

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

5-1-1979

Echoes of Pauline Concepts in the Speech at Antioch

Paul E. Deterding

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, deterdingpaul@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Deterding, Paul E., "Echoes of Pauline Concepts in the Speech at Antioch" (1979). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 561.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/561>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

ECHOES OF PAULINE CONCEPTS IN THE
SPEECH AT ANTIOCH

A Thesis Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Paul E. Deterding

May 1979

Approved by: Martin K. Scharlemann
Advisor

Fred R. Haem
Reader

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapters	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. ECHOES OF PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE SPEECH	5
III. ECHOES OF PAUL'S RABBINIC TRAINING IN THE SPEECH	18
IV. THE INCLUSION OF THE MINISTRY OF JOHN THE BAPTIZER IN THE SPEECH	37
V. ECHOES OF PAUL'S TEACHING ON THE DEATH, BURIAL AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS IN THE SPEECH.	45
VI. ECHOES OF THE PAULINE TEACHING OF JUSTIFICATION IN THE SPEECH	56
VII. CONCLUSIONS.	62
APPENDIX	69
BIBLIOGRAPHY	72

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A substantial portion of the Acts of the Apostles consists of a number of speeches which are attributed to various authors and are said to have been given on different occasions. One of these discourses is found in Acts 13:16-41. In these verses Luke¹ claims to record an address delivered by the apostle Paul in the Jewish synagogue at Pisidian Antioch.

However, the information given in Acts about these speeches, including the address recorded in Acts 13, has frequently been challenged by modern scholarship. Following the lead of Martin Dibelius,² many contemporary scholars argue that the discourses of Acts are not genuine speeches by the individuals to whom they are attributed but are actually the work of the author of Luke-Acts.

¹This is not the place to retrace all of the arguments for and against the Lukan authorship of Acts. Although there are those who deny that "the beloved physician" (Col. 4:14) composed Luke-Acts, this study will proceed on the assumption that the author of the Acts of the Apostles is Luke. Nevertheless, it should be noted that none of the arguments of this paper are dependent upon the Lukan authorship of Acts, nor would they be altered in the least if the traditional identification of the author of Acts were denied.

²Dibelius set forth his views on this matter in a number of essays which have been collected and translated in Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Heinrich Greeven, trans. Mary Ling and Paul Schubert (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956).

A major argument of those who deny the authenticity of the discourses recorded in Acts is their claim that it was the practice of ancient historians to invent speeches and put them on the lips of characters in their works. Dibelius, for example, appeals to the examples of Tacitus and Josephus. Each one of these ancient historiographers at times fabricated the addresses which his subjects allegedly delivered in order to give his own interpretation of the events which he had recorded.³ However, the major item of evidence offered to prove this assertion is the careful description which the historian Thucydides gave of his historical method. In his History of the Peloponnesian War (1,22) Thucydides indicated that since he was unable to remember the exact wording of speeches which he wished to preserve, he recorded them as the occasion seemed to demand, although adhering as closely as possible to the overall meaning of what was actually said. This, it is alleged, proves that Thucydides, like all ancient historiographers, invented most of the discourses which he recorded.⁴

Since the Acts of the Apostles is assumed to belong to this milieu of historiography, the speeches in Acts are not treated as genuine utterances of a given speaker but as literary devices by which the author of Acts communicated his own ideas and beliefs.⁵ The conclusion

³Ibid, pp. 138-139.

⁴Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction (Downers Grove Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), p. 360; Dibelius, pp. 140-142.

⁵Dibelius, pp. 164-165, 174-175, 182.

to which this line of reasoning leads is that the discourses of Acts cannot be used as sources for the thought of the individuals to whom they are attributed.⁶

The other principal argument of those who view the discourses of Acts as inventions of the author is the similarities among the speeches. The common elements of the various addresses in Acts are cited as proof that one individual, namely, the author of Acts, has composed all of them.⁷ Thus, it is also assumed on this basis that the discourses in Acts do not provide evidence for the views of the various speakers to whom they are attributed but instead reflect the opinions of the author of Luke-Acts.⁸

In addition to this evidence which allegedly disproves the authenticity of all the speeches in Acts, a number of other reasons have been offered as proof that the address recorded in Acts 13:16-41 cannot present the genuine words of Paul. The speaker in the synagogue at Antioch is said to espouse a different theology from that which is

⁶ Günther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row; Publishers, 1971), p. xvii; Dibelius, p. 184.

⁷ Eduard Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 214; Henry J. Cadbury, "The Speeches in Acts," in The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols., ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, vol. 5: Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury (London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1933), p. 407.

⁸ Dibelius, p. 184; Schweizer, pp. 212-214.

found in the apostle's letters. Therefore, it is concluded that the discourse at Antioch cannot preserve the authentic teaching of Paul.⁹

The present study will examine the speech of Acts 13 in view of these denials of its genuineness. The vocabulary, methodology, and theological concepts of this address will be compared with the thirteen letters of Paul.¹⁰ This comparison will center on five major topics: The use of the Old Testament, the use of rabbinic ideas and procedures, the ministry of John the Baptizer, the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus, and the teaching of justification. Finally, we will review the arguments against the authenticity of the speech at Antioch in light of the findings of this study in order to determine whether or not the apostle could or could not have delivered the discourse recorded in Acts 13:16-41.

⁹For example see Phillip Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," trans. Wm. C. Robinson, Jr. and Victor P. Furnish, in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966).

¹⁰This is not the occasion for a complete discussion concerning the authenticity of the New Testament documents which claim to be the work of the apostle. Suffice it to say that this investigation will be undertaken on the assumption that all thirteen of the epistles ascribed to Paul in the New Testament were actually written by the apostle. However, it should be added that the findings of this study would be modified only slightly if the Pauline authorship of such disputed letters as Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, and the Pastorals would be denied.

CHAPTER II

ECHOES OF PAUL'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE SPEECH

The speech recorded in Acts 13 offers, in part, a typological interpretation of the Old Testament history which it recounts. The various incidents from Israel's past are related in such a way as to indicate that they are types of God's action in Jesus.¹ The exposition of the history of God's people from the patriarchs to the time of David culminates in the life and work of our Lord. The address presents Jesus as a new David and indicates that in him God has fulfilled the promises made to the fathers. In light of the quotation of Ps. 2:7 (33) it seems that the description of our Lord's passion (27-29) has been patterned after Ps. 2:1-2 in order to show that the trial of Jesus was the fulfillment of those verses of the Psalter.² A citation from the prophet Habakkuk, originally a warning to the apostate people of Israel, is here applied to those who heard this proclamation of the

¹David Michael Stanley, Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Analecta Biblica, no. 13 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1961), p. 50.

²If this interpretation is correct, the nations and the kings of the Psalm refer to the Romans and Pilate, the peoples and rulers denote the Jews and the Sanhedrin, and the counsels represent the plots against the life of Jesus. J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, trans. G. E. van Baaren-Pape (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1954), p. 173.

mighty acts of God in Jesus Christ to warn them against failing to believe.

It has been alleged that this conception of Old Testament history is Lukan and not Pauline. Philipp Vielhauer has written that the speech at Pisidian Antioch presents Luke's understanding that history is a "continuous redemptive historical process." The new age, which commences when God begins to fulfill his promises, is seen as the continuation of the old aeon. The new and old eras are related to one another as are fulfillment and promise. Vielhauer asserts that, in contrast to this view of history, Paul's understanding is that in the cross of Christ God has brought the old age to an end and has replaced it with the new age.³

However, Vielhauer's analysis does not do justice to the apostle's thought. The view of Old Testament history expounded in this address is thoroughly in harmony with the Pauline understanding of the history of Israel as may be seen from the numerous parallels between the speech and the letters of Paul.

In 1 Corinthians (10:1-13), for example, the apostle sets forth a rather elaborate typological exegesis of the experiences of the people of Israel at the time of the Exodus and during the wanderings in the desert. These same incidents are also used typologically in the speech at Antioch. The Exodus and the forty years in the desert stand at the beginning of the Old Testament events which are presented as

³ Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," trans. Wm. C. Robinson, Jr. and Victor P. Furnish in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 47.

types of the life and work of Jesus. The description in Acts 13:18 of the years in the desert finds a parallel in 1 Corinthians regardless of whether ἐτροποφόρησεν, "he bore with," (see 1 Cor. 10:5-11) or ἐτροφοφόρησεν, "he cared for" (see 1 Cor. 10:3-4) is the correct reading.⁴

In this connection it may be noted that the use of the verb ἐξελέξατο to denote God's gracious disposition towards his people (17) is not foreign to the thought of Paul. While the apostle does not use the verb to refer specifically to God's election of Israel, he does employ the cognate noun ἐκλογή for this purpose (Rom. 9:11; 11:5, 7, 28). Both the verb and the noun, as well as the adjective ἐκλεκτός, are found elsewhere in Paul's letters as an expression of God's gracious choice.⁵

In the very brief rehearsal of Old Testament salvation-history given in this address the reference to the reign of "Saul the son of Kish, a man of the tribe of Benjamin" (21) is most unexpected. This is

⁴The text is very problematic. The textual evidence is about equally divided between the two readings with ἐτροποφόρησεν perhaps being more strongly attested. Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (New York: United Bible Societies, 1971), pp. 405-406; Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece, 25th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971), p. 338. The evidence of the Septuagint at Deut. 1:31 is also about equally divided with ἐτροφοφόρησεν perhaps having slightly better attestation. Alfred Rahlfs, ed., Septuaginta, 2 vols., 9th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935), 1:286.

⁵ἐκλέγω - 1 Cor. 1:27, 28; Eph. 1:4. ἐκλεκτός - Rom. 8:33; 16:13; Col. 3:12; 2 Tim. 2:10; Titus 1:1. ἐκλογή - 1 Thess. 1:4.

the only New Testament passage which mentions Saul.⁶ His rule was not one of great renown and ended ignominiously when God removed him from being king (22). It is difficult to imagine why anyone would allude to the first king of Israel in a Christian missionary discourse. However, the inclusion of Saul is quite understandable if the speaker is the apostle Paul. Paul was also a member of the tribe of Benjamin, a fact which is known only from his letters (Rom. 11:1; Phil. 3:5).⁷ The apostle also had the name Saul and may have even been named after the most illustrious member of his tribe.⁸ It is noteworthy that while the Hebrew form $\Sigma\alpha\upsilon\lambda$ is used in Acts 13, Luke always employs the Greek form $\Sigma\alpha\upsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ in his narrative.⁹ Taken together, these facts suggest that the voice which is speaking in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch is not Luke's but Paul's.

Another item in this address which recalls the apostle's correspondence is the use of a citation from the prophet Habakkuk. The sermon concludes with the quotation of Habakkuk 1:5. This calls to mind the fact that Paul refers to Habakkuk 2:4 in his letters to the Romans

⁶ Alfred Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament, 14th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968), pp. 450, 452.

⁷ Ibid., p. 83.

⁸ F. F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), p. 41; Martin Dibelius and Werner Georg Kümmel, Paul, trans. Frank Clarke (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), p. 30.

⁹ Schmoller, pp. 450, 452.

(1:17) and Galatians (3:11) to support his teaching of justification by faith in Jesus Christ without the works of the law. Therefore a citation from Habakkuk would not be unexpected in a speech by the apostle. Furthermore, the Habakkuk quotations in Acts 13, Romans, and Galatians all occur in connection with a discussion of justification by faith apart from the law. It is certainly possible that the speaker in Acts 13 would use a citation from the prophet Habakkuk as a warning against a disbelieving rejection of the offer of justification by faith, if the book of Habakkuk provided him with a major Scriptural proof for the teaching of justification by faith.¹⁰

In Acts 13:23 the speaker refers to Jesus as "Savior" (σωτήρ). In his letters Paul also identifies our Lord as "Savior."¹¹ Nevertheless, it has been alleged that this term is employed in a different sense in the speech at Antioch than it is in the Pauline correspondence. Vielhauer claims that Acts 13 uses σωτήρ to refer to the earthly Jesus, whereas the apostle employs this term of the exalted Lord.¹² Similarly, Josef Blank maintains that Paul uses "Savior" in a future, eschatological sense, unlike the speaker in Acts 13, who refers to Jesus as the "Savior of Israel."¹³ However, these objections fail to

¹⁰Frederic Henry Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1902), pp. 194-195.

¹¹Eph. 5:23; Phil. 3:20; 2 Tim. 1:10; Titus 1:4; 2:13; 3:6.

¹²Vielhauer, p. 44.

¹³Josef Blank, Paulus und Jesus: Eine Theologische Grundlegung, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 18, ed., Vinzenz Hamp, Josef Schmid, and Paul Neuenzeit (Munchen: Kösel-Verlag, 1968), p. 36.

take into account the argument of the speech at Pisidian Antioch. The earthly Jesus, who is identified as a σωτήρ for Israel, is also the one who is exalted to an incorruptible state (35-37) and in whom justification, an eschatological concept, is offered (38-39). The salvation (σωτηρία, a word which occurs frequently in the apostle's letters¹⁴) won by this Savior (26) is the subject of the eschatological proclamation of this address. There is no essential difference between Paul's use of σωτήρ and its meaning in Acts 13.

