

TH  
P442

THE CRITICISM OF SELECTED PAULINE SPEECHES  
IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

BY

DONALD H. PETERSON

B.S., St. Cloud State Teachers College

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for  
THE DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SACRED THEOLOGY  
in  
The Biblical Seminary in New York

New York, N. Y.  
1955

**BIBLICAL SCHOOL OF  
THEOLOGY LIBRARY  
HATFIELD, PA.**

21552

To the Honor and Glory of God,  
and to all the people who  
have given so much of their lives to me;  
my parents, my teachers, my fellow students,  
and my friends.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	i
A. The Subject Stated and Justified . . . . .	ii
B. The Subject Delimited. . . . .	iii
C. The Procedure of Study . . . . .	iii
D. The Source of Material . . . . .	iv
I BRIEF SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF CRITICISM ON THE BOOK OF ACTS. . . . .	1
A. Introduction . . . . .	2
B. The Beginning of Criticism . . . . .	2
1. Eduard Zeller (1814-1908) . . . . .	2
2. Samuel Davidson (1807-1898) . . . . .	5
C. The Return to Historicity - Adolph Harnack (1815-1930) . . . . .	6
D. The Evidence of Archaeology. . . . .	9
1. Sir William Ramsey (1851-1916). . . . .	9
2. Archibald T. Robertson (1863-1934). . . . .	11
E. Present Criticism. . . . .	12
1. Hans Lietzmann (1875-1942) . . . . .	12
2. Fredrick J. Foakes-Jackson (1855-1941) and Kirsopp Lake (1872- ) . . . . .	14
3. Maurice Goguel (1880- ) . . . . .	16
4. Fredrick F. Bruce (1910- ) . . . . .	17
F. Summary. . . . .	18
II A SURVEY OF CRITICISM OF SELECTED PAULINE SPEECHES. . . . .	20
A. Introduction . . . . .	21
B. General Assumptions of the Critics . . . . .	22
1. Pro-Historical. . . . .	22
2. Anti-Historical . . . . .	24
C. Speech at Antioch in Pisidia . . . . .	27
1. Setting and Message . . . . .	27
2. Pro-Historical Criticism. . . . .	29
3. Anti-Historical Criticism . . . . .	34
D. Speech at Athens . . . . .	36
1. Setting and Message . . . . .	36
2. Pro-Historical Criticism. . . . .	39
3. Anti-Historical Criticism . . . . .	44
E. Speech at Miletus. . . . .	48
1. Setting and Message . . . . .	48
2. Pro-Historical Criticism. . . . .	50
3. Anti-Historical Criticism . . . . .	54
F. Speech at Jerusalem. . . . .	57
1. Setting and Message . . . . .	57
2. Pro-Historical Criticism. . . . .	59
3. Anti-Historical Criticism . . . . .	60

Gift of the author  
 345-68  
 May 1955

Chapter	Page
G. Speech Before Agrippa . . . . .	62
1. Setting and Message. . . . .	62
2. Pro-Historical Criticism . . . . .	64
3. Anti-Historical Criticism. . . . .	66
H. Summary . . . . .	66
III EVALUATION OF THE CRITICISM ON THE SELECTED PAULINE SPEECHES	
IN THE BOOK OF ACTS . . . . .	68
A. Introduction. . . . .	69
B. Historical Content. . . . .	70
C. Literary Style. . . . .	71
D. Language. . . . .	72
E. Theological Content . . . . .	73
F. Pauline Personality . . . . .	73
G. Luke's Competence and Purpose . . . . .	74
H. Luke in Light of Classical Historians . . . . .	75
I. Summary . . . . .	77
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION. . . . .	78
BIBLIOGRAPHY. . . . .	82

INTRODUCTION

THE CRITICISM OF SELECTED PAULINE SPEECHES  
IN THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

INTRODUCTION

A. Subject Stated and Justified

The book of Acts is important to the Christian Church because of its historical information. It is the only record of the primitive church. This book also bridges the gap between the life of Jesus and the Pauline letters. The character, witness, power and message of the Church is recorded. The progress and leadership is related as the history unfolds. A unique feature of this book is its speeches. Approximately one-fifth of the book's content is devoted to the speeches. Without the speeches the interpretation of events would be difficult. Also the freshness of the book would disappear.

As the critical eye of scholars focused its attention upon the New Testament the book of Acts became a controversial book because of its importance. The very foundation of the Christian Church was being subjected to the test of validity. The question at stake was whether or not the Christian Church had a trustworthy document concerning its beginning.

The speeches of Acts did not escape the criticism given to the other contents of the book. The scholars questioned as to whether or not the speeches were authentic reports of the actual events. And if they were, to what degree? The opinions ran from the suggestion of verbatim reports to compositions created in the author's mind.

The question arises as to the reasons for such views as well

as the nature of criticism. Also the question enters one's mind as to the methods used to arrive at a particular position.

The subject of this thesis is concerned with the study of the criticism on the speeches in an effort to gain a survey of the wide range of criticism which has been made upon the speeches. Along with this an attempt will be made to demonstrate the method of criticism as well as the content. To prove whether the speeches are authentic or not is not the concern of this thesis.

The value of this subject may be demonstrated in two ways. First, bringing together the similar and dissimilar views of criticism enables one to have a better understanding of the problem which faces the future critic. It may serve to keep students from thinking in circles. It will be seen that criticism over the past century cannot be accepted on face value any more than the critics accept the object of criticism! There is a time for evaluation lest the Church be led astray because of vague criticism. What is desired is not less criticism but sounder criticism.

Second, it affords the opportunity to study the mode of criticism. Granted it is in a particular book, yet the tools and attitudes are general and basic to most of the New Testament. And one might also add that such a study reveals more concerning the historicity of the Scriptures and how they came into existence. One man might not be entirely correct in his view but he may contribute an element to the whole.

One must not forget that the speeches themselves make this an important study because through them one may gain important insight into the innermost thoughts of the original leaders concerning their mission and message, if they are authentic. They may then be regarded as

original source documents for the primitive "Kerygma" of the Apostles, rather than merely fictional reconstructions for dramatic narrative effects.

#### B. Subject Delimited

The study involves much material and many facets of related problems. Therefore it will be limited in two ways. The range of criticism will be limited to those who have written in English or whose works have been translated into English. Second, the study will be focused on the Pauline speeches. The reason for this is Paul's importance to the Christian Church. Also he is the central figure in most critical problems.

Not all of Paul's speeches will be considered. The five selected for study are unique in content and situation. The first is an evangelistic message to the Jews at Antioch. Second is a speech to the Greeks in Athens which is also evangelistic. Third is an address to the Christian Church at Miletus. The fourth and fifth speeches are defenses of the Gospel before the Jews in Jerusalem and before King Agrippa. Thus through these five speeches the nature of Paul's ministry is adequately represented.

#### C. Procedure of Study

The study will contain three chapters. The first chapter will be a brief history of the criticism on the book of Acts. It will be developed by studying particular men who have contributed the most from their particular position. The purpose of this chapter will be to show how the criticism of the speeches grows out of the history of criticism.

The second chapter will be concerned with the actual criticism of the selected speeches. The speeches will be considered in the order in which they come in the book. The purpose is to reveal the position



of the critic and what reasons he uses to support his position. The final chapter will be a summary and evaluation of the previous study.

#### D. Source of Material

The sources of this study will be standard commentaries and books that have made a special study of this problem. Some of them are: The Beginning of Christianity, Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; Saint Paul the Orator, Maurice Jones; Credibility of the Acts of the Apostles, H. Chase; Founding of the Church Universal, Hans Lietzmann; and Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles, Eduard Zeller. Many other sources will be used such as Sir William Ramsey's archaeological studies of Asia Minor. Also, Adolph Harnack's writings concerning Luke as author of the Book of Acts will be used.

CHAPTER I  
BRIEF SURVEY OF THE  
HISTORY OF CRITICISM ON THE BOOK OF ACTS

CHAPTER I  
BRIEF SURVEY OF THE  
HISTORY OF CRITICISM ON THE BOOK OF ACTS

A. Introduction

Probably one of the most amazing discoveries of a young man is the fact that things do not grow up over night. So when one views the great variety and numerous amount of criticism concerning the speeches of Acts the question inevitably arises: Where did all this come from?

This chapter does not seek to exhaust each contribution to the criticism of Acts. Rather the purpose is to point out some of the more important representatives who have given impetus to the study of the problem. The aim is to elucidate their contribution and particular method of work.

B. The Beginning of Criticism

1. Eduard Zeller (1814-1908)

The serious critical investigation of the Book of Acts began with the Tubingen School in Germany during the middle of the 19th century. Up to that time various men had undertaken a critical study of Acts. However, it was the Tubingen School which repudiated the idea of Luke's authorship of the book. This type of criticism was similar to that of David Fredrick Strauss who applied the mythical method to the whole life of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> They also strove to prove the speeches of Paul

. . . . .

1. Frederick Foakes - Jackson and Kirsopp Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. II Pro. II, p. 299.

in Acts to be untrustworthy.<sup>1</sup>

The Hegelian philosophy of thesis, antithesis and synthesis served as their principle of criticism. They pictured the history of the Christian Church in two stages. The first stage was Paul's embittered feud with the Judaizers, who were under the leadership of Peter, on the question of legalism versus Christian freedom. And the second stage was a period of reconciliation which marked the transition between the Primitive and Catholic Church. The Book of Acts was supposed to have been written during this period of reconciliation. So all facts were misconstrued in the writing of Acts to present a picture of harmony.<sup>2</sup> The only conclusion possible on this view was that Luke could not possibly have been the author of Acts.

The men that led the attack were Ferdinand C. Baur and Eduard Zeller. Both were quite convinced that the aim of Acts was reconciliation. Zeller's work is the classic representation of this school.<sup>3</sup> Zeller's criticism centers upon the question of the trustworthiness but not the accuracy of the book.<sup>4</sup> By this he seems to believe the events to be true but twisted to accomplish a certain purpose. Zeller seeks to explain the apologetic purpose which controlled the composition of Acts. The two factors governing the composition are the authority of Paul and the universalism of the Gospel. The aim of the book is to convince people of the legitimacy of Gentile Christianity. Also Zeller sees a

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II Pro. II, p. 299.
2. Ibid., p. 375
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.

political aim to commend Christianity to the Roman State.<sup>1</sup> Zeller in his study divided criticism into two parts. Criticism concerns both a study of the testimonies to the origin of the book and of the subject matter itself. The two really cannot be divided but are inter-dependent. The study of testimonies is affected by the subject matter and the subject matter by testimonies. Therefore, evaluation of both factors together, origin and content, was made by Zeller. Zeller stated his purpose and procedure as follows:

We shall first examine the most ancient witnesses for our documents; we shall next submit the historical character of its statements to a searching investigation and after these preliminaries, we shall finally endeavour to bring the question of its origin to a decision.<sup>2</sup>

Zeller's critical study of content led him to the following judgment upon the book itself:

The phenomena which we have exhibited in the parallelism of the Petrine and Pauline portions, and in the unhistorical foundation of this parallelism, are incomprehensible on the supposition of history of Apostolic missions...<sup>3</sup>

And later he concludes:

...we are here not dealing with a historical narrative having dogmatic background, but with a free employment and metamorphosis of history for dogmatic purpose.<sup>4</sup>

Besides denial of historicity Zeller repudiates the authorship of Luke, the companion of Paul.<sup>5</sup> The rejection of Lucan authorship and the placing of its composition in the second century is the logical conclusion to denying its historicity.<sup>6</sup> And this really comes from a basic

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., p. 375.
2. Eduard Zeller: The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles, Vol. I, p. 92.
3. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 136.
4. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 137.
5. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 263.
6. Ibid., Vol. II, p. 272.

philosophical assumption.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Samuel Davidson (1807-1898)

Though the majority of English scholars rejected the Tubingen School's criticism on Acts, Samuel Davidson upheld its view even though his method was somewhat different. Davidson's theology was basically rationalistic.<sup>2</sup> In rejection of the historicity of the Book of the Acts Davidson says, "The general credibility of Acts can only be decided by an examination of the contents."<sup>3</sup> Also Davidson makes another statement that points out his basic working premises as he declares, "The truth of Christianity does not depend on external evidences but on a moral and subjective basis."<sup>4</sup> In view of this attitude Davidson goes on to examine the book on the following points. First, the general conduct and teaching of Paul as set forth in the book. Second, the discrepancies between the narratives and other writings of Paul, e.g. that of Galatians and Acts concerning events that followed Paul's conversion. Third, the nature and form of the speeches. And fourth, the historical narratives.<sup>5</sup>

In all of this Davidson finds sufficient inconsistencies and prefabrications in the narratives to doubt the historicity of Acts. His conclusions regarding aim, authorship and date coincide with those of Zeller.<sup>6</sup>

The critical position which Davidson and Zeller represent may be summed up in this way: Because the author included certain facts and

. . . . .

1. Ante, p. 1-2
2. New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Vol. 13, p.366.
3. Samuel Davidson: Historical Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, p. 207.
4. Ibid., p. 249.
5. Ibid., p. 207.
6. Ibid., p. 281.

omitted others (which to those critics would have been more important), the book was written for a special purpose. Therefore, if the writer had a special purpose in mind, he obviously twisted and colored facts to prove his point. And if the aim be "conciliation", then the historicity of the book is not tenable. It is obvious that this point of view rests not upon an unbiased consideration of the possibility of reported facts being good history. Acts is forced into an artificial framework of composition which destroys the historicity.

This form of criticism was championed by distinguished scholars on the Continent. It was modified and changed somewhat by later study. F. B. Overbeck, with just as drastic criticism as Zeller's, maintained the purpose to be apologetic rather than historical.<sup>1</sup> Because of this the perversion of the historical fact was due to what the author could not see rather than would not see.<sup>2</sup> This view holds the idea that the author was too remote from the actual events and so was writing on the basis of assumptions and guesses as to the nature of the Apostolic Church.

#### C. Return to Historicity - Adolph Harnack (1851-1930)

Even though the popularity of the Tübingen criticism dominated the minds of scholars, yet a defense arose for the historicity of the Book of Acts. Adolph Harnack, the great German scholar, was one of the leaders in this return to the historical view of Acts. Harnack's general opinion concerning the whole tenor of criticism was this:

No other New Testament book has had to suffer so much as the Book

. . . . .

1. Interpreters Bible, Vol. IX, p. 13.
2. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II, Pro. II, p. 390.

of Acts, although in spite of its evident weakness it is in more than one respect the weightiest and best book in the New Testament. All the mistakes that have been made in New Testament criticism have come to a focus in the criticism of Acts...It has had to suffer because...the most extreme demands have been made upon a companion of Paul--assured understanding of the apostle, congeniality, freedom from every independent tendency, absolute trustworthiness and infallible memory.<sup>1</sup>

Harnack's bold assertion set forth a new angle in criticism as he shifted attention from the former emphasis on purpose to a consideration of the question of authorship. However, though Harnack claimed Luke to be the author, he did recognize inaccuracies in the book.<sup>2</sup> Harnack's book Luke the Physician sets forth the defense for Luke.<sup>3</sup> His idea was unpopular, but not only did Harnack accredit Luke with authority, but proclaimed him to be the beloved physician and companion of Paul. This implied that the authorship of this book must have been within the first century, close to the actual experience of Paul. Such was Harnack's claim.<sup>4</sup>

This view is built upon the following investigation. First, the unity of the "we" sections and the rest of the book. Therefore, to Harnack the author of the "we" sections is the same as the whole book.<sup>5</sup> Second support set forth by Harnack is the similarity of medical and scientific language used by the author of the Third Gospel. Harnack follows the work of Horbart, an Englishman, who demonstrated this factor in 1882.<sup>6</sup> Another argument used by Harnack is the literary style of the

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II, Pro. II, p. 390. quoting Harnack.
2. Archibald T. Robertson: Luke the Historian in Light of Research, p. 4.
3. See Bibliography for full information on publication.
4. Adolph Harnack: Luke the Physician, p. 14 and 19.
5. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II, Pro. II, p. 391.
6. Ibid., p. 391.



