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Abstract

The purpose of this thesis is to probe the nature of Luke’s soteriology by focusing on Luke’s geographical (spatial-temporal) perspective within which the narrative world of Luke-Acts moves. In this thesis, by presenting space-time as intertwined aspects of the same event or reality, I have proposed that we rethink Luke’s space-time as a dynamic event in motion. Within this framework, I have proposed that Luke’s notion of salvation should be understood not as a static system for containing motion or a fixed framework for defining action, but as a dynamic event in motion, becoming, and flowing, which creates a new salvific space-time (i.e. the kingdom of God) in-between, among, around, and beyond regions and persons. Thus, I have proposed that we think of salvation in terms of the nomadic movements of flows that unfold the multiple layers (multiplicity) of release from various fabrics of captivity and oppression – i.e., release from sins and various forms of physical-spiritual sicknesses, stigmas, and debts. Thus we should rethink salvation in the following ways. (1) Not in terms of a dichotomy between physical and spiritual, but as both physical and spiritual: both conditions applying to the same saving event. (2) Not as hierarchical or singular, but as heterogeneous and multiple. (3) Not as static moments, but as something flowing, being-toward, and in motion, showing that salvation and its nomadic event of flows is pictured as being in a constant state of movement, signifying an endless qualitative change in type and kind. This means salvation is a nomadic event of release and deterritorialization from one sphere to another. It deterritorializes the fixed, binary, and hierarchical system of the Jerusalem temple, creates the heterogeneous and relational space of God, and establishes multiple access points to the dynamic network (the kingdom) of God.
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Chapter One

1.1 Introduction

In 1961, C. K. Barrett wrote, “The focus of New Testament studies is now moving to the Lukan writings.”¹ Five years later, W. C. van Unnik described the study of Luke-Acts as “one of the great storm centers of the New Testament field.”² Since then, many scholars have undertaken to investigate the central theme and the purpose of Luke-Acts, and produced a variety of proposals as to the key motifs of its theology and soteriology. These proposals help to shape and define my own work, because they are rooted in particular ways of conceptualizing space and time – ways that I aim to challenge in this dissertation.³

The two most influential recent proposals of this kind are those of H. Conzelmann and I. Howard Marshall. The key word in Conzelmann’s book, The Theology of St. Luke, is Heilsgeschichte, which translates into English as the history of salvation, redemptive history or salvation-history.⁴ In his book, Conzelmann rightly recognizes the importance of geography to Luke’s theology, and traces the development of the history of salvation.⁵ However, without providing a thorough analysis of the relationship between salvation and geography in Luke, Conzelmann nevertheless presents the idea that for Luke, space and time are separate entities, and that Luke prioritized time. In other words, Conzelmann is interested in static boundaries defining the territories of local places, and focuses on history (events in linear time) itself.

In contrast to Conzelmann, Howard Marshall argues that, “Luke’s concern is with the saving significance of the history rather than with the history itself as bare facts.”⁶ Thus, Marshall moves away from the importance of Luke’s geography, and focuses on salvation. Yet, although he rightly claims that salvation is a key concept


What, then, is salvation? How did Luke understand salvation, particularly in relation to geography, when it is a concept that shaped and influenced his soteriology? In order to answer these questions, I will first briefly summarize recent approaches to Luke’s geography and salvation.

1.1.1 Recent approaches to Luke’s geography

Luke’s geographical perspective, and particularly its link to salvation, is significant in relation to the other gospels. In contrast to the other evangelists, Luke indeed gives more attention to geography, and to soteriology shaped and formulated by his understanding of geography. Fitzmyer notes that Luke’s geographical perspective “not only affects the structure of Luke’s writings, but it also transcends the structure.” He states, “The overarching geographical perspective in Luke-Acts can be seen in the author’s preoccupation with Jerusalem as the city of destiny for Jesus and the pivot for the salvation of mankind,” and claims, “The geographical perspective becomes a factor in the divine plan of salvation.” That is, Luke’s spatial-temporal perspective is a key factor in understanding his soteriology.

In his book, The Theology of St. Luke, Conzelmann devotes the first part to a detailed analysis of geography. The purpose of his analysis of Luke’s geographical elements is to accentuate the static boundaries and territories within the local regions, and to emphasize the inert temporal perspective, what Conzelmann calls the center of history (time), of Luke’s summary of salvation history. Thus Conzelmann divides

---

7Ibid., pp.137ff.


11Ibid., pp. 164-65.

12Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 18-94.
time into three fixed periods or epochs: (1) the time of Israel, of the law, and of the prophets until John the Baptist; (2) the time of Jesus' earthly ministry as the anticipation of the future salvation, characterized by the absence of Satan; and (3) the time of the church, the present time, the historical epoch between the exaltation and the return of Christ. Conzelmann describes such eras as the isolated and static "places" within which salvation occurs.

However, W. C. Robinson rejects this proposal and criticizes many points of Conzelmann's thesis. Robinson then attempts to substitute "the Way of the Lord" for Conzelmann's temporal — or historical — summary of Luke's theology (Conzelmann's center of time). Fitzmyer also revises Conzelmann's theory, and rightly observes that Luke's geographical understanding involves both space and time, but Fitzmyer claims that, for Luke, historical time is more important than the spatial perspective, and so privileges time. As is the case with other scholars, Fitzmyer interprets Luke's space and time as fixed and unchanged. The problems with all of these scholars' accounts derive from their assumptions that: (1) Luke views time as different or separated from space; (2) Luke conceptualizes time as a static chronological sequence or line; (3) Luke's sees space as static, fixed, inert, or motionless; and (4) for Luke, space is subordinate to time.

However, we will see that Luke's geographical (spatial-temporal) view is not constructed of either space or time, but of both space and time. Also, Luke does not subordinate space to time, nor separate them. Rather, he presents space and time as interacting with one another (what I will term space-time). Although Conzelmann recognizes this relationship between space and time, he divides time and arranges it into the fixed, discrete periods of the three epochs (the time of Israel, of Jesus, and of the Church) — a static chronological sequence \( (t_1, t_2, t_3 \ldots t_n) \). Such a conclusion is based on an assumption about the link between space and time. But Conzelmann spatializes time into a static sequence of moments, and views it as a separated and fixed place, where moments of the three epochs are stored. That is, he presents Luke's historical time as a static, chronological sequence of singular time, and describes Luke's conception of space-time as a fixed and static framework of actions.

---

\(^{13}\)Ibid., pp. 16-17.

\(^{14}\)He writes, "In explaining Lukan theology, one has to allow for both of these perspectives; both of them are obviously Lukan concerns" (Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 162).

\(^{15}\)Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 171.

\(^{16}\)Henri Bergson warned about "spatializing time", see Crang and Thrift, Thinking Space, pp. 1-2; cf. Deleuze, Bergsonism (New York: Zone Books, 1988), pp. 80, 84-85, 104.
However, as we shall see, Luke's spatial-temporal perspective should not be interpreted as a dualistic division into space and time, with time and space seen as opposite in kind, and with time privileged, but as aspects of the same reality. Also, as we will see, Luke perceives space-time not as absolute, linear, or singular, but as *relative*, *relational*, and *multiple* and not as static, fixed, or immobile, but as something *in motion*, *becoming*, and *flowing*.

1.1.2 Recent approaches to Luke's *salvation*


In his book, *Christ the Lord*, Eric Franklin argues that the central concern of Luke's writings is the presence of the *Lordship of Jesus*. He believes that Luke presents *Christ as the Lord*. By probing Luke's use of the terms *kyrie* and *ho kyrios*, Franklin claims that Luke expresses the lordship of Jesus during his ministry. But Franklin fails to define the *Lordship of Christ*, particularly in its relationship to *salvation and the name of Jesus*. Also, he fails to recognize that no significant meaning is attached to *kyrie* and *ho kyrios* in the gospel of Luke, when they are applied to Jesus. That is, the concept of the *Lordship of Christ* is simply lacking in the third gospel, although it occurs in the book of Acts, where Luke states, "God made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36). This clearly

---


suggests that the idea of Lordship of Christ is produced after Jesus is resurrected from the dead. Moreover, in his book, Franklin repeatedly mentions that God's salvation is revealed in Jesus, but does not determine the nature of that salvation.

In his book, The Unity of Luke's Theology, O'Toole argues that the main purpose of Luke's writing of Luke-Acts was to show that the God of the Old Testament continued to bring salvation to Israel through the activities of Jesus, and those of his disciples who continued Jesus' work after his ascension (cf. Acts 1:1-2). O'Toole then claims that Luke's writings are best described as salvation history. But what sort of salvation did God bring to Israel? That is, what is the nature of salvation? Moreover, how is it granted? O'Toole fails to define the meaning of salvation, and to recognize the multiplicity of salvation. Thus, he does not relate his conclusion to the other, multiple layers of which Luke's theory of salvation is comprised.

In his thesis, John Squires claims that a distinctively Lukan theme in Luke-Acts is the idea of God's plan, which he believes underpins the works as a whole. Squires states that, "Everything narrated by Luke comes under God's providence." Certainly the plan of God is one of the major themes in Luke-Acts. But it is highly questionable whether it is Luke's overarching theme. John Squires views the plan of God and the salvation of God as different in kind, and privileges the plan of God. As we shall see, the plan of God and the salvation of God should not be viewed as different in kind, but different in degree. This means that they should be understood as two aspects of the same reality or event. Moreover, though the kingdom of God is one of the major themes of Luke-Acts, Squires does not include the kingdom of God, a central feature of Jesus' teaching, in the soteriological plan of God. For this reason, he fails to provide an understanding of the nature of salvation in Luke, or to relate his conclusions to the multiple layers of salvation at work in Luke-Acts.

In short, as scholars above have taken Luke's salvation and geography for granted, none of these studies determines the meaning of salvation or provides a clear view of Luke's geography, which shaped and influenced Luke's understanding of salvation. Although Conzelmann and Marshall rightly recognize the importance of

---

22 Ibid., p. 3.
23 Like the gospel of Luke, the kingdom of God is an important theme in Acts, where Luke begins (Acts 1:3) and ends (Acts 28:31) with references to it. See Chapter 2.
Luke's geography (space-time) and salvation, they both treat it as a separate reality and do not adequately describe how Luke perceived geography and salvation. In fact, as far as I am aware, none of the Lukan studies analyzes Luke's understanding of salvation from his geographical (spatial-temporal) perspective. What then is salvation? How did Luke perceive geography and salvation?

1.2 The purpose and contribution of this thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to probe the nature of Luke’s soteriology by focusing on Luke’s geographical (spatial-temporal) perspective within which the narrative world of Luke-Acts moves.24 In the course of this investigation, this study shall contribute to the understanding of Luke’s geography and soteriology in relation to three areas: spatial-temporal geography; salvation in motion; and the multiple layers (multiplicity) of salvation.

1.2.1 Spatial-temporal geography

In contrast to much previous scholarship, I will propose that Luke’s understanding of space-time needs to be reconceived. For Luke, space and time: (1) are not distinguishable, but rather intertwined aspects of the same event or reality; (2) are not compartmentalized or rigidly confined by a static framework that is absolute and linear, but rather are dynamic and relational; and (3) are not constructed within a particular fixed, hierarchical, binary, or closed social system, but are manifested in open, heterogeneous, and multiple ways. This means that the threefold aspects of space-time are interconnected, and that a multiplicity of space-time coexists in Luke’s narrative world. Therefore, Luke’s spatial-temporal view should not be interpreted in terms of the static boundaries or the fixed territories of local places (Galilee, Judea, Samaria, Jerusalem, and so on), but rather in terms of a dynamic event and the nomadic event of flows and movements from one place to another, picturing Luke’s space-time as a dynamic event in motion.

1.2.2 Salvation in motion

Following on from this geographical perspective on Luke, I propose to rethink Luke’s idea of salvation, seeing it not as a static framework defining human action, but as a dynamic event in motion. Such a conclusion will be clearer when we look at the nomadic flows and movements of the salvational events preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem, and from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth. Just as the dynamic flows of salvation move in multiple directions and connect to other multiple regional sites, so also this study will show that such a nomadic event comprises a dynamic movement from one space to another. From this we can draw the following observations about the salvational event(s), the nomadic events of flows launched by Jesus: (1) that they deterritorialize the fixed, binary, and hierarchical system of the Jerusalem temple; (2) that Jesus creates a new notion of salvific space-time (i.e. the kingdom of God) in, in-between, among, around, and beyond regions; and (3) that he establishes the multiple ways to access this salvific space-time network, the kingdom network in which all sorts of people come and interact with Jesus, God, and one another. Note that Luke depicts the salvific space-time network (kingdom) of God, established by Jesus, as a heterogeneous, deterritorialized, and open network that can be accessed from multiple points and by numerous persons. As we shall see, this network is pictured as something in motion and flowing. That is, Luke perceives salvation as a dynamic

---


In his book, Lord of the Banquet, Moessner rightly recognizes the significance of the motif of journeying from Galilee to Jerusalem, and from there to “the ends of the earth” (p. 2). Though he presents Luke-Acts as a travel narrative, Moessner differentiates the so-called “Central Section of Luke” (9:51-19:44) from the other journey motifs. By picturing it as both window and mirror to Luke-Acts, Moessner presents “the central travel narrative” (9:51-19:44), Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem, as the fulfillment of the promised “New Exodus salvation of the Prophet like Moses” (p. 307). But Moessner does not clarify what he thinks stands behind the journey motif(s), nor does he provide a precise meaning(s) of the “new exodus”, particularly in relation to salvation and the kingdom of God. In other words, how does the motif(s) of the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, and from there to the ends of the earth, elucidate Luke’s understanding of salvation and the kingdom of God? Like Fitzmyer (Luke, p. 165), Moessner also overemphasizes the significance of the city of Jerusalem and its relation to the fulfillment of salvation, as if salvation were fulfilled only within the static territory of Jerusalem.
event in motion, and as a nomadic movement of releasing, deterritorializing, becoming, and being-toward, generated by the saving authority-power of God and bestowed in Jesus and his disciples. In this thesis, I argue that Luke’s notion of salvation should be understood in terms of space-time, not as a static system for containing motion or a fixed framework for defining action, but as a dynamic event in motion, becoming, and flowing, which creates a new space-time in-between, among, around, and beyond regions and persons. Thus, we must understand Luke’s salvation, not as an inert moment of action, but as a lively event in motion.

1.2.3 Multiple layers (multiplicity) of salvation

I will show that, for Luke, the defining features of salvation, and the basic question of what one must do to receive it, crucially involve the release of sins and the attainment of the kingdom of God; and that acts of faith and of calling on the name of Jesus are presented as the central responsive acts of the human quest for salvation. Just as Jesus explicitly discloses that the purpose of his coming is to preach the release (of sins) and the kingdom of God in Luke’s gospel, so also Luke describes these two purposes as interwoven dimensions of the same soteriological reality. In fact, as we shall see, Luke presents them as the chief motifs that unfold the multiple layers of salvation – i.e. the release of people from sins, from the various forms of physical-spiritual sicknesses, from social stigmas or stigmatizing, and from debts. Also, by linking the reception of eternal life (10:25) and salvation (13:23) to entering the kingdom of God (13:24-29), Luke describes salvation and the kingdom of God as two interconnected layers of the same salvational event. In fact, Luke explicitly connects the dilemma, what one must do to receive salvation, to the dilemma, what

---

27 I will elaborate each fabric of this fourfold theme in subsequent chapters; see the introductions to chapters two, three, four, and five.

28 Just as the preaching of good news (εὐαγγελίζετε) to the poor in 4:18 should be understood in the light of Luke 4:43, so also the theme of release in 4:18 should be understood to mean the release from sins. We will pick up this important link in subsequent sections.


one must do to enter the kingdom of God. Moreover, such questions of salvation are closely related to the acts of faith and of calling on the name of Jesus, which are centrally important in attaining salvation. Thus, just as the release of sins and the kingdom of God are central to Luke’s soteriology, so also are the acts of faith and of calling on the name of Jesus. Since this fourfold layer is the key to unfolding Luke’s soteriology, we can then ask the precise meaning(s) of each theme of salvation: (1) what is the meaning(s) of the kingdom of God? (2) What is the release from sins? (3) What does the name of Jesus signify? (4) What does one need to be saved? Through my analysis, I will show that this fourfold connected motif of salvation should be interpreted in terms of Luke’s spatial-temporal perspective. I will then pick up each layer of salvation, and closely reexamine it, based on my own analysis of Luke’s space-time, in each chapter of this thesis. At the conclusion of the thesis, I will then show that we should rethink Luke’s salvation as a dynamic event in motion, flowing, and becoming, which creates new salvational space-time (kingdom) and describes salvation as an eternal or a constant state of flows and movements.

But first, in this chapter I will provide a methodology for my own analysis of this issue, re-examine and re-evaluate Luke’s own geographical and salvific terms, and then present an initial test case based on Luke’s Infant Narratives, which is unique to Luke, and exemplifies Luke’s spatial-temporal understanding.

1.3 Methodology: a re-conceptualized framework of space-time

Before I discuss Luke’s geographical (spatial-temporal) view, which is a key factor in shaping and influencing his soteriology, I will supply a general conceptual framework of space-time and introduce some scholars who understand space and time as something in motion. Since it is impossible to survey the entire scope of recent social, anthropological, scientific, and geographical studies of space-time, my goal here is not to provide a comprehensive survey, but rather to highlight the major shifts in the concept of space-time in order to create a conceptual framework for my study.
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39In Acts 2:21, Luke writes, “Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved”. Likewise, he states, “There is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). As we shall see, in Acts the name of Jesus is central to receiving salvation (see chapter 4).
In the early twentieth century, Einstein’s theory of general relativity displaced the Newtonian world of absolute, linear space-time in which objects and events simply unfolded over time and extended in space. In contrast to Newton, Einstein viewed time not as a homogenous continuum, but simply in relation to the observer’s situation. In other words, the passage of time or the speed of an object’s progress through space altered according to the position of the observer, as time and space became irrevocably tied in relative and multi-dimensional space-time.

1.3.1 Space and time as a connected event in becoming

As I have already briefly mentioned, scholars in anthropology, sociology, geography, and the sciences have tended to prioritize time over space, and to view time as the domain of dynamism and progress, and space as the realm of stasis. That is, not only have they viewed space-time as separate realms, but they have also perceived space as a fixed place. Likewise, as we have seen, Lukan scholars tend to prioritize time over space, and to view space as a static boundary defining the territories of local places. This framework situates time as the essential matrix for the unfolding of progress in a narrative, whereas spatiality is viewed as little more than a function thereof. But, in recent years, more and more scholars in these disciplines have turned their interest to the concept of space; as Doreen Massey states, “Space is very much on the agenda these days.” Such a statement, as Crang notes, reconfirms Foucault’s announcement that the era of space was succeeding that of time needs to be taken with a pinch of salt.

What then is the nature of space and its relation to time? Lefebvre writes, “Space is nothing but the inscription of time in the world, spaces are the realizations, inscriptions in the simultaneity of the external world of a series of times, the rhythms of the city, the rhythms of urban population.” In Thinking Space, Crang and Thrift
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41 Jon May and Nigel Thrift, TimeSpace, p. 273.
42 Ibid., pp. 11-12.
44 D. Massey, Space, Place, and Gender (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), p. 249.
45 Mike Crang and Jon May, Thinking Space, p. 1.
show that space no longer remains outside the realm of social practice, and that it is
no longer understood as a static container of action, but as a socially produced set of
manifold events.\textsuperscript{47} They also discuss the current notion of space as \textit{process} and as \textit{in process}, that is, space and time combined in \textit{becoming}.\textsuperscript{48} Hence, space-time is to be understood to mean, not a separated reality, but rather an interwoven reality \textit{in motion}.

Here I will confine my analysis to two main areas: the \textit{space} of language and of experience. With regard to the former, the relationship between space and language, Crang notes that \textit{space} occurs through the medium of language (both spoken and written).\textsuperscript{49} Just as space is seen as linguistic, so also language is seen as spatial. In fact, Gilles Deleuze proposes to rethink language as a performance or practice, creating effects. Like language, space is described as an eventful and unique happening. In this sense, language does not stand outside time as a spatial system, but is bound into the spaces-times of action.\textsuperscript{50} Moreover, in geography and sociology, space moves closer to the second defined area, the social experience of daily life as a means of questioning materiality. Such a daily experience of life is central to Michel de Certeau's book, \textit{The Practice of Everyday Life}, in which de Certeau pictures stories and narratives as \textit{metaphors} for a vehicle of transportation as they traverse and organize places. He writes, "They are spatial trajectories... Every story is a travel story – a spatial practice."\textsuperscript{51} Note how he distinguishes between \textit{place} and \textit{space}. He notes that a \textit{place} is an order (of whatever kind) that excludes the possibility of two things being in the same location. Thus, for de Certeau, a \textit{place} is a shape of static positions, which discloses a fixed stability. Conversely, \textit{space} is composed of the intersection of mobile elements, and occurs as an effect produced by the operations that orient it, suggesting that \textit{space} is like the word when it is spoken. In this sense, \textit{space} is \textit{a practiced place}, which pictures \textit{space} as something \textit{in motion}.\textsuperscript{52} He writes, "Stories thus carry out a labor that constantly transforms places into spaces or spaces into places. They also organize the play of changing relationships between places and spaces."\textsuperscript{53}

\begin{flushright}
\ \[\text{\textsuperscript{47}Mike Crang and Jon May, \textit{Thinking Space}, p. 2.}\
\text{\textsuperscript{48}Ibid., p. 3.}\
\text{\textsuperscript{49}Ibid., pp. 3-4.}\
\text{\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., pp. 6ff.; cf. M. Curry, \textit{The Work in the World: Geographical Practice and the Written Word} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), p. 190.}\
\text{\textsuperscript{51}Michel de Certeau, \textit{The Practice of Everyday} (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1984), p. 115.}\
\text{\textsuperscript{52}Ibid., p. 117.}\
\text{\textsuperscript{53}Ibid., p. 118.}\]
\end{flushright}
In short, scholars like Crag and Thrift, Lefebvre, and de Certeau present space-time as an equivalent reality, and see space-time as an active event *in motion*. Also, de Certeau conceives a daily event or life experience as a dynamic space. As we shall see, such a concept of space-time is not inappropriately applied to Luke. Rather Luke understands space-time as a simultaneous life event. Moreover, not only does Luke interpret daily experiences or life events as dynamic spaces, where people come and interact with each other, but he also presents each story or event of salvation as a lively space (kingdom), where God and people come together and interact with one another.

### 1.3.2 Space and time as a dynamic event *in motion*

#### 1.3.2.1 TimeSpace and relativity

*TimeSpace* is the first book to bring an interest in both space and time together. In this book, various authors present space-time not in terms of either time or space, but as a simultaneous event that is in motion. As opposed to an absolute and linear concept of space and time, the authors posit a theory of social space-time that is dynamic, heterogeneous, relational, and multiple, varying both within and between societies and individuals and according to social position and practice.54 The following notes need to be made.

First, instead of prioritizing time above space or vice versa, Massey argues that space and time are inextricably interwoven.55 In other words, space and time are not separated from, but combined with each other. Different times mean different spaces and vice versa, and dynamic processes or changes are meant, not only by time, but by space as well.56 This means that “time is not in itself a prime determinant of change” and “the event cannot be split into spatial and temporal components.”57 So Thrift states that, “There is little sense to be had from making distinctions between time and space – there is only time-space.”58 Likewise, Novak writes, “Space and

---

54 In this regard, Jon May and Thrift discuss four inter-related domains, each of which is spatially constituted (*TimeSpace*, pp. 4-5).


57 May and Thrift, *TimeSpace*, p. 28.

time are no longer separate, not even in an everyday sense: a space-time vernacular has developed.\textsuperscript{59}

Second, as Lefebvre notes, social space is a social product,\textsuperscript{60} suggesting that space-time is no longer an absolute or fixed framework in which subjects or objects are located, but is relative and specific according to the locations of subjects or objects (like Einstein’s spaces-times of relativity), and relationally contingent according to the connections between subjects or objects (like Bakhtin’s spaces-times of dialogue). That is, space-time can be seen not as absolute, linear, and fixed, but as relative or relational, and thus to be produced differently, sustained contingently, and changed dynamically according to the ways in which social systems are combined with human bodies and practices. Thus, Harvey states, “Space and time are neither absolute nor external to processes but are contingent and contained with them.\textsuperscript{61}

Third, the concepts of “relative” and “relational” demonstrate that there appear “different” and “multiple” spaces-times within and between certain variable entities, such as bodies, buildings, cities, regions, or nations. This means that multiple spaces-times can coexist at the same point, and this point can be simultaneously located in different spaces-times.\textsuperscript{62}

To sum up, space and time should not be separated from, but combined with each other, and the concept of space-time is to be understood not as absolute, linear, and fixed, but as heterogeneous, relation, multiple, and dynamic. Moreover, space-time should be understood, not as a fixed framework of motion, but rather as a dynamic event in motion. These observations will be clearer when we look into the works of Deleuze and Guattari, Latour, and Bakhtin, who relate space-time to the dynamic event and its nomadic flows and movements.


\textsuperscript{60}Lefebvre, The Production of Space, p. 21.


\textsuperscript{62}The city itself can be seen as comprising multiple “chronotopes,” in Bakhtinian terms, which consist of manifold and heterogeneous time-spaces with different speeds, diverse cycles, and various rhythms, not in terms of a monopolist or homogeneous time-space. As Crang (2001) argues, “We need to refigure the idea of the urban not as a singular abstract temporality but as the site where multiple temporalities collide”. The city occupies a “time out of joint.” In addition, in such different and multiple time-spaces, the city has what Massey (1993, 1994) calls a “power-geometry,” and this can be seen in terms of “spatial digital divides” as “fourth intervals.”
1.3.2.2 Deleuze and Guattari's rhizome

In their book, *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze and Guattari argue that, just as the tree sprouts from a single seed, produces a trunk, and continuously branches out, growing and spreading vertically, and can be traced back to a single point of origin, so also all of Western thought is inherently arborescent. Within this framework, they describe the system of the tree's roots as linear, hierarchic, sedentary, striated, territorialized, closed, unitary, binary, homogenous, and genealogical. In contrast to arborescent structures, they claim, for the roots, "The multiple must *be made*, not by always adding a higher dimension," but always by $n-1$. Though the actual word $n-1$ is missing, as we shall see, such an idea or theme is clearly related to the theme of emptying oneself (cf. Lk 9:23-24), selling possessions (cf. Lk. 14:33; 18:22; 19:8) or that of release in Luke-Acts (cf. 4:18-19). The rhizome is the central fabric that they use to explain this multiplicity. They write, "A rhizome as a subterranean stem is absolutely different from roots and radicles. Bulbs and tubers are rhizomes."

Several features of the rhizome are worth noting here, beginning with *connection and heterogeneity*. Unlike trees or their roots (which have a fixed and static order), the rhizome connects any point to any other point. A rhizome has no beginning, end or center, but passes between things and between points, indicating that it spreads continuously and exists in a constant state of motion. The third important feature is *multiplicity*. The rhizome is not the One that becomes Two, and has neither subject nor object. It is composed, not of units, but of dimensions or directions *in motion*. That is, the rhizomatic system comprises a multiplicity of lines and connections. The fourth quality is *asignifying rupture*: "a rhizome may be broken, shattered at a given spot, but it will start up again on one of its old lines, or on new lines." The fifth and sixth features are *cartography* and *decalcomania*. A tracing is arborescent, genetic, and genealogical. Conversely, the rhizome is presented as a map that is open and connectable in all of its dimensions, and that has
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67 Ibid., pp. 8-9.
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70 A tracing is a fixed way, where there is only one fixed way to enter and exit.
multiple entryways and exits, and its own lines of flight. That is, the rhizome and the nomadic event of flows move in multiple directions and connect to many other lines, creating smooth space and deterritorializing strata and hierarchies.

1.3.2.3 Latour’s Actor-Network Theory

In his actor-network theory (ANT), Latour does not distinguish between subjects and objects or the subjective and the objective, but recognizes the relationships between human actors and non-human participants, describing them all as actants by which different and multiple spaces and times are produced. Latour writes:

Gods, angels, spheres, doves, plants, steam engines, are not in space and do not age in time. On the contrary, spaces and times are traced by reversible or irreversible displacements of many types of mobile. They [spaces and times] are generated by the movements of mobiles, they do not frame these movements. (Latour 1988a: 25)

That is, space and time are no longer conceptualized as a static frame of reference inside which events and places would occur; rather, they are produced as the result of the interactions between actors or actants. And this event cannot be split into spatial and temporal components. In relation to the dynamic flows of space-time, we can outline a few main characteristics of ANT.

First, actor-network theory is constituted not in terms of two-dimensional space (surfaces), but rather in terms of one-dimensional space, in the sense of interconnected lines (spaces). Latour states, “To have transformed the social from what was a surface, a territory, a province of reality, into a circulation, is what I think has been the most useful contribution of ANT”. Second, ANT refuses the binary, linear,
and hierarchical spatial relations between the outside and the inside. If network boundaries exist, they are defined by ideas of connection and disconnection in relational networks, rather than distinctions between outside and inside. Third, though actor-networks are assembled of materials or circulations — so-called immutable mobiles — it is presented as the translation of networks, signifying fluid spaces. Fourth, it tends to be open-ended, and can be seen in terms of empty spaces that are open for change.

1.3.2.4 Bakhtin and dialogical space

The central feature of Bakhtin's writings is the theory of dialogical space, expressed in terms of Self-Other relationships, as the relational positions of everyday life. Bakhtin uses the example of two people facing each other to illustrate the multiple different social positions that they adopt, and this represents the fundamental relationship between Self and Other. Bakhtin makes two claims (I need the other in order to create a sense of Self and I cannot become myself without another) to show that the Self is nothing in itself, and means nothing without the outsideness provided by the Other. Furthermore, once we (the "self") stop responding to the world (the "other"), we cease to be. In this sense, language should be taken in all its dynamism and mutability: the "living impulse" of language is to mark our vital engagement with the world. Bakhtin further describes language as both a dialogical process and a space, suggesting that language does not stand outside time, but is bound into the times and spaces of action. He embeds all language in the context of the utterance, which is constructed of three terms: the speaker(s), the audience(s) and the
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78 B. Latour, Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987). Law and Hetherington state, "The immutable mobile is a network of elements that holds its shape as it moves" (Law and Hetherington, 2000).
79 These "actants" are figures which are able to make shifts in space and time; hence their capacity to act. Latour's ANT helps us rethinking spaces-times not as closed, but open, and journeying in a world which unfolds by way of mediation, transformation, and circulation: as a way, that is, of getting to grips with a world always on the move.
80 B. Latour, "On recalling ANT" in Actor Network Theory and After, edited by J. Law, and J. Hassard (Oxford: Blackwell, 1999), p. 19. Law calls such a replaceable and changeable network space "fluid space" in which "objects hold themselves constant in a process in which new relations come into being because they are reconfigurations of existing elements, or because they include new elements" (Law, 2000: 99; see also Law and Mol, 2001; Mol and Law, 1994).
82 Crang and Thrift, Thinking Space, p. 76
relationship between them. Not only is the utterance the basic unit of speech, but it is also always situated in the context of social space and time, and discloses the particular position of the speaker. One may respond to this, and so adopt a responsive position\(^3\) that creates multiple times and spaces.

1.3.3 Theoretical conclusions
As opposed to a tree-root system, which is depicted as linear, hierarchic, sedentary, striated, territorialized, closed, unitary/binary, homogenous, and genealogical, rhizomatic thought is non-linear, anarchic, nomadic, smooth, deterritorialized, opened, multiplicitous, heterogenous, and non-genealogical. Similarly, the actor-network theory is presented as dynamic, fluid and open, changing configurations constantly through changing networks. These two theories together are known as the actant-rhizome.\(^4\) Moreover, as Bakhtin’s dialogical theory indicates, a multiplicity in space-time is produced by the ongoing dialogical interaction between speaker(s) and audience(s), and the relations that exist between them. What this all means is that space-time need no longer be presented as a static container of actions, or a fixed framework of motions, but rather as a dynamic event in motion. In this respect, Crang claims that while space and time are combined with each other, space-time should be understood as dynamic, flowing, being-toward, and in motion.\(^5\) Now, based on this critical methodology, we can reexamine the model of Luke’s spatial-temporal understanding proposed by scholars.

1.4 Luke’s presentation of the geographical structure of Jesus’ ministry\(^6\)
In this section I propose to rethink Luke’s spatial-temporal perceptions not in terms of either time or space, but both time and space. Also, space-time should not be viewed as a static container of motion, or a fixed framework of action, but rather as something in motion, becoming, and flowing. Hence, Luke’s geography should not be understood in terms of the static names, boundaries, or territories of local regions (i.e.


\(^4\)May and Thrift, *TimeSpace*, p. 27.


\(^6\)Conzelmann provides extensive details of Luke’s geographical elements, but he only focuses on the static names of local regions, i.e. their inert boundaries and territories (Conzelmann, *The Theology of Luke*, pp. 18-94).
Galilee, Samaria, Judea, Jerusalem), but rather in terms of the salvational event in motion, and its dynamic and nomadic flows and movements that takes place in, in-between, among, around, and/or beyond regions. In other words, as we shall see, Luke presents each of the local regions as a dynamic salvational site where multiple saving events occur, and as an intersection where all sorts of people come and experience salvation, by which means the soteriological space-time (kingdom) of God unfolds and expands. As the nomadic event of flows – the movements from one place to another – shows, each salvational site within a region becomes one of God’s new saving spaces-times, and becomes linked to other dynamic sites within the region and other regions. This means that Luke’s conception of space-time is flexible and fluid, and Luke’s theory of salvation should be viewed as a dynamic event in motion. That is, Luke depicts the salvific sites as forming a new divine network (kingdom), crisscrossing the region. As Luke unfolds his narratives, Jesus’ ministry was not limited or controlled by the static spaces-times defined by the temple authorities.

1.4.1 The dynamic movements of Jesus’ ministry from Galilee to Jerusalem

The itinerary of Jesus’ public ministry, i.e. his salvational journey from Galilee to Jerusalem, is generally described as follows: (1) Galilee (4:14-9:50) (2) Samaria (9:51-17:11) (3) Judea/Jerusalem (17:11-21:38). Schürmann, however, prefers a two-part division, distinguishing between the beginning of the ministry in Galilee (3:1-4:44) and its main course in Judea as a whole (5:1-19:27). Fitzmyer, on the other hand, prefers a threefold geographic division: (1) the Galilean ministry (4:14-9:50) (2) the journey to Jerusalem (through Samaria and Judea, but not through Perea, 9:51-
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87 In his book, Geography in Early Judaism and Christianity: The Book of Jubilees, James Scott links Jesus’ genealogy in Luke 3:23-38 with the Genesis 10 tradition reflected in Jubilees 8-9 (the Table of Nations), and concludes, “Luke emphasizes the nations of the world in a way that reflects a fundamental engagement with the OT account of the postdiluvian origins of the nations....For Luke, the promised inclusion of the nations in Israel’s return and restoration had already begun” (pp. 95-96). A strong case can be made for the link between Luke’s geographical elements and the Book of Jubilees (8-9), as Scott argues. However, Luke’s geographical view, as I have already noted, is (1) not a system of static boundaries or territories of nations, but a nomadic event of flows and movements in, in-between, among, and/or beyond nations that is in motion; (2) not a static genealogy (bloodline), but an anti-genealogy. In relation to salvation and the kingdom, Jesus states, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it” (Luke 8:21). Indeed, such a statement deterritorializes the static hierarchies of genealogy or bloodline (Green, Luke, p. 330); Malina, “Clean and Unclean: Understanding Rules of Purity” in The New Testament World, pp. 161-196). As I have already noted, there is no longer the insider (Jews) and the outsider (Gentiles/nations), but a dynamic relationship between them.


89 Schürmann, Lukas, I:256f.
19:27) (3) the Jerusalem ministry (19:28-21:38). By dividing Jesus’ ministry between two or three fixed local regions, these scholars minimize the dynamic and nomadic mobiles and movements of Jesus’ ministry, as if it were a series of separate events transpiring in places isolated from one another.

However, as we shall see, the reason Luke mentions the names of local places is not to focus on the static boundaries demarcating Galilee, Samaria, Judea, and Jerusalem, as though the salvational event simply passes from one place to another, but rather to accentuate the nomadic event of flows from one place to another. Notice that such a nomadic event of flows deterritorializes the hierarchical and binary system of the temple, and creates the new salvational space-time (kingdom) of God, where all sorts of people come and interact with God, and multiple points of access to salvation and to God. Thus, the salvational event(s) and its nomadic fluxes conveyed by Jesus should not be spatialized within fixed territories, as though access to salvation were limited by a given space-time. Rather, it should be understood as opened and deterritorialized, and as a dynamic event in motion. Such a conclusion will be borne out when we look into Luke’s inconsistent treatment of local names.

1.4.2 Static names (representations) of place in Luke

In contrast to Mark and Matthew, Luke introduces Judea as the active site where Jesus preaches the kingdom of God. As the locative εἰς indicates, Luke clearly places Jesus in Judea (Luke 4:43-44; cf. 4:18). But this positioning brings confusion to some scholars. Johnson asks, “Is this an example of Luke’s geographical ignorance? Is he using ‘Judea’ for the whole of Palestine inclusively, as ‘the land of the Jews’? Or is he simply nodding?” Likewise, Fitzmyer asks, “Does he want the reader to conclude that Jesus has left Galilee or not?” As with other scholars, Fitzmyer sees Judea as a general term referring to the whole of Palestine,
including Galilee. But by using the term Judea in 4:44 as opposed to Galilee, Schürmann justifies dividing Jesus' ministry into two parts: Galilee (3:1-4:44), and Judea (5:1-19:27). Though he views Judea as a general term, Conzelmann uses this data to show Luke's ignorance of local names. Again, these scholars have difficulty in understanding Luke's treatment of Judea in 4:44 because they focus on the static names, boundaries and territories of the local regions, seeing Jesus' preaching of the kingdom of God by passing from one place to another as signifying a quantitative change. Such a view seems to fall apart when we look at the salvational event of flows performed and created by Jesus.

In opposition to the above scholars, I propose that Luke's treatment of Judea in Luke 4:44 serves not to highlight the static names, boundaries, or territories of the local places, but to accentuate the active site where Jesus proclaims the kingdom of God, and expresses its nomadic movements. This means that each dynamic site in the region evokes the saving event and its nomadic flows, triggered by Jesus. That is, as opposed to the Jerusalem Temple, Luke pictures the salvific sites as a divine network (kingdom) crisscrossing the people and God. For example, in Luke 5:17, though Luke locates Jesus in Galilee, all sorts of people come to Jesus from "every village of Galilee and Judea, and from Jerusalem." Luke also states that a great crowd of Jesus' disciples and a great multitude of people come to Jesus "from all over Judea, and from Jerusalem" (Luke 6:17). Such a phenomenon is described thus: "the word about him [Jesus] spread from/to Judea and all the surrounding country." Moreover, Luke states, "But now more than ever the word about Jesus spread abroad; many crowds would gather to hear him and to be cured of their diseases" (Luke 5:15). All these mean that the people, who positively responded to Jesus and his message, now act and move around Jesus and his words by which the new salvational space-time (kingdom-network) is created and unfolded.

Certain elements need to be noted about Luke's treatment of this story. First, the word about Jesus, and Jesus himself, are interconnected, and together they create a single salvational event. Note also that, just as the function of the word about Jesus
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98 Conzelmann, Luke, pp. 68-73; cf. p. 41 n.1. Moreover, he argues that for Luke, "Galilee" has no fundamental significance as a local region. He writes, "It is Judea that has a significance of its own as a locality, especially Jerusalem as the place of the Temple" (Luke, p. 41).
going out into various regions is to invite people to Jesus to be saved, so also the purpose of people's coming to Jesus from various regions is to be saved (cf. Luke 5:15; 6:18). Indeed, as God sent Jesus to release people from various forms of captivity and oppression, 100 many people are released from various forms of physically or spiritually related sicknesses when Jesus touches them, 101 or when they touch Jesus. 102 Such an act of touching or being touched can be described as a spatializing action, i.e. a saving event through which people move and act. This means that, just as the ideas of coming, departing, and touching are pictured as reciprocal events, so also the salvific event is to be understood as a relational event in which people come and experience salvation. In this sense, Jesus, or the saving event itself, can be pictured as a divine network, or a salvational node through which one can be linked to the kingdom of God.

In short, whereas scholars emphasize the static names, boundaries, and/or territories of the local regions, as if the salvational event just passes from Galilee to Jerusalem, Luke emphasizes the salvational event and its nomadic flows from one place to another, events by which people move and act and by which a new space-time (kingdom) of God is created and expanded.

1.4.3 Jerusalem as an intersected site between beginning and ending

Several scholars argue that Luke represents Jerusalem as the static final destination of Jesus' ministry. 103 Fitzmyer notes that Luke presents the city of Jerusalem as the final destination or the fixed ending of Jesus' ministry. Unlike the other evangelists, Luke indeed begins his narrative (Luke 1:9) and ends it (Luke 24:53) with a scene in Jerusalem. His preoccupation with Jerusalem is expressed in Luke 4:1-13. Luke also draws explicit attention to Jesus' determination to go up to Jerusalem from Galilee: “As the days were drawing near when he was to be taken up, he set his face resolutely toward Jerusalem” (Luke 9:51). 104 Luke is evidently concerned to move Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem, the city of destiny. For example, Luke portrays Jesus as someone who has been stirring people up throughout Judea with his teaching. He states, “He began in Galilee and has come even here” (Luke 23:5). Likewise, he

102Luke 6:19; 8:44, 45, 46, 47.
presents the Son of Man as someone who has been determined to make his way to Jerusalem (Luke 22:22). Thus, the geographical movement of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem clearly relates to Luke’s theological preoccupation with displaying the interconnection between the two. Conzelmann regards the so-called travel narrative as a progress toward the Passion. But Fitzmyer argues that it is to be viewed as “the complex of events that form Jesus’ transit to the Father: passion, death, burial, resurrection, ascension, and exaltation.” Yet what is the function of these geographical (spatial-temporal) movements in relation to salvation? What does each of the events signify, particularly in relation to the destruction of the temple?

Fitzmyer writes, “It [Jerusalem] is not merely the place where Jesus suffered, died, and was raised to glory; it is also the place where salvation itself has been accomplished once and for all and from which preordained witnesses carry forth the kerygma about it.” But Fitzmyer does not clarify what he means by salvation itself. He seems to overemphasize the idea of “Jerusalem” as the only fixed territory where “salvation itself” is accomplished, and the role of Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension, as if “salvation itself” was fulfilled only at the fixed moment (space-time) of Jesus’ death and resurrection. But keep in mind that, for Luke, salvation already has been revealed and granted during the ministry of Jesus and prior to his death and resurrection, and has taken place outside the city and the temple of Jerusalem.

Furthermore, Fitzmyer undermines the important relationship between Jesus’ death and the symbolic destruction of the temple, and between Jesus’ resurrection and ascension, as well as the coming of the Holy Spirit. How could the new salvational network of God (i.e. the kingdom of God) brought by Jesus from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside) and carried on by his disciples from Jerusalem (inside) to the ends of the earth (outside), regenerate old Jewish interpretations of God’s salvation and not deal with the Jerusalem temple? Thus, there is a strong link between the act of Jesus’ going up to Jerusalem (his death, resurrection, and ascension) and the symbolic destruction of the Jerusalem temple, which Jesus already anticipates when he proclaims the kingdom of God and release from sins to the poor, the blind, the captive.

---

106 Conzelmann, Theology, p. 63.
108 Ibid., p. 165.
109 See below.
and the oppressed. In other words, Luke presents Jerusalem not as a final or fixed territory where salvation itself is fulfilled, but as a junction or crisscross where the outside (Galilee, Judea and/or Samaria) and inside (Jerusalem) overlap and intersect, where the departure of Jesus (his death, resurrection and ascension) and the coming of the Holy Spirit (the spirit of Jesus) intersect, and where the hierarchical and binary system of the temple is deterritorialized, and recreated as a deterritorialized, opened, and heterogeneous space administered by God.

Just as Luke equates the city of Jerusalem with the temple of Jerusalem, so he also describes Jesus' arrival at the city of Jerusalem as Jesus' entry into the temple. For this reason, Luke links a prophetic oracle threatening the city (19:41-44) to Jesus' dramatic and symbolic act of censure and the recovery of the temple at Luke 19:45-46. Also, in contradistinction to Matthew's sequence of desert, pinnacle of the temple, high mountain (Mt. 4:1-11), Luke has the sequence desert, elevation of Jesus, pinnacle of the temple (Lk. 4:1-13) so climaxing with the Jerusalem temple. With regard to Luke's idea of salvation, we need to think that the primary aim of Jesus' going up from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside) is to break and deterritorialize the hierarchical and binary system of the temple, and the static boundaries and territories between inside and outside created by the temple authorities, who upheld and promoted the rules of purity. Thus, the aim of Jesus' going up to Jerusalem is to replace God's old system of the temple with the new network brought by Jesus.

That is, inside (the temple) becomes outside (the wilderness) and outside becomes

---


111 E. Schweizer, TDNT, 6:406.

112 See Chapter 2.


114 See below.

115 I will pick up this theme and explore it in chapter 3.

116 Luke 20:9-19; cf. 13:6-9; 19:45-46. Just as the tenants refer to the temple authorities including the scribes (20:19), so also the vineyard represents the temple where they exercise their power and authority (see below).

117 Jesus states, "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city [the temple] that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing! See, your house is left to you. And I tell you, you will not see me until the time comes when you say, 'Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord'" (Luke 13:34-35). In line with Jeremiah 22:5, some mss. (D, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, etc.) add the adj. ἔπως (desolate, deserted) in Lk. 13:35. Though it may well refer to the people (as in Luke 1:27, 33,
inside as the hostile Jews said, “They [Jason and his brothers] turn the world upside down” (Acts 17:6)\textsuperscript{118} displaying that the role of the saving network is reversed.

This means that the static salvational system of the temple is deterritorialized and replaced with the kingdom of God (the \textit{new} dynamic network) brought by Jesus. Moreover, we must acknowledge that such a phenomenon does not merely refer to a role reversal, but also signifies that there is no longer an \textit{inside} or an \textit{outside} in the dynamic network (kingdom) of God planted by Jesus, but a reciprocal \textit{relationship} between God and the people and between the people themselves. This can be deduced from the narratives of Jesus’ birth, death, and resurrection. For example, just as Jesus’ death signifies the ending/departure of his physical life, so the symbolic destruction of the temple of Jerusalem signifies the end of its hierarchical and binary order or system. In this sense, Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension are closely related to the coming of the Holy Spirit. In addition, where Jerusalem was once known as Jesus’ \textit{final} destination, it now becomes the \textit{new} starting-point of God’s salvation and kingdom, which geographically extends to the ends of the earth. Jesus states, “You will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth” (Acts 1:8). Thus, Luke does not present Jerusalem as the \textit{final} place, a fixed territory, but as a \textit{junction} or \textit{intersection}, where \textit{inside} and \textit{outside} overlap to create the deterritorialized and heterogeneous space of God.

In conclusion, the salvational process, and its \textit{nomadic} movements from Galilee (\textit{outside}) to Jerusalem (\textit{inside}), deterritorialize the hierarchical and binary system of the temple of Jerusalem, and produce multiple points of access to salvation. Thus, Luke’s aim is not to present Jerusalem as the \textit{final} destination, a static territory where Jesus fulfils the promise of \textit{salvation itself}, but to mark Jerusalem out as a \textit{junction} or \textit{crossway} – where \textit{outside} and \textit{inside} intersect to create the heterogeneous and opened space of God – that is as something \textit{in motion}. In other words, in God’s \textit{new} network of salvation there is no longer an \textit{inside} or an \textit{outside}, but rather a


dynamic and relational (not hierarchical, but reciprocal relationship) space where all sorts of people come and interact with Jesus, with God, and with one another.

1.4.4 Jerusalem as a new salvational site of the ministry of Jesus’ disciples

Luke represents Jerusalem as a new beginning. Indeed, Jerusalem is described as the new starting-point of God’s salvation and kingdom. As I have already noted, by representing salvation as a dynamic and fluid act, Luke also represents the active sites of the regions of Jesus’ ministry (Galilee, Judea, Samaria, and Jerusalem) as an active network in motion. In Luke’s writings, the pivotal position of Jerusalem is important because it is related to “the events that have come to fulfillment among us” (Luke 1:1), which define salvation as a nomadic event of flows triggered by Jesus (Acts 1:1) and his disciples, starting again from Jerusalem and extending to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8). Within this structure, Jesus commissions his disciples to preach release of sins to all nations, beginning with Jerusalem (Luke 24:47), and commands them to be his witnesses both in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the remotest part of the earth (Acts1:8). Just as they are commissioned to do, the disciples preach and perform soteriological events from Jerusalem to outer Judea and Samaria (Acts 1:8; 8:1, 5, 26), to Galilee (9:31), and to Rome.

Two observations need to be made about this. (1) Jesus’ disciples preach and perform the soteriological events in the name of Jesus, and under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. (2) At first, their activities revolve around the temple, as they have begun their activities in the temple (Luke 24:53). However, the purpose of their going to the temple is to speak to the people about the salvational network (the kingdom of God) brought by Jesus (Acts 5:20). Thus, as in the case of Stephen, who is charged with uttering blasphemous words against Moses (i.e. the law) and God (i.e. the temple) and is killed (Acts 6:11-14; 7:54, 57-59), Paul is expelled from the temple, and also accused of preaching against the law and the temple. (3) Luke pictures Jerusalem as a divine salvific site criss-crossing the other salvational sites. (4)
Just as Jesus' death was thought to be the end of his life and ministry, so also Jerusalem, which was thought to be the final point in the journey, becomes a new starting point, and Jerusalem becomes a dynamic space in motion.

1.5 An Initial Test Case

In this section, I will revisit the treatment of Luke’s soteriological terms and themes proposed by scholars, and reexamine it from the new geographical perspective on Luke. That is, I will rethink Luke’s theory of salvation in terms of space-time. When we examine Luke’s linguistic treatment of the ideas of salvation, as demonstrated in the birth narratives and Jesus’ public mission statements, we can see again that Marshall is right to claim that the idea of salvation is the key to Luke’s theology.  

Indeed, many scholars have observed the significance of the motif of salvation by examining Luke’s application(s) of salvific terms and themes. But, like other scholars, Marshall made his claims without exploring the importance of Luke’s spatial-temporal perspective, which would have elucidated Luke’s perception of salvation. Thus, in this section, I will revisit and re-evaluate Luke’s soteriology by reexamining Luke’s application of salvific terms and themes in the context of space-time, a concept that influenced and shaped his soteriology.

1.5.1 The Issues of Terminology

The theme of salvation is initially suggested by Luke’s distinctive use of redemptive language in his writings in comparison with the other gospels. As in Matthew and Mark, Luke-Acts the term ὁσούσιν ἐλευθερίαν means to save or release people from...
sins, sicknesses from the corrupt generation (Acts 2:40), danger, perishing, or dying, and is used in close connection to entering the kingdom of God (18:26). What is unique in Luke is that the word σωτηρία is used in connection with what Marshall describes as *spiritual salvation*. Interestingly, only Luke explicitly links the term σωτηρία to the multiple layers of release: release from sins, social stigma (19:10), demon activity (8:12), and “demon-possessions” (8:36). This is reconfirmed by Luke’s characteristic use of the noun σωτηρία in 1:69, where Luke interconnects salvation and the release from sins. In fact, the meaning of σωτηρία is release from sins in Acts, as it is in Luke.

Furthermore, by applying σωτηρία to Jesus, Luke also interlocks the one who saves (2:11) with the one who releases sins. Just as Luke applies σωτηρία to God (1:47) and Jesus, so he alone attributes the adjective σωτήριον (saving, bringing salvation) to God, by describing God as the one who bestows salvation. What is to be noted here is that the terms σωτήρ, σωτηρία, σωτήριον, and σωτήρ are used to refer to “spatializing actions,” which signify the salvational event(s) and the unfolding of the nomadic event of flows and movements from one sphere to another that constitute the new salvational network (or kingdom) of God, which connects the saviours (God and Jesus) and the ones who are being saved. Note also that only Luke uses the words λυτρόν (to liberate, in Luke 24:21), λυτρωτής (liberator, in Acts 7:35), λύτρωσις (setting free, in Luke 1:68; 2:38), and ἀπολύτρωσις (release, in Luke 21:28).

is to be noted here, as the use of σωτήρ and σωτηρία in LXX indicate, is that this idea of salvation discloses the dynamic movement of God’s saving flows or acts from one sphere to another.

---

131 Luke 7:50; cf. 4:18; 5:20; 24:47.
136 Note that the word λυτρόν in Luke 24:21 may need to be translated as “to liberate/deliver Israel” from the foreign power, the power of Rome (cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, pp.1564-1565), describing a salvational action as a lively event of movements from one place to another. Lk 2:38 may well be understood in a similar manner to Lk 24:21. In LXX, the word λυτρόν used in Lk 24:21 is expressed as to deliver or liberate God’s people, Israel, from the burdens and slavery of Egypt (cf. Ex 6:6; Deu 7:8; 9:26; 15:15; 21:8; 24:18; 1Ch 17:21; Ps 25:22; Is 41:14). It is also connected to ritual purification (Lev 19:20), and the year of Jubilee (cf. Lev 25:25, 30, 33, 48, 49, 54). In LXX, the word λυτρωσις is used in close connection to the year of Jubilee (cf. Lev 25:29, 48; Is 63:4).
Interestingly, the word λύτρωσις in Luke 1:68 interacts with other salvific words (i.e. visitation, salvation, release from sins, and deliverance), which unfolds the multiple layers of salvation. These words are also described as spatializing actions, in this case referring to releasing people from their enemies and from those who hate them (1:71, 74), releasing them from sins (1:77), and liberating them from darkness and the shadow of death in order to attain light and peace (1:79).

In short, Luke's distinctive use of salvific language, and particularly how he links salvation to the multiple layers of release, suggests that salvation plays a centrally important role in his writings. Also, the various salvific terms that he employs disclose his belief in the multiple layers of salvation, and are described as spatializing actions, i.e. actions that animate the network of salvation that proliferates between God and his people. By describing God and Jesus as saviours who act, Luke anticipates, even at this early stage, that: (1) God saves through Jesus, whom God has appointed as a savior and Lord (Luke 2:11); and that (2) the new saving space (i.e. kingdom) of God produced by Jesus is no longer place-bound by the static conditions of space and time, "here" and "there," as the temple of Jerusalem is, but is a dynamic and relational event in motion. Moreover, what stands behind all these spatial terms or actions – αἰρετέω, σωτηρία, σωτήριον, σωτήρ, λυτρώω, λυτρωτής, λύτρωσις, and

---

137 Luke 1:68, 78. The word ἐπισκέπτομαι, to visit, is used with λύτρωσις in 1:68 and with the phrase "to give light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace" in 1:79 (cf. LXX Ps 106:10, 14; Is 59:8) signifying the same soteriological event of God.


139 Luke 1:77; cf. Lk 4:18; 24:47.

140 Luke 1:74. The purpose of Israel "being delivered" (ῥύομαι) from the hands of her enemies is so that Israelites can serve or worship God, as the infinitive "to serve" indicates (1:74). Such a term should be understood as referring to the relationship between God and God's people.

141 Interestingly, at the outset Luke seems to depict the sphere of darkness and death as a motionless place of exclusion or desolation, where the poor, the sick, and the sinful are situated (Luke 1:79; cf. Luke 18:35; Acts 3:10). He describes these people as motionless and out of place, that is, outside God's salvation (cf. 1:68, 78; 7:16; 19:44; Acts 7:23; 15:14). For example, when a dead man was being carried out from the gate of Nain, Jesus saw the mother of the dead son and felt compassion for her (7:11-17). Touching the coffin, Jesus said, "Young man, I say to you, arise!" (7:14), and the dead man was raised from the dead. To put it differently, through the soteriological event articulated by Jesus, a motionless (dead) man becomes in motion (alive). As a result, people who saw this glorified God and said, "God has visited God's people" (7:16). Both the word ἀρτω in 7:15 and ἐπισκέπτομαι in 7:16 are understood as "spatializing actions," referring to the soteriological event by which the new relational space between God, Jesus, the dead man, his mother, and the multitude is created. In contrast, Luke anticipates that this sphere of exclusion/desolation is to become the open space of inclusion and peace, as God visits and touches those who are trapped in desolate places. Luke's treatment of the saving words to visit, to give light, and to guide points in this direction.

142 We will see that the soteriological operation of God's salvation is no longer limited to or territorialized in a fixed/given place like the temple of Jerusalem, suggesting that God's redemptive activity is no longer located at or confined within a static/fixed territory with a boundary controlled by the temple authorities.
_apologiropos_ — is the _nomadic_ event of flows and motions that unfolds the multi-dimensions of _salvation_ and moves in multiple directions. Such a conclusion pictures _salvation_ as a constant or eternal _state_ of movements and proliferations and as a _dynamic event in motion, becoming, and being-toward._

1.5.2 The Infancy Narratives

In previous sections I have proposed that we rethink our understanding of Luke’s depictions of Jesus’ spatial-temporal movements from Galilee to Jerusalem, and from there to the ends of the earth, seeing them as something _in motion_. Likewise, I proposed that we rethink _salvation_ as a dynamic event, _in motion, flowing, and becoming_. Also, I have suggested that Luke represents _Jerusalem_, not as a _final_ or fixed territory of Jesus’ ministry, but as a _junction_ or a crisscrossed site, where _beginning_ (life) and _ending_ (death) cross over and where _inside_ and _outside_ intersect and overlap, to create a _relational_ and _deterritorialized_ space-time (kingdom) of God.\(^\text{144}\) What is important here is to note that these concepts are already anticipated in the Infant Narrative, where Luke introduces his understanding of space-time and anticipates its later treatment. Indeed, Luke intentionally begins his gospel with the event of salvation revealed through the Infant Narratives (cf. Luke 1:5-2:52).\(^\text{145}\)

Luke starts his narratives with accounts of two births: the birth of John the Baptist and that of Jesus. Though the actual term _salvation_ does not appear in these birth narratives, we will see that the soteriological phenomenon is clearly presupposed and expressed. In the account of John’s birth (1:5-25), Luke reports that although Elizabeth was a righteous person before God (1:6), she was regarded as a _disgrace_.


\(^\text{144}\) Chapter 2.

\(^\text{145}\) Green, _Luke_, pp. 47ff. Note also that just as Luke begins the birth narratives (i.e. the coming of John the Baptist and that of Jesus), so also he ends his gospel with the story of the resurrection (Lk 24:1-49), another form of _new birth and life_, and links it to the coming of the Holy Spirit (24:49).
among men (1:25) because she was barren, describing her womb as a motionless or closed system. By giving a child to Elizabeth, God delivers Elizabeth from her disgrace among men, and represents this salvational event as a nomadic movement from one sphere (closed) to another (opened). For this reason, Elizabeth praises God by saying: “This is the way the Lord has dealt with me in the days when He looked with favour upon me, to take away my disgrace among men” (Luke 1:25).

Note that the story of John’s birth, articulated by Gabriel in 1:13, is visualized by the physical birth (1:56), meaning that the word and the act are described as the same salvational event. By bringing a new life (space) both inside Elizabeth’s womb (a closed-motionless place) and outside her womb (an opened-moving space), a relational space between child and mother is established. Not only does John’s birth bring salvation, i.e. a new life-movement, to his parents, but also the joy of salvation will be extended to many people through John the Baptist (1:14). In other words, through John’s saving connection with other people, the folded space-time of God’s salvation will unfold and spread. Indeed, Luke portrays John as the one who is destined to “turn back many of the sons of Israel to the Lord their God” (1:16) and to give “knowledge of salvation” (1:77). Thus, this phenomenon of salvation interacts with a spatializing action to create a new reciprocal network, between God and the people, and among the people themselves.

Several observations need to be made. First, God’s revelation about John’s birth takes place in the temple of Jerusalem. Second, the word about John’s birth does not come directly to Elizabeth; rather, the angel appears to Zechariah, who represents the temple authorities, and who stands to the right of the altar of incense (1:11), and reveals that Elizabeth, who was barren, will bear a son. But Zechariah,

---

146 Childlessness was viewed as a disgrace (cf. Gen 16:4, 11; 29:32; 30:1; 1 Sam 1:5–6, 11; 2:5, 7–8). Marshall notes that in contrast to having a child, which is a sign of blessing (Gen 1:18; Pss. 127, 128), the idea of barrenness may well be viewed as a sign of divine punishment. Luke, p. 53.

147 Interestingly, the author of 1 Timothy claims that women shall be saved through the bearing of children (cf. 1 Timothy 2:15) reflecting a view of those who lived in the first century.


150 The term ἀνατριχία (return) used in 1:16 has a soteriological reality (cf. Luke 1:17; 8:55; 17:4; Acts 3:19; 9:35; 11:21; 15:19; 26:18, 20) implying an act of creative separation from one reality to another. Through an act of separating, as a means of restoring or releasing, many unbelieving sons of God from the Lord God, a new space of God is created.
who represents the *old* system of the temple, does not believe in the angel (Luke 1:18). As a result, Gabriel punishes Zechariah with “dumbness,” and temporarily excludes him from God’s plan, until it is fulfilled (1:20). Furthermore, although some words pass between Gabriel and Zechariah, they take the form of a monologue in which the voice of Gabriel, who represents God, simply informs Zechariah what will happen to Elizabeth. For this reason, Elizabeth is silent until she is pregnant (1:24-25), as if she has no place to speak in this whole process. As this analysis indicates, the whole process is represented as a hierarchical system, and a case can be made that Elizabeth’s closed, folded, and motionless womb may well symbolize the closed, territorialized, and sedentary system of the Jerusalem Temple, which is barren and does not bear fruit. In this regard, John the Baptist, who represents the *old* epoch (that is, the *old* system of the temple of Jerusalem), criticizes the multitudes that come to him by saying, “Bear fruits worthy of repentance. Do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our ancestor’; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham” (Luke 3:8).