In this speech the Old Testament is viewed as having been fulfilled in Jesus, more particularly, in his death (27-29) and resurrection (32-35). This is precisely the Pauline understanding of the way in which the Old Testament revelation was fulfilled. On the basis of Paul's letters, C. H. Dodd has identified the fulfillment of prophecy as the initial element of the Pauline kerygma.¹⁵ According to the apostle himself, the reading of the Old Testament is unveiled only in Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 3:14). Paul indicates that the prophetic scriptures spoke of the resurrected Lord (Rom. 1:1-4). The Law and the prophets foretold that God's gift of justification would be freely given apart from the law in light of the crucifixion of Christ Jesus (Rom. 3:21-26; cf. Gal. 3:13-14). The apostle sees the fulfillment of the Biblical account of the story of Abraham in Jesus' death and resurrection (Rom. 4:13-25, especially 17 and 24-25). This view of the Old

¹⁴Rom. 1:16; 10:1, 10; 11:11; 13:11; 2 Cor. 1:6; 6:2; 7:10; Eph. 1:13; Phil. 1:19, 28; 2:12; 1 Thess. 5:8, 9; 2 Thess. 2:13; 2 Tim. 2:10; 3:15.

¹⁵C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, n. d.), p. 17.

Testament Scriptures is clearly reflected in the sermon recorded in Acts 13.¹⁶ Paul claims that the reading of the Old Testament can be unveiled only in Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 3:14); the speaker at Antioch indicates that the Old Testament Scriptures which had just been read can be understood only in light of Jesus (23, 26, 36-37). The speech at Antioch echoes the apostle's understanding that the Old Testament has been fulfilled in the crucifixion and resurrection of our Lord. This common view of the Old Testament Scriptures suggests that the discourse at Antioch is the work of the author of the Pauline corpus.

The concept of promise and fulfillment plays a dominant role in the address at Pisidian Antioch. Many parallels to what is said here about this matter are to be found in Paul's letters, as we shall show.

The speaker in the synagogue at Antioch notes that God's promise was made to the Old Testament fathers (32). The apostle makes a similar statement in his epistle to the Romans (15:8). According to Acts 13 God fulfilled his promise by sending Jesus (23). Paul says the same thing in his letters. Christ confirms the promises made to the fathers (Rom. 15:8). All of the promises of God find their "yes" in Jesus (2 Cor. 1:20). The coming of Jesus fulfilled the promise of justification by faith (Gal. 3:21-24). God's promise of life is to be found in Christ Jesus (2 Tim. 1:1).

It is implied in the speech at Pisidian Antioch that the promise of the Old Testament Scriptures was fulfilled when Jesus was put to

¹⁶ Stanley, p. 56; see also Herman Ridderbos, Paul: An Outline of His Theology, trans. John Richard De Witt (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), p. 51.

death on the cross (27-29). This recalls the apostle's teaching that the promise of God given in the Old Testament applies to all mankind in light of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:13-14).

The speaker in Acts 13 states that God fulfilled the promise given to the fathers by raising Jesus from the dead (32-33).¹⁷ This assertion is paralleled in Paul's letter to the Romans. The apostle indicates that the subject of the gospel which God promised ahead of time in the Old Testament is Jesus Christ, risen from the dead (Rom. 1:2,4). In the same epistle Paul notes that the promise to Abraham was fulfilled through the righteousness of faith, for which Jesus was raised from the dead (Rom. 4:13,22-25).

In the address recorded in Acts 13 the fulfillment of the divine promise in Jesus is associated with the teaching of justification by faith apart from the law (39). The apostle conjoins these same two concepts in his epistles. Paul asserts that righteousness before God does not come by way of the law (Gal. 3:11,21) but is given through faith in Jesus Christ, who fulfilled God's promise (Gal. 3:22). Similarly, in Romans 4 the apostle states that it is not by the law but by way of the righteousness of faith that one receives the promise which was fulfilled in our Lord (13-25).

¹⁷While the expression ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν could refer to the Incarnation (as in Acts 3:22,26; 7:37), several factors indicate that here it must refer to the resurrection: 1) The resurrection is the subject in verses 30-34. 2) A fuller object than simply a name is given when ἀνίστημι refers to something other than the resurrection (Acts 3:22,26; 7:37; 13:22). 3) ἀνίστημι refers to the resurrection in 13:34. 4) ἀνίστημι can denote the resurrection even without the addition of ἐκ νεκρῶν. Evald Lövestam, Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13, 32-37, trans. Michael J. Petry, Coniectanea Neotestamentica, no. 18 Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), pp. 9-10.

Another point made in this speech about the promise of God is that it has been fulfilled for Gentiles as well as for Jews. At two different places in his sermon, the speaker notes that his audience is comprised of two different groups of people. Some of his hearers are "men of Israel" (16) and "brothers, sons of Abraham's race" (26), that is, Jews. The rest of the assembly consisted of God-fearers ($\phi\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\nu$ - 16,26), that is, Gentiles who took an interest in Judaism but who did not become incorporated into the Jewish people by circumcision.¹⁸ To this mixed group of Jews and Gentiles the good news is proclaimed that the promise made to the Old Testament fathers has been fulfilled for all of them (32-33).

That Gentiles as well as Jews have received the promises of God is a theme which occurs in a number of places in Paul's letters. According to the apostle the promise first made to Abraham has also come upon the Gentiles in Christ Jesus (Gal. 3:14). He defines the mystery of Christ as the fact that the Gentiles, who at one time were strangers to the covenants of the promise (Eph. 2:11-12), are now part-takers with the Israelites in the promise of God in Christ Jesus (Eph. 3:6). Paul sees that the promise to Abraham comes by the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:13), which is available to the uncircumcised (Rom. 4:11) as well as to the circumcised (Rom. 4:12). This means that the promise is certain for all those who share the faith of Abraham and not only for the Jews (Rom. 4:16-17). The apostle indicates that Christ

¹⁸F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), p. 271; George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930), 1:325.

has fulfilled the promises made to the Old Testament fathers for both the Jews and the Gentiles (Rom. 15:8-9).

The preacher in Acts 13 refers to those to whom God has fulfilled his promise, both Jews and Gentiles, as children of the Old Testament fathers (33).¹⁹ Paul makes a similar identification in his letter to the Galatians. According to the apostle there is no distinction between Jew and Greek among those who have been baptized into Christ, for all who belong to Christ are the seed of Abraham and heirs of the promise (3:27-29). He also gives his readers, among whom were many Gentiles, the name "children of promise" (4:28).

In the speech at Antioch the people of Israel are called "our fathers," even though there are Gentiles in the audience. Paul does the same thing in 1 Cor. 10:1, referring to the people of Israel as "our fathers" in spite of the fact that his addresses included non-Jews. In Rom. 4:16 the apostle denotes Abraham as the father of all believers.

The equality of Jew and Gentile before God is one of the points made in this sermon, and it is also characteristic of the theology of Paul.²⁰ It is, therefore, to be expected that the unity of Jew and Gentile would be stressed in an address delivered by the apostle, as it is in the speech recorded in Acts 13.

¹⁹The text is extremely difficult (Metzger, pp. 410-411). However, regardless of which reading is correct, the general meaning of the passage seems to be that all of the hearers, Gentiles as well as Jews, are to regard themselves as children of the patriarchs.

²⁰In addition to the references already cited add Rom. 1-4, Gal. 3-4, and Eph. 2:11-22.

The speaker in the synagogue at Antioch states that in accord with his promise God sent Jesus from the seed of David (23), and much of the remainder of the sermon elaborates this theme by presenting Jesus as a new David. Both David and Jesus were buried (29,36). God raised (ἡγείρεν) Jesus from the dead (30,37), even as he had once raised up (ἡγείρεν) David as king over Israel (22). Additional parallels between the son of Jesse and our Lord became evident when it is recognized that 2 Sam. 7 lies in the background of the speech of Acts 13.²¹ In Nathan's oracle it is indicated that David's heir will be God's son (2 Sam. 7:14); in the address at Antioch Ps. 2:7, "you are my Son" (the background of which is probably 2 Sam. 7:14²²), is said to refer to Jesus. The speaker in Acts thereby justifies his application of Is. 55:3, which denotes the everlasting dominion of the Davidic king (see 2 Sam, 7:13-16),²³ and of Ps. 16:10 to Jesus.

Blank sees the development of the new David theme in the speech at Antioch as a sign of its un-Pauline character. His argument is that the promise made to David plays no role in the theology of Paul.²⁴ However, Blank fails to consider two important concepts in the apostle's thought.

First of all, Blank does not take into account the importance which Paul gives to the Davidic descent of Jesus. In the first chapter

²¹Lövestam, pp. 6-7; Dale Goldsmith, "Acts 13:33-37: A Peshet on II Samuel 7," Journal of Biblical Literature 87 (September 1968): 321-324.

²²Lövestam, p. 15. 2 Sam. 7:14 and Ps. 2:7 are also conjoined in Heb. 1-5.

²³Ibid., pp. 72-74.

²⁴Blank, p. 36.

of his letter to the Romans the apostle indicates that the content of the gospel of God is Jesus Christ, born from the seed of David (3). In the second letter to Timothy Paul notes that according to his gospel Jesus is from the seed of David (2:8). These passages justify the conclusion of C. H. Dodd that the birth of Jesus from the seed of David was one element of the Pauline kerygma.²⁵ It would, therefore, be expected that one who included the Davidic descent of Jesus as a component part of his gospel would make mention of it in a missionary homily before an audience which was familiar with the Old Testament.

Moreover, the apostle does make reference to the promise to David in 2 Cor. 6:14-7:1. In this passage Paul cites 2 Sam. 7:14 in order to prove that the Church is the temple of God (16,18). 2 Samuel 7 reports how Nathan told David that God himself would build a house for him. The word "house" (בַּיִת) has a two-fold meaning in this passage. On the one hand, it denotes David's posterity. On the other hand, "house" refers to the temple which Solomon, David's son and heir, would build (2 Sam. 7:11b-13). In addition to this promise to build David a house, the Lord had assured David that he himself would be a father to David's heir and that David's son would be his own son (2 Sam. 7:14). The apostle quotes 2 Sam. 7:14 in a slightly altered form ("I will be a father to you, and you will be my sons and daughters") in order to make the point that God's presence among men in grace is no longer to be found in the Jerusalem temple but within the Christian Church.

²⁵Dodd, Preaching, p. 17

Since Paul identified Jesus as the true son of David (Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8) and the true Son of God,²⁶ he could apply the promise of 2 Samuel 7 to the Church, for in Biblical thought what is true of Jesus may also be predicated of his Church.²⁷ This indicates that the apostle viewed Jesus as the fulfillment of the promise to David, which is precisely the point made in the discourse at Antioch.

We have seen that there is a substantial amount of similarity between the treatment of the Old Testament in Acts 13:16-41 and the way in which Paul used his Bible in his letters. In general the speech reflects the apostle's typological method of interpreting the events of the Old Testament as foreshadowing the work of Christ. Furthermore, the speech echoes a number of Pauline concepts with regard to the Old Testament revelation, particularly that of promise and fulfillment. Taken together, these various items support the claim of Acts 13:16 that this is, in fact, an authentic speech by Paul.

²⁶Rom. 1:3,9; 5:10; 8:3, 29, 32; 1 Cor. 1:9; 2 Cor. 1:19; Gal. 1:16; 2:20; 4:4,6; Eph. 4:13; Col. 1:13; 1 Thess. 1:10.

²⁷Bertil Gärtner, The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965), pp. 49-56, 122.

CHAPTER III

ECHOES OF PAUL'S RABBINIC TRAINING IN THE SPEECH

Before examining the speech recorded in Acts 13 for indications that it is the work of one well schooled in rabbinic Judaism, it will be helpful to review the New Testament evidence which demonstrates that Paul was trained as a Pharisaic rabbi. This evidence consists of one reference in the Acts of the Apostles and several passages from the Pauline correspondence.

Acts 22:3 indicates that, although the apostle was born in Tarsus of Cilicia, he spent his youth in the city of Jerusalem. In due time he was instructed in the Torah according to the traditions of the Pharisees (Gal. 1:14; Phil. 3:5) by Gamaliel.¹ Several of Paul's letters reflect his rabbinic training, and it will be useful at this point to take a brief look at three passages in which he exhibits his familiarity with rabbinic theology.

In 1 Cor. 10:4 the apostle mentions a spiritual rock which followed the people of Israel during their sojourn in the Sinai peninsula and from which they all drank a spiritual drink. There are two instances recorded in the Old Testament when Israel received water from a rock. The first of these is found in Ex. 17:1-7; the second is recorded in

¹For a more complete discussion of the interpretation of Acts 22:3 see W. C. van Unnik, Tarsus or Jerusalem; the City of Paul's Youth, trans. George Ogg (London: Epworth Press, 1962), pp. 17-45,

Num. 20:2-13. Rabbinic legend explained the twofold occurrence of a miraculous supply of water from a rock by postulating that the rock had followed the Israelites from place to place in the desert (see the Targum Onkelos on Num. 21).² Paul, who would have learned this legend in the course of his rabbinic instruction, adapts it in 1 Corinthians in order to make the point that Jesus the Messiah was with the people of Israel at the time of the Exodus and during the wanderings in the desert.

