

Cambridge University Press  
 0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech  
 and 1 Thessalonians  
 Steve Walton  
 Excerpt  
[More information](#)

# 1

## WHY STUDY THE MILETUS SPEECH?

The study of the portrait of Paul in Acts has a long history; it has been investigated by virtually every modern scholar who has written substantially on Acts. Two particular issues gave rise to this study: how far the portraits of Paul in Acts and the Pauline epistles are compatible, and what knowledge Luke<sup>1</sup> has of the Pauline epistles. In both of these debates Paul's Miletus speech (Acts 20.18b–35) is pivotal.

On the one hand, it is the only Pauline speech in Acts given to a Christian community – in other words, it is addressed to an 'epistle-like' situation, by contrast with other Pauline speeches, which are evangelistic or apologetic. It is therefore a key 'test case' for the compatibility of the two portraits of Paul, for it offers the opportunity to compare Luke's and Paul's dealings with Christians and, in particular, the understandings of Christian leadership which are presented.

On the other hand, the speech's language and ideas are widely recognised as paralleling the language and ideas of the Pauline epistles. This raises the question of the relationship between the speech and the epistles: are the epistles the source for the speech, directly or indirectly, or is Luke utilising independent Pauline tradition or composing freely?

In order to orientate ourselves, we shall consider the state of play in these debates and highlight the contribution which studying the Miletus speech can make to them. We shall also briefly survey previous work on the speech, to learn positively from the work of other scholars, as well as to identify their blind spots and failings.

<sup>1</sup> I use 'Luke' throughout to denote the author of the Third Gospel and Acts, without presupposing anything further about him (beyond his gender – see Alexander, 'Luke's Preface', p. 2 n. 2).

## 2 Leadership and Lifestyle

### 1.1 The Paul of Acts / Paul of the epistles debate

#### 1.1.1 Three schools of thought

Recent study of the relative values of Acts and the epistles as sources for the study of Paul – both his life and his thought – can be divided roughly into the ‘schools’ enumerated by Mattill.<sup>2</sup> They are not necessarily mutually exclusive: Mattill notes that some scholars seem to shift between one and another.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, they form useful broad categories to outline the debate. In each case Mattill considers the areas of general description; the method used to distinguish tradition from redaction; Paul’s *cursus vitae*; the supernatural; practices and principles; and Paul’s doctrine.<sup>4</sup>

First is the ‘One Paul View of the School of Historical Research’,<sup>5</sup> represented by scholars such as Rackham, Gasque and Bruce.<sup>6</sup> This ‘school’ sees only one Paul in Acts and epistles, and finds consistency with regard to the views of the law, the Jewish-Gentile problem, divine calling and adaptability to different kinds of people and situations. Proponents of this approach see the linguistic uniformity of Acts as a barrier to any separation of sources, and believe that the so-called ‘we’ sections<sup>7</sup> derive from Luke having been Paul’s travel-companion.

The ‘Lopsided Paul View of the School of Restrained Criticism’<sup>8</sup> is the second group, represented by scholars such as Munck, Harnack and Mattill himself.<sup>9</sup> This group believes that, while there is no absolute divergence between the two portraits of Paul, a

<sup>2</sup> Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’.

<sup>3</sup> Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’, pp. 77 n. 1, 83 n. 10.

<sup>4</sup> Mattill considers four ‘schools’, although the fourth includes only van Manen, whose views have not been followed in recent scholarship (e.g. he regards all of the Pauline corpus as pseudepigraphic) and are not germane to our topic. See Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’, pp. 95–7; van Manen, ‘Paul’.

<sup>5</sup> Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’, pp. 77–83.

<sup>6</sup> Rackham, *Acts*; Gasque, ‘Speeches of Acts’; Bruce, *Acts* (2nd edn); Bruce, ‘Speeches: Thirty Years After’ (but see n. 9 below).

<sup>7</sup> That is, the parts of the book narrated in the first person plural, namely Acts 16.10–17; 20.5–15; 21.1–18; 27.1–28.16. For brief discussion from the perspective of this ‘school’, see Bruce, *Acts* (3rd edn), pp. 40f.

<sup>8</sup> Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’, pp. 83–7.