In contrast to the way in which he announces the birth to Elizabeth, Gabriel comes directly to Mary, who is described as the lowest of God’s maidservants (1:48). In addition, God’s revelation about Jesus, whom God appoints the Saviour, Christ the Lord (2:11), takes place in the city of Nazareth, in Galilee, i.e. *outside* the temple of Jerusalem. That is, a *new* salvational route to God is created. For this reason, as Luke unfolds his narrative, all sorts of people come to and revolve around Jesus. In contrast to the meeting with Zechariah, who represents the authority of the temple, there is *dialogue* between Gabriel and Mary. When Gabriel reveals God’s universal plan of salvation at Luke 1:30-33, Mary says, “How can this be, since I am a virgin?” Gabriel then explains how God will fulfill his plan in Luke 1:35, and says, “For nothing will be impossible with God” (1:37). After Gabriel says this, Gabriel awaits Mary’s response, as if God were waiting for Mary’s permission to implement the coming of Jesus, through whom God will save God’s people, through Mary’s womb. In response to Gabriel, Mary then says, “Here am I, the servant of the Lord; let it be with me according to your word” (1:38). When Mary gives her acceptance to Gabriel, Gabriel leaves her (1:38). Notice here that Mary’s act is viewed as a gesture

---

151Luke 1:34.
As opposed to Elizabeth, not only does Mary have her own voice and place in the whole process, but also God invites her to participate in the decision-making about Jesus' coming. Unlike Zechariah, God does not force Mary, or inform what will happen to her, but invites her to make her own decision. That is, the coming of Jesus is the outcome of a mutual decision, or dialogical production, between God and Mary. Notice that this is not a hierarchical image of God, but a non-hierarchical one. This new image of God is powerful, and breaks the old, static image of God, and anticipates the renewal of the old hierarchical system of the temple of Jerusalem through the relational network brought by Jesus.

As in the case of John's birth, the word about Jesus' birth, articulated by Gabriel in 1:31, is visualized in 2:7 through the physical birth. The story of Jesus' birth opens a way (i.e. an invisible space) and provides a foundation for the operation of the physical birth (i.e. a visible space) to take place. The descriptive narration of Jesus' birth involves both word and action, which are thus part of the same spatializing action, that is, the active salvational event by which the new dialogical network of God is established and visualized. Through the conversation between Gabriel and Mary (1:28-38), this new relational or dialogical network is built between Mary, Gabriel, and God. Moreover, when the word of Jesus' birth is articulated by Gabriel and accepted by Mary (1:38), the new relational space is thereby extended to include God, Gabriel, Mary, and the unborn Jesus. Based on the relational network created between Mary and Gabriel, God brings a new life inside Mary's womb (a space within space) and outside Mary's womb (a space outside space), suggesting that not only does the inside (invisible space) become outside (visible space), but also that the new soteriological network of God is created between God, Gabriel, Mary, and the child Jesus, whom God has appointed as a

---

152 See below.
153 By using Georges Dumézil's analysis of the Latin word fās (foundation) and its associated rites, Michel de Certeau notes that the story's first function is to authorize, or more exactly, to found, a providing space for the actions that will be undertaken, creating a field which serves as their "base" and their "theater" (Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Every Life, pp. 123-124) See Georges Dumézil, Idée romaines (Paris: Gallimard, 1969), 61-78, on "lus fetiale."
154 That is, Mary's womb functions as a bridge, juxtaposition, or transitional space where inside and outside connect and interact to create a new space of God, where God and all sorts of people interact, anticipating that there is no longer inside or outside in the new saving network of God, but a relational network (see chapter 2).
Saviour and the Lord and Messiah (2:11; cf. Acts 2:36), and through whom God will spread and unfold his salvation to all people.\(^\text{155}\)

Note also that when Mary accepts the word of Gabriel she becomes pregnant, signifying that outside becomes inside, and inside becomes outside, as Jesus departs from Mary’s womb. At first, when the infant Jesus leaves the womb, it appears that inside again becomes outside. But when at the moment of departure there is in fact no longer an inside or an outside, but an interaction between Mary and the child Jesus, as well as between Mary, Gabriel, and God. What is significant here is that, as we observed earlier, God’s salvation begins with a movement from outside to inside, and spreads out again from inside to outside, unfolding as a nomadic event of flows and movements to create a relational or dialogical network — where God and all sorts of people interact — which establishes salvation as being in a constant state of flows and as a dynamic event in motion. This network continues to unfold and become visual through the acts of salvation and its nomadic movements from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside), and from there (inside) to the ends of the earth (outside).

Indeed, Luke presents the narration of Jesus’ birth as God’s mighty act of salvation (1:26-38; 2:1-20). Without doubt, Luke assures us that, not only will Jesus be great and be called the Son of God, but also that God will give him the throne of his father David, and that Jesus will reign over the house of Jacob forever and his kingdom will have no end (Luke 1:32-35).\(^\text{156}\) Mary views this story as God’s salvational activity.\(^\text{157}\) Thus, she calls God her Saviour and praises God for his mighty acts of salvation in 1:46-55, where Mary extends her personal experience of God’s salvation (vv. 46-49) to Israel’s experience of God’s salvation (vv. 51-54), implying the existence of the continual flows of God’s salvation from the personal to the national level. Also, Luke portrays Jesus as a Saviour and Messiah, the Lord of all in 2:10-11, saying: “I bring you good news of a great joy which shall be for all the

\(^{155}\) Cf. 2:30-32; 3:6; Acts 13:47; 26:23. At the same time, Jesus positioned between those who will fall and rise with the words, “This child is appointed from the fall and rise of many in Israel and for a sign to be opposed” (Luke 2:34), anticipating a major division and conflict between those who accept Jesus and his words and those who reject them (see below).

\(^{156}\) The phrases θαυμάζω...τοίς αἱλίναις...οὐκ ἔσται τέλος refer to both time and space and signify spatializing actions, suggesting that Jesus will ceaselessly articulate and perform the soteriological events by which the folded space-time of God’s salvation will be unfolded, visualized, and expanded.

\(^{157}\) This reflects the Old Testament promises to the royal line (cf. 2 Sam 22:51; Ps. 98:2; Mic 7:20), and the phrase τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ in 1:55 supports this view (cf. Nolland, Luke, pp. 52ff. and pp. 73ff.). This also reflects the messianic thought that God will demonstrate the mighty deeds described at 1:51-53 through Jesus.
people for today in the city of David there has been born for you a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord."158 It is noteworthy that it is here that Luke applies the term σωτήρ, "saviour," to Jesus for the first time.159 Just as a child has been born to bringing a great joy for all the people,160 so also Jesus is presented as the saviour of all people,161 defining Jesus as the central node to be connected to. As the phrase all the people indicates in Luke 2:10,162 God’s salvation will be extended through Jesus to attain universal scope, indicating the nomadic movements of salvational event, by which the relational or reciprocal network of God moves in multiple directions.

Such a view is fully exposed in Simeon’s statement in Luke 2:30-32: “For my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples, a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to your people Israel” (cf. 3:6). The book of Acts shares this point in 2:21: “Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved.” At the outset, Luke seems to anticipate that God’s salvation extends from an individual to Israel, and then from Israel to all nations (cf. Acts 1:8) signifying the continual movements of God’s salvational event. Indeed, Luke ends his two volumes by quoting Paul’s message: “Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles” (Acts 28:28).

In conclusion, as the above analysis indicates, the two birth narratives revolve around the soteriological event and its nomadic flows and movements in producing the new salvational network of God, where God, Jesus, and the people interact and crossover. Several points need to be made here. (1) Both the word and the act of the births are presented as constituents of the same salvational event(s). (2) Elizabeth’s closed-motionless womb may symbolize the closed-territorialized system that does not bear fruits, i.e. the temple of Jerusalem. (3) As John the Baptist represents the old epoch or system, his ministry is territorialized and limited within the boundary of...
Israel.  

(4) By bringing a new life or movement both inside and outside Mary’s womb, the new network of God (between a mother, an unborn child, Gabriel, and God inside the womb, and between child, mother, people, and God outside the womb) is established.  

(5) God’s salvation begins by moving from outside to inside, and spreads out again from inside to outside, defining salvation as a constant state of movements.  

(6) Inside or outside no longer exist in the new salvational network (i.e. the kingdom) of God, and are replaced by a relational, dialogical, or reciprocal network in which all sorts of people come and interact with Jesus and God.

All of these observations force us to imagine the salvational event(s) as a dynamic event in motion and as a nomadic event of flows and movements from one sphere to another, creating multiple routes to salvation. As Luke’s narrative unfolds, the old salvational system that was closed and territorialized within the temple, and that was controlled by the temple authorities, becomes open and deterritorialized. The various salvific terms employed by Luke point to this conclusion, and Jesus’ own public mission statement, and the salvational activity of his disciples, elucidate it.

1.6 Tentative Conclusions

As my analysis shows, the soteriological terms and ideas used by Luke reveal that, not only do the kingdom of God and release from sins lie at the heart of salvation, but also that the act of faith and that of calling upon the name of Jesus are presented as the central responsive acts of human beings in receiving or connecting to salvation. Luke portrays this fourfold construction as the interactive salvational event. Luke also presents the dynamic flows of salvation as a nomadic event of movements from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside), and from Jerusalem (inside) to the ends of the earth (outside), portraying it as a dynamic event in motion, flowing, and becoming. Not only are such motifs the decisive key factors in understanding Luke’s theology and geography in his two volumes, but also they are presented as constituting the process by which the dynamic network (kingdom) of God is created, expanded, and proliferated. Thus, I propose that we must come to understand the fourfold theme of salvation as a nomadic event of flows and fluids. Several other, tentative conclusions can be made.

---

165Since John represents the period of Israel, it makes perfect sense when John’s ministry was limited for the people of Israel (Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 18-27).
(1) Luke emphasizes that the salvational event(s) and its nomadic movements take place in, in-between, among, around, and beyond regions, rather than within the fixed, static boundaries and territories of the local regions. This suggests a qualitative change in the nature of salvation, rather than the quantitative change proposed by modern scholars. Such a nomadic event of movements deterritorializes the hierarchical and binary system of the temple and creates both a new salvational space-time, and multiple ways to access it. That is, the new salvational network (kingdom) of God conveyed by Jesus is depicted as an open and deterritorialized network that can be connected from any point(s) and person(s). Interestingly, the active site where the saving event(s) occurs embodies this new salvational network (i.e. the kingdom of God), where all sorts of people come and interact with God and Jesus. As opposed to the static temple of Jerusalem that people visit, people from diverse regions now perform their daily activities around Jesus, or in response to the salvational events that he preaches and performs, which inscribes Jesus as the central node of God’s new network. Also, as opposed to the Jerusalem temple, which is place-bound by the static conditions of space and time, Luke describes the new saving network (i.e. the kingdom) of God brought by Jesus as relational and reciprocal and as a dynamic event in motion, becoming, and flowing.

(2) A strong case can be made that the purpose of Jesus’ going up to Jerusalem is related to his death, resurrection and ascension as well as to the symbolic destruction of the temple of Jerusalem. Such a symbolic ending is closely connected to the coming of the Holy Spirit, by which the endless flows and movements of salvation continue and proliferate, extending from Jerusalem outwards to the ends of the earth. As the nomadic event of flows and motions from one place (outside) to another (inside) indicate, the salvational event(s) moves from outside to inside, and spreads out again from inside to outside, to produce the relational and heterogeneous space of God, suggesting that there is no longer inside or outside in the new salvational network (i.e. kingdom), but that it is relational and multiple.

(3) Again, these observations force us to conclude that Luke’s spatial-temporal perspective is not one divided into either time or space, but sees both space and time as something relational and multiple, and as something becoming, flowing, and in motion. Consequently, I propose that we rethink salvation as a
dynamic event in motion, a cyclical event of movements, and a nomadic event of flows from one place to another, signifying an eternal state of movements.

In the following chapters I examine the fourfold themes of salvation that I discussed earlier (1.2) in greater detail, picking up each layer of salvation and investigating it further by focusing on the spatial-temporal framework of Luke within the unified literary work of Luke-Acts. It is also worth noting that, in this work, I am concerned with Luke-Acts in its final form, not with pre-Lukan tradition. Though I will provide brief comparisons of Luke with Matthew and Mark where parallel texts exist, I will not engage in detailed analysis of the changes and additions used in Luke, but focus on the many internal connections within Luke-Acts as I discuss the texts, in order to establish the primary theme of Luke's narratives. In this sense, I will present each text of Luke's narrative, not as an isolated work, but as a related space-time event, suggesting that multiple spaces-times coexist in Luke-Acts.


Chapter Two:


2.1 Introduction

In his writings, Luke explicitly states that preaching about the *kingdom of God* is central to the message and mission of Jesus, his disciples, and the early church. In contrast to Matthew and Mark, Luke alone expressly says that the reason that God sent Jesus was to proclaim the *kingdom of God* from one place to another, disclosing the nomadic flows and movements of the kingdom. In Luke, Jesus says, “I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also; for I was sent for this purpose” (Luke 4:43). As the phrase “other cities” employed in 4:43 shows, Jesus’ preaching of God’s kingdom is closely linked to a geographical movement from one sphere to another. Just as he says he will, Jesus does indeed go

---

166 The term βασιλεία (kingdom) occurs 45 times in Luke and 8 times in Acts. It is used both implicitly and explicitly to refer to τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεου (the kingdom of God) 37 times in Luke and 8 times in Acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrences of the phrase τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεου in Luke are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The occurrences of the phrase τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεου in Acts are as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note also that the term βασιλείας (king) occurs 11 times in Luke and 20 times in Acts. Mostly it refers to earthly kings and their territories. It is also applied to Jesus, negatively in the charges brought against him (Luke 23:2, 3, 37, 28; Acts 17:7), and positively as the recipient of the royal promises made to the descendant of David (Luke 1:32; 3:31; Acts 2:30; 13:22-23, 33-40) and as the king who has come in the name of the Lord (Luke 19:38). Interestingly, the term βασιλεία (kingdom) is used 4 times in Luke (Luke 1:33; 22:29, 30; 23:42) to refer to both the Kingdom of Jesus and his spatial-kingdom. The term βασιλείαν (to rule or to reign) is used three times in Luke (1:33; 19:14, 27), and refers to the authority to rule over the house and territory of Jacob (1:33) and the cities/territories therein (19:17, 19).

167 Borg notes that preaching about the kingdom of God was central to Jesus’ message and mission (Marcus Borg, *Jesus in Contemporary Scholarship*, pp. 87-88).

168 As we shall see, the expression the kingdom of God should be understood here in the light of Luke 4:18-19, since 4:43 is the summary statement of Jesus’ activities proclaimed in his programmatic mission statement (4:18-19) and demonstrated at 4:31-42. I will pick up this link and elaborate upon it further below. The phrases “I was sent” at Luke 4:18, 43 and “I have come” at Luke 5:32 and 19:10 are used interchangeably, revealing the fluid nature of Jesus’ message and mission.
around cities and villages to preach and proclaim the kingdom of God (Luke 8:1), confirming the nomadic flows of the kingdom in Luke.

Luke narrates that Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God throughout his entire ministry, and describes such a saving event in terms of a nomadic event of flows and fluids. In addition, the preaching of the kingdom of God is continued even after Jesus was raised from the dead. At the outset of the book of Acts, Luke reports that Jesus appeared to his disciples for an extended period of forty days, and spoke of the things concerning the kingdom of God (1:3). During this period, the central theme of Jesus' teaching was the kingdom of God, a phrase which elsewhere sums up Jesus' earthly ministry.

Moreover, references to the kingdom of God in Acts 1:3 echoes multiple events of salvation and its nomadic flows and movements performed by Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem in Luke (cf. Acts 1:1), and from there to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8), a ministry in which multiple saving events and its nomadic motions are depicted as a geographical expansion of God's kingdom from one place to another. It means that just as the salvational ministry of Jesus and his disciples revolve around the kingdom of God, so also it must be understood in terms of the kingdom of God.

We might recall that, just as he was sent to proclaim the kingdom of God, so Jesus also came to perform healings and exorcisms, a fact that discloses the link.

---

170 In the introduction, I described the soteriological journey of Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem and that of his disciples from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth, terming their activities nomadic (see above).
172 Note that in his gospel, Luke has already represented Jesus' disciples as persons who preach the kingdom of God and perform healings and exorcisms. Although some scholars believe that the phrase "the end of the earth" refers to Rome (cf. Pss. Sol. 8:15; van Unnik, pp. 386-401), the phrase ought really to be understood in a wider sense (cf. Marshall, Acts, p. 61; Witherington III, Acts, pp. 110-111) to refer to the geographical (temporal-spatial) flow and expansion of God's kingdom. Luke's treatment of the terms receiving, coming, and witnessing seem to point in this direction. Such words are described as "spatializing actions", i.e. signifying the soteriological events by which the spatial-temporal kingdom of God flows and is unfolded. That is, the theme of witnessing is reminiscent of Jesus' sending his disciples to preach the kingdom of God and to perform healings and exorcisms (Luke 9:1-2, 6; cf. 10:9, 19).
174 Cf. Luke 4:31-42; 6:6-10, 18-19; 8:2; 9:11; 11:14-15; 13:11-13; 17:11-19; 18:35-43. Notice that Luke intentionally puts Jesus' preaching of God's kingdom and the performing of healings and exorcisms side by side within the same chapter, and sometimes within the same verse, to show the link between the proclamation of the kingdom and the performance of God's salvation, which together signify the same soteriological event(s). Also, as we shall see, healing and exorcism are presented as a demonstration of God's kingly and salvational power, signifying those events by which a new soteriological space is created and moves.
between God’s kingdom and salvation. Likewise, Jesus also sent his disciples out to preach the kingdom of God and to perform healings and exorcisms, a process described in Acts. Philip preached the kingdom of God (8:12) and performed healings and exorcisms in Samaria (8:6-7, 13); Paul also boldly spoke about the kingdom of God and performed healings and exorcisms. In fact, Luke summarizes his two volumes with Paul’s message, which echoes the message of the early church that his role is in: “proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness and without hindrance” (Acts 28:31). Thus, Luke presents Jesus as the one who established and revealed God’s kingdom, and his disciples as those who took over and carried on their master’s tasks: to proclaim the kingdom and to perform healings and exorcisms (Luke 9:1-2; 10:9). This relationship discloses the link between God’s kingdom and salvation and its geographical, spatial-temporal, expansion. That is, the preaching of the kingdom and the performing of healings and exorcisms are not isolated, but multiple layers of the same saving event, or the reality by which the hidden/invisible kingdom of God is visualized.

Such a conclusion is evident in Luke 7:22, where Luke summarizes Jesus’ mission by having Jesus state, “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them” (cf. 4:18). As in the case with persons who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death in Luke 1:79, Luke portrays the blind, lame, leprous, deaf, dead and poor in Luke 7:22 as those who are out of place (lost) and as those who are placed in desolate or abandoned places, i.e. out of the realm of salvation. But, as we shall see, through the soteriological events

---

175 The active words: to proclaim and to heal refer to spatializing actions, i.e. soteriological events that create a dynamic relational network between speaker(s) and hearer(s).
176 Luke 9:1-2, 6; 10:9, 11. Evidently, as Luke notes elsewhere, the central characteristic of following Jesus was the preaching of the kingdom of God; as he states, “Go and proclaim everywhere the kingdom of God” (9:60b). Again, the active words: go, proclaim, and everywhere are “spatializing actions,” signifying soteriological events that create a new relational space between speaker(s) and hearer(s) and uncover the continual movement of God’s spatial-temporal kingdom.
preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples, the abandoned place(s) will be transformed into the new saving space, or network, of God, by which people act and move. Whereas the blind, lame, leprous, deaf, dead, and poor are all initially described as motionless people, the present verbs now applied to them (i.e. receive, walk, are cleansed, hear, are raised, have the good news) in Luke 7:22 are spatializing actions, which establish a new relational space between God and the people. These pivotal observations force us to conclude that the notions of the kingdom of God and the salvation of God refer to the same event: the multiple layers of salvation by which the invisible/hidden kingdom of God is visualized. Moreover, just as the eternal saving event of flows and motion conveyed by Jesus, his disciples, and the early church activates the new saving space (kingdom) of God, so also such a nomadic event of flows and fluids from one place to another describes God's kingdom and salvation as something in motion, flowing, and becoming.

The connotation of βασιλεία.

The Hebrew term נְוֵית denotes royal power, kingly rule, and reign, and the term מֶשֶךְ stands for kingship and royalty. That is, these words both refer to kingdom, reign, and realm – i.e. the territory where kingly rule is exercised. Likewise, the basic Greek term βασιλεία denotes kingship and royal rule, which means the power exercised by a king, and refers to kingdom, reign, and realm – i.e. the territory ruled in.

---

181 In Luke 14:15-24, Luke contrasts people of wealth - who can buy a field and five yoke of oxen and who can marry - with the poor, i.e. the helpless street beggars (cf. Robert Tannehill, The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts, vol. 1, pp128-129). The phrases: “into the streets and lanes of the city” in 14:21 and “into the roads and lanes” in 14:23 refer to (1) the places of exclusion, abandonment, or desolation and (2) those persons who inhabit such places, describing the poor, crippled, blind, and lame as persons who are outcasts and street people, i.e. out of place, in contrasting to people of wealth who are in place. A soteriological reversal then takes place (cf. Lk 1:51-54; 6:20-26; 15:11-32). People of wealth, who are supposed to be inside, remain outside the house of the host, as they reject his invitation. Conversely, the poor, who are supposed to remain outside, now dwell inside the house of the host, and eat bread with him in the kingdom of God (cf. 14:15).

182 The ancient ideas of monarchy usually associated dynasty (space) with kingship (Deut 17:14-20; 28:36). God established David and his dynasty forever over Israel (2 Sam 7:4-17; cf. 2 Sam 6; 1 Kings 8; 2 Sam 23:1-7). The theology of Davidic kingship is best seen in the royal psalms, including: Psa 2; Psa 18; Psa 20; 2 Psa 21; 4 Psa 45; 7 Psa 72; 8 Psa 89; 1 Psa 101; 1 Psa 110; 1 Psa 132; Psa 144:1-11. The substance of this theology is that Yahweh's choice to link Zion and the Davidic house is eternal (Psa 89:3 [H 4]; Psa 132:11-14). The king ruled as Yahweh's "son" (Psa 2:7; 25 Sam 7:14), his "first-born" (Psa 89:27 [H 28]) and his "anointed" (Psa 2:2; Psa 18:50 [H 51] [H 7]; Psa 20:6). Cf. John Bright, A History of Israel, Westminster, 1959, p. 204. Note also that in ancient monarchy the king's body was not metaphor, but a political reality. Just as its physical presence was necessary for the functioning of the monarchy (a kingly operational space), so also the king's power and its ruling/operational realm went hand in hand, as the kingly operational spaces (Israel and the house of David) indicate.
over by a king. This linguistic observation discloses the integration between the kingly reign and the territorial kingdom that is ruled over. But, by carefully examining the background of Hebrew and Galilean Aramaic spoken and taught by Jesus, Dalman notes that the phrase the kingdom of God always means kingly rule, never kingdom, “as if it were meant to suggest the territory governed by him.”

Thus, he claims that the term, βασιλεία, should not be translated as territory or space, but as kingly rule, reign, divine power, or sovereignty. Bruce Chilton holds a similar view, describing the kingdom of God as “the dynamic, personal presence of God, God in strength, the sovereign activity of God,” and “the saving revelation of God Himself.”

However, both Chilton and Dalman’s narrow definition of the kingdom as kingly rule seems to be far from adequate. At first, Dalman seems to be moving in the right direction when he observes that the word malkuth does not refer to a local or national territory when applied to God. However, his proposition seems to fall apart when he claims that the word malkuth exclusively refers to kingly rule, separating the kingly rule from its ruling territory, referring to the king’s political body (space) where the kingly rule is exercised and enforced, and from the people who are to be ruled. What is so significant about a kingly rule without a ruling territory or people, referring to political space? Likewise what is so significant about God’s kingly rule, reign, authority, or sovereignty if God does not have any realm or people to rule over? Hence, just because the word malkuth does not refer to a local or national territory ruled or governed by God does not mean that it exclusively refers to kingly rule. Rather, it still refers to God’s operational space as well as his ruling authority.

184 Dalman, The Words of Jesus, p. 94.
187 Though he recognizes the significant link between rule and its operational realm, Hunter moved away from this inter-relationship and focuses on rule itself. He writes, “Reign or Rule does not operate in the void-since it implies a sphere of rule-since, moreover, in the Gospels the Basileia is something which a man enters, from which he can be excluded, we may reserve the right (as Moffatt does) in a few passages to render Basileia by ‘Realm.’ But the dominant meaning is always that of God acting in His kingly power, exercising His sovereignty” (Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p. 69). What is at issue here is not which is the more dominant meaning, God’s kingly rule or its operational realm, but the interconnection between God’s kingly rule and the ruling space created between God and God’s people.
In this respect, Hayward rightly states, "The concept of God's kingship is inseparable from His authority over the angels who perform His service in heaven; and it cannot be divorced from His presence in the earthly Temple, which is a replica of heaven. The Service carried out there is the fulfillment of the royal commands of the king to his earthly subjects, the Jewish people." That is, the kingdom of God should not be understood in term of either God's reign or territory, but rather both God's reign and God's ruling space.

We might also wonder, what is the precise meaning of a local or national territory that Dalman so strongly rejected? In other words, what did Dalman have in mind when he argued that kingdom did not refer to a territory? As in the case with the static, visible, and glorious kingdoms of the world, Dalman seems to picture the kingdom of God as a static or visible territory, place-bound by the static conditions of space of here and there, and he then concludes that the kingdom must not be viewed as a territory, by which he means a static territory. Of course, the kingdom of God, the dynamic space of God, preached by Jesus does not refer to a fixed or visible territory ruled by God, but rather it is pictured as invisible, changeable, stretchable or deterritorialized space, i.e. no longer place-bound by the static conditions of place. That is, the exercising of God's kingly authority presumes a spatializing action, which establishes a dynamic space between God, who exercises God's will, and those who are to be ruled by God.190

Furthermore, Dalman presented the kingdom of God as God's reign or rule. But what does it mean, particularly its relation to how God rules God's people? In other words, what kind of God's reign or rule was Dalman referring to? As we shall see, Luke does not describe God as an emperor, invader, nor occupier, but as a savior (Luke 1:47) who releases people from various forms of captives and shows mercy toward the poor, the captive, the oppressed, and the outsider through Jesus (Luke 4:18ff.). In this sense, one should not understand God's reign imperially or

188Hayward, The Jewish Temple, p. 11.
189In Luke-Acts, the hidden/invisible/deterritorialized kingdom of God is visualized as moving in-between or among God's people through the soteriological events preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples. This contrasts with the static/visible/folded/territorialized space of the Jerusalem temple. Here, the idea of the deterritorialized space of God does not lead to the desolate place of darkness, destruction, and death, but to the new soteriological/reational space of light, peace, and life created between God and God's people an in which they interact (cf. Luke 1:79; 7:50; 8:48; Acts 26:18).
190Again note the link between the authority of God and the ruling or operational space of the kingdom.
hierarchically, but as means of non-hierarchical, reciprocal relationship between God and God's people. In other words, in contrast to worldly kings and the temple authorities rule over people and their daily activity, Luke highlights God's mercy, love, and salvation that are demonstrated through the ministry of Jesus preaches and brings the kingdom of God.

Moreover, Dalman fails to relate the kingdom of God brought by Jesus to the Jerusalem temple, which is as the center for the social-economic-political-religious-cultural life of Israel and an earthly kingdom of God, a replica of the heavenly kingdom. The structural dynamics are made explicit here: the Jerusalem temple is static and place-bound, operated and controlled by the temple authorities, in contrast to the kingdom of God (both visible and invisible) that is represented as a dynamic event or space in motion, flowing, and becoming. The kingdom of God should not be viewed in terms of the static lines of boundaries or territories, but rather as the power of mercy, grace, and release, which is demonstrated to those who languish in the misery of darkness and death when they are transported into the power of light and life (cf. Acts 26:18). Before we can examine this in any detail, however, we need to recall the function and the historical-social background of the Jerusalem temple in the first century.

---

191 On the link between heavenly and earthly kingdoms, Ben Sira notes that the earthly kingdom (or Temple) belongs to God as king (Hebrew ben Sira 50:2, 7; see Hayward, the Jewish Temple, p. 11).

192 As we shall see, the nomadic ministry of Jesus and that of his disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem (Luke) and from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth (Acts) points to this.
2.2 The organization of the Temple in the social world of Luke

There are a few significant facts about the Jerusalem temple. (1) The architectural entity known as the Jerusalem temple occupied a central religious and ritual role in the life of the Israelites. (2) Not only was it linked to the political rule of Israel, but also was a center for the social-economic-political-cultural life of the Israelites. (3) Though it was surrounded by a large area containing courts and buildings that apportioned various spaces for people classified by the degree of their purity, the Jerusalem temple was mainly known as the dwelling place of God. (4) Not only was the temple presented as a meeting place or crossway between heaven and earth, but also its service was described as a heavenly reality.

Just as the places of the temple were separated according to degrees of holiness, so also the temple is designed to have a place for everything and everyone, with everything and everyone in its place and with all anomalies properly excluded. The temple design shows that the priestly duty of the temple authorities was to maintain holiness or purity of the temple by monitoring people and their daily activities.

---


194 Note that all soteriological activities of sacrifice, worship, prayer, praise, revelation, hope of salvation, tithe, and legal observance were centered on the Jerusalem Temple. See John H. Elliott, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts”, in Social World of Luke-Acts, pp. 218-224. Also note that all ritual/religious activities at the temple revolved around sacrifices for the sins of the high priest, the priests and the people, and these sacrifices were the prime religious duty of the high priests.


196 Ezra 2:2-58 and Neh. 7:7-60. On the rules of purity, see the following chapter.

197 The basic term for temple in the Hebrew Bible is bet Yahweh or bet elohim, “house of Yahweh” or “house of God” (1 Kgs 7:12, 40, 45, 51; 1 Chr 9:11, 13, 26; Zech 8:9; Neh 6:10). They are also used in reference to Yahweh shrines located outside Jerusalem (e.g. Jdg 19:18; 2 Sam 12:20).

198 Hayward, The Jewish Temple, pp. 1-17.

activities or conduct (Lev. 18-22) just as they governed the fixed time-space of the

temple by which people moved and acted. As this brief summary indicates, the
temple was no mere building, but it provided a symbolic representation of the
structure of the universe, Jewish national identity as constituted by the Torah, and
an elaborate system of purity signifying the saving structure of God, where the
hope of the world’s salvation and the universal experience of God’s mercy and grace
were realized, and by which people moved and acted. In relation to salvation,
therefore, it is almost impossible to talk of the kingdom of God without talking about
the Jerusalem Temple.

2.2.1 Representations of place: Herod’s temple, known as the second
temple, was mainly divided into the places for God and humankind. The place of
God consisted of the holy of holies, which was represented as the dwelling place
of God, and which marked the center of the temple mount, the center of Jerusalem,
the center of the holy land and the center of the world. The holy place, on the other
hand, was seen as the second most sacred place of God.

The place of humankind consisted of two main courts: an inner and an outer
one. The inner court was mainly divided into the court of the priests, the court of
Israel, and the court of the women. The court of the gentiles was located
in the outer court. The wall around the temple – called a temenos – defined the sacred
place and marked it out from the profane place. As human beings are born into

---

200 Drawing information from the Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and the book of Jubilees,
Hayward notes that, just as the temple service was pictured as a power for stability and order, so also
Israel’s temple worship took place on the correct/fixed days and at the correct/fixed times, indicating
that people moved and acted according to the static times-spaces controlled by the temple authorities
(Hayward, The Jewish Temple, pp. 7-8).

201 For the holiness and purity of the temple, see Sanders, Judaism: Practice and Belief 63
BCE-66CE, pp. 70-76.

202 See Figure A above.

203 The veil/curtain separated the space of God (holy of holies) from the threshold of God’s
space (holy place). In contrast to Mark, who describes the tearing of the curtain after Jesus’ death
(15:37-38), Luke states that the curtain was torn in two before Jesus’ death (Luke 23:45), suggesting
that, not only was the soteriological glory of God already revealed in the ministry of Jesus, but also that
through the soteriological events preached and performed by Jesus, salvation was granted.

204 Robert W. Funk, Honest to Jesus, p. 202. Note also that the ten degrees of spatial holiness
were described in m. Kelim: (1) The Land of Israel is holier than any other land...(2) The walled cities
(of the land of Israel) are still more holy...(3) Within the walls (of Jerusalem) is still more holy...(4)
The Temple Mount is still more holy...(5) The Rampart is still more holy...(6) The Court of Women is
still more holy...(7) The Court of the Israelites is still more holy...(8) The Court of the Priests is still
more holy...(9) Between the Porch and the Altar is still more holy...(10) The Sanctuary is still more
holy...The Holy of Holies is still more holy... [m. Kelim 1.6-9], cf. Neyrey, “The Symbolic Universe
systems of lines that mark off, delimit, and define, so they were divided by systems of lines based on their purity and sacredness. As the assigned name of each place of the temple itself testified, the designated persons alone could enter their own designated places, and must not cross over their assigned line. In fact, contamination and defilement occur when people cross a symbolic line by which they should be separated. By controlling and monitoring the lines of the system, the static territories-boundaries of the temple, the temple authorities exercised their authority-power to determine who could be in and out of the holy community, out of the holy temple, and ultimately out of God’s protection and salvation, suggesting that their authority-power was territorial, hierarchical, and imperial in nature.

2.2.2 Representations of person: Just as the places of the temple were separated based on degrees of holiness, so also people were separated based on the degree of their purity, demonstrating the interconnection between the body of a person and his or her social-religious place. The sanctity of persons was defined in descending order:

1. The high priest
2. The priests
3. Levites
4. Israelites of pure blood
5. “Illegal” children of priests
6. Gentiles converts, proselyte freemen
7. Bastards, the “fatherless” (born of prostitutes), foundlings, eunuchs
8. Those born with deformed sexual features, Hermaphrodites
9. Gentiles: non-Jews

As the list above indicates, the high priest was considered to be the most sacred and holy person of God, since he alone could enter into the place of the holy of holies.

---

207 This simply means that a) only the priests could enter into their court [5] every morning and night and undertake their various duties, 2) only men could enter in the court of Israel, 3) only women were allowed into their own court, and 4) the gentiles were only allowed into the court of gentiles, located in the outer court. They were not allowed to enter the inner court.
209 Though the high priest could enter into the holy of holies on the Day of Atonement once a year, it was reserved for the divine presence, the space of God. The purpose of the high priest’s entering into the holy of holies was to present a sacrifice for his and his nations’ sins (Lev. 9:7; 16:6; Heb 5:1ff. and 7:27) disclosing the most important religious duty of the high priest was a ritual sacrifice of sins for God’s people.
Also, the priests were considered as the second most holy people of God, since they alone could enter into the second most holy place [3] of the temple. They were portrayed as the most holy persons and as mediators through whom God's authority and power were displayed, through whom God's salvation was conveyed, and through whom God and God's people could interact. Note that they offer sacrifice, as a central duty performed at the altars (Lev. 1-7), by which their sins and the people's sins were forgiven (Lev. 9:7; 16:6), by which people and things were cleansed or purified (Lev. 11-15), and by which God and God's people could interact, demonstrating that the holy people were not able to be in union with the Holy One of Israel without sacrifice, and that the soteriological interaction between God and God's people took place at the altars in the temple. Ironically, only the high priest and the priests aided by their Levites could move freely in the transitional or intersecting space [4, 7], whereas God and God's people were placed in their proper places as if they were motionless.

It is important to note that, just as the priests performed their religious activities in a given place in the temple, so they also believed that God's salvational event(s) or salvation must occur exclusively in a fixed place, demonstrating that the static boundaries of the temple acted as a fixed framework defining the people's movements and actions. Thus, it was vital that priests had clear territories or definition of territories, which in turn reveals that their authority and power lay in their ability to territorialize. "To territorialize" means to monitor the lines or definitions of the boundary and to control people and their daily activities or conduct (Lev. 18-22). Thus, the priests enforced and promoted the rules of purity or

---

200 The bread of the presence was on display in this holy place, along with the seven-branched candelabrum and an altar for incense [4]. It was near this altar of incense where the angel of the Lord appeared to Zacharias (Luke 1:11). The sacrificial altar and the giant laver for ritual cleansing were located in the court of priests. As the presence of the altar of incense in the holy place and the altar of sacrifice in the court of priests indicated, the religious duty of the priests revolved around the altars, revealing that the major function of the priests was to perform ritual sacrifice to atone for the sins of God's people.

201 Hayward, The Jewish Temple, pp. 1-17.

202 For sacrifices, see Sanders, Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE-66CE, pp. 103-118.

203 On the ceremonial duties of the priests and the forms of the rites, see Schürer, History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, rev. and ed. By G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black (Clark: Edinborough, 1979), vol. 2, pp. 237-313. Malina describes this space as on the threshold of God's space, a space of interaction at the outer limits of man's space, where an altar, laver table, and seven-branched candelstick curtain were located before the sanctuary, Malina, The New Testament World, pp. 184-185.

204 See Lev. 17-27 for a series of practical standards to which people are to be conformed in holy living.
holiness by which persons, places, and times were separated, and by which people and things were required to act and move.215

2.2.3 Representations of time: Jews had both a lunar and a solar calendar to differentiate the days and the seasons, and according to which they identified the days of pilgrimage, sacrifice, fasting and feasting. Hayward states, “The order of creation...is for a strictly defined period of time, of days and seasons as we know them, of days and seasons regularly and predictably recurring as they were promised to Noah.”216 The classification of times is listed in m. Moed:217

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m. Moed</th>
<th>Classification of Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Shabbat and Erubin</td>
<td>Sabbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Pesahim</td>
<td>Feast of Passover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yoma</td>
<td>Day of Atonement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sukkoth</td>
<td>Feast of Tabernacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Yom Tob</td>
<td>Feast of Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rosh ha-Shana</td>
<td>Feast of New Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Taanith</td>
<td>Days of Fasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Megillah</td>
<td>Feast of Purim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Moed Katan</td>
<td>Mid-Festival Days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the data above indicates, the times were apportioned fixed classifications, which dictated when priests needed to perform specific religious duties. For example, although the high priest could enter the holy of holies, he could only enter once a year, on the Day of Atonement. This means that he acted according to a defined timeframe, and the times of classifications formed a static framework of actions, and a fixed container of motions, by which people acted and moved. In other words, just as the priests lived by the fixed framework of times, so they also forced the people to live by it. Thus, by controlling the static timetable, they monitored and controlled the daily activity of the people. For example, just as the Sabbath became a law of time (spatialized time), so also people had to observe it and live by it.

In contrast, however, Luke’s Jesus does not live by the law of the Sabbath or by any fixed order of time, rather, states, “The Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath” (Luke 6:5). In fact, Luke’s Jesus constantly violates the law of the Sabbath218 by

---

215 We will discuss the idea of holiness and purity rules by which things, times, spaces, and persons are separated in the following chapter (see chapter 3).  
granting salvation and days of fasting on the sacred day, thus creating a new salvational space-time of God, that is, the kingdom God. Consequently the temple authorities in Luke’s gospel are filled with rage and plotted to kill him (Luke 6:11).

Several observations need to be made at this point. The temple building was seen as a symbolic structure of universe and functioned as a visible, static meeting place between heaven and earth, and between God and human beings. Just as persons, places, and times were separated hierarchically based on the degree of their purity (holiness), so also the imperial structure of Judean society was established according to the rules of purity. Here, the lines of the system implied who was in and who was out of place. This hierarchy echoed the binary system (i.e. inside or outside) of the temple, which had a place for everything and everyone, with everything and everyone in its place and with anomalies properly excluded.

Furthermore, the priests proclaimed, manifested, and granted salvation within the given time-place of the temple, which demonstrates (1) that their activity was sedentary and motionless, and (2) that their activity was governed by the static framework of time and place, as if God and God’s saving event(s) were territorialized or limited within fixed territories and were under their control. Thus, for the temple authorities, securing and monitoring the territories and boundaries of the temple were essential tasks. Within this static framework, the temple authorities monitored the people and forced them to observe the rules of purity, thereby controlling the people in their daily activities. This suggests that (1) as long as they had clearly defined boundaries and territories, they could control the people, and (2) the power and

---

220 Hayward, The Jewish Temple, pp. 8-11.
221 On the theme of purity/holiness, see the next chapter.
222 In Genesis 1, God separated time, things, and places from one another, and placed them into their proper place. (1) Time was separated into day (light) and night (darkness), and a week was separated into workdays and the Sabbath, the day of rest; the sun, moon and stars were created to mark that time precisely. Just as the idea of time here is cyclical, so also one full day is a cycle of day and night (1:5), a week is a cycle of seven days and nights (Gen. 1:5, 8, 13, 19, 23, 31; 2:2), and there is a cycle of seasons and years (1:14). (2) Things: grass, herbs, fruit trees (1:11-12), animals (1:24-25), birds (1:20-21), and fish (1:20-21) were separated from each other and placed into their own kinds (1:11, 12, 21, 24, 25). (3) Place: just as the dry land was separated from the waters above and below it, so also animals, birds, and fish were separated into their proper place: animals to creep the earth, birds to fly in the air, and fish to swim in the sea. The heavens were to govern the earth, the light was to govern the day and night (1:16-18), and Adam was charged to rule over all creation, and so the hierarchical order of creation was established, cf. Neyrey, “The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts”, p. 277; Robert W. Funk, Honest to Jesus, p. 202.
223 As we shall see, all sorts of social deviants, and particularly those who had the visible marks of God’s punishment, were excluded from the temple (see below).
authority of the temple was centered on control and territorialization. We may describe this activity as power-in-space.

In short, although the temple was composed of the place of God and the multiple places of the people, (1) the entire building of the temple was presented as a visible and static place, (2) the temple system was pictured as hierarchical, striated, linear, closed, fixed, and territorialized, and (3) the activity of the priests was pictured as sedentary and motionless. These three layers of the temple were not separate entities, but interacted with one another, revealing the temple to be a fixed framework of action, and a static container of motion, in or according to which people acted and moved. In addition, the maps of places, persons, and times of the Jerusalem temple are closed maps, i.e. tracings, which are arborescent, genetic, and genealogical. Furthermore, to secure and maintain the order of the temple, the temple authorities had to establish a clear definition of territories and boundaries by promoting and upholding the rules of purity. That is, the power and authority of the temple were viewed as territorialized power and authority. By territorializing space-time, the temple authorities could control the people in their daily activities. This shows that the priests' central focus was not on the people whom they classified as outcasts, lost, or out of the reach of the soteriological maps, but rather on the clear lines defining their territories.

2.3 Luke's perception of the Jerusalem temple

In his writings, Luke uses three words - temple, house of God, and the holy place to refer to the temple, and describes its buildings, precincts, and courts as the sanctuary or the holy place where God dwells, and where God and God's holy people interact. Luke also acknowledges that the temple authorities promoted and upheld the theme of holiness (purity) based on the expression: "You shall be holy, as I the Lord your God am holy" (Lev 19:2). Likewise, Luke understands that they separated the holy place of God from the profane or unclean place, and allowed the holy-clean to

---

224See chapter one.

225The word ἡσυχία occurs four times in Luke (1:9, 21, 22; 23:45) and twice in Acts (17:24; 19:24).

226In relation to the Jerusalem temple, the word ἡσυχία is used four times in Luke (6:4; 11:51; 13:35; 19:46) and once in Acts (7:47-49).

enter the temple, to interact with God through the sacrifice performed by the priests, aided by the Levites.228 As I have already noted, the theme of holiness (purity) promoted by the temple authorities displays the static lines of separation between holy-clean (inside) and unholy-unclean (outside). At the same time, Luke recognizes that not all people had access to the temple or experienced God’s salvation. To put it another way, though the Jerusalem temple was known as the center of the universe, the dwelling of God,229 where people came to God to experience his salvation, it was not the central node of God’s saving network for all people, nor did it function as though it were. As the static map of places and persons above indicates, the unholy or unclean persons (the poor, sick and lost)230 were excluded from communion with their fellows, from the holy temple, and ultimately from God’s salvation. This means that, not only were they simply out of the saving map (i.e. lost), but also they were isolated and disconnected from the temple and from God’s salvation. Once again, only those who were considered as holy-clean were connected to the temple.

It is within this cultural setting that the kingdom of God was born. As Luke unfolds his narratives, we see several important aspects of the new saving network of God, brought by Jesus that contrasts with the old system of the Jerusalem temple. (1) Rather than support the expression: “You shall be holy, as I the Lord your God am holy” (Lev 19:2), Luke promotes the theme of God’s mercy: “Be merciful, just as your Father is mercy” (Luke 6:36), which anticipates the fact that the saving power-authority of God is no longer about the separation and/or disconnection between holy and unholy, but about mercy and grace.231 That is, the authority-power of God reside not in his capacity to territorialize or confine, but rather to deterritorialize and release people from various forms of captivity and oppression,232 displaying the dynamic transition, i.e. salvational event, from one place to another and the nomadic flows and movements of the kingdom. (2) In contrast to the temple authorities, who focused on who was in and out, Luke fixes his gaze on those people who are out of place (lost) as

---

228Note that in relation to salvation, not only did Jesus reject temple sacrifices (see Dunn, Unity in Diversity, p. 125-129), but he also publicly predicted and threatened the destruction of the temple (Lk 19:45-47; cf. Mt 21:12-13; Mk 11:15-18). Cf. E. P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, p. 156.
229Just as all the religious/cultural activities of sacrifice, prayer, praise, revelation, hope of salvation, tithing and legal observance are associated with the temple, so also the temple authorities governed such activities; cf. Elliott, “Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts”, p. 219.
230See Chapter 3.
231See Chapter 3.
Jesus came to save and release *outcasts* (the poor, lost, and sick) from various forms of captivity and oppression. Unlike the temple authorities, who performed and granted the events of *salvation* within the fixed and closed territory of the temple, Jesus preached and performed the salvational events of God’s kingdom in opened and deterritorialized space, outside the temple. Thus, not only is the system of the temple pictured as fixed, closed, sedentary, and/or motionless, but also its activity is challenged and threatened by the *new* salvational network of God brought by Jesus, described as *placeless, opened, dynamic, and becoming*. When these two kinds of activities collided, the temple authorities attempted to kill Jesus and his disciples who proclaimed the kingdom of God.

This conflict is brought to a head when Jesus publicly predicts and even threatens the destruction of the temple (Luke 19:45-46). Jesus enters the temple and begins to *drive out* those who were selling things there, and he says, “It is written, ‘My house shall be a house of prayer’; but you have made it a den of robbers” (Luke 19:46). By linking Jesus’ action of *driving out* the merchants (i.e. the agents of the temple authorities) with that of *driving out (releasing)* demons, Luke effectively describes the activity of the temple authorities as demonic activities. No longer does Luke describe the temple as the holy place where God dwells, and where God’s salvation is granted. Instead, he writes, “The God who made the world and all things

---

25^ Cf. Mk 11:15-18; Mt 21:12-13. In his book, *Jesus and Judaism*, E. P. Sanders has rightly argued that one important key to understanding the ministry of Jesus is understanding the incident in the temple (Mk 11:15-18; Mt 21:12-13; Lk 19:45-47), and states, “Thus we conclude that Jesus publicly predicted or threatened the destruction of the temple, that the statement was shaped by his expectation of the arrival of the eschaton (p. 75).... Jesus expected the kingdom in the near future, he awaited the rebuilding of the temple...his disciples thought about the kingdom concretely enough to ask about their place in it” (p. 156). Note that the idea of the destruction and rebuilding of the temple seems to disclose the visible architectural image(s) of the temple. Sanders thought that, when this static image was no longer visible, Jesus must then expect the kingdom of God in the near future. However, William R. Herzog II criticizes many of Sanders’ points, and argues that Jesus’ conflict with the temple was far deeper than Sanders imagined (Herzog II, *Jesus, Justice, and The Reign of God*, pp. 111-112). Herzog then concludes that, “Jesus attacked the temple system itself” as if it was a separate entity from the visible image of the temple, including the priestly activity that went on there (Herzog, p. 112). However, the issue here is not a choice between the destruction and rebuilding of the static architectural building, including *all* priestly activity, and the temple system itself, but both the static building *and* the temple system. As I have already noted, the body, system, and action of the temple are not separate, but interact with one another.
26^ In Luke-Acts, as in the case of the word ἕξοδευ (Lk. 4:35, 36, 41; 8:2, 29, 33; 11:14, 24; Acts 8:7; 16:18), the word ἕξοδολευ (Lk. 9:40, 49; 11:14, 15, 18, 19, 20; 13:32) is used as a technical term for exorcism, signifying the destruction and defeat of the power of Satan (see below).
in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands" (Acts 17:24).\textsuperscript{237}

In conclusion, as the analysis above indicates, places, times, and persons were separated hierarchically in terms of degrees of holiness (rules of purity), showing that (1) the body of the temple was described as visible and place-bound by the static conditions of space and place, here and there, (2) the system was described as hierarchical, striated, binary, territorialized, closed, and fixed, and (3) the activity of the temple performed by the priests was described as sedentary and motionless. What is important to note here is that the threefold layers of the temple interacted with each other, and represented a static framework of actions by which people acted and moved. Also the ultimate goal of the temple authorities is to secure and maintain the \textit{holiness} and \textit{order} of the temple. To fulfill their task, the temple authorities needed to have a clear definition of territories and boundaries (derived from the rules of purity). Thus, not only did the temple authorities promote and uphold the rules of purity in order to maintain their power, but also they monitored and controlled people and their daily activities by enforcing them to observe the purity laws and to live by them. That is, the authority and power of the temple authorities was in territorializing and confining people within a fixed place.

2.4 Luke’s social-geographical understanding of the kingdom of God

What then is the nature of \textit{the kingdom of God}? How did Luke perceive the kingdom of God, in relation to the Jerusalem temple? As opposed to the fixed system or order of the temple, we will see that Luke describes the kingdom of God preached by Jesus and his disciples as (1) \textit{a dynamic space of God}, that is, a \textit{deterриториализированный} space (both visible and invisible) and \textit{placeless}, (2) \textit{a nomadic event of flows}, that is, \textit{becoming} and \textit{flowing} in-between, among, beyond places and persons, and (3) \textit{an active and a dynamic relational network}, that is, a \textit{heterarchical} and \textit{reciprocal} space, where God and God’s people interact and where all sorts of people come and interact with one another. The threefold layers of God’s kingdom are not separated, but integrated, and

\textsuperscript{237}This echoes Acts 7:48-50: “Yet the Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands; as the prophet says, ‘Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool. What kind of house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest? Did not my hand make all these things?’” (cf. Isa. 2:18; 16:12; Lev. 26:1). However, Barrett writes, “The question of the Jerusalem Temple is not raised here” (Acts, p. 840). Yet in the light of the co-texts: Acts 6:11-14; 7:48-50; 17:6; 21:21, 28, Luke narrates that God, the creator of universe, is not to be confined in any temples including Jerusalem temple made by human hands.
revolve around the soteriological events preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples. That is, the kingdom of God is pictured as a dynamic network, that is, in motion, becoming, and flowing. Moreover, as we shall see, for Luke, the kingdom, power and authority of God are not abusive, imperial or territorialized, but merciful and gracious – something by which people are saved or released from various forms of captivity and oppression, and by which the hidden and folded kingdom of God is visualized, unfolded, expanded, and moved. In this sense, the kingdom of God or the authority-power of God should be understood in terms of the release and deterritorialization of power and authority. In addition, not only do people act and move around or in the kingdom of God, but it also revolves around people through whom it proliferates.

2.4.1 The kingdom as the dynamic space of God

In his writings, as we shall see, Luke expresses the idea that the kingdom of God is a dynamic space (event) that belongs to or embodies the poor and the children, and that it can be given and received. At times, not only is it depicted as a place that one enters and departs from, but also as a place, where one can share meals, and where one can be called least or greatest. Note that the ideas of belonging, receiving and giving, entering into and departing from, and sharing are all spatializing actions (i.e. active events), which unfold a dynamic space between God, Jesus, and all sorts of people. Also, Luke describes it as a dynamic space that is within or among the people, signifying the invisible space of God (Luke 17:21). Moreover, as we shall see, by using the symbolic image of the twelve tribes of Israel and the metaphors of belonging, embodiment, heaven, cities, and persons, Luke seems...
to describe the kingdom as the dynamic space of God. Thus I will discuss the link between God’s kingly authority-power and its operational space. By employing the symbolic structure that he does, Luke represents the dynamic space of God as an active event that is changeable (visible and invisible), relational, and reciprocal.

2.4.1.1 Kingly authority-power and ruling space

2.4.1.1.1 Luke 1:32-33. Luke’s gospel is the only gospel to contain this text. By stating that (1) God will give the throne of David to Jesus, (2) Jesus will rule over the house of Jacob, and (3) his kingdom shall be forever, Luke interconnects Jesus’ kingship (the kingly authority-power and its ruling space) and the endless flows of Jesus’ kingly authority-power over his kingdom in a dynamic space. Such a combination of themes seems to recall Nathan’s oracle to David in 2 Sam 7:12-16, where David’s successor is called God’s son, and God promises that his “throne” will be established “forever” (cf. Acts 2:30). The word throne in 1:32 signifies kingship, as does in 2 Sam 7:13, meaning “a position of authority and power to rule/reign”, which unpacks the link between kingly authority-power and its operational space (cf. Is. 9:7). What is presupposed here is people who are to be ruled by David’s successor. The phrase “the house of Jacob” seems to confirm that. And it echoes Isaiah 9:7 and 2 Sam 2:4. Marshall notes that the phrase “the house of Jacob” in 1:33 is a synonym for Israel. Nolland argues that “the house of Jacob” is used to emphasize rule over all twelve tribes (Is. 2:5; 8:17; 10:20).

In any case, whether the phrase refers to Israel or the twelve tribes, the weight to be given here is on the idea of people (operational space) who are to be ruled by

---


248 Interestingly, Jesus, who will rule over the house of Jacob, is also identified as a savior, Christ the Lord (Luke 2:11), who will save God’s people from the power of the world/Satan. In this sense, Luke 1:33 should be understood in the light of Luke 2:11. The interactive relationship between a king and a savior is found in 2 Sam 19:9 and Dan 6:14. Deissmann notes that the term “king” stands in parallel with “savior” (Light from the Ancient East, pp. 362ff). He also claims that many individual words like ἐξοτερικός, κράτος, ἡγεμονία, ἀνθρωπος, ἡμιθρεματικός, ἁμαρτιματικός, λάβω, δόξα, τιμή, χάρις, ἀληθής, φίλανθρωπία, ἀρτιώς and αἰώνιος, possibly belong to the retinue of “king,” p. 363 n. 9.

249 Nolland notes that the phrase he will rule over the house of Jacob, is close to LXX 2 Sam 2:4, where David is anointed “to rule over the house of Judah.” But Marshall observes that Luke 1:32-33 is more close to Isaiah 9:7 (cf. Mi. 4:7).


Jesus. As the word \( \text{παρεξουει} \) (will reign) indicates, the prepositional phrase over the house of Jacob in Luke 1:33 refers to the operational space to be ruled by Jesus, indicating that Jesus’ kingly authority-power or kingship and its operational space go hand in hand. Therefore, at this early stage, not only does Luke make the link between Jesus’ kingly authority-power and its ruling space, but he also anticipates that the symbolic space of Jacob’s house to be ruled by Jesus is the dynamic space of God. Furthermore, the idea of Jesus’ ruling over his kingdom (space) forever (time), denoting an eternal kingdom that has no end (space-time), discloses the coexistence of space-time and the endless flows of God’s kingdom brought by Jesus. In other words, Jesus’ kingly authority-power and its dynamic space (i.e. the kingdom of Jesus) are interconnected, and merged into the salvational event of God that creates a new space of God (i.e. the kingdom of God) and the eternal flows and movements of the kingdom. And, as Luke unfolds his narrative still further, we will see that the kingdom of God that Jesus will rule does not refer to a static territory or visible space, but rather to the invisible, changeable, and moveable space of God.

2.4.1.2 Luke 4:3-12. After he showed Jesus all the kingdoms of the world, the devil offered Jesus the glory of authority over them, if only Jesus would bow down before him, saying: “If you fall down before me it shall be yours” (4:7). But Jesus rejected the offer by saying: “You shall worship the Lord your God and serve him only” (4:8). By linking the idea of ruling authority to the glory of all the kingdoms of the world, Luke exposes the interaction between the ruling authority-power and its operational territories. Unlike Matthew (4:8), who uses the term \( \text{κυριεύω} \), Luke employs \( \text{oikoumiēn} \) (inhabited world) to refer to the worldly kingdoms, the visible world (i.e. static place) ruled by the devil (Luke 2:1; 31). Also, by using

---

252 In the New Testament the term \text{Israel} is used to mean the people (Acts 4:10), the house (Mat. 10:6), the nation, (Mat 27:42), the twelve tribes (Rev. 21:2), the land (Mat. 2:20), and the Christians as the new covenanted people of God (Gal. 6:16), which reveals the nature of the ruling/operational space to be ruled.

253 The verb \text{παρεξουει} (to rule, to reign) is used three times in Luke (1:33; 19:14, 27) and none in Acts. Here it refers to rule over the house of Jacob, i.e. the spatial-kingdom.


255 Whether the phrase refers to \text{Israel} or to all twelve tribes, it refers to the ruling or operational space to be ruled by Jesus.

256 Cf. 2 Sam 7:13, 16.

257 See below.

the phrase τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν and the word δείκνυμι (show), Luke makes the link between the static territorial kingdoms of the world and their visibility and glory. Thus, ἐξουσία and δόξα (4:6) are integrated with all the kingdoms of the world (4:5), the visible territories of the world, which exposes the interlink between the ruling authority-power and its static-visible-glorious territories. Moreover, by showing Jesus' rejection of the devil's offer, Luke anticipates that the source of Jesus' ruling authority-power and glory comes not from Satan, but from God, and shows that the kingdom of God stands in sharp contrast to that of Satan. In fact, as Luke unfolds his narrative, we will see that (1) the invisible-moveable kingdom of God stands in sharp contrast to the visible-static territorial kingdoms of the world ruled by the devil, (2) the kingdom of God and that of Satan are presented by way of warfare between the authority-power of God and that of Satan, and (3) the invisible-moveable kingdom of God is visualized and animated by the saving events preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples.

In short, Jesus and God's kingly authority-power and its dynamic space (i.e. kingdom) interact, and are merged within the eternal flows and movements of Jesus and that of God's kingdom, displaying the coexistence of space-time. In contrast to the static-visible-glorious kingdoms of the world ruled by the devil, the kingdom of God brought by Jesus is presented as invisible and changeable, just as God and God's kingly authority and power are invisible. As Luke unfolds his narrative, this invisible kingdom of God will eventually be visualized by the salvational event preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples.

2.4.1.2 The Spatial Images of God

world" (4:5) was under the charge of the Roman emperor, Green rightly notes that it[what does 'it' refer to?] discovers the world of humanity ruled by the devil. He states: "Luke elsewhere gives us no reason to doubt that the world of both Jews and Gentiles is characterized by the darkness of satanic rule" (cf. 1:78-79), Luke, p. 194.

Deissmann notes that ἐξουσία and δόξα are closely connected to kingship, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 363 n.9. Schmidt also notes that both ἐξουσία and δόξα are synonyms with βασιλεία, *TDNT*, 1:583.


262 See below.
2.4.1.2.1 The Twelve Tribes of Israel. As I have already noted, the phrase "the twelve tribes of Israel" refers to the dynamic space that is to be ruled by Jesus and God (cf. 1:32-33). In Luke 22:29-30, the idea of the twelve tribes of Israel is expressed as a divine kingdom and a potential space to be ruled: Jesus gives a kingdom to his disciples just as God gave him a kingdom with the words "I confer on you, just as my Father has conferred on me, a kingdom" (Luke 22:29).263 This echoes comments that he makes elsewhere in Luke.264 Note that the kingdom that Jesus receives from God in 22:29 refers to Jesus' saving authority-power, which is perceived as a dynamic space,265 which is revealed in the saving events preached and performed by Jesus.266 As the ἰνα clause (of purpose) indicates, the purpose of Jesus' conferring of the saving authority-power on his disciples is to judge or to rule the symbolic space of "the twelve tribes of Israel".267 As the images of eating and drinking at my table, in my kingdom, and on thrones indicate, the kingdom of God is pictured as a dynamic, relational, and reciprocal space.268 Likewise, the power relationship between the disciples who will judge or rule and the twelve tribes of Israel who are to be ruled (22:29-30) describes the kingdom as an active space.