Another passage in which the apostle displays his rabbinic training is Col. 1:15-20. The picture of Christ which Paul presents here is modeled after the description of wisdom recorded in Prov. 8:22-31. Since wisdom is associated with "the beginning" (א'שׁר) in Prov. 8 (22-23), rabbinic exegesis identified wisdom with the first word of the Hebrew Bible ("in the beginning") and interpreted the opening of Gen. 1:1 (א'שׁר) as meaning "by wisdom." The apostle evidently adopts this identification in Colossians 1. In presenting Christ as wisdom, Paul applies three possible explanations of the preposition א' ("in," "through," "into") and four possible interpretations of the substantive א'שׁר ("beginning," "sum-total," "head," "firstfruits") to our Lord as follows:

²E. Earle Ellis, Paul's Use of the Old Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957), pp. 66-70.

ἐν	- "in	- ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (1:16)
	- "through"	- τὰ πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ . . . ἐκτίσται (1:16)
	- "into	- τὰ πάντα . . . εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκτίσται (1:16)
ἀρχὴ	- "beginning"	- ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχὴ (1:18)
	- "sum-total"	- τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (1:17) - πλήρωμα (1:19)
	- "head"	- αὐτός ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλὴ τοῦ σώματος (1:18)
	- "firstfruits"	- πρωτότοκος (1:15, 1:18)

The apostle's meaning is that in every possible sense of ἀρχὴ Christ is its fulfillment. By this characteristically rabbinic type of argumentation Paul identifies Jesus as the wisdom of God.³

One additional example of the use which the apostle made of his rabbinic instruction is the occurrence of the names Jannes and Jambres in 2 Tim. 3:8. The names of the magicians of Pharaoh are not given in the Old Testament, but Jewish tradition knew them as Jannes and Jambres. When writing to Timothy, Paul adopted these traditional names in order to refer to these ancient exemplars of human opposition to divine truth.⁴

Thus it may be seen to what extent the apostle to the Gentiles was indebted to his Jewish heritage and rabbinic training. As we turn to an examination of the discourse recorded in Acts 13:16-41, we will observe that the speaker at Pisidian Antioch displays his familiarity with the traditions and methodology of rabbinic Judaism.

³W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology, 2nd ed. (London: S. P. C. K., 1955), pp. 151-152.

⁴Ellis, p. 55.

Jesus is never identified as "the Messiah" (ὁ Χριστός) in Acts 13. However, this does not mean that there is no Messianism in the speech, since the speaker indirectly designates our Lord as the Anointed One by applying certain Messianic expectations held among the Jews to him.

In the previous chapter we noted how in this sermon Jesus is presented as a new David. By doing this, the preacher indicates that Jesus is the Messiah. The Davidic lineage of the Messiah was widely accepted among the Jews, particularly the Pharisees (Matt.22:41-42; Mark 12:35; Luke 20:39-41). In fact, the title "son of David" became a common designation for the Messiah.⁵ Therefore, when the speaker in Acts 13 stated that God brought Jesus from the seed of David (23), his audience would understand this as an identification of Jesus as the long-awaited Messiah.⁶ In this connection it may be noted that the addition of "the son of Jesse" (τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί) to the Old Testament citation recorded in verse 22 may stem from the Messianic interpretation of Isaiah 11.⁷

Another indication in this address that Jesus is the Messiah is the application of Ps. 2:7, "You are my son, today I have begotten you" (33), to him. Although the Jews did not frequently identify the Messiah

⁵George Foot Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era, 3 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930), 2:347.

⁶Otto Glombitza, "Akta XIII. 15-41: Analyse einer Lukanischen Predigt vor Juden," New Testament Studies 5 (1958-1959): 308-309.

⁷Traugott Holtz, Untersuchungen über die Alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, no. 104 (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968), p. 134.

as the Son of God,⁸ there are several passages in rabbinic writings which do interpret the second Psalm messianically.

A rabbinic application of Ps. 2:8 to the Messiah is preserved in the Midrash Rabbah on Gen. 44:8 (15:2):

R. Jonathan said: Three persons were bidden "ask," viz.: Solomon, Ahaz, and the King Messiah. Solomon: Ask what I shall give thee (1 Kings III, 5). Ahaz: Ask thee a sign (Isa. VII, 11). The King Messiah: Ask of Me, etc. (Ps. II, 8).

The same interpretation is to be found in the Midrash on Psalm 2 (§ 10):

R. Johanan taught: To three men--Solomon, Ahaz, and the lord Messiah--the Holy One, blessed be He, said, "Ask of Me." . . . To the lord Messiah, as is written Ask of Me, and I will give thee the nations for thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession.¹⁰

A tractate of the Babylonian Talmud (Sukkah 52a) states that God is speaking to the Davidic Messiah in Ps. 2:7-8:

Our Rabbis taught, The Holy One, blessed be He, will say to the Messiah, the son of David (may he reveal himself speedily in our days!), "Ask of me anything, and I will give it to thee," as it is said,

⁸ Evald Lövestam, Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13, 32-37, trans. Michael J. Petry, Coniectanea Neotestamentica, no. 18 Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), pp. 23, 90.

⁹ H. Freedman and Maurice Simon, gen. eds., Midrash Rabbah, 10 vols., (London: The Soncino Press, 1939), vol. 1: Genesis I, trans. H. Freedman, pp. 365-366.

¹⁰ William G. Braude, ed. and trans., The Midrash on Psalms, 2 vols., Yale Judaica Series, ed. Leon Nemoy, no. 13 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959), 1:42.

I will tell of the decree etc. this day have I begotten thee, ask of me and I will give the nations for thy inheritance.¹¹

Furthermore, the application of Ps. 2:7 to the resurrection of Jesus recalls the rabbinic use of this passage to denote the re-creation of the Messiah after his suffering. This understanding of Ps. 2:7 is preserved in the Midrash on Psalm 2 (§9):

R. Huna said: Suffering is divided into three portions: one, the Patriarchs and all the generations of men took; one, the generation that lived in the time of [Hadrian's] persecution took; and one, the generation of the lord Messiah will take. When the time comes, the Holy One, blessed be He, will say: "I must create the Messiah--a new creation." As Scripture says, This day have I begotten thee--that is, on the very day of redemption, God will create the Messiah.¹²

In Midrash Samuel (19 §1) the connection is made between the sufferings of the Messiah and the forgiveness of sins, a connection which is also implied by the speaker in Acts 13 (27-28,38):

R. Huna (ca. 350) has said in the name of R. Acha (ca. 320): The sufferings are divided into three portions: One for the generations (viz. for all) and for the fathers, one for the generation of the religious persecution (at the time of Hadrian), and one for the King Messiah, as it is written (Is. 53:5): but he was pierced on account of our sins, etc.¹³

¹¹Israel W. Slotki, trans. and ed., "Sukkah," in The Talmud, 35 vols., ed. Isidore Epstein, vol. 12: Mo'ed VI (London: The Soncino Press, 1938), p. 247.

¹²Braude, 1:41.

¹³Cited by Herman L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 4 vols. (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965), 2:287. Strack and Billerbeck's German translation reads as follows: R. Huna (um 350) hat im Namen des R. Acha (um 320) gesagt: In drei Teile sind die Leiden geteilt worden: einer für die (d. h. für alle) Geschlechter u. für die Väter u. einer für das Geschlecht der Religionsverfolgung (zur Zeit Hadrians) u. einer für den König, den Messias; das ist es, was geschrieben steht Jes 53,5: Aber er ist durchbohrt von wegen unsrer Sünden usw.

The Midrash Yalqut Shim'oni (2:620) conflates these two readings and so combines these two ideas by referring Ps. 2:7 to the re-creation of the Messiah after his suffering for the sins of others:

R. Huna (ca. 350) says in the name of R. Acha (ca. 320): The sufferings are divided into three parts: One for David and the fathers, one for our own generation, and one for King Messiah, as it is written, "He was wounded for our transgressions," etc. (Isa. 53:5). And when the hour comes, the Holy One, blessed be He, says to them: I must create him a new creation, even as it is said, "Today I have begotten you" (Ps. 2:7). This is the hour when he is made a new creation.¹⁴

Several factors make it likely that those who heard this sermon were familiar with these rabbinic interpretations of the second Psalm. Even though these works were written later than the New Testament, they preserve much earlier rabbinic teachings which were transmitted orally for centuries. Since these Messianic applications of Psalm 2 are found in a number of different rabbinic sources, we may be certain that they were commonly accepted among the Pharisaic scribes. These rabbis took charge of the educational program throughout the Jewish synagogues and succeeded in substantially indoctrinating those who attended the synagogue with their interpretations of the Old Testament Scriptures.¹⁵ Therefore, it is possible that the speaker at Pisidian Antioch could have assumed that his audience would have grasped that by applying Ps. 2:7 to Jesus he was claiming that Jesus was the promised Messiah.

¹⁴Cited by Lövestam, p. 42; F. F. Bruce, Commentary on the Book of the Acts, The New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954), pp. 275-276 n. 52.

¹⁵Moore, 1:286-289.

A final indication of the Messiahship of Jesus occurs in verse 25. The preacher reports the Baptizer's disclaimer of being "what you think I am." These words have evidently been included in order to demonstrate that John denied that he himself was the Messiah, and that he had instead pointed men to Jesus as the Messiah.

The reason why the speech in Acts 13 identifies Jesus as the Messiah only in this indirect way becomes clear when one recalls the connotations which the title Messiah had during the New Testament era. If the speaker had referred to our Lord as $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, his hearers may well have understood this designation in a sense which was very different from that which he intended.¹⁶ Instead, the preacher indirectly denotes Jesus as the Messiah in order that he might indicate what sort of Messiah this Jesus was, namely, a descendant of David who had been raised from the dead by God after he had suffered for the sins of others.

It is difficult to imagine Luke fabricating a speech which contained such an argument. He frequently employs $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in his narrative.¹⁷ Of the other five missionary discourses recorded in Acts, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ occurs in the four longest ones.¹⁸ $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ is found on the lips of various speakers in Act.¹⁹ Furthermore, Paul himself frequently

¹⁶ Everett F. Harrison, Acts: The Expanding Church (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), p. 210.

¹⁷ Acts 5:42; 8:5,12; 9:22; 17:3; 18:5,28; 24:24; 28:31.

¹⁸ Acts 2:31,36; 3:18,20; 4:10; 10:36.

¹⁹ Peter - 2:31,36; 3:6,18,20; 4:10; 9:34; 10:36; 11:17, Paul - 16:18; 17:3; 26:23; the assembled believers at Jerusalem - 4:26; the letter from the Apostolic Council - 15:26.

uses $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ in his letters.²⁰ If Luke had attributed a speech of his own creation to the apostle, it is reasonable to assume that he would have employed the term $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, either in imitation of Paul or in accord with his own custom, instead of identifying Jesus as the Messiah only by implication. Moreover, it is most improbable that Luke, who was not a Jew (Col. 4:10-11,14), would have possessed sufficient knowledge of the rabbis' Messianic interpretations of Psalm 2 so that he could have constructed this subtle designation of Jesus as the Messiah. To assume that one who referred to the vernacular of the Jews as "their language" (Acts 1:19), thereby disassociating himself from the Jewish people, would have been familiar with the Messianic speculations of the rabbis is quite illogical. However, there would be nothing surprising about the apostle Paul making use of Rabbinic exegesis. Since Paul employs his rabbinic training in his letters, it is to be expected that he would do so when delivering a missionary sermon to a synagogue congregation. In fact, as far as we know, the apostle is the only early Christian who had been trained as a Pharisaic rabbi. Therefore, the use of Psalm 2 in the speech at Antioch, in order to identify Jesus as the Messiah, is a strong argument in support of the claim of Acts that Paul actually delivered this address.

As has already been noted in passing, the discourse recorded in Acts 13 is a sermon delivered in the course of a regular sabbath worship service in a Jewish synagogue (14-15). In the synagogue order of worship the reading of the law and the prophets was followed by an edifying

²⁰ Alfred Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament, 14th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968), pp. 524, 527.

sermon in which the readings from the Scriptures were expounded (15).²¹ There are a number of items in this address which indicate that in many ways it is a typical synagogue homily delivered by one who was well versed in the methods of synagogue preaching.

Initially it may be noted that the sermons delivered in synagogue worship services were rather brief, whereas longer discourses were reserved for the synagogue schools.²² Thus, while the speech recorded in Acts 13 may be a condensation of a longer address, it is also possible that in keeping with the custom of the synagogue the homily delivered on this occasion was no longer than the brief discourse given in Acts 13.

One type of synagogue sermon which is found frequently in the Midrashim is the proem (or petihta) homily.²³ Proem homilies followed a distinct pattern. The preacher chose a sermon text which could in some way be related to one of the lessons which had been read.²⁴ The speaker stated his interpretation of the text and then proceeded to support his exegesis by quoting a series of Biblical texts, interspersed with some illustration and explanation, which directed the theme of the homily towards a concluding text.²⁵

²¹ Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, 5 vols. in 2 divisions, trans. Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890), 2:2:76, 82.

