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Chapter 1

Introduction

1. The Question of Jesus and Judgment in Acts 10:42 and 17:31

When the protagonists of Acts testify about Jesus, what do they say about him? Among other elements of their proclamation, they say that he is a judge. This role is of such importance that two speeches conclude with the most direct statements about Jesus’s judgment in the book. Peter’s speech to the house of Cornelius, which marks the shift in Acts to proclaiming the message about Jesus to Gentiles, declares in 10:42, οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ὄρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κριτής ζῴων καὶ νεκρῶν.1 Paul’s final mission speech before his arrest likewise concludes in 17:31 by declaring that God ἐστησένες ἡμέραν ἐν ἧν μέλλει κρίνειν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαίωσεν, ἐν ἀνδρὶ ὁ ὄρισεν, πίστιν παρασχὸν πᾶσιν ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν.

What do these statements say about Jesus? How does Jesus’s role as judge place him in relation to other eschatological judges in Judaism? How does Jesus’s role as judge in Luke-Acts relate to his authority and identity?2 Finally, how does Jesus’s judgment relate to the final judgment of God?

---

This study considers the christological significance of Jesus’s role as judge in the speeches in Acts 10:34–43 and 17:22–31 by offering a reading of these speeches according to their place in the book within its first-century Jewish context. The unique presentation of Jesus as judge in these speeches both expresses his messianic identity and suggests his divine authority.³

The significance of this study lies most directly in answering the question, what is the christological significance of the way Acts portrays the presentation of Jesus’s role as judge in these two speeches? The relationship of this question to wider conversations in biblical studies leads to three further points of significance. First, this study speaks into three areas of New Testament scholarship that have lacked integration: the study of the speeches in Acts, of Lukan theology, and of early christology. Second, the approach of this study avoids common pitfalls in the study of early christology, judgment, and Acts’ speeches. It engages thoroughly with relevant figures from other Jewish texts, gives attention to the use and influence of scriptural texts, identifies difference within the similarity of judgment activity, and appreciates the placement of the speeches within a narrative whole. Finally, this study suggests further work to address the relationship between messianism and “high” christology elsewhere in Luke-Acts and in other early Christian texts.

2. The Intersection of Three Fields

Reading speeches in Acts to consider their christological significance advances three areas of scholarship that have often been separated. First, it follows previous research of early Christian proclamation and the content and function of the Acts speeches. Second, by addressing a theological topic in passages of Acts, it advances discussion of Lukan christology. Third, through its concern with christology, particularly messianic identity and divine authority, this study contributes to research of christology in New Testament texts and early Christianity. A description of its relationship to studies in each of these fields follows below, showing the need for further work. Those in the first area of research, when discussing judgment, do not do so in relation to christology. Those in the second have not offered developed discussions of judgment and often include little interaction with judgment figures in other Jewish literature. Those in the third, while at times presenting Jesus’s judgment as a messianic or a divine function, have neither developed these ideas nor focused attention on Acts and its speeches.

³ By “divine authority,” I mean authority of the sort that God possesses rather than merely, for example, “authority from God.” The former may not, however, exclude the latter.
2. The Intersection of Three Fields

2.1 Studies of the Acts Speeches and Early Christian Proclamation

Studies of Acts’ speeches and early Christian proclamation have not focused on judgment in light of the book’s larger narrative. Three categories of research deserve note: studies of early Christian kerygma, rhetorical analyses of the speeches, and studies of the speeches that approach their content as part of the larger narrative’s theology but do not offer developed discussions of judgment.

2.1.1 Form-Critical Studies and Early Christian Kerygma

Many of the major studies of the Acts speeches until the last three decades of the twentieth century used form-critical methods to construct forms of early Christian kerygma to which the Acts speeches could provide windows. This often involved identifying common elements in the speeches and removing content that appeared dependent on the speeches’ narrative context. Close relation to narrative context, in this approach, indicates the secondary nature of speech content, whereas common elements across speeches more likely stem from early kerygma. Since direct statements about judgment appear in some speeches but not others, these studies either do not consider judgment an important part of early kerygma or they merely identify the motif as an element of kerygma without developing its christological significance. The studies by Martin Dibelius, C. H. Dodd, Ulrich Wilckens, and Donald Lee Jones, among others, illustrate this approach.