2.4.1.2.2 A place where the poor belong. Just as the idea of belonging implies a space where people belong, so also the kingdom of God that belongs to the poor in 6:20-26 implies a dynamic space of God, where the poor come and interact with God and with one another. This unexpressed quality of the kingdom is fully realized when Jesus proclaims, "Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God" (Luke 6:20).269 Here, Luke explicitly reveals the relationship between God’s kingdom and salvation, referring to God’s dynamic events by which the invisible kingdom of God is visualized. In other words, when Jesus speaks to the poor about God’s kingdom, not only do they experience God’s salvation,270 but also the invisible space of God is realized, which creates a new dynamic conception of God that passes

263 The word διατίθεμαι means "to give someone the right to rule."
267 Cf. Judge 3:10; 10:1-2; 12:7; 1 Sam 2:10; Dan 9:12. Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 1419. Note that "judging" or "ruling" refers to authority over spatial territories, namely Israel (Judge 3:10; 10:1-2; 12:7) and the whole earth (1 Sam 2:10).
268 The subjunctive present verbs may eat...drink, the future verb will sit and the participle present verb judging refer to spatializing actions, and express the continual movement of God's kingdom.
269 Cf. Luke 4:18, 43
270 Bultmann notes that in the beatitudes, blessing has come to the poor who yearn for the Messianic salvation, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 110.
between Jesus (speaker), the poor (hearers), and the wider audience. As a result, the poor who were disembodied (out of place) by the temple are now embodied through their connection to the new redemptive network of God brought by Jesus. In other words, by experiencing God’s salvation, the poor no longer see the kingdom of God as symbolic, but actual. For this reason, the poor come to and move around the kingdom of God as it is articulated by the words of Jesus. As Nolland rightly observes,\(^\text{271}\) the kingdom of God is portrayed as a place where people come and experience God’s salvation. It is also important to note that though the present form ἐστὶν in 6:20 indicates the past-present reality of the kingdom, because it does not refer to the precise moment of arrival of God’s kingdom, but to the idea of being-toward, further confirming that the kingdom of God is a dynamic event in motion and perpetually proliferating.\(^\text{272}\) Thus, as the ideas of belonging or embodiment imply an actual place, the form ἐστὶν implies the dynamic space of God, where the poor come to interact with God and with one another. The once invisible kingdom of God is realized and visualized through Jesus’ preaching, and, through the imagery of belonging, Jesus clearly pictures the kingdom as something relational and in motion.

### 2.4.1.2.3 Heaven

By linking God’s kingdom with heaven in Luke 6:20-26, Luke imagines the kingdom to be an invisible place (6:20, 23). He makes a link between “reward in heaven” (6:23) and “treasure in heaven” (12:33; 18:22), and the idea of a “reward in heaven” articulated in 6:23 seems to refer to believers’ secure placement in heaven. Johnson notes that the phrase may refer to: (1) God, since it is viewed as a periphrasis for God (cf. 15:18, 21); (2) an inscription in a heavenly book (cf. 10:20); or (3) a place where the reward will be enjoyed.\(^\text{273}\) More importantly, not only are the three concepts interwoven, but also they depict heaven as a dynamic space of God, where God and people interact. As Luke unfolds his narrative, he describes heaven as the highest place where God,\(^\text{274}\) angels,\(^\text{275}\) the Holy Spirit,\(^\text{276}\) and Jesus\(^\text{277}\) dwell, a place that is both invisible and dynamic. Note, however, that, although it is an invisible space, it is not merely represented as symbolic, but as an experiential and actual space of God. Thus, heaven is portrayed as a place in which

---


\(^{272}\)See the subsequent sections.


one can find enjoyment and be glad, where one's name is recorded (10:20), where one stores one's treasure (12:33; 18:22) and where there is joy over one sinner who repents (15:7). Thus, by linking the kingdom of God with heaven, Luke describes the kingdom of God as the invisible, experiential, actual, and dynamic space of God, where God, angels, the Holy Spirit, the risen Jesus, and all sorts of people come and interact. Note that, just as God and God's authority-power are invisible, so also the kingdom of God is described as an invisible and dynamic space.

2.4.1.2.4 The body of a person. As I noted earlier, Luke portrays the blind, the lame, the leprous, the deaf, the dead and the poor (Luke 7:22) as persons who are out of place, lost (Luke 19:10), who are placed in the desolate/abandoned places ruled by the devil, and who sit motionless in the shadow of darkness and death (Luke 2:79). Likewise, by describing a person (ανθρωπος) in terms of a house (oikos) in Luke 11:24, Luke presents the body of a person as a place where the unclean spirit enters (εισελθοντα) and lives (καινουκει εκει). The unclean spirit refers to the body of a person as my house in 11:24, and it is presented as the dwelling place of the unclean spirit in v. 21, i.e. a place of Satan. This treatment of oikos is anticipated in the parabolic use of αυλη (house) in v. 21, and it is closely linked to the references to waterless places and a resting-place in v. 24. The body of a person is depicted as a place, but it is also described as a battleground where the power of God and Satan collide and intersect (vv. 21-22).

Specifically, in this case, when Jesus releases a dumb man from the power of Satan (vv. 21-23), the man's body becomes a dynamic space of God. That is, when

---

280In the New Testament, God's kingdom is not constructed by visible/static territories and boundaries, but by God's people, through whom the hidden kingdom of God is revealed and through whom that kingdom moves. Note that the author of Revelation describes the people of God as God's kingdoms/spaces. In Revelation 1:6, John states: “[Jesus] made us to be a kingdom, priests serving his God and Father, to him be glory and dominion forever and ever (cf. Rev. 5:9-10). Likewise, the author of 1 Peter writes, “But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light” (1 Pet 2:9). God's people represent the kingdom/spaces of God, and so also they are pictured as “a walking kingdom”, denoting that the kingdom is something becoming, in motion, and moving.
281The expression “who is not with me is against me” in 11:23 employs the metaphor of a military-battle (cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 923).
282As we shall see, Luke sees Jesus' performance of healings/exorcisms as an act of disembodying and of releasing a person from the power of Satan, revealing that those who are disembodied or released from Satan become the potential site for the space(s)/kingdom of God. In this sense, Susan Garrett states: “Every healing, exorcism, or raising from the dead is a loss for Satan and a
the dumb man is disembodied from Satan, he has already been transferred to and embodied within the kingdom of God (past-present). At the same time, the captive and oppressed persons, who are living under the power of Satan, are pictured as potential spaces of God (present-future). In this sense, by releasing the dumb man from a demon (11:14), Jesus increases the scale of the kingdom of God, and simultaneously scales down Satan’s kingdom. Thus, Jesus urges his audience to respond to his message by stating, “Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters” (11:23). As the text in 11:24-26 relates to 11:23, Jesus’ invitation invites people to participate in the expansion of God’s kingdom – those who do not, explicitly contribute to its fragmentation.

Luke presents the body of a person as a potential space of God, and therefore as the site of an invisible battle between the power of God and Satan, which takes place within and around the body. This ‘invisible kingdom’ is visualized when Jesus releases the dumb man from the power of Satan.

2.4.1.2.5 Cities. In the parable of Money Usage (19:11-27), Luke again links kingly authority-power to its ruling space, and presents the bodies of persons and cities as operational spaces to be ruled. Here Luke describes a kingdom as something to be received (19:12, 15) and to be given (19:17) which shows the link between authority-power and its operational space (19:14, 17, 19, 27). This reveals that the kingdom is a nexus of spatializing actions, a relational network that creates a dynamic space between the one who gives and the one who is to be received. The purpose of kingly rule, then, is to reign over people (19:14, 27) and cities (19:17, 19). That is, people and cities are understood as operational spaces. Although this parable has parallels with Matthew’s parable of the Talents (Mt. 25:14-30), there are many differences in detail between the two narratives. As Manson rightly observes, Luke exclusively retains the following lines: “A nobleman went to a distant country to get gain for God”, drawing a contrast between the scaling up of God’s kingdom and scaling down of Satan’s kingdom (see below). Cf. Garrett, The Demise of the Devil, p. 35.

This means that people released from various forms of captivity had already become God’s kingdom/space.

Luke 11:23 recalls Luke 9:50 (cf. 9:48; 10:16), and shows an urgent desire to welcome/accept Jesus, through whom God’s kingdom moves and is revealed.

Green notes that the function of vv 24-26 is to demonstrate a positive and urgent response through ongoing faithfulness (cf. 8:11-15), Luke, p. 459.

Note that the whole parable of 19:12-27 is spoken in response to the kingdom of God, suggesting that those who refuse to be ruled by a certain nobleman can be compared to those who reject Jesus, who receives power-authority from God to rule over them and who is sent by God (cf. 9:48 and 10:16).
royal power for himself and then return” (v. 12)...But the citizens...do not want this man to rule over us (v. 14)...But as for these enemies of mine who did not want me to be king over them...bring them...slaughter them” (v. 27). In these verses, thus, Luke depicts people as operational spaces and as potential spaces (kingdoms) of God. As vv. 14 and 27 indicate, those who refuse to be ruled are already excluded from the kingdom. This means that those who accept Jesus and his message have already experienced God’s salvation, and are living in the kingdom of God. Again, just as Luke links the ruling authority-power to its operational space, so also Luke shows people and cities as operational and potential spaces of God. Moreover, the hidden/invisible kingdom of God can be realized by accepting Jesus and his message.

2.4.1.3 In summary, as the above analysis indicates, not only are Jesus/God’s kingly authority-power and its operational space interwoven, but also multiple images (the twelve tribes, places of belonging, heaven, persons, and cities) are pictured as potential spaces of God. Through the saving work(s) of Jesus such potential spaces become the dynamic space(s) of God, the kingdom(s) of God. In contrast to the visible/static earthly kingdoms, Luke describes the authority-power of God as a release and deterritorialization of conventional authority-power, an act through which people are saved or released from various forms of captivity and oppression. The invisible kingdom of God is visualized as a relational space, where God and all sorts of people come and interact, and which is established and moves through the act of deterritorialization. Luke therefore shows God’s kingdom to be the invisible, relational, and dynamic space of God.

2.4.2 The Kingdom of God in motion

So far, I have illustrated the idea that Luke portrays the kingdom of God as a dynamic space, not as a visible, inert, or fixed territory, but as an invisible, actual, and experiential space, where God and all sorts of people come and interact. In contrast to the static/motionless activity of the temple, I would argue that the kingdom of God brought by Jesus is pictured as becoming, flowing, and in motion. Furthermore, the nomadic flows and movements of God’s kingdom demonstrate the coexistence of space and time. Referring to this coexistence of space and time, Mike Crang writes

287 Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, p. 313.
288 We will see more of this in the following sections.
that "space without time is as improbable as time without space." With this in mind, I propose that one cannot talk of the kingdom without referring to notions of space-time. In line with my previous discussion, I argue that we should not spatialize time, nor present space as fixed, frozen, or motionless.

Despite this, it is clear that from the beginning of the 20th century scholars’ primary interest has been in the temporal aspects of the kingdom of God, that is, the question of when the kingdom is expected to come. As I have demonstrated, Conzelmann spatializes time by dividing it into three epochs: the times of Israel, of Jesus and of the church. He views each epoch as a frozen place within which a salvational event occurred, and as an isolated place disconnected from the others. Conzelmann perceives time as absolute-singular-linear, and space as inert and fixed. However, as we have seen, not only are Luke’s spaces-times relational-multiple-nonlinear, but also Luke presents space-time as a dynamic event in motion.

In regard to the question of when the kingdom appears, Conzelmann argues that Luke has downplayed the hope of an imminent parousia, but that he emphasizes salvation history, and Conzelmann maintains that what belongs to Luke’s time is not the kingdom itself, but that “It is the message of the kingdom that is present, which in Luke is distinguished from the kingdom itself”. By separating the message from the kingdom “itself”, Conzelmann minimizes the role of those who have already experienced God’s salvation and kingdom (cf. 6:20; 11:20). As in the case with time-space, Conzelmann understands the kingdom “itself” to be a visible, static, and fixed territory. Thus, he fails to see the dynamic nature of the kingdom of

\[\text{References:}\]

289 Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift, *Thinking Space*, p. 1; see chapter one.
290 The debate about the kingdom was initiated at the beginning of the twentieth century, and re-emerged in its last two decades. The debate was triggered primarily by the tension between the idea of the kingdom yet to come and the one already present. For this reason, scholars constantly debate whether the kingdom already has come, or is yet to come. Beasley-Murray puts the following texts under the heading of already present: 4:16-30; 7:22-23, 28; 8:4-8; 10:23-24; 11:20, 22; 13:18-19; 14:16-24; 15:4-32; 16:16; 17:20-21; he puts the following texts under the heading of future, i.e. yet to come: 8:4-8; 9:27; 11:2-4, 52; 12:32; 12:39-40; 13:18-19, 20-21, 28-29; 16:1-8; 18:1-8, 17, 24; 19:11-27. He also organizes the parables of “growth” under the headings of present-future. He treats the Son of Man and the kingdom of God, including the discourses of Jesus on the Parousia, separately. See Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*; Perrin, *The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus*. The problem for Beasley-Murray is that he has spatialized time by separating the texts from one another and placing them into inert/static spaces, as if there were no relation between them.
291 See footnote 16.
292 I have already suggested that Luke’s geographical position is situated in both time and space, and can be described as relational and as something becoming and in motion.
God and its *nomadic* movements, the eternal saving event of flows, preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples, by which the invisible kingdom is revealed and experienced, and by which the dynamic network (kingdom) of God is set *in motion*.

In this respect, Marshall rightly claims that the kingdom of God "itself" is present in Luke's church. However, Marshall does not define the precise meaning(s) of the kingdom, nor does he discuss its relation to the multiple layers of release and its *nomadic* event of flows and motions preached and performed by Jesus from one city to the other. In fact, Luke's prime concern is not to define the final or fixed territory of God's kingdom, but to show it as a dynamic event actualized and moved by the eternal *nomadic* event of flows preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples. Another scholar, Dunn, also insists on a spatial or territorial image of the kingdom, and so also denies the model of the active space of God, and focuses on the temporal image of the kingdom, as if the two were opposed in kind and type. Dunn states, "A more dynamic sense certainly seems to be implied in talk of the kingdom 'coming', having 'drawn near', and having 'come'." Not only does Dunn assume that time and space are separate, but, like Dalman, he also views the kingdom in spatial terms, as constructed of static territories and boundaries. Moreover, he fails to recognize the *nomadic* event of flows and movements of the kingdom.

My primary task in this section, then, is to rethink the primary function of the words *has come near* (10:9, 11), *come* (11:2), *is coming* (17:20), *comes* (22:18), *is near* (21:31), and *has come* (11:20), on the assumption that they do not demonstrate the static moment of the coming of the kingdom, but rather that they represent the kingdom as something *being-toward, becoming, flowing, and in motion*, which reveals the eternal *nomadic* event of flows and fluids of the kingdom. This expresses the idea that the kingdom is *changeable and moveable* – i.e. changeable in kind and type (a qualitative change). That is, the kingdom should not be understood to be a visual-static-fixed territory, but rather as an invisible network *in motion*.

---

299 In his paper, Crang draws a contrast between cities of motion and cities *in motion*. On the one hand, the city of motion involves looking at space-time as a frame of action through which people and things move. Crang argues that "The urban imaginary has long been populated with tropes of the city as container of motion." On the other hand, however, the city *in motion* is a malleable field that
2.4.2.1 The Kingdom has come

2.4.2.1.1 Luke 11:20. This text is a response to the charge made by some people (11:14-26). When Jesus was expelling the demon of dumbness from the dumb man, some people accused him of casting out demons on the authority of Beelzebul, the ruler of the demons, and so demanded a sign from heaven (vv. 14-16). Replying to their charge, Jesus asked them: Why would Satan divide his own kingdom by raising civil war in his own realm (cf. vv. 17-18)? He also asked, “Now if I cast out the demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your exorcists cast them out?” (v. 19).

He then states, “But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you” (v. 20). By linking the two, as we have noted earlier, Luke describes the saving event as a dynamic and transitional event whereby the kingdom of Satan gives way to the kingdom of God (cf. Acts 26:18). This shows that the acts of release, in this text and elsewhere, are not isolated, but are the same saving event(s) by which the hidden space (kingdom) of God is visualized and by which the invisible authority-power of God is demonstrated.

Several observations need to be made at this point.

(1) Just as there is an interaction between kingly authority-power and its operational space in vv 17–18, so also the kingdom of God in verse 20 refers to the dynamic space of God realized by Jesus’ saving event. Of course, the kingdom of...
God here is not presented as a visible or static territory, but as an invisible, dynamic, and morphological space visualized and realized when Jesus releases the dumb man from the power of the demon (cf. 11:14). That is, not only is the invisible kingdom of God visualized at the moment when Jesus releases the man from his dumbness, but also the kingdom of God is presented as the actual, dynamic, and experiential space where God and the dumb man interact.

(2) By using the phrase by the finger of God, Jesus reveals that the source of his ruling authority-power is not Satan or devils, but God. But Luke's intention here is not merely to disclose the source of the saving authority-power of Jesus, but to disclose the nexus between the authority-power of God and its geographical space. Certainly, by linking the phrase by the finger of God with the kingdom of God, Luke again displays that the hidden authority-power of God and its operational space are visualized by the soteriological event performed by Jesus.

(3) As I noted earlier, Luke describes the body of a person as a dwelling place or battleground where the power of God and that of Satan intersect (11:21-23). In this regard, Jesus' use of exorcism becomes a transitional event, involving departure (dismembering) from the power (kingdom) of Satan to the coming (embodying) into the kingdom of God. Specifically, the body of the dumb man becomes connected to the kingdom of God. Note also that, once the unclean spirit becomes disembodied, it becomes as an empty space (cf. 11:24, 26), which is open for change. In this sense, the body of a person is described as a potential space of God, and can become a dynamic space of God when the person responds to Jesus and his message. It is in this light that Jesus says, "Whoever is not with me is against me, and whoever does not gather with me scatters" (11:21). Not only is the saving event marked as a dynamic

---

306 Manson claims that the phrase "finger of God" is the true Q text altered by Matthew to "spirit of God" (Manson, Teaching, p. 82). The use of such a phrase is founded in Exodus 8:19, where Egyptian magicians say, "This [i.e. the works of Moses] is the finger of God." Dunn notes that the phrases spirit of God (Matthew) and finger of God (Luke) refer to the power of God (Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit, p. 46). Moreover, whether he accomplishes his exorcisms by the "finger" of God (Luke) or the "Spirit" of God (Matthew), Jesus liberates and releases those who are in bondage to Satan or his demonic minions as a broker of God's power acting on God's behalf (cf. Herzog II, Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God, p. 203f).

307 Luke 4:18; cf. Ex. 7:8-8:19. The phrase "finger of God" echoes the struggle between Moses and Pharaoh's magicians in Ex. 8:19, where they perceive the plagues as the powerful works of God and say, "This is the finger of God" (cf. Eve, The Jewish Context of Jesus' Miracles, p. 332).

308 Twelftree writes, "The Pharisees' accusation and Jesus' reply have, so far, only to do with Jesus' source of power-authority" (Twelftree, Exorcist, p. 107).

309 Stegemann notes that there is no difference between "the Spirit of God" and the "finger of God", suggesting that the active power of God is already working on earth (cf. Ex 8:15). See The Library of Qumran, p. 238.
transition from the authority-power (kingdom) of Satan to that of God, but also Jesus’
exorcism, performed here, creates two different outcomes: (1) an increase in the scale
of the kingdom of God and (2) a decrease in the scale of the kingdom of Satan.  

(4) As the use of εφθασεν shows, the kingdom of God has already come upon
the hearers when Jesus casts out the demons, revealing the spatial and temporal
(geographical) flows and movements of the kingdom. The verb εφθασεν here should
be understood as a genuine aorist, meaning that it displays a past-present reality.
This is an important piece of evidence for Dodd, who argues that it implies the arrival
of the kingdom, that is, “realized eschatology.” However, the word does not refer to
the precise moment of the kingdom’s arrival, but to the geographical expansion of
God’s kingdom, a process of being-toward. By linking the aorist εφθασεν (past-
present) to the present tense εκβάλλω (present-future), Luke describes the kingdom as
something being-toward, becoming, and in motion, suggesting the nomadic movement
of the soteriological event by which the invisible kingdom is realized. Luke’s use of
the present-tense verb εκβάλλω (keep casting out) recalls a past saving event and
anticipates a coming saving event, thus marking the present as a junction where past
and future intersect, as though past and future events are available today. Here the
idea of today is to be understood as a nexus of multiple dimensions (spaces-times),
and so as something becoming and in motion.

(5) Marshall emphasizes the addition of εις μιᾶς when he states, “The point is
that the kingly and saving power of God has drawn near to the hearers and is there for
them to grasp; and the proof that it is near to them is that its power has been
evidenced in the lives of other people, specifically in the exorcism.” But the real
issue is: from whose point of view is the kingdom of God near? Who are the
hearers? Are they those who questioned Jesus and demanded of him a sign from
heaven (vv. 16-17)? Are they those persons who have already experienced God’s

---

310 Dodd notes, “The exorcisms performed by Jesus are treated as a sign that the kingdom of
Satan has been overcome” (Dodd, Parables, pp. 44). As we shall see, exorcisms performed by Jesus
are viewed as defeats of Satan (cf. Luke 10:18), suggesting that Jesus reduces the kingdom of Satan by
casting out demons by the power of God (cf. Twelftree, Exorcist, 106).

311 Dodd, Parables, p. 44. However, Campbell argues that this is a “timeless” aorist with a
future meaning, i.e. “The kingdom of God will be upon you immediately”, or, “The kingdom of God
has come close upon you” (J. Y. Campbell, ‘The Kingdom of God has come,’ Exp. T 48, 1936-37, 91-
94). Moreover, Clark argues that the verb εφθασεν means “to draw near, even to the very point of
contact”, but no more (K. W. Clark, “Realized Eschatology”, JBL 59, 1940, 367-383). Yet Dodd
rightly insists that this verb has a genuine aorist meaning (cf. Exp. T 48, 1936-1937, 138-142). On
εφθασεν, see Kümmel, Promise, pp. 106-109; Jeremias, Theology, vol. 1, p. 34.

salvation, as in the case of the dumb man in v. 14? Or are they prospective hearers? If
the phrase ἐφ’ ἵματι refers to the first-mentioned group, why did Jesus say the
kingdom of God had come upon them, as opposed to those people who already had
experienced God’s salvation (cf. 11:14)? Marshall seems to prefer the idea that the
phrase refers to prospective hearers. His point is well taken, but what is at issue
here is not upon whom the kingdom of God came, but the fact of the saving event
itself, and its nomadic motions, which create the dynamic space of God where the
speaker (Jesus) and multiple hearers interact. What this means is that multiple times-
spaces co-exist, between Jesus and his hearers and between multiple hearers. Indeed,
for Luke, the kingdom of God has already come and been realized for those who have
already experienced God’s salvation (past-present). But for those who have not yet
experienced God’s salvation, the kingdom has not yet come or been realized (present-
future). Thus, the plural form of “you” (ἰμάτι) here does not refer to particular hearers,
but to the multiple audiences who move and act in the multiple times-spaces: those
who are already connected and those are not yet linked to the network (kingdom) of
God. The locative word ἐφ’ further reveals that the authority-power of God and its
dynamic space move and flow in-between or among persons, which reveals the
nomadic flows of God’s kingdom.

In short, Luke links the authority-power of God to its dynamic space or
ingdom, and represents the body of a person as a crossway, a battleground where the
powers of Satan and of God collide. Furthermore, multiple times-spaces coexist
among Jesus’ audiences. As the link between ἐφ’ ἵματι (past-present) and ἐκβάλλω
(present-future) indicates, not only is the present reality of the kingdom described as
being-toward, changeable, and movable, but it also recalls a past event and anticipates
a future event, inscribing the present as a junction, or crossway, where past and future
intersect. The saving event(s) conveyed by Jesus brings two opposite outcomes:
diminishing the kingdom of Satan and expanding the kingdom of God.

2.4.2.1.2 Luke 17:20-21. This passage comes just after Luke has informed us
about the cleansing of the ten lepers and the belief of one. As the phrase “those stood
from a distance” in 17:12 indicates, the ten leprous men were placed outside the city
(out of place), showing that their movement was limited and territorialized because

---

315 See chapter five.
of the visual and static conditions of their bodies through leprosy. When leprosy is removed/released from the Samaritan, he oversteps the line drawn between him and the others, the unclean and the clean, and he then comes to Jesus and glorifies God (17:15-16). This act creates a new dynamic space between the Samaritan, the others, Jesus, and God. Jesus then says, “Rise and go your way; your faith has saved you” (17:19). As Green rightly points out, it is difficult to miss the contrast between the Samaritan leper who has experienced God’s salvation (past-present) and the Pharisees who have not yet experienced salvation (present-future), even though the kingdom of God is set in motion and becomes operative among and around them. In contrast to the Pharisees, the immovable and motionless activity of the Samaritan leper now becomes moveable and active. That is, he is connected to the saving network of God brought by Jesus, and, witnessing this, the Pharisees ask Jesus when the kingdom is coming. In response to this question (v. 20), Jesus answers: “The kingdom of God is not coming with signs that can be observed, nor will they say, ‘Look, here it is!’ or ‘There it is!’ For behold the kingdom of God is (éστιν) among you (ἐν τοῖς ὑμῶν)” (vv. 20-21).

A few observations need to be made about this exchange. As the present verb éστιν in 17:21 clearly indicates, the kingdom of God is described as a present reality that includes elements of the past, and which signifies being-toward (present-future). Also, Luke represents the kingdom of God as not place-bound by the static conditions of space, which suggests that the Pharisees understood the kingdom to be a static and fixed territory. To put it differently: for Luke, the kingdom is not a static or visible sign to be observed, but it is invisible, changeable, and moveable, i.e. something becoming and in motion. Thus Jesus instructs his followers to stop looking for a static or visible territory, as if it were here or there, but to see and experience the

---

316 Green, Luke, pp. 628-629. In contrast to the Samaritan leper, the Pharisees simply do not recognize the kingdom of God that is operative in their midst, nor God’s kingly power by which salvation is conveyed. Indeed, their lack of understanding about Jesus and his ministry is compared with a Samaritan leper who recognizes Jesus and his authorized/ruling words, and who thus experiences God’s salvation. For this reason, he glorifies God (17:15).

317 Green notes, “Even if Luke has been involved in a narrative reinterpretation of the kingdom of God in terms of its relation to the presence of Jesus, this perspective has thus far not been shared by the Pharisees” (Green, Luke, p. 629).

318 Fitzmyer notes that the παρατηρήσεως does not refer either to the (Pharisaic) “observance” of the Law or to the observance of cultic rites, but must be understood in the Hellenistic sense of watching for premonitory signs (e.g. from heaven), or as an apocalyptic allusion to “times and seasons” (e.g. Wis 8:8; 1 Thess 5:1; cf. Mark 13:32; Matt 24:36), Luke, p. 1160.

319 Beasley-Murray, Jesus and the Kingdom, pp. 98-102.

kingdom that moves and flows *within* or *among* people. Note that there is a lengthy discussion of the phrase ἐντὸς ἐμῶν amongst scholars, as to whether this phrase should be interpreted to mean *within* or *among* you.\footnote{The phrase ἐντὸς ἐμῶν is translated as *within you*, signifying that the kingdom is in people's hearts as some sort of inward, invisible power (cf. LXX Ps 39:4; 58:22; 103:1; 109:22; Isa 16:11; Dan 10:16 [Theol.]; Eccl 19:23 [26]; cf. Mt 23:26; Josephus, Ant. 5.1,26§107). Though he recognizes that the natural way of translating the word ἐμῶν is *within* or *in* (cf. Luke 22:27), Manson is in favor of the sense *among* rather than *within*, for the following reasons: 1) Since Jesus addresses the Pharisees, it is not likely that Jesus would say that the kingdom of God was *within* them, and 2) the kingdom of God is viewed as a state of affairs, not a state of mind. For detailed discussions of these points, see Manson, *Sayings*, pp. 303-305; Plummer, *Luke*, p. 406; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, p. 1161; Marshall, pp. 655-656.} What is absent from this debate, however, is a recognition of the relationship between ἐντὸς ἐμῶν (space) and ἐστὶν (time). That is, irrespective of whether ἐντὸς is translated as *within* or *among*, scholars have failed to see the nomadic event by which the kingdom (space) of God flows and moves *within* (inside) or *among* (outside or around) people.\footnote{GTh 3: "...the kingdom is within you and outside you..."; GTh 113: "His disciple(s) said to him: On what day does the kingdom come? (He said) It does not come when one expects (it). They will not say, Look, here! Or Look, there! But the kingdom of the Father is spread out upon the earth, and men do not see it".} Where Luke refers to the body of a person as a place, the phrase ἐντὸς ἐμῶν reveals the multiple time-spaces that connect these bodies/places to one another and to God.

In short, the nexus between the co-text (17:11-19) and the text (17:20-21) reveals that God's salvation and kingdom are not discrete, but are the same salvational event by which the invisible kingdom of God is visualized and moves. By linking the phrase ἐντὸς ἐμῶν (space) to ἐστὶν (time), Luke shows the connections between time and space, and reveals the multiple layers of times-spaces that pass between God, Jesus and those who hear Jesus' message. The word ἐστὶν (present-future) in 17:21 reveals the continual flows and movements of the kingdom, and reveals that the kingdom of God is changeable and moveable and something in motion and flowing.

### 2.4.2.2 The kingdom to come: the use of ἐγγίζειν and ἐγγύς

#### 2.4.2.2.1 Luke 10:9, 11.

The verb ἐγγίζειν used in 10:9, 11 means "to draw near" and "to arrive, reach" (cf. John 3:6).\footnote{C. H. Dodd claims that beyond the word engiken and Q's ephthasen lies the Aramaic term meta (to reach, to arrive). But Dunn notes that a different Aramaic form (qereb, to approach) is equally possible, and that Q's use of different Aramaic verbs implies an awareness, early in the establishment of the tradition, of a significant difference between the two sayings, see Dunn, *Jesus*, p. 407.} In contrast to 9:2, where Jesus commissions his disciples to proclaim the kingdom of God and perform healing, the phrase "to you" is added in Luke 10:9.\footnote{For a brief survey of the discussion see Meier, *Marginal Jew* 2:485.} By observing an addition of the phrase "to
you” (ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς) in Luke 11:20, Conzelmann argues that Luke 10:9, 11 are dealing with the future. However, the question of “whose” future and the precise reference of “to you” are unclear. Marshall rejects Conzelmann’s analysis, and argues that the phrase refers to a present entity. Dunn claims that the perfect verb ἐγγίσκεν does not refer to a timeless nearness, but to something that has happened to bring the kingdom near. But what is to happen before the kingdom of God comes? Marshall notes that it is the presence of Jesus that brings the kingdom near. Yet, he does not explore the precise nature of the kingdom that is near, nor its relation to the continual movement of God’s kingdom. What then does the word ἐγγίσκεν signify? Not only does it refer to the saving event(s) about to be preached and performed by Jesus’ disciples, but also it refers to the nomadic process of salvation by which the kingdom of God moves and expands (cf. 10:17-20). The result of the mission of the seventy in 10:17-20 suggests this, because it depicts the saving experience(s) of those who have accepted the message of Jesus’ disciples, suggesting that people who experience salvation are those who have already become God’s kingdom and who are thus living in the kingdom of God. Therefore, the central focus in 10:9, 11 is not on the fixed moment of the arrival of the kingdom, but on the dynamic movements of God’s kingdom through the soteriological events that are about to be proclaimed and performed by the seventy, and that are about to be received by their audiences. Such a conclusion indicates that the function of the word ἐγγίσκεν is to expose the eternal flows and movements of God’s kingdom from one place to another, which is yet further evidence that the kingdom of God is something flowing, becoming, and in motion – a changeable, morphological, and moveable kingdom.

325The means that the futurity of the kingdom is coupled with its present existence, as demonstrated in the activity of the missionaries. (Conzelmann, op. cit., p. 98 - not in English translation).
327Marshall, Theology, p. 133.
330Note that the concept of the geographical expansion of God’s kingdom presupposes that the kingdom of God has already come (cf. 4:43).
331It is also important to note that there is no significant difference between the mission of the twelve in 9:1-2 and that of the seventy in 10:9, 11. Just as there is a connection between proclaiming the kingdom of God and performing healing/exorcism in 9:1-2, so also the two are interconnected in 10:9. The words of the kingdom of God are bound up with the acts of the kingdom of God.
332Note the interrelation between to come near and to welcome or receive (cf. 15:1-2), which are all spatializing/relational actions.
2.4.2.2 Luke 15:1. The participle \(\text{ἐγγίζοντες}\) ("approaching" or "coming near") in 15:1 is closely associated with \(\text{προσέχομεν}\) ("welcoming" or "receiving") in 15:2. Again, such a link is another indication that the word \(\text{ἐγγίζω}\) in v. 1 refers to the nearness of saving event, suggesting the movements of the kingdom through which God, Jesus, and all sorts of people come and interact. Note that just as the tax-collectors and sinners come near Jesus in order to be saved, so their quest is fulfilled, as the word \(\text{προσέχομεν}\) illustrates (v. 2). Note also that the text of 15:2 echoes that of 5:31-32, where Jesus states that the purpose of his coming is to save sinners, and it is also connected to 19:1-10, where Jesus reveals that he has come to save the lost (out of place). That is, as Jesus’ welcoming, receiving, and eating with them (15:2) indicate, Jesus is described as the central node by which the tax collectors and sinners are connected to God and God’s kingdom. In Luke, having or sharing meal with Jesus is viewed as securing one’s placement in the kingdom of God. Jesus states, “Blessed is everyone who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God” (Luke 14:15; cf. Rev. 19:9). Clearly, the saving event of sharing a meal with Jesus is the same as having a relationship with God through Jesus. Thus, the participle \(\text{ἐγγίζοντες}\) does not refer to the fixed moment of the arrival of a salvational event or the kingdom, but discloses the dynamic movements of salvational space-time, describing salvational event or the kingdom as something becoming and in motion.

In short, as the analysis above indicates, the use of \(\text{ἐγγίζω}\) and \(\text{ἐγγίζει}\) exposes the dynamic spatial-temporal (geographical) expansion or movement of God’s kingdom, revealing the kingdom of God to be a dynamic network or event becoming, flowing, and in motion. What actuates the dynamic event of flows of God’s kingdom is the salvational authority-power of God, by which Jesus preaches and performs, by which the hidden kingdom is visualized, and by which the dynamic network (kingdom) of God brought by Jesus moves and expands. Moreover, Luke presents Jesus, and the saving events preached and performed by Jesus, as the same saving event of God.

---

333 Luke has already linked the act of coming to Jesus with receiving salvation. That is, people have experienced God’s salvation through Jesus (cf. 5:15; 6:18-19).
334 Nolland claims that 15:2 has stronger links to 5:30 than v. 1 (Luke, p. 770).
335 The “one who was lost” (19:10) probably refers to the chief tax-gatherer (19:2), who was labeled as a sinner (19:7).
336 This statement signifies anticipation of securing one’s place at the heavenly banquet, that is, eschatological salvation (cf. Luke 22:30).
2.4.2.3 The kingdom to come (ερχομαι)

Luke 11:2-4. At first glance, it seems as though the kingdom is described as something yet to come in the second petition of the Lord’s Prayer: “May your kingdom come” (Luke 11:2). However, Johnson suggests that the expression “kingdom come” (ελθετω) fits within Jesus’ ministry of proclaiming the arrival of the kingdom of God.337 But Dunn insists that the kingdom is not here yet and states: “One does not pray for something to come if it is already present.”338 Many scholars agree on the similarities between the Lord’s Prayer and an early form of Jewish Kaddish prayer: “May he (God) establish his sovereignty in your lifetime and in your days and in the lifetime of all the house of Israel even speedily and at a near time”.339 Dunn states: “The point is that both prayers look for an effective implementation of God’s kingdom”.340 Dunn also notes that the petition may well be understood as an expression of hope in God as a king, and then concludes: “It is the undisputed petition for the kingdom as still to come which gives the prayer as a whole its eschatological note.”341

But what is the precise nature of the kingdom in Luke 11:2? Do these words refer to its impending arrival or final consummation? Do other related petitions in Luke 11:3-4 also refer to the anticipated arrival or final consummation? If so, what is the point of praying the Lord’s Prayer daily, if the kingdom will only come at a fixed time? How does this prayer benefit those who are poor, sick, and lost now? Alternatively, if the phrase does not refer to the final consummation, then does it refer to a near future? For whom is it a near future? How does this prayer fit with the soteriological events articulated and performed by Jesus and his disciples, by which God’s kingdom is manifested and moves?

Once again, as we already have seen, the issue here is not in determining the fixed moment of the arrival or final consummation of the kingdom, but rather in recognizing the saving authority-power of God and the eternal flows and motions of the kingdom that comprise the dynamic network (space) of God. We will see that the

338 Dunn, Jesus, p. 409.
340 Dunn, Jesus, p. 410. Dunn’s claim is based on an assumption that there is only absolute, singular, or linear time. However, we already noted that just as multiplicity of space-time operates among Jesus’ audiences, so also Luke’s view of time is not absolute or linear, but relational.
341 Dunn, Jesus, p. 411.
coming of the kingdom in this text is closely related to the coming of God’s salvation (cf. 4:19).

Several points need to be made here.

(a) As the link between “Father” and the name in the first parallelism with the first petition, the emphasis is on the salvational authority-power of God. In other words, the name in 11:1 stands for God and God’s saving authority-power. Likewise, the kingdom discloses the authority-power of God. As Luke unfolds his narrative, he links the act of calling on the name of the Lord to receiving salvation (cf. Acts 2:21). Similarly, in Acts 2:38 Luke links the act of calling on the name of Jesus in baptism to receiving salvation, that is, through the release from sins and the acceptance of the Holy Spirit. In this respect, not only are the name, the kingdom, and the salvational event (release from sins) connected to one another, but also the kingdom and the name signify the salvational authority-power of God by which people release sins of others and are to be released from sins (v. 4).

(b) The petition for daily bread has two implications: (1) that the source of the bread/food is from God; (2) that the lives of petitioners depend on God. In other words, people’s daily lives revolve around God. The difficult adjective τὸ τρόπον used in 11:3 (cf. Matt 6:11) can mean: (1) daily, (2) future, and (3) necessary. Johnson translates the phrase as the bread we need. But Green notes that, in the light of the evidence of Acts, it most probably refers to the bread pertaining to the coming day, and thus ultimately to the bread of the kingdom (cf. 14:15). Yet, as the ώρα indicates, τὸ τρόπον denotes daily bread, meaning something recurring on a daily basis, suggesting the basic element for sustaining one’s life. This means that the phrase refers both to the daily and the coming bread of the kingdom. Not only does such a present-future sense imply that God provides endlessly for those

Note that the “coming” of the kingdom is not paralleled in ancient Jewish texts. But in the Old Testament the coming of the LORD (1 Chr 16:33; Pss 96:13; 98:9; Isa 26:21; Mic 1:3) and the coming of the Day of the LORD (Isa 13:6; Joel 2:1; Zech 14:1; Mal 4:5) are interconnected and revolve around God’s soteriological event/s.

See below.
The word ἀπὸ can refer to both “bread” and “food”, Green, Luke, p. 442 n. 20.
Note that the purpose of electing the seven was to serve the daily food, because many widows of Hellenistic Jews were neglected (Acts 6:1-3).
who depend on him, but it also reveals the eternal saving event of flows and movements. That is, as the use of τῶν ἀρτον and ἡμέραν indicates,\textsuperscript{351} the daily and coming (present-future) activity of the people must revolve around the soteriological event(s) of God, manifested in Jesus.

It is also worth noting that the theme of providing bread for those who depend on God, namely the poor and hungry to whom the kingdom belongs (6:20-21), is closely associated with God’s salvation. Just as God’s feeding the hungry is a component of Jesus’ birth narrative (1:53), so also it is revealed through Jesus in the feeding the five thousand (9:12-17). Such a dynamic salvific event is viewed as a typical feature of the individual’s present-tense experience of salvation and of the kingdom, showing that those who experience salvation are those who are connected to the saving network of God brought by Jesus and who are therefore living in the kingdom of God. Significantly, where Matthew uses the aorist, Luke uses the present tense of δίδωμι to emphasize the continuous act of giving.\textsuperscript{352} In fact, Jesus has already stressed how important it is to give to those who ask, saying “Give to everyone who asks of you” (6:30, 38). Similarly, John the Baptist encourages people to share food with one another (cf. Luke 3:11). In Luke 16:19-31, Luke states that those who neglect to feed those who are poor will be punished. In Acts, neglecting to distribute food daily becomes a major failure of the apostles’ ministry, which leads them to select deacons (Acts 6:1ff.). The act of giving bread/food indicates that, although God is the ultimate source of salvation, salvation is experienced through God’s people (cf. 6:27-38). Thus, Luke’s use of the present tense to describe soteriological events (present-future) recalls the past event of salvation (past-present), and anticipates a future event (present-future), situating present reality at the intersection of past and future as if the past and future events of salvation were available to be experienced today.

(c) Luke discloses that the theme of “release” is central to Jesus’ missionary program (4:18-19), and is linked to the kingdom of God (4:31; 9:1-2; 10:9). Luke describes the multiple layers of release: release from sin, sickness, “demonic possession,” social stigma, and debt.\textsuperscript{353} Significantly, in this verse Luke links sins to debts. Here Luke connects τὰς ἀμαρτίας to the participial ὁφείλοντι (indebted, or one

\textsuperscript{351}Green, \textit{Luke}, p. 443.
\textsuperscript{353}I will pick up the significant theme of release and elaborate on it in the following chapter.
who is indebted), showing that Luke understands debts and sins to be synonymous.\textsuperscript{354} The link also illustrates that those who release others from debt are those who will themselves be released from their sins. The use of the \( \gamma \alpha \rho \) clause indicates that divine release depends upon men’s release.\textsuperscript{355} A similar observation is also found in 6:37, where Jesus says to his listeners: “Release, and you will be released.” But the emphasis here is not on whether God can release sins on the basis of human effort, but on the urgency of the need for people to release one another from sin or debt (17:3-4; 24:27). Where Matthew uses the aorist \( \delta \phi \iota \kappa o \mu e \nu \), Luke uses the present verb \( \delta \phi \iota \o \mu e \nu \) to express the continual movement of release from sins and debts. Jesus’ disciples have already practiced releasing others from sins and debts daily.\textsuperscript{356}

It is also important to note that, rather than the idea that sin and debt are motionless, the word release suggests movement and even rhythm, a moving act by which a dynamic space, between the one who releases and the one who is released, is created. Therefore, the petition for forgiveness of sins in relation to God’s kingdom exposes the dynamic flows of that kingdom. As we have seen, this is reaffirmed in Luke 11:20, when Jesus states: “If I cast out demons by the finger of God, then the kingdom of God has come upon you.”\textsuperscript{357} Again, note that Luke’s treatment of present tense depicts present reality as a junction between past and future, suggesting that the soteriological event combining past and future is available today.

(d) The use of the word \( \pi e \rho a \alpha m o \varsigma \) recalls Jesus’ temptation (4:1-13) and the need for faithfulness in a time of temptation (8:13), and points to Luke 22:40, where Jesus instructs his followers: “Pray that you may not enter into temptation” (cf. 22:46). The primary theme connecting these texts together is of faithfulness to God and God’s words. The sequence depicting the devil’s temptations and Jesus’ responses in 4:3-12 clearly reveals Jesus’ obedience and faithfulness to the one who

\textsuperscript{354} Luke understands sins and debts as oppressions and bonds from which people need to be released (cf. 4:18). Evan notes that the word \( \delta \phi \iota \o \mu e \nu \) involves “mixing cancellation of debts with forgiveness of sins,” Luke, p. 483. Luke portrays Jesus as one who releases people from sins and debts that are due to the priests.


\textsuperscript{357} Jesus’ saving activity of “release” from the power of evil spirits/Satan is closely related to his healing activity, because there is a link between sickness and the power of evil spirits/Satan (see below).
commissioned him (Luke 9:48; 10:16; cf. 4:43). Luke also illustrates the interaction between faith and salvation in 8:13, where Jesus encourages the disciples not to fall away in a time of temptation, but to be faithful (cf. Luke 22:40, 46). It is noteworthy that Satan enters into Judas (22:3-6), as the devil is always looking for a good opportunity to test God’s people (cf. 4:13). Hence Jesus prays for Simon not to fail in the time of his test (22:32). Likewise, he instructs him to pray for help in the time of tribulation/testing (22:40, 46). Note that the endless prayer is unfolded in 11:5-13, where prayer is described as an ongoing activity (cf. 11:9): *keep asking* (αἰτεῖτε), *keep seeking* (ζητεῖτε), and *keep knocking* (κρούετε). Therefore, the petition about the coming kingdom is related to the eternal activity of giving people *daily bread* and *releasing* people from sins/debts, and refers to the prayer for recurring help in maintaining one’s faithfulness in God in times of temptation (cf. 18:8; 22:32). The idea of the *coming* of the kingdom in this text, then, is depicted as *being-toward* or *becoming*, and refers to the eternal flows and movements of God’s kingdom, which is something *becoming* and *in motion*.

(e) Not only does Luke 11:13 tie with Luke 11:2, but it is also closely associated with 12:32, where the Father promises the gift of his kingdom. It appears that the references to the Holy Spirit in Luke 11:13 and to the kingdom in Luke 12:32 are closely associated with God’s saving authority-power, by which Jesus grants salvation and access to the kingdom, and by which Jesus’ disciples takes over his works (Acts 1:8). Just as Luke describes how Jesus was anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power, so he also anticipates how people will be anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power. Notice that Luke has already mentioned that Jesus

---

361 Just as the Holy Spirit is understood as the power of God (4:14; 5:17; 24:49; Acts 1:4-5, 8; 10:38), so also the kingdom is portrayed as the power of God who reigns/rules over all the powers of Satan (9:1-2; 10:9, 18-19; 11:2 (?), 12:32).
gave authority-power to his disciples (9:1-2) and the seventy (10:1, 18). With God's saving authority-power, Jesus' disciples proclaimed the kingdom and performed healings (10:17-20). Thus, as the co-texts 11:13 and 12:32 indicate, the extension of God's power in granting the Holy Spirit or access to the kingdom is a means of transfiguring God's salvational power on a universal level. Surely Acts 2:21 points to this: "Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved." Here Luke explicitly connects calling on the name of the Lord to receiving salvation. As the co-texts in Acts 1:4-5, 8 and 2:17 indicate, the content of salvation in 2:21 is closely related to receiving the Holy Spirit. It is equally important to observe the fulfillment of the divine promise (Luke 11:13 and Acts 2:21) through an act of calling on the name of Jesus in Acts 2:38. Just as the authority-power and its operational space are interconnected, so also the co-texts in Acts 1:4-5 and 8 indicate the interaction between the Holy Spirit and authority-power, and the geographical (temporal-spatial) expansion of the kingdom.

(f) In contrast to Matthew, the phrase "your kingdom come" in Luke has a textual variation. Some mss. (162, 700), e.g. Marcion, the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, and Maximus Confessor, have a different form of the petition: "May your Holy Spirit come upon us and purify us". In the light of Luke 11:13, where Luke speaks of God giving the Holy Spirit to those who ask him, some scholars claim that "your kingdom come" is of secondary importance, and that the variation indicates that the phrase "the kingdom" does not carry the same force as it does in Matthew 6:10. However, what is at issue here is that the coming of God's saving authority-power still carries the same force as it does in Matthew. Thus, the idea of coming in the Lord's Prayer discloses the flows and motions of God's saving authority-power by which salvation is given, by which the hidden kingdom of God is visualized, and by which the saving network (kingdom) of God is established and moves.

To summarize the preceding analysis, the idea of coming does not refer to the fixed moment of arrival or the final moment of consummation, but displays the

---

3:21-22; 4:18-19), from Jesus to Jesus' disciples (Luke 9:1-2), and from Jesus' disciples to all who commit themselves to Jesus (Acts 8:17), describing the power as something flowing and in motion. Note also that receiving the Holy Spirit is viewed as a form of salvation (Acts 2:38; 8:14-17; 10:38-48). Some scholars reason that this should probably be regarded as an old petition, used in connection with the baptism of converts, which found its way into the Lord's Prayer. See Mason, The Sayings of Jesus, pp. 265-266. For detailed arguments on this issue see Marshall, Luke, p. 458. There is a close link between the coming of the Holy Spirit and the coming of power in Acts 1:8, where Jesus states: "You shall receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you" (Acts 1:8a).
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nomadic event of flows and movements that characterizes the kingdom. As we already have illustrated, the name and the kingdom of God both signify the authority-power of God. In this respect, the phrase “Your [i.e. God’s] kingdom come” entails the temporal-spatial expansion of the kingdom of God, defining the kingdom as something in motion. That is, the expression discloses the eternal flows and movements of God’s saving authority-power, by which the dynamic network (kingdom) of God - between Jesus/God who releases and those who are released from sin and debt - is created and moves from one sphere to another.

In conclusion, I have illustrated that the primary function of the words has come near, come, is coming, comes, and has come is not to refer to the fixed or static moment of the coming of the kingdom, but to expose the active flows and motions of that kingdom, defining it as a dynamic event in motion and becoming - a changeable and moveable kingdom. This nomadic movement can be viewed as the spatial-temporal (geographical) expansion of God’s kingdom. What actuates the dynamic movements of God’s kingdom is God’s saving authority-power, by which salvation is granted, by which the hidden kingdom is visualized, and by which the relational network (kingdom) of God is created and proliferates. Note also that Luke depicts the present reality as a crossroads where past and future intersect, seeing it as a multi-layered intersection of moments. In this way, the past-future event of salvation can be experienced in the present, as the movements of past and future merge into the present day, or the direction of today moves out into the past and the future.

2.4.3 The relational network of God

In the previous sections I have illustrated the idea that what actuates the nomadic movements and flows of the kingdom is the saving authority-power of God, which is itself expressed through salvational events that create a relational network between God, Jesus and the people. This will be clearer as we examine the following parables. In the parables of the sower, the mustard seed, and the leaven, Luke links the sower, the seed and the leaven to the places (i.e. soil, garden, and meal) in which they are sowed, and so discloses the relational network that exists between them. Also, as the theme of growing indicates, Luke demonstrates a nomadic event of flows and

---

366 Luke 8:10-11; Mt 13:3-9, 18-23; Mk 4:2-20.
movements. By comparing the growing of the seed, the mustard seed, and the leaven to the kingdom of God, Luke presents the kingdom as a relational network; that is, as something in motion. As we shall see, the relational network of God is not presented in hierarchical or binary terms, but in terms of heterarchical and multiple relation(s).

Before we proceed, however, it is important to recognize that the idea of becoming or duration here is not one of absence, of empty time, but it refers to perceptions and actions in a flow of experience, because attention is always situated in a duration that throws itself into the future. Here duration is pictured as being-towards, becoming. So, for example, the seed that contains the multiple phases of the future in the following parable should not be viewed as insignificant or nonbeing, but as significant and being. Again, the nomadic flows of being-toward define the kingdom of God as a relational network.

2.4.3.1 The parable of the sower (Luke 8:5-15). In the same way that Luke’s gospel begins with a summary of Jesus’ salvational ministry/event (8:1, 2), so also the parable articulated by Jesus here should be understood as part of the ongoing flows and movements of the saving events revealed in Luke 4:18 and 4:43, and by which the invisible kingdom of God is visualized.

A few observations need to be noted. First, not only are the images of the seed, the word, and the kingdom presented as folded layers of the multiple phases of future, but also Luke discloses the relational network that exists between the sower and the seed and the soil in which it is sowed. When the sower sows the

---

369 Bergson calls this “attention to life” (Deleuze, Bergsonism, p. 70).
370 Mike Crang, “The city and topologies of memory”, p. 168.
371 Note also that the present includes the past through the process by which attention contracts into the future and dilates into the past (Deleuze, Bergsonism, p. 49), suggesting that the present and past coexist in a virtual order. Deleuze says, “We have great difficulty in understanding a survival of the past in itself because we believe that the past is no longer, that it has ceased to be. We have thus confused Being with being-present. Nevertheless the present is not; rather it is pure becoming, always outside itself. It is not, but it acts. Its proper element is not being but the active or useful. The past, on the other hand, has ceased to act or be useful. But it has not ceased to be. Useless, inactive, impassive it IS, in the full sense of the word” (Deleuze, Bergsonism, p. 55). Reversing the usual ways in which we think of time, the past does not recede but moves towards the present and exerts a pressure to be admitted, gnawing its way into the future (Deleuze, Bergsonism, p. 70).
373 Note that Luke alone maintains to use the singular seed as opposed to plural seeds (cf. Mk 4:8; Mt 13:8).
374 The idea of becoming, growing, and producing points to this direction. Elsewhere, Luke describes the word of God as something grows and spreads (Acts 19:20; cf. 6:7; 12:24). The becoming of the word was operated by “the power of the Lord” signifying the soteriological event (Acts 2:47).
375 As opposed to the phrases: beside (apisthē) the road (8:5, 12), on (ēn) rocky (8:8, 15), and among (ē kai) thorns (8:7, 14), which are pictured as non-relational, Luke presents the phrase eis (into) soil/heart (8:8, 15) as relational.
seed-word (8:11) into the good soil-heart (8:15), the folded seed-word unfolds in the soil-heart (i.e. below ground), sprouts (above the ground), grows up (on the surface), and produces fruit (an extension of the surface). This dynamic motion of stretching out is a metaphor for the unfolding of the multiple layers of future, a nomadic event of flows and movements, where the seed-word is the folded thing that contains the multiple potentialities of the future. This means that Luke does not view the seed as insignificant or not-being, but rather as significant and being; more strictly, being-towards. In other words, without the seed-word, there is no hope for the future.

Secondly, as the hidden seed-word is unfolded, so the hidden-folded kingdom is visualized-unfolded into the multiple layers of a relational network through Jesus' preaching of the kingdom and the performing of healings (cf. 8:1-2, 26ff.). This relational network links God and Jesus (the sowers) to God's people (the sowed ones). In other words, Luke understands the kingdom to be a relational network connecting the one who sows, the sowed, and everything in between. Moreover, the purpose of Luke's linking the theme of growing to the kingdom, the seeing and hearing of God's word (8:8, 15, 21), and believing and being saved (8:12, 21) is to present the kingdom as a relational network between the sower(s) and the sowed, between the speakers and hearers, and between the savior(s) and the saved. Moreover, the nexus between hearing (the word) and doing (work) in 8:21 (cf. 8:1-2), and between hearing and believing in 8:10-13 shows us that 376 Luke presents people who have experienced God's salvation as connected to the relational network of God (cf. 10:23-24), i.e. living in the kingdom of God (8:10). 377 Note that what actuates the relational network between God, Jesus and God's people is the interaction between the act of sowing and the act of those who receive and believe in the word of God (8:12, 15) (the sowed). 378 For this reason, the devil comes and takes away the word from the hearts of those who have heard the word of God so that they may not believe

376 Just as the link between belief and salvation is expressed in 8:12, and connected to the relationship between hearing God's word and doing what it says in 8:21 (cf. 6:49), so also those who hear the word of God and do it are presented as those who become and dwell in the kingdom, Green, Luke, p. 424.

377 The plural "secrets of the kingdom" may reflect the contemporary Jewish use of הָסְרִים, râzê ūl, the "secrets of God" known from various Qumran texts (1QpHab 7:8; 1QS 3:23; 1QM 3:9; 16:11; 4Q Instruction). In contrast to Mark (4:11), Luke replaces the singular μυστήριον with the plural form of τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (cf. Matt 13:11) and adds the infinitive γινώσκει "to give," describing God's gift to the disciples as a cognitive experience of the kingdom (cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 707).

378 Note that the words hear, hold and bear are "spatializing actions," referring to soteriological events that create a relational network (space) between the sower/s and the sowed ones, and between the sowed ones and all that lies between them.
and be saved (8:12). In this sense, persons who are *beside* the road (8:12), *upon* the rocky path (8:13), and *among* the thorns (8:14) are presented as persons who are *out of place*, who are disconnected from the *relational* network of God (13:22-30).

2.4.3.2 The Parables of Growth (Luke 13:18-19, 20-21). Dodd views the parables of growth as the end of the process of growth.\(^{379}\) He argues that the emphasis of the parables lies upon the completion of the process of fermentation.\(^{380}\) His argument is based on Luke 10:2, where Jesus calls his disciples and sends them out to reap. Dodd views Jesus’ ministry as a major shift from the process of growth to the time of harvest.\(^{381}\) But Hultgren argues that the parable of growth emphasizes a contrast between small beginnings and big endings in the coming of the kingdom, not a gradual development.\(^{382}\) For Hultgren, the kingdom of God is in the future. He says, “The accent is on the certainty and powerful significance of the coming of the kingdom in due course.”\(^{383}\) He then argues that, because the parable of leavening portrays the kingdom of God as something hidden, believers must await the full manifestation of the kingdom.\(^{384}\)

However, for Luke the kingdom has already come, and is *in operation* among the people.\(^{385}\) Johnson notes that these two parables contrast (1) small beginnings with powerful results: the seed shoots into a tree; the yeast leavens a whole lump and (2) the hidden with the manifest: the seed is planted but becomes visible in the plant; the yeast is hidden in the flour and is known only because of the growth it gives.\(^{386}\) Likewise, Dunn understands the kingdom as a process of growth or development as well as of climax.\(^{387}\)


\(^{380}\)Ibid., p. 191.

\(^{381}\)But the kingdom of God is still presented as something that comes *near* in 10:9: “The kingdom of God has come near to you” (cf. 10:11).

\(^{382}\)Hultgren, *The Parable of Jesus*, p. 395.

\(^{383}\)Ibid., p. 401.


\(^{385}\)Hultgren assumes that the kingdom of God has not yet come because the glory of the kingdom is invisible in the present, suggesting that for him, the kingdom is something visible and static. As Dodd justifiably demonstrates, for Luke the kingdom of God is already realized. Dodd states, “The kingdom of God, for which the prophets until John made preparation, has now come” (*Parables*, p. 191). As Dodd rightly observes, the use of aorist verbs: ἐπέφερεν ("grew"), ἐγένετο ("became"), κατεσκυρώσεν ("made") in 13:19 and λαμβάνει (“took”), ἐσκεραύθεν ("mixed"), ἐξωμοίθη ("was leaven") in 13:21 refers to a past event that took place in the ministry of Jesus (past-present), suggesting that what is of central importance here is not whether or not the kingdom has come, but the fact of the *becoming* of the kingdom through the dynamic movement of unfolding as a consequence of the soteriological event(s).


\(^{387}\)Dunn, *Jesus Remembered*, p. 463.
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However, none of these modern scholars really explains the precise reference to the kingdom, nor do they relate it to the dynamic movement of God's kingdom. Also they interpret the parable of becoming on the basis of their modern perception of absolute/singular/linear time (etic), not by way of Luke's view of becoming, which comprises relational/multiple time (emic). By emphasizing big endings, they treat the seed/kingdom as insignificant, as if it were nonbeing or empty space-time, and they emphasize the visible/static kingdom, and understand time as absolute/singular. Thus, they fail to see (1) the significance of the invisible and changeable seed (kingdom), (2) the relational network created between man, seed, garden, tree, birds of the air, and everything that is in between them, and (3) the dynamic mobility of the seed (kingdom) as something flowing, becoming, and in motion, revealing the multiple layers (times-spaces) of the kingdom. In fact, this threefold theme is intermingled with the saving event(s) by which the hidden-folded kingdom is visualized-unfolded and moves.

One further observation needs to be noted. Because they are introduced by oνε, the parables are closely linked to the preceding summary of the saving event and the humiliation of all God's opponents (v. 17). Thus, the parables of the kingdom are to be understood in close connection to the soteriological events preached and performed by Jesus in 13:10-17, where the hidden/invisible kingdom of God is visualized and manifested when Jesus releases a crippled woman from her sickness. Jesus says, "Woman, you are released from your sickness," but Jesus' opponents complain, and criticize him for performing such a saving event on the Sabbath. In return, Jesus rebukes them for not releasing this woman from her bondage by Satan (13:15-16). As a result, his opponents are humiliated and the crowd rejoices at all the glorious things being done by Jesus. Because the phrase, glorious things, refers to the

---

388 I call this parable "the parable of becoming," to emphasize the lack of static, chronological growth or development in the parable.

389 It is true that there is an element of contrast, between a small beginning (a mustard seed) and a great result (a tree/the birds of the air). Marshall states, "The stress is not so much on the idea of growth in itself as on the certainty that what appears tiny and insignificant will prove to have been the beginning of a mighty kingdom" (Marshall, Luke, p. 561). But not all tiny and insignificant seeds will prove to be the beginning of a mighty kingdom (cf. 8:5-15). Moreover, the issue here is not to contrast a small beginning with a mighty ending based on a linear time, but to draw attention to the becoming itself, not as a form of visible and static chronological development, but as something in motion, disclosing the multiple layers of the kingdom.

390 Mike Crang and Nigel Thrift, Thinking Space, p. 3.

391 The word ἀφλεἴν in 13:12 can be translated as "to release" or "to set free". Not only did a spirit cause her sickness (cf. 13:11), but also the power of Satan or Satan bound her for eighteen long years (cf. 13:16).
visible saving events of Jesus, we can see that the hidden kingdom of God is visualized by the salvational events articulated and performed by Jesus. Surely, by Jesus touching the woman who was bound by Satan for eighteen long years, the relational network between God/Jesus, the woman, the entire multitude, and the larger audience is established and moves. It is within this framework that Luke compares the kingdom of God to a mustard seed and to leaven.

