

# Leadership and Lifestyle

The portrait of Paul in the Miletus speech  
and 1 Thessalonians

**STEVE WALTON**

*London Bible College*



**CAMBRIDGE**  
**UNIVERSITY PRESS**

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE  
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS  
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK  
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA  
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia  
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Cambridge University Press 2000

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception  
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,  
no reproduction of any part may take place without  
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

*Typeset* Times Roman 10/12pt *System* 3b2 [CE]

*A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library*

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data*

Walton, Steve, Dr.

Leadership and lifestyle: the portrait of Paul in the Miletus speech  
and 1 Thessalonians / Steve Walton.

p. cm.

Originally presented as the author's thesis (doctoral) – University of  
Sheffield, 1997.

Includes bibliographical references and indexes.

ISBN 0 521 78006 3 (hardback)

1. Bible. N.T. Acts XX, 18–35 – Criticism, interpretation, etc.
2. Bible. N.T. Thessalonians, 1st – Criticism, interpretation, etc.
3. Paul, the Apostle, Saint.
4. Leadership – Biblical teaching. I. Title.

BS2625.2.W25 2000

225.9'2–dc21 99–051378

ISBN 0 521 78006 3 hardback

## CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	page xi
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xiii

<b>1 Why study the Miletus speech?</b>	1
1.1 The Paul of Acts / Paul of the epistles debate	2
1.2 Luke's knowledge of the Pauline epistles	14
1.3 Review of previous work on the speech	17
1.4 Orientation of this study	32
<b>2 Are parallels in the eye of the beholder?</b>	34
2.1 Introduction	34
2.2 Parallelism in Luke-Acts	34
2.3 What kind of unity have Luke and Acts?	40
2.4 A hierarchy of connections	44
2.5 Acts and the Pauline parallels	47
2.6 Conclusion	51
<b>3 The Miletus speech in context</b>	52
3.1 Immediate context	52
3.2 Literary genre	55
3.3 Structure	66
3.4 Overview of contents	75
3.5 Themes	84
<b>EXCURSUS 1: THE TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF ACTS 20.28b</b>	94
<b>4 The Miletus speech and Luke's Gospel</b>	99
4.1 Introduction	99
4.2 Luke 22.14–38	100

4.3	Luke 12.1–53	118
4.4	Luke 21.5–36	128
4.5	Briefer passages	130
4.6	Conclusion: leadership	134
<b>EXCURSUS 2: THE TEXT OF LUKE 22.17–20</b>		<b>137</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>The Miletus speech and 1 Thessalonians</b>	<b>140</b>
5.1	Introduction	140
5.2	Orientation to 1 Thessalonians	142
5.3	From the Miletus speech to 1 Thessalonians	157
5.4	From 1 Thessalonians to the Miletus speech	174
5.5	Leadership in 1 Thessalonians	183
5.6	Conclusions	185
<b>6</b>	<b>The Miletus speech, Ephesians and 2 Timothy</b>	<b>186</b>
6.1	Ephesians and the Miletus speech	186
6.2	2 Timothy and the Miletus speech	192
6.3	Conclusion	198
<b>7</b>	<b>Concluding reflections</b>	<b>199</b>
7.1	Review and summary of results	199
7.2	Implications for study of the Miletus speech	201
7.3	Implications for the Paul of Acts / Paul of the epistles debate	212
7.4	Future work suggested by this study	213
	<i>Bibliography</i>	215
	<i>Index of ancient texts</i>	240
	<i>Index of modern authors</i>	253
	<i>Index of subjects</i>	255

# 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).

## 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.

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*.

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.



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 metaphysical.

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', p. 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.

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*, pp. 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

and those in ‘obviously inferior Greek historians’, such as Josephus. He cites Ehrhardt’s observation<sup>54</sup> that there are obvious occasions in Acts where Luke could have inserted a speech (e.g. after 5.21 and 28.6<sup>55</sup>) but chose not to do so, proposing that the lack of a speech at such points results from the author’s lack of knowledge of a speech on that occasion. Gasque believes that the Third Gospel’s use of Mark provides evidence of the author’s method: there, he does not freely invent speeches of Jesus. Therefore the possibility should be considered that in Acts Luke works similarly.