²² Israel Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917, 1924), 1:4.

²³ Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1971 ed., s. v. "Preaching. In the Talmudic Period," by Joseph Heinemann.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ J. W. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form," New Testament Studies 14 (1967-1968):100.

Certain features of the sermon delivered at Antioch indicate that it is an example of a proem homily. In light of the prominence given to presenting Jesus as the new David throughout the address, it seems likely that 1 Sam. 13:14 (22) was the text. Immediately following the text the preacher asserts that its interpretation points to Jesus. After he had indicated who this Jesus is, the speaker proceeds to substantiate his interpretation by citing a number of Biblical passages (Ps. 2:7; Is. 55:3; Ps. 16:10), which, he maintains, cannot be understood of King David (36) but must instead refer to Jesus (37). The sermon concludes with one final Biblical quotation. Thus, we can see that the outline of this address is the same as that of a standard proem homily.²⁶

Furthermore, it is possible tentatively to identify the Pentateuchal and Prophetic lessons which may underlie the sermon of Acts 13. We have already noted that 2 Samuel 7 lies in the background of this address.²⁷ Since the proem text had to have some connection with one of the lessons, it is certainly possible that 1 Sam. 13:14 would have been chosen as the text if a lection taken from 2 Samuel 7 had been the reading from the prophets. J. W. Bowker has also shown several possible echoes of Deuteronomy 4 in this homily.²⁸ The summary of the Exodus, wilderness wanderings, and Conquest (17-19) may be based upon Deut. 4:37-38. The reference to the fathers and their descendants (32-33) may be patterned after Deut. 4:37. Witnesses are mentioned in the sermon at Pisidian Antioch (31) and in Deuteronomy 4 (26). The final Biblical

²⁶ Ibid., p. 102

²⁷ See page 15.

²⁸ Bowker, pp. 102-103

However, as Max Wilcox has demonstrated,³¹ it is more likely that this rendering has been influenced by the version of 1 Sam. 13:14 preserved in the Aramaic Targum, which differs considerably from the textual tradition of both the Masoretic text and the Septuagint. In place of the reading of the Masoretic text, *יֵלֵךְ אִישׁ אַחֲרֵי לֵבָבּוֹ* ("a man after his heart"), which the Septuagint renders *ἄνθρωπος κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ*, the Targum has *ל'לילג ת'לג גלל*.³² Since *ל'לילג* could be either singular or plural, this reading could be translated: "a man doing his will" (*ἄνδρα ποιοῦντα τὸ θελήμα αὐτοῦ*) or "a man doing his wills" (*ἄνδρα ποιοῦντα τὰ θελήματα αὐτοῦ*).³³ Because the participle in Palestinian Aramaic can also serve as an ordinary future tense, the reading of Acts 13:22, *ἄνδρα . . . ὅς ποιήσει τὰ θελήματατά μου*, would also be a proper translation of the Targum version of 1 Sam. 13:14.³⁴ Thus, it seems that the quotation recorded in Acts 13:22 is not a conflation of three different Old Testament citations but rather a combination of the Masoretic (or Septuagint) text and the Targum rendering of 1 Sam. 13:14. This possibility is all the more likely when we consider that the sermon recorded in Acts 13 may originally have been delivered in Aramaic.³⁵ Moreover, the use of the Targums in the synagogue service may have given the speaker occasion to make use of a Targum

³¹Max Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965), pp. 21-26.

³²*Ibid.*, pp. 21.

³³*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22

³⁴*Ibid.*, p. 22. The reading *μου* in place of *αὐτοῦ* is demanded by the context in Acts 13:22.

³⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 90-91, 120, 153-154.

reading. Therefore, it is very probable that the speaker at Pisidian Antioch was familiar with the Targum tradition.³⁶

It is doubtful whether Luke, a Gentile, would have had this sort of familiarity with renderings preserved in the Targums. Thus, it is very unlikely that Luke could have been the source of the words recorded in Acts 13:22. However, a similar use of a Targum tradition which differs from the reading of the Masoretic text and the Septuagint is found in Paul's letter to the Ephesians.

In Ephesians 4:8 the apostle quotes Psalm 68:18 (68:19 in the Hebrew, 67:19 in the Greek). However, the form of the citation does not correspond to either the Masoretic text or the Septuagint ("you received gifts from men") but to the reading of the Targum ("you gave gifts to men").³⁷ Rabbinic exegesis interpreted this psalm as a reference to Moses' receiving the Torah on Mt. Sinai in order to give it to mankind.³⁸ This rabbinic interpretation explains why the targum rendering differs from the Hebrew and Greek. In Eph. 4:8 Paul employs the rendition of the Psalm given in the Targum to serve his purpose of presenting Jesus as a new Moses, who ascended into heaven in order to give the gifts of apostles, prophets, and other offices (Eph. 4:8-12) to the Church.

The use of an Old Testament quotation which follows the tradition of the Targum indicates that the speaker of Acts 13 was acquainted with the interpretative renderings preserved in these Aramaic paraphrases of the Old Testament Scriptures. It is highly improbable that

³⁶ Ibid., pp. 23-24

³⁷ Strack and Billerbeck, 3:596.

³⁸ Ibid., Braude, 1:545.

this could have been Luke. However, it is to be expected that Paul's rabbinic training would have familiarized him with the Targum traditions, particularly since he employs a Targum rendering in one of his letters. Therefore, the form of the Old Testament citation recorded in Acts 13:22 supplies a weighty argument in favor of identifying the speech at Antioch as an authentic address by the apostle.³⁹

A final indication that the sermon delivered at Antioch is the work of a well-trained rabbi is the way in which the speaker relates the Old Testament quotations which he cites in verses 33 to 35. In these verses the preacher employs several characteristically rabbinic methods of dealing with the Scriptures.

Initially it may be noted that the way in which the citation of Ps. 2:7 is introduced, γέγραπται, "it is written" (33), is one of the traditional introductory formulas used in rabbinic and other Jewish literature.⁴⁰ Furthermore, it is an expression which is frequently used by Paul to introduce quotations from the Old Testament.⁴¹

A stronger indication of the rabbinic character of this discourse is the combination of two Old Testament citations. In verses 34 and 35 Is. 55:3 and Ps. 16:10 are strung together in a chain quotation. This practice, known as the haraz (חרז) method, originated in the preaching of the synagogues and may be found frequently in the Talmud.⁴²

³⁹Wilcox, pp. 25-26, 182.

⁴⁰Ellis, pp. 48-49; the Hebrew equivalent is לִי כָתוּב.

⁴¹Rom. 1:17; 2:24; 3:4,10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13,33; 10:15; 11:8,26; 12:19; 14:11; 15:3,9,21; 1 Cor. 1:19,31; 2:9; 3:19; 4:6; 9:9; 10:7; 14:21; 15:45; 2 Cor. 8:15; 9:9; Gal. 3:10,13; 4:22,27.

⁴²Ellis, pp. 49-51.

Paul uses the hazaz method. His letter to the Romans contains several examples of this manner of quoting the Old Testament.⁴³ Moreover, the speaker in Acts 13 connects these two citations by means of a single catchword (Stichwort), ὅθια/ὅθιοι.⁴⁴ The apostle's letters also contain chain quotations in which the individual citations are united by a Stichwort.⁴⁵

An even more distinctively rabbinic touch in this sermon is the manner in which the preacher interprets Is. 55:3 by way of Ps. 16:10. According to the second of the rabbinic hermeneutical rules (middoth) enunciated by Hillel, an obscure passage could be interpreted by analogy. This meant that the expositor would find an intelligible passage which had at least one word in common with the passage under consideration and would interpret the obscure passage in light of the clear one.⁴⁶ In Acts 13 the speaker states that the incorruptibility of the resurrected Jesus is proven by Is. 55:3 (34). In order to substantiate his claim that τὰ ὅθια ("sure decrees," Hebrew: 'ט וְט) is proof of this, the

⁴³9:12-13 (Gen. 25:23 + Mal. 1:2-3); 9:25-29 (Hos. 2:25 + Hos. 2:1 + Is. 10:22-23 + Is. 1:9); 10:19-21 (Deut. 32:21 + Is. 65:1 + Is. 65:2); 11:8-10 (Is. 29:10; Deut. 29:4 + Ps. 69:23-24); 15:9-12 (Ps. 18:50 + Deut. 32:43 + Ps. 117:1 + Is. 11:10); Ellis, p. 186.

⁴⁴J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, trans. G. E. van Baaren-Pape (Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1954), pp. 173-175.

⁴⁵ὁ φθαλμεύς - Rom. 11:8-10 (Is. 29:10 + Deut. 29:4 + Ps. 69:23-24); ἔθνη - Rom. 15:9-12 (Ps. 18:50 + Deut. 32:43 + Ps. 117:1 + Is. 11:10); ὁφθαλμοί - 1 Cor. 3:19-20 (Job 5:13 + Ps. 94:11); Ellis, p. 50, n. 2; Frederic Henry Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1902), pp. 181-182.

⁴⁶F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, gen. eds., The Beginnings of Christianity, 5 vols. (London: MacMillan and Company, Ltd., 1933), vol. 4: English Translation and Commentary, by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, p. 155; Frederick W. Danker, Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study, 3rd ed. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970), pp. 216-217; Ellis, p. 41.

preacher appeals (δῖότις) to Ps. 16:10, in which the singular τὸν ὅσιον ("holy one," Hebrew: הַיְיָ אֱלֹהֵינוּ) occurs (35).⁴⁷ By using Ps. 16:10 to determine the meaning of Is. 55:3, even though the only apparent connection between the two passages is a single common word, the speaker indicates his familiarity with the principle of gezerah shawa (גְּזֵרַת שְׂוָא), the second hermeneutical rule of Hillel.

This uniquely rabbinic method of employing Ps. 16:10 distinguishes the speech of Acts 13 from Peter's Pentecost discourse (Acts 2:14-36). Although both addresses make use of Ps. 16:10, only the speech at Antioch does so in a manner characteristic of a schooled rabbi.⁴⁸ This fact refutes the argument of critics, such as Vielhauer, who assert that Ps. 16:10 is used in the same way in both addresses, and who cite this as evidence for the common authorship of these two speeches.⁴⁹

It is unconceivable that a Gentile such as Luke could have formulated this example of an unquestionably rabbinic method of exegesis. The use of the rabbinic principle of gezerah shawa in Acts 13:34-35 makes it impossible to attribute the speech recorded in Acts 13 to the creative imagination of the author of the Acts of the Apostles. However, not only might we expect Paul to employ such rabbinic principles of interpretation, but, in fact, we do find the apostle using this same hermeneutical rule (gezerah shawa) in his letter to the Romans.

⁴⁷ Doeve, p. 186; Lake and Cadbury, p. 155

⁴⁸ Doeve, p. 175.

⁴⁹ Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," trans. Wm. C. Robinson, Jr. and Victor P. Furnish, in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 43.

In Romans 4 Paul intends to prove to his imaginary Jewish opponent that faith alone, and not the works of the law, justifies one before God. In order to accomplish this the apostle appeals to the example of Abraham and sets out to demonstrate that Abraham believed, that by believing he obtained the forgiveness of sins, and that this occurred before he was circumcised, that is, without the works of the law. Gen. 15:6 substantiates Paul's claim that Abraham believed (Rom. 4:3). The apostle then employs gezerah shawa to show that by believing Abraham received the forgiveness of sins. Paul proves that ἐλογίσθη (Hebrew: לִיְיָ וְלִפְנֵי) in Gen. 15:6 denotes the forgiveness of sins on the basis of Ps. 32:1-2 (μακάριοι ὧν ἀφέθησαν αἱ ἀνομίαι καὶ ὧν ἐπεκαλύφθησαν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι· μακάριος ἀνὴρ οὗ οὐ μὴ λογισθῆται κύριος ἁμαρτίαν), where the same word (λογίσθηται - Hebrew: לִיְיָ וְלִפְנֵי) occurs (Rom. 4:7-8). The apostle then makes a second use of gezerah shawa, returning to Gen. 15:6, to demonstrate that Abraham received forgiveness before he was circumcised. Because Abraham was forgiven by believing before he was circumcised, he secured forgiveness while still a "Gentile," without the law, and hence without the works of the law. In this way Paul proves that both Jews and Gentiles receive righteousness before God only by faith—apart from the works of the law.⁵⁰

The use of the principle of gezerah shawa in the speech at Antioch indicates that the speaker was well-versed in the ways of rabbinic hermeneutics. The fact that Paul employs this same rabbinic rule of interpretation in his letter to the Romans strongly supports the identification of the preacher in Acts 13 as being the apostle himself.

⁵⁰ Danker, pp. 216–217.