<sup>9</sup> Munck, *Acts*; Harnack, *Acts*, esp. pp. 231–8; Mattill, ‘Purpose of Acts’. Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’, p. 77 n. 1 also suggests that the later Bruce belongs to this group, citing Bruce, ‘Paul of Acts’. We might add Bruce’s subsequent work, particularly Bruce, ‘Acts: Historical Record?’, in which he seems to go further towards a ‘lopsided Paul’ position.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Why study the Miletus speech?*

3

portrait of Paul emerging from either Acts or epistles alone would be lop-sided. Acts fills out gaps left by the epistles and the epistles may balance the one-sidedness of Acts. This ‘school’ holds that written sources lie behind the early parts of Acts, a consequence of the belief that Luke used Mark’s Gospel as a source plus the evidence of Luke 1.1–4 (especially the work of ‘the many’, verse 1). In the ‘we’ sections Luke is composing freely in describing events in which he took part – he continues to be seen as Paul’s travel-companion. This is why the (Pauline) speeches are not seen as free inventions of Luke, for Luke had heard Paul speak and understood him enough to present his thought reasonably accurately.

The third view is the ‘Two-Paul View of the School of Creative Edification’,<sup>10</sup> represented by Dibelius, Vielhauer, Haenchen and Conzelmann.<sup>11</sup> These scholars see the Paul of the (authentic) Pauline epistles (at least, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians and Galatians) as the historical Paul. The portrait to be found in Acts is the work of an admirer of Paul looking from some distance, both chronologically and theologically. Acts is only to be depended upon when it is corroborated by the epistles. Luke is not Paul’s travel-companion,<sup>12</sup> but an ‘edifier’ of the church of his day – which means that the primary significance of Acts is not as an historical record: ‘it is above all a *religious* book that we are dealing with. [Luke] is trying to show the powers of the Christian spirit with which the persons in his narrative are charged, and which he wishes to make live in his readers.’<sup>13</sup> The portrait of Paul thus created is virtually fictional. Miracles and events involving the supernatural are regarded as unhistorical, on the grounds that they are incredible. The speeches are seen as free compositions by the author. Haenchen’s commentary is a brilliant exposition of Acts from this perspective.<sup>14</sup>

## 1.1.2 Vielhauer and Haenchen

It is the debate between these views that is of interest for our study. In particular, Vielhauer continues to be cited as having shown that

<sup>10</sup> Mattill, ‘Value of Acts’, pp. 88–95.

<sup>11</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*; Vielhauer, ‘Paulinism of Acts’; Haenchen, *Acts*; Conzelmann, *Theology of St Luke*; Conzelmann, *Acts*.

<sup>12</sup> With the exception of Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 95 n. 4.

<sup>13</sup> Dibelius, *Fresh Approach*, p. 265 (italics his).

<sup>14</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)4 *Leadership and Lifestyle*

the theology of Paul in Acts is incompatible with that found in his letters.<sup>15</sup> His article, in combination with Haenchen's arguments on the subject in his commentary,<sup>16</sup> set the agenda for scholarly study of the portrait of Paul in Acts for a generation. We shall therefore summarise their arguments before looking at the responses that resulted.

Vielhauer's important essay appeared in 1950, and its influence was increased by an English translation in 1966. Vielhauer argues that the Paul of Acts is at variance with the Paul of the epistles at four significant theological points.

First, the Paul of Acts shows a natural theology closer to the later apologists than the real Paul.<sup>17</sup> Vielhauer contrasts the Areopagus speech (Acts 17.22–31) with Romans 1.18–32. He believes the speech offers a positive view of pagan religion as a *praeparatio evangelica* – Acts 17.28f implies people may find God on the basis of human kinship to the deity.<sup>18</sup> The tone of the Areopagus speech is enlightenment, not accusation – by contrast with Romans 1, where mention of 'natural' knowledge of God appears in the context of God's wrath.<sup>19</sup> The natural theology functions differently in the two contexts – in Athens it is seen positively and can be built on by Paul, whereas in Romans its sole purpose is to show that people are responsible for their actions.

Second, Vielhauer sees the Paul of Acts as having a positive view of the Jewish law, whereas the real Paul waged an anti-Jewish polemic against the law.<sup>20</sup> Vielhauer believes eight points show the Lukan Paul's loyalty to the law: his missionary method of beginning with the synagogue in each place; his submission to the Jerusalem authorities; his circumcision of Timothy (Acts 16.3); his spreading of the apostolic decree (Acts 16.4); his assumption of a

<sup>15</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts'. Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 48 implies that Vielhauer's article marks the opening of a new chapter in study of Acts. Vielhauer's influence can be seen in Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity*, pp. 133–6, who repeats most of the ideas of Vielhauer's article (without acknowledgement).