Gasque regards the linguistic and theological diversity of the speeches in Acts as significant. As one example, he refers to the speeches of Stephen, Peter, and Paul in Athens and Miletus, concurring with Moule that there are varying Christologies within these speeches.<sup>56</sup> This suggests that Luke has not uniformly imposed his own theology on the speeches, and that they cannot be read simply as expressions of Luke’s own view.

Jervell believes that Luke had access to traditions about the apostles and early churches in composing Acts.<sup>57</sup> He finds places in the Pauline epistles where Paul shows that the formation of an already existing church is part of the missionary proclamation of the gospel in another place (e.g. Rom. 1.8; 1 Thess. 1.8ff; 2 Cor. 3.1–3).<sup>58</sup> He further identifies allusions to stories about the life of a congregation being used in paraenesis and paraclesis (e.g. 1 Thess. 3.6; 2 Thess. 1.3ff).<sup>59</sup> Finally, Jervell finds the Jerusalem church being used by Paul as a model for other churches (e.g. 1 Thess. 2.14; Rom. 15.6–28).<sup>60</sup> Jervell concludes that conditions favoured the formation and preservation of traditions about the apostles and their churches.<sup>61</sup>

Such scholars also seek to provide an historical framework for Luke’s writing on the basis of the evidence available, with the limited aim of undercutting claims that Acts is entirely unhistorical. For example, Hemer cites Ramsay’s work,<sup>62</sup> which shows Luke’s

<sup>54</sup> Ehrhardt, *Framework*, p. 88.

<sup>55</sup> Mis-cited by Ehrhardt as 28.16, a mistake reproduced in Gasque, ‘Book of Acts and History’, p. 62.

<sup>56</sup> Moule, ‘Christology of Acts’, esp. pp. 166–72.

<sup>57</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, pp. 19–39.

<sup>58</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, pp. 23–8.

<sup>59</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, pp. 28–30.

<sup>60</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, pp. 32f.

<sup>61</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, p. 36.

<sup>62</sup> Hemer, ‘Luke the Historian’, 36–9, citing Ramsay, *St Paul*; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, vol. II, p. cxiv, providing a similar list of features represented accurately by Luke.

accuracy on small points of administrative and geographical detail – Hemer sees this as suggesting that it is likely that Luke is reporting first hand, particularly because the library resources available to modern scholars writing historical novels (for example) were not freely available to ancient writers.

Similarly, after his own extensive discussion of a considerable number of points of contact between Acts and external evidence, Hemer affirms that he is not seeking ‘to *prove* the historicity of Acts’,<sup>63</sup> but believes that the accuracy on detail which Luke demonstrates is an important factor in an estimation of Luke as a writer.

#### 1.1.4 The relevance of the Miletus speech

Paul’s speech at Miletus is central to this discussion, for it contains a number of parallels of vocabulary with the Pauline epistles. Indeed, Dodd asserts that this implies either that Luke used the epistles (which he regards as unlikely) or that he used reminiscences of a genuine Pauline speech.<sup>64</sup>

The Miletus speech occurs within a ‘we’ section of Acts<sup>65</sup> and is the only speech of Paul to occur within such a section. Bruce therefore believes the author was present and suggests that Luke may have taken shorthand notes.<sup>66</sup> At least, the ‘we’ sections have

<sup>63</sup> Hemer and Gempf, *Book of Acts*, p. 219 (italics his).

<sup>64</sup> Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, p. 32. For verse-by-verse lists of parallels, see, e.g., Rackham, *Acts*, pp. 389–96; Bruce, *Acts* (3rd edn), pp. 429–37; Conzelmann, *Acts*, pp. 173–6; Johnson, *Acts*, pp. 360–6.

<sup>65</sup> Although 20.18–38 itself is in the third person. The first person plural is found in 20.6–15; 21.1–18. Nonetheless, the first person plural in 20.15, recording the arrival in Miletus, implies that 20.18–38 should be seen as part of the ‘we’ section, *contra* Barrett, *Acts*, vol. II, p. xxvi.