2.4.3.2.1 Luke 13:18-19. Jesus compares the kingdom to a mustard seed, saying, “It is like a mustard seed that someone took and sowed in the garden; it grew and became a tree, and the birds of the air made nests in its branches” (13:19). Here Luke omits the contrast between “the smallest of all the seed” and “the greatest of shrubs” which is critical to the point in Mark 4:31, Matt 13:32, and the Gospel of Thomas 20, suggesting that Luke does not wish to focus on the contrast between small beginnings and big endings, but on the processes or movements of the seed-kingdom. In this sense, the folded seed-kingdom is depicted as the significant being (being-toward or becoming). Likewise, the dynamic motions of the seed-kingdom describe the seed-kingdom as something changeable and flexible from one shape to another.

Interestingly, what establishes the relational network of God is the interaction between the sower(s) and the sowed (cf. 8:12). By the act of an individual, a

---

392 Generally, a “mustard seed” grows into a six (ABD 2:812), twelve (Manson, Sayings, p. 123), or in rare cases fifteen-feet tall tree (The New Encyclopaedia, 8:455).


394 Such a qualitative change and its eternal movements are reflected in the eternal cycle of Jesus’ life in terms of coming (connecting) and departing (disconnecting): Jesus’ birth (the coming of Jesus), death (the departing of Jesus), resurrection (the coming of Jesus), ascension (the departing of Jesus), and the coming of the Holy Spirit (the coming of Jesus). Such a dynamic life of flows and motions is implied in Jesus’ birth narrative, his life/ministry, and the coming of the Holy Spirit: the coming of a seed-word (from God) inside Mary’s womb — the departure of the infant Jesus from his mother’s womb — the child growing and becoming strong (2:40, 52) — the public life/work of Jesus — Jesus’ physical death (the departure of Jesus from his physical body) — resurrection (the coming of Jesus, another form of life, that is, the glorious-spiritual-invisible body) — ascension (the departing of Jesus to God) — the coming of the Holy Spirit (the coming of Jesus, the coming of Jesus’ Spirit)(cf. Marshall, who links the Holy Spirit to the spirit of Jesus (Acts 16:7), Historian and Theologian, p. 181) — the present life-work of the Holy Spirit among the people. As we can see, there is no static and fixed moment of beginning or ending, nor are the movements of Jesus’ life place-bound by static notions of place and space, here and there, but rather there is a condition of eternal flows and movements of life from one sphere or shape to another (i.e. a qualitative change in type and kind), which depicts his life as an eternal cycle(s)-movement(s) of coming (turning) and departing (returning).

395 Where Matthew uses the phrase “sowed (σπέρειν) in his field” (Mt 13:31), Luke says that the sower “threw (βάλειν) into his garden,” which seems to reveal that Luke saw the man’s action as less deliberate than did Matthew (see Fitzmyer Luke, p. 1017). This exposes the dynamic relational network that exists between the sower and the sowed. On the link between faith and salvation, see chapter five.
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relational network (time-space) is initially created between the man (the sower), the mustard seed (the sowed), and the garden/soil, and this extends to include the man, the mustard seed, the garden, the tree, and the birds of the air and everything that is in-between and among them, so that the folded seed-kingdom, which contains multiple phases of the future, unfolds and spreads out. The phrase “the birds of air made nests in its branches” points in this direction. According to Hunter, this phrase signifies a great empire embracing all the people, because the rabbis sometimes referred to the Gentiles as “the birds of the air.” Again, the image of the coming of “the birds of the air” and nesting in the branches of the tree does not refer to the contrast between static, small beginnings and big endings, or to the fixed moment of the coming of the kingdom, but displays the active movements of the kingdom. Thus, the weight should be given to the dynamic flows of the kingdom brought by Jesus.

2.4.3.2.2 Luke 13:20-21. In this parable, Jesus compares the kingdom of God to leaven. As in the case with 13:18-19, this parable should be read in close connection to the saving events preached and performed by Jesus in 13:10-17. Hunter notes that the kingdom is not being compared to leaven itself, but to what happens when you put leaven into three pecks of meal, and it thus demonstrates the power of God. Hultgren also writes, “The imagery is used here simply to illustrate the inevitable power of the kingdom.” Certainly, the power of God is seen here, but the primary emphasis is not on either the power of God or the leaven, but on the relational network of God expressed through the dynamic flows of the saving power-authority of God, the woman, leaven, dough, and everything in-between them. Luke’s use of the aorist words λαβοῦσα (“took”), ἐκ τούτου (“mixed”), and ἔσχατον (“was leaven”) in 13:21 point in this direction. Not only do such words disclose the past-present (being-toward) reality of the kingdom, but also they are visualized as dynamic events (spatializing actions), which create the relational network between God/God’s power-authority, the woman, and the ingredients that make up the dough (including water and sugar). As in the case with the seed, the idea that the yeast is hidden is not insignificant, denoting nonbeing or empty space-time, but it is significant, a quality of being-towards and becoming. Thus, as the image of hiding the leaven indicates, the

---

397 Hunter, The Parables, p. 44 n. 1. Note the idea of embracing discloses the hierarchical and binary system.
398 Ibid., p. 44.
hidden-folded kingdom of God is visualized-unfolded through the soteriological event(s) by which the relational network of God is created and proliferates.

In short, as these parables indicate, the kingdom is represented as hidden, invisible, and folded, but containing the multiple phases-potentials of the future. As the folded kingdom is exposed and proliferates into the multiple layers of the kingdom, the relational network (kingdom) of God, between God and Jesus (the sowers) and persons (the sowed) is created and grows. What actuates the relational network of God is the interaction between the act of the sowers (God, Jesus, and the messengers) who speak of the kingdom, and the act of the persons (the sowed) who hear and believe them. Within this framework, the folded kingdom is pictured as a significant event and as something changeable (a qualitative change in type and kind). Also the kingdom is pictured as a dynamic event in which past, present, and future intersect. Moreover, not only do the eternal movements of the kingdom reveal the kingdom as something flowing, becoming, and in motion, but they also unfold the multiple dimensions (spaces-times) of the kingdom.

2.5 Conclusion

My primary goal in this present chapter has been to investigate the precise meaning/s of the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ and its significant relationship to τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ from the geographical (spatial-temporal) perspective of Luke-Acts, within the cultural setting of the Jerusalem temple in the first century. As the preceding analysis indicates, the kingdom of God must be understood within the framework of the nomadic flows and motions of salvation preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem and from there to the ends of the earth.

I would argue, then, that we need to think of the kingdom as a body, not in terms of the visible-static architectural building of the temple, placed-bound in Jerusalem, but as the dynamic space of God that reveals the invisible-changeable-moveable body. This means that the kingdom is no longer place-bound by the static conditions of space and place, here and there. Furthermore, we should see the activity of the kingdom, not in terms of the sedentary and motionless activity of the temple, but as the nomadic flows and movements of the kingdom in-between, among, and

---

400 As we have seen, the phrase “the salvation of God” is expressed and revealed in various forms and shapes of saving events, that is, the multi-layers or events of salvation. We will elaborate this in the next chapter.
beyond things and persons. Finally, we should see the system of the kingdom, not in terms of a hierarchical, striated, territorialized, linear, closed, and fixed system, but as a dynamic, relational network of God, which describes the kingdom as the heterarchical, smooth, multiple, opened, deterritorialized, and unfixed space of God, where God and God’s people interact openly and freely, and where all sorts of people come and interact with one another regardless of their gender, ethnic, social, and religious status. Not only is this threefold layer of the kingdom completely interwoven, but also the kingdom is presented as the saving event that is in motion. For this reason, those who want to be saved act and move around Jesus or the saving events preached and performed by him and his disciples, which defines Jesus, or at least the saving events manifested by Jesus and his disciples, as the central node(s) or door(s) to the kingdom of God.

Chapter Three:
3.1 Introduction

As I noted in the introduction to this thesis, Luke explicitly links the saving terms σωτηρία and αφεσίων to the multiple layers of release (ἀφεσίων): release from sins, social stigmas (19:10), "demon-possessions" (8:36) and the binding power-authority of a demon (8:12). This has already been illustrated in the analysis of Luke's distinctive employment of the noun σωτηρία in 1:77, where Luke makes a precise nexus between salvation and release from sins, describing the two as essentially the same salvational event. As Marshall rightly notes, what lies at the heart of Luke's concept of salvation is release from sins. In fact, the meaning of σωτηρία is release from sins in Acts, as it is in Luke. In his gospel, Luke describes Jesus as a savior (Luke 2:11) and as the liberator who liberates and releases people from their sins and from captivity and oppression (Luke 4:18-19); he describes Jesus in the same terms in Acts, saying, "God exalted him [Jesus] at his right hand as

401 The verb form of ἀφίημι is used about 145 times in the NT. Forty-seven are found in Matthew, 34 in Mark, 33 in Luke, 15 in John, 3 in Acts, and 13 in the rest of the NT. It is notable that ἀφίημι occurs only 24 times in the sense of "to forgive sins" (4 times in Matthew, five times in Mark, 12 times in Luke, once in John, and twice in 1 John) and 7 times to mean "to forgive debts and trespasses" (5 times in Matthew; 2 times in Mark). In most cases, however, ἀφίημι means "to let go" and "to send away" (Mt. 13:36; Mk. 1:34; 4:36; 5:19, 37 par.; Acts 14:17), "to dismiss," "divorce," or "release" (Matt. 13:36; 1 Cor. 7:11-13); "to leave" (Mt 4:11; 8:15; 26:44; 27:50; Mk 1:20, 31; 10:28f; John 4:3); "to leave behind" (Mt. 5:24; 18:12; Mk. 1:18; John 14:18), and "to abandon" (Mk. 7:8; Rom. 1:27).

Unlike ἀφίημι, the noun form ἀφεσίων is used seventeen times in the New Testament, and mostly in the sense of forgiveness of sins. It is used fifteen times in the sense of forgiveness (Mt. 26:28; Mk. 1:4; Lk. 3:3; Acts 2:38; Heb. 9:22), and two times in the sense of release from captivity and oppression (1 K 4:18). It is notable that ἀφεσίων is found ten times in Luke-Acts, twice in Hebrews, twice in Mark, and once each in Ephesians and Colossians. It is also interesting to note that ἀφεσίων is totally absent from the undisputed Pauline letters. Although the word ἀφίημι occurs about 35 times in Luke-Acts, 12 times in Luke it is used in the sense of "to forgive sins" (5:20, 21, 23, 24; 7:47, 48, 49; 11:4; 12:10; 17:3, 4; 23:34) and once in Acts 8:22. This latter usage of ἀφίημι in Luke-Acts is not significant. However, in comparison with its usage in the other synoptic gospels and the rest of the New Testament, the usage of the noun form, ἀφεσίων, is clearly significant in Luke-Acts.


403 Cf. 4:18; 5:20; 24:47; Acts 10:43; 13:38

404 Just as he does in 5:32, here Luke reveals that the purpose of Jesus' coming is to save the lost, that is, the sinner (19:1-10; cf. 15:11-32). To save a sinner presupposes a release from sins.


Leader and Savior, that he might give repentance to Israel and forgiveness [release] of sins” (Acts 5:31; cf. 10:).

In Luke-Acts, the preaching of ἀφεὶς ἁμαρτίων (release from sins) is one of the focal messages in the ministry of John the Baptist, of Jesus Christ, and of the leaders of the early church. The primary role of John the Baptist is to prepare the way for the Lord (Luke 1:76) and to give knowledge of salvation to God’s people (ἐν ἀφείς ἁμαρτίων αὐτῶν, Luke 1:77). John begins his public ministry by preaching a baptism of repentance (eἰς ἀφείς ἁμαρτίων, Luke 3:3). Similarly, Jesus reveals his public ministry by proclaiming ἀφείς to the captives and the oppressed (Luke 4:18); in the course of doing so, he releases (ἀφίημι) Simon’s mother-in-law from a great “fever” (Luke 4:39) and a crippled woman from her sickness (Luke 13:11). In fact, Jesus releases (ἀφίημι) the paralyzed man and the sinful woman from their sins by pronouncing, “Your sins are forgiven you” (Luke 5:20; 7:48). In these two texts, Luke portrays Jesus as the one who has authority-power on earth to release people from sins, showing us that the soteriological network (kingdom) of God is manifested and unfolded in Jesus. At the same time, Jesus teaches his disciples to pray to God to release them from their sins as they have released other people from their debts (Luke 11:4), and instructs them to release others from their sins (Luke 17:3, 4).

Moreover, the risen Lord Jesus commissions his disciples to proclaim μετάνοιαν eἰς ἀφείς ἁμαρτίων in his name to all nations, beginning with Jerusalem (Luke 24:47). As he has been instructed, Peter proclaims repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus eἰς ἀφείς τῶν ἁμαρτίων (Acts 2:38). Likewise, Paul and Barnabas proclaim ἀφείς ἁμαρτίων to the people at Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:38). So too the mission of Paul is to turn people from darkness to light, and from the power-authority (ἐξουσίας) of Satan to God in order to receive ἀφείς ἁμαρτίων (Acts 26:18). As

Note that the two phrases, “to prepare the way of the Lord” and “to give knowledge of salvation” in Luke 1:76-77 are interconnected, suggesting that, at the outset, Luke presents John the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus. Not only is John presented as the representative of the old epoch (cf. Conzelmann), but he is also portrayed as a juxtaposition between the old epoch (i.e. the Jerusalem temple) and the new epoch (i.e. the saving network (kingdom) of God). This means that Luke does not present John the Baptist as the one who actually brings the saving network (kingdom) of God, but as one who provides a space for the kingdom of God that will be brought by Jesus. As in the case with the temple, for John the Baptist, the baptism of repentance is the key to the forgiveness (release) of sins (cf. Luke 3:3ff.; Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, pp. 108ff.).


Jesus taught his disciples how to pray: “And forgive [release: ἀφείς] us our sins, for we ourselves also forgive [release: ἀφίημι] everyone who is indebted to us” (Luke 11:4). Here Luke refers to sins as debts, and vice versa (see below).
these texts indicate, the proclamation of release from sins is one of the focal messages in the ministries of John and of Jesus, and a vital Christian message in the apostolic church, and it interacts with other themes of release: release from various forms of captivity and oppression.

What, then, does the phrase ἀφεσις ἀμαρτίων signify? Although many studies have been done on Luke’s writings, scholars have hardly worked in any detail on the precise meaning(s) of the phrase release from sins, nor on its relation to the multiple layers of release and to the nomadic flows and movements of the kingdom. As the frequent use of the noun ἀφεσις and that of the verb ἀφίημι in combination with sins indicates, sins are presented as the objects from which people are to be released. Although the vital link between sins and sickness is at the heart of the theme of release in Luke-Acts, scholars have downplayed its importance. In this chapter, therefore, I want to ask: what is the decisive relationship between sins and sicknesses, and particularly in relation to the multiple layers of release? What is the outcome of release from sins preached and performed by Jesus and his disciples? I will address these questions within Luke’s narrative world and his cultural context, particularly within the framework of holiness (the purity rules) in the first century, which was upheld and promoted by the temple authorities. Hence, I will first examine how sin and sickness were viewed in the first century. I will then explore the multi-layered fabric of the idea of release from the geographical perspective of Luke-Acts, that is, the nomadic flows and movements of the idea of release from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside) and from there (inside) to the ends of the earth (outside).

3.2 How were sin and sickness perceived in the first century?

In order to have a better understanding of sin and sickness, it is necessary to place them within a first-century cultural context, to allow us an insider’s perspective.

410 As we shall see, in his writings, Luke presents various forms of captivity and oppression, including sin, sickness, demonic possession, social stigma, and debt as the consequences of sin, from which people are to be released.

411 Though ἀφεσις is not used with the word ἀμαρτία in Luke 4:18, as we shall see, the concept of releasing people from sins is implied in the usage of the word ἀφεσις (see below).

412 Luke’s worldview, particularly in relation to sickness, lies heavily under the influence of a belief in spirits and demons. Hull argues that not only was Luke strongly influenced by Hellenistic magical belief and practice, but he also believed in magic. J. M. Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, p. 87. I will discuss how Luke viewed magic in the next chapter.
This means that we have to place them within the framework of the concepts of **holiness** and **impurity**, since the theme of **holiness** was the central motif in the life of Jewish people in the first century. E. P. Sanders explains that the majority of Jews in the land of Israel at the time of Jesus observed the rules of **purity** (i.e. **holiness**).\(^{413}\) Borg also notes that the Jewish social world came to be dominated by the **politics of holiness**.\(^{414}\) He claims that “**Holiness** became the paradigm by which the Torah was interpreted.”\(^{415}\) He then describes **holiness** as an act of **separation** between “clean and unclean, purity and defilement, sacred and profane, Jew and Gentile, righteous and sinner.”\(^{416}\) In a similar manner, Dale Martin states, “In almost every part of the ancient Mediterranean one can find notions of ritual pollutions, purifications, and cleanings.”\(^{417}\) Thus, one of the core values of first-century Judaism was God’s **holiness**,\(^{418}\) and this concept of **holiness** was based on the phrase: “You shall be holy, as I the Lord your God am holy” (Lev 19:2).

If this is the case, then the interrelation between **sin** and **sickness** in the ancient world should be interpreted within the framework of the rules of **holiness** (purity), since this concept was one of the core-values of the time. Moreover, as the ethos and organization of political, economic and social life were necessarily determined in large part by their relationship to the Jerusalem temple, the idea of **holiness** is also bound to the temple and territorialized in Jerusalem.\(^{419}\) In fact, as I have already shown, the places and people of the temple were separated according to the degrees of their purity (holiness) and the temple authorities upheld and promoted the rules of purity in order to control people through their daily activities. Through such rules of purity, the temple authorities monitored and controlled who was in and out of their

---

\(^{413}\) Sanders notes that the emphasis of the laws was on clean and unclean food and on not eating blood (Sanders, *Judaism*, pp. 214-30). We can find this reflected in Acts 10:14, where Peter states, “I have never eaten anything common/profane and unclean” (*pan koinon kai akatharton*). In ordinary Greek, *koinos* means simply “common, ordinary”. The sense, “profane, defiled, unclean” is derived from the use of *koinos* as equivalent to the biblical *tame*’ (e.g., Lev. 11:4-8; Deut. 14:7-10) or *chol* (e.g., Lev. 10:10; Ezek. 22:26; 44:23); hence the use of *koinos* in 1 Macc. 1:47, 62 (“unclean food”), Mark 7:2, 5 (“defiled hands”) and Acts 10:14 and 11:8. For the connection between this and Luke’s understanding of **purity/holiness**, see below.

\(^{414}\) For Borg, “politics” means the “shape” of the city and that of any human community. That is, “politics” is concerned with the shaping and the shape, the process as well as the result, *Jesus*, p 86.


\(^{419}\) Dunn, “Jesus and Holiness: The Challenge of Purity,” p. 177.
social world. This shows that the power of the temple authorities was binding and territorializing. That is, the idea of holiness (purity) discloses the hierarchical and binary system of the Jerusalem temple.

3.2.1 The Theme of Purity (Holiness) and Impurity (Pollution). In her book, *Purity and Dangers*, Mary Douglas discusses pollution on two levels: instrumental and expressive. In the former, pollution taboos are used to uphold the values of society, which maintains social morals, order, and roles through a belief in dangerous contagion. At the expressive level, Douglas presents the idea that pollution is an analogy "for expressing a general view of the social order." She treats pollution as equivalent to dirt, which she defines as matter out of place, signifying disorder. For example, garden dirt is in its proper place in the back yard. However, when the same dirt gets into the house (thus crossing the line), the house is considered dirty, defiled, unclean, and impure, showing that inside the house, dirt is out of place, i.e. the wrong thing at the wrong time and in the wrong place. Here, two conditions are implied: "a set of ordered relations and a contravention of that order." The idea of dirt, then, presumes a system, a set of line-markings or definitions. For "dirt is the by-product of a systematic ordering and classification of matter, in so far as ordering involves rejecting inappropriate elements."

In a similar vein, Countryman writes, "Dirt is what lies outside the system, what is perceived as not belonging in association with people of this particular society, whether as unfamiliar, irregular, unhealthy, or otherwise objectionable." That is, persons who are classified as deviants are presented as out of place (i.e. viewed negatively), showing that just as sickness was understood to be the direct result of sin in the first century, so also those persons who were labeled as sinners and who had visible sicknesses were portrayed as dirty, signifying that they were out of place.

Purity and pollution are mutually opposed. That is, pollution denotes the wrong thing, at the wrong time, and in the wrong place. Conversely, purity refers to the orderly system whereby people perceive that certain persons or things belong in

---

420 Douglas, *Purity and Dangers* p. 35.
422 Douglas, p. 35.
425 Foakes-Jackson and Lake write, "All ills [sicknesses] came from sin", vol. 4, p. 156.
certain places at certain times. In this sense, Neyrey notes that purity is the abstract way of indicating what fits, what is appropriate, and what is in place. Put differently, purity refers to a system, a coherent and detailed drawing of lines in the world, to peg, classify, and structure that world. For this reason, Neyrey understands purity to be a cultural map, which establishes “a place for everything and everything in its place.”

Moreover, Douglas perceives pollution as uncleanness and purity as holiness, and argues that adherents of primitive religions make no clear distinction between sacredness and uncleanness, because the concept of the sacred is little more than a prohibition to them. She defines the Latin word “sacer” as a “restriction through pertaining to the gods.” Just as the Hebrew root ליפ denotes apartness, separateness, sacredness, holiness of God, of persons, of places, and of things, so also Douglas translates it as whole and complete. She then concludes that “to be holy is to be whole, to be one: holiness is unity, integrity, perfection of the individual and of the kind”. In order to be holy or maintain order, persons must conform to the class to which they belong, indicating that holiness involves clear definition, order, and discrimination. Likewise, Malina notes that rules of purity establish a place for everything and everyone, with everything and everyone in its place and with anomalies properly excluded. Similarly, Countryman argues that purity means avoidance of dirt, which shapes much popular morality in cultures. He writes, “All rules that govern the boundaries of the human body tend at least to be presented as purity rules.” The idea of purity and that of pollution, therefore, define a system whereby person, place, and time are in place. Since the function of the boundaries (the rules of purity) is to separate, to purify, and to punish transgressions – in short, to impose system on an inherently untidy experience – it is vital for individuals to maintain their bodies in holiness or wholeness in order to be in place. Thus, the primary function of the purity rules (holiness) is the maintenance of fixed boundaries.

427 On a map of person, space, and time in the temple, see chapter two.
429 Mary Douglas, Purity and Danger, p. 121.
430 See BDB, p. 871.
431 Douglas, Purity and Dangers, p. 52.
432 Ibid, p. 53.
434 William Countryman, Dirt, Greed, and Set, p. 11.
435 Douglas, Purity and Dangers, p. 4. Note also that Douglas identifies four kinds of social pollutions: 1) danger pressing on external boundaries; 2) danger from transgressing the internal lines of the system; 3) danger in the margins of the lines; 4) danger from internal contradiction, pp. 122-124.
and territories. That is, the idea of holiness reveals the static binary and sedentary system of the temple.

3.2.2 The Body and its relation to Sickness. Just as Douglas portrays the physical human body as a symbol of the social body, so also Martin understands the human form as a form of society, and the individual's identity as dependent on his or her place in that society. Hence, it is important for a person to preserve his/her body in holiness/wholeness/purity in order to keep their place in that society. Although ancient Mediterranean cultures did not clearly define the nature of pollution, the concept depends to a great extent on differing ideologies of the body. Dale Martin provides an illustration of ancient ideologies of the body by analyzing the way in which disease was thought to threaten the body. The two major theories of etiology in the ancient world were the etiology of imbalance and the etiology of invasion.

(a) The etiology of imbalance means that "the body is normally a balanced ecosystem whose elements or forces are all necessary: good health results when none of those elements or forces oversteps its natural bounds or becomes too dominant." In other words, sickness results when the balance is disrupted by internal or external factors. Martin states, "The important element in the causation of disease is not invasion by a hostile, foreign element but the influence of outside forces on the composition and balance of the internal elements." Thus, the emphasis is on restoring the balance of the body rather than on a fear of the invasive agent itself. For imbalance-etiology, fears of pollution or infection are not as serious as fears of disruption. The main danger to the body is the disruption of its normal balance and equilibrium, not invasion by foreign bodies. People who are in power are sensitive of empowerment because of their position in the higher levels of society. For them

---

436 Douglas states, "Even more direct is the symbolism worked upon the human body. The body is a model which can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious. The body is a complex structure. The functions of its different parts and their relation afford a source of symbols for other complex structure. We cannot possibly interpret rituals concerning excreta, breast milk, saliva and the rest unless we are prepared to see in the body a symbol of society, and to see the powers and dangers credited to social structure reproduce in small on the human body" (Douglas, Purity, p. 115).
437 Ibid., p. 139 n. 2.
438 Ibid.
440 Ibid.
441 Ibid.
442 Ibid., p. 149.
“the body is simply a microcosm of the balanced universe and is naturally constituted of the same substances,” which is not necessarily bad so long as the social order is restored and maintained.

(b) The etiology of invasion means that “The body is construed as a closed but penetrable entity that remains healthy by fending off hostile forces and protecting its boundaries. Sickness is caused by alien forces, either personal agents (like demons or gods) or impersonal but harmful material (like germs, pollutions, or ‘tiny animals’), that invade the body.” Although disruption of balance is a factor, the main emphasis in the healthy body is to protect the body from invasion, in cases of sickness, by expelling harmful agents from the body. Thus concerns about pollution, contagion, and infection tend to be more important than the mere concern to maintain the equilibrium of the bodily elements. To maintain a health regimen is to solidify the boundaries of the body, to assure purity and the avoidance of pollution or infectious agents, and to quarantine polluted or infected persons. Those who believe in the etiology of invasion also fear invasion and pollution. For them “the body is not a secure microcosm of the balanced universe but a site of cosmic battles between good and evil”, so that the body of a person becomes the battleground between the power of God and that of Satan (cf Luke 11:21-24). Thus, it is necessary to protect the body against invasion, manipulation, and disintegration. Martin concludes that the overriding etiology of sickness in early Christian texts is that of invasion. In short, just as it is important for a person to preserve his/her body in holiness, so also it is important for the social body of the temple to maintain the holiness of its body. Thus, the temple authorities monitored who went in and out of the temple. More

---

444 Ibid., pp. 143-144.
445 Ibid., p. 144.
446 Ibid., p. 161. Note also that the idea that disease results from attacks by gods or demons occurs regularly in pre-Socratic Greek texts. In the Odyssey disease is the result of attack by an “evil [or base] daimon” (kakos daimon, 10. 64, 5. 396, p. 153 n. 59). This means that the belief that disease was due to divine displeasure or attack was quite common in pre-Hippocratic Greece and continued in classical Greek literature and beyond (p. 154 n. 62). The magical papyri provide a summary of the invasion- etiology of disease in Greco-Roman culture. Hans Betz states that “Zeus, Hermes, Apollo, Artemis, Aphrodite, and others are portrayed not as Hellenic and aristocratic, as in literature, but as capricious, demonic, and even dangerous, as in Greek folklore” (p. 158 n. 85, 88, 89). Therefore, sickness is attributed to a demon that has entered a person’s body and must be exorcised. One speaker claims to have seen a man healed when the infecting demon, “black smoky in colour,” was expelled from the body (p. 155, n. 70).
447 See above.
448 Martin, The Corinthian Body, p. 165 n. 5.
importantly, as the data above indicates, the body of an individual was presented as a place where the power of God and that of Satan collide.

3.2.3 Place-Body of a person(s). The rules of purity deal with the body of persons, and also with their proper place in society. On one hand, those who belong to the sphere of purity, holiness, or wholeness are the ones who fit into the holy community and temple. As I have already noted, the holy temple, which symbolized the dwelling place of God, was understood to be a replica of both the entire holy land and the whole world, and persons allowed to come to the holy temple were those who belonged to the sphere of holiness and righteousness. They were presented as insiders. However, persons who belonged to the sphere of pollution, impurity, or uncleanness were dislocated from society because they were perceived as dangers to the holy community and the temple. They were labeled as outsiders and as persons who were beyond the salvational map and lost. Just as the social placement of a person is determined by the visible condition of his/her physical body, so also persons who had the visible mark(s) of God's punishment were cut off from the holy community, the temple, and ultimately from God. Put differently, persons who were labeled as sinners or had various forms of sickness were presented as dirt. Likewise, they were perceived as outsiders and persons who were lost, meaning that they were out of God's protection and salvation. Lev 12-15 lists persons who are unclean — including persons who are suffering from skin disorders or unusual, abnormal bodily flows such as menstruation, seminal emission, and suppuration — and states that they must be relocated, and separated from having social relations with their fellows. Furthermore, neither a blemished priest nor an Israelite were allowed to offer sacrifices. It is written, "For no one who has a blemish shall draw near, a man blind or lame, or one who has a mutilated face or a limb too long, or a man who has an injured foot or an injured hand, or a hunchback, or a dwarf, or a man with a defect in his sight or an itching disease or scabs or crushed testicles" (Lev 21:18-20). This means that persons who belonged to the category/place of uncleanness/impurity lacked holiness, wholeness, and perfection, and they could not

---

449 Malina, The New Testament World, p. 165. Not only are persons separated hierarchically, based on the degree of their purity, but also the hierarchical structure of Judean society was established according to the degrees of the purity rules.


451 Note that those who are separated from the temple were also separated from social-economic-political power, because the holy temple was the focus of this power structure in Judea.
replicate the perfect society under the perfect God. Thus they were to be separated from social relations with their fellows, from the holy temple, and ultimately from God's salvation.452

3.2.4 The Relation between Sin and Impurity/Sickness. In his book, Jesus and Judaism, Sanders argues that impurity was not sin. Just as impurity was an unavoidable consequence of daily life, so also the impure did not need forgiveness, but cleansing. He also notes that impurity did not make a person a sinner.453 Moreover, not only does Sanders argue that the most pervasive laws concerning purity refer to corpse uncleanness (Num. 19), menstruation, intercourse, and childbirth (Lev 12:1-8; 15:16-24),454 but he also recognizes that impurity prevented access to the temple.455 Based on a literal linguistic definition of sin, Sanders may be moving in the right direction in claiming that impurity is not sin. But, as Dunn recognizes, in the Old Testament there is no clear distinction between impurity and sin.456 Dunn claims that in factional polemic, impurity and sin go hand in hand.457

Furthermore, Sanders also has undermined the link between sickness and impurity. Since he limits purity laws to within the framework of corpse uncleanness, menstruation, intercourse, and childbirth, Sanders minimizes the vast scale of impurity. For example, impurity was understood not as merely to be an unavoidable consequence of daily life, but as a sickness, that is, the outcome of sin, suggesting that impurity and sickness go hand in hand. In fact, not only were impurity and sickness viewed as the consequence of sin, signifying the visible marks of God's punishment, but they were also presented as dirt that had already been transferred from inside to outside. This means that the impure were already classified as outsiders. As we shall see, in Luke-Acts, just as sickness is presented as impurity, so also there is no clear difference between release from sins and cleansing impurities.458 Though Sanders repeatedly points out that those who were impure were denied access to the temple, he understates the effects of this. Not only were persons who were impure relocated and

453 Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, pp. 182-186.
454 Ibid., p. 182.
455 Sanders makes this point repeatedly in his book Jesus and Judaism, pp. 182-92.
457 Dunn, "Jesus and Holiness: The Challenge of Purity", pp. 177-180. Though he may be justified in observing the interconnection between sin and impurity, Dunn undermines the interconnection between sin, sickness, and impurity, and does not elucidate further.
separated from their political, economic, and social place, but also they were denied access to the holy temple, the center of their cultural and religious life, demonstrating that those who were relocated from the temple were far from God’s salvation. Thus, not only was the idea of sin, impurity, and/or sickness represented as a condition of dirt and of being beyond the salvational map (lost), but also it suggests that the major function of the temple was to determine who was in and who was out based on their degree of purity.

3.2.5 Summary. As the preceding analysis indicates, the theme of holiness was the central motif in the life of Jewish people in the first century, and reveals the binary and sedentary system of the temple. In this sense, the idea of sin and sickness is to be understood within the framework of purity and pollution. As I have demonstrated, not only do sin, sickness, and impurity go hand in hand, but also they represent as dirty and as outsiders (lost) those who had already been relocated from inside. Note that this idea of holiness was based on the holiness of God expressed in the Old Testament: “You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy” (cf. Lev 19:2). This shows that those who belonged to the dimension of holiness were established within the holy community and the temple, and thus had access to God and God’s salvation. However, those who belonged to the area of impurity, uncleanness, or blemish could not approach the holy temple, showing that those who were sinners, sick, and impure had no access to God and God’s salvation. Since they were perceived as a danger both to the holy community and the temple, they were portrayed as dirty, and beyond the saving map (lost). That is, they were disconnected from the holy temple, and transferred from the light and from God to the place of darkness and Satan. Since the visible marks of God’s punishment were understood to be the result of sin, the temple authorities separated persons who were sinner, sick, and impure from the holy community and the temple and placed them outside the saving map. This shows that their social place was determined on the basis of the visible conditions of their bodies. For this reason, one of the central tasks of the temple authorities, including the Pharisees, was to establish a clear and firm definition of the boundary in order to maintain and preserve their religious order and

459The name “Pharisees” (perushim) is generally derived from the root parash, “to separate”; the “Pharisees” were “separatists.” The obvious implication is that they were so-called because they tried to separate themselves from the rest of Israel, with the clear implication that the motivation for this separation was purity-driven. That is, they sought to separate themselves as much as possible from the impurities that characterized daily life for most of their compatriots (Dunn, “Holiness and Scripture”, p. 174).
belief system, and to control and monitor what went into and out of the temple. This shows that the authority-power of the temple involved binding and territorializing power in order to maintain the boundaries of the static-fixed territory. Thus, the purity rule(s), by which the Torah was interpreted, discloses the hierarchical binary system of the temple by which persons and places were organized or separated from one reality to another.

Note that the act of separation creates two opposite movements: (1) negatively, there is a movement from light, life, and God to darkness, death, and Satan, signifying destruction and judgment, and (2) positively, there is a movement from darkness, death, and Satan to light, life, and God, signifying creation and salvation. The first movement is pictured as an act of binding or territorializing, whereas the second movement can be understood as an act of releasing and deterritorializing. Within this cultural system, Jesus proclaims release from sins. That is, not only does an act of releasing and deterritorializing stand in opposition to an act of binding or territorializing, but also it should be understood in terms of the nomadic flows and movements of release.

3.3 How did Luke understand sin, sickness, and impurity?

In this section I will demonstrate the nexus between sin, sickness, and impurity, which can be summarized as follows. (1) The verb ἁμαρτάνειν means to sin, implying a sinful activity; (2) sickness is presented as the direct result of sin and the extensive state of sin; and (3) various forms of physical and spirit-related sicknesses are presented as impurities. This threefold layer interacts around the notion of sin/s, which confirms it as a single reality.

Note that those who lived in the time of Jesus believed that visible misfortunes, including various sicknesses and demon-possessions, were the result of sin (See chapter 4). To define the nature of sin is important. But who defined what sin was in ancient Judea? Not only did the temple authorities have the authority-power to define what sin was, based on the purity rules, but they also upheld the law and made sure that it was carried out according to their definition(s) of sin(s). Interestingly, in Luke 5 Jesus commands the leper, who just has been healed of leprosy, to show himself to the priest for cleansing. Jesus says, “Go and show yourself to the priest, and make an offering for your cleansing, just as Moses commanded, for a testimony to them” (Luke 5:14). Notice that those who are covered with “leprosy” are presented as impure and are separated from others. What is also to be noted here is that only the priests have the authority and power to pronounce lepers cleansed of their leprosy (cf. Lev. 14:1-32) and to separate them from others (Lev. 13). Though Jesus recognizes the priestly prerogatives, he publicly pronounces cleansed one of the ten lepers in Luke 17:19, when he says, “Rise, and go your way; your faith has saved you.”
3.3.1 Luke's concept of sin. In the New Testament, the verb ἀμαρτάνειν\(^{461}\) denotes *not to hit* or *to miss the target*, and implies a *sinful* activity. It is used 4 times in Luke,\(^{462}\) and only once in Acts 25:8. The noun ἀμαρτία is used 11 times in Luke\(^{463}\) and 8 times in Acts.\(^{464}\) Just as the thought of *sins* is used in close connection to the singular form of κακία (Acts 8:22) and ἀδικίας (Luke 13:27; 16:8, 9; 18:6; Acts 1:18; 8:23.), so also the word κακία seems to refer to the extensive state/condition of *sin* (cf. Acts 8:23). Even though he uses these terms, Luke does not explicitly define the nature of *sin*. Other than in Acts 7:60,\(^{465}\) Luke always uses ἀμαρτία in plural form, and uses it mostly along with the noun form of ἁφεος\(^{466}\) and the verb form ἀφίημι\(^{467}\) defines *sins* as the antithesis of *release*. Not only does such usage reassure us that the object to be *released is sins*,\(^{468}\) but it also illustrates that Luke's primary emphasis is not on a clear or precise definition of *sin*, but on the theme of *release*, suggesting that the authority-power of Jesus is not to territorialize static territories and boundaries, but to *release* people from these structures. Furthermore, the plural usage of ἀμαρτίαι does not refer to a particular violation of the law (i.e. the purity rules),\(^{469}\) but it is used along with *sickness* (Luke 5:20ff.), *social stigma* (Luke 7:47ff.), and *debts* (Luke 11:4) from which persons are *to be released*. Not only does Luke link ἀμαρτίαι to these various forms of *captivity and oppression*,\(^{470}\) but he also uses the noun form of *sins* to refer to the extensive state/condition of *sinfulness*. That is, Luke seems to

---

\(^{461}\)The verb ἀμαρτάνειν occurs 43 times in the New Testament (Matt. 18:15, 21; 27:4; Jn. 5:14; 8:11; 9:2; 3; Rom. 2:12; 3:23; 5:12, 14, 16; 6:15; 1 Co. 6:18; 7:28, 36; 8:12; 15:34; Eph. 4:26; 1 Tim. 5:20; Tit. 3:11; Heb. 3:17; 10:26; 1 Pet. 2:20; 2 Pet. 2:4; 1 Jn. 1:10; 2:1; 3:6, 8, 9; 5:16, 18).

\(^{462}\)Luke 15:18, 21; 17:3, 4.


\(^{465}\)The singular form ἀμαρτία in Acts 7:60 refers to a particular sin (Marshall, *Acts*, p. 150). In other word, in contrast to the Pauline letters, *sin* here is not presented as a victory over *sin* or the power of Satan.


\(^{468}\)Note also that the plural form of *sins* is linked closely with *debts* (Luke 11:4).

\(^{469}\)Interestingly, no particular *sin* refers to a violation of the laws of God, especially a violation of Sabbath' law, ritual purity, and the corban vow. In fact, Luke discloses that Jesus himself violates the Sabbath' law (6:1-11), ritual purity, and the corban vow (Dunn, *Diversity*, p. 63). Note also that in relation to salvation, Jesus rejects the traditional sacrificial system by which one can be forgiven in old age. Instead, Jesus releases people from sins and from sickness without any animal sacrifices or repentance (cf. Luke 5:20-26; 7:47-50). Also note that Jesus' *acts of release* (salvation acts) occur *outside* the temple, the space of God. For Jesus, the temple and the idea of sacrifices performed by the priest alone belong to the *old* age, already passing away (cf. Acts 6:14). Cf. Dunn, *Diversity*, p. 126.

\(^{470}\)Cf. Luke 4:18. I will pick up this issue and elaborate on it further in subsequent sections.
understand the state of sin and its extensive structure of captivity and oppression to be one of frozen, motionless desolation, where the poor, the blind, and sinners are placed. In this sense, the act of release – an act of motion – is depicted as the antithesis of sin and the extensive state of sinfulness, which are motionless. This demonstrates the nomadic flows and movements of release conveyed by Jesus and his disciples that translate people from one sphere (darkness, death, Satan) to another (light, life, God).

3.3.2 Luke's Idea of Sickness and Impurity. In his writings, Luke reflects the popular view of the purity laws in the first century. Just as terms like clean, purify, holy, wash away (Acts 22:16), and blameless are used to refer to holiness or purity, so also words like unclean, profane, and defilement are

471 The word καθαρίζειν translates as "to clean" (as in the inside and outside of the cup and platter, Luke 11:39, 41) and as "to clean" in the sense of the healing of a sickness which has caused a ceremonial uncleanness, namely leprosy (Luke 4:27; 5:12, 13; 7:22; 17:14, 17). It is used to mean "to cleanse, to purify" a person so that they become ritually acceptable and free from ritual contamination or impurity (Acts 10:15; 11:9; 15:9). In regard to a pig, which was considered ritually impure, a voice from heaven declares, "What God has made clean (καθαρίσω), you must not call profane (κοινόν)."


472 The verb ἐγκαθίζειν, to purify, occurs three times in Acts (Acts 21:24, 26; 24:18), and the noun ἐγκαθίζησις, purification, occurs only once in Acts 21:26.


474 The word άμώμος (blameless) and δίκαιος (righteous) in Luke 1:6.


476 The verb form κοινός means "to make unclean, to defile, to profane" (Acts 10:15; 11:9; 21:28). In other words, it denotes something common, defiled, and ritually unacceptable (Acts 10:15). In relation to food, the adjective κοινός ("common/profane, unclean, defiled") refers to ritually unacceptable animals (Acts 10:14, 28; 11:8). But the issue in Acts 10:14, where Peter states, "I have never eaten anything defiled and ritually unclean," is not about unclean animals, but ritually unclean persons. It means that the idea of unclean animals is replicated for persons (cf. Malina, The New Testament World, pp. 177-180). The sense "profane, defiled, unclean" derives from the use of koinos as equivalent to the biblical tame (e.g., Lev. 11:4-8; Deut. 14:7-10) or chol (Lev. 10:10; Ezek. 22:26; 44:23); hence the use of koinos in Macc. 1:47, 62 ("unclean food"), Mark 7:2, 5 ("defiled hands") and Acts 10:24 and 11:8 (cf. Dunn, "Jesus and Holiness", p. 173 n. 14). It is also important to note that the word ἑθιμός is translated as "to desecrate, to profane" in Acts 24:6, where Paul is charged with profaning the temple.

used to refer to *impurity*. Luke's treatment of such words illustrates that his idea of *impurity* is linked to ritual purification, and is plugged into concepts of physical-spiritual *sicknesses*.478

From this, we can draw three observations. First, Luke was well aware of the popular view of *holiness*, which was one of the core values of first-century Judaism: “You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy.”479 Also, Luke understood that those words were used to support the classifications by which the temple authorities defined who was to be *in place* or *out of place*.480 Moreover, Luke recognized that persons who belonged to the sphere of *sickness/impurity* were beyond the saving map (lost), because they were disconnected from the temple and thus from salvation. Indeed, Luke recognized that lepers were considered to be the *impure* and *sick* who were separated from the *holy* temple and from salvation.

What is to be noted here, however, is that Luke does not promote the theme of *holiness* or the *purity laws* by which person and space are to be separated. Rather, Luke presents Jesus as the one who demonstrates his *mercy* towards the *unclean* and *outcast* by cleansing and releasing (saving) them from their uncleanness.481 In fact, as we shall see, Luke has replaced the old idea of *holiness* (“You shall be holy, for I the Lord your God am holy,” Lev. 19:2) with the theme of *mercy*, that is, “Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful” (Luke 6:36). By replacing Matthew’s phrase, “You must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect” (Matt. 5:48) with the phrase, “Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful” (Luke 6:36),482 Luke illustrates that he does not promote the popular idea of *holiness* or the *purity* rules by which persons are separated from one another, but that he highlights the theme of *mercy*. As Luke unfolds his narrative, God’s mercy is revealed in Jesus who releases persons from

---

481In Luke, Jesus regularly heals and saves those who are presented as unclean and outcast, who are either incapable of social relations with the rest of the *holy* community (e.g. lepers (Luke 5:12-14; 17:11-19) and the woman with a hemorrhage (Luke 8:43-48)), or excluded from the *holy* temple and from the rites of sacrifice because of a lack of wholeness (for example, the spirit-possessed, the paralytic, the lame, the blind, and so on). Cf. Malina, *The New Testament World*, pp. 187-188.
482Cf. Tg. Jer. I on Lev 22:28: “As our Father is merciful in heaven, so be merciful on earth.”
their sins and sicknesses without the need for any form of ritual or sacrificial purification (cf. 5:20-24; 7:48).\textsuperscript{483}

A couple of points need to be noted here. First, the adjective δικτηρίων (merciful) in Luke 6:36 is closely related to loving enemies, doing good, and lending, as God is kind to the ungrateful and evil (6:35), and to releasing (6:37) and giving (6:38), evoking the idea that mercy (release) stands in opposition to holiness (separation). Second, the theme of mercy is expressed with terms like ἐλωος (mercy), \textsuperscript{484} ἐλεεω (to show mercy), \textsuperscript{485} and ἰλάσωμαι (be merciful), \textsuperscript{486} picturing them as identical soteriological events.\textsuperscript{487} In this respect, Green rightly notes that the thought “God is merciful” in Luke 6:36 refers to God’s redemption and salvation.\textsuperscript{488} This shows that Luke does not advocate the theme of holiness (separation), but promotes the idea that God’s mercy comes to those who are out of place (lost). Thus, the themes of mercy, release, and salvation are presented as equivalent soteriological events, and surface amidst the popular view of holiness (purity rules) in first-century Judaism. For this reason, confusion and conflict arise between Jesus, his disciples, and the temple authorities when these polemical themes collide.

3.3.3 Summary. As we have seen, Luke does not clearly define the nature of sin, but links it to various forms of captivity and oppression, suggesting that sickness and impurity are the extensive spheres of sinfulness. For Luke, sin/s, sickness, and

\textsuperscript{483}Note that in Luke-Acts, the theme of mercy and that of release from sins are presented as the same soteriological event (cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 641).

\textsuperscript{484}Luke 1:50, 54, 58, 72, 78; 10:37.


\textsuperscript{487}In the infant narrative, Luke portrays God as the one who saves (1:47) and shows mercy towards his people (Luke 1:50, 54, 58, 72, 78), particularly towards the humble (cf. Luke 1:48-55) and outcast (cf. Luke 1:79). For example, in contrast to a Pharisee who exalts himself, God justifies the tax-gatherer who has identified himself as a sinner (cf. Luke 18:9-14). By showing mercy to a sinner, God saves him. Jesus then states, “Everyone who exalts himself shall be humbled, but he who humbles himself shall be exalted” (Luke 18:14). Luke also presents Jesus as the one who saves (Luke 1:69; 2:11; Acts 5:31; 13:23) and shows mercy (Luke 17:13; 18:38, 39). Furthermore, Jesus commands, “Be merciful as God is merciful” (Luke 6:36). Note here that Jesus has already revealed those to whom mercy is to be demonstrated, that is, your enemies, those who hate you, the ungrateful, and the evil ones who are presented as social outcasts (cf. 6:27-35). The lawyer’s question, “Who is my neighbor?” (Luke 10:29), seems to be answered with the question: “To whom is mercy/love to be demonstrated?” or “Who has acted as a neighbor? (Luke 10:36-37). Jesus then commands the lawyer to show mercy to the one who is ignored and neglected by the Priest and Levite who represent the temple authorities (cf. Luke 10:30-37). Thus, not only do the texts in Luke 6:27-38 and 10:25-37 illustrate the link between love and mercy, but they also reveal those to whom mercy is to be demonstrated, who are the same sorts of people for whom Jesus performs healings and exorcisms (see below). This illustrates the nexus between salvation and mercy and those to whom mercy or salvation are to be demonstrated. Though each text cited above deserves full treatment, I shall limit myself to a discussion of the stories of the ten lepers and that of Bartimeus to demonstrate the interactions between mercy, healing, and salvation.

\textsuperscript{488}Green, Luke, p. 275.
impurity are not isolated, but interconnected entities. In this sense, they can be described as dirt, which discloses an act of separation between inside and outside. Just as sickness and impurity are represented as the extensive realities of sins, so they also revolve around sins. Although he understood the popular theme of holiness (purity laws) in first-century Judaism, Luke advocates the theme of mercy, phrased in terms of release. Jesus says, “Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful” (Luke 6:36). As we have seen, the saving authority-power of Jesus is to show mercy and so release persons from their sins, and from various forms of captivity and oppression.

3.4 Luke's Perception of Sin and Its relation to Sickness

3.4.1 Luke 1:18-20. Although the actual word ἀκαρπία is not used in this episode, Luke reflects on the link between sin and sickness, and makes it clear that the dumbness of Zechariah is the direct result of unbelief in God's message brought by Gabriel. As the word because in 1:20 indicates, Gabriel gives the precise reason why Zechariah is to be punished: it is because he has not believed (οὐκ ἐπιστεύομαι). Whether οὐκ ὁμωνοῦ in 1:20 is translated as “dumb” or “deaf,” it nevertheless refers to God’s punishment. Thus, the text (1:18-20) reveals the link between sin and sickness, and reveals that Zechariah's sickness is part of the extensive reality of his sin, and his sickness is the dirt by which Zechariah is momentarily separated from the soteriological plan of God (1:20). Note also that the one who does not believe in God's agent is presented as the one who does not believe in God.

Luke intentionally sets out this link at the very beginning of his first volume to anticipate the idea that to reject Jesus, whom God has sent, is to reject God (cf Luke 9:48; 10:16). Just as Zechariah, who represents the authority of the temple (cf. 1:5-
10), disbelieves in God’s word brought by Gabriel, so the temple authorities will ultimately reject Jesus and his message. Interestingly, God’s punishment begins with a word articulated by Gabriel, and becomes an act of silencing (striking dumb). Therefore, Zechariah’s sin and sickness are not isolated, but integrated events, suggesting that the visible sickness of Zechariah reveals his past sinful act, that is, disbelief in God. Note that sin here is not to be understood to mean a violation of any particular laws, but it refers to Zechariah’s conscious rejection of Gabriel who was sent by God. As I have noted, Zechariah is temporarily prevented from being a part of God’s saving plan and from prophesying the words of God, until the words of Gabriel are fulfilled (Luke 1:20; cf. 1:64ff.). Ironically, Zechariah, who is understood to be an insider, who represents the temple authorities, and who is supposed to lead God’s people into the ways of God, momentarily steps aside (becomes an outsider) from the saving place of God due to his lack of belief.

3.4.2 Luke 5:17-26. This episode depicts the friends of a paralyzed man, who expect a physical healing of their friend just as the multitudes expect to be healed of their sicknesses (5:15; cf. 6:18). However, Jesus does not grant healing instantly. Instead he says, “Man, your sins are forgiven you” (5:20). This sudden transition surprises his audience, including the scribes and the Pharisees (v. 21). Until now, Jesus had performed many healings (4:40-41; 5:13f) and exorcisms (4:35, 39, 41), but never explicitly pronounced release from sins prior to performing them. But here, for the first time, Jesus releases the paralytic from his sins prior to releasing him from his physical sickness. That is, rather then focusing on the sickness, the outcome of sin, Jesus removes the sins themselves, the very cause of sickness, thereby making the implicit relationship between sin and sickness explicit (cf. 1:18-20), and exposing the links between releasing people from sin and curing sickness.

494 Though Zechariah is presented as righteous, he is the first representative of the temple authorities who disbelieves in the message of God brought by Jesus.

495 It is interesting to note that Luke uses the term ἀφεύρωνες instead of τέκνου (Mt. 9:2) when Jesus addresses the paralyzed man, and adds οὖν because not only does the vocative ἀφεύρωνε express a rebuke or contempt in classical usage (cf. 12:14; 22:58-60), but it also may be used here to imply that the paralytic man was indeed a sinner (cf. Evans, Luke, p. 300).

496 I will investigate whether Jesus actually forgives sins or merely pronounces forgiveness of sins, as a prophet or priest would do, in the last section of this chapter.

497 Though Schweizer does not explicitly state what “inward healing” refers to, nor how the sins of the paralyzed man relates to his sickness, he seems right to correlate inward and outward healing with sin and sickness; see Edward Schweizer, Luke, p. 110. It is important to note that people who lived in the first century believed that an “evil spirit” caused sickness as a punishment for sins (cf. Luke 13:2; John 5:14; 9:2). Luke seems to express the correlation between sin and sickness in the
Most scholars have recognized that there is a close link between sin and sickness in this narrative. Caird, however, argues that not all illness is caused by sin. What is at issue here, however, is not whether modern scholars believe that all sicknesses came from sins, but whether ancient Mediterranean peoples believed this. In this respect, Foakes rightly writes, “All ills came from sins.” This means that, not only does the visible sickness of the paralytic reveal his prior sins, but also that his sickness is viewed as part of the extensive state of sinfulness, demonstrating that sickness revolves around sins. For this reason, Jesus first removes sins, the cause of sickness, by pronouncing, “Your sins are forgiven” (v. 20). He then heals the physical sickness, the effect of sins, of the paralytic by saying “Rise and take up your stretcher and go home” (v. 24). This interconnection between sin and sickness demonstrates that when sin(s) is removed, then so is sickness, and vice versa. That is, sickness no longer revolves around sinfulness when sin(s) is released. As in Luke 1:18-20, Luke makes the implicit correlation between sin and sickness explicit. By connecting sin and sickness together, Luke (1) illustrates that they are not isolated, but sense of an interconnection between cause and effect. In other words, where there is an effect, i.e. a form of sickness, there is also a cause, i.e. a sinful act.

Fitzmyer also rightly observes that this episode links the sickness of the paralyzed man to sin, noting that Jesus is here depicted reacting to this popular tradition. Fitzmyer writes, “In this the NT writers are reflecting a common Palestinian conviction about the relation of sin and suffering inherited from the OT” (cf. Ex. 20:5; cf. 1QapGen 20:16-29), Fitzmyer, Luke, p. 580. Evans notes that “Paralysis could be specially significant since it had been the divine punishment upon tyrants and the destroyers of God’s people (1 Macc. 9:55; II Macc. 3:22ff.; III Macc. 2:22),” Evans, Luke, p. 301. But Thomas and Nolland reject such an interpretation. Though he does not deny that there is a link between forgiveness and healing in Mark 2:1-12, Thomas notes that Jesus does not directly attribute the cause of sickness to sin. In fact, he argues that the forgiveness and the healing should be treated separately, because the healing of the paralytic validates Jesus’ claim to have the authority to forgive sins. Thomas also has difficulty in understanding why Mark would only make such a connection on this particular occasion (Thomas, Devil, Disease, Deliverance, p. 146). Nolland also argues that the motivation for Jesus’ explicit declaration of the forgiveness of sins is not to be sought in either the particular situation of the paralytic, nor in the general Jewish connection between sin and sickness. Rather, it renders explicit the challenge to the religious leaders of Jesus’ ministry to call sinners to release their sins (5:31-32). See Nolland, Luke, p. 232.

He also notes that in this episode (5:17-26), Jesus has “diagnosed this particular ailment as psychosomatic (i.e. a physical disease with a mental or emotional cause),” G. B. Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke, p. 94. But it appears that such an observation is purely a product of modern scholarship. In the ancient world, it was an evil spirit that was thought to cause various kinds of sicknesses/diseases (cf. Luke 4:33; 13:16; see Kee, Medicine, Miracle, and Magic in the New Testament). Moreover, in the ancient world people believed that all sicknesses/illnesses were a consequence of sin. 

Note that the lame were banned from the priesthood in Israel, and at Qumran were excluded from full participation in the community (cf. Lev 21:18-24; 1 QM 7:4-6; 1QSa 2:5-7). See also Green, Luke, p. 239. They were excluded from their community and the temple because they were considered impure (cf. Lev. 12-15).

Note also that according to rabbis, no sickness was healed until his sins were forgiven. Ellis, p. 105; cf. Jas 5:15; Ned. 41a.
are the same reality, (2) shows the interconnection between release of sins and sickness, and (3) describes sins and sickness as dirt, portraying the paralytic as a person who is beyond the soteriological map (lost) and who is disconnected from the temple. Note also that, as the words παραλελυμένος and κλίνη (5:18) indicate, the paralytic was immobile and motionless, as if he lived in the shadow of darkness and death (cf. 1:78-79). In this sense, the visible sickness of the paralytic can be marked out as the dirt by which he is separated from the temple and from salvation.

3.4.3 Luke 13:1-5. As the phrase because they suffered these things in Luke 13:2 indicates, the calamity of the Galileans was the result of their past sins, showing the link between sin and punishment. As I have noted, such a concept is the reflection of the Jewish worldview of the first century, and is again presupposed in 13:3: “Unless you repent, you will all likewise perish” (cf. 13:5). Thomas argues that “Luke [13:1-5] challenges the notion that calamity is [generally] the direct result of one’s sinfulness,” but he fails to substantiate this conclusion. Rather, as the text (vv. 1-5) demonstrates, Luke does not challenge the notion that calamity is the direct result of sins. Of course, Jesus emphatically denies that the sins of the Galileans are worse than the others, but he does not explicitly deny that the catastrophe of the Galileans was the outcome of their sins. The purpose of Jesus’ comparing his audience to the Galileans is to invite his hearers to repent (13:3, 5), and this reveals the link between sin and punishment. Whether Jesus’ audience was right or wrong, the fact still remains that they understood suffering to be a visible mark of God’s punishment. But Luke’s purpose in making the relationship between sin and punishment explicit was to maximize the importance of release (cf. 17:3-4).

3.4.4 Acts 3:2. Many commentators argue that the aim of Luke’s description of the man as “lame from his mother’s womb” in these texts is to underscore the seriousness of the man’s plight and the greatness of the healing that will be performed.
But the popular Jewish view of the relation between sin and sickness is not totally excluded (cf. John 5:14; 9:2-3). Note that in Lev 21:16-18, a lame man could not approach the altar to offer his bread to God. That is, he was excluded from the priesthood, as a lame lamb could not be offered because of its "blemish" (Deut 15:21; Mal 1:8, 13). The same sort of exclusion from full participation is envisaged in 1Qsa 2:5-6. In the respect, the lame man can be marked as dirty and as an outsider who was already been disconnected from the temple and from salvation, which reinforces the link between sin, sickness, and impurity.

3.4.5 Acts 13:4-12. Again, the episode of Elymas explicitly discloses the nexus between sin and sickness. Luke labels Elymas a "magician" and a "false prophet" who is full of all deceit and fraud, a son of the devil and enemy of all righteousness, thus portraying Elymas as a person who is in the state of sin. Put differently, in opposition to John the Baptist, a true prophet, who made the ways of the Lord straight, the sinful act of Elymas was to make crooked the straight ways of the Lord (v. 10). Indeed Luke explicitly states that the way of Elymas, who attempts to make the proconsul fall from the faith, is in opposition to the way of Paul, who proclaims the way of the Lord, the way of salvation. Thus Paul, who is filled with the Holy Spirit, curses Elymas with blindness. As a result, Elymas becomes blind and attempts to find people who might lead him. Ironically the one who attempted to show the proconsul the way now becomes the one who is lost and cannot see the way. Thus, the blindness of Elymas is seen as the result of his sinful act, the visible mark of God's punishment, which began with a cursing word. Due to his sinful act, the movement of Elymas, who was once able to move freely, becomes static and motionless.

3.4.6 Summary. As I have demonstrated, by linking sin, sickness, and impurity together Luke shows us that various forms of sickness and impurity revolve around sins, suggesting that sin, sickness and impurity are not isolated states, but part of the same reality. Note that sickness, suffering, and the other consequences of sin

512Cf. Johnson, Acts, p. 65
513Cf. Johnson, Acts, p. 65
514The phrase "at the gate of the temple" indicates that he was not permitted to enter the temple because his visible sickness was viewed as impure.
515Witherington notes that v. 11 seems to involve a form of oath curse (Acts, p. 402).
are understood to be the visible mark(s) of God’s punishment, which can be projected as dirt, being out of place (lost), and becoming outsider(s), i.e. an act of separation from the holy community and the temple (inside) to the desolate and motionless places (outside). Furthermore, because Luke employs the plural forms of sins, no particular sin is presented as a violation of the laws of God, including the Sabbath law, purity rules, and the corban vow. In fact, the Lukan Jesus does not define what sin is. Though he reflects the popular view of the link between sin, sickness and impurity, Luke does not promote it, but advocates release by pronouncing the release from sins and sicknesses without first requiring the performance of sacrificial practices from one place to another, which discloses the nomadic flows and movements of release. Again, the central aim of Luke in linking sin with various forms of sicknesses is to accentuate the nomadic flows of release by which the hierarchical and binary system of the temple is deterritorialized, and the non-hierarchical and relational space (kingdom) of God is established.

3.5 What does it mean to be released?

As I noted in the introduction, the theme of ἀφεων ἀμαρτιῶν is a vital message throughout the ministries of John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostolic church. As I also noted, in Luke 4:18 not only is the noun form of ἀφεως used in opposition to captives (αἰχμαλώτους) and the oppressed (τεθραυσμένους), but also it is connected to the poor (πτωχοί) and the blind (τυφλοί). Note also that it is used with σωτηρία and σωτηρία. Except in Luke 4:18, it always occurs with the plural form of ἀμαρτία. Though the verb form of ἀφίημι is expressed in many different ways, it is used with the plural form of ἀμαρτία eight times, and once with ἀφέλομαι (indebted or be bound) in Luke 11:4. That is, ἀφίημι is used as the opposite

518 See footnote 1, above. Though the actual word ἀμαρτία is not present in this text, the concept of sin is clearly present because αἰχμαλώτος and τεθραυσμένος also metaphorically denote the image of sin, suggesting that the pictures of captivity and oppression are extensions or consequences of sin’s. This will become clearer as the narratives unfold.
522 See above.
of sins, sicknesses, and debts. Also it is closely linked to σώχελν (Luke 7:48-50) and to release – from κακία (wickedness) in Acts 8:22 and σώνθεμων ἀδικίας (a prisoner of sin) in Acts 8:23. Moreover, the word ἀφίημι is related to the word λύειν (to set free), ἀπολέειν (to release), and καθαρίζειν (to cleanse, purify).

