stands clear behind Acts 20:18ff. By not quoting the letter, and by not mentioning it explicitly, Luke does not only leave out valuable information – something different, “manipulative” is going on when letters are reproduced in the frame of history-writing: first, Luke would presuppose the Pauline letters to have reached public status. They are disseminated already and cannot be reproduced as “letters,” but rather within speeches. Second, letters in history-writing, best described as “insertion letters,” per se have a different function: they are either fictitious texts, or they are used (or rephrased) for documentary purpose (e.g., Acts 15:23b-29; Tacitus, ann 14.11). In other words: it is the ancient culture of literary activity as such which prevents Luke (and Tacitus) from documenting “real literary” letters and inserting them into history-writing. However, to ignore Paul as letter-writer also has consequences for how Luke reproduces Paul: third, since Luke consciously wants to reshape the image of the apostle, he remodels the “epistolary Paul” as “free speaking Paul.” While the apostle in his letter to the Philippians says farewell to a Macedonian community by epistolary means, indeed as a prisoner, the Lukan Paul gives a speech in Asia Minor. He speaks as a free man and, only in Acts, is Paul able to present his “apostolic” self-understanding to a community delegation of Christ-believers. It is hardly accidental then that only in Acts 20:18ff. can Paul do what he normally does in his letters: address Christ-believing communities.

By tremendously re-shaping the image of Paul, Luke himself chooses how much and what kind of Pauline thinking he wants to preserve and to carry forward. At the same time, Luke’s compositional technique cannot simply be seen as contingent or arbitrary. It seems to me that – as stated above – to Luke three principles are decisive when composing (especially the speeches in) Acts: Luke’s image of Paul is based on (a) eyewitness reports, (b) contemporary, evaluative images of the apostle which Luke shares with his audience(s), and (c) Paul’s letter-writing as such. In a conceptual sense then, what Luke does with Paul is not so different to the way Tacitus “manipulates” the image of Seneca as a literary author.

3. Some conclusions for the interpretation of Paul’s letter to the Philippians

Acts 20 and Paul’s letter to the Philippians share a lot of semantics and motifs. Luke probably used Philippians when composing the farewell speech in ch. 20. Could, however, Luke’s reception of Philippians also illuminate our under-

23 See E.-M. Becker, Birth, esp. 100f.
standing of the letter – could the phenomenon of intertextuality lead to *mutual illuminations* of both texts (without necessarily playing themselves out in a kind of a circular argument)? Luke’s supposed reception of Philippians can reveal some intriguing insights, not only into Luke’s compositional technique but also into the early history of reading and interpreting Philippians. Let me conclude with some brief reflections.

(a) As pointed out earlier, Luke does not and cannot see himself limited to sources such as Paul’s letters, for instance the letter to the Philippians, when composing a speech or a farewell scene. He has to consider other sources of information as well (s. above). His interpretive task is to combine and reconcile diverse, partly divergent types of sources and to satisfy his reading audience. This view on Luke might shed interesting light on the (authoritative) status of Pauline epistolography (Philippians included) in the end of the 1st century.

(b) In light of Acts 20:18ff., Paul’s letter to the Philippians seems to be perceived by Luke as a farewell discourse since the historian draws on it to a remarkable extent. The debate about Philippians’s literary genre and rhetorical purpose (see J. Reumann) might be enriched by comparing Philippians to Acts 20:18ff. and by observing how the letter was read and interpreted by Luke.

(c) Having said this, we will also have to make crucial distinctions between both texts. Even though Acts 20:18ff. and Philippians are close in terms of semantics and motifs, and even though both texts might share conceptual features of ancient farewell discourse literature, significant differences come to light: *first*, Acts 20:18ff. contains a farewell *speech*, which is pretty close to farewell discourses which we know from the Jewish world (s. above), while Philippians entails consoling motifs also, which rather derive from consoling literature of the Greco-Roman world.24 *Second*, Luke’s overall purpose of presenting Paul in ch. 20 is apologetic; in his letter-writing to the Philippians, in contrast, Paul intends to implement mimetic ethics. *Third*, while the epistolary setting has an ethical purpose in Philippians, it widely serves an apologetic purpose in Acts 20:18ff. Luke transforms the ethical teacher Paul, whom he finds in Philippians, and Paul’s legacy therein, into the paradigm of a Christ-believing witness who practices apologia.25 As such a paradigm of an “apologist,” the Lukan Paul finally appears as a moral example: accordingly, the reader might understand in a new way, and indeed different to Phil 2:3, what ταπεινοφροσύνη and παρρησία are about.

---

24 See the rich discussion about “consolation” in Philippians; see G. L. Parsenios, *Departure*, 25ff.

25 Luke in fact might be stimulated to do so since Paul himself describes his situation in his imprisonment as *apologia* [Phil 1:7] – a self-description chosen, in order to foster Paul’s concept of mimetic ethics.