<sup>66</sup> Bruce, *Acts* (2nd edn), p. 377. Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 590 can only respond with an exclamation mark to this suggestion, but Bruce, ‘Speeches: Thirty Years After’, p. 63 argues that shorthand was not unknown in the first century and that Luke is the kind of man who would use it. For evidence of shorthand in our period see Milne (ed.), *Greek Shorthand Manuals*, p. 1; Kenyon, ‘Tachygraphy’. Both cite Diogenes Laertius 2.48 (concerning Xenophon (4th century BC) being the first to represent spoken words using signs (ὕποσημειωσαμένος τὰ λεγόμενα)); Plutarch *Cato Minor* 23.3 (attributing the introduction of shorthand in Rome to Cicero in 63 BC); Cicero *Letters to Atticus* 13.32 (3 June 45 BC, where Cicero suggests that Atticus might not have understood what he wrote concerning the ten legates, because he wrote it διὰ σημείων; the use of the Greek term in a Latin author Milne and Kenyon understand to mean that the Greek shorthand system preceded the Latin).



been understood as indicating a source used by Luke which goes back to eyewitness testimony.<sup>67</sup>

Further, the Miletus speech echoes the theology of Paul. Most notably, verse 28 contains the most explicit reference to the redemptive significance of the death of Jesus in Acts. Moule claims not only that the theology of Paul is heard at this point, but also that the situation is like that of a Pauline letter – Paul is ‘recalling an already evangelized community to its deepest insights’.<sup>68</sup>

The audience of the speech is also significant. Moule argues that it is likely that Paul would speak differently to a non-Christian audience by comparison with addressing those who were already Christians. This is why the Miletus speech is pivotal for the comparison of the two portraits of Paul, for it is the only occasion in Acts where Paul speaks to Christians: all the other Pauline speeches are evangelistic.<sup>69</sup>

Haenchen is quite dismissive of the possibility that the Paul of the Miletus speech may be similar to the Paul of the epistles, claiming, ‘Dibelius finally proved the speech to be Luke’s work and evaluated it.’<sup>70</sup> However, Dibelius himself carefully differentiates the task of examining the artistry of Luke in writing the speech and the question of the origins of the speech. On the latter, he asserts that we cannot know whether Paul spoke at Miletus or what he said there.<sup>71</sup> Thus Dibelius side-steps the question of the historicity of the speech and the portrait of Paul it offers.

So the Miletus speech provides a significant test case for the Vielhauer-Haenchen thesis that the ‘two Pauls’ are at variance theologically. If the Paul of the speech proves to be quite different from the Paul of the epistles, their thesis may be well grounded; if not, questions are raised against it.

<sup>67</sup> Pace Robbins, ‘By Land’, pp. 215–43. For critique see Porter, ‘We Passages’, esp. pp. 554–8; Hemer, ‘First Person Narrative’.

<sup>68</sup> Moule, ‘Christology of Acts’, p. 171. The first proponent of the similarity of the situation at Miletus to the Pauline epistles seems to be Tholuck, ‘Reden’.

<sup>69</sup> Moule, ‘Christology of Acts’, p. 173. He further observes that there are a small number of occasions within the epistles (where Paul is undoubtedly addressing professing Christians) where Paul recalls his initial evangelistic message (he cites 1 Thess. 1.10; Rom. 1.3f; 1 Cor. 15.1ff), and it is notable that these summaries approximate to the ‘bare κήρυγμα of the Acts’.

<sup>70</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 590.

<sup>71</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 158.

## 1.2 Luke's knowledge of the Pauline epistles

A related debate concerns whether Luke knew and used the Pauline epistles in writing Acts. The 'Tübingen school' of the last century believed that Luke was writing Acts in the second century to reconcile the Petrine and Pauline versions of Christianity, and therefore assumed that Luke had access to the epistles.<sup>72</sup>

Subsequent research tended to react against this axiom as part and parcel of the reaction against the Tübingen reconstruction of early Christianity.<sup>73</sup> It was left to Enslin in 1938 to re-open the question.<sup>74</sup> More recent work has divided on this issue, with some arguing that Luke knew the epistles, but did not utilise them in writing Acts; some that Luke knew and used the epistles; and some that Luke did not know the epistles at all. We shall briefly summarise the main lines of argument before indicating the relevance of the Miletus speech.

### 1.2.1 The case for no knowledge

The case for Luke not having known the letters hinges on three arguments.<sup>75</sup> First, if Luke had known the letters, he would surely have used them in writing Acts. Scholars believe it is incredible that Luke, having such a rich source at his disposal, would decline to use it.<sup>76</sup>

Second, there is no hint in Acts that Paul wrote letters. But if Luke had known that Paul wrote letters, even if Luke had no access to them, he would have mentioned that fact in Acts, not least because Paul's letters were acknowledged to be 'weighty and strong' (2 Cor. 10.10).