<sup>16</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 112–16.

<sup>17</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', pp. 34–7.

<sup>18</sup> Vielhauer argues in dependence upon Dibelius' analysis of the Areopagus speech, which posits a Stoic origin for many of the speech's key ideas (Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, pp. 26–77, originally published in German in 1939). Dibelius' work is in turn dependent on Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 28 n. 27). For critique of Vielhauer and Dibelius, see Gempf, 'Historical and Literary Appropriateness', pp. 111–34; Gempf, 'Athens, Paul at'.

<sup>19</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', p. 36, citing Rom. 1.18, 20, 21.

<sup>20</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', pp. 37–43.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Why study the Miletus speech?*

5

vow (Acts 18.18); his journeys to Jerusalem for festivals (Acts 18.21; 20.16); his participation in a Nazirite vow (Acts 21.18–28); and his stress on being a Pharisee when on trial (Acts 23.6; 26.5). By contrast, the historical Paul believed that in Christ he was free from the Jewish law. He could therefore accommodate himself to Jewish practices at times (1 Cor. 9.19–23), while being unbending when the substance of the gospel was at stake (e.g. Gal. 2). Vielhauer cannot accept that the Paul who wrote Galatians 5.2–6 could have circumcised Timothy, for to be circumcised must have allowed saving significance to the law. Even in Acts 13.38f, which Vielhauer sees as the only place where Luke's Paul speaks thematically on the law's significance, there are contrasts with the real Paul: justification is equated with the forgiveness of sins, something that Paul never does; forgiveness derives from Jesus' messiahship, based on the resurrection, rather than coming from the death of Jesus; and justification is partial, being 'also by faith'.<sup>21</sup> This misrepresentation of Paul results from Luke's Gentile origins, which meant that he had never experienced the law as a means of salvation, and so he did not grasp the Pauline antithesis of law and Christ.

Third, Vielhauer sees Christological differences between Paul in Acts and Paul in the epistles.<sup>22</sup> He sees Acts 13.13–43; 26.22f as the only extended Pauline statements on Christology in the book, both made before Jews. There, Paul asserts that Jesus is the Messiah, using scriptural proof-texts in support. Vielhauer sees the obvious Pauline parallels (Rom. 1.3f; 1 Cor. 15.3f) as pre-Pauline formulae<sup>23</sup> which therefore display neither Luke's nor Paul's Christology, but that of the earliest congregations. Likewise, the Christological statements of Acts 13.16–37; 26.22f are the views of the earliest congregations, and neither Pauline nor Lukan. Lukan Christology is 'adoptionistic', whereas Pauline Christology is meta-physical.

Fourth, Vielhauer sees the Lukan Paul's eschatology as different from the real Paul's. Paul himself expected an imminent parousia;

<sup>21</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', p. 42 (italics his).

<sup>22</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', pp. 43–5.

<sup>23</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', p. 44 n. 32 cites Bultmann, *Theology*, vol. 1, p. 49 in support of the assertion that Rom. 1.3f is non-Pauline. But Bultmann offers no arguments! (Cf., *contra*, Wright, 'Messiah and People of God', pp. 51–5.) Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', pp. 43f observes that Paul states 1 Cor. 15.3f to be tradition from the earliest congregation, in agreement with Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, pp. 101–3 and, more recently, Fee, *1 Corinthians*, p. 718.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)6 *Leadership and Lifestyle*

this motivated his work and determined his relationship with the world (1 Cor. 7.29ff). He never speaks of the ‘age to come’, since the fullness of time is already here. By contrast the Lukan Paul presents Luke’s own eschatology, which expects the parousia in the distant future and replaces the imminent expectation by a theology of history ‘as a continuous redemptive process’.<sup>24</sup> This is why Luke writes a history of the early church at all – those who are expecting the end of the world any moment do not write their own history!<sup>25</sup>

Haenchen accepts Vielhauer’s points<sup>26</sup> and adds further discrepancies. First, Luke’s Paul is a great miracle-worker (Acts 13.6–12; 14.8–10, 19f; 20.7–12; 28.3–6), whereas the real Paul’s exploits were so unexceptional that his opponents could deny that he performed miracles.<sup>27</sup> Second, the Paul of Acts is an outstanding orator, but the real Paul was a feeble and unimpressive speaker (2 Cor. 10.10). Third, Luke did not accept Paul’s claim to be an apostle; for Luke, only the Twelve were apostles, for they alone were witnesses to the ministry, teaching, death and resurrection of Jesus.<sup>28</sup> Fourth, Haenchen contrasts Luke’s portrayal of the risen Jesus eating and drinking with the disciples and Paul’s belief that Jesus was no longer flesh and blood (1 Cor. 15.50).<sup>29</sup> Luke’s image of the risen Jesus was the kind required for a later generation, when eyewitnesses were no longer available and the threats of gnostic docetism and Jewish or pagan scepticism appeared.