We have noted a number of items throughout the sermon delivered at the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch which indicates that it was the work of an individual who had received a thorough rabbinic education. The speaker makes use of certain Messianic expectations held by the rabbis. The entire address follows the general pattern of a synagogue homily. An Old Testament quotation is cited in a form which has been affected by the Targum. Another Old Testament citation is introduced with a standard rabbinic introductory formula. Two more Old Testament verses are joined together in a characteristically rabbinic fashion to form a chain quotation. The preacher employs a rabbinic hermeneutical principle. In light of all these factors it would be absurd to suggest that a Gentile author such as Luke could have composed this discourse. However, since Paul was, as far as we know, the only early Christian, who had been trained as a rabbi, and since many of the rabbinic elements of the address at Antioch are paralleled in the apostle's letters, it would be logical to assume that the voice speaking in Acts 13:16-41 is that of the apostle Paul. The familiarity with rabbinic Judaism displayed in the discourse recorded in Acts 13 is a potent argument in support of the claim of the author of Acts that this is a genuine speech by Paul.

CHAPTER IV

THE INCLUSION OF THE MINISTRY OF JOHN THE BAPTIZER IN THE SPEECH

Up to this point we have noted a substantial number of parallels between the speech given at Pisidian Antioch and the letters of Paul. However, there is one item mentioned in this address which does not appear in the apostle's correspondence; namely, the ministry of John the Baptizer (24-25). In this regard the sermon of Acts 13 has more in common with the other missionary discourses of Acts than it does with Paul's letters.¹

It cannot be denied that at first glance there is very little in the apostle's writings about the life of Jesus,² to which the ministry of the Baptizer serves as an introduction. Many contemporary scholars, particularly in Germany, would attribute this lack of any extensive treatment of the life of Jesus by Paul to the apostle's own disregard for our Lord's earthly sojourn. Under the influence of scholars such as Rudolf Bultmann the opinion that Paul had no interest in

¹C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, n. d.), p. 29

²Ibid., p. 27; Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 55-56.

the historical Jesus, much less in his ministry, has received wide acceptance.³

To those who have accepted this view of the apostle's attitude towards the life of Jesus, the fact that the speaker at Antioch mentions the work of John the Baptizer is certain proof that this address did not come from Paul. However, a closer inspection of both the speech recorded in Acts 13 and the apostle's letters demonstrates that such a conclusion is not supported by the facts.

First of all, even if the writings of Paul did not contain the slightest bit of information about the life and ministry of our Lord, this would not prove that the apostle had no knowledge of or interest in the earthly career of Jesus. Since the letters of Paul were addressed to Christian congregations who had already been instructed in the principal facts concerning the earthly life of our Lord, the apostle had no need to dwell at great length upon the ministry of Jesus in his epistles. However, the situation would be entirely different in the case of a missionary address before an audience which had never heard of Jesus Christ. Under these circumstances it would be necessary to supply some of the details about the ministry of Jesus, such as the work of John the Baptizer, in addition to a minimal outline of the apostolic kerygma.⁴ Therefore, it is to be expected that a speech like the one recorded in

³F. F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), pp. 98-99.

⁴F. F. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (London: The Tyndale Press, 1943), p. 26; Dodd, Preaching, pp. 9, 28; Martin Dibelius and Werner Georg Kümmel, Paul, trans. Frank Clarke (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), pp. 88-89.

Acts 13 would include some facts about the life of our Lord, such as the preparatory ministry of John the Baptizer.

In describing the role of the Baptizer the speaker in the synagogue at Antioch relates how John directed the attention of his hearers away from himself toward Jesus, the one who would come after him (25). Since the report of the Baptizer had spread as far as Ephesus during the New Testament era (Acts 18:24-25; 19:1-4), the preacher may well have known, or at least surmised, that some of his hearers had heard about John. In this situation it would have been important for him to have indicated that the Baptizer himself had refused to accept any Messianic claims and had instead pointed his followers to Jesus (25). Thus, even if the speaker had composed thirteen letters in which he had not even mentioned the preaching of John or any other incident in the ministry of our Lord, it is entirely possible that he would have had occasion to do so in a missionary discourse such as the one delivered in the synagogue at Pisidian Antioch.

Furthermore, Paul's letters reveal that he was not nearly so ignorant of nor disinterested in the ministry of Jesus as some contemporary scholars would have us believe. Although the apostle may have never seen or heard our Lord during his ministry,⁵ this does not mean that he had no knowledge of Jesus' earthly career. According to Paul's own testimony, three years after his calling, he visited with Simon Peter for fifteen days (Gal. 1:18), and, as C. H. Dodd has said, "we may presume they did not spend all the time talking about the weather."⁶ In

⁵ Bruce, Paul, p. 98

⁶ Dodd, Preaching, p. 16.

1 Corinthians the apostle indicates that his knowledge concerning the Lord's Supper (11:23-25) and the details of Christ's resurrection (15:3-7) had been taught to him by others.⁷ We may assume, therefore, that Paul received other facts about the life of Jesus from his fellow apostles.⁸

This assumption is substantiated by a number of allusions to our Lord's earthly life throughout the apostle's letters. In addition to the institution of the Lord's Supper and the Resurrection Paul knew that Jesus was born a Jew (Gal. 4:4; Rom. 9:5) of Davidic descent (Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8) and that he had several brothers (1 Cor. 9:5), one of whom was named James (Gal. 1:19). The apostle mentions that our Lord was betrayed (1 Cor. 11:23), that he appeared before Pontius Pilate (1 Tim. 6:13), that the Jews were responsible for his death (1 Thess. 2:14-15), and that he was actually put to death by crucifixion (for example, Gal. 3:1) at the order of the civil government (1 Cor. 2:8).⁹ Moreover, Paul presents a definite picture of the personality of Jesus. He notes that our Lord's life was characterized by obedience (Phil. 2:8), meekness and gentleness (2 Cor. 10:1), humility (Phil. 2:7-8),

⁷ Schoeps, pp. 59-60; C. H. Dodd, History and the Gospel, 2nd ed. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964), p. 45.

⁸ It should be noted that the apostle's disclaimer of dependence on any human authority in his letter to the Galatians (1:1, 11-12) does not mean that he did not receive information about the life of Jesus from other Christians. In Galatians Paul claims to have received two things by divine revelation, the gospel of Jesus Christ and his own apostleship to the Gentiles (1:16). This does not preclude the possibility that he could have been taught details about the life of Jesus, and, in fact, the apostle's first letter to the Corinthians (11:23; 15:3) demonstrates that he was so taught.

⁹ Dodd, History, pp. 45-46; Schoeps, pp. 55-56.

and the willingness to please others instead of himself (Rom. 15:2-3).¹⁰ These traits are held up for imitation by Christians (1 Cor. 11:1; 1 Thess. 1:6) in such a way that excludes the idea that the apostle is thinking of an ideal Messianic figure instead of the historical Jesus, for he offers Christ as an object of imitation in the same sense as he offers himself.¹¹

In addition to a knowledge of various facts about the life of Jesus, Paul's letters also indicate his acquaintance with the teaching of our Lord. Besides referring to Christ's institution of the Lord's Supper (1 Cor. 11:23-25; cf. Matt. 26:26-29; Mark 14:22-25; Luke 22:17-20) the apostle explicitly mentions the instruction of Jesus on divorce (1 Cor. 7:10-11; cf. Mark 10:2-9) and on the livelihood of those who proclaim the gospel (1 Cor. 9:14; 1 Tim. 5:18; cf. Luke 10:7). Other portions of Paul's writings reflect a knowledge of the teaching of our Lord on other matters such as faith to move mountains (1 Cor. 13:2; cf. Matt. 17:20; Mark 11:23), love for one's enemies (Rom. 12:14; cf. Matt. 5:44; Luke 6:27), paying taxes (Rom. 13:7; cf. Matt. 22:21; Mark 12:17; Luke 20:25), love as the epitome of the commandments (Rom. 13:8-10; cf. Matt. 22:39; Mark 12:31), and innocence in clever action (Rom. 16:19; cf. Matt. 10:16).¹²

Since the apostle's correspondence demonstrates that he was acquainted with the life of Jesus, there is no ground for assuming that

¹⁰Dodd, History, p. 46

¹¹Ibid., p. 46 n. 7; W. D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology, 2nd ed. (London: S. P. C. K., 1955), p. 88.

¹²Bruce, Paul, pp. 100-109, Dodd, History, p. 46

Paul could not or would not have spoken the words recorded in Acts 13: 24-25. Although it was unnecessary for him to treat the preparatory ministry of John the Baptizer in his letters, the apostle would have certainly supplied some of the details about the life of our Lord in a missionary discourse like the speech at Antioch.

C. H. Dodd has suggested an additional reason for regarding the reference to the Baptizer in Acts 13 as coming from Paul. In his first letter to the Corinthians the apostle refers to Apollos, who had once been a "follower" of John (Acts 18:24-25), as a fellow-servant of Christ (3:5-9), although others set him up as Paul's rival (1:12; 3:4). According to Professor Dodd, this indicates that the apostle must have had the opportunity to relate the ministry of the Baptizer to the Christian gospel.¹³

Finally, the dissimilarity of the account of the work of John given in the speech at Antioch and that recorded in Luke's Gospel should be noted. If Luke had put the words of verses 24 and 25 into the mouth of Paul, we would expect to find a substantial amount of agreement between them and the report of the ministry of the Baptizer given in the third Gospel. However, despite Blank's assertion to the contrary,¹⁴ we do not find a significant amount of correspondence between these two accounts.

The initial verb in Acts 13:24 προκηρύξαντος is slightly dissimilar to the verb used in the Synoptics, κηρύσσω (Matt. 3:1;

¹³Dodd, Preaching, p. 30

¹⁴Joseph Blank, Paulus und Jesus: Eine Theologische Grundlegung, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 18, ed., Vinzenz Hamp, Joseph Schmid, and Paul Neuenzeit (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1968), p. 37.

Mark 1:4; Luke 3:3). The phrase *πρὸ προσώπου* is found in Luke, although not in connection with John's preaching at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (7:27), but it is also employed in Matthew (11:10) and Mark (1:2). The expression *τῆς εἰσοόδου αὐτοῦ* is peculiar to Acts 13. The description of the Baptizer's proclamation as a *βάπτισμα μετανοίας* is recorded in Luke's Gospel (3:3) but also in Mark (1:4) and in Paul's address in Acts 19 (4). The indirect object *παντὶ τῷ λαῷ Ἰσραήλ* occurs only in the speech at Antioch (*τῷ λαῷ* is used in Acts 19:4), as does the dependent clause *ὡς δὲ ἐπλήρου Ἰωάννης τὸν δρόμον*. John's disclaimer of being the Messiah corresponds more closely to the account in the Gospel of John (1:20) than to Luke (3:15-16). While the verb *ἔρχεται* is found in Luke's account (3:16), it is also used in Mark (1:7) and, in a different form, in Matthew (3:11), John (1:27), and Acts 19 (4). The verb *ἔρχεται* is modified by the phrase *μετ' ἐμέ* in Acts 13 but not in Luke. According to Acts 13 and John's Gospel (1:27) the Baptizer says he is not "worthy" (*ἄξιος*) to unloose the sandals of Jesus; Luke (3:16) has John say he is not "sufficient" (*ἰκανός*) to do so. All four of the evangelists employ the same word for sandal which is used in Acts 13 (*ὑπόδημα*), but none of them have the same form of the word, nor do any of them add the modifier *τῶν ποδῶν*. Whereas in Luke's account (3:16) the Baptizer says he is not sufficient to loose the strap (*ἰμάντα*) of Jesus' sandals (*ὑποδημάτων* - plural), in Acts 13 he says he is not worthy to unloose his sandal (*ὑπόδημα* - singular). The infinitive *λῦσαι* occurs in Luke (3:16) but also in Mark (1:7) and, in a variant form, in John (1:27).

There is nothing distinctively Lukan in Acts 13:24-25, but there are several items in these verses which vary from the account in the

third Gospel. In some ways this section has more in common with Mark and John than it does with Luke.¹⁵ This makes it quite unlikely that the author of Luke-Acts wrote these words himself and simply attributed them to Paul.

We have seen that, although there are no parallels to Acts 13:24-25 in his letters, there is no reason why the apostle should not have referred to the ministry of John the Baptizer in a missionary discourse like the one recorded in Acts 13:16-41. Furthermore, a comparison of Acts 13:24-25 with Luke 3 makes it improbable that Luke himself composed these words. Therefore, the reference to John the Baptizer in the speech at Antioch does not prove that it could not have been delivered by Paul.

¹⁵Max Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965), p. 162.

CHAPTER V

ECHOES OF PAUL'S TEACHING ON THE DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF JESUS IN THE SPEECH

In verses 26-33 of Acts 13 the speaker at Antioch dwells upon the Passion of our Lord. The preacher mentions that Jesus died in fulfillment of the Scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised from the dead in fulfillment of the Scriptures, and that by his resurrection he was designated as the Son of God. These items correspond to the outline of the Pauline kerygma as this has been extracted from the letters of Paul by C. H. Dodd.¹ This similarity between the discourse at Pisidian Antioch and the apostle's writings supports the claim of the author of the Acts of the Apostles that this address was given by Paul.

Despite this correspondence Vielhauer sees a number of non-Pauline elements in this section of the speech. According to Vielhauer, Acts 13, unlike the apostle's letters, presents the death of our Lord as an error of justice and a sin of the Jews, who, although they regularly heard the reading of the Old Testament, did not recognize Jesus as the Messiah. Missing from this discourse are such characteristically Pauline

¹C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, n.d.), p. 17.

emphases as the saving significance of our Lord's death, the concept of being "in Christ," and "the presence of the whole of salvation."²

However, Vielhauer's allegations are not substantiated by the facts. Instead, we find a considerable amount of similarity between the speech at Antioch and the letters of Paul with respect to the crucifixion of Jesus.