Third, Luke provides quotations from letters elsewhere in Acts (e.g. 15.23–9; 23.26–30). This shows that he had no *a priori* objection to letters as such. If he had access to Pauline epistles, there were natural opportunities within the narrative to quote

<sup>72</sup> For a helpful summary of the 'Tübingen school', see Gasque, *History of the Criticism*, pp. 21–54.

<sup>73</sup> Thus Emmet and Windisch in Foakes Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings*, vol. I, pp. 297, 308 (arguing respectively for and against the identification of Luke as the travel-companion of Paul) both agree that Luke did not know the Pauline epistles.

<sup>74</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul".

<sup>75</sup> e.g. Enslin, 'Once Again', p. 253; Walker, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus', p. 3.

<sup>76</sup> e.g. Zahn, *Introduction*, vol. III, p. 119.

them. The lack of such quotations demonstrates that Luke did not have such access.

Thus the case for Luke's lack of knowledge of the epistles is put.<sup>77</sup> This argument is combined by some with the view that Luke was the travel-companion of Paul. Some of these scholars then argue that Luke knew Paul so well that he would not need to use the epistles, which makes the case one for having knowledge, but not using it.<sup>78</sup> Others also hold that Luke never knew Paul.<sup>79</sup>

### 1.2.2 The case for knowledge

Enslin, Knox and Walker argue that Luke had access to the Pauline epistles.<sup>80</sup> Enslin and Walker hold that Luke used the letters, whereas Knox believes that Luke preferred to use independent traditions, because of the association of Paul with schism in Luke's day.<sup>81</sup> Three arguments favour Luke knowing and using the letters.

First, it is mistaken to claim that Luke would not have modified and transformed his sources. On the basis of the freedom with which he believes Luke handles Matthew and Mark,<sup>82</sup> Enslin

<sup>77</sup> e.g. Bruce, *Book of Acts* (revised edn), p. 15; Conzelmann, *Acts*, p. xxxiii; Haenchen, *Acts*, pp. 125f; Hemer and Gempf, *Book of Acts*, p. 245; Hengel, *Acts and the History*, pp. 38, 66; Longenecker, 'Acts', pp. 237f; Maddox, *Purpose of Luke-Acts*, p. 68; Marshall, *Acts* (TNTC), p. 48.

<sup>78</sup> e.g. Bruce, *Commentary on Acts*, p. 25 n. 30. He appears to have changed his mind on the grounds for this view, while continuing to hold that Luke was Paul's travel-companion, in Bruce, *Acts* (3rd edn), p. 53. Hengel, *Acts and the History*, p. 66 suggests that the reason for Luke's lack of knowledge of the letters is that, by the time he began travelling with Paul, almost all of the letters (save Philippians and Philemon) were already written. Marshall, *Acts* (TNTC), p. 48 n. 1 suggests that the epistles are not mentioned because Luke's concerns were with the progress of the gospel, rather than the internal problems of Paul's churches – thus the crisis in Corinth, known to us from the epistles, receives no mention in Acts. Walaskay, *Acts*, pp. 4, 190 argues that Luke can show a deep understanding of Pauline theology, particularly in the Miletus speech, but he has internalised Paul's teaching, rather than simply quoting the letters (which Walaskay thinks Luke knew).

<sup>79</sup> e.g. Conzelmann, *Acts*, p. xxxiii.

<sup>80</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul"; Enslin, 'Once Again'; Enslin, *Reapproaching Paul*, pp. 25f; Enslin, 'Luke, the Literary Physician'; Knox, 'Acts and Pauline Letter Corpus'; Walker, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus'.

<sup>81</sup> Knox, 'Acts and Pauline Letter Corpus', pp. 281–6; cf. Schmithals, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 15f, arguing that Luke saw the epistles as suspect because of their use by hyper-Pauline false teachers, against whom Luke was directing a polemic.

<sup>82</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 82f, Enslin, 'Once Again', p. 256. Enslin rejects the existence of Q.

claims that Luke handled the Pauline epistles with liberty, amending their information at various points.

