FROM TEMPLE TO HOUSE-CHURCH IN LUKE-ACTS: A LUKAN CHALLENGE TO KOREAN CHRISTIANITY

Young-San Jung

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of St. Andrews

2000

Full metadata for this item is available in Research@StAndrews:FullText at:
http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:
http://hdl.handle.net/10023/2796

This item is protected by original copyright

This item is licensed under a Creative Commons License
University of St. Andrews

From Temple to House-Church in Luke-Acts:
A Lukan Challenge to Korean Christianity

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF DIVINITY
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Young-Sung Jung
St. Andrews, Scotland, United Kingdom
1 March 2000
DECLARATIONS

I) I, Young-Sung Jung, hereby certify that this thesis, which is approximately 100,000 words in length, has been written by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree.

Date 1 March 2000  signature of candidate

II) I was admitted as research student in September 1994 and as a candidate for the degree of Ph.D in April 1995; the higher study for which this is a record was carried out in the University of St. Andrews between 1995 and 2000.

Date 1 March 2000  signature of candidate

III) I hereby certify that the candidate has fulfilled the conditions of the Resolution and Regulations appropriate for the degree of Ph.D, in the University of St. Andrews and that the candidate is qualified to submit this thesis in application for that degree.

Date 1 March 2000  signature of supervisor
COPYRIGHT DECLARATION

In submitting this thesis to the University of St. Andrews, I understand that I am giving permission for it to be made available for use in accordance with the regulations of the University Library for the time being in force, subject to any copyright vested in the work not being affected thereby. I also understand that the title and abstract will be published, and that a copy of the work may be and supplied to any bona fide library or research worker.

Date 1 March 2000 signature of candidate
ABSTRACT


This dissertation examines the portrayals of the Temple, synagogue, and house-churches in Luke-Acts to pose a Lukan challenge to the Korean church by using a model of architectural space which is derived from social-scientific ideas originating in anthropology, sociology and social psychology. The dissertation proposes the relevance of the Lukan house-church to the Korean church today so as to transform the latter’s character in its architecture and use of space into the inclusive and missionary one which is featured in Luke-Acts. The argument of the dissertation begins with an exploration and defence of social-scientific method (Chapter 1). Chapter 2 begins with a history and analysis of Korean Christianity which raises problem surrounding its use of architectural space, before setting out a social-scientific model of architectural space, which is then applied to contemporary Korean church architecture. Challenging current understandings of a positive Lukan attitude toward the Temple, this study proposes in Chapter 3 that Luke had a negative understanding of the Temple in that it was an oppressive institution characterised by segmented spaces which divided the people of God and thus showed its illegitimacy in relation to the saving plan of God in Jesus. The dissertation next proposes in Chapter 4 that first-century synagogues were subsidiary Temple spaces which were extended to most parts of Mediterranean world from the central sanctuary in Jerusalem, and that Luke portrays the synagogues as similar to the Temple. Contrary to the Temple and synagogue, the house in Luke-Acts expresses the inclusive salvation of the gospel which incorporates a variety of people regardless of social status, gender, age and ethnic origin (Chapter 5). In this interpretation, the house-church is represented as an inclusive space accessible without institutional constraints. In the Gospel, it serves to express the Kingdom of God into which sinners are invited to enter through meals and to be incorporated into a fictive-kinship group created by Jesus. In Acts, the house is not only a locus of Christian meetings in which the social relationships, characteristic of family, are practised to enhance and legitimise the social identity of Jesus’ followers, but also the modus operandi of Christian mission through which the Christ-movement spreads throughout the Mediterranean world. This study concludes with an Epilogue containing brief suggestions for changes in Korean church architecture and use of space based on these Lukan insights, which have the potential radically to transform Korean Protestant Christianity.
CONTENTS

List of Abbreviations

Prologue: Purpose and Method

Purpose of Study 1
Outline and Methodology of Study 6

Chapter One
I. Social-Scientific Approach to New Testament 8
  1. The Social History or Interpretive Approach 9
  2. The Modelling Approach 13
     (1) Social Construction of Reality 16
     (2) Use of Models 19
II. Objections to Modelling Approaches 22
  1. Misunderstanding of Modelling 22
  2. Claims of Incommensurability 25
  3. Challenges from Postmodernism 28
III. Conclusion 30

Chapter Two
The Architecture and Phenomenology of the Korean Church 32
I. The Phenomenology of the Korean Church 32
  1. A Short History of Korean Protestant Church 32
  2. The Current Dilemma of Korean Church 34
     3. Dialectic Relation of These Problems to Architecture 39
II. Sociological Consideration of the Current Dilemma 40
  1. Theoretical Perspective on Religion 40
  2. Brief Characterisation of This Dilemma 43
III. Theoretical Perspective on Architectural Space 44
  1. Why Architecture? 44
  2. Architecture Speaks 45
  3. How Does Space Speak in A Society? 45
  4. Architectural Space as Human Territoriality 48
  5. Space and Society 50
IV. Applications of the Architectural Theories 51
  1. Brief Architectural History of Western Christianity 52
  2. A Short History of the Korean Church Architecture 54
  3. The Current Problem of the Church Architecture 58
     (1) Disharmony of Grand-Scale Churches with their Surrounding Society 58

I. Introduction: Application of the Architectural Theory 80
   1. Political Centrality of the Temple 82
   2. Economic Centrality of the Temple 86
   3. Temple as Religious Centre 92
      (1) The Social Nature of Sacrifices 92
      (2) The Social Implication of Purity 94
   4. Social Centrality of the Temple 96


IV. The Temple in Luke 102
   1. The Temple in the Infancy Narratives (Lk.1-2) 103
   2. The Temple Incident (Lk.19.45-48) 105
   3. The Teaching Activity in the Temple (Lk.19.47-20.19) 110
   4. The Widow’s Gift (Lk.21.1-4) 113
   5. Jesus’ Death and the Demise of the Temple-Curtain (Lk.23.44-49) 116

V. Theory of Intergroup Interaction and Its Preliminary Application to Acts 120
   1. The Social Identity Theory and the Early Christians 121
   2. Language-Use and Interaction between the Hellenists and the Hebrews 123
   3. The Ethnic Interaction and the Apostolic Degree 126

VI. The Temple in Acts 128
   1. Early Christians’ Testimony in the Temple (Ac.2-5) 128
      (1) Pentecostal Events (Ac.2.1-13) 128
      (2) Creating Social Space in the Temple (Ac.3-5) 131
   2. Stephen’s Speech (Ac.6.1-8.1) 135
      (1) Temple-Criticism in Stephen’s Speech (Ac.6.11-7.53) 135
      (2) Selective Persecution of the Hellenists (Ac.8.1b) 139
      (3) The Hellenists (Ac.6.1-6.10) 140
   3. The Temple as a Tragic Finale in Paul’s Visit (Ac.21.17-40) 147
      (1) Paul’s Visit to Jerusalem (Ac.21.17) 147
      (2) James’ Proposal (Ac.21.20-25) 150
         (i) The Law-Zealous Christians (Ac.21.20) 150
         (ii) James and The Apostolic Decree (Ac.21.25) 152
      (3) Paul in the Temple (Ac.26-30) 157

VII. Conclusion: Luke’s Attitude to the Temple 161

VIII. Figures 163

I. Current Issues of the First-Century Synagogues
      (1) Literary Evidence
      (2) Epigraphic Evidence
      (3) Archaeological Evidence
   2. Synagogue as the Temple Space
   3. God-Fearers


III. Synagogue in the Gospel
   1. The Nazareth Manifesto (Lk.4.16-31)
   2. Healing of the Crippled Woman (Lk.13.10-17)
      (1) Jesus’ Claim for honour (vv.12-13)
      (2) Counter-Challenge by the Synagogue-Ruler (v.14)
      (3) Jesus’ Riposte (vv.15-16)
      (4) Public Verdict (v.17)
   3. Jesus’ Criticism to the Synagogue

IV. Paul’s Synagogue Activity in Acts
   1. Synagogue at Pisidian Antioch (Ac.13.14-52)
      (1) Paul’s Claim (vv.13-41)
      (2) Challenge of Jews (vv.42-45)
      (3) Paul’s Riposte (vv.46-47)
      (4) Public Verdict (vv.48-49)
      (5) The Jews’ Counter-Challenge (v.50)
      (6) Paul’s Positive Reaction (vv.51-52)
   2. The God-fearers’ Response to the Gospel

VII. Conclusion


I. Theoretical Perspective on the House and Family
   1. Family in Ancient Mediterranean Society
   2. The House in the Mediterranean World
      (1) Domestic Dwelling in Palestine
      (2) Urban House in the Greco-Roman Society
         (i) Atrium-Peristyle House
         (ii) Insulae and Tabernae
   3. Christian House-Churches
      (1) The Pauline House-Churches
      (2) Some Suggestions

II. Related Themes to House
   1. Data on οἰκία and οἶκος
   2. Important Topics of House
      (1) Ἑ βαπτισθέντων τοῦ θεοῦ
      (1) Hospitality
      (2) Rituals: Baptism and Meals
         (i) Baptism: Incorporating into a fictive-kinship
         (ii) Meal
### III. House in the Gospel

1. **Magnificat (Lk.1.46-55)**  
2. **Jesus' Meal with Sinners: The Call of Levi (Lk.5.27-39)**  
3. **The Woman with Ointment (Lk.7.36-50)**  
4. **House as Central Mission Field (Lk.9.1-6; 10.1-16)**  
5. **Jesus' Teaching on Prayer (Lk.11.1-13)**  
7. **Parable of the Narrow Door (Lk.13.22-30)**  
8. **New Social Relations in the Meals (Lk.14)**  
9. **Zacchaeus’ Story (Lk.19.1-10)**  
10. **The Lord’s Supper and Diakonia (Lk.22.7-30)**

### IV. House in Acts

1. **Christian Community in Jerusalem (Ac.1-2)**  
2. **The Cornelius’ Story (Ac.10.1-11.18)**
   - (1) Cornelius (Ac.10.1-8)
   - (2) Divine Reversal of the Space (Ac.10.9-23)
   - (3) Social Interaction between Judean Christians and Gentiles (Ac.10.17-43)
   - (4) Divine Confirmation (Ac.10.44-48)
3. **The House-Church in Philipii (Ac.16.11-40)**  
4. **The Corinthian House-Church (Ac.18.1-17)**  
5. **The Ephesian House-Church (Ac.19.8-10; 20.17-38)**  
6. **The House-Church at Troas (Ac.20.5-8)**  
7. **Paul at Rome (Ac.28.16-31)**

### V. Figures

**Epilogue:**

**Relevance of the Lukan House-Churches for the Korean Church Today**

I. Luke and His Community  
II. The Present Korean Church  
III. Lukan House-Church Model for the Korean Church

**Bibliography**
**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abod.Zar</td>
<td>Aboda Zara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abot</td>
<td>Abot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AnBib</td>
<td>Analecta Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANRW</td>
<td>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt, (ed.) H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1972-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apuleius</td>
<td>Met. Metamorphoses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athanaeus</td>
<td>Deip. Deipnosophistae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATR</td>
<td>Anglican Theological Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Babylonian Talmud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAR</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar.</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3Bar.</td>
<td>Syriac, Greek Apocalypse of Baruch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn.</td>
<td>Barnabas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASOR</td>
<td>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ber.</td>
<td>Berakot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>Bikkurim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJRL</td>
<td>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Librarry of Manchester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BJS</td>
<td>Brown Judaic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMC</td>
<td>Catalogue of the Greek Coins in British Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Mes.</td>
<td>Baba Mesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Qam.</td>
<td>Baba Qamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRev</td>
<td>Bible Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTB</td>
<td>Biblical Theology Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZ</td>
<td>Biblische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD.</td>
<td>Cairo (Genizah), Damascus Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1-2 Clem. 1-2 Clement

Clement of Alexandria

Strom. Stromata


CR: BS Currents in Research: Biblical Studies


Deut. Rab Deutromony Rabbah


Did. Didache

Dio Chrysostom

Orat. Orationes

Dio Halicarnassus

Rom. Ant. Antiquitates Romanae

Dio.Laert. Diogenes Laertius


EKK Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament

l-3. Enoch Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch

Ep. Arist. Epistle of Aristeas

Epictetus

Diss. Dissertationes

1-2. Esdr. 1-2 Esdras

ET English Translation

Euripides

Ph. Phoenissae

Eusebius

Hist. Eccl. Historia Ecclesiastica

EvT Evangelische Theologie

Exod. Ra. Exodus Rabbah

Exp. T Expository Times


Gen. Rab. Genesis Rabbah

Gos. Thom. Gospel of Thomas

Hermas

Mand. Mandates

Sim. Similitudes

Vis. Visions

Herodotus
Hist. Histories

Horace
Carm. Carmina

HTR Harvard Theological Review
IEJ Israel Exploration Journal

Ignatius
Eph. Ephesians
Mag. Magnesians
Phil. Philadelphians
Smyrn. Smyrnaeans


JAAR Journal of the American Academy of Religion
JBL Journal of Biblical Literature
JETS Journal of Evangelical Theological Society

JJS Journal of Jewish Studies

Josephus
Ant. Antiquitates Judaicae
Ap. Contra Apionem
War. De Bello Judaico
Life. Vita Josephi

JPOS Journal of Palestine Oriental Society
JQR Jewish Quarterly Review
JRS Journal of Roman Studies
JSGPR Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (E.R. Goodenough, 1953-68)
JSJ Journal for the Study of Judaism
JSNT Journal for the Study of the New Testament
JSNTSS Journal for the Study of the New Testament Suppliment Series
JSOT Journal for the Study of the Old Testament
JSP Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha
JTS Journal of Theological Studies

Justin
Apol. Apologia
Dial. Dialogue with Trypho

Juvenal
Sat. Satirae

Kelim Kelim
Ketub. Ketubot
KTSI Korean Theological Study Institute.
Lam. Rab. Lamentations on Rabbah
LCL Loeb Classical Library
Lev. Rab. Leviticus on Rabbah
LTQ Lexington Theological Quarterly

Lucian of Samosata,
Peregr. De Morte Peregrini
Tox. Toxaris
Pseudep. Pseudepigrapha

m. Mishnah
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-4.Macc.</td>
<td>1-4 Maccabees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martial</td>
<td>Ep. Epigrammata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meg.</td>
<td>Megilla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mek.</td>
<td>Mekilta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menah.</td>
<td>Menahot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>Middot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midr.Gen.</td>
<td>Midrash on Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moed.</td>
<td>Moed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Rufus</td>
<td>Musonius Rufus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Massoretic text of the Hebrew Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nazir.</td>
<td>Nazir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ned.</td>
<td>Nedarim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>Negaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NICNT</td>
<td>The New International Commentary on the New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIGTC</td>
<td>New International Greek Testament Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIV</td>
<td>New International Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovT</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NovTSup</td>
<td>Novum Testamentum Supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>New Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTAbh</td>
<td>Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>New Testament Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num.Rab.</td>
<td>Numbers on Rabbah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohol.</td>
<td>Oholot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origen</td>
<td>Orationes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orat</td>
<td>Contra Celsum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orosius</td>
<td>Historie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBSR</td>
<td>Papers of the British School at Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pe'a</td>
<td>Pe'a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesah.</td>
<td>Pesahim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesiq.</td>
<td>Pesiqta Rabbati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pes.Rab.Kah</td>
<td>Pesiqta de Rab Kahana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td>De Decalogo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decal.</td>
<td>Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari soleat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det.</td>
<td>In Flaccum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flacc.</td>
<td>Legatio ad Gaium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legat.</td>
<td>De Migratione Abrahami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migr.</td>
<td>Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omn.Prob.Lib</td>
<td>De Opificione Mundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opif</td>
<td>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum I-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaes.Ex.</td>
<td>Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin I-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quaes.Gen.</td>
<td>De Specialibus Legibus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spec.Leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vit. Cont.  De Vita Contemplativa
Vit. Mos.  De Vita Mosis

Plato
Grg.  Gorgias
Sym.  Symposion

Pliny
Ep.  Epistulae

Plutarch
Amat.  Amatorius (Dialogue on Love)
Amor. Prolis.  De Amor Prolis (On Affection for Offspring)
Conj. Praec.  Conjugalia Praecepa (Advice to Bride and Groom)
Frat. Amor.  De Fraterno Amore or Peri Philadelphiais (On Brotherly Love)
Quo. Ado.  Quomodo Adolescens Poetas Audire Debeat (How the Young Man Should study Poetry)
Rec. Rat.  De Recta Ratone Audiendi (On Listening to Lectures)
Stoic. Repugn.  De Stoicorum Repugnantis (On Stoic Self-Constradictions)
Sym.  Quaestitium Convivalium libri ix or Symposiaca, (Table-Talk)
Vita Rom.  Vitae Romulus

Ps. Aristotle (Pseudo-Aristotle),
Oec.  Oeconomica

Ps. Clem. (Pseudo-Clementines)
Recog.  Recognitions
Hom.  Homilies

Ps. Philo  Pseudo Philo, Liber Antonitum Biblicarum
Ps. Sol.  Psalms of Solomon

1QapGen  Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1.
1QH.  Hodayot (Thanksgiving Hymns) from Qumran Cave 1.
1QM.  Milhamah (War Scroll) from Qumran Cave 1.
1QS  Serek Hayyahad (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline) from Qumran Cave 1.
1QSa  Appendix to 1QS (Rule of the Congregation) from Qumran Cave 1.
1QpHab.  Pesher on Habakkuk from Qumran Cave 1.
4QppS.  Pesher on Psalms from Qumran Cave 4.
11QMelch.  Melchizedek text from Qumran Cave 11.
11QTemple  The Temple Scroll from Qumran Cave 11.

Qidd.  Qiddusin
Qod.  Qodasian
RAC  Realllexikon für Antike und Christentum, 10 vols. (ed.) T. Klauser, Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1950-

RB  Revue biblique
ResQ  Restoration Quarterly
Rev. Rel  Review for Religious
Sabb.  Sabbat
Sanh.  Sanhedrin
SBFLA  Studii biblici fiscianci liber annuus
SBLDS  Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLMS  Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSP  Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBT  Studies in Biblical Theology
SEA  Svensk Exegetisk Årsbok
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seb.</td>
<td>Sebi‘it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEG</td>
<td>Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (ed. J.J.E. Hondius, 1923-).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>De Beneficiis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ira.</td>
<td>De Ira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup.</td>
<td>De Superstitione</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ep.</td>
<td>Epistulæ Morales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seqal.</td>
<td>Seqalim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sib. Or.</td>
<td>Sibylline Oracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNs</td>
<td>Journal of Women in Culture and Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sir.</td>
<td>Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SJT</td>
<td>Scottish Journal of Theology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNG</td>
<td>Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum (London, 1971)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTSMS</td>
<td>Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNTU</td>
<td>Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umgebung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sota</td>
<td>Sota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>Studies in Religion/Sciences religiosæ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stobaeus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anth.</td>
<td>Anthologium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strabo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geog.</td>
<td>Geographica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suetonius</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vit.</td>
<td>De Vita Caesarum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug.</td>
<td>Augustus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claud.</td>
<td>Claudius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nero</td>
<td>Nero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sukk.</td>
<td>Sukka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t.</td>
<td>Tosefta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.12.P.</td>
<td>Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tacitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann.</td>
<td>Annales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hist.</td>
<td>Historiae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adel.</td>
<td>Adelphoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertullian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apol.</td>
<td>Apologia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tg. Yer.</td>
<td>Targum Yerushalmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThB</td>
<td>Theolosiche Bücherei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophrastus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oec.</td>
<td>Oikonomicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThL</td>
<td>Theologische Literaturzeitung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ThZ</td>
<td>Theologische Zeitschrift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Levi.</td>
<td>Testament of Levi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Moses.</td>
<td>Testament (&quot;Assumption&quot;) of Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Naph.</td>
<td>Testament of Naphtali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob.</td>
<td>Tobit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tohar.</td>
<td>Toharot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimalchio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Satirae

TynB Tyndale Bulletin
Ulpian (Marcellus)

Dig. Digesta

USQR Union Seminary Quarterly Review
Varro

Ling. De Lingua Latina

Vegetius

Militari. Epitoma rei militaris

Velleius Paternus

Vitruvius

Archit. De Architectura

WBC Word Biblical Commentary

WTJ Westminster Theological Journal

WUNT Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

Xenophon

Oec. Oeconomicus

Sym. Symposium

Hist. Grae. Historia Graeca (Hellenica)

y. Jerusalem Talmud

Yebam. Yebamot

Yoma Yoma (=Kippurim)

ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
PROLOGUE: PURPOSE, OUTLINE and METHODOLOGY

PURPOSE OF STUDY

My interest in the relationship between church architecture and theology has developed during various stages of my career as a minister in Korea. It first started in Dongboo Presbyterian church in Seoul, having a congregation of nearly 800 members, where I served as a Jun-do-sa, overseeing the youth ministry. In this church, I had a disquieting experience of not belonging. Such an experience is usual in a Confucian society, where the young are considered inferior to the old, thereby being marginalised. In that particular church, the youth group had meetings at different times and in different rooms from other congregations. As a youth leader, I was exclusively involved in youth ministry, which was not well integrated into the main congregation. Accordingly, I had hardly any chance to meet anyone from the main congregation, nor did I have much sense of belonging to this Christian community. Then, one Sunday, when I went to a dining room in the church, one deaconess told me, "You, young man, go over there! This place is for senior members." If she had known that I was a minister, she would not have spoken like this. I felt that I was an alien in relation to the dominant group of the church. I pondered, "What produces such an experience of alienation?" I reasoned that one important underlying cause had to do with the architectural structure of the church. As a medium size congregation, the church had several buildings separated from one another. Each building was used by different groups. Such segmented space rarely gave rise to the opportunity for different groups to meet together, and the social intimacy between the members was consequently weak.