Our Lord's innocence of anything deserving of death is maintained by the speaker at Antioch (28). While this point is also made in Luke's Gospel (23:4,14,15,22), the wording of the Gospel differs from that of the discourse in Acts 13.³ More importantly, the innocence of Jesus is also taught by Paul in 2 Cor. 5:21, where, as in Acts 13 (38), it is connected with man's justification.

Vielhauer's claim that Acts 13 does not describe the presence of salvation as the result of Christ's death is simply untrue. The crucifixion of Jesus is a part of the word of salvation (26) which the speaker proclaims. The preacher indicates that it is through the crucified and risen Christ that forgiveness of sins (38) and justification (39) are offered. That these statements are thoroughly in harmony with Paul's theology may be seen from his letter to the Romans and his first epistle to the Corinthians. In Rom. 4:24-25 the apostle states

² Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," trans. Wm. C. Robinson, Jr. and Victor P. Furnish, in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 45.

³ Acts 13:28 - μηδεμίαν αἰτίαν θανάτου εὐρόντες; Luke 23:4 - οὐδὲν εὐρίσκω αἴτιον . . . ; Luke 23:14 - οὐθὲν εὔρον . . . αἴτιον; Luke 23:15 - οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου . . . ; Luke 23:22 - οὐδὲν αἴτιον θανάτου εὔρον. Acts 13:28 has as much in common with John 18:38 (οὐδεμίαν εὐρίσκω ἐν αὐτῷ αἰτίαν) as it does with any of the verses in Luke.

that Jesus died and was raised to give us justification and the forgiveness of our trespasses. 1 Cor. 15:17 indicates that Paul believed that, without his resurrection from the dead, Christ's death would have been of no avail in securing the forgiveness of sins and salvation. Thus, we see that the forgiveness of sins and justification are attributed to the death and resurrection of Jesus in the speech of Acts 13 and in the apostle's letters.

It is not surprising that the Pauline expression "in Christ" is not used in the address at Pisidian Antioch. The apostle employs the formula "in Christ" to describe the life of those who are already Christians. It would hardly be appropriate to use this phrase in a missionary discourse like Acts 13:16-41.

According to the speaker at Antioch, because the Jews of Jerusalem and their leaders were ignorant of our Lord and of the Old Testament Scriptures which they heard read every sabbath, they persuaded Pilate to have Jesus put to death by crucifixion (27-29). These details about the death of our Lord are also found in the letters of Paul. The apostle teaches that the unbelieving Jews have a veil lying over their minds which prevents them from understanding the Old Testament when it is read and seeing the glory of the Lord Jesus Christ (2 Cor. 3:14-18). In his first epistle to the Thessalonians (2:15) Paul indicates that it was the Jews who killed Jesus. The apostle demonstrates his knowledge of the role of Pontius Pilate in the death of our Lord in his first letter to Timothy (6:13). When Paul speaks of "the rulers of this age" in 1 Corinthians 2 (8), his reference is, at least in part,

to Pilate and the Jewish leaders.⁴ The speaker at Pisidian Antioch uses the word *ξύλον* ("tree") for the cross on which Jesus was crucified; the apostle does the same thing in his letter to the Galatians (3:13).

Thus, we see that the degree of correspondence between the speech recorded in Acts 13 and the letters of Paul goes beyond the simple inclusion of the death of Christ in their presentations of the gospel. The description of the crucifixion of Jesus which is given in the address at Antioch recalls many of the details which the apostle records about the Lord's death.

The speaker in the synagogue at Antioch reports that after the Jews had succeeded in persuading Pilate to have Jesus put to death, they took him down from the cross and laid him in a tomb (29). This explicit reference to the burial of Christ is significant both because none of the other missionary discourses recorded in Acts make mention of it⁵ and also because Paul incorporates it into his description of the gospel which he proclaimed (1 Cor. 15:1,4) as well as into his presentation of baptism (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12). This inclusion of the burial of our Lord in the presentation of the kerygma is another item of agreement between the apostle and the preacher at Antioch and another point of dissimilarity between the address recorded in Acts 13 and the rest of the speeches in Acts.

Furthermore, the unusual way in which the speaker at Pisidian Antioch describes the burial of Jesus should be noted. Acts 13:29

⁴Hans Joachim Schoeps, Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History, trans. Harold Knight (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), pp. 55-56.

⁵Dodd, Preaching, pp. 21-23.

seems to say that the Jews and their leaders were responsible for having Christ buried. There are at least two possible explanations for this apparent divergence from the accounts which the four evangelists give of our Lord's burial. It may be that the subject of the sentence recorded in Acts 13:27-29 changes at verse 29 from "those who dwell in Jerusalem and their rulers" to an impersonal "they." On the other hand, it is equally probable that the speaker is referring to the fact that the Jewish leaders received permission from Pilate to secure the tomb of Jesus with a seal and a guard (Matt. 27:62-66). Regardless of which of these explanations is accepted, the emphasis of the account of the burial of Jesus recorded in Acts 13 differs from that of the report of this event in Luke's Gospel. Luke highlights the roles of Joseph of Arimathea and the women who had followed Jesus (Luke 23:50-56); the speaker at Antioch does not mention either of these but, if the second interpretation of this passage given above is correct, stresses the part played by the Jewish leaders.

In view of the uncertainty as to the correct understanding of these verses, one cannot draw any definite conclusions from these facts. Nevertheless, the difference in emphases between the description of the burial of our Lord recorded in Luke 23 and the account given in Acts 13 suggests that the two reports are not the work of the same individual.⁶

The preacher at Antioch applies Ps. 2:7, "You are my Son, today I have begotten you." to the resurrection of Jesus and thereby indicates

⁶Frederic Henry Chase, The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles (London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1902), p. 185.

that our Lord's resurrection attested to his status as the Son of God (33). This is another unique feature of the speech delivered at Antioch, as none of the other discourses of Acts identifies Jesus as the Son of God.⁷

Vielhauer sees this presentation of Christ's resurrection as being diametrically opposed to Paul's theology. He maintains that the speaker of Acts 13 understands Jesus' divine sonship "adoptionistic-ally," whereas the apostle viewed it "metaphysically" and did not base it on Ps. 2:7.⁸

However, nothing could be further from the truth. In his letter to the Romans (1:4) Paul indicates that it was by way of the resurrection from the dead that Jesus Christ was designated as the Son of God. This is precisely what is taught by the preacher at Antioch. The understanding of our Lord's divine sonship exhibited in Acts 13 is no more adoptionistic than is the view presented in Romans 1. Moreover, the absence of a reference to Ps. 2:7 in Rom. 1:4 is of no consequence, as the apostle is writing a brief, epistolary salutation and not a fully developed synagogue sermon.

By associating Ps. 2:7 with the resurrection of Jesus, the speaker at Pisidian Antioch employs the idea of birth as a figure of the resurrection. This concept is also found in the letters of Paul. In Col. 1:18 the apostle identifies our Lord as the "first-born from

⁷Dodd, Preaching, p. 25; David Michael Stanley, Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology, Analecta Biblica, no. 13 (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1961), p. 32.

⁸Vielhauer, p. 44.

the dead," and in Rom. 8:29 he refers to the risen Christ as the "first-born among many brothers."⁹

While Ps. 2:7 is applied to the resurrection of Jesus in Acts 13:33, it is used in connection with our Lord's baptism in the Gospel of Luke (3:22). This fact tends to discredit the claim that the author of Luke-Acts is the real author of the address recorded in Acts 13.

Thus, we see that Acts 13:33 echoes the presentation of the resurrection of Christ which is given in the Pauline epistles. This constitutes another argument in favor of the identification of the speaker at Antioch as Paul.

In addition to these theological parallels between the speech at Pisidian Antioch and the letters of the apostle we also find agreement between Acts 13 and the Pauline corpus in the terminology used to describe our Lord's resurrection from the dead. The speaker at Antioch states that God raised Jesus from the dead (31, 33, 34, 37) rather than that Jesus rose from the dead. With the lone exception of 1 Thess. 4:14 this is the way in which Paul always speaks of the resurrection of Jesus in his letters.¹⁰ The preacher in the synagogue of Antioch also states that the risen Lord "was seen" (ὤφθη) by certain witnesses (31).

⁹J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts, trans. G. E. van Baaren-Pape (Assen; Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1954), p. 173.

¹⁰Stanley, p. 261; Rom. 4:24,25; 6:4; 7:4; 8:11; 10:9; 1 Cor. 6:14; 15:4,12,15,20; 2 Cor. 1:19; 4:14; 5:15; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 1:20; Col. 2:12; 1 Thess. 1:10; 2 Tim. 2:8.

The majority of other passages in the New Testament in which this manner of speaking about the resurrection appearances of Christ is used are found in the apostle's writings.¹¹

The speaker at Pisidian Antioch identifies those who travelled with Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem as witnesses of the resurrection to the people of Israel (31). This is said to be a sure sign that Acts 13: 16-41 cannot be an authentic speech of Paul's. It is claimed that the apostle would have referred instead to his own vision of the risen Lord and to his own calling to be a witness of the resurrection.¹²

However, it is possible to explain this lack of any reference to Paul's vision of the resurrected Jesus and to his call to be a witness of the risen Christ. It would have been necessary for the apostle to have related the story of his calling if he had wanted to refer to his own testimony to the resurrection of the Lord. Such an autobiographical report would have constituted a sizeable addition to the sermon, as may be seen from the length of the account of his calling which Paul gives in his letter to the Galatians (1:13-17; cf. Acts 26:9-18). Instead of directing the attention of his audience to his own personal history, it is entirely possible that the apostle wanted to keep his hearers focused

¹¹ Alfred Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament, 14th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968), p. 367; Paul writes that the resurrected Christ "was seen" (ὡφθην) by some witness(es) in 1 Cor. 15: 5,6,7,8.

¹² Joseph Blank, Paulus und Jesus: Eine Theologische Grundlegung, Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 18. ed., Vinzenz Hamp, Josef Schmid, and Paul Neuenzeit (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1968), p. 39; Otto Glombitza, "Akta XIII. 15-41: Analyse einer Lukanischen Predigt vor Juden," New Testament Studies 5 (1958-1959): p. 312.

on Christ's resurrection.¹³ Hence the omission of some reference to Paul's witness of the risen Lord does not prove the un-Pauline origin of the speech recorded in Acts 13.

Furthermore, the speaker at Antioch identifies those who travelled with Jesus as witnesses of his resurrection "to the people" (πρὸς τὸν λαόν - 31). The preacher of Acts 13 reserves the title "people" for the nation of Israel (17, 24). Thus, he is not saying that only those who followed Jesus during his earthly ministry are witnesses of the resurrection but that the travelling companions of the Lord are witnesses of the resurrection for the Jews. Paul viewed himself as an apostle and witness to the Gentiles; he considered those who had been with Jesus during his earthly ministry to have been entrusted with the gospel of the risen Lord for the Jewish people (Gal. 2:7-8). Therefore, it is not impossible that the apostle would have referred to those who were witnesses of the risen Christ to the Jews in an address delivered in a Jewish synagogue.¹⁴

Finally, it should be noted how the speaker at Antioch stresses that the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ occurred according to the Scriptures. The preacher notes that the Jews and their leaders fulfilled "the voices of the prophets" and "all things written" in the Old Testament Scriptures about Jesus by persuading Pilate to have the Lord

¹³ Chase, p. 186; Everett F. Harrison, Acts: The Expanding Church (Chicago: Moody Press, 1975), p. 212.

¹⁴ The possibility of this being the case is made more probable if the incident recorded in Gal. 2:1-10 is to be identified with the Famine Visit (Acts 11:27-30), which preceded the events recorded in Acts 13.

put to death (27-29). This recalls Paul's statement in 1 Cor. 15:3 that according to his gospel "Christ died for our sins in accordance with the Scriptures." Moreover, the speaker at Pisidian Antioch indicates that by raising Jesus from the dead God fulfilled the promise made to the Old Testament fathers and then quotes three Old Testament citations (Ps. 2:7; Is. 55:3; Ps. 16:10) which speak of the Lord's resurrection (32-35). This corresponds to what is said in 1 Cor. 15:4, where the apostle identifies Christ's resurrection in accordance with the Scriptures as a component part of the gospel which he preached. Furthermore, in the address of his letter to the Romans (1:1-4) Paul maintains that the gospel which was promised in the prophetic Scriptures deals with the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. Thus, we see that the kerygma of the speech recorded in Acts 13 is the same as the kerygma which the apostle proclaimed, namely, Christ's death and resurrection according to the Scriptures.

Despite this agreement in the matter of the kerygma Josef Blank claims that Acts 13:33-35 cannot be Pauline, since, according to Blank, the apostle never cites specific passages from the Old Testament of which the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ is the fulfillment.¹⁵ However, Blank's objection is completely refuted by 1 Cor. 15:54-58. In this passage Paul quotes Is. 25:8 and Hos. 13:14 and indicates that these have been fulfilled in the resurrection of our Lord.