## 1.1.3 Responses to Vielhauer and Haenchen

Responses may conveniently be considered as methodological or evidential. There have been responses on particular points, notably

<sup>24</sup> Vielhauer, ‘Paulinism of Acts’, p. 47.

<sup>25</sup> The outlines of an understanding of Luke as a proponent of nascent *Frühkatholizismus* can here be seen, and are developed more fully by Conzelmann, *Theology of St Luke*; Käsemann, *NT Questions*, pp. 21f, 236 n. 1; Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, pp. 341–66 (esp. 346–9, 352–8, 362).

<sup>26</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 48f.

<sup>27</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 113f sees this as the background to 2 Cor. 12.12.

<sup>28</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 114 n. 5 sees the use of ‘apostles’ of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 14.4, 14) as irrelevant, since they are envoys from Antioch. But Wilson, *Gentiles*, pp. 113–20 (esp. 116f) argues cogently that Luke used the term ‘apostles’ both as a shorthand for the Twelve and for a wider group of apostles, including Paul and Barnabas – a group recognised by Paul as apostles too (e.g. Rom. 16.7; Gal. 1.1; 1 Cor. 9.6; 15.5); cf. Clark, ‘Role of the Apostles’, esp. pp. 182–90.

<sup>29</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 114f.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Why study the Miletus speech?*

7

Vielhauer's four contrasts,<sup>30</sup> but these are not particularly relevant to our theme.

*Methodological responses*

Critics of Vielhauer and Haenchen cite problems caused by the nature and paucity of material at our disposal in considering the 'theologies' of Luke and Paul. Luke's account is selective and episodic, impressionistic rather than integrated, and linked together by generalising summaries or an itinerary.<sup>31</sup> In Acts, we have only three recorded missionary sermons of Paul, which can only be summaries.<sup>32</sup> Hengel asserts that to see Luke primarily as a 'theologian' is to err:

The radical 'redactional-critical' approach so popular today, which sees Luke above all as a freely inventive theologian, mistakes his real purpose, namely that as a Christian 'historian' he sets out to report the events of the past that provided the foundation for the faith and its extension. He does not set out primarily to present his own 'theology'.<sup>33</sup>

Further, Paul's role in Luke's writings is not primarily as a theologian, but 'as the missionary, the charismatic and the founder

<sup>30</sup> On natural theology, see Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 45f; Gärtner, *Areopagus Speech*; Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, pp. 213f, 288, 290; Bruce, 'Paul of Acts', 301–3; Marshall, *Acts* (NT Guides), pp. 96f. On the law, see Gasque, 'Book of Acts and History', p. 66 n. 39; Marshall, *Acts* (NT Guides), p. 97. (The debate over Paul's understanding of the law has moved on considerably in the light of the 'new perspective'. For discussion, see Cranfield, *Romans*, vol. II, pp. 845–62; Sanders, *Paul, Law and Jewish*; Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law*, esp. pp. 183–214; Wright, *Climax*, esp. p. 208.) On Christology, see Ellis, *Luke*, p. 46; Marshall, *Acts* (NT Guides), p. 62; Moule, 'Christology of Acts', pp. 171, 182. On eschatology, see Hengel, *Acts and the History*, p. 59; Ellis, *Luke*, pp. 48–50; Munck, *Paul and the Salvation*, pp. 36–55; Borgen, 'Paul to Luke'; Wenham, *Paul*, pp. 297–304; Maddox, *Purpose of Luke-Acts*, pp. 115–32; Moore, *Parousia in the NT*.

<sup>31</sup> Davies, *Gospel and Land*, p. 285.

