

Daniel A. Gleich, *Die lukanischen Paulusreden: Ein sprachlicher und inhaltlicher Vergleich zwischen dem paulinischen Redestoff in Apg 9–28 und dem Corpus Paulinum*, Arbeiten zur Bibel und ihrer Geschichte 70, Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, Leipzig 2021, pp. 349 + n.pag.

Daniel A. Gleich is lecturer of the New Testament at the Theologisches Seminar St. Chrischona in Basel (Switzerland). His monograph is a reworked version of his 2019 PhD dissertation at the Evangelische Theologische Fakultät Leuven, written under the supervision of Prof. Dr Armin D. Baum. It is devoted to the perennial problem of the relationship between the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline letters. The general theological approach of the Author to this problem is evangelical, as can be deduced, among others, from his remarks concerning the theological milieu in which he developed his theological interests and studied (Arbeitskreis für evangelikale Theologie, Albrecht-Bengel-Haus in Tübingen, etc.: pp. 7–8).

After the first, introductory chapter (pp. 23–26), the second chapter of the monograph (pp. 27–59) sketches the history of the research on the problem of the historical and literary origin of the speeches contained in the Acts of the Apostles. Gleich rightly begins this overview not with the 19th-century critical scholars, but with the church fathers. Among the authors who dealt with this problem most recently, in the 21st century, Gleich mentions Daniel Marguerat, his own promotor Armin D. Baum, Richard I. Pervo, Craig S. Keener, Marion L. Soards, Osvaldo Padilla, and Nathanael Lüke (pp. 52–58).

The third chapter (pp. 61–76) is devoted to the literary speeches in ancient historical works. Gleich analyses speeches contained in the works of Thucydides, Polybius, Josephus, and Tacitus, investigating them against the background of the authors' theoretical declarations (Thucydides and Polybius) and comparing them with materials contained in other sources (Josephus, and Tacitus). He concludes that some ancient historical writers may have preserved the contents of real historical speeches, but they generally did not aim at preserving their wording.

The fourth chapter (pp. 77–84) shortly describes the extent, number, length, and literary genres of the Lukan speeches of Paul. It is worth noting that Gleich takes into account not only the great missionary, farewell, and apologetic speeches of the Apostle (Acts 13:16–41 etc.), but also his minor utterances, including his answer to Jesus on the road to Damascus, consisting of merely three words (Acts 9:5).

The fifth, rather short chapter concerns the thorny issue of methodology (pp. 85–97). Gleich first describes his system of classifying parallels between the Lukan and Pauline material, which is divided into two groups, the uncontested letters (Rom, 1–2 Cor, Gal, Phil, 1 Thess, Phlm) and the contested ones (Eph, Col, 2 Thess, 1–2 Tim, Tit). The parallels are assigned to categories, according to their more or less identical content and/or wording. The Author then proceeds to discussing the term “Paulinism”, which is variously defined by scholars as referring to the Pauline teaching, stance towards Paul, utterances inspired by Paul, Pauline terminology, and Pauline contents. Gleich, quite understandably following his promotor Armin D. Baum, argues that the latter option best suits his research aims. Although his choice may be right, one could expect more scholarly justification of this particular methodological stance.

The sixth chapter is devoted to the farewell speech of Paul in Miletus (Acts 20:18–35 – pp. 99–143). After a presentation of the state of research on the relationship between this speech and the Pauline letters, its structure, and literary genre, Gleich analyses the parallels of the fragments Acts 20:18–21; 20:22–27; 20:28–30; 20:31–35 to the material within the *Corpus Paulinum* and outside the *Corpus Paulinum*. The latter procedure serves to verify which parallels can be regarded as specifically Pauline. Thereafter, the Author analyses thematic parallels to the Gospel of Luke and to the Pastoral Epistles. In his opinion, the strongest thematic and linguistic parallels can be found between Acts 20:18–35 and 1 Thess (6), Rom (3), 1 Cor (3), and 2 Cor (1), as well as Eph (6), Col (2), 1 Tim (1), 2 Tim (1), and Tit (1).

The seventh chapter concerns the missionary speeches of Paul: Acts 13:16b–41; 14:15b–17; 17:22–31 (pp. 145–226). Having analysed their thematic and linguistic parallels to the material within the *Corpus Paulinum* and outside the *Corpus Paulinum*, Gleich concludes that, taken together, these speeches contain parallels especially to Rom (24), then to 1 Cor (5), Gal (5), 1 Thess (4), 2 Cor (2), and Phil (1), as well as Eph (3), Col (3), 2 Tim (2), and 1 Tim (1).