"we" sections; it is identical to that of the rest of the book and the Third Gospel. The time of composition, as mentioned previously, is also a factor in Harnack's decision that Luke is the author.<sup>1</sup> And finally, Luke's portrayal of Paul as a Jewish-Christian is consistent with what is known about Paul.<sup>2</sup>

Harnack afterwards reduces the problem to two questions that he must answer in order to vindicate Luke. They are: Can the "we" sections be separated from the rest as a source? And, does the subject matter impose insuperable difficulties to the hypothesis that the Book of Acts is the work of St. Luke? It is Harnack's opinion that Luke had written sources for the first part, namely Petrine and Philippine, and that he was an eye-witness or had eye-witness reports for the second.<sup>2</sup> His study leads him to claim the purpose to be to show the power of the Holy Spirit as demonstrated by the Apostles in the spread of the Church.<sup>3</sup> Harnack concedes the possibility of a secondary aim being an apology for Paul against the Jews; yet he denies any political purpose.<sup>4</sup>

The value of Harnack's work is testified to by Hans Windisch as he said, "Harnack set Biblical criticism new tasks to accomplish. Every investigator of the authorship must learn from him and must meet his arguments."<sup>5</sup>

Harnack, by his insistence upon the examination of the facts before the critics, reopened the field for true historical criticism. For Harnack accused his fellow critics of being more philosophical than

. . . . .

1. Ante., p. 7, and Harnack, A., Luke the Physician, p. 224.
2. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II, Pro. II, p. 302.
3. Harnack, A., Op. Cit., p. 157 and 165.
4. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II, Pro. II, p. 302.
5. Ibid.

historical. He forced them to abandon their theoretical assumptions and deal with the historical evidence of the book. This was mainly in relation to the linguistic and literary style of the book.<sup>1</sup>

D. The Evidence of Archaeology

1. Sir William Ramsey (1851-1916)

As did Harnack through linguistic and literary work, so William M. Ramsey came to the same conclusion of the trustworthiness of Luke through geography. Ramsey confesses that he started his study of Asian geography and archaeology with the idea that the critics were right.<sup>2</sup> Luke was not to be trusted.

Ramsey's study of the geography of Asia Minor was undertaken providentially rather than from deliberate purpose, according to his own statements. He traces his life showing how he was spared the boredom, as he called it, of sitting in a classroom lecturing and studying out of books.<sup>3</sup> Ramsey's life as a pioneer in research in Asia Minor took place in the last quarter of the 19th century.

Ramsey's re-evaluation of Luke's work was due to the discovery that the proclamation of the unhistoricity of the Iystra incident was false.<sup>4</sup> Through his archaeological discoveries on the site of Iystra Ramsey claims that he was forced to acknowledge Luke to be a creditable historian.<sup>5</sup> The continual research caused Ramsey to pass a verdict upon Luke's work as being "...unsurpassing in respect of its trustworthiness."<sup>6</sup>

.....

1. William Ramsey: Luke the Physician, p. 4.
2. Ramsey, W. M., The Bearing of Recent Discovery, p. 38.
3. Ibid., Chapters I and II.
4. Narrative in Acts 14:5ff.
5. Ramsey, W. M., Op. Cit., p. 79.
6. Ibid., p. 81.

Ramsey expresses his work in the following manner, "The work that marked itself out for me in Asia Minor was to study the art, history and antiquities of the country."<sup>1</sup> And this kept Ramsey from having to depend upon theological presuppositions and preconceptions, which he called upon the critics to give up. His evaluation of previous criticism was as follows:

It has for some time been evident to all New Testament scholars who were not hidebound in the old prejudice that there must be a new departure in Lucan criticism. The method of dissection had failed ...Criticism for a time examined the work attributed to Luke like a corpse, and the laborious autopsy was fruitless. Nothing in the whole history of literary criticism has been so wasted and dreary as a great part of the modern critical study of Luke.<sup>2</sup>

Too much of the scholarship, to Ramsey, has been done according to prior rules and presuppositions as to what must be said or what must not be said.<sup>3</sup>

Ramsey's work has been evaluated by his fellow English scholars as being among the best contributions to scientific scholarship in his generation.<sup>4</sup>

In summarizing Ramsey's contribution it may be said with certainty that Ramsey considered Luke a most trustworthy historian. This was not based upon theological grounds or philosophical grounds but upon archaeological findings which to Ramsey warranted complete trust in Luke. Along with this was Ramsey's insistence that the narrative in Acts takes one into the life of the first century. Thus the date of composition is placed in the first century.

. . . . .

1. Ramsey, W. M., The Bearing of Recent Discovery, p. 35.
2. Ramsey, W. M., Luke the Physician, p. 3.
3. Ibid., p. 8.
4. Interpreters Bible, Vol. IX, p. 14.

Ramsey's work set the pace for English scholarship which supported the traditional view over against Continental criticism. English scholarship, typified at its best in Ramsey, is adequately described by J. W. Hurkin when he states:

British scholarship has shown little tendency to originate startling hypotheses...It rather devoted itself to the more concrete problems of textual criticism and archaeology, and its general temper has been conservative.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. Archibald T. Robertson (1863-1934)

American Protestant scholarship furnished a counterpart to Ramsey in Archibald T. Robertson. Robertson's contribution to the criticism of Acts came through his work with Greek.<sup>2</sup> His reputation as a Greek scholar was respected as the highest.<sup>3</sup> Robertson's main contribution to the defense of Acts' historicity is his book Luke the Historian in the Light of Research. This book is made up of his personal direct research in the Gospel by Luke and the Book of Acts. Along with this he incorporates the archaeological, historical and philological research of other scholars.<sup>4</sup> He speaks of his work as follows:

The research of Harnack, Horbart and Ramsey have restored the credit of Luke with many critics who had been carried away by criticism of Baur...It has been like mining--digging now here, now there. The items in Luke's books that were attacked have been taken up one by one. The work has been slow and piecemeal, of necessity.<sup>5</sup>

And his conclusion is, "It is a positively amazing vindication of Luke. ...His books can be used with confidence."<sup>6</sup> It is Robertson's desire to

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. II, Pro. II, p.433.
2. Everett Gill: A. T. Robertson, A Biography, p. 159 ff.
3. Ibid., p. 190 ff.
4. Robertson, A. T., Luke the Historian in the Light of Research, p. vii.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid.

let the facts speak for themselves. He believes the author's own declared method of research was soundly historical. Robertson gathers this fact from Luke's introduction to the Gospel, Chapter 1:1-4. In his opinion there is no reason to deny this sound method to the writing of the Book of Acts. By a critical study of the Greek grammar and intensive exegetical work he sets forth Luke as having the highest and most scholarly motives.<sup>1</sup>

Robertson goes on in his book to use source criticism, medical language and archaeological evidence to demonstrate Luke's fidelity to his method. He uses ample source material from men who have likewise discovered Luke's trustworthiness as a historian. Robertson's contribution is important as it lays bare the true nature of Luke before the critical world. It is another step in forcing antagonistic critics to leave theories and preconceptions and come face to face with historical facts.

#### E. Present Criticism

##### 1. Hans Lietzmann (1875-1942)

At the turn of the century in the criticism of the New Testament a new approach was undertaken to the study of the origins of Christianity. Such men as W. Bousset and R. Reitzenstein led the development of this approach.<sup>2</sup> This introduced the discipline of comparative religions into the study of primitive Christianity. The claim of this school was that first century Christianity is a syncretism of the Hellenistic-Roman

.....

1. Robertson, A. T., Op. Cit., p. 42.

2. For a better understanding the inquirer may read, The Origin of Paul's Religion, by Machen, J. G., MacMillan Company, New York, and From Locke to Reitzenstein, Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 22, October, 1929.

religions. The Christian gospel could be derived from a comparative study of contemporary mystery religions and mythology.<sup>1</sup> This school of criticism known as the "religio-geschliche Schule" (religious-historical school), advances the theory of a pre-Christian Christianity. To them Paul already had a theology and fitted Jesus and the primitive gospel into it. The thought of this group forced upon New Testament scholarship a more thoroughgoing exegesis.<sup>2</sup>

Hans Lietzmann's work has been noted for its thorough study of the origins of Christianity. Conservative critics, even though not agreeing with his conclusions, commend his work on political and religious background.<sup>3</sup> Lietzmann's scholarly work has been praised and held in high esteem by all scholars.

In 1924 he succeeded Harnack in Berlin. Though he displayed less rationalism, he was less conservative than Harnack.<sup>4</sup> Because most of his writing has been written in German evaluations of his work are not too common. Now his work is gradually becoming better known to English scholars. Some of his works translated into English are: The Beginnings of the Christian Church and The Founding of the Church Universal.<sup>5</sup> Concerning his work on the beginnings of the Christian Church the translator says, "No living scholar has written more largely or more acutely on the historical problems surrounding the first centuries of the Christian era..."<sup>6</sup>

Lietzmann rejects the Tubingen "tendencious" reconstruction of

.....

1. Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 22, October 1929, p. 325-30.
2. Ibid., p. 330.
3. Evangelical Quarterly, Vol. 22, April 1950. Book reviewed by F. F. Bruce.
4. Ibid.
5. See bibliography for full information.
6. Hans Lietzmann: The Beginnings of the Christian Church, p. vii.

history as untenable and grants unto Luke the quality of faithfulness in recording the historical facts which he had at his disposal. However, he stresses the factor of historical reconstruction by the author due to a lack of full historical knowledge.<sup>1</sup> The speeches to him are of free composition. They are trustworthy in the sense that they represent the average opinion of his time and environment. In fact, the entire book is limited by the conventional traditions of the author's time. The book cannot be regarded as historically accurate because of the lack of good source material and of deficiencies in the talents of the author in spite of his honest intentions.

Evaluation of this approach leads to varied reactions, but one cannot help feeling that Lietzman has followed too closely the "religio-geschliche Schule".

2. Fredrick J. Foakes-Jackson (1855-1941) and

Kirsopp Lake (1872- )

The Interpreters Bible is of much aid in introducing the significance of the work of Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake as they write: "Indeed, for English-speaking scholars at least, the work of these scholars (Harnack and Ramsey)<sup>2</sup> might seem to have re-established the Lukan authorship and historical trustworthiness of Acts, had not..."<sup>3</sup> The "had not" is the place where the present critics come in.

The work of Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake contains five volumes entitled The Beginnings of Christianity. The Interpreters Bible

. . . . .

1. Lietzman, H., *The Founding of the Church Universal*, p. 99.
2. Parentheses and contents are the writer's.
3. *Interpreters Bible*, Vol. IX, p. 15.

claims that this has thrown the whole problem back into the melting pot again.<sup>1</sup> The purpose of this great work may be demonstrated from the author's preface. It is felt that the Synoptic problem has been discovered and solved by the last fifty years of scholarship. They are also convinced that Christianity in the first century was a synthesis between Greco-Oriental and Jewish religions in the Roman world.<sup>2</sup> They summarize the situation as follows: "The preaching of repentance, and the Kingdom of God begun by Jesus passed into the sacramental cult of the Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>3</sup>

How this synthesis took place is the purpose of the investigation of Acts. For Acts contains the record of the Primitive Church. The outline of approach is in the first place sound understanding of the backgrounds of the history, e.g. the religious, intellectual and political world out of which Christianity evolved. The second volume deals with the literary phenomena, and the third volume with the exegesis of the text. The fourth gives a translation and commentary, and the fifth deals with notes on special problems. The editors make the following claim: "The claim of Christianity to be a 'faith once delivered to the saints' cannot bear the scrutiny of the historian of religions."<sup>4</sup> And this statement demonstrates the position of comparative religion on which this work was carried on.

The summary of the editor's study is: 1) The "we" sections written by a companion of Paul are separate from the other sources; 2)

. . . . .

1. Interpreters Bible, Vol. IX, p. 15
2. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. I, Pro. I, p. vii.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 15



the author was unfamiliar with the primitive Christian trend and misrepresented historical facts; and 3) the author is ignorant of Paul's character (referring to Paul's anti-Judaism).<sup>1</sup> So it has turned out that the sound work of criticism by Harnack, Ramsey and Robertson has been challenged once again.

3. Maurice Goguel (1880- )

The method of comparing the relationship of Christianity with its surrounding environment has produced a great effect on the study of Acts. Maurice Goguel, a French critical scholar, has produced a large work on the problem of the origins of the Primitive Church. Noted for his thoroughness in study, he endeavors to study the Christian Church purely from the standpoint of the historian.<sup>2</sup> Nothing is to be postulated or reserved in the name of theology. The facts are to be subjected to the most rigorous discipline of historical study.<sup>3</sup>

He also claims that the study of the Christian religious society must consider the reason for appearance in history. Specifically this is the formation, stabilization and organization of a Christian religious society. The existence of such a society is not due to chance phenomena, but depends upon certain laws and conditions. Its growth has been regulated by the law of religious sociology which provides the proper guide for research and study.<sup>4</sup>

The premise for study seems to seek the sociological element in Christianity to explain its growth, i.e. the effect it had on society and society had on Christianity as it came in contact with the world.

.....

1. Interpreters Bible, Vol. IX, p. 15.
2. Maurice Goguel: The Birth of Christianity, trans. by H. C. Snape, p. 10.
3. Ibid., p. 11.
4. Goguel, M., Op. Cit., p. 10.

Concerning the Book of Acts, Goguel believes it to comprise historical facts of the Early Church. However, Goguel does not credit the authorship to Luke or to an "Auctor ad Theophilum". Though the book was written in AD 80 or 90 the book is not completely historical and the facts are not correctly used. The work is that of a compiler who had the outline from Luke and employed other sources as well.<sup>1</sup> However, Goguel maintains that the compiler did not pervert the sources by his personal theological convictions.<sup>2</sup> The question of judging historicity has to be weighed and the answer well defined according to Goguel. He considers the history of Acts fairly trustworthy in view of the environment and the personality of the writer.

4. Fredrick F. Bruce (1910- )

Although the idea of comparative religion obsesses the minds of many present-day critics, the historical and exegetical problem of the book has been kept alive. In England, Fredrick F. Bruce has made a notable contribution in this field. In his booklet, "Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?", he pleads for the trustworthiness of the book on the basis of historical fact. He sets his goal to demonstrate that the inquiring mind can use the New Testament to seek God and be sure of its reliability.<sup>3</sup>

In his Greek commentary The Acts of the Apostles Bruce does a thorough piece of work in exegeting the text. Especially in his Introduction he searches out many of the individual problems concerning the trustworthiness of the book as a whole. In this introductory discussion

. . . . .