Further observations need to be made. First, in contrast to the word δέλν (to bind, imprison), the term λύειν exploits the dynamic movement of release – from sickness (bound by Satan) (Luke 13:16), from death (Acts 2:24), and from prison (Acts 22:30). Second, the words ἀπολέω and ἀφίημι are applied interchangeably in Luke 6:37, where Jesus instructs his disciples to release in order to be released. Not only does the word ἀφίημι occur in Luke 17:3-4, where Jesus commands his disciples to release others from sin, but also the word ἀπολέω is employed in close connection to the release of a sick person from the power of Satan (Luke 13:12) and a prisoner from a prison. Furthermore, the word καθαρίζειν denotes cleansing the hearts of the Pharisees, who are presented as those who are full of “greed and wickedness” (11:39; cf. 1:17), so as to be acceptable ritually. Similarly, it means to purify or cleanse in the sense of physical healing. Thus, the words πτωχοίς, τυφλοῖς, αἰχμαλώτοις, τεθραυσμένους, ἡμαρτία, ἀφείλοντι, κακία, σώνθεμων, and ἀδικίας are linked to one another, and can be depicted as frozen and motionless place(s) of exclusion and desolation from which persons must be released. Conversely, the words ἀφίημι, σώχελν, λύν, ἀπολέω, and καθαρίζω are interconnected to one another, and illustrate the dynamic event of flows and movements from one place to another, which discloses the nomadic motions of the process of release by which the relational network (kingdom) of God is established and moves. Similarly, the dynamic flows

524 As we shall see, the expressions “your sins are released” (Lk 5:20; 7:48) and “your faith has saved you” (7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42) are used interchangeably to refer to the same soteriological events.
525 Although the object of forgiving or pardoning is unclear in Luke 6:37, it seems to refer to sins or debts. Related texts (11:4 and 17:3-4) will confirm this (see below).
526 The word ἀπολέειν means “to forgive, pardon”, and is used interchangeably with ἀφίημι (cf. Lk. 6:37). In his article, Duling notes that the notion of binding and loosing is well established in the magical world and in Hellenistic and Jewish texts, (“Binding and Loosing,” p. 7). Morton Smith writes: “Another more frequent pair of metaphors is ‘binding’ and ‘loosing.’ By demons men are ‘bound’ with diseases; ‘binding’ explains paralysis, loss of casualties, etc., and a cure may be described as ‘the bond’ of a disease being ‘loosed.’ A helpful magician like Jesus will not only ‘loose’ spells, afflicted persons, and ‘the bonds’ of their afflictions, but will also ‘bind’ the demons. And evil magicians may lose harmful demons” (Smith, Jesus the Magician, p. 127).
and movements of release from one place to another can be pictured as the active movements of restoration from darkness, death, and Satan to light, life, and God.\(^{530}\)

In this section, then, I will attempt to investigate the precise meaning(s) of ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτίων, and its relationship to various themes of ἀφεσιν (release) and to the saving network (kingdom) of God initiated by Jesus and expanded by his disciples within the narrative world of Luke-Acts. Just as blessing (life) is contrasted with curse (death) in the Old Testament,\(^{531}\) we will see that the nomadic flows and movements of release (motion) stand in sharp contrast to the sedentary states of captivity and oppression (motionlessness).\(^{532}\) As I have already mentioned, release from sickness represents confirmation of a release from sins, and it is linked to release from various forms of captivities and oppressions: all sorts of sicknesses, demonic possessions, social stigmas, and debts. Such a variety of forms of release reveals the multi-layered fabric of salvation.

Moreover, we will see that the releasing words and activities of Jesus can be understood as nomadic events of restoration - from darkness to light, from death to life, and from Satan to God. That is, the dynamic movements of release parallel the acts whereby people are transported from confined/desolate places (motionless states) to free/open space (states-in-motion), which creates the dynamic relational space (kingdom) of God, where God and his people come and interact. Since the phrase ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτίων occurs in various contexts, an exploration of the relevant texts is necessary if we are to extract the exact nuances of this phrase. We begin with Jesus’ public mission statement.

3.5.1. Luke 4:18-19.\(^{533}\) Just like John the Baptist (cf. Luke 4:18; also 1:77, 3:3), Jesus begins his public ministry by proclaiming ἀφεσιν to captives (αἰχμώτωτι) and the oppressed (τεθραυσμένοι). He also concludes his entire ministry by commissioning his disciples to proclaim ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτίων to all nations (24:47), showing that the social, economical, political, and cultural themes of release from

---

\(^{531}\) For the list of the covenant of blessings, see Douglas Stuart, Hosea-Jonah WBC, pp. 31-42
\(^{532}\) A practical place is understood to be a free space, whereas a non-practical place is pictured as a confined space.
\(^{533}\) Though the phrases to proclaim to the captives release and to send forth the oppressed in release are drawn from two texts (Is 58:6 and 61:1-2), they are interrelated because both texts illustrate the theme of release from various forms of captivity and oppression. Note that the phrase, “and the day of vengeance of our God” in Isa. 6:2b is omitted from Luke 4:19 so as to draw special attention to the word release. This theory is supported by the fact that the word “release” is repeated in line six. For the details of the text’s form, see Darrell Bock, Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern, pp. 105-111; Turner, Power from on High, pp. 220-226.
Captivity and oppression are not isolated from one another, but that they interact within the religious theme of release from sins.\textsuperscript{534} Noteworthy here is that the noun form \textit{δήσος} appears in Luke 4:18, where Jesus lays out the programme for his ministry, and disappears until Luke 24:47, where Jesus summarizes the vital message of his entire ministry and commissions his disciples with their task: "Repentance and release of sins \([\textit{δήσος} \textit{ἀμαρτιῶν}]\) to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem." What occurs in-between 4:18 and 24:47 are the nomadic flows and movements of \textit{ἀποφεύγω} which unfold the multiple layers of release from the various forms of captivity and oppression listed in 4:18.\textsuperscript{535} These forms of captivity and oppression, and the sins listed in 24:47, evoke the dark-frozen-desolate-motionless place(s) where the outcasts and outsiders, who are poor, sick, captive, and oppressed, are placed and abandoned. The connections between the captive and oppressed and the blind and the poor seem to point in this direction. This becomes clearer if we arrange the text as follows.

The Spirit of the Lord is upon me,  
Because he has anointed me;  
To preach good news to the poor he has sent me:  
To proclaim to the captives release  
And to the blind sight,  
To send forth the oppressed in release,  
To proclaim the year of the Lord’s favor.

Several observations need to be made about this. (1) By using the phrase "the Spirit of the Lord," Jesus discloses the source of his authority-power, that is, from the

\textsuperscript{534} Though Turner recognizes that \textit{δήσος} means "release" or "liberation," he distinguishes the use of \textit{κρίνω} \textit{αἰχμαλώτος} \textit{δήσος} from \textit{δήσος} \textit{ἀμαρτιῶν} for the following reasons: (1) Luke does not present sin as an enslaving power in the way Paul does; (2) he does not otherwise use metaphors of captivity or oppression in relation to sin; (3) the semantic connection between the clause and its referent in such circumstances would in any case not be achieved through the lexeme \textit{δήσος} (Turner, \textit{Power from on High}, p. 223). These first two points can be developed. (1) Though Luke does not view sin as the power of Satan, the idea of sin as an enslaving power is not totally missing from Luke-Acts. The concept of an enslaving power is expressed in the sense of the binding power of Satan, who stands behind every sickness and demonic possession. This idea is seen in various occasions in Luke-Acts (cf. Luke 4:18, 35, 39-41; 13:13, 16; Acts 8:23). As I have noted, various forms of sicknesses and "demonic possessions" were viewed as the visible signs/marks of God’s punishment for sins, by which people and spaces were separated from one another. (2) Luke does not actually treat the concepts of captivity or oppression in a literal sense (cf. Nolland, \textit{Luke}, pp. 196ff.). Instead, by picturing captivity and oppression as a territorialized, fixed, static place where God’s people were held prisoner, Luke describes those who were poor, sick, demon-possessed, outcast, sinful, and lost as people who sit in the darkness of the shadow of death, and place-bound in a frozen and dark place ruled by Satan, and from which they need to be released. Thus, the major problem for Turner is that he totally ignores how Luke understood sin and its relationship to various forms of sickness.

\textsuperscript{535} As I have noted, the noun \textit{δήσος} is presented as the extensive reality of the verb \textit{ἀποφεύγω}.
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Lord God (cf. 4:14; 5:17), not from the devil (cf. 4:1-13). The idea of being anointed (χρίσθη) infers the closely related themes of the Spirit of the Lord, the authority-power of God, Jesus’ baptism, and his commission from God. (3) The single main verb καθιστάμενος connects the last five lines together. As the last five lines reveal, God sends Jesus to proclaim release to the poor, the captive, the blind, and the oppressed, i.e. “those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death” in Luke 1:79. By linking these two texts, Luke discloses the fixed place of darkness and death where the poor, blind, captive, and oppressed are held as prisoners of Satan who controls and rules them (cf. Acts 26:18). As we already have seen, those who are place-bound in such a motionless place receive the visible marks of God’s punishment and are therefore projected as dirty (beyond salvation) and as outsiders, a state from which they need to be released. (4) The content of the good news is release (from sins). The repeated word ἄφεσις discloses the movements of release from various forms of captivity and oppression. Though the words themselves are not used again in Luke-Acts, they are inferred through their relationship to sin, sickness, demonic possession, social stigma, and debt. Within this framework, the words and acts of release articulated and performed by Jesus and his disciples are to be understood as the same saving events, by which the relational space (kingdom) of God, where people find peace, comfort, security, and salvation, is created. Thus, from the outset Luke shows that the saving authority-power of Jesus stands in contrast to the binding and territorializing power of Satan. That is, the saving authority-power of Jesus is

536 Luke has already linked the Spirit of the Lord and the Holy Spirit to the power of God (Lk. 1:35; 4:1, 14; cf. 5:17; Acts 1:8; 10:38). The first two lines recall Luke 3:22, where Luke describes how the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus (cf. Lk 1:35). Note also that the repeated word με (me) indicates that the authority/power of the Lord is bound in the person of Jesus.


538 Note that the phrase “God has sent me” (Lk. 4:18) stands in parallel with the phrase “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord” (Lk. 13:35; 19:38; cf. Ps 118:26) signifying the authority and power of God.

539 Tannehill states, “They are closely related in form and meaning” (Luke, p. 62 n. 32). The theme of God’s sending Jesus (Luke 4:18, 43; 9:48; 10:16; Acts 3:20) and of Jesus’ sending his disciples (Luke 9:2; 10:1, 3) is important motif in Luke-Acts. What is also interesting here is that the idea of God’s sending Jesus and the idea of Jesus’ coming are interrelated. In 5:32, Jesus discloses that the purpose of his coming is to call sinners to repentance: “I have not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance.” A similar view is also found in 19:9-10: “Today salvation has come to this house because he, too, is a son of Abraham. For the Son of Man has come to seek and to save that which was lost” (19:9-10). Thus, God’s sending Jesus and Jesus’ coming are interrelated, and the purpose of Jesus’ coming is to save.

540 Fitzmyer notes that “those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death” (an allusion to Ps 107:10) are the sinners referred to in Luke 1:77, Luke, p. 388. Moreover, they are those who rebelled against the word of God (Ps 107:11) and who are prisoners in poverty and chains (Ps 107:10). At the same time, they are the ones whom God released from darkness and the shadow of death by breaking their bonds (Ps 107:14).
expressed as a releasing and deterritorializing authority-power, by which people are liberated from darkness and death and transported to light and life.

In relation to the idea of captivity and oppression, a couple of points need to be made. By taking both terms literally, Esler argues that release from captivity primarily means salvation on a physical level, namely the emancipation of Jewish slaves scattered around the East. He argues that this is consistent with Luke 21:24, where Luke states, “They will be led off captive among all the nations.” To visit prisoners certainly seems to be an important duty of discipleship (Mt. 25:36; Heb. 10:34), and Luke seems to show his interest in prison in his writings, and he describes a literal release from prison in Acts. Yet, although Esler’s proposal may be correct, salvation is not restricted exclusively to its literal sense, because it has some metaphorical applications. In fact, as the subsequent narrative unfolds, the concepts of captivity and oppression in 4:18 no longer refer to an imminent release of prisoners, but to metaphorical imprisonment by Satan. In this respect, Bultmann rightly notes that the inclusion of δήμως in the quoted verse implies the notion of δημοσίων μαρτυρίων. The idea of imprisonment or bondage as a consequence of war seems to be carried over into the idea of captivity and bondage to the power of Satan as a consequence of sin, implying military defeat on the one hand, and warfare between God and Satan, on the other. Thus, captivity and oppression by Satan are the result of sin and defeat.

In The Demise of the Devil, Garrett argues that Luke portrays magicians such as Simon Magus (Acts 8:9-13), Elymas (Acts 13:6-12), and the seven exorcist sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13-20) as impotent allies of the defeated Satan, and claims that “Every

541 The terms αἴμαλθωτος and θραύμα only occur here in the New Testament. The word αἰμαλθωτείων occurs 4 times (Lk 21:24; Rom 7:23; 2 Cor. 10:5; 2 Tim 3:6) and the word αἴμαλθωσία occurs twice (Eph 4:8; Rev 13:10) in the New Testament.
543 Esler, p. 181-182.
546 Tannehill, Luke, p. 64.
547 Note that there was no explicit written evidence that Jesus ever visited any prisoners during his own ministry, nor did he attempt to free anyone from prison, including John the Baptist. It appears that the early Church developed the ministry of visiting prisoners, as Esler demonstrates. Also, the principal evidence that Esler used comes from Acts. See n. 200 below.
549 Note that Luke has already informed us that the authority of the world was handed to the devil or Satan (cf. 4:4-5).
healing, exorcism, or raising from the dead is a loss for Satan and a gain for God.\textsuperscript{550} Put differently, Luke understands the activity of \textit{release} as part of the warfare against the activities of Satan. As opposed to the stratified systems of \textit{captivity} and \textit{oppression}, which disclose a territorialized, static, frozen, motionless, and dark place where people are held as prisoners and ruled by the power of darkness (Satan), Luke presents the process of \textit{release} as a series of dynamic, active events of restoration and deterritorialization, whereby the nomadic flows and movements of \textit{release} unfold from one place to another.

Note also that the word \textit{αιξιμάλωτοι} (\textit{prisoners}) is used in close connection to the slaves who were bound by debts. Just as the word \textit{ἀφεσις} is understood to mean \textit{release} from debts in LXX,\textsuperscript{551} so also Esles admits that the word \textit{αιξιμάλωτοι} may refer to the debt-bound slaves.\textsuperscript{552} Deissmann writes, “The idea of forgiveness (remission) of our trespasses which was established for the ancients by the legal procedure they were accustomed to. In cases of non-payment of a money debt the system of personal execution allowed not only arrest but even slavery for debt.”\textsuperscript{553} What is to be noted here is that in Luke 11:4, Luke portrays \textit{debts} as \textit{sins} (see below). In this sense, just as the word \textit{αιξιμάλωτος} implies the results of \textit{sins} or the state of being punished,\textsuperscript{554} it also evokes the image of slaves owing a debt. In this sense, the word \textit{αιξιμάλωτος} evokes the place of darkness and death ruled by Satan on both a spiritual and physical level.

In short, because the last five lines of this text depend on a single main verb, \textit{ἀπέσταλκεν}, the poor, the blind, the captive, and the oppressed are interconnected and revolve around the nomadic movements of \textit{release}. As the link between 4:18 and 24:47 indicates, the idea of \textit{ἀφεσιν} is linked to bringing good news to the poor, and presumes \textit{ἀφεσις ἀμαρτίων}. Note also that the idea of captivity and oppression evokes the frozen and dark place where the outcasts are territorialized and ruled by Satan. By picturing those who are territorialized as being in a frozen and dark place ruled by Satan, Luke seems to reflect the popular view of first-century people, who believed that the poor, blind, captive, and oppressed were afflicted as a direct result of \textit{sin}, and so Luke describes them as persons who are disconnected from the temple and

\textsuperscript{550}Susan Garrett, \textit{The Demise of the Devil}, p. 45.
\textsuperscript{551}R. Bultmann, \textit{TDNT}, Vol. 1, p. 510.
\textsuperscript{552}Esler, p. 182.
\textsuperscript{553}Deissmann, \textit{Light from the Ancient East}, p. 330.
\textsuperscript{554}I will discuss the correlation between debts and sins later in this chapter.
who are therefore *out of place* (lost). In contrast to this dark place, the dynamic movements of release reveal the nomadic events of *restoration* or *transition* from darkness, death and Satan to light, life and God, events by which the relational network (kingdom) of God – where God and *all* people interact – is created, and proliferates.

3.5.2 *Release from sins and sicknesses.* As Jesus publicly announced that he was sent to bring *good news* to the poor, that is, to proclaim *release* to the captives and the oppressed, Jesus releases people from various forms of physical sickness. That is, not only is release from captivity and oppression connected with release from various forms of physical sickness, but also the two are described as the *same* saving event. All forms of healing-curing-cleansing-restoring are part of the same soteriological event, and Luke’s summary statements clearly confirm this. Jesus releases Simon’s mother-in-law from a high “fever” (4:38). He also releases the leper from his leprosy (5:12-14; 17:11-19) and the paralytic from paralysis (5:17-24). When great multitudes come from various regions to hear and to be healed (5:15; 6:18), Jesus heals them, which discloses the movements of release from various kinds of sicknesses (6:18-19). Moreover, Luke describes how Jesus restores a man, whose right hand was withered, on the Sabbath (6:6-10), heals the slave of the centurion (7:10), and raises a young man from the dead (7:14-17; cf. 8:49-56). Again, Luke summarizes Jesus’ healing ministry in Luke 7:21, and relates that Jesus heals many people of various kinds of sickness, including “demonic possession,” and grants sight to many who were blind. In relation to his own identity, Jesus states, “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news” (Luke 4:40-41; 5:15; 6:18-19; 7:21, 22-23; 8:2-3; 9:1, 2, 6, 10-11; 10:9, 17-20; 13:32; Acts 5:15-16; 8:6-7; 10:38; 19:11-12.

---


555 The words καθαρίζω (Lk. 4:27; 5:12, 13; 7:22; 11:39; 17:14, 17; Acts 10:15; 11:9; 15:9), καθαρός (Lk. 11:41; Acts 18:6; 20:26), and καθαρισμός (Lk. 2:22; 5:14) seem to be used in the same ways to signify soteriological events. Thus, in relation to release, such words are described as soteriological events by which the folded space-time of God’s salvation unfolds and spreads, and as spatializing actions that create soteriological spaces between God and God’s people. As the word διόρισμα (leave) indicates, Jesus releases a man from his leprosy.

556 See below.
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brought to them” (7:22). Luke provides a short summary statement of Jesus’ healing ministry in Luke 8:2, and describes how Jesus heals the woman who had hemorrhaged for twelve years (8:48), and how Jesus raises a child from the dead (8:49-56). Jesus also heals a man who was suffering from dropsy (14:4) and granted sight to Bartimaeus (18:35-43).

Likewise, in Acts Luke reports that Jesus’ disciples perform healing(s). First, Peter heals a certain man who had been lame from the time he was inside his mother’s womb (Acts 3:2-8). His healing of the lame beggar is presented as an act of salvation (Acts 4:9-12). Note that, not only is the lame beggar healed outside the Jerusalem temple, but also one who could not enter the temple due to his physical sickness is now entering the temple, leaping and praising God. And all the people who see him walk praise God. Peter also heals Aeneas, who had been bedridden eight years because he was paralyzed (Acts 9:33). Peter says, “Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you; arise, and make your bed” (Acts 9:34). Furthermore, Peter raises Tabitha from the dead (Acts 9:37); when Peter says, “Tabitha, arise”, she opens her eyes and sits up (Acts 9:40). Philip also heals many who had been paralyzed or were lame (Acts 8:7). Finally, Paul heals a man who was lame and who had never walked in his life (Acts 14:8). By healing him, Paul saves him (Acts 14:9).

One point needs reinforcing from the preceding summary. As healing—release from sins and sicknesses—is presented as a soteriological event, the act of release from various forms of sicknesses unfolds the release from sins. This is because in Luke-Acts, salvation is never presented as incomplete, nor the release from sins and sickness as isolated, but they form the same saving event. Thus the acts of healing articulated and performed by Jesus and his disciples are linked to the theme of release in Luke 4:18-19. Not do these forms of release interact, but they express the same soteriological events by which the relational network, where God/Jesus and all people interact, is created, and proliferates.

Luke 5:17-26. Just as the purpose of the coming of the power of the Lord through Jesus is to heal (iāōθα) sicknesses (v. 17), so also the word iāōθα and the immediate appearance of the paralyzed man seem to indicate that the friends of the paralyzed man expect a physical healing (vv. 18-19). We also expect a physical

559 It is interesting to note that Jesus performs the last physical act of healing, restoring Bartimaeus’ sight, before he enters Jerusalem. In fact, Jesus does not perform any further physical acts of healing once he enters Jerusalem, until he restores the ear of the slave of the high priest, cut off on the Mount of Olives.
healing, as we have already learned about the link between power and healing (4:36; 5:15; cf. 6:18-19; Acts 10:38). But Jesus does not grant a physical healing to the paralyzed man immediately. Instead, for the first time, Jesus pronounces the releasing words, “Your sins are forgiven” (v. 20), and claims that he has the authority to forgive sins (release people) on earth. He then releases the man from his physical sickness.

By doing this, Jesus demonstrates that he indeed has authority to release sins and power to heal (vv. 24-25). Notice that the sickness of the paralytic is understood to be the direct result of his sins, which suggests that the release of/from sins and of/from sickness are the same soteriological event. Also note the dynamic flows and movements of release: Jesus releases the paralytic from his sins/sickness (v. 20, 24) by commanding him to act (v. 24) → the man acts and moves (v. 25) → all the people there glorify God (v. 26).

With regard to the idea that the release from sins and sickness are depicted as a single soteriological event, it is clear that the releasing words articulated by Jesus in 5:20 become a soteriological event (5:25). Just as people come to Jesus from various regions (v. 17), so also they all revolve around the soteriological network of God brought by Jesus when they glorify God, which identifies Jesus as the person of God to be connected to. Note also that this soteriological event does not take place inside the territorialized or fixed space of the temple, but outside it, which signifies that the dynamic space of God brought by Jesus is an opened and deterritorialized space that can be accessed from any point(s) or person(s). Surely, as the direct result of the releasing event of Jesus, the relational space of God flows and proliferates between God/Jesus, the paralytic, his friends, and the crowd (v. 56). Finally, note that the one who was disconnected from the temple and from God is now connected to the saving network of God brought by Jesus. Conversely, the Pharisees and teachers of

---

560 I will explore the power of the Spirit in relation to salvation in the next chapter.
561 Note the process of salvation in this episode. First, as the news of Jesus spreads throughout all the villages of Galilee, Judea, and Jerusalem (5:17; cf. 4:37), the friends of the paralyzed man bring their friends to Jesus. Second, Jesus sees the faith of the friends of the paralyzed man (I will deal with faith as a basis for salvation in the next chapter). Third, Jesus utters forgiving words. Fourth, he claims that he has authority to forgive sins. Finally, he heals the paralyzed man.
562 In Lk 4:36 and 5:24 the power to heal runs parallel with the authority to forgive. Although there is a connection between the authority and the power of Jesus (Lk. 4:36), the authority of Jesus is often expressed through words (cf. Lk. 4:32) and his power is expressed through healing (Lk. 5:17). Not only does the word of Jesus refer to his preaching and teaching the release from sins, but it also implies releasing people from their spirit-related sicknesses (exorcism) (Marshall, Luke, p. 216).
564 Schürmann notes that since healing can also be done by the power of God (cf. 5:17b), the person who can heal is also authorized to forgive sins. Schürmann, Lukas, 1:283.
the law, i.e. the agents of the temple authorities, who are connected to the temple, are
disconnected from the saving network of God because they reject Jesus’ movements

3.5.3 Release from sins-and-from spirit-related sicknesses.\footnote{The words ἀφεύξεω (Lk. 4:35, 36, 41; 8:2, 29, 33; 11:14, 24; Acts 8:7; 16:18), ἐξεφεύξαι (Lk. 9:40, 49; 11:14, 15, 18, 19, 20; 13:32), λύτρωσις (Lk. 1:68; 2:38) and λυτρόσαμα (Lk 24:21) seem to be used to mean “release.”} Though
many scholars identify Jesus as an exorcist,\footnote{See Twelftree, Jesus the Exorcist, pp. 142ff.} Luke presents Jesus’ exorcisms as acts
of release, which unfold the nomadic events of flows and movements from one sphere
(disembodying Satan) to another (embodying God).\footnote{Pilch states that “Luke considers Jesus’ exorcisms as the healing of illnesses” (Pilch, Healing in the New Testament, p. 105).} In addition to the stories he
receives from the other synoptic gospels,\footnote{Luke describes the mission of Jesus’ disciples against the demons who brought sicknesses
(Luke 10:17), and reports that not only did Satan enter Judas (22:3), but also that he wanted to sift Simon like wheat (22:31-34). In Acts 8:7, Luke reports on Philip’s activity in casting out unclean spirits, and describes how an angel of the Lord struck Herod in 12:33. Paul is also said to have healed people and cast out evil spirits (19:11-12). Luke also describes how seven sons of Sceva were
overpowered by evil spirits (19:14-16).} Luke provides his own account of the
activities of unclean and demonic spirits, and of Satan.\footnote{Since the demon recognizes Jesus as “the Holy One of God,” it obeys him when Jesus
commands it. In fact, demons know that Jesus comes to destroy their power (cf. 4:34).} After his public
proclamation in Luke 4:18-19, Jesus brings his soteriological message into reality by
releasing people from evil and unclean spirits. Just as he promises (4:18), Jesus
releases a man from the spirit of an unclean demon (4:35). When Jesus commands,
“Come out of him” to the unclean spirit, it does so (4:35). Such word(s) and action(s)
amaze people (4:36).\footnote{Since Luke uses the word οὐκέχω to refer to being held prisoner in 22:63, the word οὐκέχω here seems to suggest a prisoner of evil (cf. Twelftree, Jesus: The Miracle Worker, p. 147). This observation confirms that Jesus’ ministry involves release from captivity and oppression (cf. 4:18).} Interestingly, here there is no clear difference between Jesus’
words (message) and actions (reality).

Jesus also releases Simon’s mother-in-law from her physical suffering,\footnote{Since Luke 13:12, where Jesus releases (ἀπολύειν) a crippled woman from her
physical sickness, which is caused by a spirit (cf. 13:11). As the text in Luke 13:16

\footnote{Since Luke 4:35, Jesus commands (ἐπετιμησεν)\footnote{Cf. Luke 5:21; 6:7, 11; 7:49.} the fever, implying that the fever is caused by a demon or spirit. This idea becomes more plausible when we look at Luke 13:12, where Jesus releases (ἀπολύειν) a crippled woman from her
physical sickness, which is caused by a spirit (cf. 13:11). As the text in Luke 13:16
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indicates, a demonic spirit, Satan, had caused her sickness. Note that Luke has already informed his readers that an evil spirit can cause physical harm (cf. 4:35). In 4:40-41, Luke informs us that Jesus heals all those who had various sicknesses by laying \(^{575}\) his hands on every one of them and by releasing them all from the power of the demons.

The link between release from an unclean-evil spirit and the process of salvation is also explicitly articulated in Luke 8:36. Luke has already described, in 8:27, that the one who is seized by the power of Satan does not live in a house (i.e. a living space), but in the tombs (i.e. a dead/motionless place). Indeed, his life is portrayed as miserable, because he is bound with chains and shackles and kept under guard (8:29), which suggests that his life is immobile. Yet, when Jesus releases him from the power of demons, his life is transformed. Not only does he regain his right mind and return to his home, he also proclaims what Jesus has done for him throughout the whole city (8:39), demonstrating the creation of the relational space between God and Jesus, him, his family, the audience, and the people to whom he proclaims the news. Jesus also releases a woman from Satan in the form of evil spirits who have bound her for eighteen years (13:12-16).\(^{576}\) Equally, Jesus' disciples release people from the power of Satan in the form of evil spirits, (9:6; 10:1-17).\(^{577}\)

Luke also indicates that it is the mission of Jesus' disciples to release people from the power of Satan, in the form of evil spirits, in Acts. Luke describes the dynamic flows of release from sickness and unclean-evil spirits performed by Peter (Acts 5:15-16), Philip (Acts 8:6-7), and Paul (Acts 19:11-12), and tells how Paul releases a woman from a spirit of divination (Acts 16:16). A summary statement of

\(^{575}\)The word ἐριρέλθημι appears 19 times in Luke-Acts (Lk. 4:40; 10:30; 13:13; 15:5; 23:26; Acts 6:6; 8:17, 19; 9:12, 17; 13:3; 15:10, 28; 16:23; 18:10; 19:6; 28:3, 8, 10), and is described as "a spatializing action," signifying the soteriological event by which a new relational space, between the one who touches and the one who is being touched, is created and moves.

\(^{576}\)For the rule of Satan as chief of the demons and ruler of the kingdom opposed to God, see 10:18 and 11:18. Luke uses δεό ("bind") in this metaphorical sense only here, but the notion of being bound by evil is obviously implied by the "release of captives" (4:18), the exorcism of the violent demoniac (8:26-29) and the dumb demoniac (11:4), as well as in the "release" of sins (5:20, 23; 7:47). This connection is important, for the essence of the Sabbath was that it should be a time of "rest," that is, of "liberation," as the notion of the Sabbath year, when debts were redeemed and slaves were freed, indicates. See Johnson, Luke, p. 212.

\(^{577}\)In fact, Jesus gives his disciples authority over all the demons (cf. Luke 9:1). I will elaborate on the exorcisms performed by Jesus' disciples in the following section.
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Luke-Acts indeed reveals that sickness and "demonic possession" are in the same category of sicknesses.\(^{578}\)

In short, the nomadic flows and movements of release from evil-unclean spirits performed by Jesus and his disciples (1) recalls the preaching of the good news to the poor and the proclamation of release to captives and the oppressed in 4:18;\(^{579}\) (2) pictures a release-event as an event of restoration or one of transition from the power of darkness and Satan to the power of light and God (cf. Acts 26:18); and (3) depicts the saving network (kingdom) of God initiated by Jesus and expanded by his disciples as relational and as something becoming and moveable. Note also that such a saving event occurs outside the temple, which depicts the saving network (kingdom) of God brought by Jesus as something open and deterritorialized that can be accessed from any point and by any person. Indeed, the outcasts who were disconnected from the temple are now connected to the saving network (kingdom) of God.

3.5.4 Release from sins and from social predicaments (Luke 7:47-50). In this text, Jesus releases a woman from her sins. The woman, who is classified as a sinner (v. 37, 39), comes to Jesus and anoints his feet with ointment from an alabaster jar. In response to her behavior, Jesus releases her by announcing, "your sins are forgiven" (7:48).

Several issues need to be highlighted here. As the term salvation in 7:50 refers to release from sins in 7:48, the phrases "Your faith has saved you" 7:50 and "Your sins are forgiven [released]" in 7:48\(^{580}\) correspond to the same saving event. Interestingly, once Luke has established the interaction between the two releasing words in 7:48 and 7:50, Luke no longer uses the soteriological formula \(\alpha\varsigma\kappa\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \sigma\omicron\\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\ \dot{\alpha}m\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\iota\) in connection with salvation (cf. 5:20; 7:48), but uses it with \(\eta\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma\ \sigma\omicron\ \omega\varsigma\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu\ \varsigma\epsilon\) (17:19 and 18:42).\(^{581}\)

Also, it is worth noticing the link between salvation and peace in 7:50, which reflects the contrast between the ways (places) of peace and the ways (places) of


\(^{579}\)Note that not only sin, but also the power of Satan, causes captivity and oppression.

\(^{580}\)Luke retains the soteriological formula \(\alpha\varsigma\kappa\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota\ \sigma\omicron\\upsilon\ \alpha\iota\ \dot{\alpha}m\alpha\rho\tau\iota\alpha\iota\) only twice in Lk. 5:20, 7:48.

\(^{581}\)I have already demonstrated that every healing act, including exorcism, performed by Jesus already includes forgiveness of/release from sins, because every sickness, including demon-related sickness, is presented as being the result of sin.
darkness in Luke 1:79 and 2:14. Unlike in Luke 5:20, there is no mention of physical healing in this episode. What, then, is the link between salvation and peace? As the term ἀμαρτωλός indicates, the woman's status as a sinner echoes her past sinful acts. Although he does not detail which sorts of sins she committed, Luke later reports that her sins are many (v. 47) disclosing the nexus between sin and social stigma. But here the weight is given to the theme of release. By releasing her from her sins, Jesus removes her social stigma. Note that the expression Go in peace echoes 1:79, where the way of peace and light is described in opposition to the way of darkness and death. In this regard, release from social stigma can be seen as an event of restoration or of transition from the way of darkness and death to the way of light and life, denoting the soteriological event by which the living and peaceful space (kingdom) of God is established. This simply means that the one who was disconnected from the temple and God's salvation is now connected to the peaceful network brought by Jesus. Moreover, both the sinful woman (the accused) and the righteous Pharisee (the accuser) are in the presence (space) of Jesus. Since they did not normally associate with one another, such a meeting would not have occurred if Jesus had not come to the Pharisee's house. In this sense, Jesus is portrayed as a junction where the lives of the Pharisee and the sinful woman intersect. However, there is still no interaction between them. Ironically, the righteous Pharisee who invites Jesus into his house seems to be disconnected from the saving network of God and Jesus, while the uninvited guest, the sinful woman, is connected to Jesus, who is presented as the central node in the network.

In short, Luke presents us with a nexus between sin and social stigma (which is an extension of sins) and between the release from sin(s) and social stigma. By releasing her from sin, Jesus releases the woman from her social classification and grants her peace: that is, the living and peaceful space of God. The expressions ἡ πίστις σου ἀφέωνται σε· and ἀφέωνται σου ἀι ἀμαρτίαι comprise the same saving

---

582 The phrase "Go in peace" is a common farewell formula in Judaism (e.g., Judges 18:6; I Sam 1:17; 18:6; I Kgs 22:17; Luke 8:48; Acts 16:36; Jas 2:16), which here takes on a deeper significance in the context of the coming of eschatological salvation (Nolland, Luke, p. 360).
583 Green understands the phrase "go in peace" in close connection with the restoration of her social stature within a redefined religious community (7:47ff), Luke, pp. 314-315. But he does not specify its precise meaning. I suggest that we see "the redefined religious community" as the new soteriological network brought by Jesus, in contrast to the old network of the Jerusalem temple.
event by which the relational network (kingdom) of God (between God, Jesus, the sinful woman, and Jesus' audience) flows.

3.5.5 Release from sins and from debts (Luke 11:4). As I discussed Luke 11:1-4 in the previous chapter, here I will focus on the relationship between sins and debts. In the prayer form, Luke uses τὰς ἁμαρτίας (sins) instead of Matthew's τὰ ὀφειλήματα (debts), the participle ὀφείλομεν (indebted) instead of Matthew's noun form ὀφειλέταις (debtor), and αὐτοὶ (ourselves) instead of Matthew's ἡμεῖς (we), all of which reveals the nexus between sins and debts. But Marshall notes that Luke nearly loses the idea that sin equals debt, by using ὀφείλομεν instead of Matthew's word ὀφειλέταις which has a stronger sense. Yet the participle verb ὀφείλομεν still seems to carry the basic meaning of debtor (one who is indebted). In contrast to Matthew 6:12, where Matthew emphasizes the person to whom one is indebted by using ὀφειλέταις, Luke seems to put an emphasis on the debt itself by using the word ὀφείλομεν. In this respect, Evans rightly notes that the word ὀφείλομεν denotes “mixing cancellation of debts with forgiveness of sins.” Thus, Luke 11:4 implies that persons who release others from debts-sins are the ones who will be released from their sins-debts, thereby disclosing the relationship between creditor and debtor.

Two observations need to be noted. First, in contrast to Matt 6:14 the γὰρ clause appears to indicate that divine release is linked to men’s release of their fellow men. However, Geldenhuys rejects this notion. Yet what is at issue here is the importance of releasing others from sins (cf. 17:3-4; 24:47). Second, where Matthew

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 6:12</th>
<th>Luke 11:4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἄφως ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφίζομεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν.</td>
<td>καὶ ἄφως ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίζομεν παρὰ ὀφειλόμεν ἡμῖν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And forgive us our debts, as we also have forgiven our debtors (NRSV).</td>
<td>And forgive us our sins, for we ourselves forgive everyone indebted to us (NRSV).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

590 The word ὀφείλομεν denotes to owe, sin against, be bound, wrong. Sin is described as a debt to be forgiven. When someone acts against another, he or she incurs a debt. Bock, Luke, pp. 204-205.
593 Geldenhuys, the Gospel of Luke, p. 323.
uses the aorist ἀφέκαμεν, Luke uses the present verb ἀφιμενό denoting the daily practice of release from sins-debts. This shows that the disciples of Jesus already practiced releasing other people from sin from day to day. The nexus between divine and human release is documented elsewhere in the Jesus’ tradition. Therefore, the close analogy between sins and debts reveals that release from debts should also be understood to mean release from sins. Luke clearly uses the imagery of debts and sins to emphasize the relationship between them, which recalls the preaching of good news to the poor and the proclamation of release to the captives in 4:18 (cf. 6:20; 7:21). The consequences of debt, just like those of sin, are captivity or slavery. As Deissmann writes, “The idea of forgiveness (release) of our trespasses which was established for the ancients by the legal procedure they were accustomed to. In cases of non-payment of a money debt the system of personal execution allowed not only arrest but even slavery for debt.” Unsurprisingly, given this context, release from sins is presented as an event of restoration or transition from sins-debts-slavery to sins-debts freedom, which is of course the same saving event by which the relational network of God is created and moves.

3.5.6 Summary. Just as the words πτωχοίς, τυφλοῖς, αἰχμαλώτοις, τεθραυσμένους, ἀμαρτία, ὀφείλοντι, κακία, σώνδεσμον, and ἀδικίας are described as static and motionless territories, so also the words ἀφίημι, σῶξω, λῦω, ἀπολύω, and καθαρίζω unfold the dynamic event(s) of release by which the relational network (kingdom) of God proliferates. That is, whereas the words πτωχοίς, τυφλοῖς, αἰχμαλώτοις, τεθραυσμένους, ἀμαρτία, ὀφείλοντι, κακία, σώνδεσμον, and ἀδικίας are closed, territorialized, and motionless, the active fluids and motions of release are portrayed as open, deterritorialized and in motion. As I have noted, the theme of ἀφοείν in 4:18 presumes ἀφεοεισ ἀμαρτιῶν, showing that the folded image of captivity and oppression unfolds into its multiple layers – sin(s), sickness, demonic possession, social stigma, and debts – and evokes the frozen and dark place where outcasts and outsiders are territorialized and ruled by Satan, which describes them as persons who echo those who were disconnected from the temple and who were out of the soteriological map (lost). That is, as the link between the preaching of good news to

---

the poor and that of the release of captives shows, release from captivity and oppression must be understood in terms of release from sins, from physical and spiritual sicknesses, from social stigmas, and from debts. As we have seen, the outcasts who were disconnected from the temple are now connected to the saving network brought by Jesus. In this sense, the act of release may well be described as an event of restoration or transition from darkness, death, and Satan to light, life, and God. Just as various people from various regions came to Jesus, so also Jesus went to various villages to proclaim release from sins, demonstrating that Jesus was the person of God to whom one should be connected. In contrast to the sedentary and territorialized system of the temple, the nomadic fluids and motions of Jesus' acts of release in one place after another define the saving network of God as an open and deterritorialized system that can be accessed from any point(s) and by any person(s). Indeed, the dynamic events of release themselves occur in an open and deterritorialized space, that is, outside the temple.

3.6 Conclusion

My central aim in this chapter has been to examine the precise meaning(s) of ἀφεων ἀμαρτίας and its relationship to other themes of release and to the nomadic flows and fluids of the kingdom of God initiated by Jesus and expanded by his ministry.

First, I examined the decisive relationship between sin and sickness and impurity within the framework of the popular theme of holiness and pollution in Luke's cultural context. Not only were sickness and impurity viewed as the extended realities of sinfulness, but also they were perceived as dirt, that is, something out of place (lost). That is, persons who were labeled as sinners and outcasts were disconnected from the temple and from salvation, because they were classified as contagious, and a danger to holy people and the temple. This shows that their social place was designated by the visible marks on their bodies. Conversely, persons who belonged to the dimension of holiness were represented as connected to the temple and to salvation. Thus, one of the central tasks of the temple authorities was to establish a clear definition of the boundary between these two categories, in order to maintain their religious order-system-belief and to control and monitor what went in and out of the temple. This shows that the power of the temple authorities was a binding and territorializing power. That is, to regulate and maintain the purity of the
temple, they controlled people and their daily activities, which mean that we can define their religious activity as having *power-in-space*.

Second, although Luke understood the popular conception of *holiness* in his time, in his writings he promotes *release from sins*. As opposed to the static words πτωχοίς, τιφλοίς, άσωματοις, τεθραυσμένους, ἀμαρτία, ὁφείλοντι, κακία, σώζεσθεμόν, and ἀσκείας, he uses the mobile words ἀφίημι, σώζω, λύω, ἀπολύω, and καθαρίζω to expose the *nomadic* flows and movements of release by which the relational network of God is established and proliferates. As the nexus between the preaching of good news to the poor and the promise of release from captivity and oppression shows, the ideas of poverty, captivity and oppression are interconnected and must be understood in terms of release from sins, from physical and spiritual sicknesses, social stigmas, and debts. As Jesus releases persons from various forms of captivity and oppressions, the *sinners* and *outcasts* who were cut off from the temple are reconnected to the saving network of God.

Third, I have proposed that we rethink the multi-layered structure of *release* as a manifold event of *restoration* or *transition* from darkness, death, and Satan to light, life, and God. This takes place in a deterritorialized space criss-crossed by Jesus, the disciples and the people, and stands in opposition to the stratified and sedentary structure of the temple. Because the soteriological events of Jesus and his disciples occur outside the temple, we see that God's soteriological event should not be confined by static boundaries and fixed territories. Instead, this relational network is continually being established, and proliferates by way of the nomadic movements of the people. Thus, Jesus' authority-power is not seen to be territorializing or binding, but releasing and deterritorializing.

Therefore I suggest that the phrase ἀφεῖς ἀμαρτίων should be understood in terms of the *nomadic* movements of release that flow from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside) and from Jerusalem (inside) to the ends of the earth (outside). These *nomadic* movements (1) unfold the folded image of captivity and oppression into a multi-layered features of release: release from sins, from physical and spiritual sicknesses, from social stigmas, and from debts and (2) deterritorialize the hierarchical, binary, and motionless system of the temple, and (3) establish the non-hierarchical relational network (kingdom) of God. Such a conclusion forces us to
understand release from sins and its nomadic flows in terms of a dynamic relational and multiple event, and as a salvation event flowing, becoming, and in motion.
Chapter Four:

The name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus

In relation to salvation, Luke makes two significant pronouncements about the name of Jesus: “Everyone who calls on the name [δύναμι] of the Lord shall be saved [ωθησθαι]” (Acts 2:21; cf. Joel 2:28ff.) and “There is salvation [σωτηρία] in no one else, for there is no other name [δύναμι] under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved [ωθησθαι]” (Acts 4:12). As these statements indicate, Luke links salvation with the act of invoking the name of Jesus.

4.1 Introduction

Clearly the name of Jesus, and particularly its connection to salvation, is one of the major elements in Luke-Acts. When they return, joyful, from their missionary works, the seventy disciples make their report and say to Jesus, “Lord [Jesus], even the demons are subject to us in your name” (Luke 10:17). Just as the risen Lord Jesus commissions his disciples to preach repentance for the release of sins ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ (Luke 24:47), so these disciples also proclaim the message of salvation ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (Acts 2:38). In fact, they speak, teach, and baptize.

The following tables detail the occurrences of δύναμι in Luke and Acts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word δύναμι occurs mostly in chapter one, yet only once does it refer to God (1:49), and once to the child Jesus (1:31). It refers to the adult Jesus eight times (1:31; 2:21; 9:48, 49; 10:17; 21:8(?)) [In this text, Jesus foretells about a false prophet who will come and speak in his name (cf. Acts 19:13ff.), 12, 17] and only once does it refer to the risen Lord (24:47). It also refers to the name of a person eighteen times, to the name of a place twice, and to the name of an evil spirit once. Out of 34 occurrences in Luke, δύναμι refers to God only four times (1:49; 11:2; 13:35; 19:38).

The word δύναμι in Acts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chap</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, δύναμι occurs mostly in chapter nine, which details Paul’s conversion story. It refers to Jesus Christ 31 times, to the name of a single person 25 times, and to more than one person twice (1:15; 18:15). Out of sixty occurrences, however, δύναμι refers to God only twice (15:16, 17). For further information, see Robert L. Mowery, “Lord, God, and Father: Theological Language in Luke-Acts,” SBL, pp. 82-101.

598 The following tables detail the occurrences of δύναμι in Luke and Acts.

599 The phrase ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ literally means “on the basis of his name.”

600 Acts 4:17; 5:40.

in his name (ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ). Moreover, they perform healings and exorcisms in the name of Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ). Just as signs and wonders (salvational events) take place through the name of Jesus (ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι τοῦ ἀγίου πατρὸς σου Ἰησοῦ, Acts 4:30), so also salvation is received through his name (ἐφεσιν ἀμαρτίων λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τῶν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν, Acts 10:43). Philip too performs miracles and proclaims the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 8:12). In the same manner, Paul speaks (Acts 9:27, 28) and performs miracles (Acts 16:18) in the name of Jesus. Not only do they speak and act in the name of Jesus, but they also suffer for his name.

Why are the disciples prepared to speak and act in the name of Jesus? Moreover, why would they be willing to suffer for his name? Because they believed that salvation would come through the name of Jesus. Thus Peter proclaims, "There is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved" (Acts 4:12). Remember that Peter has already announced, "Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts 2:21), showing that salvation is no longer limited to the Jews, but is expanded to include the Gentiles, so long as they call upon the name of the Lord [Jesus]. Apparently, then, not only is the name of Jesus the foundation of the words and actions of the leaders of the early church, but it is presented as the central node of the saving network (kingdom) of God, rather than the temple.

What, then, do the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus signify? Some scholars have argued that Luke’s treatment of them, particularly in

---

602 B D 945. 1789. 1891 ρ; Did read ἐν instead of ἐν in 2:38. Ziesler thinks that ἐν is a better reading, since it is used in both Lk. 9:48 and 24:47 (Ziesler, “The Name of Jesus”, p. 29). However, Bruce prefers ἐν as in 10:48 (Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 98).


608 Bietenhard provides a review of the prepositional combinations in the NT. He understands that the expressions ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι and ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι are identical and are closely related (TDNT, V., p. 271). Although his analysis is somewhat helpful, it would be more helpful to see how ὄνομα itself is used in Acts as a whole. Thus, I will look how ὄνομα is used in combination with various verbs (Bietenhard has listed these combinations, but in limited fashion). In Acts, the name of the Lord Jesus Christ is used with following verbs: ἐπικαλέσθησαι and σωθήσεται (2:21); μετανοήσηται and βαπτισθήτω (2:38); ἐγερθείς and προσέβαλλεις (3:16); ἐστέκετε (3:16; cf. 16:5); ἐπισκόπησε (4:7); παρέστηκεν ὑπὸς (4:10); σωθήσεται (4:12); λαλεῖς (4:17); φθείρηκες and διδάσκεις (4:18); γίνομαι (4:30); διδάσκεις
the context of healings and exorcisms, is to be understood within the framework of magic. In his article, “The Name of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles,” Ziesler argues that the name of Jesus has some sort of “magical” power, particularly in relation to healings and exorcisms, and he calls it a “very powerful name to be approached with caution and even awe.”609 Since it has “magical” power, Ziesler claims that Jesus’ disciples used the phrase in the name of Jesus as a “magical” formula in their healings and exorcisms. Similarly, in his book, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, Hull contends that, of all the synoptic Gospels, Luke is most strongly influenced by Hellenistic “magical” belief and practice. Hull argues that the “magical” episodes are representative of Luke’s worldview, because Luke believed in “magic,” saying, “Luke wrote about magic because he saw and believed.”610 Finally, in his article, “Magic in Early Christianity”, Aune concludes that, not only did Jesus use “magical” techniques, but his disciples also used them. They used the name of Jesus in healings and exorcisms because his name was very powerful.611 This causes Aune to conclude that “Acts” contains several examples of the “magical” use of the name of Jesus in healings and exorcisms.612

In his article, “Magic in the Biblical World”, Yamauchi points out that “There can be no doubt that both the Old Testament and the New Testament were born in environments permeated with magical beliefs and practices.”613 Indeed, Pliny’s talk of “magical” beliefs and practices in his Natural History, the second-century Apuleius’ Apologia against the charge of sorcery, the Greek Magical Papyri, and the existence of tabellae defixionum (curse tablets), amulets, ostraca, and other miscellaneous “magical” apparatus all reveal the prevalence of such beliefs and practices at this time.614 Unquestionably, magic flourished in Greco-Roman religion.

\[
\begin{align*}
(5:28): & \text{ λαλεῖν} (5:40); \text{ ἄτιμοσθήσατε} (5:41); \text{ εὐαγγελιζόμενῳ} (8:12); \text{ βεβαπτισμένον} (8:16); \text{ ἄραι ἐπικαλομένους} (9:14); \text{ βεβαπτισμένο} (9:15); \text{ παθεῖν} (9:16); \text{ πορθήσας} \text{ καὶ ἐπικαλομένος} (9:21); \text{ ἐπαρθηκαίσαστα} (9:27); \text{ παρηγοροῦσθαι} (9:28); \text{ λαμβανεῖ} \text{ καὶ ποιεῖ} (10:43); \text{ βεβαπτισθήσαι} (10:48); \text{ παρασκεύασθαι} (15:26); \text{ παραγγέλλω} (16:18); \text{ ἱκανοθήκη} (19:5); \text{ ὄνομάξειν} (19:13); \text{ ἐμεγαλύνει} (19:17); \text{ ἀποθηρυεῖν} (21:13); \text{ βάπτισαι, ἀπόλοιποισα, ἐπικαλομένος} (22:16); \text{ ἐδοξασάν} \text{ καὶ} (26:9). \text{ See Harry W. Hurtado, One God, One Lord, pp. 108-124; W. Kramer, Christ, Lord, Son of God, SBT 50 (London: SCM Press, 1966), pp. 75-80; G. R. Beasley-Murray, Baptism in the New Testament, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1962).}
\end{align*}
\]

610 J. M. Hull, Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition, p. 87.
614 Origen himself regarded the name of Jesus as a very powerful name, so that it was even effective when bad men used it (Contra Cels 1:6; cf. Aune, p. 1545). In his introduction, Betz states,
even though its practices and practitioners were generally illegal throughout the history of the Roman Empire. In fact, Jesus of Nazareth himself was accused of being a practitioner of "magic" and "sorcery" by his contemporaries and later critics.

Given the severe negative implications of being associated with magical practice, it was necessary for the authors of the New Testament to demonstrate that the activities of Jesus and his disciples were not "magical" in either character or form. This was particularly important for Luke, because Luke referred to the use of the name of Jesus and that of the phrase in the name of Jesus in healings and exorcisms, which could look very like "magical" practice. These resemblances require us to consider the problem of defining "magic," if we are to provide a satisfactory account of the use of Jesus' name in Luke-Acts.

How do we define magic, and in particular how do we distinguish it from miracles (and vice versa)? How did Luke and his readers understand magic? And, if not by way of magic, how did Luke apply the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus to the nomadic events of release from physical and spiritual sicknesses? What sort of message did he want to convey to his readers by portraying such methods and using such formulas? That is, what do the name and the phrase in the name of Jesus signify? In this chapter, we will look at the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus not from an outsider's position (etic), but from an insider's perspective (emic).

4.2 What is magic?

Etymology. The word "magic" comes from the Greek μαγεία. Delling has defined μαγεία as the "activity of the μάγος," and μαγεύω (Acts 8:9) as "to belong to the order of μάγοι." (Matt. 2:1) and "to do the work of the μάγος" (Matt. 2:7, 16; Acts 13:6, 8), and so it might be helpful to recount the nature and function of μάγος.

"Magical beliefs and practices can hardly be overestimated in their importance for the daily life of the people" (Hans Betz, The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation including the Demotic Spells, p. xli).
617 Cf. Celsus, as cited in Origen, Contra Celsum 1.28.
618 See Susan Garrett, The Demise of the Devil, p. 3.
619 Delling, TDNT, 4:359.
In general, the “magician” is portrayed negatively in the Bible, and understood figuratively as a “deceiver” and “seducer.” Yamauchi observes that as early as the fifth century B.C. the word μάγος came to have the pejorative sense of “sorcerer” or “quack,” and was thus applied to the activities of Simon in Acts 8:9 and 11, and of Elymas in Acts 13:6 and 13:8. Betz views the term “magician” negatively, and writes, “People want to believe, so they simply ignore their suspicions that magic may all be deception and fraud. In many crucial areas and in many critical situations of life, deception is the only method that really works. Of course, it is all deception.” However, it is important to note that the activity of the μάγοι is portrayed positively in Matthew 2:1, where the μάγοι demonstrate supernatural insight or power(s). Charlesworth notes that Matthew himself, or another Jewish Christian before him, was influenced by astrological predictions.

In other contexts, the μάγοι were “members of the Persian priestly caste”, showing that the term can be used in a positive sense. A third use of the term “magician” refers to a person who exercises “magic,” and whose arts are connected with the name of a Persian magus, Ost(h)anes. A fourth use is provided by Bauer, who defines μάγος as “a wise man and priest, who was an expert in astrology, interpretation of dreams and various other secret arts.” Yet Gordon views the “magician” sociologically, and believes that the aims of the “magician” are entirely anti-social. He writes, “[the magician] destroys decency, custom and law; he offends the gods; but most of all he threatens the hierarchy of the politico-social order.” Finally, μάγος is generally defined as “a possessor and user of supernatural knowledge and ability.” It is noteworthy that, whether the term is understood positively or negatively, all the above scholars acknowledge the existence of “magic” and its practice(s), as if the invisible knowledge or power(s) of “magic” and its operational space can be visualized and do unfold within the visible world. This shows that

621Hans Betz, p. xlviii.
622During the Hellenistic period the word magi came to denote astrologers (Yamauchi, “Magic in the Biblical World,” Tyndale Bulletin 34, 1983, p. 175).
624Delling, TDNT, 4:356.
625Ibid., p. 357.
628Delling, TDNT, 4:357.
*magic* cannot merely be explained etymologically and linguistically, but must be understood phenomenologically and spatial-temporally.

**4.3 How is magic perceived in Luke-Acts?**

Although Luke retains the positive definition of *magic*, it has generally been viewed negatively elsewhere. For example, Christians easily dismiss it, and distance from it as much as possible, because they do not want anything to do with it. Some New Testament scholars have viewed “magic” as a vestige of an early stage of human religious development, or as a perverse and corrupt form of religion. Since “magic” tends to be portrayed negatively, many scholars have attempted to make a clear-cut distinction between religion and “magic.” Festugiere claimed that “magic” is the inverse of religion. Also, the pioneer anthropologist Sir James Frazer contended that “magic” constrains or coerces superhuman powers instead of conciliating or propitiating them, as religion would do. He argued that “an Age of Magic” is everywhere prior to “an Age of Religion.” He viewed “magic” as the bastard sister of science and as something false. Likewise, M. Nilsson argued that “magic” and religion were fundamentally different. “Magic” is generally defined as a technique for manipulating supernatural powers so as to attain one’s own ends, and as “an intervention into the mysterious network of the powers of nature and cosmos.” Kee argued that if a technique is effective in overcoming a hostile force and attaining one’s own desired ends, then the action is “magical.”

However, the anthropologist Evan-Pritchard strongly rejected such a clear-cut distinction between religion and “magic” as ambiguous, and argued that “magic” could not be dismissed as unimportant. Similarly, A. D. Nock argued, “There is not, then a sphere of magic in contrast to the sphere of religion.” He insisted that there is no fundamental difference between “magic” and religion, just as there is none

---

634 Ibid., pp. 56-57.  
635 Ibid., p. 50.  
639 Ibid., p. 4. See also H. H. Rowley, *The Faith of Israel*, p. 27.  
between incantation and prayer. Moreover, John G. Gager has even criticized the editors of the English translation of PGM, for failing to choose a different title other than “magic.” Yet many scholars still attempt to make a clear-cut distinction between “magic” and religion. J. de Vries noted that the most common distinction between “magic” and religion involved detecting a different attitude towards supernatural powers. However, Aune argued that the distinction between “magic” and religion is not attitudinal, but sociological. The sociologist E. Durkheim understood “magic” as something individualistic and anti-social. M. Mauss viewed “magic” itself as unauthorized and abnormal, even though the entire social unit shared a belief in it. Since “magic” was private, secret, and prohibited, Mauss observed that the essence of “magic” is illegality. Likewise, J. Z. Smith understood “magic” in terms of illegality.

All of these various definitions of the functions of “magic” suggest that it is important for modern interpreters to recognize the various cultural and social influences on the meaning of “magic” in antiquity. Also, whether it is perceived positively or negatively, scholars have recognized the existence of “magic” and its operational powers (times-spaces), suggesting that magic (visible or invisible) is not merely symbolic, but an actual power by which people move and act. Such a power creates hierarchical and binary lines between the one who performs magic and the ones who receive it. In the following sections, we will look at the use of magic in Luke-Acts, in the context of the use of the name of Jesus.

Perhaps a brief account of recent studies on this subject will shed light on how Luke and his readers understood “magic,” and why he used the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus as a form of magical incantation in his descriptions of healings and exorcisms. First, as noted above, Ziesler contends that Luke used the
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642 Quoted by Nock, Paul and the Magus, p. 315.
644 Though Nock strongly argued that there was no fundamental difference between “magic” and religion, he offered a definition of “magic” which does indeed differentiate between the two: “The profession by private individuals of technical ability enabling them to supply recipes or perform rites to help their clients and damage their clients’ enemies; the use by the clients or by others of such proceedings to damage enemies; and ...the religions belonging to aliens on any general ground disapproved” (Nock, Paul and the Magus, p. 171).
649 Ibid.
The name of Jesus as a "magical" power and the phrase in the name of Jesus as a "magical" formula because he believed that some sort of power operates when the right name is invoked. But Ziesler fails to show how Luke understood "magic," and why he used the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus in the way that he did. Nor does he discuss magic within the temporal-spatial perspective of Luke. He simply relies on Hull's perception of Hellenistic "magic," without closely examining Hull's "magical" materials.

Hull does actually define "magic" as a belief in invisible powers which are linked by invisible bonds of sympathy to visible symbols, and that knowledge of these powers, sympathies, antipathies and symbols makes it possible to influence the supernatural world. He writes, "The art of magic is to collect such knowledge and apply it correctly so as to swing the enormous forces of the universe in the desired direction." After examining various examples of invocation and ritual performance from the Hellenistic period and from magical papyri, he claims that Luke, of all the gospel writers, was most strongly influenced by Hellenistic "magical" belief, and that he put strong emphasis on the existence of angels and demons, and particularly on the power of demons. Hull therefore claims that Luke's worldview was "magical." Hull seems to be right in claiming that Luke believes in invisible powers and its operational (visible) spaces. But, as others point out, Hull's study is problematic in

651 Ziesler, p. 32.
652 Ibid., pp. 37-38. Hull notes that an understanding of the sympathies and antipathies of the universe was the key weapon for the magician. He observes the two major ways in which the magician put all his knowledge to work: the invocation (κληρίς or επικλήρις) and the ritual (προφητεία). Hull lists six stages of the invocation: 1) the invocation proper, beginning "I call upon you," "I summon you," "come to me," "help me" and so on; 2) uttering the name of the god; 3) delivering epithets describing the god; 4) praising the god, to increase the benevolence of the one invoked; 5) recounting memories in which the god was reminded of what he had done in the past, and particularly deeds similar to that which he is being asked to do; 6) finally, uttering the request. The subsequent ritual could take various forms, involving the use of amulets, sacrifices, the mixing of special substances and potions, libations, and/or secret writing (pp. 42-45). Generally, magicians used various forms of ritual and pronounced all kinds of names of gods (see Koester, p. 380).
653 Garrett observes that Hull's notion of a magical world-view goes back to the works of Edward B. Tylor and James G. Frazer. Garrett also notes that Hull works mainly with an observer-oriented ("etic") definition of magic, which is imposed from the outside, by the modern observer, in contrast to a subject-oriented ("emic") definition of magic, which is imposed from the inside. Yet he unconsciously brings in subject-oriented (emic) categories by arguing that it was the early Christians' beliefs about magic and magicians that caused them to recount Jesus' miracle stories as they did. Hull's inconsistent use of subject-oriented categories makes his argument rather weak. On one hand he maintains that the early Christians' assumptions about magic were irrelevant and unimportant, but on the other hand he implies that such assumptions are relevant (Garrett, pp. 27-28). Hull also totally ignores the apocalyptic world-view of Luke, who believed and waited for the kingdom of God and salvation of his faithful people (Lk. 4:43; 9:2; 11:20; 18:24; Acts 1:3; 14:22; 28:28, 31).
many areas. Hull mainly probes how "magical" belief and practice influenced the transmission and redaction of the miracle stories in the gospels, but he fails to prove that any link exists. He disregards the worldview of all sorts of participants as "irrelevant" and "unimportant." That is, he ignored the important function of all participants who actually modified and redacted the synoptic traditions based on their "magical" understanding of the world.