We have seen that the speech recorded in Acts 13 not only reproduces the general outline of Paul's preaching concerning the death,

¹⁵Blank, p. 40

burial, and resurrection of Jesus but also contains a substantial number of Pauline concepts and a sufficient amount of Pauline terminology with respect to these matters. Both the apostle and the preacher of Antioch present the crucifixion, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as soteriological events. Both indicate the innocence of Jesus and refer to the roles played by Pontius Pilate and the Jews. In the speech of Acts 13 the resurrection of our Lord is identified as the event by which his divine sonship was affirmed. Paul also designates the resurrection of Jesus as the attestation of his status as the Son of God. The speaker at Pisidian Antioch agrees with the apostle in stressing that Christ's death and resurrection occurred according to the Scriptures. This correspondence between the address recorded in Acts 13:16-41 and the Pauline epistles gives additional support to the view that this is an authentic speech of Paul's.

CHAPTER VI

ECHOES OF THE PAULINE TEACHING OF JUSTIFICATION IN THE SPEECH

The conclusion of the speech recorded in Acts 13:16-41 begins with verse 38, as is indicated by the repetition of the introductory address "men and brothers" (ἀνδρες ἀδελφοί).¹ This concluding section recalls several Pauline ideas, the most significant of which is the apostle's characteristic teaching and vocabulary of justification by faith apart from the law.

Initially, it may be noted that the speaker at Antioch tells his hearers that the forgiveness of sin "is proclaimed" (καταγγέλλεται) to them through Jesus Christ (38). Outside of the Acts of the Apostles this verb is used to denote the preaching of the gospel only seven times, and all seven of these occurrences are found in the letters of Paul.²

The preacher of Acts 13 states that both the forgiveness of sins and justification are offered in Jesus (38-39). Vielhauer claims that this assertion is at variance with Pauline theology. Vielhauer maintains that by equating justification with the forgiveness of sins, the author of Acts betrays his negative conception of justification, a conception

¹Otto Glombitza, "Akta XIII. 15-41: Analyse einer Lukanischen Predigt vor Juden," New Testament Studies 5 (1958-1959):315.

²Alfred Schmoller, Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament, 14th ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968), p.269; Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 2:1; 9:14; 11:26; Phil. 1:17,18; Col. 1:28.

totally foreign to the thought of the apostle. Moreover, according to Vielhauer, the very use of the phrase "forgiveness of sins" is an indication of the un-Pauline character of the speech at Antioch, since this expression does not occur in Paul's major letters but only in Ephesians and Colossians, the Pauline authorship of which he evidently denies.³

However, Vielhauer's objections are not supported by the facts. If one assumes that Ephesians and Colossians are authentic letters of the apostle, the references in these epistles to God's forgiveness of man's sins⁴ demonstrate that the forgiveness of sins is not an idea which is alien to the theology of Paul. Furthermore, it is incorrect to say that there is no mention of the forgiveness of sins in the Hauptbriefe. In Rom. 4:7-8 the apostle explicitly speaks of the forgiveness of sins, and in several other passages in Romans and 1 Corinthians⁵ he indicates that in Christ God has taken away man's sin. Finally, the association of justification and forgiveness in the discourse of Acts 13 is not without parallel in Paul letters. In Rom. 6:7 the apostle states that one who has died with Christ in baptism has been justified from sin. The reference to the forgiveness of sins in Rom. 4:7-8 is an integral part of Paul's argument to prove that justification is the result of faith alone. Thus, we see that the occurrence of the phrase "forgiveness of

³Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," trans. Wm. C. Robinson, Jr. and Victor P. Furnish, in Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville; Abingdon Press, 1966), p. 41.

⁴Eph. 1:7; 4:32; Col. 1:14; 2:13; 3:13.

⁵Rom. 6:6,7,18,22; 8:2,3; 11:27; 1 Cor. 15:3,17.

sins" in Acts 13:38 does not prove that the speech at Antioch can not have been delivered by the apostle Paul.

The speaker in the synagogue at Antioch states that in Jesus Christ everyone who believes is justified from all the things from which he could not be justified by the law of Moses (38-39). This recalls the distinctively Pauline way of presenting God's saving action toward men,⁶ namely, justification by faith alone without the works of the law.⁷

However, it is alleged that these verses do not really contain the genuinely Pauline teaching of justification but are an attempt by the author of Acts to make the speech at Antioch appear to be the work of the apostle. It is claimed that what is taught in Acts 13 is that an individual is partially justified by the law of Moses and that faith justifies him from those things from which the law does not justify. Whereas Paul championed the view that faith alone justifies and that the law plays no role in justification whatsoever, the author of Acts is said to have expounded the teaching of justification by faith in addition to the law.⁸

It is grammatically possible to understand Acts 13:38-39 to mean either that one is justified by faith and the law or that one is

⁶Günther Bornkamm, Paul, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), p. 115.

⁷Rom. 1:17; 3:20-26,28; 4:5; 9:30-10:10; 11:6; Gal. 2:16; 3:11,21,24-25; Eph. 2:8; Phil. 3:9; Titus 3:4-7.

⁸Vielhauer, p. 42.

justified by faith without the law.⁹ However, a number of factors make the latter interpretation the only acceptable alternative.

First of all, there is no emphasis at all in the speech at Antioch on the keeping of the law. The giving of the law on Mt. Sinai is not even mentioned in the recitation of Old Testament history in the introduction of the sermon. Instead, the entire speech points to what God has done in Jesus Christ.

Secondly, the warning and exhortation with which the sermon concludes (41) says nothing about keeping the injunctions of the law. Rather, the hearers are warned against failing to believe what they have just heard. If the author had intended to teach justification by faith and the law, we might well expect him to have given an exhortation to keep the law as well as to believe.

Another argument in favor of understanding Acts 13:38-39 as an exposition of justification by faith alone is the association of justification with the forgiveness of sins. Because the concept of forgiveness leaves no room for the individual to make a contribution to his salvation, it would seem that the idea of justification presented in Acts 13 also excludes any co-operation on the part of man.

Finally, the very idea that Luke would have wanted to teach justification by faith and the law must be rejected. It is absurd to think that an author who included in his two volume work accounts such as the Two Debtors (Luke 7:41-42), Jesus' words to the sinful woman

⁹F. F. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (London: The Tyndale Press, 1943), p. 12.

(Luke 7:50), the Prodigal Son (Luke 15:11-32), the Pharisee and the Publican (Luke 18:10-14), the story of Cornelius (Acts 10:1-11:18), and Peter's speech at the Apostolic Council (Acts 15:7-11) would have assigned even the smallest role in justification to the keeping of the law.

Thus, we see that Acts 13:38-39 is not an unsuccessful attempt by the author of Acts to make the speech at Antioch sound Pauline. On the contrary, these verses teach the characteristically Pauline view of justification by faith in Jesus Christ apart from the law.

Günther Bornkamm has pointed out that in the first chapter of his letter to the Romans Paul points to the "primitive gospel," according to which Jesus was a physical descendant of David and was designated Son of God by his resurrection from the dead (1:3-4), and connects it with his distinctive theology of justification by faith (1:16-17).¹⁰ These two concepts are also conjoined in the speech at Antioch (22-23, 30-33, 38-39).

Although Acts 13:38-39 does not spell out the Pauline teaching of justification by faith without the works of the law in all its fullness (which would, in fact, be impossible to do in so few words), the passage is in complete accord with what the apostle has to say concerning justification in his letters.¹¹ The occurrence of this characteristically Pauline concept in the speech at Antioch is a strong argument

¹⁰ Bornkamm, pp. 116-117, 248-249.

¹¹ F. F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977), p. 165.

in favor of the identification of the speaker of Acts 13 with the
apostle Paul.

CHAPTER VII

CONCLUSIONS

It remains for us to apply the findings of this study to the question of the authenticity of the speeches in the Acts of the Apostles. We will first of all re-examine the standard arguments against the genuineness of these discourses and determine whether or not they are supported by the facts. Secondly, we will review what our comparative study of Paul's letters and the speech of Acts 13 has uncovered to see whether this supports or undermines the claim that the discourse at Antioch is an authentic address by the apostle.

Those who deny that the speeches in Acts are accurate accounts of what was actually said on a specific occasion often appeal to Thucydides to prove that it was common practice among ancient historians to invent speeches and attribute them to some individual in their works. However, it seems that Thucydides' practice was actually the opposite of what he is frequently alleged to have done. Thucydides emphasized that he himself had heard some of the discourses which he recorded and that he had made use of other sources for those which he had not heard. These facts indicate that Thucydides did not fabricate the speeches in his works but rather recorded genuine addresses as accurately as possible.¹

¹Donald Guthrie, New Testament Introduction (Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970), p. 360.

Thucydides was not the only ancient historian who approached his task in this way. Polybius, a historian of the second century B.C., severely criticized those who invented speeches. He himself advocated that the historian should record only that which was actually said on a given occasion.²

In contrast to men such as Thucydides and Polybius, there were many ancient historians (for example, Josephus, Tacitus) who did fabricate speeches and attribute them to individuals who never gave any such addresses. The works of these men were not factual reports but rather dramatic and rhetorical exercises.³

Thus, it must be asked whether Luke was a careful and accurate historian in the mold of Polybius and Thucydides or a creative storyteller who made his characters give speeches which they never would have delivered in real life. Two factors suggest that the author of Luke-Acts was a historian who faithfully recorded the facts.

First of all, the speeches in Acts do not include the deliberate debate and rhetorical elaboration characteristic of the addresses found in the works of most ancient historians.⁴ This absence of stylistic flourishes in the speeches recorded in Acts is an indication that they are the accounts of what was actually said on a given occasion rather than polished examples of the author's rhetorical skill.

²Ibid, p. 361 n. 1

³Martin Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, ed. Heinrich Greevan, trans. Mary Ling and Paul Schubert (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956), p. 139; Guthrie, p. 360.

⁴Dibelius, pp. 181-183.

Secondly, it has been noted that Luke was quite faithful to Matthew and Mark where he employed them as sources for the composition of his Gospel. Since the author of Luke-Acts treated his sources for his first volume with great care, it is logical to assume that he would have done so in his second volume.⁵

Therefore, we may tentatively conclude that Luke was a historian like Thucydides who did careful research (Luke 1:1-4) and adhered faithfully to the facts. This tentative conclusion is supported by the findings of our study of the speech at Antioch. This address not only exhibits significant differences from the other missionary discourses in Acts, but it also displays striking similarities to the letters of Paul.

In addition to an appeal to the method of many ancient historians, a second major argument against the authenticity of the speeches in the Acts of the Apostles is their similarity. This similarity is said to prove that the discourses of Acts are all the work of one author. However, our study of the address recorded in Acts 13 has revealed a number of unique characteristics of this speech, including some (for example, the use of rabbinic ideas and methods) which cannot be regarded as the work of Luke. As C. H. Dodd has demonstrated,⁶ the similarities between the missionary addresses of Acts are not the result of common authorship but of the common faith of the New Testament Church. What is recorded in Acts 13:16-41 is not one more Lukan composition in the

⁵F. F. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (London: The Tyndale Press, 1943), p. 8; Guthrie, p. 361.

⁶C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, n. d.), pp. 7-35.

same mold as all the rest, but an original, unique, and certainly non-Lukan production.

Furthermore, in terms of vocabulary, theological concepts, and methodology the speech at Antioch displays a substantial amount of agreement with the writings of the speaker to whom it is attributed, the apostle Paul. The parallels between the address of Acts 13 and the letters of Paul are listed in the appendix. A number of these parallels are highly significant. The discourse at Antioch follows the Pauline practice of understanding the events of the Old Testament as typological prophecies which were fulfilled in Jesus Christ, particularly in his death and resurrection. The sermon of Acts 13 echoes the apostle's view that the promises made to the Old Testament fathers were fulfilled in the crucified and risen Jesus for the Gentiles as well as for the Jews. The speaker at Antioch was obviously an individual who had received a thorough rabbinic education, and he makes use of his rabbinic instruction in several places in his speech. That Paul was trained as a Pharisaic rabbi is well known from his letters, which display several examples of his familiarity with rabbinic thought. Moreover, some of the rabbinic techniques used by the apostle are also found in the discourse of Acts 13. These include the use of a Targum rendering and the interpretation of an Old Testament citation by the hermeneutical principle of gezerah shawa. The description of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus given in the speech at Pisidian Antioch has many similarities to what Paul has to say on these matters in his correspondence. The sermon of Acts 13 presents the distinctively Pauline

teaching of justification by faith in Jesus Christ without the works of the law.