Three years later, I was appointed as an assistant pastor in a mega church (Dongboo Presbyterian in Tea-Gu, with 4,500 members), which I had attended during my college years. After erecting a new big church building, the members of the

---

1 Jun-do-sa is the title and office created and given by Korean churches to those who are seminary students or ministers in training before ordination.
congregation had rapidly multiplied and various segmented spaces had been newly created. As a consequence, the social atmosphere of this church had been drastically changed. When I first entered its main hall, I had an odd spatial experience: how similar the church interior was to the Temple in Jerusalem! The highly elevated and decorated platform alone was enough to create the imagery of the sanctuary (Fig. 20. b). Only the ordained ministers and elders were permitted on the platform. The platform was spatially highlighted to dominate the rest of the space. Each gender would sit predominantly on one side of the nave: as viewed from the platform, the male members sat mainly on the right, and the female mainly on the left. And the forefront seats in the nave were generally regarded as the seats of the elders. During my ministerial period at that church, I felt that in this church there was a dialectical relationship between its spatial features and its social structure. Social boundaries were hierarchically structured between ministers, elders, Kwon-sa,2 deacons, and lay people. As a result, there was a lack of intimacy within the whole congregation, and the members depended on the subgroups to which they belonged for any kind of intimacy.

Such experiences led me to look back at a church in which I had spent nearly fifteen years since my childhood. In a church of about 100 members (Bookok in Pusan), I experienced social intimacy as in a family. In the group-oriented Confucian society of Korea, Christians used to endure a severe persecution from relatives, neighbours and friends from their village. In this context, the church provided its members with social support and protection. Even as a youngster, I enjoyed my church’s care, and I knew every member. The whole congregation participated in all activities. The church was to me like another home. But with the growing number of the congregation, the church erected a new building. The social structure of the new church was then hierarchically organised, and the whole congregation was segmented into various subgroups. The previous intimacy within the church became weak. Several friends of mine were disappointed and left the church. One day, one of these friends called me and invited me to a meeting of the so-called ‘local church’, which is

2 Kwon-sa is the title of a women’s group which has been elected but not anointed. It is generally regarded as an equivalent to the elders since a woman cannot be elected as an elder.
influenced by the teachings of Watchman Lee, a former missionary in China. My friend told me, ‘We have neither a church building, nor a hierarchical structure, nor an institution. We are a family’. I was surprised that they had a strong social identity as a Christian group, even without any formalised doctrines, or organisation, or building. For them, to gather as a family was a significant rationale which enhanced and legitimised their social identity vis-à-vis the mainstream Christian groups.

The above mentioned experiences have led me to the following questions: Why, when Korean churches build a new meeting place, it is so similar to the Jerusalem Temple? After building such a building, why does the church become an institution which has a more hierarchical, segmented, and formalised social structure? Why does the church have social boundaries between the members? What legitimises such tendencies and activities? Do these characteristics harmonise with the teachings of Jesus? What can we learn from the experiences of the earliest Christians to help us understand these questions? How can we transform the church into a family-like community? How can we enhance the social identity of Christians in accordance with the New Testament? Is there a relation between architecture and theology?

To answer these questions, I was drawn to Stephen’s speech in Acts 7, with its critical attitude to the Temple, and to the broad Lukan position on arguably cognate issues. In particular, I consider that Luke-Acts provides rich information about the teaching of Jesus and the life of the early Christians in ways helpful to the Korean situation. Christians throughout the centuries have used their meeting places to express their theology, and architecture has also significantly influenced their social activity and relations, and shaped their social identity. Unfortunately most Korean

---

3 For the Korean Church, the Gospel of Luke is significant because it was first translated (1878) and published (1882) in a Korean version of the Christian scripture, by a Scottish missionary, John Ross, and his Korean translators in 1878 (The Acts of the Apostle, in 1880). Here I take Luke-Acts as a two-volume work written by one author, whom I will designate as “Luke,” sometime after the destruction of the Temple, from some undetermined Mediterranean urban location. Specific qualifications of these introductory identifications do not affect our discussion: see the detailed discussions, Kümmel 1975:147-151, 156-159. I also assume that the Lukan community were living under political and social pressures from both Jews and Gentiles in a need to legitimise their faith in Jesus (Esler 1987; Contra Bauckham et al 1997, who suggest that the gospels were written for general circulation
church architecture has been modelled after the Western church architecture that has developed in Western Christianity since the Constantinian era, such as Gothic, Romanesque, or Baroque, and even Postmodern styles. In Korea, to my knowledge, no one has suggested as a guideline for church architecture the idea of the New Testament house-church. Scholars generally have taken for granted that the early Christians had no specific ecclesial or architecture of their own, often assuming that they were gathering inevitably at private homes due to social and economic circumstances, but without addressing the social meaning and impact of such a context.

Architecture is an essential part of human existence. We construct a building, and afterward the building also shapes us. As I will show, this is the case now, as it was in the days of the early Christians. Luke interacted with his surrounding architectural context, including the Jerusalem Temple (probably destroyed by the time he was writing), pagan temples, synagogues, other public edifices, and various houses. If we examine how Luke responds to these architectural realities in Luke-Acts, we will have a useful biblical model for how to evaluate our church architecture, how to use our architectural space, and how to build our church buildings. Especially if a Christian church receives Luke-Acts as a part of the Word of God, as does the Christian church of Korea, it needs to hear Luke’s voice. The lack of concern over architectural aspects of Luke-Acts reflects a failure by biblical scholars to utilise social-scientific ideas and perspectives in order to incorporate the social world of the early Christians into their study of the New Testament which some critics categorise as “the idealist fallacy” (Holmberg 1990) or “methodological docetism” (Scroggs 1980; 1986). Only a few writers have noticed the importance of the domestic setting of the early Christian house-church (Filson 1939; Theissen 1982; Murphy-O’Connor 1983; Jewett 1993; 1994; Esler 1996b). But a systematic effort to illuminate the interconnections between the New Testament texts and their architectural circumstances has not been fully made. Here we will investigate how Luke relates to his architectural context in his Gospel and Acts.

around the Christian communities and so envisage a general Christian audience in the first-century, 1997; see, a critique, Esler 1998d).
Another problem with current biblical scholarship is a widespread lack of commitment to serve the Christian community to which it, to a certain extent, belongs. Unfortunately many biblical critics are inclined to contribute to their scholarly fields, without necessarily addressing the wider community, which is struggling to cope with the diverse challenges brought about by the scepticism of (post)-modern society to the Christian faith, and without seeking to enhance its social identity \textit{vis-à-vis} its significant outgroups whether they are Christian or non-Christian. Thus their works are largely devoted either to making a mark in a battlefield of competing theories or to discovering an ancient treasure or to enjoying an aesthetic surrender of a living story to an art. Moreover, the majority of ordinary Christians would not find their writings intelligible without training in a higher academic institution. If we are not to forget our fellow Christians who believe in the New Testament as the Word of God, we should attempt to enable the New Testament to address to empower, provoke, and activate them in their surrounding societies by fusing horizons and creating a tension of the mutual co-existence between the biblical past and the present (Gadamer 1982; Esler 1995b: 14-19; cf. Schneider 1991: 27-93). To an extent, the life of the early Christian community can be reconstructed from the texts of the New Testament, which, for this purpose, are best understood in their original social contexts. So historical criticism integrated with social-scientific perspectives provides a promising way of illuminating the texts within their social worlds. If there are similarities between the early Christian community and the present one, even at a reasonably high level of abstraction, we can elaborate the correlation between them, and pose the significance of the texts to the present Christian church in Korea at the level of model or challenge.

Just as Stanley Hauerwas has paved the way for an indispensable connection between Christian ethic and the ‘character’ of a particular community (1981), and as George Lindbeck has viewed Christian theology as a cultural-linguistic framework which not only describes reality, formulates belief, and expresses experiences of life but also shapes, moulds, and constitutes reality, experience of life, and value systems (1984), so too Philip Esler has also proposed that an understanding of New Testament experiences can be more enriched and developed in the context of a particular Christian community by seeking to undertake correlations between biblical
interpretation and the scrutiny of the contemporary, local situation through an intercultural reading than through some other readings (Esler 1995b:14-19; 1998:26-28). In addition, this reading can more contribute to a local community if it is undertaken through the eyes of the non-elite than those of modern Western intellectualism (cf. Morgan 1989:5). In our study, we will draw correlations between Lukan community and Korean Protestant church to serve the latter Christian community in terms of its use of architectural space and the way it promotes various forms of social identity.

**OUTLINE AND METHODOLOGY OF STUDY**

A short outline will be useful to set out how this project will develop in subsequent chapters. In Chapter 1, we will explain and justify our methodology, a social-scientific approach to Luke-Acts. Since this approach is now reasonably well-known, we will concentrate especially on how the use of social-scientific is legitimised in the face of objections such as reductionism, incommensurability, and the postmodern challenge. In Chapter 2, we will describe the history and current situation of Protestant Christianity in Korea, then construct a model of architectural space, which is largely derived from anthropology and sociology, and finally relate this model to contemporary Korean church architecture. The model will also provide us with a heuristic device to look at the Temple and house in Luke-Acts later in this dissertation. In Chapter 3, Luke's attitude to the Temple will be re-examined from our model of architectural space. Here social identity theory derived from social psychology will also be briefly introduced to aid our understanding of how the early Christians interacted with the other significant social groups like Gentiles and Judeans. Chapter 4 will deal with the synagogue, and argue that it is a distant temple space and expresses a similar character to the Temple. Chapter 5 will serve to illustrate how Luke capitalises upon house and family to legitimise the social identity of the Lukan community in the Mediterranean social world. Finally, in the Epilogue, we will apply our study to Korean Protestant church today to see how Luke's ideas of house and Temple are relevant to that church.
In our study, the primary methodology employed is social-scientific criticism used to interpret the relevant texts. This approach makes use of models drawn from sociology, anthropology, social psychology, and economics, in order to understand better what the biblical text meant to its original readers (Elliott 1993:7; cf. Malina 1982:229-233; Esler 1994:2-3; Horrell 1999:3-4) and can be employed (although this dimension is relatively new) to explore what it means to (post)modern Christian readers today (Esler 1995b:1-20; 1998:21-25). Several works have already defended the usefulness of the social-scientific methodology (see Elliott 1986; Kee 1989; Holmberg 1990; Osiek 1992; Elliott 1993; Esler 1987; 1994, 1995b; 1998; 1998b Neyrey 1994; Rohrbaugh 1996; Horrell 1999).
CHAPTER ONE:
A SOCIAL-SCIENTIFIC APPROACH TO LUKE-ACTS

I. SOCIAL-SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

Until we ask questions of a text, it will never respond to us with answers in our own language and for our situation. These new answers do not result from examining new material, but rather from asking new questions of the same texts; and new questions emerge from the use of new epistemological and methodological paradigms (Bultmann 1958:51). For example, the cultural anthropological approach to interpreting New Testament texts inaugurated by Bruce Malina reflects the major elements of a new paradigm: a new epistemology and a new methodological and conceptual apparatus (Malina 1983; 1986). As such, Malina's new paradigm suggests new questions, which in turn reveal new answers about the original setting of the texts and our own situation as well. Applying this paradigm to our own investigation, we no longer view the New Testament texts only as sources for historical reconstruction, but also as products of a particular social system and rooted in that social system. The social worlds in which these texts were produced play a crucial role in the interpretive process. Whereas historical criticism sought to engage the texts on traditional historical matters like authorship, traditions, and community, social-scientific criticism seeks to engage the texts on matters concerning these social worlds, such as structures, values, roles, groups interests, conflicts, control and power, and symbols.

---

4 We are using the term, paradigm, in Kuhn's sense: the conceptual and methodological framework of a discipline, the detailed model on which the research is based, and the world view that is implicit in the model (1970:174-210). But we refrain from speaking of 'a fundamental paradigm shift' because we retain principally the value of historical criticism by complementing and improving it with the use of the social-scientific methods. However, Elliott's clear-cut differentiation between the model, perspectives, and paradigm (1986:7-8) is somewhat arbitrary since Kuhn himself uses paradigm as model (1970:175; Küng & Tracy 1991:212-219).

Since the 1970s a growing number of biblical scholars have used social-scientific approaches to the New Testament, many of whom are now associated with an emerging new paradigm in the field. There is not a consensus, however, on matters of methodology, presuppositions or agendas. For now it is probably best to see the variety of approaches thus far as basically complementary rather than as mutually exclusive (Smith 1975; Elliott 1993:17-35; Horrell 1999:4-19). Among this variety of positions, two prominent approaches deserve particular consideration: the social-scientific approach and the social-history or interpretive approach. The two are distinct in that social-scientific criticism makes explicit use of the methods and models of the social science disciplines (sociology, anthropology, psychology, etc.), whereas the social history approach does not (Gager 1979:175; Osiek 1989:268-74; Martin 1993:107-10).

1. The Social History or Interpretive Approach

Social historians have engaged in social description and analysis of early Christianity by using the results of archaeology, history, ancient literature, and to a limited extent sociological theory, thereby producing a socio-historical framework in which the New Testament texts can be analysed. Their analysis focuses only on the description of early Christianity, answering the 'what' questions, but leaving the 'how' and 'why' questions unaddressed. These scholars, who frequently appeal to the interpretivism of Clifford Geertz, may be classified as 'Interpretivists.' They are intent on searching for 'realia,' assuming that such a project is possible without making explicit a whole range of decisions at the theoretical level (Malherbe 1977, 1983; Hock 1980; Meeks 1983, 1986, 1993; White 1988a, 1988b, 1991; Garrett 1989, 1992). They are particularly dependent on the work of Geertz, who advocates a style of analysis that produces a 'thick description' of the culture, which is based on participant immersion in the culture so that the interpreter sees from the native's point of view (1973; 1983). This approach makes use of theory only tentatively as a "sensitising" tool and seeks to explore the symbolic meanings of the texts, which is relative to particular sets of socio-cultural context (Garrett 1992:91-93).
Several critiques of interpretivism are available (Esler 1995b:4-8). The fact that Interpretivists distinguish their inductive-investigative method from a hypothetical-deductive method might initially suggest that they avoid imposing the interpreter's order on social reality, while others boldly impose law-like patterns on empirical data to produce 'objective' or 'true' knowledge, as though there were a body of authoritatively established truths to which details may be added but which is not subject to basic revision, or that there exist some sort of universal or deterministic laws or generalisations about reality (Marcus and Fischer 1986:179; Peacock 1986). Hostility to the positivistic dimension of social science sets the stage for the anthropological interpretive turn (cf. Geertz 1973:5; 1980:178; Marcus and Fischer 1986:22; Rabinow and Sullivan 1979; 1987) and its postmodern concern with reflexivism and textual representation (cf. Tyler 1988).

Stephen Tyler, who assumes that scientists clothe their practice in a rhetoric of objectivity and entertain highly positivistic notions about what they are doing, suggests that the failure of Positivism must lead to the collapse of the social sciences (1986:122-125). But Tyler overlooks the fact that what collapsed was not the scientific approach but Positivism's unique application of scientific thought, as Roscoe criticises: "to suppose that this accurately reflects what they are really doing is to mistake what the natives say they are doing for what they actually do" (1995:495). Furthermore, it is wrong to claim that the scientific method, developed with reference to the natural world, is not applicable to the social world, at least in some analogous sense. While it is true that the social construction of reality (Berger and Luckman 1967) indicates that social facts cannot be observed as can physical facts (Ellen 1984; Holy 1987), it is misleading to insist that the interpretive method of viewing the field 'from the native's perspective' is the only means of accurately understanding that social world (Ellen 1984:29; Holy 1987:6).

If humans are suspended in webs of significance, as Geertz (1973:25) suggests, can the natural world escape these webs? That is, like the social world, the natural world too must be a human construct, to an extent existing in the minds and senses of humans. Thus even something as apparently fundamental as 'sound' would
not exist without creatures, such as human beings, capable of interpreting compression waves in air or water as a sensation in an auditory organ. The natural world is not simply "out there" waiting to be discovered; rather, it is in the human mind being constructed (Rorty 1982:199). To the extent that the social world exists in the mind of the beholder, any interpretive method, which seeks to enter that world, must approach the subject with conceptual and cognitive means ('models for'), as well as with certain interpretive constraints. Therefore, it is misleading to dismiss the social-scientific method on the basis of the failure of Positivism and to confine our understanding within the domain of humanities as if science or anything like scientific method was only an alien intruder (Garrett 1992; Horrell 1996:9-18).

In relation to the interpretive turn, the interpretivists' attack on positivist social science (Garrett 1992:92-93) fails to recognise "the equivalence of the methods of natural science and interpretive anthropology" because it overlooks the interpreted nature of physical facts (Roscoe 1995:496). How does interpretivism differ from a scientific method described as hypothesis or presupposition followed by validation or refutation? For Geertz, interpretive method involves "guessing at meanings, assessing the guesses, and drawing explanatory conclusions from the better guesses" (1973:20). It is a similar interpretive method to Paul Ricoeur's ideas on textual interpretation as a dialectic involving erklären and verstehen (1971:547-553; 1976:75-88), in which many interpretivists find their immediate methodological inspiration (cf. Rabinow and Sullivan 1987:12-13; Peacock 1986:101-102): inquiry begins with an initial guess about the meaning of the whole text, moves to procedures for 'validation,' and finally moves back to a more developed understanding of the text. For Ricoeur, the critical difference between scientific and interpretive method is in the procedures for "validating" the initial guess, which are "comparable to the juridical procedures used in legal interpretation" (1976:78). Thus the interpretive validation relies on a "logic of probability", because juridical validation produces only a "probable," not a "true," interpretation, while scientific method depends on a "logic of empirical verification", which produces true interpretation. However, this claim fails to note both that the juridical procedure to characterise interpretivism has been used to represent scientific interpretation (Popper 1959:109-111), and that empirical verification does not produce 'truth' but only an interpretation (cf. chaos theory, quantum theory), more
probably in the light of comparative and evaluative procedures that juggle interpretation (facts and theories) with different, subjectively perceived degrees of problematicity. Any attempt sharply to differentiate between the interpretive approach and scientific interpretation fails to recognise both the interpreted nature of physical facts and the socially constructed reality of the natural world (Jackson 1989:182-187).

No human interpreter is completely devoid of preconceptions since there is no ‘purely objective and inductive’ social or historical interpretation. Historians often talk about ‘the evidence,’ as if its social significance were positively evident to everyone, but that evidence is ‘drawn out’ only in relationship to a larger perspective or theoretical framework. As far as every interpreter brings preconceptions to the task, an explicit social theory or model helps to trace interconnected social phenomena and offers a control against anachronism and inappropriate cultural assumptions. “Presuppositions are not to be denied but to be clarified and then tested on the basis of the data examined” (Elliot 1993:36). Otherwise, there is ample opportunity for the uncontrolled subjectivity of the researcher to enter into play in an act of interpretation unconsciously affected by etic points of view, the researcher’s world-view and experiences. Without specification of what types of etic or other perspectives are governing the researcher’s imagination, we cannot plausibly translate the social script of one culture into another and we risk being left in a kind of “cognitive apartheid” which prevents us comprehending the meanings of the actions we observe (Kuper 1992b:1-4; Descola 1992:108). Rather we should acknowledge that ‘facts’ are socially constructed by theories and we can communicate between the different social worlds, while always avoiding sociological over-generalisation as quite unsuited to the interpretation of foreign ways of life, and while always being open to a counter-theory that bears witness to the experience of the native and deconstructs the ideology, and powerful knowledge of the experts.