Second, examples of Luke using the letters are proposed: the destinations visited by Paul in Acts are either destinations for the epistles, or places mentioned in the epistles;<sup>83</sup> 1 Corinthians 15 is the source for the appearance to Simon (Luke 24.34) and the period of time after the resurrection during which Jesus was seen (Acts 13.30f);<sup>84</sup> some unusual vocabulary is shared by Acts and the Paulines;<sup>85</sup> Paul's escape from Damascus (Acts 9.23–5; 2 Cor. 11.32f);<sup>86</sup> the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15.1ff; Gal. 2.1–10, 11–14);<sup>87</sup> the (fictional) presence of Paul at Stephen's stoning;<sup>88</sup> the visit to Corinth (Acts 18.1–17; 1 Cor. 1);<sup>89</sup> Paul's change of plans (Rom. 15.31; 2 Cor. 1.15ff);<sup>90</sup> the circumcision of Timothy (Acts 16.1–3; Gal. 2.3–5).<sup>91</sup>

Third, Luke did not mention Paul's letter-writing because he tones down controversy within the church in Acts – and the epistles are full of controversy.

### 1.2.3 Responses to the case for knowledge

Barrett acknowledges that Luke could have had an apologetic motivation which led him to minimise church conflicts, but argues that Luke could have made selective use of the epistles.<sup>92</sup> Barrett rejects the argument that Acts is late enough for Paul to need recovering from the clutches of heretics. His proposal is that Luke

<sup>83</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 84f; Enslin, 'Once Again', pp. 258–60; Lindemann, *Paulus in ältesten Christentum*, p. 165. Thiering, 'Acts as Art', pp. 185f argues that the places where Paul is persecuted in Acts are all mentioned in the epistles. But Alexander, 'Narrative Maps' shows that Acts includes many places not mentioned in the epistles.

<sup>84</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 86f; Enslin, 'Once Again', pp. 260f.

<sup>85</sup> Πορθεῖν in Acts 9.21; Gal. 1.13, 23 (the only NT uses); the instrumentality of angels, and the verbal similarity of Acts 7.53 and Gal. 3.19f; similarities between Acts 22.3; Gal. 1.14 and Acts 11.30; Gal. 2.10 (Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 87f; Enslin, 'Once Again', p. 262).

<sup>86</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 88f; Enslin, 'Once Again', p. 263.

<sup>87</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 89; Enslin, 'Once Again', p. 263 believes Acts 15 to be dependent on Gal. 2.11–14. Walker, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus', pp. 11f prefers Gal. 2.1–10.

<sup>88</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', p. 89; Enslin, 'Once Again', p. 264.

<sup>89</sup> Enslin, "'Luke' and Paul', pp. 89f; Enslin, 'Once Again', pp. 264f.

<sup>90</sup> Enslin, 'Once Again', pp. 266f.

<sup>91</sup> Walker, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus', p. 11.

<sup>92</sup> Barrett, 'Acts and the Pauline Corpus'. For example, the collection is mentioned relatively little in the letters, so Luke could have used those letters selectively.

knew of Paul, although not personally, and knew that Paul wrote letters, but did not have access to any. In favour of this Barrett argues: Paul's epistles were not regarded as 'canon' at the time of the writing of Acts – some were lost and others may have been deliberately suppressed – and therefore they were not carefully preserved; Acts is early enough for this view, for there are no traces of *Frühkatholizismus* within Acts; it is unlikely that Luke knew Paul personally; and the 'we document' used by Luke was most likely a bare itinerary, rather than a diary including references to letters.

Lüdemann is similarly critical of the arguments for use of the epistles by Luke. He accepts that there are genuine parallels between Acts and the epistles at a number of the points noted, but concludes that Luke has independent traditions from the Pauline mission territories, without specifying how Luke obtained them.<sup>93</sup>

#### 1.2.4 The relevance of the Miletus speech

The Miletus speech is central to this discussion, for it is acknowledged on all sides to be the speech in Acts with most points of contact with the Pauline epistles.<sup>94</sup>

Schulze and Soltau seek to demonstrate by synoptic tables that the speech is derived from 1 Thessalonians.<sup>95</sup> More recently, Aejmelaeus has argued for the dependence of the Miletus speech on 1 Thessalonians (and other Paulines) on the basis of a detailed redaction-critical study of the speech, concluding that every verse of the speech contains possible connections with the Pauline letters.<sup>96</sup> We shall consider Aejmelaeus' arguments following our discussion of possible parallels between the speech and 1 Thessalonians,<sup>97</sup> but for now we note that the relationship between the material in the speech and 1 Thessalonians is potentially significant for the question whether Luke knew the Paulines.