Aune has taken a somewhat different approach to Hull. He rejects the concept of "magic" defined in opposition to religion as ritual procedures for manipulating and coercing supernatural beings for utilitarian ends, and instead adopts a sociological model. By using such a model, Aune argues, "magic can be understood neutrally in terms of religion. That is, 'magic' is a form of religiosity which is generally disapproved and which is the object of social stigma and social control." Aune defines magic as a "form of religious deviance whereby individual or social goals are sought by means alternate to those normally sanctioned by the dominant religious institution," and argues that "goals sought within the context of religious deviance are magical when attained through the management of supernatural powers in such a way that results are virtually guaranteed." Such a definition characterizes "magic" as a form of social deviance, and incorporates many of the observations of W. J. Goode within the theoretical framework of a structural-functionalist approach to social deviance. Indeed, "magic" was viewed as a form of social deviance in antiquity. David Gill notes that, in the first-century Roman world, "magic" was

654 Achtemeier rejects such claims and argues, "the Jesus of Luke appears less influenced by magical practice than the Jesus in Mark." He also dismisses the idea that Luke puts special emphasis on the demonic (Achtemeier, "Lucan Perspective on Miracles," p. 558; cf. pp. 556-558). Also note that the nature and function of the angels and demons in the Old Testament seem not to be coercive and manipulative, which was how they were viewed in the second and third centuries (Kee, p. 118); Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," p. 1543; Garrett, The Demise of the Devil, pp. 26-29.  
655 Hull, p. 59.  
657 Ibid.  
658 Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," p. 1515. Goode has formulated eleven "non-dichotomous empirical differences" between magic and religion. I will list seven of them. First, magic tends to express a manipulative attitude toward "extra-ordinary" reality, while religion tends to involve a supplicatory attitude. Second, magical activities tend to be used instrumentally for specific goals, while religious activities tend to be regarded as ends in themselves. Third, magic emphasizes individual goals, while religion focuses on group goals. Fourth, magical activities tend to be private and individual, while religious activities tend to be carried out by groups. Fifth, magic tends to develop professional-client relationships, while religion tends to emphasize the "shepherd-flock" or "prophet-follower" relationship. Sixth, magic tends, in cases of failure, to introduce substitute techniques, while substitution is less a characteristic of religion. Finally, magic tends to act impersonally, with minimal emphasis on emotion, while religion tends to make greater use of emotion and to evoke attitudes of awe and worship (W. J. Goode, Magic and Religion, pp. 50-55).  
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perceived as being the opposite of “normal” Roman religious practice. For example, Lucan records the case of the female magician Erichtho, who subverted normal sacrifices by using dead animals, and by eating the flesh of a corpse.

For Aune, “magic” is also a way of exercising social control over something regarded as undesirable. However, we must question his definition of magic, because he assumes that the charges of “magic” were always made by “those within the dominant social structure to label and exert control on those in the ambiguous and unstructured areas of society.” Likewise, he assumes that there is always a clear-cut distinction between someone who was a member of “the dominant religious institution” and someone who was “socially deviant.” In this respect, Loren Stuckenbruck raises several important questions regarding Aune’s attempt to find “meaningful parallels within early Christianity:” (a) “How can concepts such as ‘religious deviance’ and ‘dominant religious institution’ be properly defined?” (b) “Is it the broader or more immediate context which determines whether an activity is understood as ‘magic’?” (c) “Does Aune’s distinction between dominant and deviant practices actually describe the different social contexts for ‘magic’ in antiquity?”

More importantly, for our purposes at least, Aune attempts to territorialize the movements of the phenomenological reality of “magic” and force it into static definitions, which undermines the actual reality of “magic” by which people move and act in Luke-Acts.

In her book The Demise of the Devil, Susan Garrett has taken a new approach to the subject of magic. She rightly asserts that “Because Luke’s ‘discussion’ of magic consists of a series of stories set within a narrative framework, the primary context for interpretation must be the narrative world.” She then attempts to show that Luke portrayed magicians such as Simon Magus (Acts 8:9-13), Elymas (Acts 13:6-12), and the seven exorcist sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13-20) as impotent allies of a defeated Satan by using literary criticism within the narrative world. She claims that “Every healing, exorcism, or raising from the dead is a loss for Satan and a gain for

---

661Ibid., p. 1523.
662Segal, Hellenistic Magic, p. 370.
Throughout her book, she also illustrates the idea that "Luke regarded Satan as the authority behind all acts of magic, including the summoning of demonic spirits," in opposition to the authority-power of God who is behind all acts of the Christian miracle workers. She insists that distinguishing the authority-power of God from that of Satan is the key to understanding how Luke viewed "magic," and so she argues that the issue is not about the nature of the exorcisms or healings themselves, but about the source of power by which they are performed (cf. Acts 4:7). Thus she proposes that the source of power can either be good, in which case God is with the exorcist, or evil, in which case the exorcist is himself evil because he has invoked either the spirit of a dead human or a demon for help. In her conclusion, Garrett offers her own definitions of magic: (1) "magic is the routine mode of action by the antagonists in a spiritual world that is present on all sides at all times;" (2) "magic is a gauge that indicates by its success or failure the strength or weakness of Satan and his forces."

Yet, although Garrett's literary criticism approach to the narrative world of Luke-Acts has made an important contribution to the scholarly discussion of magic, a number of her primary assumptions must be questioned. Because she believes that discerning the source of authority-power, whether from God or from Satan, is the key to understanding how Luke viewed magic, Garrett proposes that if it is good, then it is from God, and if it is evil, then it is from Satan. But, how can concepts such as "good" and "evil" properly be defined? And who can define what is "good" and what is "evil"? Furthermore, her definitions of magic seem somewhat ambiguous. She assumes that every healing, exorcism, or raising from the dead is performed, not by the power of Satan, but by the power of God. But if Satan cannot perform any signs or wonders, what sort of authority-power does he have, and why does Luke portray him as a powerful being? Moreover, although the name of Jesus is one of the principle attributes of salvation, as granted by Jesus' disciples in Luke-Acts, Garrett simply ignores it, and particularly its relationship to the dynamic movements of release (miracles) by which the kingdom of God is created and proliferates. That is, she fails to interpret the function of the name of Jesus from the geographical (temporal-spatial) perspective of Luke-Acts.

---

667 Ibid., p. 45.
668 Ibid., p. 66.
669 Ibid., p. 44.
670 Ibid., p. 107.
To sum up, Ziesler, Hull, and Aune categorize the New Testament data from an observer-oriented (etic) perspective. Although they recognize the importance of the invisible powers and their operational spaces, they overemphasize the idea that Luke’s use of the name of Jesus should be understood within the framework of magic, and ignore the issue of how Luke and his readers perceived magic within their own particular contexts. Although Garrett’s approach is helpful in seeing how Luke and his readers understood magic, her definitions of magic and the criteria she uses for distinguishing between the sources of authority-power are ambiguous. She also downplays the significance of the name of Jesus, and particularly its relationship to the Holy Spirit and the power-authority of Jesus by which Jesus’ disciples acted and moved. Thus, together these scholars fail to demonstrate the important connections between the name of Jesus, the saving authority-power of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and God, and between the name of Jesus and the dynamic flows and fluids of release; they also neglect the purpose of Luke’s application of the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus in the context of his soteriology. Moreover, they fail to examine the name of Jesus in close connection to Luke’s spatial-temporal perspective.

4.4 How did Luke view magic?

In this section I want to investigate how Luke viewed the power(s) of “magic” and its operational activities (spaces), and inscribed them within the narrative world of Luke-Acts. The term “magic” itself is rarely used in Luke-Acts, and Luke provides virtually no information about the nature of “magic,” nor any detailed descriptions of “magical” practices. However, he does report several “magical” activities, suggesting that Luke knew of “magical” power and its operational spaces (both invisible and visible). In fact, at times he clearly makes a determined effort to distance himself from magical practices, whereas he narrates a number of miracle accounts, which look magical, in a positive way(s).

---

669 In fact the noun word μαγεία is used only once in Luke-Acts (Acts 8:11), the verb μαγευω is used only once (Acts 8:9), and μαγικος occurs only twice (Acts 13:6, 8).

670 Although Luke gives a short description of how the name of Jesus was used by the seven sons of Sceva in an exorcism (Acts 19:13), he seems to differentiate their “magical” formula from his use of the name of Jesus in an exorcism (see below).


672 The episodes of Magus (Acts 8:9-13, 24), the magician Elymas (Acts 13:6-12), the seven exorcist sons of Sceva (Acts 19:13-20), and the public burning of the “magical books” by the Christians in Ephesus (Acts 19:19) clearly put that beyond doubt.
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However, the evidence of Luke-Acts itself seems inconsistent. Luke describes a number of events as "miracles", even though they look "magical." Consider Luke's accounts of the sudden deaths of Ananias and Sapphira after Peter's abusive words (Acts 5:3-11), the cursing of Elymas (Acts 13:10-11), the healings and exorcisms accomplished by Peter's shadow (Acts 5:15-16) and by Paul's aprons (Acts 19:12). At the first glance, these conflicting accounts appear to indicate that Luke does not know much about "magic" and its practices. However, not only does Luke seem to have been well acquainted with the powers of "magic" and its realities (or spaces), but he also attempts to differentiate his treatment of the soteriological formula from that of the magicians. For example, in Acts 19:13 Luke uses a regular "magical" adjuration, ὁρκὶζω, instead of the more usual exorcism terms ἐξελθεῖν and ἐκβάλλειν in order to differentiate Christian exorcism from that of the magicians. Indeed, the Jewish exorcists used the typical "magical" adjuration word ὁρκὶζω to mean a charm or spell efficacious against those who had evil spirits (Acts 19:13). But, Luke never uses the word ὁρκὶζω in connection with any Christian exorcisms.

Also, both the double accusative (ὁρκὶζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐν Παύλος κηρύσσει) that comes after ὁρκὶζω and the phrase "to name over" (ὁνομάζειν ἐπὶ), have "magical" connotations. Moreover, as Deissmann has already noted, the term πράξεις in 19:18 may refer to magical "practices" found in PGM. Finally, the word περίεργα in 19:19 refers to "magical" practices, and the term τὰς βιβλίους may refer to "magical" books or even "magic books". Hence, as his careful treatment of these various "magical" terms indicates, Luke is familiar with "magic" and its practices, and is well aware of the realities of its invisible powers. At the same time, though Luke attempts to distance himself from "magical" practices, he positively

673 Aune argues that the usual form of "magical" adjuration is ὁρκὶζω (David Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity," pp. 1531-32). Kee also notes that the regular terms for "magical" adjuration are ὁρκὶζω, ἀπολαυσι, and the more emphatic ἐξ ὁρκὶζω (Howard Kee, Medicine, Miracle, and Magic in the New Testament, p. 107). Indeed, the use of ὁρκὶζω is found in PGM 4.3019-20 (see Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 281 and Light from the Ancient East, p. 260).
676 The word ὁρκὶζω is used only once elsewhere in the New Testament. The demon uses it against Jesus, saying, "I adjure you by God, do no torment me" (Mark 5:7).
678 Deissmann, Bible Studies, p. 323 n. 5.
680 PGM 3.424; 13.739.
reports on a number of "miracle" narratives, which look "magical." These contradictions do not seem to suggest that Luke was naïve about "magic" and its practices, but rather indicate that his understanding of "magic" simply differs from that of modern readers.

As Garrett demonstrates, Luke's perception of "magic" is indeed different from that of modern readers. To give one example, Luke hardly makes any distinction between "miracle" and "magic" in his writings because a clear-cut distinction between the two was rarely made in antiquity. Furthermore, although he does not promote "magical" practice, Luke positively reports that good results and supernatural power (insight) can be attained by "magical" practice. For example, when the disciples attempt to stop someone who had used the name of Jesus in exorcism (Luke 9:49), Jesus tells them not to prevent him, but to allow him to practice it (Luke 9:50). In Acts 16:16, Luke also records the case of a certain slave girl, who testified that Paul and his companions were bondservants of the Most High God and proclaimed the way of salvation (Acts 16:17). Although she had a spirit of divination and made a lot of money for her masters, Paul made no attempt to release her from the demon instantly. Instead, Luke shows the Apostle can utilize her power of foreseeing in a positive way. When Paul eventually releases her from the "spirit of divination," he does so in the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 16:18). Note that Paul releases her from the spirit when he has become greatly annoyed or worn out (διαπονηθές) and not because of her "magical" practice.

Elsewhere in his gospel Luke certainly employs the demonic supernatural power, which speaks through the mouths of the people possessed, in a positive way. That is, demons testify that Jesus is "the Holy One of God" (Luke 4:34), "the Son of God" (Luke 4:41), "the Messiah" (Luke 4:41), and "the Son of the Most High God" (Luke 8:28). Although he does not promote magical practices, then, Luke nevertheless recognizes the reality and efficacy of the invisible powers, and turns the supernatural knowledge gained from the invisible powers of Satan to good in order to make his theological (or Christological) point. Of course, there are times when Luke

---

682 Betz, The Greek Magical Papyri in the Translation including the Demotic Spells, p. xli.
683 Barrett interprets the phrase πνεῦμα πίθανον as "a pythonic spirit" and perceives it as "not a good spirit" (Barrett, Acts II, p. 785). But the issue is not whether it is good or bad, but the invisible power and its operational space by which the slave girl speaks and acts, disclosing that the invisible power is visualized and presented as a part of the visible world.
seems to distance himself from such practices in Acts, particularly when it appears to challenge the authority-power of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and/or God.

What, for Luke, are the nature and function of magic, particularly in relation to the name of Jesus? As I will show, for Luke the issue is not magic itself or even its practice, but rather the evil intentions behind the act: namely, the illegitimate use of the name of Jesus and the nature of the ultimate source of the authority-power by which the magic is performed.

4.4.1 “Evil” intentions behind “evil” acts. For Luke, magic itself is not evil, only the intention behind it can be evil, and this is exemplified in the story of Simon Magus.

4.4.1.1 Acts 8:22. The episode of Simon Magus is part of the first missionary work of Philip, who encounters the magician in Samaria (8:9-24). Just as he does in the episodes that take place in Jerusalem (Acts 1:8, 17-21; 2:38), Luke connects the names of Jesus and the Holy Spirit to the release from physical and spiritual sicknesses, presenting them as the same saving event. The episode falls into two parts (8:9-13 and 8:18-24).

In the first part (8:9-13), Luke does not condemn Simon Magus, and describes him as more than merely a successful magician. He informs us that Simon claims to be someone great, and that the Samaritans call him “the Great Power of God” because he has astonished them with his “magical” arts for a long time (8:10). But when the Samaritans saw the signs and wonders performed by Philip, they believed and were baptized. Likewise, Simon Magus believed and was baptized (8:13). His submission to baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus demonstrates that the authority-power of the Lord Jesus is superior to that of magic. Indeed, the signs and great miracles performed by Philip constantly amaze Simon Magus. Ironically, the one who was once called “the Great Power of God” has now submitted himself to Jesus Christ, the Lord of all.

Later, however, Luke reproves Simon when he offers money to buy the gift of God (8:20). Peter says, “May your silver perish with you, because you thought you could obtain God’s gift with money!” (8:20). The “gift of God” in 8:20 equates to the

---

684 In the previous chapters, I have constantly made the case that release from sickness equates to release from sins.
685 The precise meaning of this title is debatable (see Johnson, Acts, p. 147).
686 The name “simony,” which means to buy the authority or ecclesiastical office with money, may be derived from Simon’s “evil” act (Dunn, Acts, p. 112; Johnson, Acts, p. 148).
gift of the Holy Spirit (2:38; 10:45; 11:17), and so his desire to buy the authority-power of the Holy Spirit is the desire to control this power, so that he can give it to whomever he wishes by the laying on of his hands (8:19). That is, Simon attempts to territorialize the saving authority-power of the Holy Spirit and bind its flows and movements. However, Luke makes it very clear that the authority-power of the Holy Spirit and its nomadic motions cannot be territorialized or confined by the static conditions of place and space, here and there. Instead, Luke demonstrates that bestowing the Holy Spirit is the prerogative of God, and prohibits the buying of the authority-power of the apostles with money. This means that God is not a subject to be controlled or territorialized by a human agent. Such an act is regarded as an “evil” or “magical” practice. Thus, Luke condemns the “evil” act of Simon because his heart was not right or straight (εὐθεία) before God (8:21). The phrase “your heart is not right” is closely connected with the phrase “the evil intention of your heart.” Clearly Simon’s conduct leads him on a “crooked way” (8:21; 13:10) as opposed to the “straight” way of salvation, and Peter commands him to repent and pray to the Lord Jesus so that his “evil” intention may be forgiven (8:22). In short, Luke’s primary interest in this episode is not magic itself, or its practice, but rather Simon’s “evil” intentions behind his “evil” act.

A couple of points need to be made about this. First, Luke establishes a link between the name of Jesus and the Holy Spirit, which unfolds the authority-power of God by which the saving events are preached and performed. Second, for Luke, the “evil” or “magical” act is an act of territorializing or confining the authority-power of

---

687 As a former magician, not only did Simon perceive that the laying on of hands (ἐκθέως) was a “magical” technique by which power is conferred, but he also thought that he could buy it. In the Old Testament, the motion of “the laying on of hands” is used in the formal transfer of authority from Moses to Joshua (Num 27:18-23; Deut. 34:9). Likewise, in Luke-Acts, the laying on of hands symbolizes the transfer of power and authority. In Luke, Jesus heals many sick people by laying his hands on every one of them (4:40; 13:13). In Acts, the Holy Spirit is bestowed through the laying on of the hands of the apostles (8:17) and of Paul (19:6). The laying on of the hands is used in healings (9:12, 17; 28:8), in the appointment of seven deacons (6:6), and in commission missionaries (13:3).

688 The word ἐλεημονή here implies that Simon does not have the right relationship with God because he attempted to gain the gift of God illegitimately, which is different from the right way of God, who gives his gifts freely.

689 The word ἔννοια simply means “intention” or “thought,” but here it is used in the sense of “evil” intention because it is closely connected with the word kaiás.


692 In Acts, the illegitimate gaining of money is a factor in the “evil” acts attributed to Judas (1:18), Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11), the owners of the soothsaying girl (16:16-19), and Demetrius the silver worker (19:24-27).
the Holy Spirit and channeling its dynamic flows and movements, suggesting that *magical* authority-power is binding-territorializing, in opposition to the authority-power of God which is releasing-deterritorializing, as demonstrated by Jesus and his disciples. That is, because the name of Jesus signifies the person and authority-power of Jesus, then the authority-power of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and God are pictured as something _in motion_.

4.4.1.2 Acts 13:10. The episode of Bar-Jesus is the first event in Paul’s missionary work in Cyprus. When Paul confronts Bar-Jesus, he castigates him as a “magician” and a “Jewish false prophet,” because Bar-Jesus has the “evil” intention of seeking to turn the proconsul away from the faith (13:8). Here the faith represents the saving network (kingdom) of God, the believing network (community), brought by Jesus.  

This story raises a couple of issues. First, the link between “magician” and “Jewish false prophet” (13:6) reveals the integration of the nature and function of both. Once he has exposed the true identity of Elymas as a “magician” and a “false prophet,” who is full of all deceit and fraud, a son of the devil, and enemy of all righteousness, Paul urges him to stop making crooked the straight ways of the Lord (13:10). Unlike John the Baptist, a true prophet who makes crooked paths straight (or right) for the Lord, the major function of a “magician” and a “false prophet” is to make the straight ways of the Lord crooked. Thus Luke reveals that the _magical_ way of Elymas is the opposite to the way of the Lord, the way of salvation.

Furthermore, when the “evil” intention of Elymas is revealed by the authority-power of the Holy Spirit, Paul punishes Elymas with blindness for a while (13:11). Immediately darkness comes over him and he attempts to find people who will lead him (13:11). Ironically, the one who attempted to disconnect the proconsul from the faith-community (network) is transferred into darkness and becomes lost. Seeing this, the proconsul believes and remains in connection to the saving network of God brought by Jesus, because the “miracle” astonishes him (13:12). Again, the issue here is not the “magical” practice itself, but Elymas is condemned for standing in opposition to the straightway of salvation and for attempting to disconnect the proconsul from the saving network of God established by Jesus.
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693 Johnson, _Acts_, p. 108. On the link between faith, salvation, and the saving network (kingdom) of God brought by Jesus, see chapter five.

694 Johnson notes that the title of “magician” and “Jewish false prophet” is used here synonymously (Johnson, _Acts_, p. 222).


696 Here it seems that teaching and miracle are seen synonymously.
In short, as we have seen, for Luke, *evil or magical* intention involves the attempt to confine and territorialize the authority-power of the Holy Spirit and its *nomadic* movements into a static framework of place-time. The purpose of confining the authority-power of God is to gain control over persons and their daily activities, and so, ultimately, over God. But Luke asserts that God is not a subject to be controlled or territorialized. Another aspect of *evil or magical* intention involves the attempt to disconnect people from the saving network of God brought by Jesus. Thus, Luke encourages his readers to hear the word of God, and invites them to have *faith* in and to walk in the right way of the Lord: the way of salvation (cf. Acts 16:17).

4.4.2 The illegitimate use of the name of Jesus (Acts 19:8-20). After Jesus gives the twelve disciples authority and power and sends them to proclaim the kingdom of God and to perform healing (Luke 9:1-2), they believe that only they can utilize the name of Jesus. But the name of Jesus is widely used throughout the third Gospel. In Luke 9:48, Jesus commands that every believer should act towards or welcome another person in his name. Also, Luke narrates the story of a man who uses the name of Jesus in an exorcism. Although he was not authorized to act in the name of Jesus, he is nevertheless successful. When the twelve see him casting out demons by calling on the name of Jesus, they attempt to stop him (9:49), but Jesus allows him to continue. The use of Jesus' name extends to the seventy other disciples (10:1ff.). The seventy return to Jesus with good results unlike the twelve disciples (9:40), who have failed in their task, and they say to Jesus, “Lord, even the demons are subject to us in your name” (10:17). The text clearly shows that they apply the phrase *in the name of Jesus* in their healings and exorcisms.

Thus, in the third Gospel all sorts of people employ the name of Jesus in various spaces-times to effect saving events. But in Acts, the application of the expression *in the name of Jesus* seems to be limited to the leaders of the church, particularly those who are commissioned by either the Lord Jesus or the apostles. Still everyone can *call on the name of Jesus* (2:21), but at first not *all* can use the phrase *in the name of Jesus*. This is illustrated by the episode of the seven sons of Sceva in Acts 19:15-16.

---

697Plummer notes that although the exorcist was not authorized to use the name of Jesus, he believed in the power of the name of Jesus and tried to make use of it for good, in contrast to the mere juggling of the seven sons of Sceva in Acts 19:13-20 (St. Luke, p. 259).

698Although Jesus gave the twelve his authority and power, they nevertheless failed to heal a boy who was possessed by a spirit.
Unlike the unauthorized exorcist who uses the name of Jesus in Luke 9:49, the seven sons of Sceva have disastrous results when they attempt to use the name of Jesus in an exorcism (Acts 19:15-16). Since the name of Jesus was well known to be a powerful name to invoke in an exorcism, it is understandable that the seven sons of Sceva employ it. But they are humiliated and suffer calamitous results. When they attempt to overpower the evil spirit by using the name of Jesus, the evil spirit overpowers them instead, saying to them, “Jesus I know, and Paul I know; but who are you?” And then the man with the evil spirit jumps on them and overpowers them all, so that they flee out of the house naked and wounded.

In this episode, although Luke does not explicitly indicate the reasons for their failure, he implies that the seven sons of Sceva were not authorized to use the phrase in the name of Jesus. Luke seems to have adopted the concept of illegitimate use from the Old Testament. In the Old Testament, it appears that anyone can call upon the name of God (Gen. 4:26; Joel 2:32; Zep. 3:9); however, not all people can speak and act in the name of God. In fact, God forbids the illegitimate prophets to speak in his name because he has not appointed or sent them. He declares, “You shall not live, for you speak lies in the name of the LORD.” More importantly, as the larger context (19:1-7) indicates, the seven sons of Sceva were not permitted to use the name of Jesus because they had no faith in Jesus, nor had they received the Holy Spirit by which his kingdom moves and expands. Thus the category of those who are authorized to use the phrase in the name of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke seems somewhat different from that in Acts. The use of the phrase in the name of Jesus seems to be limited to the leaders of the church in Acts, and particularly those persons who are full of faith and the Holy Spirit (Acts 6:5; 11:24; cf. 2:4), and who utilize their faith for the common good.

4.4.3 How, then, did Luke view magic? Clearly, in Luke-Acts miracles and magic are both related to the invisible powers and its operational spaces (realities), and there is no clear phenomenological difference between them. Yet Luke does not promote so called magic or its practice, even though he acknowledges its good results and shows how supernatural knowledge attained through supernatural power(s) can

---

70 Ziesler rightly notes that they failed because they were not authorized to act in this way (Ziesler, p. 33).
73 On the link between faith, baptism, and the Holy Spirit, see chapter five.
be used in positive ways to fuel Christ’s mission. Although he acknowledges the resemblance between the authority-power of God and that of Satan, Luke differentiates between the two by using the name of Jesus in the stories of the healings and exorcisms by which the saving network of God is visualized and expands. For Luke, “evil” or “magical” practice aims to territorialize and confine the authority-power of God and contain its nomadic flows and fluids within a static and fixed place, in opposition to the dynamic movements of release. Luke interrelates between the name of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and the events of release from various forms of sicknesses, and thereby links the nomadic flows of the Holy Spirit’s authority-power to the dynamic movements of Jesus’ name by which the disciples preached and performed from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth. Thus he situates the name of Jesus as the central node of the kingdom and as something in motion. Hence, the nomadic movements of Jesus’ name should not be territorialized by the static conditions of place and space, here and there.

4.5 What does the name of Jesus signify?704

Before answering this question, perhaps it would be helpful to list several ways in which the name of God is portrayed in the Old Testament. To begin with, there is no clear difference between the name and the person — the very essence — of God. As the author of Ecclesiastes writes, “Whatever has come to be has already been named, and it is known what human beings are” (Eccle. 6:10a). Fossum also writes, “The name expresses the living essence, the vital energy, the power of the human person or the deity.”705 Apparently, the name and the person of Yahweh are interconnected, like two sides of one coin. In fact, Von Rad argues that the name of God is “a double of his being.”706 This simply means that the name stands in parallel to Yahweh himself, and is a substitute for Yahweh:707 the name signifies the person of God. In

704 At the outset, it is to be noted that the name of Jesus implies the person and power of Jesus through whom the saving network of God is brought. Thus the phrase “in the name of Jesus” refers to the saving network of God brought by Jesus and its dynamic expansion by his disciples, and is also the authorizing formula used by the disciples.
705Jarl E. Fossum, The Name of God and the Angel of the Lord, p. 86.
707The name of Yahweh is not to be blasphemed (Lev. 24:11, 16; cf. Amos 6:10), misused (Ex. 20:7; Deut. 5:11), or profaned (Lev. 22:2, 32). For his name is good (Psa. 52:9; 54:6) and holy (Psa. 99:3; 111:9; Isa. 57:15) as God is good (1Chr. 16:34; 2Chr. 5:13; Psa. 106:1; Jer. 33:11) and holy (Lev. 11:44, 45; Isa. 6:3). Note that to blaspheme the name is to blaspheme God himself (Lev. 24:15). For this reason, those who blaspheme the name will be put to death (Lev. 24:16). Second, the name of God alone is to be exalted (Psa. 148:13; Isa. 12:4; cf. Neh. 9:5; Psa. 138:2) and magnified (2 Sam.
this regard, as God acts, so does the name act; as God protects, so does the name protect;\textsuperscript{708} as God judges, so does the name;\textsuperscript{709} as God is near, the name of God is near.\textsuperscript{710} Interestingly, the phrase “I am the LORD” is another way of saying “my name is the LORD.”\textsuperscript{711} In short, the name of God is portrayed as the person, the authority-power, and the very essence of God.\textsuperscript{712}

Similarly, in Luke-Acts the name of Jesus signifies the person, presence, work, authority-power, and very essence of Jesus.\textsuperscript{713} Since the name signifies multiple meanings, the name is to be understood in terms of hybridization or multiplicity. Significantly, the whole soteriological mission of the apostolic church is based upon the name of Jesus, which comes to define the saving network (kingdom) of God. O’Toole argues that the name of the risen Lord Jesus Christ replaces his (physical) absence from Acts.\textsuperscript{714} Its use demonstrates that Jesus is among the people as an invisible presence, and that his person, authority-power, and very essence live on.\textsuperscript{715} Note also that just as the person of Jesus is presented as the central node in Luke, so the name of Jesus becomes the primary node in Acts. The Lord Jesus is to be called upon,\textsuperscript{716} proclaimed,\textsuperscript{717} preached,\textsuperscript{718} taught,\textsuperscript{719} and glorified,\textsuperscript{720} and he...
saves and heals; equally, the name of Jesus is to be called upon, proclaimed, and glorified, and it saves and heals. Note also that the name of Jesus is spoken by way of a rebuke and as worthy enough for Christians to suffer and die for. In this sense, we can understand the name of Jesus as a hybrid name (space), composed of various spaces where all sorts of people come and interact with God. The following three episodes - Acts 2:21, 3:16, and 4:12 - will help to illustrate this idea.

4.5.1 Acts 2:21. In this text, Peter proclaims, “Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved” (cf Joel 2:28ff.). Although in the Old Testament the act of “calling on the name of the Lord” had a technical function in prayer, Acts 2:21 is not a mere description of prayer, as some scholars have proposed, nor the description of a “magical” incantation. Instead, in this text the nomadic flows of
salvation unfold from an individual and national level to a universal level, as everyone calls upon the name of the Lord [Jesus], which expresses the dynamic movements of release initiated by Jesus and developed by his disciples, by which the saving network spreads out from Jerusalem across the earth (Acts 1:8; cf. Luke 24:47). Thus the name of Jesus is a hybrid name, because it expresses the manifold layers of release performed by Jesus, and positions him as the central node of salvation to which all sorts of God's people must be connected, and by whom they must act and move.

Interestingly, from the outset Luke connects both ἐπικαλέω and ὁ ὄς to the name of the Lord and to all persons. Van Unnik notes that this connection is significant because "it sets the tune for the whole book." Marshall writes, "This idea governs the subsequent narrative." This can clearly be seen in Acts 2-5, and in fact the links between the name of Jesus and salvation and persons are seen throughout Acts, and it is these connections that create the saving network. The word ἐπικαλέω is closely connected with both baptism (22:16; cf. 2:38) and salvation

Background, p. 32). Kee also displays another good example: "Adonai, Iao, Psyche, Eros (IV:1753); Osiris, Isis, Anubis, catfaced Re, Selence, Kore (IV. 100-115, 155, 2340-1350); Hermes, Zeus, Helios, Iao, Adonai, with explicit references to the Book of Exodus (IV. 3030-3040); Logos, Jesus Christ, Holy Spirit, Son of the Father (IV.1235)"; cf. Kee, p. 107ff. Magicians used both biblical names and symbols like Alpha and Omega (P III), and quoted from Christian traditions like the Lord's Prayer (P IX); cf. Kee, p. 111. But there is no single piece of evidence to suggest that God is ever subject to human life (cf. John Squires, The Plan of God, pp. 2-3). Nor does Luke advocate invoking multiple names of gods in his writings, but insists that people invoke one name and one Lord for salvation (Acts 2:21; 4:12). Interestingly, Luke uses the singular construction ἐν τῷ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in baptism (Acts 2:38) in contrast to the threefold formula of ἐς τὸ δυσμα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Matthew 28:19.

In the NT, the word ἐπικαλέω occurs 3 times in relation to the name of the God (Acts 15:17; 1 Pet 1:17; 2 Cor. 1:23; Heb. 11:16), and 9 times to the Lord Jesus Christ (2:21; 7:59; 9:14; 9:21; 22:16; Rom. 10:12, 13; 1 Co. 1:2; Jas. 2:7). According to Bienkamhard, καλέω and ἐπικαλέω are used interchangeably. However, it is noteworthy that ἐπικαλέω is not used in Luke at all. In fact, it only occurs once in the synoptic Gospels (Matt. 10:25). In Acts, ἐπικαλέω occurs twenty times (Acts 1:23; 2:21; 4:36; 7:59; 9:14; 9:21; 10:5; 10:18; 10:32; 11:13; 12:12; 12:25; 15:17; 22:16; 25:11; 25:12; 25:21; 25:25; 26:32; 28:19). Yet it is used only five times with reference to the name of the Lord Jesus (2:21; 7:59; 9:14, 21; 22:16) and once to the name of the Lord God (15:17). It also occurs 5 times in undisputable Pauline letters (Rom. 10:12, 13, 14; 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Cor. 1:23) and four times in the rest of the New Testament (2 Tim. 2:22; Heb. 11:16; Jas. 2:7; 1 Pet. 1:17). The word ὁ ὄς occurs 17 times in Luke and 13 times in Acts. It occurs twice in combination with the name of the Lord, in 2:21 and 4:12. However, this is the only place that ὁ ὄς occurs with ἐπικαλέω.

Although the word ἐπικαλέω is used five times in Acts in relation to the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (2:21; 7:59; 9:14, 21; 22:16), here in 2:21 is the only place that ἐπικαλέω and ὁ ὄς are used together in relation to the name of the Lord.


in his name (7:59; 22:16; cf. 4:12): so Stephen calls on the name of the Lord to effect his own "spiritual salvation" in the midst of suffering and dying (7:59; 9:14, 21). Note that this is the first time in Acts when the name of the Lord God of the Old Testament is applied to the Lord Jesus.\(^{738}\) In Joel 3:5 (LXX), "the name of the Lord" clearly refers to the Lord God, but it refers to the risen Lord Jesus in Acts 2:21 (cf. 2:22, 36).\(^{739}\) Specifically Jesus the Nazarene (2:22)\(^{740}\) whom God raised from the dead and made both the Lord and the Messiah. Peter declares, "Let all the house of Israel know for certain that God has made him both Lord and Christ [Messiah]" (2:36), suggesting that in Acts 2:21, Luke replaces the name of the Lord God with the name of the Lord Jesus, to accentuate the name of Jesus and situate it as the central node of God's saving network. Interestingly, the word επικαλέω occurs often in LXX, particularly when people invoke God's name salvation from suffering and death.\(^{741}\) Yet in Acts it is exclusively used alongside Jesus' name (2:21; 7:59; 9:14, 21; 22:16). Hence, Luke portrays Jesus as the Lord and Savior who will save those who call his name (5:31; 7:59); in fact, Jesus is presented as the Lord of all (10:36).

Van Unnik argues that the formula calling on the name of the Lord represents a separate expression for Christians;\(^{742}\) Tannehill also notes that "Christians are described as those who 'call upon the name' (Acts 9:14, 21; 22:16)."\(^{743}\) But, in contrast to Acts 9:14, 21 and 22:16, the phrase in 2:21 does not refer to persons who have already become believers, but to potential believers, who are not yet connected to the saving network of God. Moreover, as the word πᾶς indicates, salvation is not restricted to a particular group of people, but expands to include everyone who calls on the name of the Lord Jesus. This concept flourishes throughout Luke-Acts.\(^{744}\) Furthermore, as related texts indicate,\(^{745}\) invoking the name of the Lord [Jesus] is closely related to the authority-power of the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 2:38; 10:44-48). It means that an act of calling the name of Jesus and the coming of the Holy Spirit are

---


\(^{741}\)Ps. 17:3-7; 114:3-4; 117:5; Zech. 13:9.

\(^{742}\)Van Unnik, p. 535.

\(^{743}\)Tannehill, *Acts*, p. 49.


linked, creating a new relational space between one who calls and experiences salvation and the divine who comes and delivers salvation.

In short, Acts 2:21 is not a mere description of prayer, of a “magical” incantation, or even of Christians themselves. Instead, it (1) unfolds the link between people, salvation, and the name of Lord Jesus (i.e. the authority-power of the Lord Jesus through whom God’s salvation is granted), (2) calls to mind the nomadic movements of the saving network initiated by Jesus, and (3) anticipates the expansion of this network through the ministry of Jesus’ disciples to include all people. As in the Old Testament, there is no clear difference between “calling on the name of the Lord” and “calling on the Lord.” Thus the name signifies both the person and the saving power-authority of the Lord Jesus, evoking the saving event(s) conveyed by Jesus and his disciples and the promise that God will save whoever calls upon Jesus name. This characterizes the name of Jesus as a hybrid name, composed of multiple layers of activities, which acts as the central node of salvation by which people are connected to God.

4.5.2 Acts 3:16. Just as faith and salvation revolve around the person and the authority-power of Jesus in the Gospel, so also Luke connects faith and salvation to the name of Jesus in Acts. In Acts 3:16, Luke links faith to the name to signify the saving authority-power of Jesus by which the healing is granted. Haenchen writes, “It is the name preached by Peter which enables the faith to come into being.” Indeed, Peter explicitly states that it is the faith and the name of Jesus by which the crippled man is healed, thereby unfolding the relationship between the man, Peter, and the name of Jesus and characterizing God’s salvation as a proliferating relational network. Hence, when he says that the name of Jesus heals the man, Peter means that it is the saving authority-power of Jesus that saves him. This is clearly seen in Acts 9:34, where Peter heals the paralyzed man and says, “Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you.” Just as Luke links between the name of Jesus and the person of

---

747 Van Unnik, The calling on the name of the Lord, p. 548.
749 Haenchen, Acts, p. 207.
750 See chapter five.
751 Gaventa, Acts, p. 87.
Jesus, so also Luke portrays the name of Jesus as the central node to be connected to God and God’s kingdom.

4.5.3 Acts 4:12. This powerful statement is a direct response to 4:7, where the Jewish authorities arrest the apostles and question the authority-power of their activities, particularly in healing the crippled beggar (4:9; cf. 3:6). Before the council, Peter explicitly states that their apostolic activity is based on the name of Jesus because all people must be saved by his name, which again discloses the nexus between the name and salvation.\(^{752}\) As I have already noted, the name, person, power-authority, work, and presence of God are closely related.\(^{753}\) For example, the Psalter contains the prayer, “Save me, O God, by your name, and vindicate me by your might [δωτάμε]” (Ps. 54:1). Clearly, the name, authority-power, activity, presence, and person of God are interconnected and pictured as a hybrid event, which unfolds multiple realities.\(^{754}\)

In Acts 4:12, Luke describes the name of Jesus as just such a hybrid event (cf. 5:31; 2:36; 4:10), composed of various realities, and as the central node of the saving network. The yap clause gives an explicit explanation as to why there is no salvation in any other person. The precise reason is that no other name has been given to men. The name (δομάκ) clearly refers to the person (οὐδενί), and there is a direct relationship between the two.\(^{755}\) As yap indicates, the expression no other name (οὐδὲ δομά ἐτερον) also means no other person (οὐκ ἐλλὼ ωūδενί).\(^{756}\) In this sense, the

\(^{752}\)Here salvation involves physical, social, and spiritual dimensions (see Johnson, Acts, p. 78; Witherington, The Acts of the Apostles, p. 194, especially Appendix 2 on Luke’s salvation language). Note also the usage of ὠφνπία and σδξω. The word ὠφνπία occurs six times in Acts (4:12; 7:25; 13:26; 47; 16:17; 27:34). The word σδξω occurs thirteen times (Acts 2:21; 2:40; 2:47; 4:9; 4:12; 11:14; 14:9; 15:1; 15:11; 16:30; 16:31; 27:20; 27:31). Yet this is the only place that the two words are used together in Luke-Acts and the rest of the NT. Johnson believes that “salvation” refers to the phrase “by which we must be saved” (Johnson, Acts, p. 78). ὠφνπία here combines two meanings that we usually separate. The physical healings of Jesus and the apostles are seen as paradigms of salvation (cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 217; Gaventa, Acts, p. 94). Green states, “The healing of the lame is the sign of the messianic era; this healing of the body visualizes the totality of Christ’s saving power” (Green, p. 143).

\(^{753}\)Ex. 9:16; Isa. 4:26; Jer. 16:21; Dan. 2:20; Bar. 3:5; cf. Acts 4:7; Rom. 9:17.

\(^{754}\)Charlesworth notes that the name of God was considered powerful because God was behind it. The concept of the power of God’s name in the Jewish magical papyri is different from the biblical view (viz. Ex. 3:13-15, Acts 4:9f.). In the Old Testament, God’s name is considered known, holy, revered, and often ineffable. In the magical papyri the divine name is considered secret and itself full of efficacious powers (Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigraph, Vol. 2, p. 717).

\(^{755}\)The masculine, singular adjectival pronoun αλλω means “another one” or “another person.”

\(^{756}\)Cf. Haenchen, Acts, p. 217 n. 6. As here, the person and the name are linked together in John 5:43, where Jesus complains that people do not receive him who comes in the name of the Father. Yet they receive another person who comes in his own name.
The name of Jesus and the person of Jesus are used interchangeably. The expressions οὐκ ἄλλως οἶδαν and οὐδεὶς δύομαι ἔτερον serve to accentuate the idea of one Lord and one name. This expression recalls the text of Luke 21:8, where Jesus asserts that there is only one true Messiah who must suffer and be raised from the dead (cf. Luke 24:46) although many false messiahs/prophets will come in Jesus’ name. As he prophesied, Jesus died and was raised from the dead and became Lord and Messiah (2:36). Indeed, in 4:12, the expressions no other person and no other name emphasize the idea of one Lord, one name, whereas the magicians invoke multiple names/gods to achieve their desired ends. As Zechariah prophesies, “On that day the Lord will be one and his name one” (Zech. 14:9).

Once again, in Luke-Acts the name has become interlocked with the person and authority-power of Jesus, and recalls the dynamic flows and movements of salvation by which the saving network of God is established and expands. Interestingly, in 4:10-11, Luke already has linked salvation to the name of Jesus through the image of the stone, i.e. the corner stone by which people are attached to God. Peter states, “This Jesus is the stone that was rejected by you, the builders; it has become the cornerstone” (Acts 4:11), suggesting that Jesus replaces the Temple as the central node of the salvational network.

In short, as in the Old Testament, Luke emphasizes the need to invoke one Lord and one name, rather than multiple gods and multiple names. Luke also presents the nexus between the act of calling (faith), the name of Jesus itself, the people who heal and who receive healing, salvation, and the saving authority-power of Jesus. That is, the person and the saving power-authority of Jesus are both present.

---

758 cf. Mk 13:6, 22; Mt 24:5, 24; John 5:23.
759 A variety of Jewish and Jewish-influenced texts, dating from the late second temple period through to the early-second century C.E., indicate that magic, false prophecy, and satanic agency are integrally linked (Garrett, p. 13). The New Testament (Matt. 24:11, 24; Mark 13:22; 2 Thess. 2:3-10; Rev. 13:11-14; 19:20) and Didache 16:4 describe evil figures (“false prophets,” “false messiahs,” “the lawless one,” “the deceiver of the world”) who will perform signs and wonders to lead people astray. In Acts, Luke characterizes Bar-Jesus as a magician who attempts to turn the proconsul away from the faith (see Garrett, chapters 1-2 for a further discussion on this subject).
760 In Exodus 3:15 the people equate Yahweh revealing his name to Moses with Yahweh giving himself away for them, which reveals the link between the name and the person of God. Here the name of Jesus recalls the symbolic act of Jesus’ giving himself to/for the people in the Passover meal, where Jesus pronounces, “This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me” (Luke 22:19): remembering Jesus means remembering his name. Indeed, the words and actions of Jesus are remembered by his name (2:36) as God’s name is remembered by his words and actions in the Old Testament (cf. Ex. 3:15; 20:24), showing that the people will recall the saving events of God preached and performed by Jesus when they hear the name of Jesus.
and available when *the name of Jesus* is invoked by the people, which situates Jesus’ name as the central node of God’s salvation. By using *the name of Jesus* in this way, Luke constantly reminds his readers of the saving network (kingdom) of God brought by Jesus, and its eternal flows and movements carried by Jesus’ disciples from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth, and so defines the name as a hybrid network, which unfolds multiple events and realities, and which is in motion.

4.6 *What does the expression in the name of Jesus signify?*

In Luke-Acts, the phrase *in the name of*, in relation to the name of Jesus, has several forms: (1) ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι, (2) ἐν ὄνοματι, (3) ἐν τῷ ὄνοματι, and (4) εἰς τὸ ὄνομα.\(^{762}\) Noticing these variants, and particularly Luke’s inconsistent use of the expression *in the name of Jesus* in baptisms: ἐν (Acts 2:38);\(^{763}\) εἰς (Acts 8:16 and 19:5); ἐν (Acts 10:48), Barrett argues that for Luke the variations were not as important as *the name of Jesus* itself.\(^{764}\) However, it is important to examine how each preposition is used in Luke-Acts with various verbs in each context in order to gain a better understanding of the meaning of the phrase *in the name of Jesus*.\(^{765}\) As we will see, the phrase is employed in baptism,\(^{766}\) preaching,\(^{767}\) speaking,\(^{768}\) teaching,\(^{769}\) healings,\(^{770}\) and exorcisms.\(^{771}\) From this, we can draw the following conclusions: (1) The phrase recalls the saving network (kingdom) of God brought by Jesus, (2) the phrase is used as an “authorized formula” to validate these activities,\(^{772}\) and (3) the

---


\(^{763}\)Ἐν is read by B D 945 1739 1891 /JC; Did.


\(^{766}\)Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48; 19:5.

\(^{767}\)Luke 24:47.

\(^{768}\)Acts 4:17; 5:40; 9:28, 28.

\(^{769}\)Acts 4:18; 5:28.

\(^{770}\)Acts 3:6, 16; 4:7, 10.


\(^{772}\)In the Old Testament, the phrase “in the name of God” signifies the authority and power of God and is used as an “authorization formula” to validate the saving activities of the prophets and

---
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phrase discloses the eternal flows of Jesus' authority-power by which his disciples preach and convey salvation and expand the kingdom that he has implemented.

4.6.1 Baptism in the name of Jesus. In Acts 2:38, Luke shows us that Christian water-baptism was administered in the name of Jesus in the early Church. But what does Luke mean by the phrase? Just as he was commissioned to do (Luke 24:47), Peter uses the phrase by proclaiming, “Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ so that your sins may be forgiven; and you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit” (2:38). A couple of issues need to be noted:

(1) As opposed to the three-fold formula of “in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit” in Matthew 28:19, Peter uses the single formula εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ιησοῦ Χριστοῦ, suggesting that the source of their authority-power is from one Lord, Jesus Christ.

(2) For the first time, Peter uses the phrase in the name of Jesus as the authority and power for apostolic activity (3:6, 16; 4:10, 12, 17-18, 30; 5:28, 40-41; 8:12; 9:16, 21, 27, 28; 15:26; 16:18; 19:13, 17, 21:13; 22:16, 26:9), Johnson, Acts, p. 57.


Hartman has listed two major interpretations of the phrase “into the name of Jesus” (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ); cf. L. Hartman, Into the Name of Jesus, pp. 432-440. First, W. Heitmuller argues that the phrase “into the name” was used in Greco-Hellenistic banking terminology, the 'name' being that of a person to whose account something was credited. This view implies that the baptized person was transferred to the Lord Jesus like a piece of property. Hartman rejects Heitmuller's point by saying, “His [Heitmuller's] fundamental mistake was the assumption that a word or a formula such as 'into the name' carried from one context to another the specific connotation, which it acquired in the first”; cf. Hartman, p. 433. Second, both P. Billerbeck and H. Bietenhard argue that the phrase is not derived from a Hellenistic commercial usage, but that it is driven by the Hebrew-Aramaic expression אֱלֹה (leshem-leshum), and they come to a similar conclusion as Heitmuller and his followers: “to become the property of” or “be assigned to” the one who is named. Again Hartman criticizes both Billerbeck and Bietenhard for putting too much grammatical emphasis on the phrase leshem-leshum (cf. Hartman, p. 433). By arguing that the phrase should not be interpreted as into his name, Hartman then concludes that it should be interpreted as with regard to, with reference to or for, that is, it refers to a “Jesus baptism” as opposed to a “John baptism” (cf. Harman, p. 440). But his conclusion seems to be too weak, and he undermines Luke’s wider treatment of the phrase in various contexts. Joseph Fitzmyer argues that Luke’s use of the phrase “in the name of Jesus” echoes the Old Testament use of the phrase שֵׁם (Exod 5:23; Deut 10:8), “name,” which makes a person present to another: “For as is his name, so is he” (1 Sam 25:25). For Luke the “name of Jesus” connotes the real and effective representation of Jesus himself. One puts one’s faith in it, is baptized into it, miracles are worked through it and salvation is found in it; disciples preach the name and suffer for it (Fitzmyer, Acts, p. 266; cf. Fitzmyer, Luke, vol. 1, 817).

In his commentary on Acts, Dunn argues that the threefold formula in Matt. 28:19 is a later development, p. 33.

Essentially following Heitmuller, Barrett argues that “the person baptized becomes the property of, is assigned to the company of, Jesus” in baptism (Barrett, Acts, p. 154). Likewise Marshall thinks that the phrase conveys the thought that the person being baptized swears allegiance to Jesus. Thus he understands Christian baptism as an expression of faith and commitment to Jesus as Lord (Marshall, Acts, p. 81). It appears that there is an implication that Christian baptism is understood as an expression of faith and commitment to the Lord Jesus. However, both Barrett and Marshall over
in close connection with receiving *release from sins* and gaining the gift of the Holy Spirit, establishing *the name* as centrally important in the attainment of salvation. Notice that the expression is used with two imperative verbs (*μετανοήσατε* and *βαπτίσθητε*), implying that Peter commands the people to act and move *by or through* the name of Jesus Christ. With regard to the phrase *ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί Ἰηροῦ Χριστοῦ* itself, in Acts 10:48 Peter orders (*προσέταξεν*) the Gentiles to be baptized *by* the name of Jesus, that is, by the authority-power of Jesus, and so uses the phrase as an *authorized formula*. Thus the phrase invokes the saving kingdom of God brought by Jesus, and unfolds its *eternal* expansion.

However, the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κριοῦ Ἰηροῦ* has a somewhat different emphasis in 8:16 and 19:5, and needs to be distinguished from the phrase *ἐπὶ άγιος Χριστὸς* (2:38; 10:48). The expression used in 8:16 and 19:5 emphasizes the acts of the baptisands; put simply, here the weight is given to those people who are being baptized *into* the name of Jesus, which refers to the act of persons who are moving toward Jesus. Thus, as opposed to the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κριοῦ Ἰηροῦ* which occurs in Acts 8:16 and 19:5, the primary functions of *ἐπὶ* and *ἐν τῷ ὄνοματί Ἰηροῦ Χριστοῦ* in 2:38 and 10:48 are (1) as distinctive marks of the source of the apostolic authority-power, in order to validate their saving works, (2) to recall the saving kingdom of God brought by Jesus and to unfold its *eternal* flows and movements of expansion via Jesus’ disciples, and (3) to describe the *name* of Jesus as the central *node or cornerstone* to be connected by which the people now act and move.

### 4.6.2 Healings and Exorcisms in the name of Jesus

As noted earlier, it has been a difficult task to make a clear-cut distinction between *miracles* and *magic* because a different view of the gods is operative in the different spaces-times. Nonetheless, Howard Kee suggests a criterion that might help to differentiate between *magic* and *miracle*. He says, “If the technique is effective of itself in overcoming a hostile force, then the action is magical. If it is viewed as the

---

emphasize the role of the baptisand and what it means for him/her. Rather it appears that the primary focus of the phrase in 2:38 and 10:48 is not on the baptisand, but on the authority and power behind the apostolic activity. See also Johnson, *Act*, p. 57.


780 We have already examined healings and exorcisms in relation to salvation. Thus, in this section, we will only examine healings and exorcisms performed *in the name of Jesus*. 
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intervention of the god or goddess, then it is miraculous." However, how can a concept such as "a hostile force" be defined, and who can define technique and intervention? Also, as already noted, there is no clear phenomenological difference between the two in Luke-Acts. Moreover, Luke's concern is not with magical practice itself, but with the dynamic flows of the authority-power of Jesus by which effects are accomplished. Intent, not effects, is what concerns Luke.

For example, in an effort to demonstrate the nature of the authority-power of Satan, Luke emphasizes the evil intentions behind the activity of the magicians or false prophets who attempt to territorialize and control the authority-power of the Holy Spirit and stem its dynamic flows and movements. Their purpose is to control the flows of the Holy Spirit — and ultimately God — in order to rule over people in their daily lives. By using in the name of Jesus in healing and exorcism, Luke unfolds the eternal flows of Jesus' authority-power by which the saving network of God expands and proliferates. In this sense, the expression can be understood as a continual act of expanding the kingdom of God.

Now we shall examine significant texts (3:6, 4:7, 10, 30; 16:18) that show that Luke does not emphasize the acts of healing or exorcism themselves, but focuses on the source of the authority-power by which they are performed, and the act of faith in Jesus Christ. In Acts, miracles — in contrast to magic — lead people to have faith in the Lord Jesus (3:16) and in God (16:34).

4.6.2.1 Release from physical sicknesses. As I pointed out earlier, in Acts the phrase εν τω ονόματι του Ιησού Χριστού is usually employed in healings and exorcisms (except 9:27, 28 and 10:48), and signifies the eternal flows of Jesus' saving authority-power by which the saving network of God expands. In the following texts, Luke interlinks faith, the name of Jesus, and healings, describing them as the same saving event.

4.6.2.1.1 Acts 3:6. On their way to the temple to pray, Peter and John encounter a crippled beggar who is sitting at the Beautiful Gate of the temple (3:6). He asks them for alms, but they do not give him anything. Instead, Peter heals him, saying, "I do have no silver or gold, but what I have I give you; in the name of Jesus

---

781 Kee, p. 4.
782 See above.
783 Interestingly, Dunn states that faith played no part in Jewish or Graeco-Roman miracles (Dunn, Jesus and the Spirit, p. 75).
784 Achtemeier, p. 553; see also Witherington, Acts, p. 579.
Christ of Nazareth, stand up and walk” (3:6). Immediately, the crippled beggar stands and begins to walk. As he walks into the temple, he leaps around and praises God (3:9). All the people who see what has happened to him are filled with wonder and amazement. This is the first healing event in Acts that the apostles perform in the name of Jesus, and they are successful. Yet, Peter humbles himself and exalts the name of Jesus and gives full credit to him, claiming that it is not their own power or piety that has healed the crippled man (3:12); rather, it is the name of Jesus that has cured him (3:16).

Ziesler argues that the phrase in the name of Jesus in 3:6 is used in the sense of a magical formula, because Peter believes that some sort of power would operate when the right name was invoked or claimed. As already noted, for Luke a magical practice involves territorializing the dynamic movements of God’s power and fixing them in a static place, attempting to disconnect God’s people from the saving network of God brought by Jesus. Clearly, in this episode Peter does not manipulate Jesus, territorialize his saving authority-power, or subordinate its nomadic flows under his own authority-power, but instead Peter heals the crippled beggar by the power of Jesus. This episode thus echoes Luke 9:1-2 and 10:1-20, where the connection between Jesus’ name and his power is made. This shows that when Jesus imparts his authority-power to proclaim the kingdom of God and to perform healing, Jesus imparts his name (cf. Luke 10:17). Thus, in relation to salvation the weight in 3:6 should be given to the phrase in the name of Jesus, which functions as an authorized formula for performing the apostolic saving ministry (cf. 4:7) to effect the expansion of the authority-power of Jesus Christ.

4.6.2.1.2 Acts 4:7. In this episode, the apostles are brought and questioned by the authorities of the temple, who ask them, “By what power, or in what name, have you done this?” Robertson thinks that the purpose of their question is to test whether the apostles were practicing some sort of magic, but Ziesler strongly argues that the nature of the arrest is not about the miracle itself but the content of the message, saying that healing by the name is a “gospelised” act. Based on this point, he argues

---

785 There is an interesting parallel between the ministry of Jesus and the ministry of the disciples in relation to the balance between words and miraculous works. Jesus cures the man with the unclean spirit after he has preached and taught (Lk 3:31ff.; cf. 4:14ff.); similarly, Peter heals the crippled man after he has preached and taught the people (Acts 3:7ff.; cf. 2:14ff).
786 Ziesler, p. 32.
788 Ziesler, p. 34.
that the expression in the name of becomes a part of the content of the message, because in Acts 4 “the dispute about the healing becomes primarily a dispute about the teaching.”

However, as the link between name, power and healing in 3:6, 12, and 16 indicates, the dispute is still about the healing and the source of the saving power for the healing. Moreover, Ziesler’s attempt to separate the teaching from the healing seems futile, since healing is closely connected with teaching. Marshall observes that healing and the preaching of the resurrection are interrelated throughout the book of Acts. Certainly, the power to heal and the authority to preach are so intertwined that it is almost impossible to separate one from the other. Preaching and teaching become so effective and powerful because of the healing performed in the name of Jesus (3:6). There is no clear distinction between preaching the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and teaching about the person of the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 8:12; 28:31). Note that it is the healing that draws people’s attention at first (3:10f.). Thus, the question “by what power or in what name, have you done this?” is about the source of their power and their entire apostolic activities, which reinforces the idea that the name of Jesus is the basis of the salvific mission and central node of God’s salvational network.

4.6.2.1.3 Acts 4:10. Here, Peter again lets all the people of Israel know that the healing is to be credited to the name of Jesus Christ, that is, the person of Jesus Christ, reiterating that the person whom they have crucified is the one whom God has raised from the dead. In name of, or by the power of, this person, the crippled man became whole. The phrase ἐν τῷ ὄνομα can be translated as either in this name or in this person; although ἐν has also been used with ὄνομα, the expression ἐν τῷ ὄνομα should be taken to refer to Jesus Christ since the nearer antecedent of τῷ ὄνομα is Ἰησοῦς. In this verse, then, Peter reminds his audience that the crippled man has

789Ibid.
793Although it may be translated as either “in this name” or “in this person,” Barrett prefers “in this person” (Acts, p.229). However, Ziesler thinks that it refers only to the name, not to Jesus Christ himself. He then argues that if it must refer to the nearest antecedent noun, this would be God and not Jesus. However, this would make the text more confusing than it is. The preposition ἐν never occurs with God in Luke-Acts. Hence, the expression ἐν τῷ ὄνομα should be read alongside “Jesus Christ whom God raised from the dead” (ἐν θεος πνευματικος εκ νεκρων). The crippled man is healed through Jesus Christ who died and was resurrected, not through his name.
been healed by the name of Jesus Christ. Put simply, Peter reiterates the fact that it is Jesus Christ, standing behind his name, who has saved the man, because salvation can be found in Jesus Christ (cf. 4:12).

Notably, 4:10 is parallel with 13:39, where Paul claims, "Through him [ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι] everyone who believes is justified from everything you could not be justified from by the Law of Moses." This indicates that those who believe in him are released from their sins, suggesting that release of sins can be found in (13:39) and given through Jesus Christ (13:38; cf. 4:10, 12). As in 4:10, the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι here reveals the link between the name and the death and the resurrection of Jesus Christ, whom God has raised from the dead (13:37; cf 4:10) and made both Lord and Messiah (2:36). As God performs miracles, wonders, and signs through Jesus (δι' αὐτοῦ) in the third Gospel, so he performs them through the name of Jesus (διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος Ἰησοῦ) in Acts (4:30). The name of Jesus unfolds the multiple events of Jesus: the person, the authority-power, the saving ministry, the death-resurrection-ascension, and the continual- eternal expansion of his saving ministry, which marks the name of Jesus as a criss-crossing where God and all sorts of persons come and intersect. Since the singular word ἱασμένον refers back to the healing of the crippled beggar (3:16), the healing is the primary attribute primarily intended in 4:30, but again the name signifies the person, i.e. the saving authority-power of Jesus. By this name, the man is transferred from outside the temple to inside temple (cf 3:2-10) and praised God (3:8). In this sense, not only does the name of Jesus evoke multiple events of Jesus and God, but also it is described as a criss-crossing between God, Jesus, and people to intersect.