Finally, even Geertz has regretted the peril of the interpretivism in falling prey to postmodern ‘epistemological hypochondria,’ wherein some ethnographers are troubled by grave inner uncertainties “concerning how one can know that anything one says about other forms of life is as a matter of fact so” (1988:71-72). Thus, the excessively interpretive approach is exposed to the danger of falling into postmodern
melancholy and of slipping into a morass of relativism or subjectivism without theoretical aids. This would thwart the significant task of the biblical scholarship to communicate something about the contemporary relevance of the texts, since extravagant attention to textuality and difference would blunt our ability to make claims about the world. Given the postmodern incredulity to metanarratives (Lyotard 1984), which reduces ethnography to "a mere game of words" and threatens anthropology with "a corrosive relativism in which everything is more or less clever expression of opinion" (Geertz 1988:2), interpretivists have ultimately to decide either to evoke the meanings of the other through poetry (Tyler 1986), or to indulge in the interpreter's own experiences (Anderson and Staley 1995), or to be aided explicitly by consistent theoretical perspectives in order to safeguard themselves from the postmodern peril.

2. The Modelling Approach.

The second approach is characterised by the systematic use of models and theories developed in social-scientific research and applied to New Testament texts, offering fresh new perspectives and generating new questions, which give access to previously unexplored landscapes in the social world of the ancient texts. Unlike the Interpretivist approach, advocates of modelling explore the foregrounding of social information, that is, the relationship between the social structures and meaning systems of the Mediterranean world and the New Testament texts, by using models and theories in the interpretive process. They believe that it is unwise to ignore cross-cultural research which social scientists have carried out in related fields of human social activity.

The modelling approach is complementary rather than antagonistic to historical criticism. Alongside the older, long-reigning methods of historical

---

6 A metanarrative is a decontextualised narrative that we use to guide and judge behaviour, to legitimate action, and is presumed to have great generality and represents a final and apodictic truth which is supposed to be that we know something with absolute certainty without the possibility of mistake.
criticism, new approaches to studying the New Testament have been developed recently using theories from other disciplines, including literary and social-scientific criticism (see Morgan and Barton 1988; Anderson and Moore 1992; McKenzie and Haynes 1993; Green 1995; Porter 1997). Whereas some forms of literary criticism (e.g., reader-response and structuralism) view the text as an autonomous literary world, independent of the original social and historical settings of the author and recipients (cf. Sheeley 1992; Tannehill 1986; 1990), social-scientific criticism seeks to strengthen ties to the original historical and social setting of author and audience (Neyrey 1994:x-xiii). The text of Luke-Acts is a historical document from the distant past, separated from us not only chronologically, but also in its language, thought-forms, culture, and social patterns. Reading this text today, giving due respect to its original author and recipients, necessarily involves engagement with these historical, cultural, and social matters. Luke himself announces in his prologue (Lk.1.1-4) that he used something like historical methods to test the reliability of his sources (Downing 1990:284-85).

But Francis Watson's claim that historical criticism is concerned only "to reconstruct the diachronic historical processes underlying the texts as it now stands" (1994:15; cf. 15-57) is erroneous. His assessment neglects the achievements of redaction criticism (Smith 1997), which illuminates the unique theological and ecclesial concerns of the authors, the specific purposes for writing the documents, and the Sitz im Leben of the communities. Furthermore, Watson subordinates the historical setting of the text itself to the historical framework of the canonisation of the text at a later period (Esler 1998:21-23). The fundamental concern of historical criticism is to determine the meaning of the text when it was originally written and read. Historical criticism primarily seeks to encounter the text in its original historical context. It seeks the Sitz im Leben of the final form of the document. To achieve these goals historical critics have developed analytical tools such as tradition-criticism, form-criticism, redaction-criticism, and research in the history-of-religions (Berger 1987; Lührmann 1984). It has often been noted, however, that historical criticism faces significant methodological problems in seeking a historical reconstruction of texts and their contexts (Wink 1973; Nineham 1976; Muilenburg 1979; Marshall
Social-scientific criticism draws attention to the way in which meaning springs from interpreting the relation of one social actor to another within the complex web of culturally-determined social systems and patterns of communication. Historical criticism directs its attention to the particular, unique, and unusual but overlooks the usual, typical, and recurrent, which are necessary for appreciation of the relationship between the biblical text and social context. Recognition of the unique, the unusual, and the particular is dependent on prior knowledge of the typical, the usual, and the ordinary. Those practising the modelling approach recognise the value of comparative research, the use of analogies, the ability to find generalities and the typical, in locating the distinctive and the different (Weber 1978: lxxxix). Distinctiveness can be discovered only on the basis of established similarity. "Sociology without history is empty; history without sociology is blind" (Gottwald 1979:17).

When using models and theories, social-scientific critics do not create or manufacture new data; rather, they see the old data in a new light, a new and more comprehensive framework. The model has a 'heuristic' function, stimulating the imagination, expanding conceptual horizons, and enabling discovery. It thus deepens the historical method, adding to the foci and operations of historical criticism the newer perspectives, theories, models, and research derived from the social sciences, thereby allowing the interpreter to understand the biblical texts and contexts more fully. Since the 1970s social-scientific critics of the New Testament have studied the first-century Mediterranean world using models drawn from sociology, anthropology, and social-psychology, focusing especially on that culture's pivotal values (honour and shame), dyadic personality, labelling and deviance, social institutions (temple, house, patron-client relations, pre-industrial cities, the ancient economy), social dynamics (healing and sorcery, purity rules, rituals), social movements (sectarianism, cognitive dissonance, millenarian movements), social structure (charisma and

---

7The term 'heuristic' is from the Greek, εὑρίσκω, 'to discover.' It is a kind of educational technique involving or serving as an aid to learning, discovery, or problem-solving by experimental and especially trial-and-error methods.

In our study of Luke-Acts, we will use this modelling approach, and also pick and choose among these models on offer to look at those most likely to help in producing historically plausible readings of the texts, in a dialogue between ideas and techniques drawn from the social-sciences and historical criticism (Esler 1987:2-6). This methodology is useful both for exposing the biblical authors' theological frameworks and for offering an apparatus for an investigation into the dialectical relationship between a text and its socio-cultural milieu (Rohrbaugh 1987b:31).

(1) Social Construction of Reality

Total objectivity in research is an illusion (Carney 1975:1). Reality itself is partially at least a social construction, as sociologists of knowledge have recognised (cf. Berger and Luckmann 1967). The interpreter must acknowledge the formative power of his or her own social-cultural context in reading the biblical texts (Kuhn 1970). Gadamer's claim that hermeneutics has a universalistic orientation because language encompasses all meaning (1965) must be countered by Habermas' argument that language itself is dominated by social forces and, therefore, a "critique of ideology" lies at the heart of hermeneutics (1970). Awareness of the interpreter's own ideological and social-cultural context is necessary to prevent unrestrained subjectivity and to move towards relative objectivity. Such awareness highlights the distance between text and interpreter and also places the interpreter's own presuppositions in front of the text where they can be recognised, rather than behind the text where they affect reading, but remain hidden.

In the case of Luke-Acts this means that the text is a product of Luke's social world, which the reader must enter (to some degree of historical plausibility). We must, therefore, understand how Luke constructs and legitimises the social world of Luke-Acts. Berger and Luckmann (Berger and Luckmann 1967; Berger 1969; Berger & Keller 1981) provide a useful model of "the social construction of reality," which
has been applied to New Testament documents frequently (Meeks 1972; Gager 1975; Esler 1987; MacDonald 1988). Its basic thesis is as follows. In contrast to non-human animals, the human is born without specialised instincts and drives that determine the structure of their world, therefore humans must create their own stable environment by constructing an ordered “social world.” This social construction of reality is accomplished through repeated cycles of “externalisation—objectivisation—internalisation” in the ongoing and fundamental dialectical process between humans and their social world (Berger and Luckmann 1967:79). “Externalisation” refers to the idea that humans have the ability to create and project meaning into the world and thereby produce the “firm structures of life” (language, tools, values, etc.). But these meanings become so “objectified” as to take on their own authority. They then begin to dominate humans (syntax and grammar, customs, systems of social control, etc.). Individual humans “internalise” these objectified meanings and become socialised into the culture. By absorbing the values, norms, and other presuppositions of their environment, humans create their own personal and social identity. This internalisation and socialisation occurs in relationship with “significant others” (“plausibility structures,” i.e., parents, friends). But instead of merely reproducing the features of the objectified world, humans challenge, threaten, and transform these features and externalise new meanings.

The institutional programmes set up by society become objectively real as attitudes, motives and values. Having developed various levels of objectified meaning during the dialectical process, the final level is represented by “the symbolic universe,” which describes the integrated totality of the various bodies of meaning and symbolism used to legitimate a social world. The symbolic universe gives “order” to the lives it embraces. It is continuously shaped by social experience and continuously shapes that experience. A meaningful order, or nomos, is imposed upon the discrepant experiences and meanings of individuals. It is for this reason that radical separation from the social world constitutes such a powerful threat to the individual, who loses not only emotionally satisfying ties to other people, but also his or her orientation in experience, sense of identity and reality.
All socially constructed worlds are inherently precarious and a symbolic universe is exposed to changes, since the prevailing arrangements are under threat from dissenters from within, or through opposition from without, which may be capable of causing the members to falter in their commitment: oppression by an enemy, natural disasters, social injustice, economic catastrophes, appearance of heretics. To maintain a social world, the process of ‘legitimation’ is necessary to explain and justify the social order. Legitimation denotes the socially objectivated ‘knowledge’ as newly constructed meanings, to answer to any questions about the why of institutional arrangements. But some events and experience are not so easily interpreted within the existing meaning system. An entire group can undergo meaning-threshing experiences. Because the threat of the meaninglessness of such events is so great, groups try to build special legitimations into their meaning systems to justify these apparent contradictions or discrepancies. Religion is one of the classic forms of legitimation (Berger 1969:42) that makes especially strong claims for the bases of order and authority and for the specific arrangements of the social order by its references to a higher authority, legitimating human existence and providing a theodicy to explain its misery. An understanding of ‘legitimation’ is particularly significant because these processes are concerned with the transformation of the symbolic universe. In studying Luke-Acts, we understand Luke’s projection of the thought and symbolism of the Lukan community to be a ‘symbolic universe’ and we understand Luke-Acts to be an attempt at ‘legitimation’ of the community’s ‘symbolic universe’ in the face of threats from inside and outside the community. Luke uses various theological and social strategies to accomplish his purpose, especially using the language of humble social status in family and household in contrast to Temple and prominent Judean groups.

Since this thesis makes use of Berger and Luckmann, it is necessary to respond to some of the criticisms of their theory. David Horrell, largely in reliance on the works of Anthony Giddens, rejects their theory as a useful framework for research on two counts (1993; 1996:39-45; see Esler’s response, 1998c). First, he views their theory as placing too much stress on the objectivity of the social world and its coercive power, obscuring the process in which human activity reproduces and transforms that social world. But Horrell’s objection ignores Berger and Luckmann’s
focus on the dialectical process in the construction of reality whereby there is a subjective dimension as well as objective one to the transformation of the meanings of social structure. In other words, transforming activities of individuals are not forgotten (1967:66, 114). Second, he objects to their lack of a conception of critique and alternatives which means they tend to legitimise the social status quo so as to marginalise changes to the social order. But this suggests a serious misreading of Berger and Luckmann by Horrell, who fails to understand that Berger and Luckmann are attempting a phenomenological description of the social reality of everyday life, not a demonstration of the validity or invalidity of such reality (see Wuthnow 1984:54-71). Finally, postmodern challenges to Berger and Luckmann on epistemological grounds do not negate the usefulness of their model as a heuristic tool for our investigation of Luke-Acts, as we will discuss below (see Gill 1977:18-25; Thomason 1982; Esler 1987:228).

(2) Use of Models

Given the differences between the social world of Luke-Acts and our own postmodern social world, we must be careful to avoid anachronistic and ethnocentric readings of Luke-Acts, which would insert our own social context into the ancient text. Rather, we must distinguish and clarify those differences at the outset (see Malina 1991; Esler 1994:22-25; Craffert 1994). When describing social worlds, anthropologists distinguish between the ‘emic’ and ‘etic’ perspectives of description (Harris 1976; Feleppa 1986). Emic descriptions come from the insider’s point of view, the view of a native, one indigenous to the culture. In contrast, etic descriptions come from the perspective of an outsider, using cross-cultural comparison and social-scientific perspectives to understand the social world. Thus, Luke and his contemporaries give emic descriptions of their social world, whereas biblical interpreters today give etic descriptions of Luke’s social world. The social-scientific critic listens to Luke’s description and supplements it with cross-cultural comparisons. The New Testament documents were written in a ‘high context’ society, in which communicators can assume a great amount of information shared by their listener/reader and need not be spoken/written. This means that while insiders easily
‘fill in the gaps’ or ‘read between the lines,’ outsiders have a much more difficult time understanding their communication and must make more use of cross-cultural comparisons so as to pose questions likely to make sense of the data.

Is it possible to interpret the world of New Testament texts without falling into the twin pitfalls of anachronism and ethnocentrism? Despite Nineham’s (1976) gloomy scepticism, it does seem to be possible to interpret the emic data of the texts with etic concepts, theories, and models so as to arrive at plausible readings of the New Testament that avoid anachronism and ethnocentrism. The etic concepts must be based on cross-cultural comparisons that seek to answer questions about the native’s thoughts and behaviour, recognising different means of legitimising reality. Thus etic perspectives enable one to put emic data into a wider perspective, discerning relations that even a native would not have noticed (Elliott 1993:39-40). Models, then, developed from the etic perspective, play a key role when reading ancient Mediterranean texts, because merely to collect data without any explicit model would too often allow our common sense derived from modern consciousness to govern the reading (Carney 1975; Malina 1993:18-25).

We define a model as an abstract, simplified intellectual network of reality emphasising the recurrent, the ordinary, and the typical represented in a pattern of characteristics and properties which is aimed at understanding a reality under examination and controlling etic perspectives (Burke 1992:52; cf. Barbour 1974:6; Malina 1982:231). It is important to note that a model is not social law but a heuristic device to aid discovery of reality, and thereby to stimulate imagination and expand our conceptual horizons. Although models derive from a science-oriented approach to reality, models are not reality but rather useful simplifications of reality to aid in understanding, and, therefore, they are not used to determine a reality in nomothetic assertions (Barnes 1990:9-24; Esler 1998c:253-254). As reality is socially constructed, data can be collected which reflect, however imperfectly and incompletely, ‘what actually happens.’ Model construction begins with data-dredging, the relentless search for correlation between variables, followed by the formulation of explanations for the correlations that have been detected, to discern systematic regularities and variations between similar events that have occurred at
different times and different places and that have involved different communities and societies. The way then is clear for the construction of a model, an abstractly simplified version of the diverse actual manifestations of the phenomenon under scrutiny. Even if a precise measure of goodness of fit is not feasible, it is always possible to confront the model with additional data, the confrontation which may merely increase the analyst's confidence in the plausibility of the model, or lead to its elaboration to accommodate the new data, or simply to a closer specification of its limited applicability. The next step is to inquire into the reasons for the difference and to establish how the different types of external elements impinged on the various features of the society under scrutiny. A model does no more than exemplify connections between various categories of data, but it says nothing about how these connections arise and are sustained. Models are part of the human process of perception and understanding. They, in contrast to typology, generate a set of hypotheses which once verified, may either found or substantiate a theory (Esler 1987:9). Employing one or more theories, a model provides a simplified framework which can be brought to bear on some pertinent data, whether it is experimental or generalised or explanatory.

The functions of models are mainly cognitive, heuristic, and explanatory. First, cognitive models are the conceptual maps through which we perceive, filter, and organise the mass of raw material. Models have no ontological status but are only cognitive maps (Carney 1975:16; Rohrbough 1987:23). Social models are "maps" that organise selected prominent features of social terrain such as pattern of typical social behaviour, social groupings, process of social interaction, and the like. Such models provide the social traveller with typical and recurrent patterns of everyday social life in the ancient texts. It is meaningless to ask whether models are "true" or "false," or "valid" or "invalid," for what matters is whether they are useful or not (Esler 1994:12-3; 1995b:4; Barnes 1990:218). Second, they have an important heuristic function. They serve as vehicles for discovery, trying out new points of view, asking new sets of questions. And they prompt the search for patterns, correlation, and coherency. With a model of house in mind, readers will be more sensitive to the complex social dramas involved in the house scenes in Luke-Acts. Third, models also have an essentially explanatory function. Well-tested models can
serve as a means for testing theories or hypotheses (Riley 1963:14-15, 26-27). A model of ancient kinship and of the reciprocal relations typical of families can help explain the reason why the family rather than the Temple figured so prominently in Jesus' teaching on the familial character of the kingdom of God and his stress on the values of generosity, mutuality, and giving without counting the price. Models are consciously structured and systematically arranged in order to serve as an instrument for the purpose of organising, profiling, and interpreting a complex welter of raw material. Precisely since our modern interpreter's knowledge about the biblical texts is based on fragmentary information, it is useful to have models of interpretation which allow the fragments to be pieced together into a larger explanatory whole.

Models determine both what contesting sets of materials are to be examined and regarded as relevant data for an investigation, and what types of reading process are to be applicable at the outset of an investigation. It is necessary to state what kind of models will be used. The choice of models is not whether or not to use them, but whether or not to use them self-consciously and self-critically (Carney 1975:5).

II. OBJECTIONS TO MODELLING APPROACHES

Many criticisms and objections have been offered to the social-scientific approach to New Testament interpretation (Osborne 1991:141-144). Most of them have been answered (see Elliott 1993:87-100; Esler 1987:12-16). We will now examine three continuing objections: the use of models, incommensurability, and postmodern metanarratives.

1. Misunderstandings of Modelling

Since modelling is an essential part of social-scientific methodology, criticisms of the use of models must be taken seriously. It is disappointing, however, that almost all these criticisms are based on a faulty understanding of models. David
Horrell (1996:9-22) claims that it is misleading to equate a sociological approach to the text with the use of models. He offers three criticisms of models. First, models are drawn from distant contexts and are based upon the natural sciences (1996:13-15). Second, use of models cannot avoid the error of empiricism, because our own presuppositions must necessarily be brought into the decision as to which models are appropriate (1996:5). Third, models reveal and order reality from a particular perspective, shaping, prioritising, and interpreting the data (1996:15-18). The empirical origin of models does necessitate a more careful use of models for comparison, prediction, control, testing hypotheses, the search for law-like generalisations and causal explanations. Garrett (1992) calls the use of models 'nomothetic,' 'hypothetico-deductive,' and 'positivist' which deploy law-like generalisations to test models or hypotheses against empirical data to produce objective reality.

We have already responded to these criticisms above, but we now point out several more problems. First, the basic point of their criticism is that models are nomistic, but this is a mistake. One must understand the difference between the natural sciences and the social sciences (Putnam 1978:55-65). Whereas in the natural sciences law-like generalisations help the interpreter to understand how things work, in the social sciences they help us to understand how things work differently. The corpus of accumulated social-scientific understanding lacks propositions analogous to laws but is made up of interpretations and models, together with a vast but only minimally interrelated array of empirical findings. The procedure of building explanatory models is far removed from the search for elusive social laws (Barnes 1990:9-24). Although models derive from an empirical approach to reality, we do not use them in the sense of deterministic and nomothetic assertions to make a law-like generalisation. Models are not a social law but a heuristic tool. As far as the practitioners of the model-using social-scientific reading claim that models are neither social laws nor ontological statements but heuristic tools, models help them to throw up a set of new and interesting questions and hence to highlight possible connections to the data under examination. The results, while not, however, 'objectively valid,' are more plausible than some which do not use models (Esler 1995b:7). The use of models allegedly constitutes the imposition of alien and inappropriate frameworks on
the first-century materials. The application of models, even those based on modern experience, to ancient data is appropriate, as far as they are not social laws but heuristic devices, as an elaborate 'what if' examination of the primary data. Once applying models to data, if the data themselves answer, the model will be validated, but if they do not, the models will be falsified and then replaced with different or modified versions. It is a pragmatic test whether models have produced plausible historical results in the process.

Second, the accusation that models are not helpful because they derive from empirical investigation commits the genetic fallacy. The validity of a model is not based on its genealogy, but its use by practitioners. Esler rightly asks, "If a model throws up new questions, or establishes a new framework which finds responsive data in the text, what does it matter whence the model is derived?" (1998c:256).

Third, no one denies the involvement of presuppositions in the choice of models or the fact that they frame the way we perceive reality. Carney is right when he says, "If we use them unconsciously, they control us, we do not control them. Our choice rather lies in deciding to use them consciously or unconsciously" (Carney 1975:5). All scholars are not theory-producers but they are theory-users, working from a theoretical orientation that conditions what one sees, how one sees, how understanding is achieved, and how interpretations are explained. Since these theoretical orientations guide one’s thought and research, it is important that they be brought out into the open and clearly defined. The scholars who believe they work with no theory work with a bad theory. One cannot avoid using models; they will be either explicit or implicit. Explicit use is always preferable to implicit because it can be scrutinised. Implicit models leave us with a greater risk of anachronistic and ethnocentric readings of the texts (Yamauchi 1984:183; see Moxnes’ criticism of Stephen Barton’s use of kinship terminology, 1997; and Malina’s criticism of Malherbe’s use of hospitality, 1986a).