<sup>32</sup> Barclay, 'Comparison', p. 165. Marshall, *Acts* (TNTC), p. 41 argues forcefully that the speeches were never meant to be seen as verbatim reports, since: (a) it would only take a few minutes to read each one, whereas Luke indicates that Paul spoke at length (Acts 20.7!); (b) it is unlikely that audiences remembered what early Christian preachers said, or that the preachers themselves kept records; (c) at times it is evident that Luke is summarising by the variant forms of the same speech that are reported (e.g. the message of the angel to Cornelius: Acts 10.4–6, 31f); (d) on some occasions it is impossible for Luke to have known what was said, such as Festus and Agrippa's private conversation (Acts 25.13–22; 26.30–2).

<sup>33</sup> Hengel, *Acts and the History*, pp. 67f.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)8 *Leadership and Lifestyle*

of communities'.<sup>34</sup> Therefore the nature of Acts as a source is not easily conducive to reading off Paul's theology as Luke understands it.

On the other hand, Hengel rightly notices what a limited knowledge of Paul's preaching the epistles provide.<sup>35</sup> Moreover, the epistles are occasional documents responding to particular situations, rather than full expositions of Paul's thought.<sup>36</sup>

In the light of the paucity of material, Gasque argues for caution, comparing the knowledge of Paul available from such limited sources with the picture of Augustine or Luther or Barth which a similarly limited range of source material would give us.<sup>37</sup>

The alleged contrast between history and edification is a second target for critics. Haenchen, Gasque observes, alleges that Luke has no concern for historical accuracy, but rather is concerned to edify the church.<sup>38</sup> Gasque properly asks whether the two are mutually exclusive. Haenchen confuses two issues: first, the distinction between aiming at history or edification; and second, measuring how accurately a writer records history. Hemer stresses that sweeping statements that ancient historians felt free to be creative are too strong, for 'at least some of the ancients were moved by a lively concern for historical accuracy'.<sup>39</sup>

Bruce suggests that differences between the 'two Pauls' may be those which would be expected between a portrait by another and a self-portrait.<sup>40</sup> Marshall argues in a related vein that the differences may be explicable by the dissimilar interests and audiences of the writers – Luke's concerns focusing on the evangelistic mission of Paul and his relation with Jewish Christians, and Paul's on problems in emerging new churches and freedom from the law for Gentile Christians.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>34</sup> Hengel, *Between Jesus and Paul*, p. 110.

<sup>35</sup> Hengel, *Acts and the History*, p. 43.

<sup>36</sup> Jervell, *Unknown Paul*, pp. 52f; Hemer and Gempf, *Book of Acts*, p. 246.

<sup>37</sup> Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, p. 289.

<sup>38</sup> Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, p. 246, citing Haenchen, 'Acts as Source Material', p. 278. It is inaccurate of Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, pp. 206f to describe Dibelius as pre-judging the question of historicity. Rather, Dibelius appears to shelve the question (e.g. Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 184). It is Dibelius' successors, such as Haenchen, who assume that Dibelius has shown that certain events were unhistorical, e.g. Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 590 on the Miletus speech. Cf. Gempf, 'Historical and Literary Appropriateness', pp. 70f.

<sup>39</sup> Hemer and Gempf, *Book of Acts*, p. 69.

<sup>40</sup> Bruce, 'Paul of Acts', 282; see also § 2.5 on Acts' categorisation as 'secondary'.

<sup>41</sup> Marshall, *Acts (TNTC)*, p. 43 n. 4. Cf. Marshall, *Acts (NT Guides)*, p. 96 for a later re-statement; cf. Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, p. xxxvi.



Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Why study the Miletus speech?*

9

Then, Gasque argues that Haenchen is antipathetic to Luke's theology (as Haenchen understands it).<sup>42</sup> In particular Gasque believes that Haenchen reads Lukan theology in Acts through (Haenchen's own) existentialist Lutheran spectacles, with the result that Luke comes off second best to Paul. Gasque criticises Haenchen and Vielhauer for misrepresenting both Luke and Paul, since they present Luke as the father of *Frühkatholizismus* and Paul as a great existentialist Lutheran.

A final methodological criticism is that the comparison made is the wrong one. It is *prima facie* likely that Paul's preaching outside the Christian community would be different from his teaching within that community.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, it is mistaken to compare the theology of Paul in his speeches in Acts as a whole with that in his epistles as a whole.

Jervell<sup>44</sup> develops this point in arguing that the historical Paul may well have agreed on much with the generality of early Christians, but that we only see hints of this in the epistles, because of their (often) polemical content. He criticises Vielhauer for his reliance on Paul's ideas, seen separately from his actions, as his source for Paul's beliefs. Jervell finds hints in the epistles of a Jewish-Christian Paul who lived in accordance with the law (e.g. 1 Cor. 9.19–21), and argues that this is the Paul of the oral tradition which lies behind the Paul of Acts. Accordingly, he claims, we need to look carefully in both epistles and Acts for a Paul who is in agreement with other Christians, rather than polarise the two.