4.6.2.2 Release from evil and unclean spirits. Since magicians in the Greco-Roman cults believed that human sickness and affliction were caused either by demons or by magical curses, they used magical techniques to effect cures, invoking the names of multiple gods in order to obtain their desired results. Ziesler argues that the dispute about healing in Chapter 4 primarily becomes a dispute about teaching (Ziesler, The name of Jesus, p. 34). However, the central issue is not only about teaching, but also about healing. In fact, the major dispute is still the source of the authority and power for apostolic teaching and healing (words and actions).

under the power of the speaker."\textsuperscript{799} For this reason, "If a man utters the name of a god and he demands or asks for something, it will be fulfilled as and because he speaks the name."\textsuperscript{800} In the magical papyri, the magicians use a form of "magical" adjuration to command their gods. Hull has claimed that the expression "come out" [ἐξελθεῖ] is the usual form of address in exorcisms in the magical papyri.\textsuperscript{801} However, Aune rejects his claim simply because ἐξελθεῖ is not common in PGM, and argues instead that the usual form of magical adjuration is ὀρκίζω.\textsuperscript{802} He then claims that "Jesus' use of the imperative mood in exorcisms is in fact a widely known and used form of adjuration in the ancient world."\textsuperscript{803}

However, Jesus and his disciples never use the words ὀρκίζω, προλάσσω, or the more emphatic ἐξορκίζω, which were the dominant forms of magical adjuration in the magical papyri. In fact, the word προλάσσω never occurs in the New Testament; interestingly, ἐξορκίζω is used only once in the New Testament, by the high priest. Matthew records him as saying, "I adjure you [Jesus], by the living God, that you tell us whether you are the Christ, the Son of God" (Matt. 26:63; NRSV translates the word ὀρκίζω as "I put [you] under oath.") Furthermore, the word ὀρκίζω is used only twice in the New Testament. The demonic force uses it against Jesus, saying, "I adjure you [Jesus] by God, do not torment me" (Mark 5:7). The Jewish exorcists also use it against evil spirits in Acts 19:13, saying, "We adjure you by Jesus whom Paul proclaims" (Acts 19:13). The purpose of the adjuration is to control supernatural powers in order to effect the exorcism. Put differently, as I have noted, it is to territorialize the invisible supernatural powers and bind them in a static place or restrict them to a particular agency in order to control them. But God is never subject to human orders. In fact, God has control over human life,\textsuperscript{804} and the wandering movements of God's power cannot be so confined.

\textsuperscript{800}Ibid, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{801}Hull, p. 68.
\textsuperscript{802}Kee also notes that the regular terms for magical adjuration are ὀρκίζω, ἀπολάσσω, and the more emphatic ἐξορκίζω (p. 107).
\textsuperscript{803}Aune, "Magic in Early Christianity", pp. 1531-32; see p. 1532 n. 111 where Aune quotes Eitrem who contrasts the magical force of imperative which are repeated many times which is the simple imperative of Jesus (p. 32, n. 3).
\textsuperscript{804}John Squires writes, "God is the primary actor throughout Luke-Acts, for the action of God extends throughout the whole span of history, from creation to final judgment. God directs the life of Jesus and the mission of the church, performing signs and wonders and enabling healings and exorcisms to take place" (\textit{The Plan of God}, pp. 2-3).
4.6.2.2.1 Acts 16:18. In this episode, a certain slave-girl, who has a spirit of divination, testifies about Paul and his companions, saying, "These men are bond-servants of the Most High God, who are proclaiming to you the way of salvation" (16:17). It appears that there is no harm done to Paul and his companions by her testimony. Naturally, Paul does not exorcise the spirit of divination. But when she keeps doing this for many days, Paul expels the spirit of divination because she begins to greatly annoy (διαπονοθείς) him. Thus, he says, "I command [παραγγέλλω] you in the name of Jesus Christ to come out of her!" At that very moment, it comes out of her. Note that the word ἔξολθεν is a typical exorcism formula in Luke-Acts, and also that exorcism has to do with the authority-power of the person who speaks (Luke 4:36). In Luke 8:29, when Jesus commands the unclean spirit to come out of the man, it obeys him because it recognizes Jesus' authority-power, by which it is expelled. That is, the phrase replaces the figure of Jesus, but both refer to the power that lies beyond, in God.

4.6.2.2.2 Acts 19:13. Here, some Jewish exorcists attempt to use "calling on the name of the Lord" as a magical formula, because to know and use the name of a god are to have a claim on the power of that god. Likewise, the seven sons of Sceva use such a formula. However, they fail to cast out the evil spirit, and are driven out of the house naked and wounded, because the man possessed by the evil spirit leaps up and overpowers them all because the evil spirit does not recognize their power-authority (19:15). The evil spirit says, "I know Jesus, and I know Paul, but who are you?" (19:15). As a result, the name of the Lord Jesus is magnified (19:17), and many who practiced magic bring out their magical books, worth fifty thousand pieces of silver, and burn them all (Acts 19:19). Thus the word of the Lord grows...
mightily and prevails (19:20). Furthermore, Luke notes that *the name of Jesus* cannot be used without faith and the Holy Spirit (cf. Acts 3:6, 16).\(^{809}\)

4.6.3 In summary, just as in the Old Testament, the leaders of the church speak and act *in the name of Jesus* to validate their activity and to disclose the source of their authority-power. By using the phrase, the apostles distance their authority-power from that of men (5:29; cf. 4:19-20), of the chief priests (9:14; 26:10, 12), and, ultimately, of Satan (26:18; cf. Luke 4:6).\(^{810}\) We see a nexus established between faith and salvation, and the name, the person, and the authority-power of Jesus. *The name of Jesus* itself signifies the person, the authority-power, the saving ministry, and the death-resurrection-ascension of Jesus, and functions as (1) a junction where timespaces and all sorts of persons and events intersect simultaneously, as if there were no static difference between past, present and future and (2) the central *node or cornerstone* of the saving kingdom of God. At the same time, the phrase *in the name of Jesus* is understood as an authorization formula to validate the apostolic ministry, and as a distinctive mark to disclose the source of apostolic authority-power, and it unfolds the nomadic flows of Jesus’ saving authority-power by which the kingdom of God is granted and proliferates. That is, the phrase signifies the continual expansion of Jesus’ saving ministry, which is to preach the kingdom of God and to perform release from various forms of captivity and oppression. Consequently we need to reconsider what *the name of Jesus* and the phrase mean, seeing them as something *flowing, proliferating, and in motion*.

---

\(^{809}\)Luke attempts to demonstrate the important connection between *the name of Jesus* and faith in him (see notes on Acts 3:6, 16).

\(^{810}\)It is interesting to note that Paul went to Damascus on the authority of the chief priests, to persecute those who called upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 26:12; cf 9:14; 26:10). However, on the way to Damascus, Paul was called, and was sent to the Gentiles with the new authority of the Lord Jesus Christ (26:16-17; 9:11f.). After this Paul proclaimed that Jesus was the Son of God and the Christ (9:20, 22), and spoke out boldly *in the name of* the Lord Jesus (9:27-18). It appears that Luke tends to reject the authority and power of humans (particularly the chief priests) and of Satan (Acts 26:18; cf. Lk. 4:6), and recognizes only the authority and power of the Lord Jesus. Susan Garrett notes that Luke sees magical power or practice as satanic authority and power. As she puts it, "Luke regarded Satan as the authority behind all acts of magic" (S. R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil*, p. 66). Thus, Luke encourages his audiences to reject magical authority and power but to recognize and believe in the authority and power of the Lord Jesus.
4.7 Conclusion

The focus of this chapter has been to determine the precise meaning(s) of the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus in relation to salvation. We have seen how Luke understood magic, and why Luke used the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus in a way that suggested magical power and technique. The thrust of this discussion should make clear that Luke’s view of magic is different from that of modern readers. I have illustrated that Luke does not make a phenomenological distinction between miracles and magic: although Luke distances himself from magical practices, he positively reports a number of miracles that look like magic. In fact, Luke recognizes the invisible powers of the supernatural and its operational spaces, and narrates supernatural insights attained by the invisible powers of supernatural to make his theological and Christological points. That is, by calling the name of Jesus, Luke unfolds the salvational activity of Jesus and the salvational work of God who raised Jesus from the dead and who made Jesus the Lord and Messiah.

Several conclusions need to be made: (1) Luke’s soteriological formula is different from that of magicians: Luke only presents one Lord with one name, whereas the magicians invoke many gods in healings and exorcisms; (2) Luke describes the name of Jesus, that is, the authority-power of Jesus, as superior to that of the magicians and the authority-power of their gods; (3) the authority-power (name) of Jesus is not portrayed as like the binding/territorializing authority-power of Satan, but as the releasing authority-power of God, which is not static, but flowing and in motion. Thus for Luke, the issue is not magical practice itself, but the evil of attempting to confine and territorialize the authority-power of Jesus and its nomadic flows and movements that magic involves.

Why, then, did Luke use the name of Jesus? As we have noted, the name of Jesus (1) invokes the person, the authority-power, the saving ministry (preaching of the kingdom and that of release from various forms of captives and oppressions), and the death-resurrection-ascension of Jesus who became the Lord and Messiah is very much present and active through his name, (2) evokes the saving network (kingdom) of God initiated by Jesus from Galilee and Jerusalem, and (3) unfolds the continuous flows and movements of Jesus’ saving authority-power by which the disciples preach the kingdom and release of sins from Jerusalem to the ends of earth.
Luke insists that the authority-power of Jesus Christ is superior to the power of Satan, and so the leaders of the church speak and act in his name. In fact, they employ it as their authorization formula to validate their ongoing activities, and as the distinctive mark of the source of their authority-power. This means that the phrase should be understood to refer to the eternal flows and movements of Jesus' saving authority-power, by which the kingdom established by Jesus proliferates. Note also that Luke presents anyone who does not obey those who speak and act in the name of Jesus as someone who disobeys the Lord Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and ultimately God. That is, Luke attempts to let his audience see that it is God, or the saving authority-power of God, who stands behind the figure and name of Jesus.

Therefore, we need to rethink the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus as being in close connection to the saving authority-power of Jesus, and to the nomadic flows and movements of the kingdom brought by Jesus from Galilee to Jerusalem, and by his disciples from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth. As I have already illustrated, the fixed binary and hierarchical system of the temple is deterritorialized by the authority-power of Jesus, which creates the relational and non-hierarchical network (kingdom) of God. Just as the person and the saving authority-power of Jesus are presented as the central node to be connected to in Luke, so also the name of Jesus is presented as the cornerstone of God's saving network. That is, Luke represents the name of Jesus, which unfolds the nomadic flows and movements of the saving authority-power of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and God, not as something territorializing or binding, but as something deterritorializing and releasing: something in motion. Likewise, Luke portrays the phrase as part of the eternal proliferations and flows of the kingdom established by Jesus.
Chapter Five:

A Vital Question: "What Must One Do To Be Saved? (Acts 16:30)

In the preceding chapters, I have consistently pointed out the important connection between belief and salvation. The primary aim of this chapter, then, is to understand what one must do to be saved from the temporal-spatial perspective of Luke-Acts. Within this broad area I will address the following questions: What is belief? What are the objects of belief? What is the meaning of believing in Jesus and its relationship to believing in God?

5.1 Introduction

It appears that the question raised by the jailer in Acts 16:30—what must I do to be saved (τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν ἵνα σωθήσομαι)—represents an important question both for him and for all people. Throughout Luke-Acts, various people ask a similar or identical question in response to the message of John the Baptist, Jesus, and the disciples. Indeed, various people from different social classes respond to John the Baptist’s message by asking, “What shall we do?” Although the actual term salvation is missing in Luke 3:10, 12, and 14, the expression “What shall we do?” implies the idea of salvation. Thus, the saving formula that occurs in these passages seems to be a tentative expression of the more developed formula in Luke 10:25 and 18:18, as well as the one in Acts 2:37 and 16:30. Likewise, many sorts of people ask Jesus how they can be saved. In Luke 10:25, for instance, a certain lawyer asks Jesus, “What must I do to inherit eternal life?” Again, this question is asked by a certain ruler in Luke 18:18, and the question reemerges in Acts 2:37, when the people turn to Peter and the other disciples and ask, “Brethren, what should we do?” And the question “What should we do?” seems equivalent to that found in Acts 16:30, “What must we do to be saved?” Thus the question “What must I do to be saved?”

---

811 Actually some authorities (D af) add ἵνα σωθήσομαι (Acts 16:30).
813 Fitzmyer understands the expression to mean a popular eagerness for salvation, Luke, p. 469.
814 Interestingly, the Lukian Jesus replaces the question of how to receive eternal life in Luke 18:18 with the question of how one can enter into the kingdom of God (cf. 18:24-27). Jesus said, “How hard it is for those who are wealthy to enter the kingdom of God” (18:24).
repeatedly surfaces in response to the messages presented by John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles throughout Luke-Acts. As Luke unfolds his narrative, various answers are given to the question, what must one do to be saved?

Marshall, for instance, provides a simple answer, by quoting Acts 16:31, where Paul said, “Believe in the Lord Jesus, and you will be saved, you and your household.” However, Marshall does not unpack the saving formula belief in the Lord Jesus, and so the question remains, what does the expression believe in the Lord Jesus mean? Notice that there is no such saving formula in Luke. In fact, Jesus never explicitly instructs his audience to believe in him in order to be saved. Although he attempted to develop his answer further, Marshall still did not adequately demonstrate the nature of faith, or the relationship between faith and its multiple objects: Lord Jesus, God, and their agents (Acts 16:34). Nor does he explore how the idea of believing in the Lord Jesus relates to the various belief methods given in Luke-Acts. Moreover, he presents the phrase as if it is a static or fixed formula by which salvation is conveyed.

5.2 What is faith/belief?

5.2.1 Etymology

Jepsen states, “It is hardly possible to get a good understanding of the Hebrew root ‘mn from related Semitic languages...[because] it has not been authenticated with certainty in Akkadian or in Ugaritic or Canaanite-Phoenician.” Although Wehr translates the Arabic verb form of the Hebrew root ‘mn as “to be faithful, reliable, or to be secure” and the Arabic noun as “security, rest, peace, or reliability, faithfulness,” it is problematic to use the “original meaning” of the root from the Aramaic and Arabic languages, because from a literary standpoint the later form of the word is more appropriate. Jepsen therefore claims that the best way to deduce an original meaning is not from Syriac or Arabic, but from Hebrew. For our purpose, therefore, we will probe how the Hebrew root, יְנַה, is used within the framework of the Old Testament, and draw primary understanding from it.

---

818 Cf. TDOT vol. 1, p. 292.
819 TDOT vol. 1, pp. 292-293.
820 TDOT vol. 1, p. 293.
5.2.2 The use of קד in the Old Testament (Jewish Scriptures)

5.2.2.1 The application of the verb קד

(a) The masculine form of the participle qal of the verb קד denotes *nursing, bringing up,* and *fostering fathers.* The feminine form is usually translated as *nurse.* Also, it occurs in a passive-participle form to denote *those brought up* (Lam 4:5). The idea of *nurse or bringing up* implies a relational action (event) between the one who nurses and the one who is nursed. (b) The imperfect form of קד (niphal) denotes *being confirmed or being verified,* with reference to the words of people and God, and the testimonies of God. The participle of the verb קד (niphal) is usually translated as *faithful, reliable,* and *trustworthy,* in relation to people, but it is also applied to God, who is called faithful, because he keeps his covenant, and a *faithful witness* (Jer. 43:5). (c) Usually, the Hiphil form of the verb קד is translated as *to believe, to rely on, to have confidence in,* or *to trust* in God, his words and his wondrous works, and also people and their words. With an infinitive, יב clause, and absolute, he 'emin is translated as *to believe something to be reliable or true.* So we can see that the verb קד is used in close connection to people and to God as well as to their words, and it expresses a

---

821Num 11:12; 2 Kings 10:1, 5.
822Esther 2:7.
823Isaiah 49:23.
8242 Sam 4:4; Ruth 4:16.
825Genesis 42:20.
8261 King 8:26; 2 Chr 1:9; 6:17; cf. Ps 19:7; 89:28.
827Ps 93:5 [in perfect form].
829Deut 7:9; Isa. 49:7.
830Gen 15:6; Ex 14:31; Num 14:11; 20:12; Deut 1:32; 9:23; 2 Kings 17:14; 2 Chr 20:20; Ps 78:22; Is 43:10; Jonah 3:5. The text in Ps 78:22 indicates that he who does not believe in God does not trust in his salvation. In other words, he who does not trust in God's salvation does not believe in God because he does not consider God as the source of salvation.
831Ps 106:12; 119:66; Is 7:9. Note also that Isaiah 7:9 discloses a nexus between faith and salvation.
832Ps 78:32.
833Gen 45:26; Ex 4:1, 8, 31; 19:9; 1 Sam 27:12; 2 Chr 20:20; 32:15; Job 12:20; 39:12; Prov 26:25; Jer. 12:6; 47:14.
834Kings 10:7; 2 Chr 9:6; Isa 53:1.
835Job 15:22; Ps 27:13.
836Ex 4:5; Job 9:16; 39:12; Lam 4:12.
837Ex 4:31; Is 7:9 [the word/s of God]; 28:16 [cornerstone]; Hab 1:5 the word/s of God; Job 29:24; 39:24; Ps 116:10.
838BDB, p. 53.
spatializing action (relation) between object(s) and subject(s), which creates a new saving space between God and people and between the people themselves.

5.2.2.2 The application of the noun יָסָרִי. The noun, adverb, and adjective of יָסָרִי occur in the following forms: יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי; יָסָרִי. However, the most common noun forms of the Hebrew word יָסָרִי are יָסָרִי and יָסָרִי.

(a) יָסָרִי occurs 127 times, and is linked to God and God’s words, exposing the integral relationship between faith in God and faith in God’s words. God is portrayed as the true or faithful one⁴⁴⁰ and the true witness (Jer 42:5). Also, God is presented as the one who keeps truth forever (Ps 146:6), who acts in truth (Neh 9:33; Ps 111:7, 8), who lives in truth and justice (Jer 10:10), who shows truth (2 Sam 2:6), and who guides in the way of truth (Gen 24:48). Because God guides in the way of truth, all the ways of God are presented as truth (Ps 25:10) and his judgments are known as true (Ps 19:9). God is truth, and so his words and laws are portrayed as truth.⁴⁴¹ Interestingly, any man of God speaks the word of God, and the word of God spoken by him is true (1 Kings 17:24), which exposes the nexus between God and God’s agent(s). In contrast to the one who struck Israel (Is 10:20), therefore, the people are instructed to rely on the Lord God in truth, to serve him in truth,⁴⁴² to call upon him in truth (Ps 145:18), to speak his word in truth (Jer 23:28), and to walk before him in truth,⁴⁴³ because God gives life to the one who walks and acts in truth according to the statutes and ordinances of God (Ezek 18:9), which unfolds the link between the

⁴³⁹ These various noun, adjectival, and adverbial forms of יָסָרִי occur in the following texts: יָסָרִי: faithfulness (Is 25:1); יָסָרִי: truly, amen, so be it (Num 5:22; Deut 25:17-26; 1 Kings 1:36; 1 Chr 16:36; Neh 5:13; 8:6; Ps 41:13; 72:19; 89:52; 106:48; Is 65:16; Jer 11:5; 28:6; יָסָרִי: a master workman (Pro 8:30); יָסָרִי: faithful (Ps 12:1; 31:23; Pro 13:17; 14:5; 20:6; Is 26:2; יָסָרִי: workman, artist (Sol 7:2); יָסָרִי: faithful, trusting (Deut 32:20); רַחִית: firmness, fidelity, truth, faithfulness, steadiness (Ex 17:12; Deut 32:4; 1 Sam 26:23; 2 Kings 12:16; 22:17; 1 Chr 9:22, 26, 31; 2 Chr 19:9; 31:12, 15; 34:12; Ps 33:4; 36:5; 40:10; 89:1; 98:3; 100:5; 119:30; 85; Pro 12:17, 22; 28:20; Is 11:5; 33:6; Jer 5:1; 31; Lam 3:23; Hosea 2:22; Hab 2:4; יָסָרִי: bringing up (Est 2:20); יָסָרִי: indeed, truly (Gen 20:12; Josh 7:20); יָסָרִי: firm, sure, certain (Neh 10:1; 11:23); יָסָרִי: verily, really, indeed (Gen 18:13; Num 22:37; Ruth 3:12; 1 Kings 8:27; 2 Kings 19:17; 2 Chr 6:18; Job 9:2; 12:2; 19:4-5; 34:12; 36:4; Ps 58:2; Is 37:18); יָסָרִי: truth, faithfulness, firmness (Gen 24:27; 48; Ex 18:21; 34:6; Deut 13:15; 17:4; 22:20; 2 Sam 7:28; 1 Kings 10:6; Neh 7:2; 9:13, 33; Ps 19:9; 31:5; 40:10; 69:13; 119:142; Prov 29:14; Is 43:9; 10:20; Jer 10:10; Dan 10:21; Zec 8:8), See BDB, pp.52-54; in TWOT #116.

⁴⁴⁰ Gen 24:27; Ex 34:6; 2 Chr 15:3; Ps 51:6; 108:4; 117:2; Jer 10:10; Dan 10:21; Zech 8:8.


⁴⁴² Joshua 24:14; 1 Sam 12:24.

⁴⁴³ 1 Kings 2:4; cf. 3:6; 2 Kings 20:3; 2 Chr 31:20; Ps 86:11; Is 38:3.
Note also that πίστις can be applied to a man and his words. Those who fear God are portrayed as men of truth and their truthfulness is disclosed by testing their words (Gen 42:16). A true man is presented as one who acts in truth. In fact, man is instructed to speak the truth, to keep the truth or faith (πίστις), to judge the poor with truth, and to love truth and peace.

(b) πιστός is applied to God and his words and actions, portraying God as the one who is faithful. That is, God’s works are done in faith (Ps 33:4). The ordinances of God are known as the faithful way (Ps 119:30), and his commandments are known as faithful. Note the link between God’s truthfulness/faithfulness and his salvation, which refers to the same saving event(s) of God. The word πιστός is also applied to man, referring to his faithfulness, and to the gatekeepers (the temple servants), referring to theirs as an office of trust. Implicitly, the one who has faith is one who acts in faith, brings tithes in faith, and works in faithfulness (2 Chr 34:12). In fact, man is instructed to act in truth. The one who speaks the truth says what is right (Prov 12:17), and the one who acts in truth is God’s delight (Prov 12:22). Noteworthy here is that a person who is faithful will abound with blessings (Prov 28:20). However, no truth is found in those who disobey the word of God and who do not accept correction (Jer 7:28).

In short, the various noun, adverbial, and adjectival forms of πίστις have numerous different meanings. Interestingly, on the one hand the idea of truth parallels that of faith/faithfulness. On the other hand, there are noticeable differences between πιστός and πιστέω: outside the books of Psalms, πιστός is translated by πιστίς and

845 Exodus 18:21; Neh 7:2.
847 1 Kings 22:16; 2 Chr 18:15; Pro 8:7; Zech 8:16.
848 LXX Prov 3:3; Jer 9:4; 23:28.
849 Pro 29:14.
850 Zech 8:19.
851 Deut 32:4; Ps 40:10; 88:11; 89:1; 92:2; 100:5; Lam 3:23.
852 Ps 119:85, 138.
853 Ps 40:10; 98:3; Pro 12:17.
854 Sam 26:23.
855 1 Chr 9:22, 26.
857 2 Chr 31:12, 15, 18.
858 LXX 2 Chr 19:9: ἀληθευε.
Note also that the two words are used in close connection to God and God’s words and actions, as well as to people and their words and actions, defining faith, or the act of faith, as a relational action (event). Moreover, faith and salvation are presented as interrelated, not as separate entities.

5.2.3 The Hebrew root word נָכַש and its various translations in LXX

5.2.3.1 LXX translates the verb form of נָכַש into various Greek terms. (a) The qal participle of נָכַש in both masculine and feminine forms, translates into the following words: γνώμη, nurse, nursing of a mother breast-feeding her child (Num 11:12); γνώμη, nursing; ἀληθινός, brought up (Esther 2:7); γνώμη, to bring up, nurse (Lam 4:5). (b) The niphal participle of the verb is usually translated as πιστός (faithful). (c) Except Deut 1:32, 2 Chr 20:20, Judges 11:20, and 2 Kings 17:14, the hiphil of נָכַש is translated as πιστεύω, to believe, to trust. What is to be noted here is that such Greek words are spatializing words or relational actions or events, which create a dynamic space between object(s) and subject(s).

5.2.3.2 LXX also translates the noun, adjectival, and adverbial forms of נָכַש into various Greek terms. (a) נָכַש is translated into γνώμη (so be it), ἀμήν and ἀληθεία (true), and ἀληθινός (truly). (b) LXX also translates נָכַש into ἀλήθεια (truth) and πιστός (faithful). (c) נָכַש is translated into πίστις (faith) and πιστοίς is translated as στηρίζω (make firm), πιστικός, πιστίς, ἀληθεία, ἀξιόπιστος (trustworthy), and πλακασώμεθα, which create a dynamic space between object(s) and subject(s).

859 TDOT notes that “The OT says that the ‘word’ is ‘emeth,’ but it never says that it is ‘emunah, and rightly claims that ‘emunah is not so much an abstract quality, ‘reliability,’ but a way of acting which grows out of inner stability, ‘conscientiousness.’” TDOT, vol. 1, p. 317.

860 2 Sam 4:4; 2 Kings 10:1, 5; Ruth 4:16; Is 49:23.
862 ἐπιστεύω: to entrust.
863 ἐκληροῦω: make stubborn.
864 Num 5:22; Deut 25:17-26; 1 Kings 1:36; Ps 41:13; 72:19; 89:52; 106:48; Jer 11:5.
865 1 Chr 16:36; Neh 5:13; 8:6.
866 Is 56:16.
868 Ps 12:1; 31:23; Is 26:2.
870 Deut 32:20.
871 Ex 17:12.
872 Deut 32:4.
873 1 Sam 26:23; 2 Kings 12:16; 22:17; 1 Chr 9:22, 26, 31; 2 Chr 31:15; 34:12; Ps 33:4; Pro 12:17, 22; Jer 5:1, 31; 7:28; 9:2; Lam 3:23; Hosea 2:22; Hab 2:4.
874 2 Chr 19:9; Ps 40:10; 88:11; 89:1; 92:2; 96:13; 98:3; 100:5; 119:138; 143:1; Is 25:1.
875 Ps 28:20.
In short, LXX translates the various forms of the root פָּהָק into a variety of Greek words. Also it has πιστεύω and πιστός for the niphal participle and the hiphil forms of the root פָּהָק and the noun πίστις for פָּהָק. These various Greek translations describe faith, or the act of faith, as a spatializing action or a relational space between objects and subjects exposing the dynamic movements of faith.

5.3 How is faith presented in the Old Testament?
In the Old Testament, as the application of the Hebrew term פָּהָק above indicates, not only is the act of faith represented as a relational action (event) between God and God’s people, but also as an act whereby God’s people believe in the servants of God and in God, disclosing the operation of its nomadic flows and movements. This will be made clearer when we look at Exodus 3-4. At the burning bush, God calls Moses and sends him to Pharaoh to bring his people out of Egypt (3:1ff.). However, Moses requests some sort of proof that God indeed has appeared and commissioned him. According to his request, God reveals his name by declaring, “I am who I am” (3:14), and instructs Moses to say that he was indeed sent by God to the sons of Israel (3:15). Yet Moses says, “What if they will not believe me or listen to my voice, for they will say, ‘The Lord did not appear to you’” (4:1). Thus, God gives him the power to perform signs (cf. 4:3-4, 6-7). In fact, God gives him a third sign (cf. 4:9), and tells him to perform it if they do not believe him after he has shown them the first two signs. Nevertheless, Moses complains about his lack of ability with words, and asks God to send someone else (4:13). In response, God promises Moses that his brother...
Aaron will come to meet him, and he promises that he will use Aaron's mouth to express Moses' teachings. In fact, God instructs Moses to put the words in Aaron's mouth, and reassures him that God will use the mouths of both Moses and Aaron. Furthermore, Moses is told that Aaron shall be as his mouth and Moses shall be as God to him (4:16). When all the words were spoken and all the signs were performed, the people believed and worshiped (4:31).

Several notes need to be made about this. First, words and signs are seen as the same events. The initial purpose of God's giving signs was to invite the people to believe in Moses' words, that God had indeed appeared and commissioned him (4:15). This act of belief ultimately leads people to believe in God, suggesting that believing in Moses and believing in God are not separate, but represent the same single reality. Also, notice the nexus between the words and signs of Moses and those of God. That is, the words and signs spoken and performed by Moses are presented as being also the words and signs of God, because they originate from God. As the subsequent narrative (Ex 7-14) reveals, though Moses performs signs and wonders against the Egyptians, the people recognize them as being God's signs and wonders (cf. Ex 14:31). Once again, as Ex 14:31 clearly indicates, the major function of the signs is to create belief in Moses, and thus in God: "When Israel saw the great power which the Lord had used against the Egyptians...they believed in the Lord and his servant Moses" (Ex 14:31). This demonstrates the nomadic movements of faith in Moses and in God. The act of believing in God's servant is understood as an act of believing in God himself.

A similar conclusion can be reached in 2 Chr 20:20, where Jehoshaphat says, "Listen to me, O Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem! Believe in the LORD your God and you will be established; believe his prophets and succeed." This text reveals the close connection between belief in God and in his prophets. Although the object of belief is not explicitly stated in 4:31, in the light of 4:1 and 4:30, its immediate object is Moses. Of course, the ultimate object of belief is God, since God is the source of the words and signs of Moses. It would be difficult to think that the people could

---

886 See Hyatt, Exodus, p. 156; Cassuto, Exodus, p. 172.
888 Clements writes, "Faith in God, and in Moses as his servant, is the proper response to what has happened, which amounts to a revelation of God through his works." Exodus, p. 88.
889 Clements notes that not only did the people believe Moses, but they also accepted him as a new leader. Exodus, p. 32.
890 Durham notes that their belief is based upon the words and signs of God. Exodus, p. 59.
worship God without first believing in him. Thus, the people believe in Moses and God (4:31), even when all the words and signs are spoken and performed by Moses.

In short, belief or the act of believing in Moses and in God unfolds in dynamic flows and movements, and is presented as a relational event between the one who speaks and the ones who listen, so that belief becomes something flowing and in motion. Moreover, what actuates the dynamic flows and movements of faith is the saving event(s) of God, articulated and performed by Moses, by which a relational space between God, Moses, and the people is created and moves.

5.4 How is faith presented in the New Testament?

Thomas Aquinas said, "Faith is the act of the intellect when it assents to divine truth under the influence of the will moved by God through grace." By intellectualizing the experience of God, he reduces the biblical emphasis on the personal experience of God. In his classic book, Two Types of Faith, Buber attempts to make a clear cut distinction between Christian πίστις (to believe in something, a relationship of acknowledgement) and Jewish אמונה (fidelity, a relationship of firm trust). The problem for Buber is that he oversimplifies the use of בקע and that of πίστις. As already noted, there is a no clear cut distinction between Christian πίστις and Jewish אמונה, but rather the two are interrelated and refer to the same relational action or event that takes place between the one who speaks and the ones who listen and act. Wallis notes that although it is difficult to distinguish between the two, בקע is viewed as intellectual acceptance and personal trust. He also notes that faith is described as a relational phenomenon demonstrated by a response to God.

Bultmann provides a general study of the πίστις group in the New Testament. He primarily examines πιστεύω and πίστις in John and the Pauline letters to examine the Christian concept of faith. However, his analysis of Christian faith is limited to the post-resurrection phenomena. Jeremias rightly criticizes Bultmann by saying, "It is significant that R. Bultmann does not even raise the

---

891 In fact, Durham argues, "The Israelites bowed down and worshiped neither the messengers nor the message, but Yahweh." Exodus, p. 59; cf. Cassuto, Exodus, p. 63. Note also that the idea of trust/belief in the Teachers of Righteous and in God is reflected in IqQpHab.
893 Buber, Two Types of Faith, pp. 7-12.
895 See TDNT, 6:174-228.
question whether Jesus could have used the group of words, but begins immediately with the kerygma of the primitive church.” As a result, Bultmann ignores the writings of Luke, and fails to illustrate the precise meaning(s) of faith and the flows and movements of its multiple objects: Jesus’ disciples, and the words of God articulated by the disciples, by Jesus, and by God. Even though many scholars have undertaken a number of studies of faith in the Pauline letters, similar issues regarding the connection between belief and salvation in Luke-Acts have been neglected. To my knowledge, no adequate study has been done of the nature of belief in Luke-Acts, and of the nomadic flows and movements of its multiple objects; that is, the dynamic relationship between believing in Jesus’ disciples, in the Lord Jesus, and in God, which represents faith or belief as something flowing, moving, and in motion. In this chapter, therefore, I will address this neglected aspect of Lukan scholarship, and articulate the nature of belief and its relation to salvation from the spatial-temporal perspective of Luke-Acts.

5.5 Faith in Luke

First I want to establish the nature of faith and its multiple objects by examining the πιστεύω and πιστίς group, and then demonstrate the dynamic movements of faith or belief. As we shall see, this threefold theme is interwoven and presented as one singular event. In Luke, the word(s) of God, articulated by Jesus and God, are represented as the objects of faith by which people move and act. Since they occur in various texts and contexts, I will not treat them in a separate sub-section, but will point them out as we go through each πιστίς group. We can then consider the link

---

898 In Luke, πιστεύω occurs three times in relation to persons (Luke 8:50; 16:11; 20:5) denoting to believe or to trust. In Luke 16:11, Jesus instructs his disciples to act faithfully in regard to worldly wealth so that they will be entrusted with such wealth. The πιστεύω used in this verse can be rendered to entrust (cf. Marshall, Luke, p. 623). Otherwise, it occurs 9 times and is used six times in connection with words (Luke 1:20, 45; 8:12, 13; 22:67; 24:25 [πιστί]), denoting to accept or to rely on. The risen Jesus criticizes those who hesitate to believe his prophetic words (Luke 24:25). In his gospel, Luke presents God as the one who speaks and acts through his messenger(s) (Luke 1:20, 45).
between belief and salvation, and I will demonstrate the link between faith in the
words of God articulated by Jesus, and in God. In this section, therefore, I propose
that we rethink faith, seeing it not as a static or fixed moment of action but as a
dynamic, relational event taking place between object(s) and subject(s), which creates
the dynamic space (kingdom) of God. Such a relational event reveals the nomadic
flows of faith and salvation. That is, what triggers the dynamic motions of faith is the
relational event that takes place between the saving event(s) preached and performed
by Jesus, and peoples' positive response to his words. Thus we can understand faith
to be a relational event or reciprocal action between a subject(s) and an object(s), and
as something flowing and in motion.

5.5.1 Faith as a relational event

5.5.1.1 Luke 1:26-38. In this episode, Mary recognizes the word of the angel
as trustworthy, as Gabriel articulates God's word concerning the birth or coming of
Jesus. In contrast to Zechariah, who does not believe the word of Gabriel regarding
the birth of John (cf. 1:18-20), Mary recognizes Gabriel's word (1:45) as being the
word of God, and accepts it, saying, "Be it done to me according to your word"
(1:38).

A couple of points need to be made about this. First, Mary's acceptance of
Gabriel's words is described as an act of belief, and her belief is portrayed as a
responsive action (event) to the word(s) of God articulated by Gabriel. The fact that
her belief or responsive action revolves around the word of God articulated by
Gabriel means that it is a relational event, which creates a new dynamic network
between God, Gabriel, and Mary. Such a relational event is not pictured as
hierarchical or binary, but non-hierarchical, mutual, and reciprocal. Interestingly, just
as Mary recognizes the word of Gabriel as the word of God, so also Gabriel
recognizes Mary's autonomous power to make her own decision, whether to accept or
reject the words of God. Mary exercises her autonomy and accepts Gabriel's
words as coming from God.

Here, the act of belief is depicted as a relational event between the one who
speaks and the one who hears. Note also that such a relational event discloses the

899 As already noted, Gabriel's dialogue with Mary and Gabriel's wait for her answer support
this point.
900 As in the Old Testament, belief in the messenger of God signifies belief in God who sends
the messenger. To put it differently: the word of Gabriel signifies the word of God.
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active flows of faith, demonstrating that faith is something in motion, and an act by which the new relational network of God is established. Moreover, the act of Mary’s faith prepares a new space for the birth of Jesus, as articulated by Gabriel (1:31-35). Thus, what activates the new saving network of God that will be revealed in Jesus is Mary’s responsive faith in Gabriel and in God. The combination of God’s initiating action and Mary’s responsive action bring forth this soteriological event: that is the coming of Jesus through whom God will save. Moreover, her act of faith is based upon the word of God, which depicts the word of God as a door to salvation, a door opened by the act of faith, and which opens on the new relational network of God.

5.5.1.2 Luke 8:11-15. In Luke 8:12, Luke establishes the nexus between belief and salvation and explains the nature of them. In contrast to the non-relational words have no root and fall away, the word παρέχομαι in 8:13 is closely linked with spatial or relational terms (hear, receive, hold fast, and bear fruit) in 8:15, which create a dynamic space between the one who articulates the word of God and those who hear and act upon it. Such a spatializing action depicts faith as a relational event, an integration of hearing and doing the word of God. This relational event unfolds the nomadic flows and movements of faith and salvation — hearing the word → accepting it → holding fast → bearing fruit (8:15) — showing that faith is not merely a philosophical abstraction or an intellectual construct, but something to be followed and put into practice. Faith is a relational event, a combination of hearing and doing (8:21).

Note also that such a relational event revolves around the word of God, making it the immediate object of faith. Moreover, just as the seed-word of God

---

904Luke brings out the apostasy implied in Mark’s term σκανδαλίζονται, “they are caused to stumble,” in combination with αφείλονται, “they withdraw,” which in the LXX is frequently used to imply falling away from God (BAGD, 126-27). Nolland, Luke, pp. 385-386.
905Fitzmyer, Luke, pp. 712-713.
is closely linked to the kingdom of God (8:1, 10), so also the word about the kingdom of God refers to the saving event(s) already preached and performed by Jesus in 8:1-2, illustrating that everyone who believes in the word of God is connected to the saving network (kingdom) of God initiated by Jesus. Recall the fact that John the Baptist warns those who believe in the physical bloodline of Abraham in 3:8, where he states, "God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham" (cf. 1:51-53). Likewise, Jesus reveals that membership of God's kingdom no longer depends on physical descent (i.e. a static blood line), but upon an act of faith, a relationship between the one who articulates the word of God and the ones who hear and act upon it. Through an act of belief, a person recognizes that the words spoken by Jesus are the words of God, and thereby finds the way to the invisible kingdom. The word of God is the immediate object of faith; faith itself revolves around the word, and is thus a responsive action by which the invisible kingdom of God (virtual reality) becomes visible (actual reality). The word is therefore the entrance to the kingdom of God. In other words, people find their way into the kingdom through the relational event of responding positively to the word(s) of God articulated by Jesus.

5.5.1.3 Summary. The act of faith is expressed as the relationship between hearing the word of God and acting upon it, so that faith can be defined as a relational event that takes place between the one who speaks the word of God and those who hear and act upon it, a process which creates the new space of God. This responsive action is based upon the word of God, which functions like a door to salvation. The word of God is presented as the immediate object of faith, and each person's response revolves around the word of God, a relational event by which the invisible kingdom of God becomes visible. In this sense, each person finds a way to the kingdom through an act of faith in the words of God articulated by God's messengers. Therefore, faith, or the act of belief, should not be understood as a static or fixed framework of action, but as a relational event that is in motion.

5.5.2 Faith in the nomadic flows and movements of salvation. I have consistently pointed out the link between faith and salvation, arguing that they should not be viewed as separate entities, but as the same saving event by which the new

---

network (kingdom) of God is established and moves. As we shall see, this link does not function as a fixed framework of motion, but as something that is in motion.

5.5.2.1 Luke 7:50. Unlike the paralytic and the centurion, the sinful woman comes to Jesus not for physical, but spiritual healing. When she comes to be released from her sins, and the social stigma attached to them,\(^910\) Jesus grants her the word of salvation, saying “Your sins have been forgiven” (v. 48).\(^911\) Jesus’ word(s) are a direct response to this woman, who publicly acknowledges Jesus in vv. 37-38. Jesus describes her public action as an act of love (v. 47) and of faith. Thus Jesus says, “Your faith has saved you” (v. 50).\(^912\) This unfolds the link between faith and salvation. More importantly, Luke employs the phrase your faith has saved you (v. 50) for the first time, and so seems to use it to replace his earlier phrase your sins have been forgiven (7:48; cf. 5:20).\(^913\) The phrase your sins have been forgiven thus parallels the expression your faith has saved you, and both now refer to the same soteriological event. In this sense, the so-called “divine passive” (ἀφέωνται)\(^914\) should be viewed in the context of the dynamic flows of the saving event. Indeed, as Jesus releases her from her sins, the sinful woman, who was outside God’s salvation, becomes connected to the new saving network of God brought by Jesus. By focusing on her responsive action (faith), Luke urgently invites his audience to respond to Jesus, and describes the saving network (kingdom) of God as open and ready to be connected from any time-space. As the saving acts of God show, God wants to save all who desire to be saved through Jesus.

Note also that the woman’s responsive action (faith) is linked to the action of Jesus’ determination to save her. In the midst of a hostile and difficult situation,\(^915\)

\(^910\)See above.

\(^911\)Of course, forgiveness of sins here is understood to mean salvation. See previous chapter for the precise link between forgiveness of sins and salvation..

\(^912\)In 8:43–48 the woman’s desire to make anonymous contact with Jesus is not faith until she declares herself. A strong connection between salvation and forgiveness is already established at 1:77, and these are in turn linked to the term “peace” in 1:79 (and see at 2:14). “Go in peace” is a common farewell formula in Judaism (e.g., Judg 18:6; 1 Sam 1:17; 18:6; 1 Kgs 22:17; Luke 8:48; Acts 16:36; Jas 2:16) which here takes on deeper significance in the context of the coming of eschatological salvation. The connotation of “peace” is more individual here than in 1:79; 2:14,” Nolland, *Luke*, p. 360. We will pick up this theme in the following sections.

\(^913\)See above.

\(^914\)Fitzmyer notes that ἀφέωνται is a “divine passive” which implies that God forgives (*Luke*, p. 687). Obviously it is God who releases sins. What is at issue here is: through whom is it granted, and how is it manifested? In 7:50, Jesus highlights the faith of the sinful woman by which her sins are released.
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Jesus saves the sinful woman, who has positively responded to him,\(^916\) by stating, "Your sins are forgiven" (7:48). As a result, two opposed (disconnected) spaces are created. On the one hand, a hostile environment (space) is established among the Pharisees, who ask, "Who is this man who even forgives sins?" (7:49; cf. 5:21). On the other hand, however, a new relational space between God, Jesus, and the sinful woman is created, expressing the nomadic movements of salvation. In short, as the phrase your faith has saved you indicates, faith and salvation are not separate entities, but they interact with one another as part of the same saving event by which people act and move. In contrast to the territorialized and closed system of the temple, the new saving network of God implemented by Jesus is described as open and deterritorialized and can be accessed from any time-space.

5.5.2.2 Luke 8:48. Green argues that the woman's real problem is religious and social, not physical.\(^917\) But, as the larger context (vv. 43-44, 47) indicates, the primary issue here is still her physical sickness, which separates her from the social world of the temple. Put differently, as her religious-social status is regulated by her physical condition, the primary issue here is the healing of her physical body. Hence the purpose of her coming to and touching Jesus is to be released from her physical sickness, which is the same reason that many come to Jesus (cf. 5:15; 6:18).

The woman, who is hemorrhaging, is denoted by her acts of faith: coming to Jesus, touching Jesus, and publicly acknowledging Jesus. These multiple acts are represented as actual (visual) faith events, which unfold both the invisible and visible realms of faith.

Notice the following movements in the act of faith. First, the woman comes to Jesus because she believes that Jesus can heal her. That is, the visible act of her coming unfolds an inner (invisible) conviction. That is, an invisible act of faith is visualized as she comes and touches Jesus. Indeed, both her private/hidden (v. 44) and public/visual acts towards Jesus (v. 47) are portrayed as τὸν θείον. When she comes to Jesus and secretly touches him, she is healed immediately,\(^918\) demonstrating that

\(^917\)Green, Luke, p. 347 n. 103.
\(^918\)The aorist passive ἐσώθη (was healed) and the adverb παραχρήσαται (immediately) illustrate that she was healed at the moment of her touching Jesus. Jesus' words that the power has gone out of him (δύναμις ἐξελπιζότων ἐκείνης ἐμοί), and the phrase "immediately her hemorrhage stopped" (παραχρήσαται ἡμᾶς οὖσας τῶν ἀλματος αὐτῆς) clearly point in this direction, and verse 47 confirms it. It is important to note that in his writings, Luke presents physical healing as a form of salvation (see chapter 3). In this regard, she experiences God's salvation at the moment she touches Jesus. However, Green
she was connected to the new saving network of God at the moment of contact. Here, as elsewhere, Luke makes a correlation between touching and healing as referring to the same soteriological event by which the new relational network of God - here, between God, Jesus, and the woman - is created.

Interestingly, a hidden act is then made visible when the woman publicly declares how she has experienced God’s salvation. In response to Jesus’ call (v. 46), she comes out trembling, falls down before Jesus, and openly declares how she has experienced God’s salvation, in the presence of all the people (v. 47). In response to her public testimony, Jesus says, “Daughter your faith has saved you; go in peace” (8:48). As the phrase “your faith has saved you” indicates, Luke interlinks faith and salvation as referring to the same soteriological event, and explores the idea that it is her faith - her responsive acts, both hidden and visible - that actuates the saving event by which the new relational space of God is established and proliferates.

At the same time, what empowers her to come to Jesus and touch him is her dynamic action(s) upon hearing the word about Jesus and his saving events. That is, her faith should not be understood as something static or fixed in time, but as something in motion. Thus, faith and salvation are not to be understood as separate entities, but as the same saving event of God, a dynamic, fluid event, here expressed as: hearing the word of God, leaving home, and coming to Jesus (outward expressions of inner conviction) → touching Jesus → receiving physical healing → giving public testimony → receiving the word of salvation that presents faith and salvation as a dynamic saving event of God and as something relational and in motion. Note that faith and salvation begin with the word of God, depicting the spoken word of

---

argues that “though her physical problem may be cured, she is not yet healed,” (Luke, p. 347) because her problem “is not physical but religious and social” (Luke, p. 347 n. 103). The problem with Green’s argument is that he does not demonstrate the differences in usage between “cure” and “heal.” And it appears that Green limits the use of the term “healing” to a religious-social context. In Luke-Acts, however, “healing” can be both physical and non-physical, and there is no clear distinction between cure (ἐπανεζω) and heal (ἰάω). Furthermore, in his writings Luke does not seem to separate physical from religious and social sickness, rather he seems to present physical sickness as religious-social sickness. For Luke, they are interrelated (see above). Furthermore, there is no such thing as incomplete healing or incomplete salvation in Luke-Acts.

920 The word ἀπανεζω occurs 4 times in vv. 44-47.
921 Schlömann, Lukas, p. 1:492, rightly notes that “faith is not the psychosomatic cause of healing, but only the subjective condition that opens one to the working of God’s power”. Cf. Nolland, Luke, p. 420.
922 As noted earlier, her act of coming to Jesus discloses her inner conviction/trust in the news about the soteriological events that he preaches and performs. Her actions can also be viewed in terms of Willis’ notion of intellectual acceptance, based on the fact that she must have heard about Jesus prior to her coming to him, as many others had.
God as a door to salvation, an entrance to the kingdom of God. Moreover, as opposed to the closed and territorialized network of the temple, the new saving network of God is depicted as open and ready to be connected from any points and persons, showing that everyone who wants to be connected to the new salvation brought by Jesus can be so connected (cf. Acts 2:21).

5.5.2.3. Luke 8:50. By inserting the words αὐθαίρεται in 8:50, Luke again makes clear the link between belief and salvation. As opposed to Mark's present verb πιστεύειν, Luke uses the aorist imperative πιστεύειν emphasizing the continual active motions of faith. Interestingly, the interaction between Jairus' faith (vv. 40-42) and Jesus' faithful action or determination (vv. 49-56) results in a saving event, that is, raising the girl from the dead, exposing the fact that faith and salvation are not separate, but that they revolve around the same saving event. Just as Jairus' acts of coming to Jesus and falling at Jesus' feet (8:41) are described as outward expressions of Jairus' faith, so they are also presented as relational actions that create a dynamic space between God, Jesus, and Jairus.

Note also that this dynamic relational network does not fall apart when both protagonists are confronted with a difficult task. For example, when one of the synagogue officials says, "Your daughter is dead; do not trouble the teacher any longer" (Luke 8:50a), Jairus could easily have given up on his girl and turned away from Jesus. Instead, Jairus believes the word of Jesus when Jesus says, "Do not fear. Only believe, and she will be saved" (Luke 8:50). The promise of salvation seems to encourage Jairus to believe Jesus' words, a fact that defines faith as a relational action between hearing and doing. Similarly, Jesus who is asked to save Jairus' daughter from dying, is now presented as the one who actively seeks to save the girl from the dead, which exposes Jesus' determination. As 8:51 shows, neither Jesus nor Jairus disconnect from the other, but they remain in close connection. Interestingly, just as Jesus saves the paralytic when he sees the faith of his friends, here Jesus saves the girl from the dead because of her father's faith.

---

923 Mark has the present verb "to believe" (πιστεύει) with the force of "continue to believe" (5:36).

924 Plummer notes, "Change of tense, 'Cease to fear; only make an act of faith' [Μὴ Θεοθολο, μόνον πιστεύον]. In Mk. 5:36 we have, 'only continue to believe.' In either case the meaning is, 'In the presence of this new difficulty let faith prevail, and all will be well.'" Luke, pp. 236-237.

925 The act of falling at Jesus' feet is a sign of recognizing his authority, as well as assign indication of one's submission to Jesus (cf. Acts 2:30); rather, as verse 49 indicates, Jairus recognizes Jesus as a teacher through whom God brings healing for his daughter.
From this we can draw a couple of points. First, since Jairus' *coming* to Jesus and his *falling* at Jesus' feet (vv. 40-42) are described as *faithful actions*, Jairus' *faith* alone brings *salvation*. But what actuates Jairus' faithful acts in 8:41 is the saving event already preached and performed by Jesus, which depicts Jairus' *faith* as a *responsive action*. The relational nature of the act is developed further when Jesus and Jairus face a major obstacle, suggesting that the combination of Jairus' *faith* and Jesus' *determination* is what actually produces the soteriological event by which the *new* relational space of God, between God, Jesus, Jairus, the girl, and Jesus' audience, is created and proliferates.

5.5.2.4. **Summary.** As the phrase "your faith has saved you" indicates, *faith* and *salvation* are not isolated, but interact in expressing the same saving event of God, by which the *new* network of God, launched by Jesus, expands and moves. As noted, both the *faith* of a person (a responsive action) and the *determination* of God and Jesus actuate the salvational event of flows and movements. In relation to salvation, the idea of *faith* should not be understood as something static, fixed, or frozen, but as a *nomadic* event of flows and movements. Note also that, in contrast to the closed and territorialized network of the temple, the *new* network of God conveyed by Jesus is presented as open and ready to be connected from any distant point(s) and person(s).

5.5.3. **Faith in the nomadic event of flows and motions.** The following texts express this redefined idea of the relationship between faith and salvation most clearly, expressing it as a relational, fluid and proliferating system that can be accessed from any point.

5.5.3.1. Luke 5:20. Luke has already informed his readers that the purpose of the great multitudes *coming* to Jesus is *to hear* the word of God (cf. 5:1) and *to be healed* from their various sicknesses (5:15, 17; cf. 6:18).²²⁶ Likewise, the *coming* of the friends of the paralytic to Jesus is to get the paralytic healed. Interestingly, just as the act of hearing the *news* about Jesus, or the saving event(s) preached and performed by Jesus (cf. 4:14, 37, 44, 15), is what impels them *to depart* from their original location, *come* to Jesus, and *overcome* any obstacle (5:18-19),²²⁷ so the act of

---

²²⁶ Luke seems to summarize the ministry of Jesus (4:31-5:14) by making a close correlation between the words of Jesus and healing (cf. 4:36).

²²⁷ McCaughey notes that faith is not simply coming to Jesus for help, but also publicly expressing gratitude (*JTQ* 45 [1978] 180–82). But Nolland argues that this definition of faith is too
coming presumes prior acts of hearing and departing, revealing the nomadic flows of faith. For example, though the friends of the paralytic come to where Jesus was staying, they are unable to find a way to Jesus because of the crowd that blocks them from reaching Jesus (5:18). Now they have to make a decision: either go back to where they have come from, or find a new way to Jesus. As the subsequent story reveals, they choose the latter. By tearing the roof apart, they let the paralytic down from above. Their action reveals their firm and dynamic action, and their love for their outcast friend who has been cut off from the temple.

As the object of ἰδὼν shows, their dynamic or determining action is presented as faith. Here, the noun πίστις is used for the first time in Luke, and it implies the actions of hearing, departing, coming, and determining, and so demonstrates the nomadic movements of faith of the paralytic friends (5:18-19). Thus, their faith is not static, but dynamic. Noteworthy here is that, just as the friends of the paralytic have to overcome their difficulties, so Jesus has to overcome an obstacle in the form of an objection to Jesus' behavior (5:21; cf. 19:7). Responding to this hostile objection, Jesus claims that he has authority on earth to release sins and power to heal. He then releases the sins of the paralytic and heals his sickness. This shows Jesus' firmness to save those who have responded positively to his message.

A couple of observations need to be noted. The salvational event that takes place in 5:20 is an outcome of the interactions between the multiple actions (faith) of the friends and Jesus' firm resolution to save. This creates the new relational network of God, between God, Jesus, the friends of the paralytic, the paralytic, Jesus' audiences, and even Luke's wider audience. Ironically, the paralytic who was narrow, saying, "Faith is seen when there is no break in the pattern of divine initiative and human response by means of which a restored relationship to God is established." Nolland, Luke, p. 360. Yet it is to be noted that a relationship with God may not be restored at the moment of one's coming to Jesus, but only when the one who comes and Jesus interact.

---

930 Fitzmyer notes that πίστις here is used in the sense of confidence in the power manifested in Jesus, Luke, p. 582. Johnson also understands πίστις to mean "the basic positive response to the visitation of God." Luke, p. 93; see also Green, Gospel of Luke, p. 240. In Luke as a whole, Nolland states, "Faith, is attributed to those who act decisively on the basis of the conviction that God's help is to be found with Jesus and gratefully receive God's action through him" (Luke, p. 235).
931 Such faith includes one's intellectual or inner conviction in the news about Jesus, that is, the soteriological events preached and performed by Jesus. Wallis notes that most expressions of faith have their source in intellectual belief. For example, the friends of the paralytic must have had some prior understanding of why this endeavor was worthwhile (cf. 4:14, 37; 5:15). The faith of Jesus Christ in early Christian Traditions, p. 13. Jepsen notes, "'emunah seems more to emphasize one's own inner attitude and the conduct it produces" TDOT, 1:317.
disconnected from the temple is now connected to the kingdom of God brought by Jesus. Indeed, the immobile paralytic who was disconnected from the temple is now able to move freely and to return to his home. For this precise reason, the free or saved man, once released from his sins and sickness, now glorifies God (5:25). Moreover, as the linked expressions δοξάζων τὸν θεόν in 5:25 and ἡμεῖς δοξάζοντες τὸν θεόν in 5:26 clearly indicate, the paralytic, his friends, and Jesus’ audience now glorify God. This dynamic act suggests that they have seen and experienced God’s salvation through Jesus.

Let us consider the multiple acts and flows of faith and salvation: the act of hearing the word about Jesus or his saving events → the act of departing from the old place of the paralytic → the act of coming to Jesus, the new space (kingdom) of God → the act of overcoming an obstacle → Jesus’ resolution to save → the attainment (in terms of connection) of salvation (release of sins and sickness) → the act of glorifying God → the act of rising and returning home. This conclusion reveals that faith and salvation should be interpreted as a dynamic event in motion. Also, faith is composed of multiple actions and is represented as relational. Moreover, the nomadic flows of faith and salvation begin with the spoken word of God (5:1, 15) about Jesus, or the saving events preached and performed by Jesus (cf. 4:14, 37), which demonstrates that the word of God is the way to salvation, that is, the entrance to his kingdom.

5.5.3.2. Luke 7:9. As the text 7:2-10 shows, the intention behind the centurion’s sending the Jewish elders to Jesus was for his slave to be healed (v. 3). When the Jewish elders ask Jesus to save the centurion’s slave, Jesus sets out for the centurion’s house (7:3-4). On his way there, however, the friends of the centurion come to him, saying, “Lord, do not trouble yourself, for I am not worthy to have you come under my roof; therefore I did not presume to come to you. But only speak the word, and let my servant be healed. For I also am a man set under authority, with soldiers under me; and I say to one, ‘Go,’ and he goes, and to another, ‘Come,’ and he comes, and to my slave, ‘Do this,’ and the slave does it” (7:6-8). In response, Jesus said, “I say to you, not even in Israel have I found such great faith” (7:9).

What does this story reveal? First, the word(s) of the centurion brought by the Jewish elders (vv. 3-5) and his friends (vv. 6-8) are viewed as the outward actions of the centurion signifying a responsive or relational action (faith) to God’s word. Out of all possible choices and resources, the centurion makes a decisive choice, and turns
to Jesus when he hears about him and the salvational acts he preaches and performs. This exposes the fact that his actions revolve around the spoken word. As 7:7-8 shows, πίστις is linked to recognizing or accepting the words of Jesus as the authoritative words of salvation. That is, Luke presents the spoken or revealed words of Jesus as components of a new way to salvation, an entrance to the kingdom of God.

Also there is a close link between the words and deeds of the messengers of the centurion and those of the centurion himself. Jesus recognizes that the words spoken by the agents are those of the centurion, which demonstrates the link between the word(s) and the person. To put it differently, even though the centurion is physically absent, Jesus nevertheless recognizes his presence in the words spoken by his agents, and pronounces that he has not found such πίστις in all Israel as if the centurion were there. In other words, Luke links the words and the presence of the centurion together and pictures them as a same event.

Furthermore, just as the phrases go...goes, come...comes, and do...does (vv. 6b-8) are spatial actions, so faith is depicted as an integration of hearing and doing, defining it as a relational action-event in motion. As the connections between hearing the word about Jesus and of coming to him indicate, the spoken word of Jesus, and Jesus himself, are both presented as the immediate objects of faith. Moreover, these nomadic movements of faith are linked to the idea of faith in God, who is presented as the ultimate object of faith. We can draw the same point from 7:3-5, where the centurion may well be identified as a “God-fearing” Gentile, which discloses his act of faith in God (7:5). This is supported by 7:16, where Luke narrates that, not only did people glorify God as the direct result of the salvational events preached and performed by Jesus, but also that Jesus is seen

---

933Plummer notes, “Perhaps, ἰδώντων hints that Jesus is superhuman” Luke, p. 196.
934Johnson states, “In contrast to the case of the paralytic (5:17-19), the centurion’s faith is not left implicit in his deeds. It is made explicit by his message” Luke, p. 118. It appears, however, that Luke does not attempt to separate the belief of the centurion from his deeds and words expressed through his agents, but links the two together. Luke has already established the notion that to believe in an agent of God means to believe in God who sent him (cf. Lk 1:20,45).
935Tannehill notes a willingness to trust Jesus’ authoritative word, even at a distance. It is also a faith which trusts that Jesus can and will bring healing in spite of the social and religious barrier which separates Jews and Gentiles, a barrier which the centurion recognizes and respects. This is faith, not only in Jesus as healer, but also in a saving power that leaps divisive walls. The centurion’s willingness to request Jesus’ help, in spite of a major barrier, relates him to other persons in Luke who come to Jesus and are commended for their faith because they go beyond accepted and polite behavior to obtain what Jesus can offer (see 5:19-20; 7:36-50; 8:43-48; 18:35-43), Luke, p. 115.
as a great prophet *through* whom God has acted and performed these mighty works: Jesus' salvational acts are equivalent to God's redemptive events of flows and movements.

From this, we determine several functions of the soteriological event(s) preached and performed by Jesus. (1) To confirm Jesus' words-works as the words-works of God. (2) To identify Jesus as a great prophet *through* whom God's salvational power operates. (3) To establish the *new* relational network of God, where God, Jesus, and all sorts of people interact. (4) To draw people to glorify God. Clearly, through Jesus' salvational events the *new* relational network (kingdom) of God, between God, Jesus, Jewish elders, the friends, the centurion, the slave, and Jesus' audience, is established and proliferates. In short, *faith* is composed of multiple acts of *hearing* and *doing*, which unfold the *nomadic* motions of faith *in* Jesus, in the word of God spoken by Jesus, and *in* God. Such a dynamic motion defines *faith* and *salvation* as relational action-events *in motion*.

Note also that the act of *faith* revolves around a spoken word. This establishes the fact that the spoken word is a *way* to salvation, an *entrance* to the kingdom of God. That is, the kingdom of God brought by Jesus is an *open* and *deterritorialized* network that can be connected from any point, or by people at any distance from Jesus, which indicates that the kingdom of God is everywhere and is nowhere. On the one hand, it is *nowhere* because it is *invisible*. On the other hand, however, it is *everywhere* because it can be accessed wherever the word(s) of God are articulated and preached. In this sense, Luke understands the spoken word of God as a *door*, an *entrance*, to the invisible kingdom of God that is *all* around and among people (*everywhere*). By the *power of faith*, the centurion recognizes the word spoken by Jesus as the word of God, and as a *door* to the invisible kingdom of God. That is, *by faith* or the *power of faith*, the *virtual* kingdom becomes the *actual* kingdom.