1. Harvard Theological Review, Vol. 17, April, 1924, p. 98.

2. Ibid., p. 83.

3. Bruce, F. F., Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?, p. iv-v.

he uses internal and external arguments to support his case. The internal evidence consists of language and style. The external evidence consists of geographic and historical facts, and the witness of contemporary and later writers, namely the Apostolic and post-Apostolic Fathers. In this Bruce has found Luke to deserve recognition as a trustworthy historian who had been loyal to his source materials. The major contribution of Bruce is his thorough and dependable exegesis, and also his able use of historical perspective to support his arguments.

#### F. Summary

The purpose of this chapter has been to sketch briefly the history of critical study on the Book of Acts. It is hoped that this sketch of the general higher criticism of Acts will be adequate preparation for an understanding of the criticism of Luke's speeches in Acts.

It was discovered that the critical studies on Acts were a sequel to criticism on the Gospels. The first criticism, by F. C. Baur, slashed the Book of Acts severely and reduced it to nothing. The historicity of the book was denied. This was done mainly through philosophical pre-conceived ideas which were forced upon the text. The leaders of this assault were of the Tubingen School which superimposed Hegelian philosophy of history on this account of the Primitive Church. Luke as a historian was completely destroyed and the entire work was placed in the second century.

However, the Tubingen School was soon to be challenged and proved to be in error. Two men, Adolph Harnack and Sir William Ramsey, probably did most to destroy the smooth scheme of the Tubingen School. Harnack's examination of the linguistics and literary style of the book

.....

caused him to rebel against his former colleagues and declare Luke, the Physician, to be the writer of the book. Ramsey took a further step and declared Luke not only to be the author but a highly trustworthy historian. His conclusions were made as an archaeologist and as an authority on ancient Near East history. Through the years of growing intensified study Luke's trustworthiness and integrity have received added support. The whole Tubingen theory had been destroyed and Luke could no longer be considered as one who fabricated facts to achieve his own ends. The importance of this vindication of Luke as an authoritative, first-century historian meant an eye-witness or near eye-witness account of the Church's early history.

But new ways of examining the problem were invented as men reshuffled the evidence. Comparative religio-historical investigation and critical exegesis were demanded. The entire origin of the Christian Church was viewed from a sociological standpoint by such men as Lietzman and Goguel. This led to the comparing of methods used by Biblical writers with contemporary methods of other writers.

Finally, the raging criticism over the years has forced scholars to evaluate and scrutinize the contents of the Book of the Acts. Scholars have had to judge the book's own testimony as to "by whom" and "how" it was composed. And because approximately one-fifth of its contents is composed of the speeches, special emphasis has had to be placed upon their value. The next step now is the examination and evaluation of this area of criticism that has grown out of the more general inquiry into the genuineness of the Book of Acts.

. . . . .

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF CRITICISM OF SELECTED PAULINE SPEECHES

## CHAPTER II

### A SURVEY OF CRITICISM OF SELECTED PAULINE SPEECHES

#### A. Introduction

This chapter is devoted to the study of the criticism on selected Pauline speeches. This procedure is necessary in view of the character of the historicity of the book. Settling the authorship, date, and sources of the book does not give one the right to make a general statement of judgment concerning the authenticity of the individual speeches. The place, situation and setting must be considered in each case. Also if one concedes the fact that these speeches passed through the mind of the writer, then one must consider the influence of the author in each speech. And one might ask if the author, when short of material or unsure of material, added his own thoughts. And did the author of the book even reconstruct each speech to fit his scheme so as to take liberties with the facts? Therefore, a general statement concerning the criticism on the speeches must come from a study of the individual speeches selected.

However, Percy Gardner has pointed out that certain basic assumptions must be made in order to criticize.<sup>1</sup> It is impossible for one to study any problem without using starting points which are assumptions. The very fact that criticism varies is sufficient to point out that one's mind has been alerted to see specific items. Why is it that one will minimize a criticism and another will expand it out of all proportion? An example may be stated in this way. If one assumes Luke to

. . . . .

1. Percy Gardner, Cambridge Bible Essays, Edited by H. B. Swete, p. 388.

be the hand of God perfectly recording the speeches, then all effort will be spent to do away with discrepancies and magnify the unity. On the other hand, if one suspects Luke of being influenced by his environment in matters of procedure, then incidents that tend to demonstrate this will be magnified. In view of this a quick survey of general assumptions made is in order before the survey of criticism on the various speeches themselves.

## B. General Assumptions of the Critics

### 1. Pro-Historical

Many critics do not state specifically the general ideas by which they are working. Others fall in line with the main ideas of their relative position concerning the authenticity of the speeches.

Maurice Jones, beginning his study, makes it clear that he is not suggesting or looking for verbatim reports of the Apostle's words. Rather he concedes that it was necessary for Luke to use summaries and epitomes of the actual words. No doubt the speeches contain many Lucan phrases and also there is evidence that Luke had done some editing. However, it is still possible to hear the voice of Paul through the reports.<sup>1</sup>

He constructs his criticism on the fact that Luke was a close companion of Paul. He was present at most of the crucial situations or was close to the source of materials. The use of the "we" documents is another point of support for the hypothesis that Luke was an eye-witness. The "we" sections denote a diary.<sup>2</sup> Jones concludes:

The trustworthiness of the speeches is, therefore, in some measure, guaranteed by the fact that, in the case of many of them, they are

. . . . .

1. Maurice Jones: St. Paul the Orator, p. 17.
2. Adolph Harnack: Acts of the Apostles, Chap. V.

reported by one who actually listened to them, and where this is not the case, they are reproduced from materials supplied by the speaker himself or by his companions.<sup>1</sup>

The working hypothesis set forth by Sir William Ramsey is summed up in the following statements. First, Luke was a great historian who endeavored to tell the truth about Christianity and was desirous of showing its development. No doubt Luke was partial. But the question resolves into whether Luke's facts are trustworthy, not whether he was biased or not. Second, if Luke wrote the history of Acts there must be found striking and convincing similarities. Third, the critics must study Luke's methods and not judge him according to whether he writes exactly as the critics consider a history ought to be written.<sup>2</sup> Finally, Ramsey claims that chronological recording of history was not necessarily the mode of history. Therefore, Luke's character as an historian depends on his selection of topics.<sup>3</sup>

The idea that Luke must be judged on the merits of his own work is corroborated by Frederick F. Bruce. Luke was able to construct narratives on the highest Greek literature level. Yet his speeches betray low quality of Greek.<sup>4</sup> More important is Bruce's insistence that if the recordings in Luke's Gospel concerning Jesus' words are faithful, then it is trite to forbid it in Acts. There is not any valid reason for thinking so. The comparison of Luke with Mark shows Luke's fidelity.

Bruce adds two more ideas that are essential. First, the similarities of the speeches are expected, for Paul claims to preach

. . . . .

1. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 19-20.
2. William Ramsey: St. Paul the Traveler, p. 77.
3. Ibid., p. 14-7.
4. Frederick F. Bruce: Acts of the Apostles, p. 18.



essentially the same Gospel as the other Apostles preach. (I Cor. 15:11) Even the use of Old Testament quotations might be similar.<sup>1</sup> Second, the fact whether the forms or models of the speeches are similar to the typical religious propaganda of the day is not the important aspect of the problem. The veracity depends upon the content.<sup>2</sup> The content of the speeches is corroborated by the Epistles of Paul. The question to ask then is whether or not the speeches portray the character of Paul as found in the Epistles.

No doubt this gives only a brief idea as to the assumed position of various commentators. Other factors such as the date of composition, source, philology,<sup>3</sup> etc., might be considered also. But the assumptions of the men who question the authenticity of the speeches must be considered now.

## 2. Anti-Historical

Henry Cadbury, writing in F. J. Jackson's and Kirsopp Lake's great book, The Beginnings of Christianity, takes a dim view of the historicity of the speeches. He states that Luke is not necessarily condemned to such practices of pagan historians, such as Thucydides, who invented the speeches of their characters. But he says, "The presumption, however, is strong that his speeches are generally without basis of definite information."<sup>4</sup> The second assumption made is the fact that Luke had no written records to draw from. To Cadbury it is highly improbable that anyone took notes on the speeches. He strengthens this

. . . . .

1. Bruce, F.F., Op. Cit., p. 19. See discussion on Old Testament quotes.
2. Ibid., p. 19
3. George Salmon: Historical Introduction to the New Testament, p. 395. Important reference to comparison of Paul's and Luke's language.
4. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake: The Beginnings of Christianity, Vol. V, p. 406.

argument by referring to the fact that Jewish and Roman tribunals did not keep any written records.<sup>1</sup> He admits the possibility of oral or verbal transmissions by the speakers or hearers. But even this forbids extensive records. And furthermore, these summaries can be attributed to an imaginative historian as well as oral tradition.<sup>2</sup>

Cadbury is aware of the fact there are similarities between the Pauline Epistles and the speeches. However, he does not concede it as a proof of originality because of the existing similarities between non-Pauline Epistles and Pauline speeches in the book of Acts. He gives examples of this fact.<sup>3</sup>

He grants the fact that Luke was faithful to the sources in the Gospel. But he refuses to grant the right to draw the inference and apply a similar attitude to the speeches of Acts. To him Luke could have used different methods in view of the fact that he had different sources. He had no written records and could have reported the history in the manner of pagan historians.<sup>4</sup>

Davidson suggests the following argument which explicitly sets forth the problem:

If it can be shown that the speeches exhibit many inappropriate particulars with a recurrence of the same ideas and modes of expression; that their language is substantially that of the writer, not of the speakers as far as we know them, their general credibility will be weakened, and the authorship removed from eye-witness or ear-witness.<sup>5</sup>

In addition to this line of thinking K. Lake adds that one can

. . . . .

1. Jackson, F. F. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. V, p. 406
2. Ibid., p. 407
3. Ibid., p. 410-3
4. Ibid., p. 416
5. Samuel Davidson: Introduction to the New Testament, p. 226.

allow for the similarity in ideology, but when language and style are the same, doubt of originality is raised.<sup>1</sup> He also suggests that if one assumes Luke to adhere to Thucydides' concept of writing history, automatically one cannot compare and contrast the Pauline speeches and Petrine speeches.<sup>2</sup>

Gardner's essay on the Pauline speeches declares very bluntly what is assumed. First he grants that Hawkins has established the fact that the "we" documents are of the same author as the rest of Acts. This is of great importance because it affects the validity of the speeches. If Luke was a fellow companion it does much to establish the historicity of the speeches.<sup>3</sup> He concedes to Ramsey's work on geographical accuracy of Luke's writings, but refuses to give Luke a clean slate in reporting facts such as Paul's conversion.<sup>4</sup>

Gardner's personal attitude is as follows:

The view which is adopted in this article is that the Acts comes from the pen of Luke...I do not believe that the writer falsified history, but he was very much under the sway of ideas which he regarded as more real than facts. And he followed the ordinary conventions which in his age dominated the writing of history..<sup>5</sup>

To Gardner, Luke was a product of his time and could not escape contemporary attitudes and moral concepts concerning the writing of history. One cannot attribute to Luke scruples of a modern historian.<sup>6</sup> The concern of the ancient historian was appropriateness instead of accuracy of fact.

. . . . .

1. Kirsopp Lake: Introduction to the New Testament, p. 94.
2. Ibid., p. 93
3. Gardner, P., Op. Cit., p. 385.
4. Ibid., p. 391.
5. Ibid., p. 388.
6. Ibid., p. 391.

Acknowledging the fact of inspiration, Gardner maintains it does not bring knowledge of scientific or historical fact. It strengthens his best powers but does not break the domination of literary habits of his time.<sup>1</sup> And he concludes concerning Luke, "...his work is not a precise record of fact, but a work full of the boldest idealism."<sup>2</sup>

Thus is made available to the reader various concepts and assumptions that affect the tenor of criticism. It is hoped that it will in some measure open up for the reader the trends of criticism. The following sections will attempt to show how these men have applied these and other principles to the specific speeches.

### C. Speech at Antioch in Pisidia

#### 1. Setting and Message

Paul and Barnabas were called by the Holy Spirit from Antioch of Syria to carry out the mission God had planned for them. This led to the so-called First Missionary Journey. The date of this journey is placed between the years of 45-9 A.D.<sup>3</sup> Sailing from Cyprus, after proclaiming the Word of God in the synagogue, they went to Perga.<sup>4</sup> Passing from Perga they came unto Antioch in Pisidia where they went to the synagogue. It was here that Paul delivered the first address recorded in Acts. It was natural for Paul to go to the synagogue for it was the Sabbath.<sup>5</sup>

The author of Acts briefly describes the situation as being a typical meeting of the Jews in a synagogue on the Sabbath. It was after

. . . . .

1. Gardner, P., Op. Cit., p. 417

2. Ibid., p. 418

3. Frank Goodwin: A Harmony and Commentary on the Life of St. Paul, p.35.

4. Acts 13:4,13

5. Acts 13:14

the reading of the Law and the Prophets that Paul was invited to speak.<sup>1</sup> Ramsey suggests that Paul's sermon was based on the reading of the Scripture for the day.<sup>2</sup> He admits it to be only a conjecture.

His speech draws the attention of the reader because of its details and content. It relates a good picture of Paul's message to the Jews. The manner of approach is based on Jewish history. Noteworthy is the fact that he identifies himself with the group by the use of the term "brethren".<sup>3</sup> Another feature is the use of Old Testament references to substantiate his points.<sup>4</sup> The content of the speech may be summarized in the following outline:

I. Historical Preparation for the Promise (16-25)

(Israel's history produced Jesus.)

II. Promise Fulfilled in Jesus Christ (26-37)

A. His rejection by Jerusalem Jews

B. His resurrection proof of fulfillment

1. Eye-witnesses

2. Substantiation from the Old Testament.

III. Fulfillment of Promise means Forgiveness of Sins (38-41)

A. Justification not by law.

B. Necessity of repentance.

Luke records the results of the speech as being divided.

Some received it with joy, others became jealous and contradicted what Paul had said.<sup>5</sup>

. . . . .

1. Acts 13:15

2. Ramsey, W., St. Paul the Traveler, p. 100.

3. Acts 13:26

4. Acts 13:33 (Ps. 2:7), Acts 13:34 (Is. 55:3), Acts 13:35 (Ps. 16:10), and Acts 13:41 (Hab. 1:5).

5. Acts 13:44-5

## 2. Pro-Historical Criticism

Beginning with general criticism concerning the speech, Conybeare and Howson write:

He has preserved, if not all the words, yet the very words uttered by the Apostle; nor can we fail to recognize in all these speeches a tone of thought, and even of expression, which stamps them with the individuality of the speaker.<sup>1</sup>

Meyer calls to the attention of the reader also that the speech contains no phrase or form that could not have been Paul's. Pauline wisdom, prudence and teaching ability is displayed in its plan and execution. Also the lack of originality is not enough to prove the speech to be the composition of Luke. He emphasizes the fact that Paul is speaking to unbelieving Jews, and there is not any pattern to follow from the Epistles.<sup>2</sup>

The nature of the speech forbids setting any standards as to what the contents should be. For it is the first of its kind in Acts. And furthermore, it is the only speech to unbelieving Jews. James Knowling picks up this idea and adds that it is unlikely for a romancer to have composed it. For there was no model to follow because it is a Gospel to the Jews and the Jews alone.<sup>3</sup> He acknowledges the fact that there are similarities between Stephen's address and Paul's. However, the beginning is the only place of similarity, which could be due to coincidence rather than copying.<sup>4</sup>

Knowling elaborates by suggesting several points in the speech

. . . . .