*Evidential responses*

A number of scholars point to similarities in the two portraits of Paul, notably Bruce. He observes a number of 'undesigned coincidences' between the two, including biographical and similar information<sup>45</sup> and, more significantly for our discussion, the impression of Paul given by the two sources.<sup>46</sup> Bruce draws attention to Paul's self-support (Acts 18.3; 20.34; 1 Thess. 2.9; 2 Thess. 3.7f; 1 Cor. 9.18); his policy of going first to Jews and then to Gentiles (Acts 13.46; Rom. 1.16; 2.9f); his adaptability (in Acts to Jew and

<sup>42</sup> Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, p. 246.

<sup>43</sup> Barclay, 'Comparison', p. 175; Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, p. 291; Bruce, *Speeches in Acts*, p. 26.

<sup>44</sup> Jervell, *Unknown Paul*, pp. 52–76.

<sup>45</sup> Bruce, 'Paul of Acts', 285–93. <sup>46</sup> Bruce, 'Paul of Acts', 293–8.

Cambridge University Press

0521780063 - Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech  
and 1 Thessalonians

Steve Walton

Excerpt

[More information](#)

## 10 Leadership and Lifestyle

Gentile, learned and unlearned, Athenians and Sanhedrin, cf. 1 Cor. 9.19–23), which explains why Paul at times lives as a Jew among Jews (e.g. Acts 18.18; 21.23ff). Bruce argues that the circumcision of Timothy (Acts 16.3) does not contradict Paul's hostility to circumcision (e.g. Gal. 5.3), for in Galatians Paul takes issue with the view that circumcision is necessary for salvation, while seeing circumcision *of itself* as a matter of indifference (Gal. 5.6; 6.15). Hengel, likewise, argues that if he had refused to circumcise Timothy, Paul would have been seen as supporting apostasy and synagogue doors would close to him. Therefore it is feasible that Paul did circumcise Timothy.<sup>47</sup>

A second criticism relates to speeches. Vielhauer and Haenchen build their study of the speeches on the work of Dibelius.<sup>48</sup> Dibelius focuses on the literary artistry of Luke in the speeches, continually asking the question, 'What did *Luke* intend to put across by this speech?'<sup>49</sup> His approach is predicated on two axioms: that the speeches in their present form are the work of Luke;<sup>50</sup> and that the question whether the speeches were delivered is irrelevant. At times he appears to assume that a speech cannot be a summary of what was said, but without discussing his reasons for this axiom.

Criticisms of Dibelius have been legion. His view of the role of speeches in the ancient historians has been challenged.<sup>51</sup> Gasque and Hemer argue that the evidence contradicts Dibelius' assertion that ancient historians uniformly invented speeches for historical figures where source material was lacking; they reply partly by producing claimed counter-examples, and partly by claiming that the interpretation of a key passage in Thucydides (1.22.1) offered by Dibelius is mistaken.<sup>52</sup>

Gasque also offers evidence that Luke did not freely compose speeches.<sup>53</sup> Gasque sees a contrast between the speeches in Acts

<sup>47</sup> Hengel, *Acts and the History*, p. 64.

<sup>48</sup> Vielhauer, 'Paulinism of Acts', p. 33 n. 1; Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 34–7, 39–41.

<sup>49</sup> e.g. Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 144, writing about ancient historians, asserts: 'What seems to the author his most important obligation is not . . . establishing what speech was actually made; to him, it is rather that of introducing speeches into the structure in a way which will be relevant to his purpose.'

<sup>50</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 3.

<sup>51</sup> Gasque, 'Speeches of Acts', pp. 242–6; Gasque, 'Book of Acts and History', pp. 59–61; Hemer, 'Luke the Historian', pp. 29–34; Hemer and Gempf, *Book of Acts*, pp. 63–100. For critical discussion of Gasque's arguments in the light of study of Graeco-Roman historical writing, see Gempf, 'Public Speaking', esp. pp. 295f.

<sup>52</sup> On the Thucydides passage, cf. Porter, 'Thucydides 1.22.1'.

<sup>53</sup> Gasque, 'Book of Acts and History', pp. 61–3.