---


5 The discussion of the Acts speeches in James D. G. Dunn, Beginning from Jerusalem, Christianity in the Making 2 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2009), 87–98 has similarities to this approach, although Dunn’s concern is the use of the Acts speeches as sources for history.
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Martin Dibelius’s *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* discusses the Acts speeches.\(^6\) Although Dibelius views the speeches as Lukan compositions, he finds in them a kerygmatic pattern like that in 1 Corinthians 15:3–4 that he thinks differs from what appears elsewhere in Luke-Acts. He attributes this pattern to indirect transferal of the earliest Christian kerygma. He does not mention judgment as part of this pattern, however, nor does he comment further on Jesus’s judgment in Acts 10:42 and 17:31. His essays in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* display the same approach, although the isolation of the speeches from their narrative context is sometimes even more pronounced, particularly in “Paul on the Areopagus.”\(^7\) None of the essays in the book discusses the significance of judgment in Acts 10:42 or 17:31.

Dodd’s first lecture in *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* approaches the speeches similarly, identifying the content of the “primitive” Christian preaching, which Dodd constructs from portions of the epistles and from the speeches in Acts 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 13.\(^8\) While he recognizes judgment by Jesus as a fundamental element of early Christian proclamation expressing Jesus’s lordship in Paul’s epistles, he considers Jesus’s judgment of less significance in the Acts speeches.\(^9\) Dodd does not consider the role of the Acts speeches within the narrative progression of the book, nor does he anywhere mention the Areopagus speech.

Wilkens places his own study of the “Missionsreden” against the background of the work of Dodd and Dibelius, and he attempts to determine if a selection of speeches displays traditional kerygmatic formulae.\(^10\) He limits his study to six speeches in Acts as “Missionsreden” with brief consideration of three others, placing 17:22–31 among the latter.\(^11\) This work considers Lukan theology across the content of the speeches, but again Wilkens’s concern is to determine early kerygma and the degree to which it appears in speeches through comparing them with each other. He views the statement of Jesus’s judgment in 10:42 as atypical for the speeches and an example of Lukan subordinationist christology, yet he also sees in 17:31 “daß der wiederkehrende Jesus in göttlicher Macht das Gericht über Lebendige und Tote abhalten

---


\(^{9}\) Ibid., 14–16, 40–41.


wird.” He does not develop how subordination and the exercise of “göttlicher Macht” in judgment relate to each other.

Finally, Donald Lee Jones’s study of christology in the mission speeches in Acts addresses the speeches in Acts 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, and 13 and attempts to locate the theology of these speeches either in an earlier, Jewish Christianity or in a Lukan theology reflecting later christological development. His examination of christology focuses on the titles of Jesus in the speeches, which he argues were all in use at the time of the composition of Acts and therefore do not demonstrate an early, primitive christology. He includes a brief discussion of the Areopagus speech in Acts 17:22–31, but only to argue that it is a Lukan composition. Although including 10:42 as part of the “christological kerygma” in Acts 10:34–43, when he describes christological kerygma in his summary of elements common to the mission speeches, he does not mention judgment. Jones mentions 10:42 and 17:31 as a repetition emphasizing what Luke deemed important. He recognizes Jesus’s judgment in these two verses as part of a theology of Jesus’s return, and he seems to imply ὁ ὅρισμένος ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίτης ζώντων καὶ νεκρῶν in 10:42 is equivalent to the title νίκας θεοῦ by comparing 10:42 to Romans 1:4. He does not, however, develop the significance of Jesus as a judge.

2.1.2 Rhetorical Studies of the Acts Speeches

George A. Kennedy’s New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism led to analysis of the speeches in Acts according to the structure and classifications of classical rhetoric. As in the case of form-critical studies, the interests of these studies led them away from theological analysis of the content of the speeches in light of their place in a larger narrative. Kennedy himself observes rhetorical features in the Acts speeches to illustrate the method of rhetorical criticism, but, although he notes Jesus’s role as judge in 10:42 and