1. W. J. Conybeare and J. S. Howson: *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, p. 174.
2. Heinrich Meyer: *Acts*, p. 251.
3. R. J. Knowling: *The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ*, p. 361.
4. *Ibid.*, p. 362.

which indicate authenticity. First is the ideology which is parallel to that of the Epistle to the Galatians.<sup>1</sup> Second, reference to Jesus as the seed of David is compatible with the Epistle to the Romans.<sup>2</sup> Third, the fact that God sent His Son parallels the idea in Galatians 4:4.<sup>3</sup> Finally, the results bear the impression of truth as the city is in division over the message. If artificially composed, a more logical conclusion would be acceptance.<sup>4</sup>

Richard B. Rackham believes the address to be an actual address by Paul. However, he does not deny the idea that it probably is a summary of a larger address. He suggests that it is compressed and bears the hand of Luke in its final composition.<sup>5</sup> He concedes the fact of resemblance to the sermon of Stephen. Yet there are unmistakable marks of Paul's thought and phraseology. The speeches of Paul and Stephen do differ in that Stephen's history shows the doctrine of the Messiah in types, whereas Paul's history emphasizes the preparation for the Messiah.<sup>6</sup>

He refers to specific elements which give the speech Pauline character. First, the Christology is similar to Paul's. This is exemplified in the development of Christ as Saviour and King, and the Sonship of Jesus.<sup>7</sup> Second, Paul is speaking to the Jews on the basis of the Promise. At the end Paul distinguishes between Law and Promise as does the Epistle to the Galatians.<sup>8</sup>

. . . . .

1. R. J. Knowling, The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, p. 363
2. Ibid., p. 364.
3. Ibid., p. 366.
4. Ibid., p. 368.
5. Richard Rackham: The Acts of the Apostles, p. 208.
6. Ibid., p. 208-9.
7. Ibid., p. 210.
8. Ibid., p. 213.

Most critics on this side admit the resemblance of Paul's address to Stephen's and Peter's. Louis Sabatier feels that this resemblance is not enough to judge it as unhistorical. He relates, "...there are passages in which we distinctly catch the inimitable accents of Paul's voice."<sup>1</sup> Concerning the parallel use of history, he suggests it is from a different view. More specifically, the fact that Paul emphasizes the life of our Lord from the standpoint of His death and resurrection and not from His daily life is typical of him. (Cf. I Cor. 15:3-4)<sup>2</sup>

Sabatier, along with many others, points to verses 38-9 as being indicative of Paul's idea of justification by faith. It is in agreement with the Epistle to the Galatians, in that the Law cannot justify but faith in Jesus does. This appears to be valuable evidence. Yet the opponents use the same verses to prove that it is not Paul's speech because it does not represent the Pauline view of justification by faith. It is obvious that the interpretation is the key to the meaning.

Meyer sets forth the most detailed argument for this verse to be interpreted along with Paul's concept in Galatians. He believes Paul to be setting down the proposition that man in Law finds no justification from sin. Paul's major proposition is contained in the first part of the verse. It is the fact that justification comes through faith in Christ. The minor proposition is the fact that by the Law no man is justified. This is found in the second part of the verse. Therefore, the conclusion Paul wants the hearer to draw is that only through Christ is justification

. . . . .

1. Louis Sabatier: The Apostle Paul, p. 100.
2. Ibid., p. 101.



acquired. This underlying logic is compatible with Galatians.<sup>1</sup>

The most detailed criticism has been undertaken by Maurice Jones. Viewing the similarities as possible points for negative criticism, Jones made a special study of this relationship. Studying the relationship between Paul's discourse and Stephen's, he concludes:

The different tone in the two discourses is also well marked, St. Stephen's leading object being apparently to affront his hearers, whereas Paul, throughout his sermon, is extremely conciliatory.<sup>2</sup>

In concluding his study of Paul's speech compared with Peter's, he says:

In both Petrine and Pauline sermons the practical outcome is the same, the declaration of the "forgiveness of sins" through Jesus Christ (confer Acts 2:38 and 13:38-9) but in St. Paul there is the additional idea of the Catholicity of the Gospel and the distinctively Pauline doctrine of justification by faith.<sup>3</sup>

As the other critics recognize the mutual relationship to Galatians, Jones likewise alludes to the Epistle in recognition of the similarities. The following relationships are listed: 1) The history of Israel is thought of as a training course to prepare the people. (In agreement with Galatians 3:24); 2) The part of demonstrating Israel to be a wayward son being trained for an inheritance under the judges, prophets and the kings (This compares with Galatians 4:1-7); 3) Importance of Sonship in the sermon and Epistle are emphasized (Compare 13:26,33 with Galatians 4:4 and 3:26); 4) Doctrine of rejection is emphasized in the sermon by Canaan and Saul (This compares with Hagar in Galatians); 5) Corresponding words, such as "δίκαιον" (which is the main theme of the Epistle.<sup>4</sup>

. . . . .

1. Meyer, H. A. W., Acts, p. 261.
2. Jones, J., St. Paul the Orator, p. 49.
3. Ibid., p. 51.
4. Ibid., p. 52-3.

Jones also elaborates on the appearance of Pauline characteristics. First, Paul's sympathetic and psychological approach by the use of the term "brethren". Second, Paul's doctrine of Jesus is compatible with Romans in reference to Him as "the seed of David." Third, the doctrine of remission of sins is based upon the death and resurrection of Jesus and the futility of the Law to justify. (This is in agreement with Romans 7:7-24) Finally, he emphasizes Dr. Chase's observation that Habakkuk is used to condemn their unbelief. It is the same prophet whom Paul uses to verify the contention "The just shall live by faith".<sup>1</sup> On this point Jones writes:

Here we have a trace of Pauline thought so delicate and unobtrusive, that it can only point to the conclusion that we have, in the Acts, a very close report of the Apostle's actual words.<sup>2</sup>

Some critics try to take a neutral position in regard to this speech. Fredrick J. Foakes-Jackson is one, and the way in which one evaluates his words determines what side he actually takes. He does deem the speech to be suited to the occasion and that it breathes the breath of primitive Christianity. It has definite resemblance to other speeches (Stephen's and Peter's) yet possesses individuality. He says, "If the speech is a composition put into the mouth of Paul there is no small skill displayed in the deft employment of Pauline phrases and ideas."<sup>3</sup>

Some further observations by Jackson are: 1) a primitive doctrine is declared, as in the speeches of Peter; 2) no proclamation of the power of the cross; and 3) use of Jesus as Saviour and not Christ;

. . . . .

1. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 57.

2. Ibid.

3. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Acts of the Apostles, p. 117.

and finally, no mention of eschatological concepts.<sup>1</sup> His conclusion is, "His speech is not a theological statement, but a Gospel of good news."<sup>2</sup>

### 3. Anti-Historical Criticism

The number of critics on this side are many, but few actually put their reasons down for holding this view. It may be that they feel that it is too obvious to spend much time discussing it. The opinion that Eduard Zeller gives is that the speech is an "echo" of those by Peter and Stephen. It is the product of the narrator.<sup>3</sup>

Benjamin Bacon criticizes this speech severely, writing, "The speech placed in Paul's mouth at Pisidian Antioch cannot be more than the historian's attempt to tell what Paul might have said..."<sup>4</sup> The reasons for such a statement are: 1) It is a rehearsal of the speech at Pentecost with few variations; 2) all events are unlike Paul and it contains not one trait of the Gospel, especially in verse 39. Bacon argues that Paul is suggesting that the Law can give partial justification and Christ completes it. This is in opposition to Galatians. Therefore, it cannot be Pauline.<sup>5</sup>

Arthur McGiffert's greatest objection is verse 38. This he claims to be Petrine. Also he views verse 39 as being below the Pauline standard for justification. He does not deny that Paul and Barnabas preached in Antioch, but does doubt whether this speech is accurate.<sup>6</sup>

Hans Windisch is as blunt as Bacon in his denial of the

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Op. Cit., p. 118.

2. Ibid.

3. Meyer, H. A. W., Acts, p. 251, Quotes Zeller.

4. Benjamin Bacon: Story of St. Paul, p. 103.

5. Ibid., p. 103.

6. Arthur McGiffert; History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, p.186.

authenticity. He remarks, "The speech of Paul at Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:15-41) is very un-Pauline, and obviously the product of the author..."<sup>1</sup> His reasons are: 1) The author borrows from the Gospel (compare 13:25 and Luke 3:16, 8:28 and 23:13, concerning the use of John the Baptist); 2) The speech implies that the Lord appeared only to those who went with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, thereby making Paul a secondary witness. This is contrary to Paul's assertion; 3) The speech is dependent upon the Pentecost speech for proof of the Resurrection (compare verses 34-37 with 2:25-32, 38). Concerning verse 39, he thinks that it was an attempt to put a familiar Pauline phrase in his mouth but it was twisted. He concludes, "For these reasons the composition of the speech cannot be by a companion of Paul."<sup>2</sup>

A number of the critics made much of the fact that Paul's purported address is similar to others in Acts. Davidson thinks its contact with history is obviously Stephen's speech. And the second part of the speech fits the two discourses of Peter in chapters three and ten. Paul places emphasis on the Resurrection as Peter does.<sup>3</sup>

In concluding the argument against the authenticity of the speech The Interpreters Bible brings up several points that deserve attention. The acknowledgment of Pauline characteristics is granted. However, to them the speech contains mostly reminiscence of the earlier speeches in Acts. The speech is Lucan in style and noteworthy for being typical of a Christian preacher of Luke's day addressing a Hellenistic-

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. II, p. 337.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 337.
3. Davidson, S., *Op. Cit.*, p. 230.

Jewish audience. Second, the fact that Paul does not mention the fact of his eye-witness in verse 31 is indicative of free composition.

(Objection is, why exclude himself?) The general conclusion of this criticism is that the speech must be regarded as a summary or free composition.<sup>1</sup>

#### D. Speech at Athens

##### 1. Setting and Message

Paul's visit to Athens occurred on his second missionary journey during the time of 50 A.D.<sup>2</sup> This city was the center of Grecian education at that time. It is of interest to note that apparently Paul did not intend to go to Athens at this time. Paul and Silas had traveled from Thessalonica and Beroea. Each time they had encountered heavy opposition from the Jews. Therefore Paul was forced to leave these cities sooner than anticipated.<sup>3</sup> Silas and Timothy remained at Beroea and Paul was escorted to Athens.

In describing the setting for Paul's defense before the Athenians, Luke relates to the reader several informative and important facts. They are as follows: 1) Paul's perception of the idolatry in the city and a negative reaction to the condition; 2) Paul's activity in the synagogue and marketplace was one of discussion concerning the Resurrection; 3) The different groups encountered were Jews, devout persons, Epicureans and Stoic philosophers, whose favorite pasttime was discussing new ideas; 4) The reaction of the people toward Paul's words. He is depicted as a man of unworthy character or one picking up scraps of learning here and

.....

1. Interpreters Bible, Vol. IX, p. 175-6.
2. Goodwin, F., Op. Cit., p. 63.
3. Acts 17:1-14.

there;<sup>1</sup> and 5) the crowd's interest was incited by his preaching of Jesus and the Resurrection which they thought to be two foreign divinities.<sup>2</sup>

The Agora, where Paul met the philosophers, is adequately described by Jones as he sums up the situation with these words:

In it were to be found the headquarters of the municipal government of the city; in the open space, in the center, the markets were held and all commercial business transacted; its colonnades were the resort of fashionable pleasure-seekers, philosophers, teachers, news-mongers, quacks and idlers. It was this busy centre of city life, and to a crowd in many respects refined and critical but shallow and devoid of moral power, that St. Paul proclaimed his message.<sup>3</sup>

And F. F. Bruce adds this fitting statement to the situation, "Versatile Paul versus philosophical friends in Athens."<sup>4</sup>

The speech comes out of this situation. The men who argued with Paul wanted to hear more and took him to the Areopagus. The question as to what the Areopagus was is represented in two opposing views. Ramsey claims the correct interpretation of the events will be determined by whether one interprets the Areopagus as a council or a hill.<sup>5</sup>

In the contents of the speech is the noticeable philosophical atmosphere which is quite different from previous speeches in Acts. Paul does not pay much attention to Jewish doctrine. One must agree with Davidson that we find the speech more complete at the beginning than the end.<sup>6</sup> The speech moves from a vague general creative God to a personal God who has revealed Himself to man. It is quite evident that

.....

1. Bruce, F. F., Acts of the Apostles, p. 333, see word,

2. Acts 17:16-21.

3. Jones, Maurice, St. Paul the Orator, p. 88-9.

4. Bruce, F. F., Op. Cit., p. 334.

5. Ramsey, W., Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, p. 100.

6. Davidson, Samuel, Op. Cit., p. 33.

Paul, beginning with the observation of the altar inscribed "to an Unknown God", moves to present the Gospel. The climactic point of the speech comes in the last two verses (30-2) where Paul depicts God as the Judge of mankind. This judgment is one of moral righteousness.

A quick way to digest the content of the speech is to follow its outline:

I. Point of Contact. (22-3)

(Reference to the heathen world and its idolatry.)

II. Doctrine of God as Creator with its corollary, the condemnation of idolatry as being in contradiction to this concept. (24-6)

III. The Revelation of God's Purpose. (27-30)

A. In unity of the human race.

B. In process of history.

C. The end that men should seek Him and worship Him.

IV. Call to Repentance and Proclamation of Judgment to come. (31-2)

The abrupt ending of the speech is to be noted. The reason seems to be that the Resurrection caused an open outburst of comments which prevented him from continuing.<sup>1</sup> The results of the speech would be considered as disappointing in light of the results of the other speeches recorded.

This speech must be recognized for the lack of any extensive mention of the Christian message. Critics on both sides regard this speech as a masterpiece for both situation and content.

. . . . .

1. Acts 17:32.

## 2. Pro-Historical Criticism

There is much criticism on this speech. Beginning with general criticism, A. C. McGiffert pictures this speech as of historical trustworthiness because of its atmosphere. He bases this contention on the mood, content and appropriate statements.<sup>1</sup> Specifically he points out Luke's portrayal of Paul's disgust with Athenian idolatry and the results of this disgust. McGiffert sums up this point by saying:

...though in view of these considerations it can hardly be doubted that Paul delivered an address in Athens upon the subject indicated, and that the general outline of that address is accurately reproduced in Luke's account.<sup>2</sup>

Jones adds several reasons for Luke's faithful reporting in relating the following ideas. First, the non-routine of similar Pauline visits strikes the attention of the reader. The visit is ascribed to accident and not planned, thus indicating reporting rather than free composition. Second, the whole narrative shows a remarkable restraint which argues for authenticity. Luke could have built Paul up as a big success. Yet the outcome is reported as a failure.<sup>3</sup> Such is Jones' basis for suggesting this speech to be authentic.