### 1.3 Review of previous work on the speech

To provide orientation for our detailed study, and to help identify potentially helpful (and unhelpful) approaches to the study of the

<sup>93</sup> Lüdemann, *Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 8f.

<sup>94</sup> e.g. Gardner, 'Speeches of Paul', p. 401 notes that 'the speech . . . at Miletus has the best claim of all to be historic . . . we find in the address constant parallels, to the Epistles'.

<sup>95</sup> Schulze, 'Unterlagen'; Soltau, 'Herkunft'.

<sup>96</sup> Aejmelaeus, *Rezeption*. <sup>97</sup> See §7.2.2.

Miletus speech, we shall review previous work on the speech, before outlining our own plan. In broad terms study of the speech has progressed from a focus on Pauline tradition in the speech to considering Lukan composition (using tools from source and redaction criticism). More recently there have been a number of generic and structural studies, and most recently narrative and rhetorical analyses.

### 1.3.1 Pauline tradition

One stream of scholarship focuses on the speech as evidence for Pauline thought, and therefore looks to the epistles as a basis for interpreting the speech. Tholuck suggests that the Miletus speech is the only speech in Acts which really parallels the epistles, since it alone is pastoral in nature.<sup>98</sup> Gardner,<sup>99</sup> Dodd<sup>100</sup> and Rackham<sup>101</sup> typify this approach in the first half of this century, agreeing that Luke does not know the Paulines, and therefore regarding the parallels as suggesting that the speech derives from independent Pauline tradition.

In the post-war era, a significant group continues to regard the Miletus speech as derived from non-epistolary Pauline tradition, from Bruce (writing first in 1943) to Hemer (1989). Such scholars agree that the wording of the speech is Lukan, while holding that it reflects Pauline thought and usage.

Bruce is representative;<sup>102</sup> he cites extensive parallels with the epistles, combined with Luke's lack of knowledge of the epistles, as evidence for the authenticity of the speech. When criticised<sup>103</sup> Bruce rarely offers direct critique in response, preferring to give a positive case for his own views.<sup>104</sup> Hemer offers a more extensive study,

<sup>98</sup> Tholuck, 'Reden', p. 312: 'So markierte Charakterzüge tragen die paulinischen Briefe, daß es nicht schwer fällt, denselben Mann anderswo wieder zu erkennen.' (The Pauline letters have such marked characteristics that it is not difficult to recognise the same man [writing] in other places.) See also Foakes Jackson and Lake, *Beginnings*, vol. IV, p. 259.

<sup>99</sup> Gardner, 'Speeches of Paul', pp. 401–4, although allowing that there are non-Pauline elements, such as the use of ἐπίσκοπος (Acts 20.28).

<sup>100</sup> Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, pp. 32f. <sup>101</sup> Rackham, *Acts*, p. 384.

<sup>102</sup> Bruce, *Book of Acts* (revised edn), pp. 387–95; *Acts* (3rd edn), pp. 429–37. Others include: Marshall, *Acts* (TNTC), p. 330; Longenecker, 'Acts', p. 511; Williams, *Acts* (GNC), p. 347; Neil, *Acts*, p. 213.

<sup>103</sup> e.g. Haenchen, *Acts*, p. 590.

<sup>104</sup> 'He [*sc.* Haenchen] seems, moreover, to assume that if Dibelius has argued for a case, the case is thereby established' (Bruce, 'Acts Today', p. 44) is an exception.

focused on historical questions.<sup>105</sup> He sees the speech as a précis of a Pauline speech, and claims extensive parallels of language, biographical information and theology with the epistles.<sup>106</sup>

In sum, these scholars focus on the Pauline connections of the Miletus speech, see independent Pauline tradition lying behind the speech, and generally identify Luke as Paul's travel-companion. Luke's creative role is limited to working with the material provided by these traditions. He handles the material conservatively, although the final form of the speech bears the marks of Lukan style.

### 1.3.2 Lukan composition

A second group of scholars focuses on Luke's creative role in composing the Miletus speech.