Fourth, the charge that models are deductive fails to comprehend the logical process of abduction or retroduction. Models are neither exclusively deductive nor exclusively inductive; rather, models are inclusive of both procedures, working in a
back-and-forth logical process, with constant checks along the way, a process known as "abduction." Knowledge is not derived from experience alone. Scientific discoveries emerge when hypotheses are tested by experience (Peirce 1931, 1935; Reschen 1995). Inductive and deductive reasoning processes must be maintained in a dynamic balance throughout the interpretive process. The scientific explanation suggested by abduction entails an explanatory hypothesis that renders the observed facts necessary or highly probable. This requires consideration of realities that are not explicit in the material under analysis and that frequently are not capable of direct observation, such as conventional ancient beliefs regarding spirits or the evil eye as the cause of illness.

2. Claims of Incommensurability

Garrett (1992:92-93) and Craffert (1992; 1994) have raised the question of incommensurability in the use of etic models to read ancient texts. The claim is that etic models cannot avoid anachronism and ethnocentrism (Stowers 1985:151). This is because terms used in one culture cannot be equated in meaning and reference with terms in our own culture. Garrett asks, "To what extent is genuine translation of the terms, concepts, or modes of being of an alien culture into the interpreter's own language and modes of thought possible?" (Garrett, 1992:92). This means that we could conceptualise persons in other cultures only as animals reacting to stimuli.

The problem is how to make etic categories correspond as closely as possible to emic categories. It is clear that we should avoid the "incorrigibility thesis," claiming that each culture must be interpreted in its own terms and then sort out those terms, showing them to be wrong, confused, or deluded (Taylor 1985:166-33), as with Garrett, who strives to hear "what is being said" in social discourse by identifying the culture-specific "vocabulary" in which it is expressed (Garrett 1989:34-35). Such activity exposes one to the perils of interpretivism discussed above. Craffert is right in recognising the significance of etic categories, but he uses them according to "the anthropological interpretive turn," which involves a dialectical process in which the interpreter moves back and forth from etic to emic perspectives (1994). But how can
Craffert escape the phantoms of historicism and cultural relativism? He commits the common fallacy of avoiding one pitfall-positivism-while falling into another-relativism. To avoid one, does not prevent one from falling into the other. To achieve a conjunction of emic and etic categories, Garrett and Craffert suggest the interpreter engage in continuous dialectical tacking between the two, but they do not specifically say what types of etic perspectives are permissible, and thus fail to clarify the dialectic they propose.

How can we conceptualise society using both the experiences of the actor and the conceptions of an observer without creating an artificial unification or relativism? Social anthropologists in Conceptualising Society (Kuper 1992) argue a cross-cultural theoretical view that ethnographic research yields findings which can be reinterpreted in different analytical frameworks and compared with similar data collected elsewhere by other ethnographers (Kuper 1992b:2). They ensure a reasonable degree of contiguity between emic and etic perspectives. Philippe Descola suggests the recognition of an overarching scheme through which each culture organises its practices in an immediately distinctive pattern, even if not cognitive universals but cultural invariants. It enables anthropology to escape its subjection to ethnography, to confer scientific legitimacy on an essentially intuitive mode of interpreting otherness, and to explain the correspondence between the image of coherence of the observer and the relative consistency of the actor (1992:107-126; see Carrithers 1992).

Maurice Bloch warns that the native’s thought processes are unable to describe what they say, and hence the post hoc overlinguistic rationalisations of most ethnography, based on the assumption that natives think in terms of propositions linked by logical inferences in a single lineal sequence, tend to distance the observers from what is going on in real situations in the field. Thus he calls for highly complex and integrated models, based on the recognition that thought relies on clumped networks of signification organised in multi-stranded, not lineal ways (1992:129-130). The awareness of how cultural knowledge is organised should modify the way in which we represent actors’ way of thinking in general and their conceptualisations of society in particular.
When conceptualising other cultures the problem of incommensurability can be overemphasised. Constructing a scientific model is in many ways like translating one language into another. Translators know that ideas implicit in the language developed under different, and sometimes unknown, social circumstances, and went through many changes throughout their use. Children learn their native language without understanding the history of the language. We can change our native language, enabling us to express alien notions. Successful translations always change the medium. Scientists build models and revise them accordingly when ideas do not fit. For example, Evans-Pritchard translated the Azande word *mbisimo* as *soul*. *Mbisimo* refers to the native’s poison oracle to see things far off. Evans-Pritchard acknowledged that this is not *soul* in the Western sense, implying life and consciousness, but it is a collection of public or “objective” events because there is an analogy between two words (1975:55). The addition modifies the use of the word *soul* and makes it more suitable for expressing what the Azande had in mind. Similarly, we use the word *family* to refer to first-century Mediterranean kinship structure, thereby employing a cross-cultural model of Mediterranean family in order to make sense of our reading of Luke-Acts. Without using that model, we would encounter the problem of anachronistic and ethnocentric readings in that the word with which we start is not the word with which we conclude our reading. Concepts are ambiguous, elastic, capable of reinterpretation, extrapolation, restriction. We can change concepts while retaining the associated model. Being aware that ‘speaking a language or explaining a situation means both following rules and changing them, we contend that: (1) Incommensurability occurs only when the conditions of meaningfulness for the descriptive terms of one viewpoint does not permit the use of the descriptive terms of other viewpoints: mere difference of meanings does not yet lead to incommensurability; and (2) Incommensurable points of view are completely disconnected—there exists a subtle and interesting relation between their conditions of meaningfulness.
3. Challenges from Postmodernism

Lyotard’s assertion of the “postmodern as an incredulity towards metanarratives” (1984) is a serious challenge to the social sciences in general and social-scientific criticism in particular, because the social sciences developed since the Enlightenment have been built on metanarratives that legitimate modernity and reduce human differences in pursuit of interests of power: (1) society is governed by social law-like regularities; (2) the monadic, rational subject is the basic unit of society; and (3) knowledge of society’s laws will bring about greater freedom and progress. Attacking these foundational assumptions, postmodernists argue that there are a plurality of rationalities, because rationality is historically and culturally constructed in specific contexts. Furthermore, they argue that knowledge is not neutral or universal, but interested and partial, and that knowledge does not liberate but incorporates tools of domination. They also reject the concept of spontaneous, rational, autonomous subjects, which have been basic to social theory (Best and Keller 1991:24). The postmodern climates of relativism, fragmentation, multiplicity and uncertainty, are inhospitable to modern grand theory, and post-modernity proposes that large scale historical narratives and social theoretical analysis are illegitimate. The postmodern position introduces a less exclusive kind of scholarship, a less one-sided view of what counts as knowledge, because it does not assume an identity among human subjects, but allows that rationality is culturally and socially constructed, thus acknowledging the partiality of all knowledge (Connor 1989:8).

Since we are using social-scientific theory in our investigation, we should ask whether or not such a theory falls prey to the postmodern incredulity to metanarratives. Before answering this question, we need to examine critically the postmodern position. First, the postmodern critique of science and religion does help to prevent the idolatrous equation between the partial and the divine; however, to reject totally the positive functions of tradition would be social, intellectual, and moral suicide. The idea that science is a socially constructed form of knowledge without reference to a ‘real’ reality is highly problematic. The postmodern claim that there can be no correspondence between our knowledge of the world as encoded in language and any extra-linguistic referent as the would-be object of this knowledge is
merely a ‘rhetorical effect’ because this largely incapacitates any project of social critique, due to its stance of all-out indifference, a stance that involves the willingness to jettison every last notion of truth and critical understanding (Norris 1990). It is in danger of reducing all knowledge to rhetoric and interested fiction by risking a nihilistic abdication of knowledge and flying from fact to chaos. The homogenous partition brought by postmodernism between the sciences and the humanities, between scientific knowledge and narrative knowledge, and more fundamentally between epistemology and ontology (Lyotard 1984:60) is misleading, as we argued in the critique of interpretivism. It can be described as a viewpoint without a viewpoint (see Gessler’s critique 1997). Lyotard’s rejection of science as a “debunking of empiricist philosophy of science” in favour of a postmodern conception (Habermas 1984:60; cf. Hesse 1980:173) makes the mistake of assuming that “science per se used to be what empiricism described it as being” (Rorty 1985:163), because what has been debunked is an empiricist account of science, not science per se. By failing to understand contemporary philosophy of science, Lyotard falls prey to a positive dichotomy between scientific knowledge and narrative.

Second, reading Luke-Acts as part of the Christian gospel, we cannot indiscreetly destroy all kinds of metanarratives, even though we should not view our methodology and our understanding of reality as universal and timeless objective truth. In order to make sense of our world and the texts, it is legitimate to read the texts within the metanarrative of the Christian gospel, rather than to read them with no overarching scheme (Gorringe 1997). The problem for Lyotard is that unmasking only makes sense if we “preserve at least one standard for [the] explanation of the corruption of all reasonable standards” (Habermas 1982:28). Ironically, we claim that Lyotard’s incredulity to metanarratives is an incredulous metanarrative itself, because it cannot escape from the need to generate a metanarrative. And in order to see reality, we need a view-point at the least: looking for the larger thing and the next smaller, we need the idea of scale—of what is appropriate at different scales and the relationships of each others—which is very important to construct a reality (Gessler 1997:44). Without any scale, we will fall in the endless play of difference. A scale can be either legitimised if it is fit to see phenomena or modified or falsified if not fit.
Having criticised the postmodern incredulity to metanarratives, we can, however, appreciate the postmodernist’s insights into the plurality of rationality. Accordingly, we view the role of social-scientific criticism in biblical studies not as providing rigid, timeless truths, but as providing heuristic tools. Thus we do not see postmodernism as “inviting the abandonment of theory” (Nicholson 1990:9). We do not claim that the models we use are universal and timeless, legitimising our knowledge of reality as the absolute truth. With Berger and Luckmann (1967) we insist that society is a human construction, and sociology itself and its theories are also constructions. Thus we offer a corrective to the positivist’s conception. For Lyotard a narrative is not a metanarrative unless it legitimates the oppressing social power (1984:19). In step with the postmodern critique, we construct theory and model situated in space and time, but we avoid the charge of nihilistic scepticism by distinguishing between legitimate and illegitimate truth claims, by validating or falsifying, by allowing a range of possibilities, and by tolerating differences—if not mutually exclusive (Craib 1992; Lefebvre 1991). We use models as heuristic tools, not as truths. This means our conceptual tools need not be true in some universal sense. They are validated by their usefulness. Theory is less a matter of truth than a matter of use, like cognitive maps at which we choose to look and in relation to which we plan our journey (Taylor 1985:104-111).

III. CONCLUSION

Approaching Luke-Acts from a social-scientific perspective, with the ultimate aim of having the text pose a challenge to Korean Christianity, we define our methodology as a way of exegeting texts with help from models drawn from the social sciences that enable us to analyse historical texts in their social and cultural contexts. Together with historical criticism, we use social scientific imagination to make sense of texts that benefit our contemporary faith community. The usefulness of the social scientific method will be demonstrated in its ability to help us imagine the facts not
mentioned by Luke, in building a holistic picture of Luke’s social world, in clarifying the social locations of Luke, and in providing kerygma for our faith communities today (see Esler 1995b), especially in a Korean Christianity caught up in arguably dysfunctional forms of ecclesial structures and architecture.
CHAPTER TWO: THE ARCHITECTURE AND THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE KOREAN CHURCH.

In order to look at the Temple and house in Luke-Acts heuristically, we will build up a model derived from church architecture with help from anthropological investigations of architectural space. Here the Korean Protestant church will be investigated as an empirical example to see how its architecture and phenomenology reveal dialectical relations between one another, while also introducing its problems for Christian identity. The procedure will be as follows: (1) a short history of the Korean church to outline its current dilemma; (2) sociological theories for analysing the problems; (3) architectural theories of social territoriality and space; (4) applications of these theories to both early Christian architecture and the architecture of the Korean church. As a result, we will find that the current dilemma of the Korean church is intimately related to the problems of its architecture.

I. THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF THE KOREAN CHURCH

1. A Short History of the Korean Protestant Church. 8

Korean Protestant Christianity began in 1876 in Manchuria at the hands of the Scotland Bible Society’s missionaries, John Ross and John McIntyre. Some Koreans were baptised in Manchuria and co-operated in Bible translation (Fig. 1). They worked in Korea for the promotion of the Bible (Fig. 2) and the establishment of the first Korean church in So-Rae, at 1884 (Fig. 3a), (Ross 1881; 1890). Until 1882, the Chosun dynasty did not officially permit foreign religions and persecuted Christianity. Over 10,000 Korean Catholics and twenty French Catholic missionaries were martyred during the five major persecutions (1771, 1781, 1839, 1846, 1866). A British missionary, Robert Thomas, was also martyred in 1866. The Chosun-American Treaty of Amity (1882) and the Chosun-French Treaty (1883) made

8See the standard references for Korean Protestant church history, Paik 1929; Min 1982; Kim 1992.
missionary activities possible. The latter prescribed concretely a missionary's rights for missionary activities, including the purchase of land and buildings for the church, and the passport (Hozo) for 'enseigner' (education) (Kim 1994:22). At the outset, Western Protestant missionaries evangelised through (1) the tour mission (Fig.4), in which missionaries used the Korean traditional space of fellowship, i.e. Sarangchae (a detached building used for a reception), and through (2) enculturation of Christianity through the Nevius method summarised in three principles: self-support, self-government, self-propagation (Clark 1930:33-34; Palmer 1967:26-30). They also contributed to the modernisation of Korea through medical (Fig.5.a.b.c) and educational activities. As a consequence of their mission, in 1907 the Korean Presbyterian church established an independent synod and ordained seven pastors to be sent as missionaries (Kim 1992:125-141), and revival movements took place at Pyongyang, and by 1907 the number of believers had multiplied by 270% compared with 1905 (Chun 1987:166-174; Huntley 1968:408).

During the Japanese colonial period (1910-1945), the Korean church suffered severe trials and persecutions through the Independence Declaration (1.3.1919) and the resistance movements opposing Shinto-worship (1931-1945), because the churches played an essential role in the resistance movements and the Christian educational institutions were the seedbed for enlightened national leaders. As a result, many churches were destroyed or damaged (82 places by 1919) and a number of Christians were imprisoned (40,000) or martyred (6,000) (Kim 1992:171, 216). Japanese occupation left deep wounds on Korean Christianity. Due to the persecution, the mode of faith characteristic of Korean Christianity degenerated into internalisation and an otherworldly-orientation which meant losing a sense of social and national responsibility. Also some of the Christian leaders conformed to Japanese colonial policy (especially Shinto-worship), thus forfeiting their national credibility and forming a church that separated itself from national history.

After the Liberation, the Korean church experienced a period of reorientation whereby the churches underwent reconstruction and segmentation (Chun 1987:269-304). From the Korean War (1950-53) to the military coup d'état (16.5.1961), the church shared in the national trials of the war and the loss of many ministries by the
persecution of communists. In this period, however, church division was intensified through theological debates between liberal and conservative, purity debates on Shinto-worship participation between those protesting and those conforming, and the introduction of new denominations (Chun 1987:320-322). During the 30 years reign of military dictatorship after 1960, Korea developed into an affluent society through vigorous economic development (O’Donnell 1973). The church also rapidly expanded by stepping up the movement of national evangelism (Fig.6,7,8). In 1964, Protestants numbered 812,254, and Catholics, 754,471, while by 1988 the figures had become respectively 10,337,075 and 2,312,328. Between 1988 and 1994, however, the number of Protestant Christians actually fell while that of Catholic Christians grew significantly, and this fact points to a malaise in Korean Protestantism which must now be addressed.

2. The Current Dilemma of the Korean Church

At the start of the twenty-first century, the Korean Protestant church set in the context of a modern pluralistic society, faces an important dilemma: How can the Korean church continually grow and develop, while it fulfils its social responsibilities and maintains a credible voice at the same time? As a social institution, its social roles and functions are indispensably related to its growth (Choi 1992:190-194). If it lacks social credibility, the church will be isolated in a religious ghetto without the social prophetic function of being light and salt. During the 1990s, the church’s members were in a state of stagnation or confusion, and its social credibility was often criticised (Gallup 1989:116-127). If church growth and development have a substantial relation to social influence, the present Korean Protestant church is in a mess and needs to review its social position for re-growth (Lee 1992:10). Why does

---

9 By the end of the war, 948 churches and Christian institutions had been destroyed, but 2,050 churches were erected.

10 The statistical situation of the Korean church

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>30,398</td>
<td>161,468</td>
<td>382,800</td>
<td>736,844</td>
<td>7,637,010</td>
<td>10,337,075</td>
<td>10,215,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>42,441</td>
<td>43,278</td>
<td>180,956</td>
<td>590,962</td>
<td>1,711,367</td>
<td>2,312,328</td>
<td>2,878,467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Protestant church lack social concern and experience stagnant participation rates? If we compare this with the outstanding growth of the Catholic church in the 1990s, we may find a clue. In the 1980s, the Catholic church carried out a successful programme of participation in the social and political fields to work for justice and to develop individual spirituality (Choi 1992). In attempting to illustrate the current problems of Korean Protestant church, we do not contend that it can be explained only from its social phenomena to a reasonable extent, but assume that the problems can be related to its social relations, because the church is not separated from but substantially related to its surrounding society.

First, the absence of social influence represents the main problem of the Korean church in its present situation. At present, although Korean Christians number ten million believers, a quarter of the total population, it has often been pointed out that they exert a minimal influence on Korean history, culture and society (Lee 1989; 1992; Yi 1995). Why are they unable to transform the Korean society, which is affected by injustice and inequality in every part? This is a serious question for the present Korean Christian identity, especially since this failure may originate in a ghetto mentality rooted in exclusive attitudes (Kim 1992b; Lee 1992:35).

The religious exclusivity of Korean Protestant believers, by which I mean an attitude toward those who belong to other religions or even denominations which are regarded as the out-groups, is distinct and strong. A Korean sociologist of religion, Won-Kyu Lee, reports that their religious exclusivity is stronger in females than males (48.7%:38.0%), the middle-aged (20s:36.0, 30s:41.1, 40s:55.4, 50s:43.5, 60s:41.7). The higher the office held, the more exclusive (lay:35.8, deacon “as proxy”:49.6, female elder:51.3, elder:55.0). Thus there exists a high correlation between the career of faith, the holding of a church office and religious exclusivity. Among the denominations, the more conservative the more exclusive (Ki-jang:13.5, Methodist: 40.6, Tonghab:46.6, Baptist:56.1, Habdong:58.5, the Holiness:68.3). The believers who practise an individual devotional life, who are enthusiastic about the church, who maintain orthodox doctrine and conservative attitudes, who have assurance of

(The Ministry of Culture and Information, 1994 (the gross population was 45,678,282 in 1994).
salvation, and who have deep spiritual experience, have a strong exclusivity. The intensification of religiosity reinforces religious exclusivity (Lee 1992:51). This exclusivity has a tendency to influence powerfully social relationships with other social groups within and outside Christianity.

What impact does the exclusivism have on the collective sense of identity? Four broad areas of concern can be identified in answer to this question. First of all, exclusivity in a pluralistic society generates a consciousness of superiority. This consciousness in a group expresses the solidarity of the in-group and antagonism toward the out-group. The more religion clings to the acceptance of its adherents’ capabilities, the more it emphasises the loyalty of this group and plants a sense of superiority, while deepening antagonism and the sense of rejection toward outsiders (Argyle & Beit-Hallahmi 1975: ch.6-7). The conflict situations with other religions or denominations enforce the solidarity of each group and produce a persistently dichotomised thinking and language of ‘we’ and ‘they’, the elected and the cursed, believer and non-believer, the saints and the secular, conservative and liberal Religious exclusivity holds the potential for social conflict owing to the close relation of religion with social consciousness. Human attitudes, expectations, knowledge, behaviour, and beliefs are generally developed into consistent orientations. If religious beliefs are conservative (or progressive), political, economic, social orientation of values tends to follow in the same direction (Shaw & Constanzo 1970). Such exclusivism is significantly reflected in the external appearance of church architecture: Most churches that have exclusive tendencies maintain or build Gothic or Romanesque style architecture, while churches that have inclusive tendencies, build environment-harmonious style buildings.