One commentator points out that the speech is typical of Paul's becoming all things to all men, speaking Greek to Greeks and as a philosopher to philosophers. Paul used the doctrines of the Stoics and then the doctrines of the Epicureans to build the speech.<sup>4</sup> The commentator makes the following generalization, "This defense is thoroughly Pauline in manner and method."<sup>5</sup> Also he adds that the speech is typically

. . . . .

1. McGiffert, A. C., Op. Cit., p. 260.

2. Ibid., Footnote.

3. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 101.

4. Rackham, R. B., Acts of the Apostles, p. 312-6.

5. Ibid., p. 312.



Gentile and proceeds along the lines of natural Theology. Rackham concludes his study by saying, "In this speech we are unmistakably listening to the voice of Paul."<sup>1</sup>

Concerning the credibility of the reporting, Ramsey has contributed much through archaeological study. He begins by stating that the movement of the narrative from chapter 13 to chapter 17 is remarkably fitting to Paul's character in each situation. The accuracy is necessary according to Ramsey and he vindicates Luke as having been exact and honest. In speaking of the cruciality of the situation Ramsey reports:

...the narrative never makes a false step amid all the many details, as scene changes from city to city. And that is the conclusive proof that it is a picture of real life.<sup>2</sup>

Breaking in on Ramsey's report, K. Lake who leans toward the non-historical side of most of Luke's works substantiates Ramsey's statement by stating:

Taken as a whole it commends itself at once as a genuine narrative. The Agora, the Stoics and Epicureans, and the Areopagus are all correct local details; the characterization of the city as full of idols and of the people as curious for novelty was made in other contemporary records.<sup>3</sup>

However, it is not fair to say that Lake gives full support to the speech which will be seen later.

Moreover, Ramsey puts great stress on the fact that Paul was before a council.<sup>4</sup> This is not to say that it was a criminal court of law. He points out that Athens was a free city and therefore quite lax in legalistic procedure.<sup>5</sup> Ramsey states that one has to interpret Luke

. . . . .

1. Rackham, R., Op. Cit., p. 313.
2. Ramsey, W., St. Paul the Traveler, p. 238.
3. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. IV, p. 208.
4. Ramsey, W., Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, p. 103.
5. Ibid.

carefully in order to sense the colloquialism and dialect of the narratives of Paul's journeys. Closing the discussion Ramsey's summation is:

Here you have real life in all its truth and variety, expressed with vividness which can spring only from the eye-witness telling what he heard and saw.<sup>1</sup>

And at the end, after citing various examples, he writes:

These examples prove Attic usage as belonging to educated colloquial speech of the Pauline period. We hear with Paul's ears and see with his eyes in Athens...<sup>2</sup>

Harnack was impressed by the distinctness of the speech and makes the following report:

As far as the speech at Athens with its prelude in XIV 15ff, (referring to Iystra)<sup>3</sup> if only critics will again learn to see clearly and to feel rightly, none of them will fail to recognize that in this attempt to give a short summary of St. Paul's fundamental teaching in his sermons to Gentiles, the genius shown in the selection of ideas is just as great as the historical trustworthiness of the report.<sup>4</sup>

With Lake and Ramsey, Harnack notes vitality and realism in Luke's description and reporting of the speech. Harnack finishes by stating that he can see no reason why this speech cannot be accepted as coming from Paul.<sup>5</sup>

Moreover, those who accept the speech as being authentic point to the theology and doctrine of the speech. Henry Chase pursues this idea with much vigor as he claims that the Pauline Epistles corroborate Luke's account. First he states that Paul's idea of idolatry is in keeping with the Epistles. Paul views idolatry as superstition and holds it in contempt.<sup>6</sup> Chase bases his opinion upon the word *δευροετέροους* as

. . . . .

1. Ramsey, W., Op. Cit., p. 103.
2. Ibid.
3. The parentheses and contents belong to the writer of the Thesis.
4. Harnack, A., Acts of the Apostles, p. 131.
5. Ibid., p. 108.
6. Henry Chase: The Credibility of the Book of Acts, p. 212.

being condemnatory toward such superstition.<sup>1</sup>

Chase has demonstrated the relation of the speech to the Pauline Epistles concerning doctrine. First is the doctrine of God as Creator and Maker of the Universe (I Cor. 8:6, Rom. 9:36, Eph. 4:6).<sup>2</sup> Second, he points out that the idea of the history of the world as the evolution of the Creator's first period is consistent with Galatians 4:4 (appointed seasons).<sup>3</sup> It is not a blind outcome as believed by Stoic thought. The doctrine of God concerning unity of the human race is corroborated by Paul's Epistle to the Colossians.<sup>4</sup> Third, the doctrine of repentance is represented in that God is the Moral Governor of the Universe who calls men to repentance (compare with Thessalonians, both letters).<sup>5</sup> Finally, the speech demonstrates Paul's attitude concerning God's willingness to overlook sin for a period of time. This is compatible with the Epistle to the Romans.<sup>6</sup>

Jones, conducting a study similar to Chase's, finds comparison between the speech and Epistles at the following points.<sup>7</sup>

1. Judgment (I Thess. 5:2-4, II Thess. 1:10, 2:20)
2. Acts 17:26-8 with Romans 3:25, 11:32, 16:25, 11:36
3. Acts 17:30 (emphasis on "now") with Galatians 3:22
4. Acts 17:26-8 with Ephesians 4:6, 3:15, 1:22
5. Acts 17:27-8 with Col. 1:15 and Acts 17:30 with Col. 1:26

(Immanence of God)

. . . . .

1. Chase, H., Op. Cit., p. 212.
2. Ibid.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid.
5. Ibid.
6. Ibid., p. 230.
7. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 102-3.

In view of the fact that it is admitted that Luke had no contact with the Epistles, it does prove the speech to be in accord with a Pauline attitude.

Knowling doubts the possibility of the speech's being composed by a second century writer because of the nature of the doctrine. His observation leads him to report:

...one distinctively Christian statement in Paul's speech at Athens, viz. that God would judge the world by the man whom He had ordained, and that He had given assurance of it by the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Here again, we have a mark of restraint and truthfulness which a second century writer would have found it hard to maintain.<sup>1</sup>

Knowling seems to think the language and style fit an actual experience in the first century.

He alludes to a second fact which concerns a reference to the Book of Wisdom in the speech (Acts 17:23-30). In view of this evidence he concludes that there is reason for acceptance of the Epistle to the Romans and this speech as being from the same mind.<sup>2</sup> The sobriety and restraint of the author are remarkable evidence of truthfulness according to Knowling.<sup>3</sup>

George Salmon, quoting Samuel Davidson on the philological aspect of the speech, states that there are no less than twenty-six words in verses 19-34 which do not occur in Luke. The language and sentiments are largely Paul's, even if summarized by the author.<sup>4</sup>

Many scholars point to the surprise ending of rejection as an earmark of its accuracy. It would have been the opportunity for the

. . . . .

1. Knowling, R., The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, p. 390.
2. Ibid., p. 387.
3. Ibid., p. 389.
4. George Salmon: An Historical Introduction to the New Testament, p. 396.

author to elaborate if composing it himself. Foakes-Jackson recognizes this to be the strongest point in establishing the authenticity of this speech.<sup>1</sup>

The above has sought to present a sample of the criticism on the positive side. Now the other side must be considered.

### 3. Anti-Historical Criticism

Once again the procedure will be to start with the general criticism and proceed to the specific. E. Zeller's work provides a good starting place because of its place in the history of criticism. Zeller first comments that the question of authenticity is partially answered in realizing that the past speeches are the work of Luke's own hand.<sup>2</sup> And he concludes that this speech most likely is also of a free composition. Zeller in comparing the speech at Athens with the speech of Stephen suggests that they have a mutual relationship and makes the following conclusion:

Such being the mutual relationship of the two accounts it is impossible to avoid the conjecture that the two speeches and events within which they are framed issued from one and the same mind, that of our author; that the scene at Athens is merely a counterpart to the scene of Stephen at Jerusalem; and that the difference between the two, which certainly obtrude themselves on every one and merely owing to the scene at Athens being enacted on Grecian soil instead of Jewish soil, and being adopted to a harmless result instead of a tragic conclusion.<sup>3</sup>

Zeller admits that this cannot be conclusive proof nor enough to dismiss the speech as unhistorical. But it does bring the genuineness of the speech in great question and must be considered so until positive proof is brought forth to remove the doubt.<sup>4</sup>

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Acts of the Apostles, p. 167.
2. Eduard Zeller: The Origin and Contents of the Book of Acts, p. 54-5.
3. Ibid., p. 55.
4. Ibid., p. 56.

Davidson, previously mentioned, declared his position to be against the historicity. He believes it to be highly superficial. He claims that the main object of the speech was to contrast Christianity with heathenism. The language of the setting in reference to details betrays the mind of the author and his creation.<sup>1</sup>

Some consider the reaction of Paul to the idolatry as being too dramatic to fit a Pauline reaction. Foakes-Jackson bases his opinion on the fact that the speech is the artistic work of Luke rather than history. Expanding this idea he comments that it is inconsistent with the statement in Corinthians where Paul said that idols are nothing (I. Cor. 8). Paul was also well acquainted with such scenes through his education and travel. Therefore his reaction is too violent.<sup>2</sup> The second doubt as to historicity in Foakes-Jackson's mind is whether one considers this to be a composition or compilation or epitome of what Paul said on this occasion.<sup>3</sup>

Gardner in his essay on Pauline speeches declares the Athenian speech to have the least possibility of being historical.<sup>4</sup> He begins his criticism with the following opinion, "...the notion that he would treasure up and repeat to his followers the words he used in his address is fanciful."<sup>5</sup> He does not deny that there is a possibility of its resembling Paul but maintains it is free composition. He is referring to the attitudes of Paul displayed in elements of the speech. These he claims can be true of both Luke and Paul. The difference that Gardner

. . . . .

1. Davidson, S., Op. Cit., p. 231-2.
2. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Op. Cit., p. 163.
3. Ibid., p. 164.
4. Gardner, P., Op. Cit., p. 401.
5. Ibid., p. 399.

sees is between the spirit of Paul and Luke. Luke was a universalist while Paul was strict in proclaiming salvation through Christ.<sup>1</sup> Paul would regard natural law as being in the hearts of Gentiles to convict them of sin.

The view of idolatry is inconsistent with the Epistles. The speech gives the idea of its being only an unworthy way to regard God, which is contrary to Paul.<sup>2</sup> Instead of the unity in Christ which is the Pauline basis for racial unity, this speech presents a weak natural unity among all peoples.<sup>3</sup> Gardner states his final position in the following words:

...it belongs rather to the historian than the Apostle; it is more in his way of thinking; and its appropriateness is rather ideal and dramatic than actually suited to the facts of the case and the exciting surroundings.<sup>4</sup>

The basic book in opposition to the historicity of this speech is Agnostos Theos by Eduard Norden. Because it has not been translated into English only quotations are available to the present writer. Herbert McLachlan sums up Norden's point of view with the following words:

The theory is that the speech is the work of a later redactor, and is based upon the traditions of Appollonius of Tyana.<sup>5</sup>

To Norden the speech is a pure fabrication. In fact all the speeches comply with the religious propaganda of the day.<sup>6</sup>

Johannes Weiss bases much of his criticism on Norden's works and takes a dim view of the authenticity of this speech. His position

.....

1. Gardner, P., Op. Cit., p. 400.

2. Ibid., p. 400.

3. Ibid., p. 400-1.

4. Ibid., p. 401.

5. Herbert McLachlan: St. Luke the Man and His Work, p. 182.

6. Bruce, F. F., Acts of the Apostles, p. 20.

is typified by the following assertion, "For example the author of Acts puts in the mouth at Athens a speech before Greek philosophers..."<sup>1</sup> And after referring the reader to Norden's study in which the narrative of the Areopagus speech is under examination he concludes:

However it may be, in any case it is proved that the Areopagus speech is a literary fiction. The question is whether it nevertheless contains features which were characteristic of Paul's missionary preaching.<sup>2</sup>

He claims that the address of the "Unknown God" is by the author who composed Acts. His position rests on the idea that Luke was conciliating and making Christianity acceptable to all. He doesn't deny that Paul could have said this but it is not probable.<sup>3</sup> At the end of his work he says:

...especially after what Norden has brought out, (the speech)<sup>4</sup> must be taken as just the work of art by the author of Acts, one of high significance and skill.<sup>5</sup>

It may be added that Weiss credits the speech to the literary modes of the day which Luke followed.<sup>6</sup>

Bacon gives the criticism a different slant as he acknowledges the fact that the Gospel which he preached in Greece is similar to the speech at Athens. However this means only that the speech possesses the spirit of the missionary message. It is not Paul's own words but a Pauline type of speech.<sup>7</sup> In fact it is related to the religious propaganda that was pre-Christian.<sup>8</sup> His summary is:

. . . . .

1. Johannes Weiss: The History of Primitive Christianity, p. 239.
2. Ibid., p. 242, footnote.
3. Ibid., p. 244-5.
4. The parentheses and contents belong to the writer of the thesis.
5. Weiss, J., Op. Cit., p. 246.
6. Ibid., p. 244-5.
7. Bacon, B. W., Op. Cit., p. 163.
8. Ibid., p. 167.



Acts, therefore, in its description of preaching to the heathen at Lystra and Athens is true to Paul, but simply because Paul was true to the standard of even pre-Christian times.<sup>1</sup>

Ned B. Stonehouse in his monogram on the speech at Athens quotes the German critic Schwietzer as having pronounced the following judgment:

That the speech is unhistorical is at once portrayed by the fact that Paul takes for his starting point an inscription dedicating an Athenian altar 'to an Unknown God'. There can never have been such an inscription. There is evidence in current literature only for altars 'to unknown gods' in the plural, not 'to an Unknown God' in the singular.<sup>2</sup>

Such is the criticism against this speech. Much more could be added. However, it would be slightly repetitious. Therefore the case must rest here.

#### E. Speech at Miletus

##### 1. Setting and Message

The speech at Miletus stands at the center of the seven Pauline speeches in Acts. The first three represent the aggressiveness of the Gospel to unbelieving Jews and Gentiles. The last three represent the Gospel on defense. This speech at the center is unique in that the message is directed to the Church. Its pastoral atmosphere sets it apart from the others.

The third missionary journey was the time of the speech (48-54 A.D.).<sup>3</sup> Paul had stopped on his way to Jerusalem. It was in Paul's plan to return to Jerusalem as quickly as possible for the festival of Pentecost.<sup>4</sup>

Although little is related concerning the actual circumstances

. . . . .