14 See ibid., 126–72 on the titles and the conclusions on pp. 173–75. Later use of titles does not, however, mean that they could not have been in use earlier.
15 Ibid., 63–66.
16 Ibid., 78, 82.
17 Ibid., 51n4.
18 Ibid., 131–32, 168n1.
19 G. N. Stanton’s study of early Christian preaching, Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching, SNTSMS 27 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974), argues that the early life of Jesus was important in early Christian preaching, but he also does not develop the significance of what the preaching said about Jesus, including his judgment.
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17:31, his concern is not to develop the christological significance of this role.\textsuperscript{21} Many subsequent commentaries include structural analyses of the speeches in Acts 10 and 17 according to rhetorical categories, placing the statement about Jesus’s judgment in each speech as part of, or immediately preceding, its peroration.\textsuperscript{22} Other studies, such as those by Robert F. Wolfe, Khiok-Khng Yeo, and Dean Zweck, provide rhetorical analyses of the content of individual speeches, further illustrating the tendency to isolate the speeches from their places in the narrative.\textsuperscript{23}

2.1.3 Studies of the Speeches in the Acts Narrative

With the increase in literary-critical research in New Testament studies, more writers have considered the content of the Acts speeches as part of a literary whole, although few studies focused on the speeches have done so. Marion L. Soards’s \textit{The Speeches in Acts} commendably emphasizes the need to approach the Acts speeches as part of the narrative of Luke-Acts in how they each, with their commonalities and unique content, relate to their narrative surroundings.\textsuperscript{24} Soards’s effort in analyzing all of the speeches in a short volume and the lack of thematic points of focus results in a running commentary on the content of the speeches. The book therefore provides simple observations of similarities across speeches rather than an argument to establish any theological theses. Soards notes Jesus’s judgment in 10:42 and 17:31, but he offers no development of their christological significance.\textsuperscript{25} Other studies have addressed how the Acts speeches play a narrative function rather than analyzing their content theologically in view of their narrative placement. They therefore have not addressed christology. Recent studies have, for example, addressed the significance of the interruption of speeches,\textsuperscript{26} as well as how Acts uses the

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., 114–40.
\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 75, 99–100.
speeches of “outsiders” to show God’s control, even through non-Christians, of advancing Christianity and its proclamation.²⁷

2.2 Studies of Lukan Theology and Christology

Studies of Lukan christology have not offered developed accounts of the christological significance of judgment, and, when they consider Acts in their discussions of christology, have given it less attention than Luke. This follows in part from the narrative presence of Jesus throughout the Gospel, but also reflects the perception that Acts has little concern with christology. Dibelius, for example, distinguishes the two books by saying of the latter, “the cultic-christological interest is, for the most part, absent,” and “a pious interest in the lives of holy men predominates” instead.²⁸ The statements about judgment in Acts 10:42 and 17:31 have not been the subject of focused study.²⁹ Few studies of Lukan theology have developed the significance of judgment for christology even in Luke, and few have considered exalted figures in other Jewish texts contemporary with Luke-Acts with depth. Martin Hengel’s Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity and I. Howard Marshall’s Luke: Historian and Theologian, for example, contain no discussions of judgment in relation to christology.³⁰ G. W. H. Lampe’s description of Lukan christology makes little mention of judgment.³¹ Even François Bovon’s chapter on christology in Luke the Theologian neither includes a discussion of Jesus as a judge, nor mentions


²⁹ See the references at the beginning of chapters 4 and 5.


any works devoted to this theme. While Petr Pokorný mentions the theme of judgment on occasion, including in relation to Jesus as savior, he does not consider its relation to other judgment figures in Jewish literature and only cursorily relates it to scriptural presentation of divine eschatological judgment. Howard Clark Kee’s discussion of the titles “Christ” and “Son of Man” in his theology of Acts mentions judgment, but without development. He also notes Acts 10:42 and 17:31 when mentioning the future role of Jesus, but he does not discuss them beyond noting that Jesus is both judge and the model after which others will be judged. The following works by Hans Conzelmann, Darrell L. Bock, H. Douglas Buckwalter, Christopher M. Tuckett, and C. Kavin Rowe, however, contribute to a foundation in the research of Lukan christology from which this study can proceed. Their discussions of Jesus’s judgment seem to consider the theme either a part of Jesus’s messianic activity or of Jesus acting as Yahweh without developing either idea. They thereby anticipate my own conclusions.

2.2.1 Hans Conzelmann


---


35 Ibid., 27. Other mentions of 10:42 in the book are on pp. 29, 53 (incorrectly identified as 10:43), 89; other mentions of 17:31 occur on pp. 64–65.


37 Ibid., 163–64.