11 Report on relation of faith and exclusivity of Korean Protestant believers (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religiosity</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Med.</th>
<th>Low</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth of faith in self assessment</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual life of devotion</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief of doctrine</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of salvation</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious experience</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(the degree of percentage refers to the ratio of respondents who reveal religious exclusivity, among each categories of ‘high’, ‘middle’ and ‘low’)
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Second, religious exclusivity has an impact not only on the social role of the church but also on the Christian community itself, in which strong tendencies of clericalism and hierarchical order are generated. Even though Protestantism explicitly claims the principle of priesthood of all believers, the Korean Protestant church is implicitly organised around clericalism. For example, the pastor is regarded as the priest of Leviticus, different from the lay believer. Furthermore, such a view is reflected in the use of the Levitical terminology: church as ‘temple’, platform as ‘sanctuary’, worship at daybreak as ‘daybreak sacrifice,’ the ordained pastor and elder as ‘the anointed servant’ (Kim 1992:305-310). Ordinary believers are not permitted to enter the sanctuary. These terms and practices imply that the ministers are more sacred than lay believers and that there are differences of degree of election within believers. Consequently, this creates the stratification of church office, imitating Leviticus, such as pastor, elder, deacon etc., and the odd deacon-system which is divided into the anointed and the provisional deacons. Moreover, the Baptist church and the Methodist church awkwardly introduced the elder-system which originally did not exist. The early Korean church had the pastor system of co-worker (different from the associate pastor), but from the 1950s, with the appearance of large-scale churches, it produced the vice-pastor system: the assistant pastor is not included in the membership of the church session, and can work only as a provisional officer. In general, these offices are recognised as relating to status and prestige rather than to function characterised by servanthood and stewardship. Thus exclusivism leads to the wrong consciousness of believers within believers. Such strong clericalism has also created or strongly contributed to the inner structure of architecture, which divides explicitly between clergy space and congregation space, as I will explain in Part III of this chapter.

Third, the Korean Protestant church is deeply involved in capitalistic materialism. Having engaged with a growth-oriented administration of the church as it has, the church tends to give priority to the quantitative growth of the church members’ numbers, the amount of collections, and the size of church buildings (Kim 1992:327-328). These administrative tendencies create numerous ways to acquire members’ economic resources. For example, the majority of churches have had
events of ‘general mobilisation’ from the late 1980s, which originated in the context of the military emergency, in order to invite anyone, whether or not a believer, to offer material gifts and rewards according to target, and even to have famous television stars or entertainers, who would attract people and speak of their experience of conversion. The church creates a system of various types of offerings to build up financial resources, which are mostly reinvested in building-programmes without spending on education of believers or on the social concerns of poor, orphans, and widows (Gallup 1989: 138-139). The gospel is commercialised to guarantee social success, faith-healing, and personal security for eternal life and in order to gather as many church members as possible. All this leads to a tendency toward individualism and churches conceived on a grand-scale. And since the worship space is focused on the preacher, the congregation becomes simply an auditor or observer, and this naturally leads the ministers of grand-scale churches to seek fame for their preaching or other talent. Consequently, mobility of believers between churches increases, and the church is re-organised along the lines of the preaching capability of ministers. Among the new-comers, about 80% are believers who move from other churches (Kim 1992: 327). Anonymous believers also increase in number, albeit with an apparent diminution of their commitment to community. The dissolution of Christian sense of community actually parallels the market situation, as market principles of capitalism are introduced into the Korean church (Kim 1992: 345-347). This commercialism is explicitly revealed in highly active church building programmes. It is difficult to find a church building which has over 50 years of history. Since 1980s, most of the churches have rebuilt their buildings to have more space to accommodate huge congregations.

Fourth, the weakened sense of community also correlates to the decreased sacramental activity, especially of the Eucharist. Sacramental rituals have a function of integration that endows meaning to everyday life and cultivates adaptability to changes in life (Mol 1983). However, most churches practise the Eucharist and baptismal rituals only twice a year, and such infrequency induces a misunderstanding of the true meaning of the Sacraments (Kim 1992: 310-312). It is hard to find anyone who thinks that Baptism is a rite of entry into a community or that the Eucharist is a celebratory rite of solidarity of community. Rather, it is commonly thought that
Baptism is a faith-confirmation of individual believers by church officials and the Eucharist is a rite of repentance. Over-emphasis on preaching and the diminished significance of sacraments make believers depend only on talented ministry while neglecting communal character of the church as the body of Christ. The emphasis upon preaching and less participation in the Sacraments are crucial factors of worship that lead the church itself to an individualistic consciousness of faith (Gallup 1989: 107-109). This tendency is explicitly exposed in the inner structure of church architecture: the pulpit platform is positioned on a higher place and tends to be more finely constructed than the Sacrament table.

3. Dialectical Relation of These Problems to Architecture

As we have mentioned, these problems are substantially related to church architecture. Deterministic formulations of the relationship between people and their built environments should be rejected, however. Architectural determinism proposes two causal relationships (Harris and Lipman 1980): that either behaviour determines the architectural form of an environment ('form follows function'); or that behaviour is the result of environment ('function follows form'). Psychological explanations such as Cooper’s Jungian interpretation of the house as an archetypal symbol of the self, or notions that private property psychologically fulfils a vital need of the soul (1974), may be criticised for treating social phenomena as a universal law (Pratt 1981).

Nevertheless, the notion that the present problems of Korean Christianity have a close relationship with church architecture is worth considering carefully. Despite various diagnoses on the origin of Korean church problems, the interrelationship between Christian identity and the built-environment has barely been investigated. Architecture asserts an enduring influence on the life of worshippers, and it provides a frame of reference capable of helping us to understand the phenomenology of the Korean church.
At the most general theoretical level, Berger’s theory of social construction (1969) can be used to understand the dialectical relationship between the human use of space and architecture: humans build architecture into which they externalise their own meanings, and the architectural meanings are also objectified to impose the socially sanctioned orders upon humans; humans internalise these social orders in accordance with the institutionalised social structure by creating their social identity in the context of architectural space. Within the plausibility structure created by these ongoing dialectical interactions, architecture plays an active role in structuring and legitimising social norms and social relations, and the social-world itself. It is important to note that the meanings and uses of space are not determined: the relationship between spaces and people is dynamic and changeable in the course of power struggles among individuals, groups, or even different societies (Rapoport 1976:9; Donley-Reid 1990:115). Once space has been bounded and shaped, it is no longer merely a neutral or passive backdrop for life, but it also actively participates in creating and maintaining power relations. Studying how spaces and objects are given meaning and how that meaning helps to shape a society is an effective means for understanding the pattern of a specific social order. Thus it is our basic argument that there is a dialectical relationship between the current dilemmas of the Korean Protestant Christianity in society and its architecture. We will seek to substantiate this view in the argument which follows.

II. SOCIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATION OF THE CURRENT DILEMMA

In order to analyse effectively the current problems of the Korean Protestant church within the framework of relationships between church and society, the understanding of religions developed by proponents of the sociology of religion is helpful.

1. Theoretical Perspectives on Religion.
Berger defines modern society as religious pluralistic society. The modernity of modern society brought about a pluralistic situation in consequence of institutional and cognitive diversification owing to loss of the transcendental foundation of the plausibility structure that provided an apparent objectivity of values in a unitary society. This structure was consequently replaced by various and subjective values. In modern society, various plausibility structures exist and these structures themselves are also unstable and inconsistent. Thus, individuals live in the market situation, keep coming and going between competitive and contradictory plausible structures, and purchase their own version of reality at any one time (Berger 1979:76).

In the market situation, religious plurality is for human beings the heretical imperative: in pre-modern society, heresy is no more than possibility, but in modern society it is typically necessary and the adoption and/or rejection of heresy are imperative (Berger 1981:22-39). The imperative of selection is fundamentally caused by human nature needing a plausible structure to harmonise the cosmos and the nomos (Berger 1981:29-37). This situation results in the dynamics of customer preference, a more powerful and newer pattern of secular influence, in which religions transform the aspects of their social structure as well as religious contents in order to have market appeal. In consequence, religion retreats from the sphere of giving meaning and sense of belonging to the preference of individuals or family, and it is deprived of its binding force and tends to be subjective. Berger calls it the privatisation of religion (Berger 1981:151; McGuire 1981:39).

Confronting pluralistic society, every religion shows two contradictory tendencies of identification and retreat. The former is the typical response of liberalism, and it conforms to the pluralistic situation. It involves a game of religious enterprise with the renovation of its products in accordance with customer desire. But it risks losing the sacred as the essential plausibility of religion. The latter is the

12 Religious pluralism in sociology is quite different from that in theology. The latter is the view that belief systems of all religions variously reflect the universal truth, thus the dialogue of inter-religions is possible. But the former is the phenomenological approach to
conservative type, which refuses to conform to the situation, and maintains its socio-religious structure. It is available to protect religiosity from modernity and to keep the sacred, but it also has the drawback of association with a cognitive minority that isolates itself from the secular society and sticks to a supernatural position, and finally becomes a sect in relation to society (Berger 1979:35).

Although Berger admirably penetrates the modern situation of religion, he does not adequately consider the third alternative, of self-transformation and renewal of religion itself, which seeks to transform society in accordance with its world-view. Berger’s theory of religious pluralism is based on an American model where Christianity is the dominant religion, but it does not fit into the Korean situation in which there is a variety of religions which are competitive and contradictory. So the following must be considered. First, as Luckmann points out, a consideration of religious society should include traditional religions as well as pseudo-religion and alternative-religions (Luckmann 1982:151). Second, it is needful to evaluate the influence of the situation of religious pluralism with respect to growth of religion in quantity and quality, and psychological effects on individual religiosity, and social contribution and problems. Third, religious groups respond to pluralism not only by retreat and identification but also by social transformation through self-renovation. In history the church not only stands passively but also moves dynamically to transform social and cultural values in order to preserve tension between the sacred and the secular (Lee 1992:84).

According to Max Weber, religion had three social functions (1963:20). (1) **Social integration**: religion justifies the dominant values and norms of society and makes arrangements for the collective sense of members, and thus contributes to social ordering and stability. Max Weber called this the priestly function of religion. (2) **Social transformation**: this is the prophetic function of religion as it leads to change of attitudes and behaviour by inducing a conscious transformation of society. (3) **Social control**: here religion sublimates existing social values and norms and maintains the priority of social aim over individual desires and the superiority of religious pluralistic society as a kind of social phenomenon in which all religious groups coexist in competitive situations (Berger 1981).
collective discipline over individual impulse. The early Korean church contributed to society in an appropriately balanced stance with these three functions, but since 1920 (when Japanese persecution was intensified), the church has operated along the lines of Berger’s notion of conformity to, or retreat from, the society (Lee 1992:87-91).

How can the Korean church manage not to retreat from modern society or assimilate into it, but rather transform it? In order to transform a sickened society into a healthy one, the Korean church needs to reflect on the first phrase of its history in which it played an active role of social transformation, and closely scrutinise why nearly ten million Christians make little impact on the wider society. The problems mentioned above involve a fundamental problem of Christian identity in a situation of religious pluralism. How can such a situation be reconciled with what Luke has to say on the question of Christian identity in the areas of inclusivism or exclusivism? In order to bring a Lukan perspective to bear upon a whole national approach to Christian identity, we need to expose the unbiblical nature of what is going on and to point to a genuinely biblical alternative. Theologically we are talking about Christianity having a prophetic rather than a Constantinian role in society, similar to the way in which the Old Testament prophets, like Amos, Hosea, Micah, and First Isaiah played a prophetic role in their society.

2. A Brief Characterisation of This Dilemma

The above-mentioned dilemmas for Korean Christianity may be categorised into retreat from and conformity to Korean capitalist society, with both characterised by a state of immaturity in terms of political democracy, economical equality, social welfare, and cultural materialism (Lee 1992:91-106). First, the church is deeply conformed to capitalist materialism and has no credible response to economic inequality (Gallup 1984). Social and economic successes, whether personal or national or legitimate or illegitimate, are uncritically recognised as divine blessing. Second, more seriously, based on a sacred-secular dichotomy, the church has retreated from any significant concern for political dictatorship, social welfare, and deterioration of social values (Gallup 1984:178-180). The exclusivistic consciousness
of Korean Protestant Christianity appears as both social indifference and individualism. And the Christian faith is privatised without a sense of community in a pluralistic market situation. This privatisation results in pronounced competition for personal social status and position within the community, by pastors, elders, or lay members.

What we need to supply in answer to these dilemmas is, above all, the prophetic role to criticise Korean social ills and to suggest alternatives. If the Christian message is the truth of God, the church should concretise it in social dimensions. The church, in a social circumstance of urbanisation and industrialisation, needs to provide plausible meanings, to supply a sense of solidarity, to heal the crisis of identity and destroyed communality. And the church should supply a social foundation for the restoration of morality and values. To suggest ways for the church to play an active role in society, we will particularly focus on Korean church architecture, which is closely related to the broad dilemmas as already intimated. Since, as I will now explain, architecture is an integral part of the problem, it can also be part of the prophetic solution in a significant way just as it was in the first 300 years of Christianity before Constantine.

III. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON ARCHITECTURAL SPACE

1. Why Architecture?

Why should architecture be a problem? Architecture is not a fixed, neutral environment, but it actively and significantly exerts its own influence on human life and experiences to create divisions and hierarchies of social structure. Architecture is not only shaped by the society that created it but also imposes constraints on subsequent social action and creates potent stage-sets for social action: “first we shape our buildings and afterwards our buildings shape us” (W. Churchill from Pearson & Richards 1994:2). Architecture is ‘meaningful’ not only as an obvious feature of human material culture but also in terms of its role in constructing society, as a mode of creating and transmitting social statements (Locock 1994:1).
2. Architecture Speaks.

What differentiates architecture from paintings and sculpture is *space* (Zevi 1957:17). Architecture does not exist as the constructing elements which are surrounding space, but rather it is void itself as the surrounded space in which human beings can live and act (Zevi 1957:167; Chang 1981:52). The spatial substance of architecture is the lives of people and their physical, mental and religious activities in space. As architectural space stirs up limitless responses to itself, it provides a possibility of architectural experience (Zevi 1957:306).

Christian Noberg-Schulz, a Norwegian architect, understands *expressive space* as the essence of architectural space, in which humans not only act, perceive, exist and think but also represent their existence in a real image of the world (1986:27-37). Expressive space forms a psychological image in the human mind, and the image is not the simple imitation or reappearance of a *Gestalt* that is passively given by perception and experience. Rather it functions as *symbol* in that humans perceive objects and gain images and knowledge, and act on the basis of them, as children do in the process of socialisation based on similarity of phenomena and habituation of the perceiver (1980:81). So architecture can express a semantic substance able to communicate social meanings in its spatial context, which affect human social identity (Eco 1973:135-136; Jeodicke 1985:261-2). In the relevant positions of each participant in relation to each other in the gathering and to items in a fixed environment, people may 'manoeuvre for position' knowing that their fellows may 'read' from this their social importance. Thus *space speaks* (Ardener 1993:2).

3. How Does Space Speak in A Society?

In speaking social meanings, space exerts actively its own social influence to form a social-world in architectural contexts. There is a reflective and ongoing interrelationship between architectural space and social order: since spatial organisations are a product of social structure, there is *a social logic of space*; and since architectural space creates and orders relations between people, there is *a spatial logic of society* (Hillier and Hanson 1989). How and why do different forms of social
reproduction require and find an embodiment in a different type of spatial order? Hillier and Hanson’s analysis of ‘space availability’ shows that architecture has its embedded-social purpose, and that the creation of physical boundaries by architecture exercises a control over the possibilities for social interaction within, and so serves to structure social relations between inhabitants and between inhabitants and outsiders.

One of their basic concepts is the contrast between spatial (organic) solidarity and transpatial (mechanical) solidarity. Spatial solidarity signifies the closeness between members of a social group generated by spatial contiguity and proximity by stressing, not the separatedness of the interior, but the continuity of interior and exterior. Movement across the boundary is the fundamental condition of existence for a spatial solidarity. In such circumstances an elaborate and controlled interior cannot be sustained, nor is it necessary. Encounters are to be generated, not limited, and this implies the weakening of restriction at and within the boundary. In contrast, transpatial solidarity signifies differentiation by spatial analogy and difference to develop the discreteness of the interior by strong control of the boundary. Such solidarity requires the segregating effect of the boundary to preserve the interior structure from uncontrolled incursion. Solidarity means in this case the reproduction of an identical pattern by individuals who remain spatially separated from each other, as well as from the surrounding world. By creating such transpatial solidarity, a social group generates spaces of control and power in order to impose its social order on its users, resulting in both social solidarity between the insider members and social segregation from the outsiders (Hillier and Hanson 1989:144-146).

For Hillier and Hanson, a building is at least a domain of knowledge in the sense that it is a certain spatial ordering of categories, and a domain of control in the sense that it is a certain ordering of boundaries, by identifying persons with special access to and control of the category of space created by boundary. In this sense lay members in church, patients in a hospital, guests in a house, all fall within a category of being more than strangers, in that they have a legitimate reason to cross the boundary of a building, but less than inhabitants in that they have no control over that building and their social individuality is not mapped into the structure of space within it (Hillier and Hanson 1990:146-47). Social identity is partly determined by “the
physical and spatial constituents of the groups’ environment” (Matthews 1980:4): space defines the people in it. At the same time, the presence of individuals in space in turn determines its nature: people define space.

The second concept of Hillier and Hanson worth noting here is the contrast between the *distributive arrangement of space*, which facilitates movement from any one area to any other and so promotes a maximum number of social encounters, and the *non-distributive arrangement of space*, which generates hierarchies and restricts those movements and interactions.

In a similar way, Edward Hall distinguishes between ‘*sociofugal* space and ‘*sociopetal* space’ (1966). Sociopetal space creates a sense of intimacy which closely brings together people who gather in the space (cf. private space), while sociofugal space tends to keep people apart (cf. public space). The environment imposes certain restraints on our mobility, and, in turn, our perceptions of space are shaped by our own capacity to move about. Controlling settings for activities constitutes one of the major prerogatives of those who are in power. Powerful people determine the use, symbolic meanings, and form of domestic spaces: spaces loaded with meaning help to ensure that the powerful will remain in power. These ranked spaces aid the continuation of the pattern of power relations. The people in power turn architectural spaces into mnemonic devices that cue their superior position. By constructing symbolic boundaries, not only does architecture affect behaviour, guide it, constrain it, but also built-environments are created to support desired behaviour (Rapoport 1977; 1982b). The divisions and hierarchies of social structure are depicted through the use of architectural space. Thus space reflects social organisation.

Architecture can be seen as ‘suggestive’ in that it can suggest new behaviour, as well as being a mnemonic device for reminding users of particular types of behaviour. It raises a fundamental question of “*who does what, where, when, including or excluding whom and why*” (Rapoport 1982a. 1982b; 1990). This last insight raises the need to consider more carefully the relationship between space and power, an area usefully focused in Sack’s notion of ‘territoriality’.

How space is used and who controls whom and why? According to Robert Sack, human territory is about power to state relationships between humans.

Territoriality in humans is best thought of as not biologically motivated, but rather as socially and geographically rooted. Its use depends on who is influencing and controlling whom and on the geographical contexts of place, space, and time. Territoriality is intimately related to how people use land, how they organise themselves in space, and how they give meaning to place (Sack 1986:2).

Territoriality is a human strategy to affect, influence, and control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting controls over a geographic space to use for security, defence and to display social hierarchy (Sack 1986:19). Simply circumscribing things in space or on maps, does not by itself create a territory, but this delimitation becomes a territory only when its boundaries are used to affect behaviour by controlling access. Boundary moulds behaviour and thus the place becomes territory. Territoriality is a strategy to establish different degrees of access to people, things, and relationships. A community will need territoriality to co-ordinate efforts, specify responsibilities, and prevent people from getting in each other’s way. Territoriality, as a component of power, is not only a means of creating and maintaining order, but is a device to create and maintain much of the spatial context through which we experience the world and give it meaning. Territoriality is always socially constructed in a way that it does not exist unless there is an attempt by individuals or groups to affect the interactions of others.

Church architectural space expresses its territoriality in both size and divisions. First, architectural space may be broadly divided into two categories: human space and monumental space. Great monuments, including mega-scale churches shout their presence and instil feelings of awe and wonder, while familiar
environments are taken for granted. Space commands bodies, prescribing or proscribing gestures, routes and distances to be covered. Monumentality always embodies and imposes a clearly intelligible message: the will to power and the arbitrariness of power beneath signs and surfaces which claim to express collective will and collective thought (Lefebvre 1991:143). A human scale, which is built for human needs, and a monumental scale, which is built for giving a strong impression and for reigning over worshippers, provide quite different experiences of architecture. The spatial distance between oneself and those with whom one is engaged in social relations of various kinds is charged with social meanings. In a monumental building, architectural space mainly consists of sociofugal space by imposing territorial boundaries which regulate who will be allowed or refused access to space. But human space is a form of sociopetal space which consolidates the members within a social group especially in contexts of kinship or fictive-kinship.

