</sup> Robert Tannehill, another influential figure with respect to literary studies of Luke–Acts, similarly states:

I make use of narrative criticism in order to understand this narrative's message, a message that cannot be confined to theological statements but encompasses a rich set of attitudes and images that are embedded in the story and offered for our admiration and imitation ... In this volume I seek to use narrative criticism to explore how Acts conveys its complex message.

But then he adds: 'when we study a narrative as rhetoric and discover that certain values and beliefs are consistently advocated within it,

<sup>25</sup> Stephen D. Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), pp. 3–4. Notable representatives of composition criticism with respect to Luke–Acts include Robert O'Toole, *The Unity of Luke's Theology* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), especially pp. 9–10, 11; Charles Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroads, 1982); *idem*, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Crossroads, 1997).

<sup>26</sup> Moore, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels*, p. 10.

<sup>27</sup> David P. Moessner, *The Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1989), p. 6.

Cambridge University Press

978-0-521-17532-6 - The Speeches of Outsiders in Acts: Poetics, Theology and Historiography

Oswaldo Padilla

Excerpt

[More information](#)10 *The speeches of outsiders in Acts*

theological questions cannot be ignored'.<sup>28</sup> I offer one final quotation from Beverly Gaventa: 'Lukan theology is intricately and irreversibly bound up with the story he tells and cannot be separated from it. An attempt to do justice to the theology of Acts must struggle to reclaim the character of Acts as a narrative.'<sup>29</sup> The present method is situated within this tradition, concentrating both on the rhetorical (i.e. configuration and persuasion) dimensions of Acts as well as on its ideational message. I summarise the salient features of my approach below.

1. I shall concentrate on the final form of the text (Luke–Acts), working under the supposition that it exhibits unity at the theological level.<sup>30</sup>

2. My goal is to examine the speeches of outsiders, not for their historicity, but in order to understand their function in the narrative as a whole. Furthermore, the speeches will not be primarily used as 'windows' to look behind the text; my aim is rather to understand the

<sup>28</sup> Robert Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. 2 (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1990), p. 4.

<sup>29</sup> Beverly Gaventa, 'Toward a Theology of Acts: Reading and Rereading,' *Interpretation* 42 (1988): 150.

<sup>30</sup> Here the words of Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian*, pp. 44–5, are very helpful:

What is 'unity' in narrative? If unity of thought in the Pauline correspondence can be deduced from a consistent vocabulary, a uniform use of conceptual tools, and a coherence in the argumentative discussions, what can be said of narrative? Are the same indications discernible? Evidently not. A narrator does not expound his views as systematically as in an argumentative genre; ideas are transmitted indirectly through characters, or distilled in (implicit and explicit) commentaries. A storyteller like Luke does not always clearly present what he thinks. In brief, while narrativity in no way excludes coherence in the author's thought system, such coherence does not reveal itself in an argumentative type of logic ... I defend the following thesis: *the narrative of Luke–Acts does aim to provide a unifying effect at the theological level; but this unity is not announced in the text; it is devolved as a task to the reader who must construct this unity in the course of reading.*

The above statement is applicable both to the unity of thought in Luke and Acts as well as to the material unity of the two volumes. On the latter, see the important recent discussion generated by Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), who argues that there is no evidence, prior to Irenaeus, suggesting that Luke and Acts were read as one work. This conclusion is taken up by C. Kavin Rowe, 'History, Hermeneutics and the Unity of Luke–Acts', *JSNT* 28 (2005): 131–57, who asks some important hermeneutical questions in light of Gregory's thesis. Rowe is answered by Luke T. Johnson, 'Literary Criticism of Luke–Acts: Is Reception-History Pertinent?', *JSNT* 28 (2005): 159–62, who basically argues that the circumstantial and temporary gap between Irenaeus and the first readers of Luke and Acts makes it tenuous to put too much weight on reception-history to adjudicate on the unity or disunity of Luke and Acts.