Not only is it significant that there are many parallels between the discourse at Antioch and the letters of Paul, but it is also noteworthy that a number of these parallels are to be found in the apostle's letter to the Galatians. This is especially true with regard to two major concepts, namely, the fulfillment of promise and justification. This rather substantial agreement between the brief address of Acts 13 and a relatively short document such as Galatians is surely no accident. This similarity may well be the result not only of common authorship but also of common addressees. Those who heard the speech at the synagogue in Pisidian Antioch helped comprise the first Christian congregation in that city, and it is entirely possible that the church at Antioch was one of the "churches of Galatia" to whom Paul sent the letter which we know as Galatians.⁷ It is reasonable to assume that the manner in which the apostle defended his gospel in his letter to the churches of Galatia would bear considerable resemblance to the way in which he had first presented the gospel to the Galatians (see Gal. 1:6-7; 3:1-2). The relatively extensive parallels between the sermon at Antioch and the letter to the churches of Galatia support the idea that those who heard the former were among the addressees of the latter. Furthermore, the agreement between the speech of Acts 13 and the letter to the Galatians substantiates the identification of the author of Galatians with the speaker at Antioch.

⁷Guthrie, pp. 452-457.

It is to be expected that there would be differences between a missionary discourse, such as the one recorded in Acts 13, and the letters of Paul. The speech at Antioch was addressed to non-Christians, and, as a result, it presents the most elementary details of the gospel. On the other hand, the apostle's writings are addressed to Christian churches, whose knowledge of the gospel is presupposed, and, for this reason, they present the Christian faith in greater detail.⁸ It would have been necessary for Paul to have told an uninitiated assembly like the synagogue worshippers gathered at Antioch certain things which he could easily have omitted in his letters (for example, the ministry of John the Baptizer). At the same time, he could not have informed such a group about certain other matters which are contained in his epistles; as for example, what it means to be "in Christ".⁹ We have seen that the differences between the apostle's correspondence and the address of Acts 13 do not prove that Paul could not have given this speech. What differences there are stem largely from the fact that the recipients of the apostle's letters were already Christians, while those who heard the sermon at Antioch were not.¹⁰

⁸Dodd, Preaching, p. 9; Bruce, Speeches, p. 26.

⁹Martin Dibelius and Werner Georg Kümmel, Paul, trans. Frank Clarke (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953), pp. 88-89.

¹⁰In this connection it may be noted that the only Pauline address to Christians recorded in Acts, the apostle's apology before the Ephesian elders at Miletus (Acts 20:18-35), has more in common with the letters of Paul than do any of the other discourses attributed to him (F. F. Bruce, Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977, p. 342).

We would hardly expect the speech in Acts 13 to preserve a verbatim transcript of what was said in the synagogue at Antioch, as though the author had had a tape recording of the speech available to him in the manner of a modern historian. It is possible that Luke summarized the speaker's actual words and in doing so may even have introduced some elements of his own style. Nevertheless, the fact that this type of homily was expected to be brief¹¹ suggests that only a slight amount of summarizing would have been necessary. Moreover, our study of Acts 13:16-41 has revealed that very little in these verses is due to the editorial activity of the author of Luke-Acts.

In our analysis of the missionary discourse delivered at Pisidian Antioch we have seen that there is nothing in this address which could not have been spoken by Paul. On the other hand, there is a substantial amount of material in this speech which finds a parallel in the apostle's letters. Furthermore, there are certain items in this discourse which could not have originated with Luke. In fact, as far we know, the only early Christian who could have delivered certain portions of this address is Paul. In every way Acts 13:16-41 is far more Pauline than it is Lukan. The facts indicate that the most likely identification for the individual who delivered the discourse at Antioch is the one to whom the author of Acts attributes this speech, the apostle Paul,

¹¹See page 27.

APPENDIX

PARALLELS BETWEEN ACTS 13:16-41

AND THE LETTERS OF PAUL

	Acts 13	Paul's letters
Typological exegesis of Exodus and wandering	17-18	1 Cor. 10:1-13
Election	17	Rom. 8:33; 9:11; 11:5, 7, 28; 16:13; 1 Cor. 1:27, 28; Eph. 1:4; Col. 3:12; 1 Thess. 1:4; 2 Tim. 2:10; Titus 1:1
"Saul, the son of Kish, a man of the tribe of Benjamin"	21-22	Rom. 11:1; Phil. 3:5
Habakkuk and justification by faith	38-41	Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11
Jesus as $\theta\omega\tau\eta\rho$	23	Eph. 5:23; Phil. 3:20; 2 Tim. 1:10; Titus 1:4; 2:13; 3:6
The use of $\theta\omega\tau\eta\rho\iota\alpha$	26	Rom. 1:16; 10:1, 10; 11:11; 13:11; 2 Cor. 1:6; 6:2; 7:10; Eph. 1:13; Phil. 1:19, 28; 2:12; 1 Thess. 5:8, 9; 2 Thess. 2:13; 2 Tim. 2:10; 3:15.
O.T. fulfilled in Jesus, esp. in his death and resurrection	27-35	Rom. 1:1-4; 3:21-26; 4:13-25; 2 Cor. 3:14; Gal. 3:13-14.
Promise made to fathers	32	Rom. 15:8
Promise fulfilled in Jesus	23	Rom. 15:8; 2 Cor. 1:20; Gal. 3:21-24; 2 Tim. 1:1.
Promise fulfilled in Jesus' crucifixion	27	Gal. 3:13-14
Promise fulfilled in Jesus' resurrection	32-33	Rom. 1:2-4; 4:13, 22-25
Promise by faith and not the law	39	Rom. 4:13-25; Gal. 3:17-22
Jews and Gentiles receive the promise	16, 26, 32-33	Rom. 4:11-13, 16-17; 15:8-9 Gal. 3:14; Eph. 3:6
Jews and Gentiles are children of the fathers	33	Gal. 3:27-29; 4:28
"Our fathers" addressed to Jews and Gentiles	17	1 Cor. 10:11; Rom. 4:16
Jesus of the seed of David	23, see p. 15	Rom. 1:3; 2 Tim. 2:8

	Acts 13	Paul's letters
Rabbinic training		(Acts 22:3); 1 Cor. 10:4; Col. 1:15-20; 2 Tim. 3:8
Davidic Messiah	22-23	
Use of Psalm 2 for the resurrection of the Messiah	33	
Proem homily form	16-41	
Use of a Targum reading	22	Eph. 4:8
The use of γέγραπται to introduce an O.T. citation	33	Rom. 1:17; 2:24; 3:4, 10; 4:17; 8:36; 9:13, 33; 10:15; 11:8,26; 12:19; 14:11; 15:3, 9, 21; 1 Cor. 1:19, 31; 2:9; 3:19; 4:6; 9:9; 10:7; 14:21; 15:45; 2 Cor. 8:15; 9:9; Gal. 3:10,13; 4:22, 27
Chain quotation (<u>haraz</u>)	34-35	Rom. 9:12-13, 25-29; 10:19-21; 11:8-10; 15:9-12.
Chain quotation connected by a <u>Stichwort</u>	34-35	Rom. 11:8-10; 15:9-12; 1 Cor. 3:19-20.
Use of <u>gezerah shawa</u>	34-35	Rom. 4:3-12
Innocence of Jesus connected with justification	28,38	2 Cor. 5:21
Forgiveness of sins results from Jesus' death and resurrection	38	Rom. 4:24-25; 1 Cor. 15:17
Justification results from Jesus' death and resurrection	39	Rom. 4:24-25
Jews ignorant of O.T.	27	2 Cor. 3:14-16
Jews killed Jesus	27-29	1 Thess. 2:15; 1 Cor. 2:8
Pilate's role in Jesus' death	28	1 Tim. 6:13; 1 Cor. 2:8
ξύλου used for the cross	29	Gal. 3:13
Burial of Jesus	29	1 Cor.15:4; (Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:12)
Jesus designated Son of God by his resurrection	33	Rom. 1:4
Birth as a figure of the resurrection	33	Rom. 8:29; Col. 1:18
Jesus was raised	31,33, 34,37	Rom. 4:24, 25; 6:4; 7:4; 8:11; 10:9; 1 Cor. 6:14; 15:4, 12, 15 20; 2 Cor. 1:19; 4:14; 5:15; Gal. 1:1; Eph. 1:20; Col. 2:12; 1 Thess. 1:10; 2 Tim. 2:8.
Risen Jesus was seen (ὡφθη)	31	1 Cor. 15:5, 6, 7, 8.
Jesus crucified according to the Scriptures	27-29	1 Cor. 15:3
Jesus raised according to the Scriptures	32-35	1 Cor. 15:4

	Acts 13	Paul's letters
The use of καταγγέλλω	38	Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 2:1; 9:14; 11:26; Phil. 1:17, 18; Col. 1:28
Forgiveness of sins	38	Rom. 4:7-8; 6:6, 7, 18, 22; 8:2, 3; 11:27; 1 Cor. 15:3, 17; Eph. 1:7; 4:32; Col. 1:14; 2:13; 3:13
Forgiveness and justification	38-39	Rom. 4:7-8; 6:7
Justification by faith without the law	38-39	Rom. 1:17; 3:20-26, 28; 4:5; 9:30-10:10; 11:6; Gal. 2:16; 3:11, 21, 24-25; Eph. 2:8; Phil. 3:9; Titus 3:4-7
"Primitive gospel" and justification	22-23, 30-33, 38-39	Rom. 1:3-4, 16-17

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Israel. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917, 1924.
- Blank, Josef. Paulus und Jesus: Eine Theologische Grundlegung. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament, no. 18. Edited by Vinzenz Hamp, Josef Schmid, and Paul Neuenzeit. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1968.
- Bornkamm, Günther. Paul. Translated by D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.
- Bowker, J. W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." New Testament Studies 14 (1967-1968):96-111.
- Braude, William G., ed. and trans. The Midrash on Psalms. 2 vols. Yale Judaica Series, no. 13. Edited by Leon Nemoy. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.
- Bruce, F. F. Commentary on the Book of the Acts. The New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954.
- _____. Paul: Apostle of the Heart Set Free. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1977.
- _____. The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles. London: The Tyndale Press, 1943.
- Cadbury, Henry J. "The Speeches in Acts." In The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. Vol. 5: Additional Notes to the Commentary, pp. 402-427. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. London: MacMillan and Co., Limited, 1933.
- Chase, Fredric Henry. The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. London: MacMillan and Co., Ltd., 1902.
- Danker, Frederick W. Multipurpose Tools for Bible Study. 3rd ed. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1970.
- Davies, W. D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology. London: S. P. C. K., 1955.

- Dibelius, Martin. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. Translated by Mary Ling and Paul Schubert. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1956.
- Dibelius, Martin and Kümmel, Werner Georg. Paul. Translated by Frank Clarke. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1953.
- Dodd, C. H. The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, n.d.
- _____. History and the Gospel. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1964.
- Doeve, J. W. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Translated by G. E. van Baaren-Pape. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum & Comp. N. V., 1954.
- Ellis, E. Earle. Paul's Use of the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1957.
- Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1971 ed. S.v. "Preaching. In the Talmudic Period," by Joseph Heinemann.
- Foakes Jackson, F. J., and Lake, Kirsopp, gen. eds. The Beginnings of Christianity. 5 vols. London: MacMillan and Company, Ltd., 1933. Vol. 4: English Translation and Commentary, by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury.
- Freedman, H. and Simon, Maurice, gen. eds. Midrash Rabbah. 10 vols. London: The Soncino Press, 1939. Vol. 1: Genesis I, translated by H. Freedman.
- Gärtner, Bertil. The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1965.
- Glombitza, Otto. "Akta XIII. 15-41: Analyse einer Lukanischen Predigt vor Juden." New Testament Studies 5 (1958-1959):306-317.
- Goldsmith, Dale. "Acts 13 33-37: A Pesher on II Samuel 7." Journal of Biblical Literature 87 (September 1968):321-324.
- Guthrie, Donald. New Testament Introduction. Downers Grove, Illinois: Inter-Varsity Press, 1970.
- Harrison, Everett F. Acts: The Expanding Church. Chicago: Moody Press, 1975.
- Holtz, Traugott. Untersuchungen über die Alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, no. 104. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

- Lövestam, Evald. Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13,32-37. Translated by Michael J. Petry. Coniectanea Neotestamentica, no. 18. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.
- Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. New York: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Moore, George Foot. Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era. 3 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927-1930.
- Nestle, Erwin, and Aland, Kurt. Novum Testamentum Graece. 25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Septuaginta. 2 vols. 9th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935.
- Ridderbos, Herman. Paul: An Outline of His Theology. Translated by John Richard De Witt. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- Schmoller, Alfred. Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament. 14th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim. Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History. Translated by Harold Knight. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961.
- Schürer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. 5 vols. in 2 divisions. Translated by Sophia Taylor and Peter Christie. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1890.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Concerning the Speeches in Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 208-216. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Slotki, Israel W., trans. and ed. "Sukkah." In The Talmud. 35 vols. Edited by Isidore Epstein. Vol. 12: Mo'ed VI, pp. 1-304. London: The Soncino Press, 1938.
- Stanley, David Michael. Christ's Resurrection in Pauline Soteriology. Analecta Biblica, no. 13. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1961.
- Strack, Hermann L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 4 vols. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1965.
- Unnik, W. C. van. Tarsus or Jerusalem; the City of Paul's Youth. Translated by George Ogg. London: Epworth Press, 1962.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts, pp. 33-50. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Wilcox, Max. The Semitisms of Acts. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1965.

79-2 Deterding, Paul E. Echoes of Pauline concepts in the speech
at Antioch.