Second, by dividing its internal space, church architecture expresses its territoriality by controlling access to the various parts of its space according to hierarchy. Its space is subdivided into areas of varying degrees of sanctity: the altar, for example, is holier than the rest of the sanctuary; the sanctuary is holier than the choir; the choir is holier than the nave; and the nave is holier than the porch (Davis 1968:205). These spaces are set apart by boundaries to express hierarchical authority according to spatial accessibility. During church ceremonies, only those who are officials of the church are to have access to the sanctuary, the altar being accessible only by the highest church officials, while the nave is reserved for the people. Church territoriality has gone hand in hand with the development of church organisation and hierarchy (Sack 1986:98).

How will territoriality affect the nature of the church? Worship space is the field where a worshipper feels that s/he takes up his/her own human duties in worship as a drama. But the establishment of a hierarchy through the segmentation of worship space causes the worshipper to feel alienated from, and passive toward, worship.

13 There are four kinds of human needs: the essential need of shelter for human survival, the functional needs of human life (including food and clothing), the meaningful need of a particular human life style, and the symbolic need for human sentiments and instinct (Maslow 1970).
Worship space is not only divine space for God but also human space for projecting human existence. The hierarchical structure of space in church architecture, which symbolises the platform as sanctuary creates a social-psychological template which replicates the exclusive consciousness of faith and society, based on dualism and hierarchy, in the structure of the consciousness of believers. I will explain the significance of this view for Korean Protestant Christianity later in this chapter.

5. Space and Society.

Finally I will consider how various social groups have used their architectural space in relation to their socio-political complexities. The use of space is a 'sociogram' not so much of a social group as of a social system (Hillier & Hanson 1984:159). Based on qualitative data derived from the Human Relations Area Files, other ethnographic and ethnoarchaeological sources and her own fieldwork, Susan Kent, a cultural anthropologist, has chosen seventy-three societies and grouped them into five categories in comparative levels of socio-political complexity in relation to organisation of architecture and use of the space (1990b:128-148). Thus she produces a useful heuristic device. Social complexity is seen as cultural segmentation which can be broken down into status stratification (social segments), hierarchies (socio-political segments), specialisation and division of labour (economic segments), and pronounced sex roles (gender segments) as well as age roles (age segments). Differentiation conveys a sense of specialisation and/or unequalness that is not present with mere segregation.

Kent categorises from category I societies (Mbuti Pygmy and 5 other nomadic ones) to V societies (China, Mediterranean [Greece, Turkey], Iran, Western and Eastern Europe, and 22 other sedentary agriculturalist societies). The Category I societies are characterised as having little socio-political stratification, economic specialisation, and a comparatively less rigid division of labour and differences between gender. Accordingly, there are no architectural partitions, nor any overt activity area segmentation, neither gender-specific nor age-segregated loci. The trend towards separate socio-political activity areas as well as architectural space is
associated with increasing socio-political segmentation from category II through category V societies. The Category V societies are the most socio-politically stratified, hierarchical, and specialised in terms of full-time social, political, religious, and economic specialists, secular and non-kin control groups. Emphasis on gender differences and a rigid division of labour are pronounced. Segmentation is visibly developed both in the architecture and the use of space in a manner familiar to modern readers.

In raising the question why some groups segment or differentiate their space and built-environment more than others, Kent suggests that the greater the amount of socio-political complexity present in a group, the higher the ratio of functionally restricted to multi-purpose activity loci and the more compartmentalised areas that appear in the architecture (Kent 1990b). Segmentation in various parts of culture, behaviour, and cultural materials increases with the development of socio-political complexity. The organisation of space can be linked to the spatial logic of society, which deals with the integration of people, culture, and socio-political complexity. Kent proposes as her two basic premises: (1) social complexity determines the organisations of space and of built-environment, particularly with respect to partitioning or segmentation; (2) societies with a more segmented and differentiated culture in terms of socio-political stratification, hierarchies, rigid division of labour, and economic specialisation, will tend to use more segmented activity areas and more segmented cultural material or partitioned architecture, functionally discrete objects, and gender-restricted items (Kent 1984; cf. Rapoport 1969).

IV. APPLICATION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL THEORIES

As noted above, Korean church architecture is intrinsically related to the dilemma facing contemporary Korean Christianity. I will first very briefly outline the histories of church architecture in the West and in Korea to provide a context for a detailed explanation of the current situation and an analysis using the theory set out above. Here we will concentrate on illustrating the reflexive relationships between architecture and ecclesiology or theology.
1. Brief Architectural History of Western Christianity.

Apart from their possible use of existing architecture, such as the Jerusalem Temple (which is characterised as a highly segmented social, political, religious space, monumental, sociofugal, non-distributive space [cf. *m. Kelim*.1.6-9; see Ch.3]), early Christians gathered in private houses, with or without alternation, not in large 'purpose-built' churches, for almost three hundred years, until the first formal Christian architecture was started with San Crisogono in Trastevere and San Sebastiano on the Via Appia in about 310 CE (Krautheimer 1939; White 1996:130-134) and the Lateran basilica, the Constantinian church architecture, in 314 CE (Ward-Perkins 1954; Milburn 1988). The development of early Christian architecture can be largely distinguished into three stages (Krautheimer 1979; cf. White 1990a; 1990b). The first period (50-150 CE) is the house-church stage in which various private houses, whether atrium or apartment, were used to accommodate Christian meetings without architectural alteration (Theissen 1982; Murphy-O’Connor 1983; Jewett 1993; 1994). This means that there was no step toward the segmentation of space and hierarchy and no territoriality (Sack 1986:98). Compared with a relatively articulated degree of synagogal space (see Ch.4), the claim that the earliest Christian utilisation of worship places was motivated in great degree by practical considerations, such as the size of the community, its organisation and its financial resources, is implausible (contra Blue 1994). Rather their uses of that space can be investigated in terms of the early Christians' theology and ecclesiology reflected in Paul’s sacramental theology (cf. Gal.3.28; 1Cor.11) and the Gospel tradition concerning meals and the Kingdom of God (see Ch.5).

The second period (150-250CE) can be typed as *domus ecclesiae* stage in which, because of a substantial growth of Christian populations, private residences were converted to meet the needs of assembly and worship, but only in relation to the interior of these buildings, as the house-churches in Dura-Europos and Rome (SS. Giovanni e Paolo) illustrate (Kraeling 1967; White 1990b:112-113). This stage indicates the progressive segmentation of the sacred space according to the spatial
division of rituals like preaching, baptism, and Eucharist, and the development of ecclesiastical offices like deacon, elder, bishop in the period of the Church Fathers (Walton 1986:12). The third period (250-313CE) brings forth the continued use of *domus ecclesiae* with the construction of Christian churches *de novo* (such as San Crisogono in Trastevere and San Sebastiano on the Via Appia), which were formed on the model of larger rectangular hall-like structure as a harbinger of the basilica type (Krautheimer 1939). This stage is specially characterised by the appearance of territoriality and monumentality in church architecture.

During the period of the house-churches and right through the first decade of the fourth-century CE, the early Christians fell under severe persecution from time to time, but they maintained their faith and continued to spread the faith so successfully that the number of believers went on increasing. Their mode of existence was characterised by the practice of mutual aid as a family life together (Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* 4.23.10; Deissmann 1927:167ff; Sandnes 1994:131-175). As the first Christians practised sharing and mutual concern (Ac.2.44; cf. Mt.25.31-46), they continually demonstrated life in common (Justin *I Apol.* 14.2-3; *Dial.* 47.2-3; Lucian *Pergre.* 11-13): visiting the sick and prisoners (Hermas *Mand.* 8.10; *Sim.* 1.8; Ignatius *Smyrn.* 6.2); sharing from the pooling of resources (Justin *I Apol.* 67); showing hospitality to strangers (Did.11.3-6; 12.2-5; Tertullian *Apol.* 39; Ps. Clementine *Recog.* 10.5); and caring for orphans and widows (Lucian *Peregre.* 12; Hermas *Mand.* 8.10; *Sim.* 1.8; 5.3.7; 9.27.2; *Vis.* 2.4.3).

After the Edict of Milan (313 CE), Christian church architecture became dominated by the triumphal basilica style under the tutelage of Constantine. In the basilica style, architectural space expressed the full-scale hierarchical structure in which the distinction of apse, *bema*, and nave was obvious (White 1964:56-60). In Romanesque and Gothic style, ecclesiastical hierarchy reached its peak by basically dividing the chancel for clergy and the nave for lay people, and by setting up the communion rail as an architectural boundary between both spaces to invest the chancel with rigorous hierarchy. The underlying impetus for hierarchical structure in

---

14 Here we are dependent on the description in Acts 2.46 and 5.42 for references to
church architecture was clericalism (White 1964:53). We can define the post-Constantinian period as the return to the temple type. It is significant to see that Eusebius referred to the Christian church building as 'temples' (Hist. Eccl. 8.1.9; 10.4.41) and described the church structure in the temple terminology like altar, sanctuary (Hist. Eccl. 7.15.3; 10.4.44, 68).

Although the Reformation tried to restore New Testament aspects in areas of exegesis, theology and ecclesiology, it failed to strip off clericalism in church architecture in that it tended to overemphasise the position of preacher. After the reaction of the Oxford movement and the Cambridge Camden Society which brought up again the idea that the Gothic style represents genuine church architectural form by separating altar from nave by using partitions and different altitudes (Pugin 1848:10; Collins 1989:98-112), a significant architectural concern for the solidarity between participants was inaugurated by the Liturgical movement and the Second Vatican Council, which tried to harmonise the church architecture with the social environment and to associate all members in worship as active participators rather than alien outsiders or mute onlookers (Lumen Gentium; Geiselmann 1972:8; Hammond 1960:11). Under the significant influences of these movements, the dominant recent trend in church architecture has included: (1) an active association of platform with nave; (2) creation of familiar worship space; (3) accommodation of diverse social needs by more stress on church as human space rather than divine space; (4) harmonisation with local society (Schnell 1974:80ff.).

2. A Short History of the Korean Church Architecture.

The history of Korean church architecture can be described in five stages: (1) the inception stage (1876-1897); (2) the establishment stage (1897-1919); (3) the stagnation stage (1920-1953); (4) the revival stage (1954-1962); (5) the proliferation stage (1963-present) (Fig. 9).
(1) The inception stage is characterised by *indigenisation*, which accommodates the function of the church to the traditional Korean-style house (*choka*, the straw-thatched house, *Fig.10a*, or *kiwa-gyp*, the tiled-roofed house, *Fig.10b*). During the persecution of the Chosun dynasty, the first Korean Christians gathered in the believers’ houses for worship and fellowship. The first official church architecture appeared in *Sorae (Fig.3a)*, which had been suggested for use by a shaman. It was the typical common and traditional house of the people popular in the Korean countryside, a two room thatched house with a stone wall and thatched doorway. In 1884, it was renovated into an eight-room tiled house and displayed a church mark in the form of a small cross on the ridge of a tiled roof. Another early church, *Samunan Church (1887) (Fig.9a)*, was the house that was first used for *Sarangchae* (a reception room for entertaining male guests) of the first Presbyterian missionary (Underwood), and then appropriated into a house church with little renovation into the facade four-room tiled house (*The Seventy Year History* 1958:22). In this period, the Korean churches started mostly from the Korean-style houses due to persecutions and financial difficulties. Christians first purchased existing houses and renovated them by eliminating internal dividing walls to make a meeting space, and their scale was three or four rooms (Kim 1988:64). The other churches were *Chungdong (1887), Sangdong (1889), Yondong (1894)*.

(2) The second, or establishment stage is characterised as the *direct introduction* stage of Western styles (Gothic, or Romanesque style), which were introduced by Western missionaries following the Chosun-France treaty (1886). As the first Western style church, imitating *Myungdong Cathedral of the Catholic church (Fig.11)*, *Chungdong church (1897, Fig.12)* was a one-storied Western-style house built as a simple Latin cross-type with a left-side tower and a square apse in the rear in which was set up a rail in the chancel and a chancel arch to divide platform and nave (*Ninety year history*, 1977:62). The Latin cross-type and simplified apse was indirectly influenced by early Catholic church architecture, and the left-side tower was formed to divide gender and its emphasis on the men’s entrance on the left side has influenced later church architecture. *Sangdong (1901), Pyongyang Sumunpagg (1909), Saemunan (1910), and Syngdong(1913, Fig.9.c.2)* followed. An eclectic Korean-Western style was introduced in *Pyongyang Jangdaehyun (1900, Fig.9.b)*.
Yondong (1907), Supyogyo (1914). The Jangdaehyun church was a representative eclectic church of large-scale with second storied space, typical upside L-type for the division of the genders, and an emphasis on the pulpit. The styles in this period mostly consisted of Romanesque or semi-Gothic, and the spatial structure of the churches was rectangular, T-type, cross-type that consistently maintained the spatial division of gender. The division of the chancel was not clearly displayed, but the chancel arch, which is based on the principle of the Cambridge Camden Society, was widely favoured in a large-scaled church. In the Syngdong church, the chancel rail had a height of people’s stature, and its authorities prohibited play and drama in the worship space in accordance with the order of the fifty third General Assembly (Hong 1994: 72).

(3) During the third stage of stagnation, church architecture suffered from the persecutions of the Japanese colonial regime (1910-1945), and many churches were destroyed during the Korean War (1950-1953). But some churches were built: Jagyo (1922), Tuksu (1922), Tongmak (1925), Ahyun (1931), the Thomas Memorial (1933), Sinouju Tongbu (1937), and Jeamri (1938). The last was burnt during worship by Japanese colonial police to put pressure on contemporary Christianity, which resisted Shinto worship. These churches lacked a curtain for the division of gender and the use of the central entrance but clearly displayed the division of chancel by having a platform at a higher level than the nave to promote imagery of holiness.

Before the Liberation, the characteristic features of church architecture were the adoption and modification of traditional space, division of gender, the formation of spatial hierarchy, and the influence of American Protestant church architecture through missionaries (Hong 1994: 76). The division of gender in the worship space was due to the Confucian tradition, which prohibited males and females sitting together. These features need explanation. First, the church accommodated this tradition in a temporal division which provided for worship at different times for

15 Under the influence of the Cambridge Camden society’s movement with its stress on authority and norms, symbolism was regarded as standard in liturgical and architectural style, and the pulpit was mostly accentuated to reflect the authority of pastor and preaching-
different gender groups in the early period. After 1900, this division of gender was accommodated in church architecture which was spatially developed from the 'upside L-type' (Jangdaehyun, 1900), to the ‘cross-type’ church (Inchun Naeri, 1901; Jongkyo, 1910) that divided the entrance by gender and blocked space by a curtain, the asymmetric rectangular type, representing the superiority of the male (Sangdong, 1910; Yondong, 1907; Samunan, 1910; Syngdong, 1912). Although the gender division disappeared in architectural space in this extreme form from 1920, it has survived to the extent that men use the area to the right-side of the nave, women the left-side.

Second, American missionaries in Korea had been influenced mostly by the Gothic revival movement, which dominated in contemporary American Christianity. This movement tended to stress especially the chancel in order to signify sacraments and to give the impression of grandeur and beauty in the worship space. The chancel was usually one third of the nave in scale and was separated from the nave by the use of a partition and a higher level. The movement created the style which positions altar, seats of choir and clergy together, and maintained the idea that worship is only efficacious when an anointed clergy leads it (Collins 1989:98-112). Consequently it revived the medieval style of church architecture, its symbolism, liturgy, and the clear division between chancel and nave.

(4) Turning now to the revival stage (1954-1962), it should be noted that by the end of the Korean war, 948 churches and Christian institutions had been destroyed, but 2,050 churches were newly erected (Min 1982:463). Under the auspices of the western church, most of the church architecture during this period tried to adopt a Gothic style and to display features of Gothic space structure. Stone-built Gothic (Youngrok, 1954, Fig. 9.d) and brick-built Gothic (Yondong, 1954) were two church styles representative of this period.

(5) The proliferation stage began in the 1960s. In the mid-1960s church building was invigorated through national economic growth and in the 1970s it was further stimulated by a rapid increase in the number of believers. Large-scale and multistoried buildings appeared in order to accommodate various needs. But these

oriented worship, as was the distinctive division of platform for clergy and nave for congregation.
buildings emphasised external form and visual effects rather than internal and spatial functions. Three types can be summarised. First, there is the revival type that reappeared in the large-scale medieval style of Romanesque and Gothic architecture with the addition of modern architectural materials and techniques, to be used as a landmark of its region, but examples of this type failed to harmonise with their environment due to their grand scale (Ahyun, 1984; Chunghyun, 1988, Fig.13; Somang, 1988; Changshin, 1989, Inchun Nearee, 1989, Fig.14). Second is the accommodation style adapted to modern social functions. There are three kinds of churches: the multistoried complex type (Sangdong, 1976), the grand gymnasium type (Yeuido Full Gospel, 1972), and the underground type (Church of Sarang, 1984, Fig.15). Third is the expressionistic type that stresses the architect’s personality and understanding (Saemunan, 1972, Roryanggin, 1975, Chungdong, 1978, Yondong, 1978, Kyungdong, 1981, Fig.16; Joenju Seomun, 1987, Fig.17).

The factors producing change in church architecture after the Liberation were as follows. First, there were the influences of two contradictory movements of the Gothic Revival and the Liturgical Movement. The former emphasised the holiness of the chancel and the chancel arch was used to divide platform and nave, but the latter accentuated the participant relationship of platform and nave with the aim of forming a liturgical space of circle, lozenge, and trapezoid type so that the congregation could positively take part in worship. Secondly, there was the introduction of internationalism in style and the adoption of traditional folk material. The third factor was the addition of new functions that modern society demanded, such as places for speech, education, fellowship etc., and the expansion of space for seating a large number of believers due to rapid growth, and the advent of the grand-scaled and multistoried church. In such churches the distinction between platform and nave consequently became very plain (Hong 1994:80). The net result was that, with the growth of finances and numbers, the church developed triumphal architectural styles.

Discrepancy of grand-scale churches with their surrounding society

From the brief history of Korean church architecture set out above, we can summarise its current problems under three headings. First, the external appearances of the architectural style are not in harmony with their social environments (Fig. 18). Most of the modern church buildings adopt the Gothic and Romanesque styles which were first introduced into the Myungdong cathedral by the French priest, John Coster and then consistently incorporated into the Protestant church architecture in every place without consideration of harmony with the surrounding social settings (cf. Chunghyun; Chung-Ju Seomun, Fig. 19; Immanuel, Fig. 9.e.1; TeaGu Dong-Boo, Fig. 20). These Western styles are mostly expressed in grand-scale churches, which reflect their congregational expansion and financial accumulation (Kim 1987:169-170). The problem is not only that they are unfitted to traditional Korean society but also that they express imagery of majesty and sovereign hierarchy, and thus assert themselves over the neighbouring society (Cho 1987:40). This problem of disharmony leads to the exclusivity of the church from society with the aim at maintaining religious purity and spatial dichotomy between the sacred as church and the secular as society. In isolating itself from society, the church presents itself as recognised as a closed social institution rather than having an open and organic relationship with the society. This means that church architecture encourages ghetto-symptoms: the church is indifferent to society and has no social influence.

It is not surprising to see how architectural disharmony is related to the current problem of the church’s exclusivity in relation to society. This problem suggests that significant architectural alternatives must not only grope for an indigenous style in harmony with surrounding culture, but must also make enough space available for neighbouring society. The church needs an architectural evangelistic strategy not only to create a space for worship and to encourage its congregations through active participation, but also a common space, beyond religious space, to meet the needs of surrounding society for public meetings, social concerns, and so on. Such religious exclusivity in architectural space is also maintained in the social relations with other religions and denominations. For instance, even within Presbyterianism, most
conservative denominations (*Hapdong, Koshin*) still prohibit the exchange of preachers with the more or less liberal ones (*Tonghab, Kichang*).

(2) Segmented internal space and its hierarchy

The second problem is that the internal space is explicitly and implicitly segmented to create pronounced hierarchical orders. As the Gothic and Romanesque styles tend to express a grand and magnificent form of authoritarianism which symbolises authority and the status of clericalism through architectural space (Hamlin 1952:335), most Korean church architecture is spatially structured in the rectangular form (*Fig.13a, 19c, 21b, 24.d*), which originated in the basilica structure to signify the superiority of the clerical role on the platform over that of the lay believers in the nave. Its ease of longitudinal segmentation of space allows expression of a spatial hierarchy, which strongly transmits the clear distinction between platform and nave. In such a rectangular form, the platform is positioned in the farthest and deepest area as the central liturgical space on which all activity of worship is concentrated and is regularly called ‘the altar.’ Only the anointed ministers and elders are permitted to enter that space, while the rest of the congregation are prohibited. The platform is often expanded in width and size to make a sanctuary in relation to which the pastor is virtually regarded as a priest (*Fig.21*). A purple curtain screen behind the platform is redolent of the curtain in the Temple creating a sacred atmosphere. Chairs (*Fig.22*) with a prominent backboard on the platform symbolise ecclesiasticism, and the practice of pastors only going onto the platform without shoes strengthens the sense of its being a sanctuary. Platform and nave are thoroughly divided in distance, altitude, and decorative elements to create a message of spatial separation as in the sanctuary of the Jerusalem Temple (*Fig.20b, 24, 25*). Decorations like musical instruments, flower-arrangement, lighting, are focused on the platform in order to highlight its sacredness. Furthermore, as the Korean church’s platform has actually developed into a double platform of higher and lower levels to signify clericalism and the stratification of church office (*Fig.13b, 19b, 20b, 21a, 22a*), this further functions to differentiate status in the church. When a woman or a non-ordained layman leads
worship or meetings, s/he must remain on the lower platform, but when the ordained leads, he does so on the upper platform (Kim 1992:306).