#### *The speech derived from the epistles*

The oldest suggestion of this type sees the speech as derived directly from the epistles.

Schulze is the first to raise this idea; he sets out a synoptic comparison of the Miletus speech and the epistles.<sup>107</sup> He finds extensive verbal parallels, particularly with 1 Thessalonians, but also with other Paulines. He concludes that the influence must run from the epistles to Luke and that 1 Thessalonians is the *Grundlage* for the Miletus speech. Soltau sees 1 Thessalonians 2–4 as the most significant source for the speech, but he also regards the Miletus speech as paralleling material from 1 Thessalonians 5, Ephesians, Romans and 1 and 2 Timothy (without necessarily suggesting that Luke was using these other letters).<sup>108</sup> Both scholars seem to believe that to exhibit a parallel is to demonstrate dependence. However, at most they give examples of parallels without necessarily offering a cogent explanation.

#### *Style criticism*

With the work of Dibelius a new era in Acts scholarship begins.<sup>109</sup> Dibelius believes that in Acts Luke had the scope to exercise a

<sup>105</sup> Hemer, 'Ephesian Elders'. <sup>106</sup> Hemer, 'Ephesian Elders', p. 82 n. 18.

<sup>107</sup> Schulze, 'Unterlagen'. His presentation of his case is not helped by his use of his own (somewhat idiosyncratic) German translation of the texts.

<sup>108</sup> Soltau, 'Herkunft', 133–5.

<sup>109</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts* brings together work published in German between 1923 and 1949.

creativity which he did not exercise in writing his Gospel. This leads to Dibelius's *Stilkritik*, which focuses on the literary method of Luke.<sup>110</sup> Dibelius tries to trace the traditions with which Luke worked and then to examine how Luke utilised this material, using a form-critical approach not dissimilar to that applied to the Gospels. He thus develops tools which form the basis of (later) redaction criticism. In his research historical questions are by and large not raised.

When Dibelius considers the Miletus speech<sup>111</sup> he notes its importance for the narrative of Acts, particularly that it is Paul's last speech as a free man. Thus a key function of the speech is that, like a will, it is providing for the future.<sup>112</sup> It is the nature of such a speech, Dibelius believes, to contain apologetic such as verses 20, 26f, 31, 33f. This apologetic is aimed not at the elders of Ephesus, who would scarcely have needed such persuasion, but at church leaders of Luke's day. Dibelius sidelines the question of the speech's authenticity and argues that only by this means can Paul's mention of his death (Acts 20.23–5) be understood correctly, that is in terms of its significance for Luke's narrative.<sup>113</sup> He concludes that the speech is located in the only place where it could go, at the end of Paul's public ministry and at the point of Paul laying down his missionary work in the east. The speech serves as Paul's testament to the church of Luke's day.<sup>114</sup>

Conzelmann and Haenchen develop Dibelius' analysis. Both assume that Dibelius has shown that Luke created the speech virtually *ex nihilo*.

Conzelmann<sup>115</sup> sees the key function of the speech as marking the close of Paul's missionary activity, and a subsidiary function as edifying the church of Luke's day. The second function is accom-

<sup>110</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, pp. 1–25 outlines this method.

<sup>111</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, pp. 155–8.

<sup>112</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 155 n. 42 cites Peregrinus' farewell speech as an example (Lucian, *The Passing of Peregrinus* 32).

<sup>113</sup> Dibelius, *Studies in Acts*, p. 158 n. 46 believes Paul was dead when Luke wrote.

<sup>114</sup> Conzelmann, *Acts*, p. 174 n. 17 refers to Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 121, who compares 2 Tim. 4.7 ('I have completed my course', using the same language as Acts 20.24) with Virgil *Aeneid* 4.653: 'I have lived and accomplished the course which fortune appointed.' However, as Houlden, *Pastoral Epistles*, p. 133 notes, the relationship between the Pastorals and the Miletus speech could be one of several possibilities: 'genuine Pauline speech and writing; coincidental use of the same imagery; our writer's [*sc.* the author of the Pastorals] use of a crucial Pauline speech in Acts; the incorporation by the writer of Acts of what he took to be a vivid Pauline image.' See further § 6.2.

<sup>115</sup> Conzelmann, *Acts*, pp. 172–6.