The eighth chapter is devoted to the apologetic speeches of Paul: Acts 22:1–21; 23:1b.3.5–6b; 24:10–21; 26:2–23 (pp. 227–295). Gleich argues that, taken together, these speeches contain parallels especially to Rom (17) and

1 Cor (12), then to Gal (7), Phil (6), 2 Cor (3), and 1 Thess (1), as well as Col (5), 2 Tim (5), 1 Tim (4), Eph (3), 2 Thess (2), and Tit (1).

The ninth chapter concerns shorter Pauline speech material (pp. 297–315). In fact, Gleich only analyses the fragments which exhibit parallels to the *Corpus Paulinum*, namely, Acts 13:10–11a; 13:46–47; 14:22c; 17:3; 18:21; 19:21b; 21:13; 28:25b–28. The Author argues that, taken together, these texts contain parallels especially to Rom (13), then 1 Cor (4), 2 Cor (3), Phil (2), and 1 Thess (1), as well as Col (2), 2 Thess (2), and 2 Tim (2).

In the conclusion to his work (pp. 317–323), Gleich summarizes his findings. He argues that the number of parallels to the *Corpus Paulinum* (169 altogether) is proportional to the extent of the farewell, missionary, apologetic, and other speeches, so that no type of speech is particularly close to the *Corpus Paulinum*. The greatest overall numbers of parallels concern Rom (57), 1 Cor (24), Gal (12), and 1 Thess (12), as well as Eph (12), Col (12), and 2 Tim (10). However, if the density of the parallels for 1000 words is compared, they can be found especially in 1 Thess (8.1), Rom (8.0), Phil (5.5), and Gal (5.4), as well as 2 Tim (8.1), Col (7.6), Eph (5.0), and 2 Thess (4.9).

Gleich also argues, in contrast to the opinion of some scholars, that the parallels in the Acts of the Apostles do not thematically disagree with the Pauline letters. However, he states that none of the Pauline letters (e.g., 1 Thess) or groups of letters (e.g., the Pastorals) is close enough to the Lukan speeches of Paul to postulate literary dependence. In his opinion, his analyses neither confirm nor deny the acquaintance of Luke with the Pauline letters. Therefore, following his promotor Armin D. Baum, he opts for the understanding of Acts as containing independent, genuine Pauline tradition. Therefore, in his opinion even Paul's utterances contained in the Lukan speeches that go beyond the contents of the Pauline letters (autobiographic statements, accounts of the history of Israel, references to the situations of the addressees, etc.) can be regarded as containing authentic sayings of Paul.

The Author deserves great praise for his systematic investigation of the relationship between the speeches of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles and the letters contained in the *Corpus Paulinum*. The number of parallels detected (169) greatly surpasses those listed in Nestle-Aland. These parallels, as well as the systematic calculations of them, are nicely presented in 218 (!) tables. Accordingly, the monograph achieves its declared goal of analysing these parallels in a systematic way.

The Author's final conclusion that so many parallels do not point to any kind of literary dependence between the Acts of the Apostles and the letters contained in the *Corpus Paulinum* is not entirely convincing. In fact, the

Author deals with this thorny issue only briefly, in passing (pp. 141, 143, 322). Moreover, his arguments concerning this issue are quite vague: “Keine Übereinstimmung im Vokabular ist jedoch lang genug” (p. 141), “aufgrund der Uneinheitlichkeit der Parallelen, sowohl im Vokabular als auch im Inhalt” (p. 143). Although he interestingly notes that in almost all parallels in the farewell speech of Paul in Miletus (Acts 20:18–35) contain key words that can be found in the *Corpus Paulinum* (p. 143), he does not discuss the possibility that precisely this phenomenon could be the characteristic feature of Luke’s literary use of the Pauline letters.

In sum, although the main argument presented in this monograph is not entirely convincing, Gleich’s systematic analysis of the thematic and linguistic parallels between the speeches of Paul in the Acts of the Apostles and the letters contained in the *Corpus Paulinum* is certainly worth taking into serious consideration by other scholars.

Bartosz Adamczewski