All this suggests that the platform is designed to replicate the Temple’s spatial structure. The lay believers are marginalised in relation to liturgical space and are only permitted to participate passively in worship. So it is not rare to hear the words- “Let’s see worship”-from Korean Christians because they are accustomed to observe worship rather than to take part in worship. Such a hierarchical structure of space is also a model which encourages Korean Christians to live according to the sacred/secular structure of dualism in other respects. First, the church is a sacred place but society and house are secular. Second, Sunday is a sacred day but the rest of the days are secular. Third, the tithes offering is holy but the rest is secular. Fourth, a pastor who serves on the platform is holy but the congregation is less holy.

In addition, the one-dimensional spatial orientation of the church with its rectangular structure, not only means that the members of the congregation are marginalised in the liturgical space, but also that they are alienated from each other. During worship they can only see the platform without paying attention to other members. There is no sociopetality, as explained earlier in this chapter to make all members feel a sense of togetherness in a worship space (Hall 1966). It is a welcome sign, however, to see that recently some prominent churches have renovated the worship space so as to minimise the division between the platform and the nave (Fig. 23.a,b) and to transform the internal space into the circular type in order that congregations will be able to participate in worship from various angles and communicate spatially with each other (Fig.15a, 16c, 23b, 25c). Where the structure of the platform is closely related to the theological expression of the church, its space and platform will also transform the theology of the church (Han 1992:114).

(3) Marginalised sacramental space

The third problem is the marginalisation of sacramental space. This is one of the main mechanisms which weakens the sense of community, because the worship
space is concentrated on preaching. In the double-platform structure, the pulpit table is higher, bigger, and wider than the communion table to stress the importance of the preaching and the clergy. And there are many churches which lack a baptistery in architectural space, while other tables for flower decoration, etc, are installed. The Eucharist and Baptism are the most important rituals for dramatising the essential elements of Christian identity, the sense of belonging and of solidarity. Ignoring them in the architectural space leads to a weakened sense of community.

In a pluralistic society, the sense of community is diminished or has disappeared; consequently individualistic society is characterised by loss of identity and the sense of belonging (Wilson 1982:153-61; Nisbet 1970:372). Berger observes that the restoration of community in modern society depends upon the existence of mediating structures such as neighbourhood, family, and spontaneous association in church. Restoring community reduces the sense of alienation of individuals who are isolated from the mega-structures of society, and it decreases the threat of anomie and shaky public order (1980). Community requires a communal sentiment in order to produce co-operation, as in the following formulation by Maclver: i) we-feeling is a shared sense that the members of a group sympathise in oneness with each other; ii) role-feeling is a sense of subjecthood in that each member takes charge of a meaningful role in the group; and iii) depending-feeling is a sense of community in that members display trustworthiness to the group to which they belong (Maclver 1951:9). While rituals and beliefs are both essential parts of religious content, beliefs represent the cognitive form of religion but the rituals carry out a wider context of religious meaning. The practice of rituals is the way to symbolise collective identity and unity. Such practice helps worshippers to memorise the events central to group identity and to appropriate their meaning, thus strengthening the commitment of its members (Mol 1983:52-60). To recover the sense of community in the church, therefore, it is necessary to restore the sacraments and the sacramental space in the architecture.

We have now discussed the relationship between architecture and the church in Korean Protestantism. Now we will turn to analyse how architectural space operates in relation to issues of the identity of Korean Protestant Christianity.
4. Application of the Architectural Theories to the Current Problems of Korean Christianity

We can conveniently divide the whole period of the architectural history of the Korean church into two types: the house-type space and the temple-type space. To recall the analyses of architectural theories, the house-church is constructed in a domestic human scale which generates sociopetal space within the architectural structure. Its spatial logic reflects a low degree of socio-political complexity, and accordingly may be characterised (following Hillier and Hanson) as 'distributive' and as encouraging organic solidarity by contiguity and proximity (Hillier and Hanson 1989). It has no claim for territoriality. In contrast, the temple-type church is built in the monumental mode to create sociofugal space and to claim territoriality. Its spatial logic reflects a high degree of socio-political complexity, and then its arrangement of space appears as 'non-distributive' and as producing mechanical solidarity by analogy and isolation, in line with the formulation of Hillier and Hanson.

The problems mentioned above are mostly derived from the temple-style church. As with early Christianity, the Korean house-church met social needs by actively participating in society and by taking on national responsibilities. It generated sociopetal space by breaking social boundaries, and embracing the common people. The church played an important role in transforming feudal society into a modern society through evangelism and by introducing modern medical and educational institutions, engaging in social services, increasing literacy in the Korean language, and promoting the social status of women. It fulfilled the social functions of transformation, and actively contributed to the acceleration of social solidarity. The Christians were thus called 'Yesu-kkun' or Yesu-jaeng-ee'. The latter meant that once people from the lower class believed in Jesus (Yesu), their faith rapidly spread like an epidemic. The former originated from the fact that early Korean Christians constituted the ensign of, and were at the frontier of social reform and national history making. For example, Christians made a great contribution in moral restoration of the

16 'kkun' means the person who is occupied of, engaged in, and notable for something; cf. 'Sirem-kkun' as wrestler. 'jaeng-ee' means person who is a constant doer of/ and or monger; cf. 'Mee-jang' as plasterer, 'Onggee-jang' as potter.
nation through the practice of puritan ethics of diligence and frugality (cf. the ‘temperance movement’ [Fig. 26] and the ‘national debt repayment movement’) (Chun 1987: 117-8).

After the church took up the monumental architectural style with its spatial hierarchy in the 1910s, it withdrew from society, and it lost its influence on national history, becoming otherworldly and growth-oriented. In the 1920s, under the intensive oppression of Japanese colonial rule, the Korean church tended to lose historical and social consciousness. Gradually its faith became internalised and eschatologically oriented. Finally, in a context of continual suffering under the colonial regime, it degenerated into being a mere shelter or refuge from active engagement in society (Clark 1968: 173-4). With the Liberation in 1945, the church continued to ignore the injustice and corruption in society. Furthermore, the church provided support to the dictatorial regime, and was at the forefront of the national defence against communism and socio-political unrest. It mistakenly identified the defence of faith with the defence of national security, by supporting the existing values and norms of capitalist society, and by justifying the existing social and political structures. The church was content to support the social status quo, rather than to engage in social transformation, and to point out social injustice with prophetic insights. With the growth in numbers, the church unfortunately became involved in various forms of social pathology. The Korean church ignored social injustice and national history that were obscured during the period of the military regime, during which economic growth and anti-democratic society were brought about.

Second, early missionaries tried to co-operate in evangelism according to the division of mission territory, but now the churches are vehemently divided against each other. As all kinds of denominations have their parishes or dioceses in the same
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17 For example, a belief among certain sectarian Christian group in Korea that the world was going to end on 28.10.1992, leading to their members selling property and even terminating marriage, disclosed the problem of ‘diseased society, diseased religion’ of Korean Christianity (Kim, Sung-Kun, Hangyere Shinmun, 2.7.1992). Kim diagnosed the symptom as the identification of Christianity with the anomie and destruction of community,
geographical locations, they compete territorially with each other to gain church membership. Such disunity induces unlimited competition between each denomination and church, and it automatically makes churches tend to individualisation and to engage in large building projects without co-operation. By spending a lot of its budget on expanding its territory, each church degenerates into a kind of religious group unable to provide a service to society, and it also makes its members understand God in a shamanistic way, set on fire by materialism and bargain-blessing. There is little room for concern with social solidarity in the churches. Their financial administrative mode concerns neither reciprocity nor hospitality but redistribution. Church members give money as kinds of offerings or tithes; church officers mostly spend the money on the church itself.

Third, the spatial availability of the house-church is flexible enough to allow for distributive space and spatial solidarity. Thus the fellowship practised in the house-church transcends divisions of social class and gender which are essential to Confucian society. Formal space is not necessary to practice the sacraments and the common meal. But the temple-style church is composed of a non-distributive worship space which creates a different kind of social hierarchy by clericalism. Whether Presbyterian or Methodist or Congregational, the church in Korea tends dominantly toward clericalism through the expansion of the authority of ministers. Within the mega-church, spatial solidarity is maintained in order to incorporate mechanically the various types of congregations, but it legitimises social distances by distinguishing the members according to social status, religious status, age, gender, occupations, region etc. Moreover, sacramental space is extremely minimised, thus contributing to the difficulty of creating a spatial proximity necessary for a sense of community. The temple-style church actually isolates the individuals or the social groups rather than breaking social boundaries between them.

V. CONCLUSION

diffusion of mammonism as the negative result of social transformation that rapid industrialization brought on from the 1960s.
We have argued throughout this chapter that architecture plays an active role in formulating the social identity of Korean Christians. In taking together the architectural aspects of early Christianity and the Korean Protestant church, we can summarise the two characteristic types of architectural space, which significantly affect the theology of Christian community: the temple-type space and the house-type space. Christianity started from the house and then moved to the triumphal style architectures: the Gothic and Romanesque styles. In early Christianity and Korean Protestantism, in the period of the house-church, the characteristic mode of life was mutual aid within the community and transformative service towards the surrounding society, whereas in the temple-type church, hierarchical differentiation is institutionally generated, and the church has opted for social control over its members.

As a consequence of our discussion, an architectural model can be developed, shown below, while in subsequent chapters it will be used to illustrate how the Lukan community went about addressing similar issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Church model</th>
<th>The temple-type:</th>
<th>The house-type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>administration</td>
<td>hierarchical territory</td>
<td>non-hierarchical territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>character of community</td>
<td>exclusiveness</td>
<td>inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>space of building</td>
<td>articulated/segmented</td>
<td>non-articulated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale of building</td>
<td>monumentality</td>
<td>human-scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the sacred/ the secular</td>
<td>dualistic</td>
<td>balanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social interaction</td>
<td>sociofugal</td>
<td>sociopetal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>symbolic features</td>
<td>Domus Dei as sanctuary</td>
<td>fictive-kinship or family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic relations(^{18})</td>
<td>redistribution, balanced reciprocity</td>
<td>general reciprocity, hospitality (fictive) kinship group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social map</td>
<td>purity system</td>
<td>meal, Eucharist, Baptism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rituals</td>
<td>sacrifice</td>
<td>low-degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spatial logic of society</td>
<td>high-degree</td>
<td>socio-political complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social logic of space</td>
<td>socio-political complexity</td>
<td>distributive and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social function</td>
<td>non-distributive and</td>
<td>spatial (organic) solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transpatial (mechanical) solidarity</td>
<td>social transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>social integrity, social control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{18}\) These were three kinds of mode of ancient economic exchange, which have been studied as a part of economic anthropology (Polanyi 1944; Sahlin 1972) and adopted by social-scientific critics (Malina 1986; Moxnes 1988; see, a more detailed discussion, Chapter 3.II.2).
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CHAPTER THREE:  
THE TEMPLE IN LUKE -ACTS

I. INTRODUCTION:  
APPLICATION OF THE ARCHITECTURAL THEORY

Keeping our previous discussion in mind, we will proceed by first investigating how the Jerusalem Temple interacted with the social-world of first-century Palestine and the earliest Christian community, and then how Luke portrays the Temple in Luke-Acts.

The architecture of the Temple (Fig. 3.1; 3.2) reveals its spatial characteristics in the following respects. First, the external appearance of the Temple-building showed its monumentality in relation to the surrounding environment. Compared with other Greek temples, the size of its walled sacred space (450x300m) was larger than the Acropolis in Athens (240x120m) and the temple in Olympus (210x170m) (Dalman 1935:286). Although in terms of size, it was not the greatest temple in the ancient Mediterranean world, an honour held by an Egyptian temple of Amun, at Karnak (Hobson 1987:136-8; contra Ben-Dov 1985:74,77), Josephus was probably not exaggerating when he called it, “the greatest [temple] ever heard of” (Ant. 15.396). Architecturally, in its beauty and splendour, the Temple may have been unrivalled by any other sanctuary of its time. The Temple Mount must have certainly dominated the Jerusalem landscape. “No one has seen a truly beautiful building unless he has seen the Temple” (m.Sukk.51.2). It is likely that no expense was spared in the creation of this wonder in alabaster, marble and gold. Its appearance was enough to evoke an overwhelming impression, described by Luke in Lk.21.5. Monumental in scale, it expressed territoriality by creating and maintaining a social order anchored in its sacred claim and its capacity to give meanings to the surrounding world. The Temple was a territorial place which symbolised the centripetal and centrifugal powers of Jewish authority, that was effectively exerted on first-century Jews in Palestine and the Diaspora, who lived under the Law and participated in its ritual and the Jewish festivals.
Second, the space of the Temple precinct was architecturally segmented into the six domains according to accessibility based on the purity law—the Courts of Gentiles, Women, Israelites, Priests, Sanctuary, and the Holy of Holies (Ant. 15.410-20; War. 5.184-227; m. Mid.). These were hierarchically replicated in the social maps of peoples and places according to the degree of holiness (m. Kelim. 1.6-9; t. Meg. 2.7). This architectural space generated a social arena in which peoples interacted with one another within the framework of an in-group strategy, one which determined (to use Rapoport’s formulation, 1982a; 1990) who did what, where, and when; including and excluding whom and why; signifying that the closer the inner court, the more the sense of attachment to the people of God, and vice versa. Of significance here were the solemn inscriptions of the Soreg. These were installed on the wall, a chest-high balustrade with gates between the Courts of the Gentiles and the Israelites, and which was meant to separate Jews and Gentiles (War. 5.193). Some of the warning notices, were in Greek and others in Latin. Of these, one Greek inscription has been found:

No foreigner is to enter within the balustrade around the sanctuary; whoever is caught will have himself to blame for the death which will follow (Greek text in Finegan 1992:197).

When Judaea was governed directly by Rome, the priests were permitted to execute this warning (War. 6.126); they could drag the offenders out of the holy area and carry out a legal lynching (Segal 1989:79-84). What is the underlying rationale behind this prohibition? Undoubtedly it meant that Gentiles were impure and would thereby defile the Temple by their presence (Ac.21.28-9). This exemplifies how the Temple was used to mark off the Jewish in-group from marginalised out-groups, such as Gentiles and probably Samaritans (Esler 1987:149).

It is reasonable, therefore, to consider that the Temple space was constructed to generate, in terms of Hillier and Hanson’s formulation, transpatial solidarity which distances and segregates peoples in terms of analogy and isolation by constituting non-distributive space which prohibits social interaction between certain categories of peoples. It also existed as a sociofugal space, often dispersing peoples centrifugally rather than creating solidarity among them. The spatial logic of the Temple was
highly articulated, segmented, and specialised; its social logic was accordingly one of a high-degree of socio-complexity.

Third, the Temple was built to express sacred space as *Domus Dei*. The sanctuary, with its core space, was meant to signify the divinely legitimated sacred nexus between God and humanity (Knipe 1988:107-12). Sacrifice was the core activity which enabled participants to experience its efficacy, but this experience was largely relegated to the cultic officials, the priests. It is important to note that in *m. Middot* the post-70 rabbis eliminated the porticoes surrounding the Temple precinct, which were a main feature of pagan temples, because they wished to emphasise dissimilarity of the Temple of Yahweh from those of the heathen (Sanders 1992:59). Like pagan temples, however, the Temple represented a hand-made dwelling place of God, as suggested by the Old Testament passages saying ‘God dwells in the Temple’ (1Kgs.8.12-13, 17, 29; Ps.132.5; Hab.2.20).

To understand the context of the Temple in Luke-Acts, we will investigate in our next section how these characteristic architectural features of the Temple were explicitly replicated in the social-world of first-century Judaism.

II. THE SOCIAL PHENOMENA OF THE TEMPLE

In first-century Palestine, the Temple was a microcosm of Jewish society and the social centre around which every aspect of Jewish life was oriented, maintaining and legitimating the social interactions of this world (Barker 1991). How it functioned in this society can be understood in terms of its role as a social institution.

In her book, *How Institutions Think* (1987), Mary Douglas argues that the way of thinking of an institution derives its legitimacy from the nature of the universe. Institutions are not individuals but are defined entities with collective power which control people, classifying social interactions, regulating ‘right’ thinking and passing blame on ‘wrong’ thinking, providing the frame of reference for their thought, and fixing identity (ibid.91, 112). It is the institution’s mode of control over people that it
first confers identity on people by bestowing sameness and then determining what should be remembered and what must be forgotten according to the principles of coherence which the institution itself authorises. An institution is also a significant social construction by which people engage in shared thinking and, to some extent, harmonise their preferences. People who come within institutional power tend to make decisions within the scope of these institutional constraints. In sacralising the social edifice by appealing to the ultimate decision-maker, God, social institutions endorse moral opinions by portraying them as based on a substantive principle of justice which is universally valid (ibid.117). Accordingly, the package of ideas that makes up the meaning of a social-world is itself the product of institutional thinking, and the categories of law are embedded in a normative and moral framework, tied to responsibilities, and embedded in the everyday practical order (Jayjusi 1984:4). The Temple in Jerusalem, controlled by priests working as practitioners and interpreters of the Mosaic Law, can be readily understood as an institution in this sense.

As a prime social institution, the Temple asserted its centrality on the various areas of society, politics, economics, and religion in the social world of first-century Palestine, which were embedded within each other (Malina 1988:23), controlling the *modus operandi* and the *modus vivendi*, and exerting institutionally its centrifugal power on the Jewish people. Now we turn to see in more detail how the Temple played such a primary role in the Jewish society.

1. Political Centrality of the Temple

In the Ancient Near East, the construction of a monumental religious building, or the renewal or renovation of an existing structure, characteristically embodied the security and divine legitimacy of the ruling ideology (Lundquist 1982; 1984). It was even more the case if a new dynastic power was emerging or a major political power shift was taking place. Viewed politically, the restoration of the Second Temple had a clear political strategy which reinforced the ruler cult in its Herodian form (Horbury 1991b:113,122), by pointing to Herodian Jewish victory, peace and piety, and to the divine appointment of kingship in an Augustan and Jewish Messianic manner (Meyer
This was the case even though the Jewish people would not consider the Temple worship as a ruler cult. Subsequent Roman governors also regarded the Temple as the symbolic centre of political power, one which determined the social integration of their subject people.

In first-century Palestine, the Temple became the focal centre of political motivation and aspiration, hence Herod and the Roman prefects appointed high priests to channel their ruling power using patron-client relationships (Ant. 18.93-95; Safrai 1976:906). Because they were appointed, the political power of the high priests was in fact being legitimised. The high priesthood was an office greatly desired since it carried with it political standing, vast wealth, and the spiritual leadership. The Roman administrators supported the high priestly groups, who served to guarantee major Roman interests within Palestinian society. As pro-Roman appointees, they fell happily in line with the customary Roman practice of ruling through the wealthy aristocracy of a particular region (Horsley 1986:24f.). The aristocratic group of high priests ruled the Jewish people through the medium of the Sanhedrin based within the Temple.

The high priests appointed administrative functionaries for the Temple, people who no doubt supported their political interests. The chief priest was known as στρατηγός, 'captain,' a Greek military term (War.2.409), and controlled everyday Temple operations and its market (Hamilton 1964:367). Under him, there were ‘the Temple police’ who were supplied from the Levites and had responsibilities not only for keeping order but also for maintaining Temple purity. Under the priests, there were the groups of scribes who worked as the copyists, recorders, administrators, and legal experts of the system. Scribes were affiliated in nepotistic form with the high priestly families (Evans 1989:259).

This political power centred on the Temple, while recognised as legitimate by the Jewish people, was distrusted by them because it was deliberately and frequently abused to meet the political and economic interests of the high priests. The unpopularity of the ruling class at this time is well documented (see Bauckham 1988; Evans 1989), and the widespread odium toward them meant that the first-century
Temple, and particularly the way in which it was abused, was regularly criticised (Goodman 1987).