1. Bacon, B. W., Op. Cit., p. 167.
2. Ned B. Stonehouse: The Areopagus, p. 16.
3. Goodwin, F., Op. Cit., Part V.
4. Acts 20:16.

of the delay at Miletus, what is given is of significance because it falls within a "we" section.<sup>1</sup> Miletus was only thirty miles from Ephesus.<sup>2</sup> From Miletus Paul sent messengers to the Elders of the Church in Ephesus.<sup>3</sup> They were to meet Paul at Miletus. Most likely the Miletus Christians were there also. Though the actual scene is not described it is suggested that they met by the seashore in a secluded spot.<sup>4</sup> The drama and tense atmosphere cannot be denied. The emotions and the characteristics of the one purported to be speaking are certainly there. The contents obviously involve the person of Paul himself. He is relating his own thought and life. The purpose of such is open to question. Some believe it to be apologetic on his own behalf. However, it must be conceded that the speech is Pauline. The zealous, driving spirit of the great Apostle is here. The parallelisms to the Epistle are remarkable in view of the fact that Luke *which?* was not acquainted with them.<sup>5</sup> The address has one peculiarity, and that is the thought tacked on after the benediction.<sup>6</sup>

The words of Paul are embodied in the fact that he will not see them again. Such is the reason for the tense and dramatic scene. It is possible that Paul is seeking to inspire the Elders to carry on toward the goal of the calling. Paul's life is the example for the exhortation to be faithful. In view of these general statements the contents may be summarized in the following outline:

. . . . .

1. Acts 20:13 and Acts 21:1.
2. Bruce, F. F., Acts of the Apostles, p. 377.
3. Acts 20:17.
4. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 135.
5. In the opinion of the scholars.
6. Acts 20:32-3.

I. Paul's labor in the past --- MOTIVATION (18-21)

- A. Serve in humility in face of opposition.
- B. Gospel declared to all men.

II. Paul's labor among the Church --- EXHORTATION (22-32)

- A. Future life full of perils.
- B. Declare the full Council of God.
- C. Feed the Church of God.
- D. Alert for false teachers.

III. Paul's interest in all his labors --- ATTITUDE (32-35)

- A. Labor with own hands.
- B. Service in light of Jesus' words.

This address gives insight into Paul's expectations for the Church and plan for expansion.

2. Pro-Historical Criticism

Rackham begins his defense of the speech with the admission that the speech could be two separate speeches put together. Yet he gives the following reasons for considering the speech to be trustworthy. They are: 1) A real advancement of thought; 2) Reflects circumstances of the moment (prophecy, excitement and anticipation of evil); 3) Full of Pauline characteristics; egotism, self-vindication and the appeal to own example, etc.; 4) Local color represents ministry at Ephesus; 5) Style in accordance with Pastoral Epistles; and 6) Retention of dramatic delivery.<sup>1</sup> He sums up his study with the comment, "St. Luke was present and alive to the seriousness of the outlook, took the notes which are written for us."<sup>2</sup>

. . . . .

1. Rackham, R., Op. Cit., p. 383-4.  
2. Ibid., p. 383.

Following a general criticism, M. Jones claims:

Of all the Pauline orations the address of Miletus, by the very fact of its being an apostolic charge to a Christian assembly, has most in common with the Epistles, and for this reason we are furnished with more complete data for comparison than is possible in the case of other sermons or addresses.<sup>1</sup>

Jones lauds the speech as being an eye-witness account of Luke.

In fact, so sure is he that he makes it without reservation.<sup>2</sup> The reasons given by Jones are: 1) The "we" sections assure the fact that it came from a diary. The diary was a book of notes made during the trip; 2) the surface of the address unmistakably shows signs of eye-witness.<sup>3</sup>

Jones strengthens his position by referring to specific points in the narrative. They are: 1) Paul's characteristic of power and tenderness; 2) echos of Pauline phraseology, such as "the counsel of God", "inheritance", and the Church as "a building"; 3) the relationship to the Epistle of Timothy; 4) the relationship of the address to the rest of Paul's ministry in the Book of Acts is supported; and 5) the phraseology and vocabulary are substantiated by the Epistles and the Book of Acts.<sup>4</sup>

In conclusion Jones writes, "...we have here an authentic report of the Apostle's discourse, in which his actual words are to a large extent embodied."<sup>5</sup>

Meyer along with Jones points to Paul's character of self-witness as indicative of authenticity. Meyer believes this to be due to self-consciousness and not apologetic. He esteems the speech to be authentic.<sup>6</sup>

. . . . .

1. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 140.
2. Ibid., p. 146-7.
3. Ibid., p. 146.
4. Ibid., p. 147.
5. Ibid., p. 150-3.
6. Meyer, H. A. W., Op. Cit., p. 388.

Knowling bases his criticism on the doctrinal aspects of the speech. From his investigation the Christology of the speech is in harmony with the Epistles. In this speech Paul mentions Christ as the binding rule of life (see I Corinthians, especially 1:4-9); and makes mention of the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, the grace of God (see Ephesians), and final redemption (see Romans).<sup>1</sup> His summary is:

If Paul speaks to us anywhere in Acts we feel that he speaks to us in the sorrowful scene at Miletus and in the hour of parting..<sup>2</sup>

Other doctrinal aspects are pointed out by critics to demonstrate the authenticity of this speech. Chase stresses three aspects. One is the Divine Sonship. Second, the teaching concerning redemption is in agreement with the Epistles. (Cf. I Thess. 5:9, II Cor. 5:18, Rom. 5:8, Col. 1:19, Eph. 1:5, Titus 2:11). And third, Chase alludes to the mention of the Trinity in the regeneration of men.<sup>3</sup>

Chase also compared the speech with the Pastoral Epistles of Paul. He finds the positive correlation high. He cites many examples, but only one will be mentioned here. The word for "overseer" used in this speech is placed in a later period by some critics. However, Chase shows it to be compatible with the Epistles. This is based on comparative usage in I Thessalonians 5:12 and Philippians 1:1. Chase considers the term to be equal to "elders".<sup>4</sup>

Concerning the doctrine of the Church, Chase notes similarities with Paul's teaching. First, the Church is universal (Cf. I Cor. 10:32, 12:28, 15:9, and Gal. 1:13). Second, the language used to describe God's

.....

1. Knowling, R., Op. Cit., p. 420-1.
2. Ibid., p. 421.
3. Chase, H., Op. Cit., p. 271-6.
4. Ibid.

purchase of the Church is familiar to the Epistles (Cf. Eph. 1:4 and I Cor. 6:20, 7:23.)<sup>1</sup>

Paul's warning concerning future events is akin to the Epistles. The emphasis on the danger from within is corroborated by I Thessalonians 3:3 and Colossians 2:8.<sup>2</sup>

McLachlan relates several general observations that make him believe this speech to be unique in verisimilitude. He asserts that it is reported so far as possible by his friend or fellow-traveler. The dramatic element points to an eye-witness. To uphold his view he quotes Harnack as saying:

In spirit and phraseology no passage in Acts is more closely allied to the Pauline Epistles than the speech. Think only of his boasting, his passionate assertion of his own personal disinterestedness, and the remarkable expression (XX28) *τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ ἣν περιποιήσατο εἰς τὸ ἄλλατὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*. This expression reminds us of Ephesians and Colossians; indeed, this whole discourse calls to mind the Epistle to the Thessalonians.<sup>3</sup>

At this juncture Harnack's opinion might be completed. He defends the authenticity of the speech in relating it to the "we" sections. Also, he claims the atmosphere and phraseology to be unique and thoroughly Pauline.<sup>4</sup>

Returning to McLachlan, he uses Gardner to bolster his argument. He quotes Gardner's observation:

Some phrases are exclusively Pauline as *πλὴν ὅτι, κρίνον, ἴσου, δεσποῦ, και θλίψεις, ναυθετεῖν* (Only in Mark besides); others characteristically Pauline and non-Lucan as *μή φείδεσθε, τραπεινόφροσύνη, ὑποστελλεσθε, νύκτα και ἡμέραν, το συμφερον*. *Περί ποιῆσθαι* is both Pauline and Lucan; it is used by them in different senses.

.....

1. Chase, H., Op. Cit., p. 276.  
2. Ibid.  
3. McLachlan, H., Op. Cit., p. 185.  
4. Harnack, A., Acts of the Apostles, p. 127.

In the speech it is used rightly in the Pauline and non-Lucan sense. 'Ye yourselves know that these hands minister to my own needs,' receives confirmation from I Cor. IV 12. ('We labour working with our hands') for the latter was written at Ephesus. Dr. Gardner therefore concludes, 'the concurrence of historical and philological criticism strongly favours the view that this speech is quite authentic'.<sup>1</sup>

Gardner does depart from his usual position to give much credit to Luke in this speech. He believes it to be quite authentic, as he admits it to be a sketch of a real speech. He says "...not so much an outline as a few striking phrases put together."<sup>2</sup>

He goes on to list phrases in the speech which resemble phrases in Paul's Epistles.<sup>3</sup> Added to this fact is his assertion that the faulty order of the speech indicates the work of one who has been an eye-witness. He refers to the fact that the benediction is in the middle of the speech instead of the end. To him it is indicative of an inserted idea after the speech was written up.

To Gardner this speech contains the most of Paul and the least of Luke. However Gardner credits Luke's personal interest in Paul rather than the love for fact as the reason.<sup>4</sup> This is an admission to the genuineness of this speech.

### 3. Anti-Historical Criticism

The criticism on this side is limited. Once again the study should be commenced with Zeller, the founder of the critical study in Acts. As he did in the case of the Athenian address, so he maintains that this speech must be suspected as being of free composition.

. . . . .

1. McLachlan, H., Op. Cit., p. 186-7.
2. Gardner, P., Op. Cit., p. 402.
3. Ibid.
4. Ibid., p. 404.

He rejects the argument from language saying it does not prove anything.<sup>1</sup> His idea is that the language is Lucan. Second, Zeller attacks the misconstruing of the statement concerning Paul's finality in departure.<sup>2</sup> He claims it to be false. Also the vagueness of the reference to heretical teachers suggests free composition. In view of these facts Zeller comments, "Thus we have an historical prolepsis not the Apostle's, but his historian's."<sup>3</sup>

However, Zeller is not through, as he makes some criticism concerning the atmosphere of the speech. First, it is apologetic instead of didactic and hortatory. Second, the self-centeredness of Paul is absurd in light of the fact that he is supposedly concerned with their welfare. It is quite out of proportion.<sup>4</sup> Being more specific he states that the reference to Paul's own labor is the effort of the writer to vindicate Paul. This fact is untrue according to the Epistles (I Cor. 9:6 and Gal. 6:6). According to Zeller, Paul expected the Church to reward him. And the final objection is the inconsistency with Paul's character to make so much of his own example when only briefly mentioning Christ.<sup>5</sup>

Zeller sums up his position in the following words:

On these grounds we only consider the speech as the work of our narrator without even admitting partial authenticity...we have not the slightest reason for the hypothesis (authenticity);<sup>6</sup> secondly, the whole tendency of the speech proves itself to be historically improbable, being, indeed, recounted solely for the sake of the speech...a retrospect of Paul's whole ministry clothed in farewell clothes.<sup>7</sup>

.....

1. Zeller, E., Op. Cit., p. 64.
2. Ibid., p. 65.
3. Ibid., p. 66.
4. Ibid., p. 66.
5. Ibid., p. 67.
6. The parentheses and contents belong to the writer of the thesis.
7. Zeller, E., Op. Cit., p. 67-8.



Davidson assails the speech and places the construction of the speech in the mind of the writer. Concerning the language, Davidson claims that the Pauline expressions do not prove anything except that the author was familiar with Pauline speech which would not demand an eye-witness. He states, "The writer must have had written notes or a traditional sketch of the speech, which he freely reproduced."<sup>1</sup>

He also criticizes the fact that the speech is apologetic rather than didactic or hortatory. The self-justification is the work of a friend of Paul who is trying to show that the Apostle had great merit. Finally, he criticizes the prophecy of the speech as being inconsistent with his plans to go to Rome as recorded in Chapter XIX:21-2.<sup>2</sup>

Cadbury in his investigation admits the possibility of a source. However he claims the negative evidence to be greater. His conclusion is that the most probable hypothesis is that Luke used other historians' ideas, namely free composition.<sup>3</sup> In his criticism of particular aspects he points out various discrepancies between the narrative in Chapter 19 and the speech. They are: 1) reference to plots by the Jews; 2) reference to Paul working with his hands; and 3) the time of sojourn which is three years. These occur in the speech but not in the narrative.<sup>4</sup>

He also attacks the relation of this speech to the Epistles as meaning nothing. For there are similar ideas in the non-Pauline Epistles as well. The greatest similarity found is in I Peter.<sup>5</sup>

. . . . .

1. Davidson, Samuel, Op. Cit., p. 235.
2. Ibid., p. 233.
3. Henry Cadbury: The Making of Luke - Acts, p. 189.
4. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, K., Op. Cit., p. 423.
5. Ibid., p. 415.

Bacon's attitude is that the basis of the speech stems from a false motivation. He says:

Indeed the reported address at Miletus represents, not so much what Paul would most wish to say, for its motive, to make clear that the blood of unbelieving Jews was on their own heads, is more Lucan than Pauline.<sup>1</sup>

The Interpreters Bible, in examining criticism pro and con concerning the speeches, gives an interesting criticism against its authenticity. It is centered in the fact that Paul being in a haste to get to Jerusalem did not hurry at Miletus. And also if he had a three day delay at Miletus, why did he not go to Ephesus?<sup>2</sup>

#### F. Speech at Jerusalem

##### 1. Setting and Message

Paul's discourse at Jerusalem took place at the end of the third missionary journey, the year of 58 A.D.<sup>3</sup> The speech is of great interest because of its defensive nature. Paul is defending the veracity of the Gospel and his own position as an Apostle of this great movement. It is an apology to the Jews.

The circumstances concerning this speech are related by the writer. Paul went to the Temple to participate in certain Jewish rites upon the suggestion of the other Apostles.<sup>4</sup> As Paul was in the Temple worshipping, some Jews from Asia recognized him and immediately seized him.<sup>5</sup> The accusation against Paul was twofold. First, he was teaching men contrary to the Law. Second, he was defiling the Temple by bringing

. . . . .

1. Bacon, B., The Story of St. Paul, p. 183.
2. Interpreters Bible, Vol. IX, p. 270.
3. Goodwin, F. J., Op. Cit., p. 119.
4. Acts 21:26.
5. Acts 21:27.

a Gentile to worship in the Temple.<sup>1</sup> The result of the charge was a riot and no doubt they would have killed Paul there, had not the Roman tribune come to the rescue.<sup>2</sup>

Paul is able to speak by permission granted from the Roman tribune. The preceding conversation with the tribune might have enabled Paul to secure this right.<sup>3</sup> It is interesting to note that Paul is more interested in justifying himself before the eyes of the people than before the Roman tribune. The language that Paul used was Hebrew, which must have impressed the native Jews.<sup>4</sup>

Looking at the speech one notices that the center of Paul's defense is himself. It is his life's experience that is the basis for the defense. And it is fitting for Paul's own life is at stake. It was Paul's business to defend himself by stressing the argument that justified his actions. The account of his experience is recorded in two other chapters.<sup>5</sup> There are discrepancies that are apparent and undeniable. The majority of the speech is related to the conversion experience and reaches a climax at the end when Paul states the logical end of his experience to be the commission to go to the Gentiles. The outline of the speech is as follows:

I. Introduction --- salutation (1)

II. Pre-Christian Experience (3-5)

A. Jew of Jews

B. Persecutor of Christians

. . . . .