5.5.3.3. Luke 17:19. In this story, Jesus encounters the ten lepers on his way to Jerusalem (v. 14). Excluding Jesus' response to the request of the ten lepers (v. 14a) and that of the Samaritan (vv. 17-19), the narrative is divided into two major scenes: the story of the ten lepers (vv. 12-13, 14b) and that of the Samaritan (vv. 15-
16. The first scene takes place outside the village and the latter occurs inside it. What divides them is the visible mark of leprosy (dirt).

Here is the first scene. When the ten lepers see Jesus, they say, "Jesus, Master, have mercy on us!" In response to their request, Jesus says, "Go and show yourselves to the priests." On their way to the priests, they realize that they have been cleansed. It is worth noting that, in contrast to the scene in 5:12-14, Luke does not explicitly record Jesus' healing words, "be cleansed" (cf. 5:13), or suggest that Jesus touches the lepers. Instead, Jesus simply commands them to go and show themselves to the priests. But because lepers are separated from the social world of the temple through the visible marks of God's punishment, so they cannot just go and show themselves to the priests while still bearing these visible mark(s). Yet they recognize Jesus' authoritative and salvational words, act, and move in response to Jesus' words, demonstrating that faith is a multiple act of hearing and doing. On their way to the priests, they find themselves to be cleansed and healed.

Marshall classifies the faith of the nine (coming to Jesus and obeying him) as "incomplete faith," but what does he mean by incomplete faith? Marshall does not explain, and he downplays the fact that all ten lepers have experienced God's salvation as the direct result of their faithful act. Even though Luke differentiates the nine from the Samaritan in the second scene, he does not present the faith of the nine as incomplete faith; rather, he presents all ten as people who have experienced God's salvation. As a result, the ten lepers, who were once disconnected from the temple, now experience God's salvation through Jesus. Note also that this salvational event occurs outside the village, or in-between regions (v. 11), which defines the kingdom of God as open, deterritorialized, and stretchable. That is, the kingdom of God cannot be closed and territorialized by static regions or places.

The second scene is defined by how the Samaritan responds positively to Jesus, through whom he has been saved. Out of the ten lepers who experience God's salvation through Jesus, only one of them returns to Jesus. On his return, the

---

940 As Leviticus 13 and Number 5:2-3 instruct, a practice of separating leprous persons from others seems to have been widely practiced in the first century, and the term ἁπάθεια (at or from distance) suggests this. Also, 2 Kings 7:3 illustrates that a general habitation for lepers is located outside the town. See Green, Luke, pp. 622, 625; Marshall, Luke, p. 650


942 The aorist passive ἐκαθαρίσθην clearly implies that they were cleaned.
Samaritan falls at Jesus' feet,\footnote{Johnson, Luke, p. 92. Green notes that the act of “falling at the feet” signifies reverence (cf. Josh 10:24; 1 Sam 25:24, 41), Luke, p. 625.} gives thanks to him, and glorifies God, which depicts Jesus and God as the objects of his faith. At the precise moment of his public prostrations before Jesus, Jesus said, “Your faith has saved you” (v. 19). Here Luke again makes an explicit connection between belief and salvation, and precisely links the phrase with the second act of the Samaritan (vv. 15-16). The concept of salvation does not merely refer to his physical healing, but to something more:\footnote{So also C. Talbert, Reading Luke, p. 165 and Tannehill, The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts, 1:119.} the Samaritan is now connected to Jesus, who has brought the kingdom of God,\footnote{Green notes that the Samaritan gains something more than physical healing, namely, insight into Jesus' role in the in-breaking kingdom. Green, Luke, p. 627.} and the invisible kingdom of God is visualized when the Samaritan publicly articulates how God has saved him through Jesus. Thus the soteriological event(s) preached and performed by Jesus draw people to God and encourage them to glorify God,\footnote{The phrase “glorifying God” in 17:15 clearly points in this direction (cf. Luke 5:25-26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43.} as well as establishing the relational space between God, Jesus, the Samaritan, and the audience. In this scene, then, Luke depicts a shift in the medium of salvation from the Jerusalem temple (a static place) to Jesus (motional space), whom Luke depicts as the salvational node, way, or network to be accessed.

In short, what brings salvation to the ten lepers is their faith. Here faith is expressed as composed of multiple acts of hearing and doing, signifying that it is a relational action, and an act of faith revolving around the words spoken about Jesus or his saving events. Jesus and God are presented as the objects of faith. Again the kingdom of God is pictured as open, and ready to be accessed from any point(s) or by any person(s). Notice that the Samaritan initially makes contact with the kingdom by his first act and the invisible kingdom of God is visualized by his second act. This twofold structure discloses the dynamic motions of the event: the act of hearing the word, coming to Jesus, experiencing salvation, and glorifying God. Again, then, faith and salvation are relational, and in motion. What inspires the flows of faith and salvation is accepting the message of Jesus, and thus the word of Jesus is the door to salvation, the entrance to the kingdom.

5.5.3.4. Luke 18:42. In the episode of the blind man in 18:35-43, Luke narrates how the blind man meets Jesus by the road (i.e. beyond the saving map),
publicly expresses his strong desire to see, and regains his sight (salvation). This narrative contains the only instance where Luke places the two soteriological formulas, receive your sight and your faith has saved you, in the same verse. Previously, and particularly in stories about healing, Jesus pronounces the formula \( \pi\iota\tau\iota \zeta \sigma\omicron \omicron \omicron \kappa\omicron \nu \zeta \) after people are healed (8:48; 17:19) and released from their sins (7:48, 50). As opposed to Matthew 20:34 and Mark 10:52, however, here Luke has Jesus use the formula, \( \pi\iota\tau\iota \zeta \sigma\omicron \omicron \kappa\omicron \nu \zeta \) along with the healing command receive your sight ('\( \nu\alpha\upsilon\rho\omega\pi\alpha\iota\eta\omicron\nu \)'). This establishes the nexus between your sins are forgiven and your faith has saved you, and links the two expressions to the same salvational event. Thus Luke again links faith and salvation and discloses its dynamic movements.

Nolland argues that the faith of the blind man does not relate to a Son-of-David-confession, but to his persistence in the midst of the crowd's resistance, but in fact \( \pi\iota\tau\iota \zeta \) refers neither to a Son-of-David confession nor his persistence, but to the nomadic movements of the blind man's faith demonstrating that faith is relational and multiple event in motion. As the phrase your faith has saved you reveals, the blind man is depicted as the one who is connected to the kingdom of God brought by Jesus; Green argues that "For this man to be 'saved' affirms that he has...”

---

947 As he sat by the road and begged, he heard a multitude going by. But when he heard that Jesus was passing by, he called Jesus for help. He said, "Jesus, Son of David, have mercy on me!" (v. 37). But the crowd prevented him from coming to Jesus. Yet he did not stop, but kept crying out all the more, "Son of David, have mercy on me!" (v. 38). Because of his undying request in the midst of the crowd's resistance (v. 39), Jesus finally noticed him and asked him what he wanted. When Jesus heard that he wanted to regain his sight, Jesus said, "Receive your sight; your faith has saved you" (v. 42). As a direct result of Jesus' miraculous work, the formerly blind man glorified God, and all the people praised God. As our task here is to examine the precise relationship between belief and salvation, and establish the object/s of belief, we will limit ourselves to those areas.

948 This narrative also contains the actual account of healing of the blind (cf. 4:18; 7:22).

949 As already noted, the phrase "your sins are forgiven" parallels the phrase "your faith has saved you" in signifying the soteriological event.


953 Green notes, "The faith of the blind man refers to both his openness to and expectation of divine benefaction through Jesus' agency and in his persistence in the fact of obstruction," Luke, p. 665. In contrast to Mark 10:47, the account in Luke 18:36-37 details the conversation between the blind man and bystanders and elaborates on how the blind man overcomes the hostile environment. What motivate him to overpower the hostile bystanders are his strong desire to be healed and his trust in Jesus. As the words: Jesus, Son of David, and Lord suggest, the blind man had already heard about Jesus, or the soteriological event(s) preached and performed by Jesus (cf. 4:14, 37; 5:15; 7:17).
entered the kingdom of God." Moreover, the blind man is presented as a person through whom the invisible kingdom of God is visualized and expanded, as he publicly recognizes Jesus as the one through whom God saves. As a result, both the blind man and all people who are around him and Jesus glorify God, and thus the kingdom of God formed between God, Jesus, the blind man, and Jesus' audience expands and proliferates through Jesus. Because this salvational event takes place by the road (outside the temple), an 'in-between' place, we see that kingdom of God brought by Jesus is open and ready to be accessed from any point.

This is the flow of events in the salvation of the blind man. The act of hearing the words about Jesus who was passing by → calling on Jesus, Son of David → overcoming an obstacle → receiving salvation (regaining sight) → glorifying God. The kingdom of God is a relational network, and faith is a multiple, relational and dynamic event, that is, something becoming and in motion.

5.5.3.5 Summary. Just as an act of coming to Jesus presumes an act of hearing and departing, so also faith involves multiple acts of hearing and doing, signifying that faith is a relational action that revolves around words spoken about Jesus or the soteriological events by which people act and move. Although Jesus and the word(s) of God that he speaks are depicted as the immediate objects of faith, and God is presented as the ultimate object of faith, they should not be viewed as separate entities, but as equivalent soteriological realities. Thus the idea of faith in Jesus and in God should be understood in terms of faithful actions in relation to Jesus and to God: hearing the word → departing → coming to Jesus or calling on Jesus → overcoming an obstacle → acknowledging Jesus' willingness to save → receiving salvation → glorifying God → returning home to create the new relational space of God that is now in motion.

What motivates people to come to Jesus is that they accept and trust the word(s) spoken about Jesus, and so Jesus and the spoken words act like a door to salvation and an entrance to the kingdom of God. Thus, just as faith and salvation are presented as the same saving event, so they should be understood not as fixed or frozen moments, but as dynamic events that are flowing, becoming and in motion. As I have illustrated, the kingdom of God brought by Jesus is pictured as open and ready.

---

954 As Green rightly notes, "he has already gained 'very much more in this age, and in the age to come eternal life' (v. 30), Luke, p. 665.

955 The act of glorifying God is viewed as an act of firm trust in God. Clearly Jesus' miraculous work draws people to trust in and glorify God (cf. 2:20; 5:25, 26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15).
to be accessed from any persons and points, showing that the kingdom of God is everywhere and nowhere. It is nowhere because it is invisible, and it is everywhere because people can connect to it wherever and whenever the word(s) of God is articulated. The spoken word of God is therefore a door to the invisible kingdom that moves in, between, among, and all around people, and Luke depicts Jesus as the central node of that network of salvation (Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11; cf. Ps. 118:22). In other words, Luke replaces the old way to salvation (the Jerusalem temple) with a new way to salvation (Jesus). It is by faith, and the power of faith, that a person recognizes that the spoken word of Jesus is the word of God, and so finds a way to the invisible kingdom of God. That is, by faith or the power of faith, the virtual kingdom becomes the actual kingdom of God.

5.6 Faith in Acts

My intention here is not to analyze all the issues that surface from within the faith texts, but, just as I did with the third gospel, I will focus on πιστεύειν and the πίστις group. By examining them, we will consider the meaning of faith, its objects, and the link between believing in the words of God articulated by Jesus’ disciples, believing in the Lord Jesus, and believing in the Lord God. Just as Luke links belief with salvation in his first volume, so also in Acts they refer to the same salvational event. Although Jesus is portrayed as a prophet in his gospel, Luke presents the risen Jesus as Lord and Christ (Messiah) in Acts and describes Jesus’ disciples as

---

957 Luke 7:50; 8:12, 48, 50; 17:19; 18:42.
sub-agents who speak and act in the name of Jesus to validate their salvational activity. Luke portrays them as men of power and wonder workers for the Lord Jesus, who is the source of their authority and power, and as men through whom the salvation and kingdom of God expand and proliferate.

5.6.1 Faith in the soteriological events.

5.6.1.1 Acts 3:16. Here Peter and John use the phrase in the name of Jesus for the first time, and link the name with faith and salvation. In relation to salvation, scholars are divided over whose faith is displayed here. Conzelmann argues that it is the faith of the lame man that is implied here, but Barrett argues that it does not refer to the faith of the sick, but to the faith of the performer (Peter), because the sick man does not exercise his belief, but only expects to receive money (3:5). Yet Bruce argues that the faith of the two apostles and that of the cripple are implied. Bruce's position seems to be the most likely interpretation. Clearly, as 3:6-8 shows, when Peter commands the lame man to walk, he stands up and walks, demonstrating that the lame man's action revolves around the words of God spoken by Peter. For Peter's part, faith is described as a complete trust in the Lord Jesus, who bestows on him the salvational power to heal when he calls on the name of Jesus. As for the lame man, faith is depicted as hearing the word spoken by Peter and acting upon it.

This means that the faith of Peter and that of the cripple are depicted as relational actions or events. More importantly, as the phrase in the name of Jesus used by Peter in the present text indicates, the relational action between Peter and the blind man is connected to the name and the faith that comes through Jesus (v. 16b), whom God glorified (v. 13) and raised from the dead (v. 15). This defines the name of Jesus and faith in him as comprising the salvational power of Jesus by which Peter


961 See chapter 4.
965 Bruce, Acts, p. 142.
967 It is not clear whether δὲ τούτου means "through him" (Jesus) or "through it" (i.e. the name of Jesus; cf. 10:43); it makes no practical difference. Bruce, Acts, p. 142.
and John preach and perform salvational events, and by which the kingdom (dynamic relational network) of God between God, Jesus, Peter and John, the lame man, and the audience moves and proliferates. In this light, the faith of Peter and that of the blind man are not separate, but interact and refer to the same saving event. Thus, faith should not be interpreted as a static framework of action or event (time and space), but as something in motion. In this context, therefore, faith and salvation should not be understood as separate entities, but as interconnected acts that refer to the same saving event, which reveals the nomadic flows of faith expressed by Peter and John in Jesus and in God, which depicts faith and salvation as relational and as something in motion.

5.6.1.2. Acts 14:9. The soteriological event performed by Paul at Lystra (14:8-18) seems to parallel the saving event performed by Peter at the Beautiful Gate (3:2-9). Here again Luke emphasizes the integration of faith and salvation. As he is preaching the gospel, Paul encounters a man who has never walked, because he was lame from his mother’s womb (14:7-10). The lame man is listening to the words preached by Paul, and when Paul looks at him closely and sees him having faith or the desire to be saved, Paul says, “Stand upright on your feet” (14:10). At Paul’s command, the lame man leaps up and walks. His action is described as faith; that is, a responsive action disclosing the relationship between hearing and doing. Conzelmann views the belief of the lame man as a “precondition” for his salvation. But the meaning of “precondition” here is unclear and vague. In the story no clear precondition is laid out. Although the lame man does not repent, nor is he baptized in the name of Jesus, he is saved nevertheless.

At first glance, the term πίστις can be viewed as something one possesses, as the word ξείει implies. The same conclusion may be drawn about ἰδὼν, which refers to a visible expression. Note that Paul’s behavior parallels that of Jesus in Luke 5:20, where Jesus releases the paralytic from sin and sickness when he “sees” the belief of the paralytic’s friends. In contrast to Luke 5:20, however, there seems to be no visible act on the part of the sick man in 14:9. As the phrase οὗτος ἡκουσεν suggests, Luke links the act of hearing the word(s) spoken and commanded by Paul with the lame man’s “strong desire” to be saved, and it is this which brings about

968 Cf. Beg, vol. 4, p. 163.
969 Conzelmann, Acts, p. 110.
970 Cf. Mk 11:22; Lk 17:6; Acts 14:9; Rom 14:22; 1 Co 13:2.
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salvation, rather than any specific act of repentance.\footnote{Luke has already made the link between hearing and belief (Acts 4:4; 15:7; 18:8), but the texts in Luke 8:12-13 seem to indicate that an act of hearing or of accepting the word of God does not in itself bring/produce salvation. As Luke 8:50 clearly indicates, belief, or the power of belief, is required to actuate salvation. As Jesus says, “Only believe and she shall be saved.” As the subsequent narrative reveals (8:54-55), Jairus believes the words of Jesus and so his daughter is saved. Also bear in mind that the Holy Spirit falls upon those who hear the word \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\omicron\omega\omicron\upsilon\omicron\tau\zeta\) in Acts 10:44.} This means that the responsive action(s) of the lame man, - the integration of hearing and wanting to be saved (cf. 2:21) - revolves around the words spoken by Paul. In other words, salvation begins with the saving word of God, and it is the spoken word of God that acts as a door to salvation and an entrance to the invisible kingdom. Thus Paul states, in 14:14-27, that the purpose of his preaching the gospel to the people is to turn them to the living God (14:15) who opens a door of faith, a door of salvation, an entrance of the kingdom of God to the Gentiles (14:27).

5.6.2. Belief of believers and their saving event. Interestingly, in Acts the participle of \(\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\) refers to the believers.\footnote{The act of baptism here can be seen as an outer expression of one’s belief in the Lord Jesus, as the use of the name of Jesus at baptism indicates. Cf. Dunn, Baptism of the Holy Spirit, pp. 90-102.} Luke presents the believers as those who are saved, and depicts their saving activity. As we shall see, Luke’s use of the participle of \(\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\) recalls those who are connected to the new saving network of God established by Jesus, and to its dynamic expansion.

5.6.2.1. Acts 2:44. The present participle \(\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\epsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\) in this text refers to the believers who are connected to the new saving network of God established by Jesus.\footnote{The act of baptism here can be seen as an outer expression of one’s belief in the Lord Jesus, as the use of the name of Jesus at baptism indicates. Cf. Dunn, Baptism of the Holy Spirit, pp. 90-102.} As the phrase \(\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\zeta\acute{\alpha}\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\tau\omicron\ \tau\omicron\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\nu\ \alpha\omicron\tau\omicron\ \varepsilon\beta\alpha\pi\tau\iota\theta\omicron\omicron\nu\omicron\) in 2:41 clearly indicates, what triggers their belief in Jesus and encourages them to be baptized in his name\footnote{The act of baptism here can be seen as an outer expression of one’s belief in the Lord Jesus, as the use of the name of Jesus at baptism indicates. Cf. Dunn, Baptism of the Holy Spirit, pp. 90-102.} is the word of God spoken by Peter.\footnote{The act of baptism here can be seen as an outer expression of one’s belief in the Lord Jesus, as the use of the name of Jesus at baptism indicates. Cf. Dunn, Baptism of the Holy Spirit, pp. 90-102.} Here, the word of God is presented as the object of faith, and faith is described as a relational action/event composed of hearing (the word) and doing (baptism). As the idea of baptism in the name of Jesus clearly indicates, the purpose of the saving events – the coming of the Holy Spirit
(2:2-13) and the preaching of Peter (2:14-36) – is to draw people to believe in, or to be connected to, Jesus whom God made both Lord and Messiah (2:36). Note also that their faith is expressed as a way of devoting themselves to the teachings of the apostles, to living in fellowship, breaking bread, and prayer (2:41-42).

Furthermore, their daily practice of faith is demonstrated as they sell their property and distribute all their possessions to those who are in need (2:44-45). This echoes Jesus’ answer to the question of a certain ruler, who asked Jesus “What must I do to inherit eternal life?” (Luke 18:18). Of course, such a question can be seen as articulating a search for the door to the kingdom of God (Luke 18:24). In response to the ruler’s question, Jesus says, “Sell all that you own and distribute the money to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; then come, follow me” (Luke 18:22; cf. 6:27-38; 12:33). When the ruler hears these words he is very sad, because he is very rich (18:23). Thus, Jesus said, “How hard it is for those who have wealth to enter the kingdom of God! Indeed, it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for someone who is rich to enter the kingdom of God” (18:24-25).

On the one hand, the word(s) of the kingdom of God preached by Jesus becomes good news to the poor (Luke 6:20; 4:18). On the other hand, the same words are seen as a stumbling block to the rich ruler (cf. Luke 2:34). Interestingly, the believers in Acts 2:46-47 gladly share their property with the needy, with a sincere heart, and praise God, demonstrating that they are those who are saved (2:47) and connected to the kingdom of God, and people through whom God’s kingdom moves and proliferates. Thus, Luke’s use of πιστεύετε (the believers) in this present text exposes (1) those who are saved/connected to the new redemptive network of God set in motion by Jesus and (2) the nomadic motions of their saving activities. Also, as 2:47 clearly indicates, the relational network of God launched by Jesus proliferates and moves through the nomadic movements of God’s saving events, as preached and performed by Jesus’ disciples and actuated by belief in the word of God spoken by these disciples, showing that faith (a responsive action) revolves around the spoken word of God, which acts as an entrance to the kingdom.

976 Just as they repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus, so also they are released from sins and receive the Holy Spirit (2:38), suggesting that they are connected to the saving network of God established by Jesus.

977 The phrase “the Lord added to their number those who were being saved” discloses the expansion (time-space) of the soteriological network of God brought by Jesus. Such an idea is clearly demonstrated in Acts 5:14, where Luke writes: “More than ever believers were added to the Lord [signifying the saving network of God brought by Jesus], great numbers of both men and women”.
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lies all around them. By the power of faith, a person will recognize that the words spoken by Peter are the words of God, and so see a door to the invisible kingdom.

5.6.2.2. Acts 4:32. As in 2:44, the phrase τοῦ δὲ πλήθους τῶν πιστευώντων signifies the community of believers,\(^\text{978}\) recalling those people who are saved, i.e. connected to the new soteriological network of God laid down by Jesus and expressed through the dynamic movement of their saving events. Here again, the word of God is presented as the object of faith. As they do in Acts 2:44, people initially believe when they hear the word of God (4:4). Since the content of God’s word here concerns the Lord Jesus whom God raised from the dead, the Lord Jesus and God are presented as the objects of faith. This conclusion is confirmed in 4:33, where Luke reports that, “The apostles were giving witness to the resurrection of the Lord Jesus” (cf. 4:2). Bear in mind that it is God who made Jesus as the Lord and Messiah (cf. 2:36), who appointed Jesus to bless all people (3:18ff.), who glorified Jesus by raising him from the dead (3:13), and who exalted Jesus as a prince and a savior to grant forgiveness of sins (5:31).\(^\text{979}\) Luke constantly reminds his readers that it is God who performs miracles, wonders, and signs through Jesus (2:22), and that it is God who stands behind the resurrection of Jesus and grants Jesus’ saving authority and power. This means that Jesus’ saving events are subsumed within God’s ultimate acts of redemption.

Note also that none of the community of the believers claim their property as their own, but they consider all things as common property (4:32); thus, the leaders of the community distribute property to the people according to need. As in the case with 2:42-47, the summary of 4:32-35 depicts the daily activities of the new saving network of God, and reveals that the believers and their saving events navigate the new saving network of God launched by Jesus.\(^\text{980}\) In short, the participle πιστεύωντες exposes the relationship between faith and salvation, and foregrounds the new saving network of God and its nomadic motions conveyed by Jesus’ disciples. Just as God

---

\(^\text{978}\) The word τοῦ πλήθους here denotes “the assembly” (cf. Johnson, Acts, p. 86) or “the congregation”. Haenchen notes that the primary meaning of πλήθος is the “multitude” or “crowd,” and the second basic meaning is “the congregation,” Acts, p. 231.

\(^\text{979}\) Tannehill describes God as the hidden actor behind each state of Jesus’ story. Narrative Unity, vol. 2, p. 36.

\(^\text{980}\) Such saving activity echoes the words of Jesus. I have already noted that in Luke 18:22, Jesus tells the rich ruler, “Sell (πωλήσον) all that you have and distribute (διαδίδος) to the poor” and he also tells the disciples, “Sell (πωλήσατε) your possession and give (δότε) alms (12:33).
extends his salvation to all believers, so these believers become the ones who bring the kingdom of God to the ends of the earth.

5.6.2.3. Acts 10:43. This text informs us that all the prophets testify that everyone who believes in him [Jesus] receives release of sins through (διὰ) his name. Once again, the words of God spoken by the prophets, and the names and persons of Jesus and God are presented as the objects of faith. Because the name implies the person of Jesus, Luke reiterates the link between belief in Jesus and salvation. Not only does belief in Jesus represent one’s desire to be connected to the new saving network of God planted by Jesus, but Luke also presents the name of Jesus as the central node to be connected to, revealing that everyone who wants to be connected shall be connected by believing in and accepting Jesus (cf. 2:21). As already mentioned, the ultimate purpose of Luke’s emphasis on believing in the name, or in the Lord Jesus himself, is to encourage his audience to have faith in God who stands behind the resurrection of Jesus. Note, as 10:38-42 indicates, it is God who (1) anointed Jesus with the Holy Spirit so that he could heal all who were oppressed by the devil (10:38); (2) raised Jesus from the dead (10:40); (3) appointed Jesus as Judge of the living and the dead (10:42).

Note also that Luke links faith with salvation (release of sin) in Acts 10:43, and he connects faith to hearing the word of God articulated by Peter and to salvation (the reception of the Holy Spirit) in 10:44, thus depicting faith as a relational action. Hence, the multiple objects of faith (the words of God articulated by Peter, faith in Jesus and in God) are not isolated, but they interact and refer to the same soteriological network of God set in motion by Jesus. In other words, as the locative word indicates, the saving space of Jesus and God is not formed of two different realities, but occupies the same dynamic relational space of God where God, Jesus, and all sorts of people come and interact. Thus, the dynamic movements of faith in the words of Peter, Jesus, and God depict faith as relational and as something in

---

981 In Acts, πιστεύω occurs 3 times with εἰς (believe in, 10:43; 14:23; 19:4), 3 times with ἐπί (believe on, 9:42; 11:17; 16:31), and 7 times with the dative (5:14; 8:12; 16:34; 18:8; 24:14; 26:27; 27:25); cf. TDNT vol. 6, pp. 210-11. Bruce notes that with the dative, πιστεύω means believe or trust (somebody or something), as distinct from πιστεύω εἰς (believe in) and πιστεύω ἐπί (believe on), Acts, p. 168. The term τούτῳ can be translated as masculine (To him all the prophets bear witness...) as well as neuter (To this all the prophets bear witness...). Barrett takes the latter, because the prophets testified certain facts about Jesus not directly testified about Christ, Acts, p. 528; Haenchen, Acts, p. 193.

982 As I have established previously, the name represents the person of the Lord Jesus and his ruling authority and power (cf. the name of Jesus).
motion. What triggers the soteriological event, by which the relational network of God moves and proliferates, is faith. By this faith or the power of faith, one recognizes or receives the word spoken by Jesus’ disciples as the word(s) of God. Faith and salvation both revolve around the word of God, and so the spoken word is a way to salvation, an entrance to the kingdom of God.

5.6.3. Faith-in-the new saving network of God brought by Jesus. I have constantly illustrated the link between faith and the new soteriological network of God launched by Jesus. In fact, in Acts, faith is expressed as in terms of the Christian church (6:7; 13:8; cf. 14:22); thus, not only is the faith in 13:8 related to the word of God, but it also refers to the new saving network of God, i.e. the Church. In Acts 13:8-10, Luke narrates the story of Elymas, who attempts to disconnect the proconsul from the new soteriological network of God brought by Jesus (13:8). In 14:22, Luke explicitly makes a close link between belief, suffering, and entering the kingdom of God (cf. Luke 8:5-15, 21) as signifying the same soteriological event(s) by which the new relational network of God moves. As the phrase ἐμμενεν τῇ πίστει suggests, τῇ πίστει seems to refer to the new saving network of God established by Jesus. This will become clearer when we look at the following text.

Acts 6:7. Luke indicates that as the word about Jesus kept on spreading, the number of disciples increased and a great number of the priests began to obey the faith (ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως). There are several possible interpretations of τῆς πίστεως. Bruce links πίστεως with εὐαγγέλιον (cf. 2 Th. 1:8). Barrett notes that, “πίστεως here must be fides quae, the content of Christian belief and life.” Lake argues, “It seems to imply a use of πίστεως as almost synonymous with ‘the Church.’” Although all of these interpretations are interrelated, weight should be given to the integration of faith, the new saving network of God, and the word of God, which keeps on spreading.

983Bruce argues that the phrase, ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως, means “from his faith”. He notes that it refers to “the subjective fides qua creditur rather than the objective fides quae creditor.” Acts, p. 297. But Lake states, “It seems more likely that from the faith is the right translation, rather than from his belief, which would imply a more technical and later meaning of πίστεως” (Beg, IV, pp. 145-146; Barrett, Acts, p. 616). Though Lake argues that the phrase should be translated as from the faith, he does not suggest a precise reference. Johnson notes that, as in 6:7, the faith is equivalent to the Christian movement, Acts, p. 223.

984Note also that the phrase, ἐμμενεν τῇ πίστει, closely is connected to the phrase προσμενεν τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ in 13:43, suggesting that τῇ πίστει implies strong confidence in God. Barrett notes that it implies confidence in the grace of God. Acts, p. 686.

985Bruce, Acts, p. 185.

986Barrett, Acts, p. 317

987Lake, Beg, IV, p. 66.
to disclose the dynamic movement of faith, and the new dynamic network of God and God’s word.

A couple of observations need to be made. Just as the content of God’s word refers to the Lord Jesus (5:42), in whom people recently believe and accept and whom they obey,\(^\text{998}\) so also it refers to the new soteriological network of God planted by Jesus, and the expansion of this network. As Luke has already linked faith with salvation, the word of God, and the kingdom of God (cf. Luke 8:5-15, 21), the spreading of God’s word parallels the dynamic expansion of God’s kingdom, revealing the new dynamic network of God to be something becoming and in motion.\(^\text{990}\) Note that the use of the imperfect verbs (ηδονέων, ἔπληθυνεν, and ὑπῆκωντο) imply spatializing and relational actions, revealing the dynamic flows of God’s word and his new saving network.

5.6.4. Faith-in-the nomadic movements.

5.6.4.1. Acts 8:12. In this episode (8:4-13), Philip proclaims the word of God\(^\text{991}\) (v. 4) concerning both the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ (vv. 5, 12), and performs healings and exorcisms (vv. 4-8, 13) signifying the saving events that led the Samaritan to believe Philip (v. 12).\(^\text{992}\) As we have seen, Luke represents faith as a consequence of hearing and doing, and here the Samaritan hears the word of God (hearing) and is baptized (doing) in the name of the Lord Jesus (8:12);\(^\text{993}\) faith is a relational action creating a new dynamic space between the speaker and the hearers. Here in Acts, for the first time, Luke links the proclamation of the kingdom

\(^{988}\) The verb ὑπακοῖω (obey) derives from ἀκοῖω, hear, (ὑπερ, hear, is translated by LXX as ὑπακοῖω). Robertson notes that the objective genitive of the phrase εἰς τὸν ὑπακοῖον τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 2 Co 10:5 should be translated as to obey Christ, Word Pictures in the New Testament, 4:253. Luke already has linked belief and obedience (Luke 8:8, 21, 25 and 2 Co 10:5).

\(^{989}\) The phrase the word of God kept on spreading strengthens this point.

\(^{990}\) Some mss. have τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δύναμις.

\(^{992}\) Barrett notes that the use of the dative τῷ Φίλιππῳ with the preacher is somewhat unusual, suggesting that the use of πιστεύειν with the dative of a divine person (cf. 16:34), or with ἐπὶ and the accusative of a divine person (cf. 9:42) makes no practical difference in relation to its use with Philip (Acts, p. 408). As Luke has already made a close link between the word (Acts 8:4) and the person (Acts 8:5), there is no practical difference between belief in the saving events preached and performed by Philip and belief in Philip. Bultmann says, “Faith in the kerygma is inseparable from faith in the person mediated thereby” by quoting Acts 14:23 (“They committed them to the Lord in whom they had believed”) and the use of πιστεύειν ἐπὶ in Acts 9:42; 11:17; 16:31 and 22:19. R. Bultmann, TDNT VI, pp. 211f.

\(^{993}\) See Dunn, Baptism of the Holy Spirit, pp. 63-68. I shall explore this precise connection and the meaning of baptism in the name of Jesus in the following section.
of God with the name of Jesus Christ (8:12), a link that foregrounds the new saving network of God brought by Jesus, and which revolves around the spoken word of God. Furthermore, Luke describes the Samaritans as believers those who are saved, i.e. connected to the new dynamic network of God launched by Jesus. Philip (or the word of God articulated by Philip), Jesus, and God are presented as the multiple objects of faith, which discloses the dynamic flow and movement of faith: in Philip → in the Lord Jesus → in God. Faith is thus a relational action and something in motion. The spoken word parallels the visible soteriological event, and both provide a way to the invisible kingdom of God, and comprise the gateway to the dynamic network of God planted by Jesus. What makes a person see this entrance is the power of faith, by which the virtual reality of the kingdom becomes the actual reality.

5.6.4.2. Acts 14:1, 23. Paul proclaims the word of God in Salamis (13:5), Paphos (13:12), and Pisidian Antioch (13:44, 46, 48, 49; cf. 13:26), and speaks the word of God in Iconium (14:1). As a result, a great multitude (both Jews and Greeks) believe (14:1). Since Paul and Barnabas move and act around the word of God, the object of belief in 14:1 refers to the word of God by which people act and move. Notice that in 14:22, Paul encourages the people to remain in the faith relative to the word of God. Interestingly, the phrase “remain in faith” (εμείνεις τῇ πίστει) exposes the dynamic movement of faith, and the faith here signifies the new soteriological network of God implanted by Jesus. As in 8:12, the content of God’s word(s) is the kingdom of God (13:22) and the Lord Jesus (14:23). As the phrase “to the Lord into whom” (τῷ κυρίῳ εἰς δυναστείαν) indicates, the object of faith in 14:23 is the Lord Jesus himself, in whom the elders were commended and in whom they recently believed. Moreover, in the summary statement of their first overseas missionary journey in 14:27, Paul and Barnabas report what God has done with them, and how he has
opened *a door of faith* to the Gentiles. This indicates that the saving events preached and performed by Paul and the other disciples are viewed as God’s redemptive events triggered by Jesus.\(^{1000}\) This echoes 14:3 and points forward to 15:6-12.

By inserting this summary, Luke reminds his audience that it is the spoken word of God that opens *a door of faith*,\(^{1001}\) a *way of salvation*, or an *entrance of the kingdom* to the Gentiles (14:27) positioning the spoken word of God as a *way* or an *entrance* to the *new* saving network of God. Through *faith*, the Gentiles recognize the words spoken by Jesus’ disciples to be the words of God, and thus they find an *entrance* to the invisible kingdom of God that moves *all* around them. In other words, by the power of their faith, the *virtual* reality of God’s kingdom becomes *actual* reality. Bear in mind that Luke has already stated that such a dynamic movement of faith comes from Jesus (3:16), suggesting that the soteriological act of God is the direct result of the joint efforts of Jesus and those who respond to Jesus’ message. Thus Jesus’ disciples (or the words spoken by them), Jesus himself, and God are presented as the objects of faith. These multiple objects of faith should not be understood as separate entities, but as interconnected events that signify the same dynamic relational network.

### 5.6.4.3. Acts 16:31, 34.

Interestingly, in 16:30 the jailor addresses Paul and Silas as *lords* (κύριοι), but they instruct him to *believe* in the *Lord Jesus* (κυρίον Ἰησοῦν) instead.\(^{1002}\) As a direct answer to the question asked by the jailor, the text in 16:31 clearly displays what he and his household must do to be saved:\(^{1003}\) by *believing* in the Lord Jesus, he will be saved. As he does elsewhere, Luke makes the connection between *belief* and *salvation*. The words πιστεύω (an imperative aorist) and οὐσθην (a future passive) clearly indicate that *believing* in the Lord Jesus will bring salvation in the future (cf. Acts 14:9). Marshall rightly notes that the phrase *believe on* [ἐπί] the Lord Jesus is a reflection of the early Christian confessional

---

1000][Ibid., p. 419. Squires claims, “the events of both volumes can be understood as ‘all that God had done’ (14:27, 15:4),” *The plan of God*, in *Witness to the Gospel*, p. 22.
1001][Barrett proposes the meaning(s) πιστεύω in three ways: a *way in*, leading to *faith* (objective genitive), *where faith enters* (subjective genitive), and *a door* (into *salvation*) consisting of *faith* (an appositional genitive). Barrett, *Acts*, p. 692.
1002][Green, *Witness to the Gospel*, p. 103.
1003][The inclusion of *your household* (οἶκος ὦν) recalls the story of Lydia (16:15) and of Cornelius (11:14). Johnson, *Acts*, p. 301.
statement: here is to believe Jesus to be the Lord and Christ whom God has raised from dead (cf. 2:36). This establishes a new relational space between God, Jesus, Jesus’ disciples, and the Jailor. But what does it mean to believe?

I have repeatedly indicated that Luke expresses faith in many different ways. Yet the essential or basic meaning(s) of faith can be described as the integration of hearing and doing, seeing faith as a responsive action, a relational event, or/and a dynamic movement. Thus, faith should not be understood as a static or fixed moment - that is, the fixed statement of Jesus-Lord-Christ’s confession - but as a dynamic event of flows and fluids. This will be clearer when we look at the nomadic movements of faith in the Lord Jesus and in God. The idea of belief in the Lord Jesus is closely related to belief in God, as the dative τῷ θεῷ clearly indicates. In fact, the one who believes the Lord Jesus (16:31) is now described as the one who believes God (16:34). The Jailor, who believes in God, shows his hospitality by serving food and rejoicing, and each act is dependent upon the others.

By linking 16:31 and 16:34, Luke demonstrates that, for all intents and purposes, an act of belief in the Lord Jesus is equivalent to an act of belief in God, and that both refer to the same dynamic space initiated by Jesus. Now, by believing in Jesus and in God, the Jailor and his whole household are connected to this new dynamic relational network, and thus faith here is represented as a relational action/event and as something in motion, disclosing the dynamic movement of faith.

---

1004 Cf. Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 12:3; Phil 2:11. The act of believing here requires trust in and commitment to Jesus as Lord (cf. 9:42; 11:17). Marshall, Acts, p. 273. As the phrase ἔρι τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ clear  indicates, the object of belief is the Lord Jesus.

1005 Some mass. C D E Ψ 0120 33 sy sa add Χριστόν.


1009 Johnson, Acts, p. 301; Barrett, Acts, p. 799. It appears that Luke has already implicitly portrayed God as the object of πιστεύω in Acts 16:25, where Paul and Silas pray and sing hymns of praise to God (τῷ θεῷ). At the same time, it is important to note that Paul and his companions are portrayed not only as those who proclaim the way of salvation, but also as servants of the Most High God. The message of salvation they proclaim seems to be validated by their behavior described in 16:25-29 (cf. 16:18). Interestingly, those who instruct the jailer to believe in the Lord Jesus are identified as servants of God, to whom they pray and give praise. Hence, it seems quite natural for Luke to describe the Jailer as someone who believes in God, and in whom he rejoices greatly (cf. Luke 1:47; 10:21; Acts 2:26). For Luke, the ultimate object of belief is God, who is the ultimate source of salvation.

1010 The perfect active participle πιστεύω, having believed, denotes permanent belief (cf. Robertson, Robertson’s word pictures, 3:263.)
What activates the new dynamic relational space between God, Jesus, Paul and Silas, the Jailer, and his family is the word of the Lord (God)\textsuperscript{1011} spoken by Paul in 16:31-32, and again the spoken word of God becomes the entrance to the invisible kingdom of God. Note also that through the power of faith, the Jailer recognizes/accepts that the word(s) spoken by Paul and Silas are the word(s) of God, and so finds a door into the kingdom of God. By his faith, the virtual kingdom becomes the actual reality by which he moves and acts.

In Acts 26:27, the dynamic movement of faith is seen once more: in the words of God spoken by the Prophets (26:27)\textsuperscript{1012} in the Lord Jesus\textsuperscript{1013} in God\textsuperscript{1014}.

5.7 Conclusion

My primary goal in this chapter has been to understand what one must do to be saved from the perspective of Luke-Acts. I have examined this soteriological question in close connection with the query how can one enter the kingdom of God? I have examined the meaning(s) of faith and its objects, and its relationship to the nomadic flows and movements of faith: in Jesus’ disciples and the words of God spoken by them, in the Lord Jesus, and in God. I have then proposed that we rethink faith, not as a hierarchical or the fixed moment(s) of action, but as a relational and multiple event and as something in motion. As we have seen, what activates the nomadic motions of faith is the inter-connection between the saving event(s) conveyed by Jesus and his disciples and the positive responses of the people. In this light, faith is presented as a reciprocal action that creates a relational space between a subject(s) and an object(s), which unfolds the endless flows of the relational network of God established by Jesus.

\textsuperscript{1011}Some mass. n* B pc have θεού.

\textsuperscript{1012}Not only does Paul’s teaching parallel the words of the Prophets, but also Paul speaks and acts in the place of the Prophets. Of course, to believe (to hear and to act) the Prophets here means to believe in their words relating to the message that the Christ had to suffer and would be raised from the dead (26:23; cf. Luke 24:46).

\textsuperscript{1013}Just as the purpose of Paul’s question to King Agrippa is to challenge him to believe in the Lord Jesus, since the words of the Prophet were fulfilled in him (26:23; cf. Luke 24:46), so also King Agrippa could have believed in the Lord Jesus: if he believed in the Prophets, then he should have believed the Lord Jesus (cf. Haenchen, p. 689; Barrett, Acts, p. 1169).

\textsuperscript{1014}As the content of 26:18 and 26:20 suggests, God is still presented as the ultimate object of belief. The verse 26:18 indicates that the purpose of Paul’s mission is to turn people from the power of Satan (darkness) to the power of God (light). For this reason, not only does Paul instruct his audience to repent and to return to God (26:20), but also the acts of repentance and of returning to God are also acts of belief (cf. Acts 20:21). The phrase performing deeds appropriate to repentance in 26:20 also implies an outer expression of their belief and obedience to God (cf. Bruce, Acts, p. 503; Conzelmann, Acts, p. 211).
In Luke, although faith is expressed in many different ways, it must be viewed in close connection to the relationship between hearing the word(s) of God and acting upon it, emphasizing that faith is a relational action or event that unfolds in nomadic flows. These nomadic flows revolve around and are based upon the spoken words of God, which act as a door to salvation and an entrance to the kingdom of God. That is, the spoken word(s) of God is marked as a juncture where God and people interact. What makes a person find a way to salvation and to enter the kingdom is faith, i.e. a positive response to the words of God articulated by God’s messengers. Note the nomadic movements of faith: hearing the word(s) about Jesus or his saving events → departing → coming to Jesus or calling on Jesus → overcoming an obstacle → Jesus displaying a willingness to save → receiving salvation → glorifying God → returning home. Faith and salvation are therefore relational and in motion.

Moreover, as the phrase your faith has saved you indicates, faith and salvation are not isolated, but interactive, and refer to the same soteriological event by which the new relational space of God, launched by Jesus, expands and moves via Jesus’ disciples. In contrast to the closed and territorialized network of the temple, the nomadic network of God brought by Jesus is presented as open, ready, and deterritorialized, something that can be connected to from any distant point(s) and person(s), suggesting that the kingdom of God is everywhere and is nowhere. It is nowhere because it is invisible, and it is everywhere because it can be connected to wherever the word(s) of God is articulated. Not only is the word of God a door to the invisible kingdom, it also moves all around people and is everywhere. Note also that it is by faith or the power of faith that a person recognizes that the word spoken by Jesus is the word of God, and so finds a way to the invisible kingdom of God. Put differently, by faith or the power of faith, the virtual kingdom becomes the actual kingdom of God. Thus faith should not be understood in terms of a static or fixed framework of action, but as a nomadic event that is in motion.

As in the gospel of Luke, in Acts faith is pictured as the integration of hearing and doing, and revolves around the spoken word of God, which acts as the door to salvation and an entrance to the kingdom of God. Again, faith and salvation are presented, not as separate entities, but as inter-related, referring to the same soteriological event by which the new saving network of God, launched by Jesus, moves and proliferates. In Acts, however, Luke explicitly links faith and salvation with the name of Jesus. Also faith is expressed in terms of devoting oneself, to the
teachings of the apostles, to fellowship, to the breaking of bread, to prayer (2:41-42), to selling property, and to distributing all possessions to those who are in need (2:44-45). In Acts, as in Luke, Jesus’ disciples (or the words of God spoken by them), the Lord Jesus, and God are presented as the objects of faith. Just as in the rest of Luke-Acts, however, these multiple objects of faith should not be understood as separate, but as inter-connected.

Overall, then, faith should not be understood as a static or fixed moment of action, but as a dynamic flow and movement by which the new saving network of God, initiated by Jesus, expands and proliferates. The dynamic movement of faith is activated by the spoken word of God, which functions as a door to salvation, an entrance to the kingdom of God. By faith or by the power of faith, the virtual (invisible) kingdom becomes the actual (visible) kingdom.
Chapter Six

Conclusion

The primary purpose of this thesis has been to investigate Luke’s soteriology from the geographical (spatial-temporal) perspective of Luke within the extant literature of Luke’s salvational narrative world. Within this framework I have mainly made three proposals.

First, I have proposed that we rethink Luke’s ideas of time and space. (1) They do not function as either time or space, but both time and space, and thus represent the same reality of event or action. (2) They should not be seen in terms of a static sequence that is absolute, linear, and binary, but as relative or relational and as something in motion. (3) They are not hierarchical or singular, but heterogeneous and multiple. Thus, I propose that we think of Luke’s time-space not in terms of static boundaries or regional territories, signifying quantitative change, but in terms of nomadic flows and movements from one place to another, signifying qualitative change in type and kind.

In relation to this, I have also proposed that we rethink the idea of saving event(s), seeing them not in terms of static containers of moment(s) or inert frameworks of action(s), but as something in motion. Saving events unfold the nomadic flows and movements initiated by Jesus and expanded by Jesus’ disciples, moving from Galilee (outside) to Jerusalem (inside), and from Jerusalem (inside) to the ends of the earth (outside). These saving event(s) do not have a static beginning or ending, but they occur in between and from outside. As the nomadic event of flows moves fluidly throughout multiple regions and connects to many other people in various places, it deterritorializes the fixed, binary, and hierarchical system of the Jerusalem temple, creates the heterogeneous and relational space of God, and establishes multiple access points to the new saving network of God that lie in, in-between, among, around, and beyond regions. This means that the kingdom of God brought by Jesus is presented as the deterritorialized and opened network of God that can be connected from multiple points and persons, and which behaves as something becoming, flowing, and in motion. In this sense, I have proposed that we think of salvation in terms of the nomadic flows and movements that unfold the multiple layers of release from various
fabrics of captivity and oppression - i.e., release from sins and various forms of physical-spiritual sicknesses, stigmas, and debts. Salvation is therefore a nomadic event of release and deterritorialization generated by the eternal saving authority-power of God, bestowed in Jesus and his disciples, and so we should rethink saving event(s) or salvation in the following ways. (1) Not in terms of a dichotomy between physical and spiritual, but as both physical and spiritual: both conditions applying to the same saving event. (2) Not as hierarchical or singular, but as heterogeneous and multiple. (3) Not as static moments, but as something being-toward and in motion, showing that the saving event(s) and its nomadic flows are pictured as being in a constant state of movement, signifying an endless qualitative change in type and kind. That is, we must think of salvation or the saving event(s) as comprising nomadic movements from one sphere to another, unfolding the eternal cyclical authority-power of God demonstrated through Jesus and his disciples under the direct guidance of the saving authority-power of the Holy Spirit.

Furthermore, I have drawn such conclusions from an investigation of the basic questions asked at the beginning of this study: what is the precise meaning(s) of the kingdom of God? What is release of sins? What do the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus signify? What must one do to be saved? Now, in this final chapter, I want to summarize the concluding remarks made at the end of each chapter.

Chapter One

(1) As the principal soteriological terms and ideas employed by Luke, not only do the kingdom of God and release of sins lie at the heart of salvation, but also the acts of faith and of calling upon the name of Jesus function as the central responsive acts of human beings in receiving or connecting to the new saving

---

1015 As I have noted, the nomadic flows and movements of this qualitative change are reflected in the cycle of Jesus' life (Christ's event): his birth, death, resurrection, ascension, and coming, and the work of the Holy Spirit. In the coming/birth narrative of Jesus, Luke discloses the nomadic flows of the qualitative change in type and kind: the coming of a seed/word (from God) inside Mary's womb -> the departure of the infant Jesus from his mother's womb to the physical world (outside Mary's womb) -> the child growing and becoming strong -> the public message and mission of Jesus -> Jesus' physical death (departure) -> his resurrection (another life, that is, a glorious/spiritual/invisible life) -> his ascension (return to God) -> the coming of the Holy Spirit, that is, the spirit of Jesus, -> the endless works of the saving events among people conveyed by Jesus' disciples under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit. As I have noted, there is no static or fixed moment of beginning or ending, but a qualitative change in type and kind from one sphere to another, revealing the nomadic mobility of life that occurs and moves in-between, describing life or salvation as a constant state of movement(s).

1016 There is no need to repeat the concluding remarks made at the end of each chapter.
network of God conveyed by Jesus. This fourfold theme constitutes the interactive saving event.

(2) By separating and spatializing time into discrete and inert moments corresponding to the three epochs (Israel-Jesus-the early Church), Conzelmann has placed them in a static chronological sequence \( t_1, t_2, t_3, \ldots, t_n \), seeing time as akin to space. For he views Luke’s historical time as a static chronological sequence of singular time, and Luke’s spatial position as the fixed framework of action(s).

(3) However, I have proposed that we think of Luke’s geographical (temporal-spatial) perspective not in terms of a dualistic separation of time and space (i.e. seeing them as opposite in kind and privileging time), but in terms of the integration of time-space. This shows that neither space nor time is subordinated to the other, but each interacts with the other. I have argued that Luke’s spatial-temporal position is presented as relational and multiple and as something flowing and in motion.

(4) In contrast to the fixed/static boundaries and territories that determine the local regions, and the quantitative changes proposed by modern scholars, Luke accentuates the idea that each saving event(s) and its nomadic flows and movements occur in, in-between, among, around, and beyond regions, signifying a qualitative change in type and kind. It is not merely that Luke’s saving narratives are written onto the regions of Galilee, Samaria, Judea, and Jerusalem, transforming them into a meaningful text, but the nomadic flows and movements of Jesus’ saving events prompts Luke’s saving narrative in each site within the regions. This shows that the saving event(s) or salvation is pictured as relational and as something becoming and in motion.

(5) In relation to salvation, the primary aim of Jesus’ going up to Jerusalem (inside) from Galilee (outside) is to deterritorialize the static boundaries and territories defining inside and outside created by the temple authorities. Put differently, Jesus’ going up to Jerusalem is to renew God’s old network of the temple with the new one brought by Jesus.\(^{1017}\) This means that inside (the Jerusalem temple) becomes outside (desolate) and outside becomes inside (cf. Acts 17:6), and thus the role of the saving network is reversed. Note that this

\(^{1017}\)See 1.2.1, 1.2.2, and 1.2.3.
phenomenon does not merely refer to role reversal, but also signifies that there is no inside or outside in the new saving network of God planted by Jesus, but a dynamic relationship between God and the people, and between the people. That is, the nomadic event of flows and fluids deterritorializes the hierarchical and binary system of the temple, and creates (1) the new saving space of God in, in-between, among, around, and beyond regions, and (2) multiple access points to the new relational network of God, where God and people interact.

Chapter Two

(1) I have proposed that we rethink the notion of the body of God’s kingdom, the dynamic space of God, not as defined by the visible/static/immoveable structure of the temple, place-bound in Jerusalem, but as an invisible, changeable, moveable, or/and stretchable space that is no longer place-bound by the static conditions of space and place, here and there.

(2) The activity of God’s kingdom should not be viewed as a sedentary, motionless, or static framework of action(s), as is the case with the temple, but as something becoming, flowing, and in motion that moves within, outside, and all around people.

(3) The system of God’s kingdom is not presented as akin to the hierarchical, striated, linear, fixed, closed, and territorialized system of the temple, but as something non-hierarchical, smooth, multiple, unfixed, opened, and deterritorialized, signifying the relational and multiple network of God where God and people interact openly and freely, and where all sorts of people come and interact with one another regardless of their gender, or ethnic, social, and/or religious status or position(s). The three layers (the body, the activity, and the system) of God’s kingdom are not discrete, but they interact

---

1008 See 1.3.2.1.
1009 I have illustrated that the primary function of the words has come near, come, is coming, comes, and has come do not refer to the fixed or static moment of the arrival of the kingdom, but they expose and accentuate the nomadic flows of God’s kingdom describing the kingdom as relational and as something becoming, flowing, and in motion.
1009 By emphasizing the ‘big ending’ in the parable of becoming, modern scholars have treated the folded image of the seed/kingdom as insignificant, as if it represents nonbeing or empty time-space. However, the emphasis is not on the contrast between small beginnings and big endings, but on the nomadic movements of the seed/kingdom, that is, the being-toward or becoming of the folded seed/kingdom into multiple layers, signifying the relational network of God.
with one another and revolve around the nomadic flows of the soteriological event(s) that constitute the new saving network, and by which people act and move.

(4) As opposed to the old network of the temple, therefore, the new space/network of God should not be place-bound in a static territory or controlled by human agency, but deterritorialized, opened, and ready to be connected or reconnected to by any person(s) and from any point(s) of distance.

(5) The kingdom of God planted by Jesus is depicted as both everywhere (present) and nowhere (absent). It is nowhere because it is invisible. And it is everywhere (present) because it can be connected from wherever and whenever the word(s) of God is articulated and preached, establishing the spoken word of God as a door or an entrance to the invisible kingdom of God that moves within, outside, and all around people. This shows that, in contrast to the old network of the temple, which had a fixed and limited access to salvation, the kingdom of God - the new saving network of God - has multiple entrances and can be connected from any points and persons, and from in-between all points and regions.

Chapter Three

(1) Not only were sickness and impurity viewed as the result of sins and as the extensive realities of sins, they were also considered dirty (something out of place), indicating that the sinners, the sick, and the outcasts were disconnected from the old network of the temple. Thus their social location was determined by the visible marks on their bodies. Thus, one of the central tasks of the temple authorities was to establish a clear definition of the boundaries in order to maintain their religious order-system-belief. They needed guidelines in order to control and monitor what went in and out of the temple, which shows that the power of the temple authorities was used to maintain a static territory, and, thus, the saving events of God.

(2) To regulate the fixed territory of the temple, the temple authorities controlled (1) the people and their daily activities and (2) God and God’s saving event(s),
by controlling the space allocated to God and to people in the temple\textsuperscript{1021}. This portrays the power of the temple authorities as \textit{power-in/of-space} and as a \textit{binding} and \textit{territorializing} power.

(3) Just as the saving events of Jesus and those of his disciples occurred \textit{outside} the temple, so God's soteriological event must not be confined within a static territory nor controlled by human agency. Instead, the \textit{new} relational space of God, where all sorts of people come and interact with God, should be \textit{open} and \textit{deterritorialized} and not subject to control.

(4) The theme of \textit{ἐθεσὶν} to the poor, the blind, the captive, and the oppressed in 4:18 presumes \textit{ἐθεσὶς ἁμαρτίων}, showing that the folded image of \textit{sins} unfolds into the multi-layered structure of \textit{sins, sicknesses, demonic possessions, social stigmas, and debts}. It evokes the frozen and dark place where the \textit{outcasts} are territorialized and ruled by Satan and his power, describing them as those who are \textit{outside} the \textit{old} soteriological network. In contrast to the dark and motionless place, the \textit{nomadic} movements of release unfold in multiple layers. That is, as opposed to the sedentary and motionless network of the temple, the \textit{nomadic} flows and movements of the \textit{releasing event} define the authority-power of Jesus as a \textit{releasing} and \textit{deterritorializing} power-authority by which people are saved. The consequences of his power-authority are (a) to unfold the multiple layers of release – release from sins, the multiple fabrics of physical-spiritual related sickness, stigmas, and debts and (b) to describe the active event of release as a \textit{transitional} or \textit{deterritorialized} event from within the motionless-confined-territorialized space of darkness, death, and Satan to the \textit{new} space of light, life, and God.

(5) Therefore, we must see \textit{release of sins} not in terms of a static framework of motion, but in terms of the \textit{nomadic} flows and movements of release that \textit{deterritorialize} the binary and hierarchical system of the temple and establish the \textit{multiple} and \textit{non-hierarchical} network of God – where God and people come and interact – as something that is \textit{flowing} and \textit{in motion}.

\textsuperscript{1021}See Chapter 2.
Chapter Four

(1) In Luke, the person of Jesus is presented as a central node of God's new saving network. Likewise, the name of Jesus is depicted as the central node to be attached to, embodied, and connected to. Moreover, in this chapter, I proposed that we consider the name to mean the body, person, power-authority, and very essence of Jesus, and see the phrase in the name of Jesus as the disciple's authorization formula for validating their saving activity and revealing that the source of their authority-power comes from Jesus.

(2) However, some scholars argue that the name of Jesus and the phrase in the name of Jesus are to be understood within the framework of "magic." Yet I have argued that Luke does not make a phenomenological distinction between magic and miracle, as if they were opposed in type and kind. For Luke, the issue is not "magic" or its practice, but the "evil" intentions behind its acts, the illegitimate use of the name of Jesus, and the ultimate source of the authority-power by which it is performed.

(3) For Luke, an "evil" or "magical" act involves the attempt to control and territorialize the authority-saving power of God, Jesus, and the Holy Spirit and constrict its nomadic flows and movement(s) within a static and fixed place and territory.

(4) Luke explicitly determines that the authority and power of Jesus Christ is superior to the power of Satan. For this reason, the leaders of the church speak and act in Jesus' name. Moreover, they use Jesus' name as their "authorization" formula to validate their activities, and as the distinctive mark that reveals the source of their authority and power. Interestingly, Luke regards anyone who does not obey those who speak and act in the name of Jesus as disobeying the Lord Jesus and God.

(5) As Luke links the name with the saving event(s) conveyed by Jesus, the purpose of Luke's use of the name of Jesus is (a) to evoke the new saving network of God brought by Jesus and its nomadic movements from Galilee to Jerusalem, (b) to remind us that the Jesus who died and was resurrected is very much present and active through his name, and (3) to unfold the nomadic mobility of the saving events extended by Jesus' disciples from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth. This determines the name of Jesus as the central node or
the cornerstone of God's saving network to be attached to, embodied, and connected to, and as something *in motion*.

(6) That is, by using *the name of Jesus*, Luke constantly reminds his readers that the new saving network of God initiated by Jesus was still *in motion* and *in operation* in the early church, and continually being *expanded* by his disciples. Therefore, *the name of Jesus* and the phrase *in the name of Jesus* should be understood in close connection to the *nomadic* motions of the saving event(s) that unfold the saving authority-power of Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and God, by which people act and move.

Chapter Five

(1) In this chapter I examined the soteriological question *what must one do to be saved?* in close connection to the question *how one can enter the kingdom of God?* Within this structure I focused on the meaning(s) of faith, its multiple objects, and its relation to the *nomadic* flows and movements of *faith in Jesus*, *in* his disciples, and *in* God. Though *faith* is expressed in various ways, the central meaning of *faith* involves the integration of *hearing* the word(s) of God and *acting* or *doing* what it asks, expressing a *dynamic*, *reciprocal*, and/or *relational* event between a subject(s) and an object(s), creating multiple *times-spaces* of God where God and God's people interact. I then suggest that we think of *faith*, not as a static moment of action(s), but as something *becoming*, *growing*, and *in motion*.

(2) As the phrase *your faith has saved you* indicates, *faith* and *salvation* are not isolated, but interactive events (a) referring to the same saving event and (b) revolving around and based upon the spoken word(s) of God, establishing the spoken word(s) of God as a *door to salvation* and an *entrance* to the kingdom of God. What allows a person to find a *way* to salvation or an *entrance* to the kingdom is the *faith* of the person who positively responds to the word(s) of God articulated by God's messengers. That is, by *faith*, or *the power of faith*, a person recognizes the spoken word(s) of Jesus and of God and finds a *way* to the invisible kingdom of God. Put differently, by *faith* or *the power of faith*, the *virtual* kingdom becomes the *actual* kingdom of God.

(3) Note the *nomadic* flows and movements of *faith* and *salvation*: *hearing* the word(s) about Jesus or his saving events → *departing* → *coming* to Jesus or
calling on Jesus → overcoming an obstacle → accepting Jesus’ willingness to save → receiving salvation → glorifying God → returning home. This structure confirms that faith and salvation are relational, growing and in motion.

(4) In Acts, and in contrast to his first volume, Luke links faith and salvation with the name of Jesus, describing faith in terms of devoting oneself, to the teachings of the apostles, to fellowship and the breaking of bread, to prayer (2:41-42), to selling one’s own property, and to distributing all one’s possessions to those who are in need (2:44-45). Thus the actions of faith are again something in motion.

(5) Interestingly, in Acts, the present participle πιστεοῦντες (a) refers to the believers who are connected to the new saving network of God established by Jesus, (b) reveals the daily saving activity of the believers who act and move in the name of Jesus, and (3) recalls the new saving network of God established by Jesus, and its nomadic flows expanded by Jesus’ disciples.

(6) In Acts, Jesus’ disciples, the Lord Jesus, and God are presented as the multiple objects of faith. But these multi-objects of faith should not be understood as separate, but as interacting objects that refer to the same event of God and unfold the nomadic motions of the saving event(s).

(7) Therefore, I proposed that we rethink faith and salvation not in terms of static or fixed moments of action(s), but as something being-toward and in motion. What activates the nomadic movements of faith and salvation are the spoken word(s) of God, which functions as a door to salvation and an entrance to the kingdom of God.
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