1. Acts 21:28.
2. Acts 21:32.
3. Acts 21:37-8.
4. Acts 22:2.
5. See Chapters IX and XXVI.

### III. Christian Experience (6-17)

#### A. Conversion

#### B. Commission

Paul's tact is evident as he refers to them as "brethren" and "fathers". He also identifies himself with the Law and as a strict observer of Jewish rites. The third manifestation of tact is the manner in which he left the controversial element to the last. No doubt it pictures Paul skillfully welding a defense for himself and the Gospel.

#### 2. Pro-Historical Criticism

The criticism on the speech is not as detailed as the previous three. Rackham credits the speech to Paul. And he believes Luke to be the trustworthy reporter. Luke was capable of understanding Aramaic and in all probability translated the speech. His conclusion is, "Certainly the speech as it stands is most true to life, exactly to the point and full of St. Paul's traits."<sup>1</sup>

Commenting on the discrepancies, A. T. Robertson states they are in the minority. And if there be discrepancies it demonstrates reality rather than composition. He concludes that the speech is genuine and based on the fact of Paul's true experience.<sup>2</sup>

Foakes-Jackson argues along the same lines as does A. T. Robertson concerning the discrepancies in the speech. To him it may be due to the retelling of his experience and Luke's faithful reporting. He also believes the termination of the speech to be natural and proof of genuineness.<sup>3</sup> He concludes with the following statement, "The speech

. . . . .

1. Rackham, R., Op. Cit., p. 421.

2. Robertson, A. T., Luke in the Light of Historical Research, p. 229.

3. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Acts of the Apostles, p. 201-2.

delivered is undoubtedly a condensation of what they may have actually heard..."<sup>1</sup>

The conciliatory attitude of the speech demonstrates Pauline tact. Jones elaborates his opinion by pointing out the following instances: 1) use of Aramaic; Greek would have raised a barrier to the Jews, but the reverence for the holy tongue appealed to them; 2) appeal to kinship by reference to the Jews as brothers and fathers; 3) complimenting the Jews for their zealotry; 4) reference to Ananias as a devout man of the Jews; 5) careful not to offend the Jews by not mentioning the word "Christ"; and 6) Paul's withholding of mention of the Gentiles until the last possible moment. Jones believes Luke to be an eye-witness of the speech.<sup>2</sup>

Alford takes up the fact that the speech is full of Hebraicisms. He proposes the idea that it might have been that Paul did not translate the speech into Greek, but one who would literally translate and not be as free with words as the speaker himself. He substantiates this proposition by the following reasons: 1) the speech is full of Hebraicisms; 2) expressions not in Luke's writings, and not one found peculiar to Paul. His summary is: "Our inference then is that Luke himself has rendered this speech from having heard it delivered..."<sup>3</sup>

### 3. Anti-Historical Criticism

The Interpreters Bible finds it difficult to believe that Paul could even secure permission to speak to such an angry crowd. Furthermore, if the speech were dismissed as an embellishment, nothing would be

. . . . .

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Acts of the Apostles, p. 202-3.
2. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 188-9.
3. Alford, H., The Greek New Testament, p. 114.

lost, for 22:24 puts the narrative in the same place as 21:34. The first part of the speech is accepted as being Pauline, but the latter part is considered to be Luke's work because the visit to the Temple is out of line with Galatians.

This speech parallels the accounts in Chapter IX and in XXVI. The speech in XXVI is considered to be authentic and the other two compositions by Luke are based on XXVI. The hypothesis maintains that Luke was aware of the fact that Paul faced such a situation and so constructed a defense for him on the basis of XXVI.<sup>1</sup>

Many of the critics admit some historicity to the narrative. Hans Windisch is one who maintains that in spite of the nucleus of historical truth the whole story is legendary. Some reasons for this attitude are: 1) failure of Paul to mention specifically that he saw the Lord; and 2) the variations show Luke to have had no certain information. Windisch claims Luke would have undoubtedly known what Paul told concerning his conversion and would hardly have written such varied accounts.<sup>2</sup>

Bacon also admits historicity to the occasion. In fact he concedes all as being reliable except the speech. He thinks it to be highly improbable that Luke took notes. Second, it is improbable that Paul even received an opportunity to speak to the mob. Third, Paul in this speech has ignored the charges.<sup>3</sup>

Zeller condemns the historicity of the speech on the following reasons: 1) the situation is artificial in which Paul spoke because it is unlikely that the Roman tribune would let him speak after such a

. . . . .

1. Interpreters Bible, p. 289.
2. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, K., Op. Cit., p. 332-3.
3. Bacon, B., Op. Cit., p. 200.

disturbance; 2) the speech fits the model of Stephen's address and the Areopagus address because the "cut-in" by the Jews comes at a convenient point whereby the speaker has said everything of importance; and 3) the investigation of the conversion shows obvious facts that are in disagreement and, therefore, discredits the speech. He summarizes with the following words, "According to all other indications, the speech is also the author's free composition."<sup>1</sup>

In concluding the case against this speech Gardner adds some good thoughts. He believes the nature of the defense, biographical, to be in accordance with the logic of the circumstances. Gardner believes that Luke was in possession of the facts. However, he believes Luke to have written only what he recalled, and that he was not accurate in relating the facts. He says, "He dashes the picture on the canvas, with fine sense of form and perspective, but with complete disregard of measurement and fact."<sup>2</sup> Concerning the ending Luke has missed the mark. He has taken liberties with the facts. They are wrongly emphasized also. Luke stresses the very facts that would irritate the Jews. It is not like Paul to offend the opposing party.<sup>3</sup> So Gardner questions the honesty of Luke's use of the facts available and therefore questions the authenticity of Paul's speech.

#### G. Speech Before Agrippa

##### 1. Setting and Message

The speech before Agrippa is declared to be the greatest and most eloquent. The historical incident that surrounds this meeting is of

. . . . .

1. Zeller, E., Op. Cit., p. 74-5.
2. Gardner, P., Op. Cit., p. 409.
3. Ibid.

importance. After his arrest and defense before Felix, Paul remained in prison for two years.<sup>1</sup> During this time a new governor took the place of Felix. The Jews approached Festus, the new governor, asking that Paul be put to death.

At this time King Agrippa came to welcome Festus in Caesarea. Upon hearing of Paul and the circumstances involved, Agrippa desired to see Paul.<sup>2</sup>

The description of the scene is rather concise. However, several phrases indicate an eye-witness who saw all the majesty and splendor that went with the ceremony. The reference to military men and high city officials indicates its importance.<sup>3</sup>

Once again the discourse is an apology built upon Paul's own experience. He is more argumentative in order to establish his defense. The elaborate speech with its sharpness is given credit for being an actual account by some. The following outline summarizes the speech:

I. Introduction (2-3)

- A. Psychological --- appeal to Agrippa
- B. Bases for defense --- false accusations

II. Christian Experience (4-18)

- A. Pre-Christian
- B. Conversion

III. Fulfillment of Commission (19-23)

- A. Preach to all repentance.
- B. Persecuted because of Divine Commission
- C. God is the Authority.

. . . . .

1. Acts 24:27.  
2. Acts 25:14.  
3. Acts 25:23.



Paul in this speech uses tact and wisdom again. His appeal is gracious and sweetened to win confidence and support. Paul's defense is based on the accusations of the Jews cast toward him. Paul's defense rests in the fact that this has been brought about by God.

## 2. Pro-Historical Criticism

The criticism is not of a great amount or clear. The reason for this is the fact that the parallel between Chapters IX, XXII and XXVI cause the commentators to consider this as part of a group.

Rackham writes:

This speech marks the supreme effort both of the speaker and his reporter. It is one of the most finished passages in the Acts, adorned with rare words and elaboration of style, not to say grandiloquence.<sup>1</sup>

He grants the fact that Luke has done much editing, yet Paul's voice is distinctly heard. Rackham points to the characteristics which are Pauline. Some are: 1) use of emotions to gain the attention of Agrippa (see verses 2, 13, 19, 27); 2) the same habit of being carried away into parentheses and digressions as the Epistles do; 3) the clearest evidence for Paul's speech is his adaptation of his witness to the phrase "both to the People and the Gentiles" (Jews and Greeks). In closing, Rackham writes that the style and doctrine are supplemented by the fact that there is a genuineness of personality, namely, Paul's ego.<sup>2</sup>

Foakes-Jackson lauds this speech as the greatest speech also. He claims that Luke obviously did not want to leave an impression of repetition. He points out that the speech also differs in many respects. The language is stately and dignified, as would be fitting to the

. . . . .

1. Rackham, R., Op. Cit., p. 462.

2. Ibid., p. 464.

occasion. The topics are well chosen to appeal to a Jewish judge, and the arrangement is excellent.<sup>1</sup>

The fact that the speech is full of Paul's peculiar expressions is used by Alford to support the authenticity of the speech. There are phrases that belong to Luke but only enough to assure that Luke had committed the speech to writing. He closes his criticism by pointing to the fact that some of the expressions are not used in other Pauline writings and are used exclusively in this instance.<sup>2</sup>

Jones proclaims the speech to be the work of an eye-witness. The reasons he gives are: 1) circumstantial description of the entry of the exalted assembly; 2) the impressive grandeur of the surroundings; 3) dramatic ending; and 4) nature of address itself because of emphatic words.<sup>3</sup> He goes on to defend the authenticity of the speech on its Pauline features. Some alluded to are: 1) thoroughness of expression (use of words expressing completeness or finality); 2) peculiar Pauline expressions; 3) development of argument is in harmony with St. Paul's practices; and 4) contact with other utterances of Paul in the book of Acts (use of "Promise" in Antioch address also), (different phrases such as ἐπιστρέφειν ἰσχυρότερος εἰς φῶς cf. Acts 14:15). Also he points out the contact with the Epistles (Acts 26:18 with I Thess. 1:9 - turn to the Living God, phrase πρῶτος ἐξ ἰουδαίου νεκρῶν in Acts 26:23, I Cor. 15:20; and "light" as in Eph. 5:8, Col. 1:12-13). Jones highly regards this speech as authentic.<sup>4</sup>

.....

1. Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Op. Cit., p. 224.
2. Alford, H., Op. Cit., p. 15, see footnote.
3. Jones, M., Op. Cit., p. 236-8.
4. Ibid., p. 239.

### 3. Anti-Historical Criticism

Criticism from this side is relatively the same as on the speech at Jerusalem. Zeller does not concede any ground in this speech either. Again he begins from the position that the speech must be considered as free composition. Zeller thinks the whole plot is false. The defense should have rested in the Law rather than in faith in the Messiah. For it was the breaking of the Law that caused the stir. To Zeller the narrative is false, even though possessing a grain of truth.<sup>1</sup>

Windisch, Davidson and Bacon use the same line of criticism as in the speech at Jerusalem. Bacon adds to his critique of this speech that it is comparatively trustworthy.<sup>2</sup>

#### H. Summary

In this chapter a survey of the criticism on selected Pauline speeches in Acts has been completed. There has been a good deal of criticism both for and against the authenticity of these speeches. The purpose has been to investigate the opinions and the reasons for such opinions on these particular speeches.

The speech at Athens was judged to be of most doubtful historicity, and the speech at Miletus was regarded as the most authentic. The most important result of this research has been the elucidation of the standards of criticism applied to such speeches in Acts. Some of these standards proved to be historical content, theological content, literary style, language, and the writer's competence and general purpose.

. . . . .

1. Zeller, E., Op. Cit., p. 38.
2. Bacon, B. W., Op. Cit., p. 211.

It has appeared quite evident that the last of these standards of criticism has carried the most weight in the majority of cases. Now the importance of these standards of criticism must be evaluated in the following chapter.

.....

CHAPTER III  
EVALUATION OF THE CRITICISM ON THE SELECTED  
PAULINE SPEECHES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

CHAPTER III  
EVALUATION OF THE CRITICISM ON THE SELECTED  
PAULINE SPEECHES IN THE BOOK OF ACTS

A. Introduction

The first two chapters have revealed some of the basic standards of criticism on the Pauline speeches in Acts. By these standards the value of criticism on the speeches is controlled. If one is to build a bridge, one must have material strong enough to carry the traffic. The material, however, will be only as good as the specifications provided. So the strength of a bridge depends upon the standards by which the material has been selected. So it is in the field of criticism. It is important for sound criticism that the right criteria be selected. If not, a false or weak conclusion will result. If one aspect is overplayed or unduly minimized, one will draw a false conclusion. Often the sensitivity of a critic either pro or con is quite lacking.

The best examples of the lack of this sensitivity are Zeller, Cadbury and Bacon. Zeller errs greatly because he arbitrarily judges Luke's purpose on philosophical grounds and places the work in the second century.<sup>1</sup> From this premise he goes on to claim that this is the basic reason for doubting the authenticity of the speeches. Then he picks his points to prove his case.

Second, Cadbury compares Luke's method with that of classical historians and then proceeds to condemn Luke's methods as untrustworthy.<sup>2</sup>

. . . . .

1. Ante., p. 3, 4, and 6.

2. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. V, p. 426-7.

He also goes on to find support to prove his case. Finally, Bacon comes to the sweeping conclusion that what can be said of the entire apostolic witness must be said of Luke's account of the speeches: Luke has only generalized. He tries to prove his point.

So the purpose of this chapter will be to point out some of these fallacies in criticism which has not been too objective. There will be discussed such factors as historical content, literary style, language, theological content, Pauline personality, Luke's purpose and competence, and Luke in light of classical historians.

#### B. Historical Content

This standard of criticism is concerned with the historical setting. Those who favor the authenticity of the speeches use this argument quite frequently. Those in opposition often fail to use it because of a previous supposition that the entire book was written in the second century. The most challenged historical setting is that of the Athenian address.<sup>1</sup>

The accuracy of historical detail is of utmost importance for higher criticism. So if the setting of a speech is shown to be authentic for the first century life and times, there may be much in favor of the speech's also being authentic. Though Sir William Ramsey's archaeological work demonstrated that the geographical descriptions in Luke's writing are accurate, it has been challenged by some critics. The majority concede the soundness of this scholarship. Either records have been used by some second century writer, or a man close to the time of Paul was the author of Acts.

. . . . .

1. Ante., p. 44.

However, it is recognized that this does not necessarily mean that the speeches are authentic specimens of Paul's speeches. Yet it does indicate something of Luke's accuracy in detail.

### C. Literary Style

Like historical content this standard does not determine in finality that the speech is authentic. But this again is of some importance, if the critics will pay attention to it. Moreover, one has in the Third Gospel a control whereby literary style may be judged. There is no reason why one should be kept from using such a control. Harnack, Hobart and A. T. Robertson have found this a valid method. It does not necessarily prove that the speeches are authentic but it establishes the fact that both the Third Gospel and the Book of Acts must be considered together when judging the time of writing. Also, judgment upon the author of the Third Gospel must be considered when judging the author of the Book of Acts. Many have failed to do this. No critic as of now has suggested that a redactor worked over both books.

Concerning literary style, which many critics use in support of rejecting the authenticity of the speeches, several things may be said. First, it must be granted that if the work was done by one author a certain amount of likeness is going to result in order to make the message of the author intelligible. The hand of the author will be somewhat in the speeches as well as in the narratives. Moreover, similarities are expected because of likeness of situation and purpose. There will be likenesses between Paul, Peter and Stephen, because they are Jewish Christians presenting an apology for the same Gospel. But when one compares Pauline speeches of a different purpose with those of Peter, let

. . . . .



one say, very little relationship will be found, and this is a very significant observation to make.

Finally, Bruce draws attention to the fact that the style of the Greek in the Pauline speeches is often below that which Luke is capable of writing.<sup>1</sup> This means a real possibility that some of Paul's speeches were recorded very accurately.

#### D. Language

The critics who uphold the authenticity of the speeches make most use of this factor. Many base their argument on the use of words by the writer. The speech at Miletus has been subjected to most study of vocabulary, and the use of Pauline vocabulary is overwhelmingly evident.<sup>2</sup>

Cadbury seeks to counter this argument by pointing out that the speeches possess words that are likewise peculiar to the other writers of the Epistles.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, by over-proving the point Cadbury claims that it proves nothing. Yet one must again plead for sensitivity. Paul, Peter, and James all lived during the same period, preached the same Gospel and fellowshiped together. This would have much to do with the similarities of Paul's vocabulary with Peter's and James'. Also, Cadbury fails to compare the Epistles of Peter and James and Paul to find out whether these Epistles have similar words. If so, is the conclusion then to be that all the Epistles were composed by one man?

Nevertheless, Cadbury saves the critic from placing too much importance on the use of words and keeps the scholar from taking a narrow base of criticism. It must be admitted by all that the use of Pauline

. . . . .

1. Bruce, F. F., Acts of the Apostles, p. 18-19.

2. Ante., p. 51.

3. Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., Op. Cit., Vol. V, p. 411-3.

words along with rough Greek style must be accounted for in some way. The best is to say that Luke was reporting the outlines of addresses by Paul.

#### E. Theological Content

By far most of the critics on both sides refer to the theological content. And yet one finds difficulty in placing too much value on its importance. The Apostolic message rests on the facts that one is trying to discover. There is no real outside measurement by which to measure whether or not it is basically Pauline. Whether it sounds like the Primitive Church's message only proves that Luke knew ideas that any early Christian knew. However, to some degree the Epistles can be used. But the importance of this is greatly overemphasized, and many critics who esteem the speeches to be authentic stretch their imaginations in trying to fit Paul's theology in the Epistles into the speeches. On the other hand, the fact that Paul does not express a full concept of salvation, justification and Christology is no valid reason to disregard Paul's speeches as being his own. The nature of an audience and a speaker's purpose determine how he speaks. Once again the lack of sensitivity is very evident in some scholars.

#### F. Pauline Personality

It was pointed out in the last section that theological content does not necessarily prove very much, and yet has some value as evidence of individuality. And so it was with style and language. Likewise, the personality of Paul is a vital factor in determining the authenticity of a speech. Once again the critic must be sensitive. And it must be remembered that personality is recognized as much by the way in which a

. . . . .

thing is said as by what is said. The critic has a good measuring device in the use of the Epistles. The critic will find much as to how Paul reacts to different situations. Those who judge simply the content can easily go wrong, because a given situation determines the content. But the mode of expression does not. For when Paul is concerned he is concerned regardless of what is said. In this area much may be observed by the critics.

#### G. Luke's Competence and Purpose

It has been previously stated in this thesis that the authorship and date do not necessarily determine whether each of the speeches was authentic or not.<sup>1</sup> It is also mentioned that the whole critical problem of Acts is centered around the authorship.<sup>2</sup> At least that is where the battle has raged the most. And though the authorship has been pretty well demonstrated as Lucan, the type of man he was is open to question. And this factor has contributed much to the results of criticism. For example, Gardner accuses Luke of having personal interests, which impairs his faithfulness to facts.<sup>3</sup> He is denied the endowment of a critical mind.<sup>4</sup> And finally, he is limited to the scruples of his age. Gardner wants to guard against regarding the writers of the New Testament as perfectionists, knowing all and seeing all. This is well and good, yet one must not lose perspective. Gardner feels one cannot credit Luke with historical methods that are possible today. Again this is good, but then is one to assume that this modern age has a monopoly on telling

.....

1. Ante., p. 21.
2. Ante., p. 7.
3. Ante., p. 26.
4. Ibid.

the truth and being critical-minded? One hardly can say "yes" to this, for critical-mindedness and truth are not products of evolution.

One need not rob Luke of individuality in order for him to tell the truth. Telling the truth does not necessarily mean repeating fact for fact. For the task of the historian is more than reporting, and though he may have a purpose in mind one is not justified to say that the purpose will pervert the facts. The idea that purpose must lead to distortion of facts is a false assumption. A fair stress upon facts may lead to fair interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Though one's motive may be religious, it does not imply disregard for all facts.

It seems only fair to judge the historian on his own merits. Luke, like other historians, set down his methods and purpose.<sup>2</sup> Why must the critics seek to put into Luke's mind unworthy purposes such as the political and the conciliatory?

#### H. Luke in the Light of Classical Historians

Finally, Luke's method is attacked from the standpoint of conventional practices of his time. Cadbury, Gardner, Goguel and others see only the reproduction of secular history writing by Luke. He is grouped with historians such as Livy, Polybius and Thucydides. It was their practice to create speeches and put them into the mouths of men at important historical occasions. The speech might have had some resemblance to the actual speech and it might not. Such a practice is accredited to Luke.

. . . . .

1. Robert L. P. Milburn: *Early Christian Interpretation of History*, Chapter I, *The Task of the Historian*.
2. Luke 1:1-4.

Tenny Frank<sup>1</sup> in discussing the Roman literature and culture in Livy's time calls attention to several important points. First, the scholar's judgment on Livy's historical sense and methods has had to be changed.<sup>2</sup> Livy has been vindicated as an honest historian. Livy diverged from the previous methods of the historians and sought to give a true picture of Roman history.<sup>3</sup> Although Livy was guilty of following Greek methods of inserting speeches, his methods were critical and true.<sup>4</sup> And a third important fact which Frank makes is that not all writers were confined to the practices of their contemporaries. Some "bolted" from the traditional methods and sought to produce true history.

As for the work of Thucydides, to be sure he also composed speeches and inserted them into narratives. However, to him they were not mere rhetorical exercises but general impressions of what was said.<sup>5</sup>

The question is: Can such a motive be attributed to Luke? The answer to this question certainly cannot be answered for certain. However, several factors would lead one to doubt whether Luke can be accused of deliberate methods. First, Luke's style in the speeches is far below his usual standards. They do not indicate the work of a composer. Second, Luke in his Gospel definitely shows restraint in recording the speeches of Jesus, for the work may be checked against other known sources such as the Gospel of Mark. And third, he shows restraint throughout the Book of the Acts when ample opportunity was afforded for

. . . . .

1. Former Professor of Latin and Roman History at The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.
2. Tenny Frank: Life and Literature in the Roman Republic, p. 186.
3. Ibid., p. 185.
4. Bruce, F. F., Acts of the Apostles, p. 18.
5. Ibid.

the use of his imagination. F. F. Bruce summarizes the problem quite adequately as follows:

If this is the verdict on Luke in places where his fidelity to his source can be controlled, we should not without good reason suppose that he was not equally faithful where his sources are no longer available for comparison.<sup>1</sup>

Bruce's proposition seems most fair.

#### I. Summary

This chapter sought to evaluate some of the methods by which the critics have tested the speeches. The different standards were discussed in light of their use by the critics. It was discovered that the conclusion of critics so much depended upon how the critic applied these tests. The critics' standards have been on the whole valid for any historical document, but the greatest need is for sensitivity in the application of critical methods. The greatest violation of true critical method has been the general condemnation of Luke's character on the grounds that other classical historians were in the habit of abusing historical facts. It was seen that not all ancient historians were unreliable recorders of fact, and Luke could well have been as careful as the best.

A greater and more thorough investigation of Luke's own methods is demanded before final judgment may be passed upon the authenticity of the Pauline speeches in Acts.

.....

1. Bruce, F. F., Op. Cit., p. 19.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The motivation for this thesis came from a study of the speeches in the Book of Acts. The speeches which seemed so splendid and alive were the object of much criticism. A desire came forth to survey the critical field in an effort to determine why the critics doubted the authenticity of the speeches. The study was limited to the Pauline speeches because of Paul's importance to New Testament Christianity.

The first chapter sought to unfold how the speeches in Acts came under the focus of the critics. Therefore, a brief survey of the historical progress of criticism on the Book of Acts was made. It was discovered that the criticism on Acts was the sequel event to criticism on the Gospels. First philosophical presuppositions were brought to bear upon Acts. This destroyed the trustworthiness of the Book of Acts. However, other critics forced a more historical method to be adopted. This was done through archaeological research and exegetical study of the book itself. As a result the question became a question as to who was the author of the book. As the discipline of comparative religion was introduced into the critical study of Acts, a more thorough exegesis of the book was demanded. Even though Luke was vindicated as its author, much suspicion was cast upon his methods. Did Luke follow contemporary historians and pervert his historical material to gain his purpose? Thus even the speeches came under the scrutiny of the critics in effort to find the answer.

Thus with an understanding as to how the speeches became the subject of critical attention, the second chapter determined to survey the criticism on the selected Pauline speeches. In this chapter each

. . . . .



speech was considered in light of the criticism it was subjected to. They were speeches at Antioch, Athens, Miletus, Jerusalem and before King Agrippa. The survey revealed that the speech at Athens was under the most suspicion of having been created in the author's mind. The speech at Miletus was the most authentic. More important was the unveiling of the methods and standards of criticism. Some of the standards were: historical content, theological content, language, literary style, and the writer's purpose and character. The last affected the entire criticism the most.

In the last chapter an appraisal was made upon the standards of criticism and the methods. It was concluded that the standards in themselves were good. However, the manner in which they were used or not used seemed questionable. Some were made to say more than they ought. Other parts were held in subjection and not allowed to manifest their witness. Most opposing critics relegated Luke's methods to that of contemporary historical writers. This was not fair in light of evidence. First, it is not conclusive that historians of Luke's age were as untrustworthy and uncritical as made out to be. In fact, it was discovered that secular literary men of today are still debating the question. Second, Luke's own statement concerning his method and procedure has been ignored by some. Evidence has been produced to claim a right for Luke to prove himself. The one great lesson learned from the evaluation is the need for sensitivity upon the part of the critics.

The findings of this study have left the writer with several impressions. First, there is a need for a more concentrated critical study on the speeches. Much of it has been done only in passing by.

. . . . .

Second, the speeches cannot be accounted for by free composition; not that the speeches are vindicated, but that there is equal evidence to postpone any final judgment. Third, the critical standards are valid and must be applied to the speeches. Also, more than anything else a more thorough study of Luke and his method must be made. The critics must become sensitive to the man himself.

And finally, to the writer of this thesis the reality of Paul's speeches still impresses him, even more so now that the rigid methods of critics have been studied. And it has given a greater insight into the concept of inspiration and revelation. The word is coming to mean more than a theological doctrine to the writer. It is becoming full of life!

The writer only desires that other students will study this subject more thoroughly in the coming years, for with the vindication of Luke and his work the Christian Church has a historical support for its "Kerygma" that cannot be shaken.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. Primary Sources

#### Books

- Alford, H., Greek New Testament, Volume II, Rivingtons, London, 1865.
- Bible, Revised Standard Version.
- Bruce, F. F., The Acts of the Apostles, University Press, Aberdeen, Scotland, 1952.
- Are the New Testament Documents Reliable?, Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, Toronto, 1950.
- Cadbury, H. J., The Making of Luke-Acts, MacMillan Company, New York, 1927.
- Chase, F. H., The Credibility of the Book of The Acts of the Apostles, MacMillan and Company, London, 1902.
- Conybeare, W. J. and Howson, J. S., The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1890.
- Davidson, S., An Introduction to the New Testament, Longmans, Green and Company, London, 1868.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J., Acts of the Apostles, Richard Smith, Inc., New York, 1931, The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.
- Foakes-Jackson, F. J. and Lake, K., The Beginning of Christianity, Volume II Prolegomena I and II, and Volumes IV and V, MacMillan and Company, London, 1909.
- Frank, T., Life and Literature in the Roman Republic, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1930.
- Gardner, P., The Speeches of St. Paul in Acts, in the Cambridge Bible Essays, edited by H. B. Swete, MacMillan Company, London, 1909.
- Goguel, M., The Birth of Christianity, translated by H. C. Snape, MacMillan Company, New York, 1954.
- Harnack, A., Luke the Physician, translated by J. R. Wilkerson, edited by W. D. Morrison, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1908.
- The Acts of the Apostles, translated by J. R. Wilkerson, Williams and Norgate, London, 1909.

- Jones, M., St. Paul the Orator, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1910.
- Knowling, R. J., The Testimony of St. Paul to Christ, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1905.
- Lake, K., An Introduction to the New Testament, Harpers and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1937.
- Lietzman, H., The Beginning of the Christian Church, translated by B. L. Wolf, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1937.
- The Founding of the Church Universal, translated by B. L. Wolf, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1938.
- McGiffert, A. C., A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age, Revised Edition, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1903, The International Theological Library.
- McLachlan, H., St. Luke the Man and His Works, University Press, University of Manchester, England, 1920.
- Meyer, H. A. W., Handbook to The Acts of the Apostles, translated by J. G. Patton, revised by W. P. Dickson, Funk and Wagnalls Company, New York, 1883.
- Rackham, R. B., The Acts of the Apostles, Methuen and Company, London, 1919.
- Ramsey, W. M., Pauline and Other Studies, A. C. Armstrong and Son, New York, 1906.
- The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1953.
- St. Paul The Traveller and The Roman Citizen, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1896.
- Robertson, A. T., Luke the Historian in Light of Research, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1920.
- Sabatier, L. A., The Apostle Paul, translated by A. M. Hellier, edited G. G. Finlay, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1894.
- Salmon, G., A Historical Introduction to the New Testament, John Murray Company, London, 1885.
- The Interpreters Bible, Volume IX, Editor-in-Chief, G. Buttrick, Abbing-ton-Cokesbury Press, New York, 1954.
- Wiess, J., The History of the Primitive Church, Volume I, Wilson Erickson, Incorporated, New York, 1937.

Zeller, E., The Contents and Origin of The Acts of the Apostles, Volumes I and II, translated by J. Dare, Williams and Morgate, Edinburgh, England, 1875.

#### Pamphlets

Stonehouse, N. B., The Areopagus Address, Tyndale Lecture Series, Tyndale Press, London, 1949.

#### Periodicals

Bruce, F. F., Christian Origins, book review of The Beginning of Christianity by Hans Lietzmann, Evangelical Quarterly, Volume 22, Number 2, April, 1950.

Salbatonelli, L., From Locke to Reitzenstein: The Historical Investigation of the Origins of Christianity, Harvard Theological Review, Volume 22, Number 4, October 1929.

de Zwaan, J., Was the Book of Acts A Posthumous Edition?, Harvard Theological Review, Volume 17, Number 2, April 1924.

#### B. Secondary Sources

Gill, E., A. T. Robertson, A Biography, MacMillan Company, New York, 1943.

Goodwin, F. J., A Harmony and Commentary on the Life of St. Paul, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1951.

Milburn, R. L. P., Early Christian Interpretation of History, Adams and Charles Black, London, 1954.

Ramsey, W. M., Luke the Physician, Hodder and Stoughton, New York, 1908.

#### Encyclopedias

The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, Editor-in-Chief, Samuel M. Jackson, Volume III, Baker Book House, Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1952.