Josephus recorded six events representative of the shameless and illegal activity on behalf of high priests (Sanders 1992:324): (1) enmity and strife among chief priests (Ant.20.181); (2) the high priest’s use of henchmen who were sent to take the tithes from the threshing-floor’s grain belonging to ordinary priests, thus leaving them to starve (Ant.20.181, 214); (3) Ananias’ stealing tithes by beating the peasants who wished to save the ordinary priests (Ant.20.206f); (4) When Agrippa II replaced the high priest Jesus son of Dammaeus with Jesus son of Gamaliel (63CE), there was a feud, and the followers of the two high priests resorted to street fighting (Ant.20.213.); (5) During the strife between these two high priests, Ananias kept the upper hand by using his wealth to attract those who were willing to receive bribes; (6) the high priests’ employment of the two descendants of Herod who collected gangs of villains and plundered the property of people (Ant.20.214).

Such high priests clearly demeaned the office. Those who held the office and used bribery to get their way, were clearly corrupt. And more, this is well supported in Rabbinic tradition (t. Menah.13.21) that may generally recall their reputation. These estimations allow us to understand Jesus’ visceral anger against the Temple which is well preserved in the Lukan Jesus’ words, a “cave of bandits” (Lk.19.46). The root of the problem goes back to the reign of Herod when the old aristocracy was decimated by Herod, with many of the Hasmonean supporters killed or disenfranchised, and with many of those on the Sanhedrin and in other high offices who opposed Herod killed or removed. From that time, the wealthy and those high up in the administration owed their position to Herod. Herod began the practice of filling the office of high priest with his own nominee and also changing this incumbent with some frequency. This practice continued under Roman administration and later still under Agrippa I and Agrippa II. The priesthood, which the people would naturally have looked up to, therefore, became the subject of suspicion and was seen by many as staffed with Roman puppets.
2. Economic Centrality of the Temple

Unlike the modern market-price system, the ancient economy operated on the principle of reciprocity in which the exchange of gifts, or barter system, was conducted according to a standard which had quality rather than quantity as its basis (Sahlins 1972; Strathern 1988). What is the basis of this obligation to give, receive, and return gifts? How are production, exchange and distribution organised? Karl Polanyi has claimed that the ancient economy was one characterised by an absent motive of gain, and not by a distinctive economic institution, and has suggested three principles of economic behaviour: *reciprocity* between kinship groups; *redistribution* by a central figure of authority who keeps it in storage for subsequent disposal and distribution to his subjects; and *house-holding* as a production-for-use that is based on a closed, self-sufficient system (1944:48-49).

Marshall Sahlins develops Polanyi's term, 'reciprocity,' into three categories: negative, generalised, and balanced reciprocity. *Negative* reciprocity is the "unsocial extreme" and designates "the attempt to get something with nothing with impunity" such as haggling, bartering, gambling, theft, and other varieties of seizure (1972:195). *Generalised* reciprocity is the "solidarity extreme" and "refers to transactions that are putatively altruistic" for assistance. Only in possible and necessary cases, is assistance returned. Examples are food-sharing, suckling of children, help and generosity (1972:194). *Balanced* reciprocity is 'less personal' and 'more economic' than generalised reciprocity by attempting exchange of goods and services at the level of equivalence. It expresses the need to transcend hostility in favour of mutuality based on a symmetrical relationship. Examples are formal friendship and corporate alliances in the form of feasts, peace-making ceremonies and martial exchanges. Here reciprocity refers to the specific quality of the relationship between the transactors, whether it is mutual friendship (positive reciprocity) or mutual hostility (negative reciprocity) (see more Malina 1986:98-111; Moxnes 1988:32-40).

Given our discussion of the ancient economy, the Temple economy might be categorised as a central distribution system which "refers to any type of pooling
a priestly group (Malina 1986:106). Centralised accumulation of agricultural surplus and its redistribution were typical characteristics of the temple-based economy in general (Carney 1975:172-75). The temples were central institutions which collected goods and services, and then controlled and redistributed them within a centralised hierarchical system which was asymmetrical and stratified in its social constraint and which sought to control commitment, influence, inducement and power. Especially in times of crisis, such as food shortage, or war, this centralised role became more prominent with the collection of all sorts of social resources into the hands of the governing elite group to ensure their community's survival. Consequently, a rather broad social gap developed between the elite minority and the non-elite majority, a gap which was represented in the form of debt.

From this observation, the economy of the Jerusalem Temple can be considered in terms of its income, use, and result.19 The Temple income can be classified into three categories. (1) *Sacrifices* must have contributed very high sums (Issac 1983:86-92), which were mainly intended to sustain the Temple, the priests and the Levites: sacrifices and offerings, first fruits and firstlings, 'heave offering,' the Levitical tithe, a freewill-offering, and property of any sort vowed or dedicated to the Temple (Lev.7.16; see Sanders 1990a:289). (2) Though we have no way of estimating the number of pilgrims,20 *pilgrims' expenditures* in Jerusalem must have been considerable, for pilgrims commonly brought sums of money with them to Jerusalem for the purpose of Temple donation, for purchasing animals for Temple sacrifices, and for living expenses (Safri 1976:901-2). (3) The *half-Shekel due* (two drachmas), 'the Temple-tax', was institutionalised as an annual tax from the Hasmonean period onwards for Temple maintenance and sacrifice (*m.Seqal* 1.3; 4.2); and was collected

---

19 Although perhaps closely related to the Temple economy, the Herodian economy (Broshi 1987:31-37; Gabba 1990:160-71; Welch 1997:74-83) and the general Roman Palestinian economy (Safrai 1994) are excluded here for the sake of space.

20 A twelfth century Syrian chronicler of Jewish descent, Barhrbreus, estimated the numbers of Diaspora Jews as eight million by relying on a census of the Jewish population of the Roman Empire taken in 48CE., under Claudius, that reported 6,994,000 Jews, to which he might have added Jews living outside the empire in Mesopotamia, Iran, and southern Arabia, etc. (Broshi 1987:35). There is no doubt that eight million is an exaggerated number, but it also suggests that the numbers of Diaspora Jews, who travelled to Jerusalem and paid the half-shekel, were considerable in the first-century CE (see Safrai 1976:898ff.).
from Judean males over the age of twenty in Palestine and the Diaspora\textsuperscript{21} (\textit{War}. 7.281; \textit{Ant}. 14.110; \textit{m.\,Seqal}. 1.3-4). This was normally paid using the Tyrian silver didrachma (\textit{m.\,Ber}. 8.7; \textit{t.\,Ketub}. 13.3; \textit{y.\,Seqal}. 2.4; \textit{m.\,Seqal}. 2.4), thus necessitating money-changers who charged a premium of 4%-8%. Rome withdrew from Tyre its right to issue "Tyrian" coin, and this coin was minted in Jerusalem beginning in 19 BCE under Herod (\textit{t.\,Ket}. 13.3; Meshorer 1982:7-9),\textsuperscript{22} no doubt, astonishingly, with the blessing of the high priests even though it contained the 'image of pagan god,' Melkart (known as Hercules, the god of the Phoenicians), on the obverse, and an Eagle on the prow of a ship with the legend—"Tyre the Holy and City of Refuge"—on the reverse (SNG. 4.6089; 4.6093; \textit{BMCPhoenicia} 255.255-259; 257.269). This change correlates with the time of Herod’s Temple expansion in 20 BCE, demonstrating the economic power of Herod and the Romans, one which manifested itself in an attempt to control the Temple in new ways.

Two narratives from Josephus suggest indirectly the scale by which the Temple was related to economic factors, although it is not possible to demonstrate the degree of correlation with exactitude. Crassus raided the Temple on his way to attack the Parthians (54 BCE), and took 2,000 talents in coins, 8,000 talents of golden vessels, and lots of golden bars (\textit{Ant}. 14.105-9). Immediately before the conquest of Jerusalem, Phineas, one of the chief treasurers, was able to buy his freedom even

\textsuperscript{21} The collections from the Diaspora were classified as sacred money by Caesar and Augustus, and whoever meddled with them was subject to capital punishment (\textit{Ant}. 14.215; 16:163-70; Cicero Pro. Flac. 28.67-9).

\textsuperscript{22} Why were Tyrian shekels struck in Jerusalem? It was accepted as the currency for temple-tax due to its high purity of silver (95%), in order to meet the requirements for pure silver currency stipulated by Jewish religious law (cf. Ex. 30.12-13; 38.25f). When the mint of Antioch began to strike Roman provincial issues in 20/19 BCE, during the reign of Augustus, Tyre lost its right of autonomous issuance of silver shekels as a continuation of Seleucid tetradrachmas with the only change being the image of Melkart instead of the Seleucid king on the obverse. Realising that these coins were no more available, Jewish authorities picked up and continued to issue them in Jerusalem for a ceremonial coin of sufficient purity (Meshorer 1984:179). \textit{T.\,Ket}. 13.20 testifies that Tyrian shekels were struck in Jerusalem—"Silver mentioned in the Pentateuch is always a Tyrian silver: What is a Tyrian silver? It is Jerusalemite". There is no doubt that issuing money as well as controlling the temple market by approving or refusing certain coins as official Temple currency was to the Temple’s advantage and constituted a major factor in its economic prosperity. In 65/6 CE, Zealot leaders changed the coin type entirely to a new, exclusively Jewish, silver coinage which was linked to their own specific iconography and political needs (see \textit{BMC Palestine}. 269-275).
when most of the Temple wealth had already been plundered by the rebels (War 5.562f). The Temple wealth was vast: cash, precious furnishings, estates, and private money deposited there for security (2Macc.3.6,10ff.;15.22; Tacitus Hist.5.8.1). In ancient society, the temples were normally used to store deposits of surplus products, as well as being centres for redistribution at the hands of the local rulers, as already mentioned (Janssen 1979). The Jerusalem Temple also operated as a national bank (4Macc.4.3; Jeremias 1969:56). The behaviour of Roman officials demonstrates this ancillary storage function of the Temple (Pilate: Ant.18.60-2; Flaccus: War.2.293; Cicero Pro.Flac.28.66).

Undoubtedly the centripetal flow of vast amounts of goods to the Temple was substantially controlled by the high priestly families (Belo 1981:44-59). They also engaged in trade in the Temple market as the Gospel tradition evidences (Mk.11.15). They traded with local merchants and craftsmen for numerous items: incense, cloth, vessels, and basins for cooking and carrying blood to the altar. The Mishnah depicts the Temple as a tough trading partner, and records numerous second-century disputes about how the Temple managed its goods. In the case of price variation between conclusion of contract and completion of sale, the Temple always has the upper hand (t.Segal.4.9). The high priests obtained a considerable amount of profit through the monopolised control of Temple income and became the richest group. The elegant houses in the Upper City (see Avigad 1984:81-138) attest to the nepotism, cruelty and corruption of the chief priests, who commonly oppressed the people. They were harsh, callous, and often allowed their greed to get the better of them.

How did they control their wealth? Besides the evidence in Josephus, there were numerous criticisms of the priesthood in the Roman era (Ps.Sol.8; 1QpHab.12.8; CD.4.17-5.11;6.15-16; T.Moses 6.1; Mk.11.17). One might find a way of defending the high priest groups (Sanders 1992:321f.), but the majority of scholars have accepted the polemic against the priesthood as generally true and as an indication of their immorality. What was wrong with their management of Temple wealth? The problem in Judaea was not one primarily of wealth itself, since the province seems to have been prosperous on the whole at the time, but rather one of distribution (Grabbe 1992:414). There is the obvious differential between the very wealthy few and the
many poor. In a pre-industrial society, the elite (only 2% of the population) who lived in the city, controlled most of the land and the distribution of its production by rents, taxes, and debts, while the peasants (90%) who lived in the hinterland supported them (Lenski 1966:284). Many of the problems of Judaea in the first-century can be traced to this failure on the part of the ruling class of Judaea: the wealthy priestly aristocracy sought to invest their surplus in the acquisition of land owned by the peasantry because there was no other adequate outlet in which to invest in Palestine at that time (Goodman 1982; 1987).

The general situation of the Jewish peasantry in first-century Palestine was related to their levels of debt and the phenomenon of absentee landlords. Practices of double or triple taxation were a great burden on ordinary Jewish people (Appelbaum 1976:661f; Horsley 1987; Borg 1984; contra Sanders 1992:182f.). Tacitus reports a Syrian and Judaean complaint against heavy Roman tribute in 17CE (Ann.2.42, "Syria and Judea, exhausted by their burdens, were pressing for a diminution of the tribute"). The peasantry suffered from food shortage, debt, and inability to make tax-payments, especially during the times of crises. Judean peasants for their part could not just opt out of these imposed economic commitments. Galilean and Judean peasants generally balked at meeting some or all of these obligations (Freyne 1980:282; Horsley 1987:287-8). This meant they had to sell off their own land or/and rely on loans from the hands of the wealthy elites, and these latter had every incentive to establish rigid control of Judean land.

The escalation of debts contributed to widespread peasant misery and resentment (Oakman 1986:72-80). Interest rates were exorbitant and usurious as high as 50% sometimes. Jewish society had the benefit of a biblical law (Dt.15.1-2) which forbade the taking of usurious interest, but those same rich were presumably behind a change in the Law whereby, through prosbul, they ensured the security of such loans even in spite of a Sabbatical Year. The prosbul measure attributed to Hillel (though actually originating in Hellenistic-Egyptian law) evaded the prescription of Deut.15.1-2, and turned debtors over to creditors through the agency of the courts. The court system played an important role in enforcing the collection of debts (Neusner 1973:16-7; ND.6.13:91-2). Whether understood as collection guaranteed by the
judge, or, as a court-enforced confiscation of land used as security, the debtor could be evicted from patrimonial land thus becoming "landless" or legally redefined as tenants. Small independent peasants, the craftsmen and urban plebs of Jerusalem, were vulnerable to fall heavily into debt, since the rich landowners needed to invest surplus income profitably and the poor needed their loans to survive (Goodman 1982:418). This was irksome to some, as shown by Tannaitic texts which complain that the laws on usury were being infringed \((mB.\, Mes.\, 5.11;\, mSanh.\, 3.3.)\). Whereas the 'earlier layers of the Torah' had been concerned with the general welfare of the people, in Second-Temple Judaism the taxes were centralised for the benefit of the Jerusalem priesthood (Horsley 1987:281-4). Thus the system itself was detrimental to the people's welfare. Rich people in first-century Palestine were rich because they robbed poor people: the rich man's wealth was an accumulated unrighteous mammon.

This vicious spiral of poverty and debt should have led to general social unrest in first-century Palestine and must have certainly played a crucial part in the Jewish Revolt in 67-70 CE. Since debt primarily results in the loss of control over land, the two chief themes of ancient peasant rebels were "abolition of debt" and "redistribution of land" (Oakman 1991:159). Evidence for the problem of distribution might be traceable to the rebels' first action in the Temple, the burning of the archive of debt documents \((War.\, 2.427)\). This action clearly indicates that the poorer classes evidently regarded the Temple as symbolising the oppression they suffered at the hand of the rich elite through many loans which had been across the class divide. Ordinary Jewish people were also indebted not only through the need to rectify sins and remove impurities but also through the heavy expectation of pilgrimages. Pilgrimages were especially a strong-group experience, expressing social solidarity. The communal sacrifices of the Temple brought hope to ordinary people that the God worshipped by Judeans was a God of justice who offered alternative visions for a new household economy. The great pilgrimage festivals functioned as 'solidarity celebrations' and were times of communal joy when God provided food to the hungry and when a different kind of redistributive economy was associated with the divine will. At these times of great joy, the ordinary Judean envisioned a new domestic economy of God. Ironically, the Temple was a source of economic burden and political irritation for the
non-elite as the temple-type distribution system played itself out in the everyday realities of society.

3. Temple as Religious Centre

Unlike other Greco-Roman societies, all Israelite sacrifices were absolutely confined to the Jerusalem Temple. The sacred space of the Temple was the dwelling place of Yahweh and the cosmic centre of the universe where heaven and earth converged and from where divine control over the universe was exercised (Meyers 1992:351,359). The existence of the concentric circles of increasing holiness radiating out from the Holy of Holies signified that the Holiest One could be only accessed at the sacred centre. The accessibility of the sacred centre involved not only physical cleanliness but also the moral perfection associated with the nature of Yahweh (Ps.24.3-4) (Levenson 1985:111-75). The sacred nature of the Temple was intimately related to sacrifice and purity. Here we will investigate the social aspects of sacrifice and of purity in their relation to Jewish society, because these largely defined the social identity and boundaries of this religious community.

(1) The Social Nature of Sacrifices

In the ancient world, religion was essential to a society wishing to preserve its collective order and values and to create and maintain a distinctive social identity which set one people apart from other peoples (Durkheim 1961). Sacrifices played an essential role in heightening the sense of community and in reinforcing the social order and values. Accordingly, sacrifice can be seen as a social drama, understood as social ritual by anthropologists (Schechner 1994). Victor Turner located “four main phases of public action”, which constitute “the diachronic profile of social drama”: (1) breach, (2) crisis, (3) redressive action, and (4) reintegration or schism (1974: 23-59). A breach is a violation of “norm-governed social relations” within a society. A crisis
is a widening of the breach until “it becomes coextensive with some dominant cleavage in the widest set of relevant social relations to which the conflicting or antagonistic parties belong”. A crisis is a situation that cannot be overlooked, that must be dealt with here and now. Redressive action is what is done to resolve the crisis, to end the conflict. This may range from personal advice and informal arbitration to formal juridical and legal machinery, political deliberation or revolution, the performance of public ritual either to resolve certain kinds of crises or legitimise other modes of resolution. Reintegration is the elimination of the breach endangering the crisis. If, however, reintegration is not possible, either the problem will escalate or a schism will result. Schism might be creative in founding new social groups.

Viewed from the perspective of social drama, sacrifices can be understood as redressive actions meant to deal with social breach—sins and impurity. The Temple was the place of sacrifices where forgiveness of sins and cleansing from defilement were believed to be effected through burnt offering, peace offering, and the offerings of sin and guilt (Wright 1996:408-9). For René Girard, these sins and impurities are treated as social violence and illness, which threaten the social life of a group and need to be purified by ritual (1977:31,36). To resolve the social crisis, society finds scapegoats, which are identified as the surrogate victims substituted for the real violators of social norms (ibid.83). Hence their death by social violence restores the society’s health and maintains social order and values (ibid.57). In so doing, sacrifices have a significant role in confirming the values and structures of the social institutions, reaffirming the members’ status, and drawing the social boundaries which mark off the in-group, showing who is a member and who, on the other hand, belongs to the out-group (Malina 1986:38). The whole sacrificial system was embedded in the Jewish group to ensure Jewish exclusiveness, maintaining the inclusive identity of the ‘chosen people,’ and defining the out-group as another species or even as non-human. The out-group was treated as subject to the will of the in-group, thus justifying cruelty towards its members. Ancient ethnic cruelty or violence was symptomatic of a strong group-oriented society bent on justifying the social norms of the in-group and affirming, or restoring, the collectivistic assessment of the ingroup’s superiority and

23 On the general discussion of the Temple sacrifices, see Esler 1987:148-151;
exclusivity. This is why the violence narratives concerning Jesus, Stephen, and Paul, are closely associated with the Temple in Luke-Acts (Lk.19.45ff; Ac.6; 21).

(2) The Social Implication of Purity

While sacrifice drew social boundaries between in-group and out-group, the Temple’s purity was architecturally expressed in its articulated space, which prescribed the degree of accessibility and thus defined the hierarchy within the in-group (see I above). In establishing a gradation of purity from the profane territory outside the sacred precinct to the holiest area within, the Temple space expressed a conscious awareness that the closer one came to the Temple, the closer one drew to the Holiest One, and the further one moved up the carefully graded scale of purity in meeting explicit requirements (Sanders 1992:70f; Wright 1996:407).

From the anthropological perspective, purity is an abstract term used to classify things and people in a social system (Douglas 1975). To make sense of purity, ‘dirt’ can be seen as the key apposite term that signifies ‘disorder’ or ‘matter out of place.’ For example, if mud or dung is in the field outside, it is not dirt, but if it is in a house, it is dirt as being ‘out of place.’ ‘Purity’ is a coherent and detailed way to delineate what fits and what is appropriate to a certain place and time. First-century Judaism clearly maintained its purity laws by drawing social maps of people and place in terms of fitness in the Temple so as to heighten the holiness of the Temple, distinguishing the things that could be offered on the altar (m.Kelim.1.3), who could offer and who could participate in the sacrifice (t.Meg.2.7), and where and when offerings could be made (m.Kelim.1.6-9; m.Moad).

Let us imagine the effect of this Temple purity system in terms of worship. When God-fearing Gentiles travelled to the Temple for the purpose of worshipping the Jewish God, how might they have felt in the Temple space, especially facing the Soreg, barred from participating in sacrifices? Although they came to the Temple with an exceptional devotion to God, more than likely, they felt themselves

marginalised in relation to the group boundary of Judaism (Esler 1987: 156). It was the Temple where people were divided into several categories based on purity status: Gentiles, Samaritans, and the stigmatised Israelites who were institutionally segregated from the ordinary Jewish people. Although Israel's one Temple was meant to unify Israel under one God (Philo Spec. Leg. 1.12.67), the Temple also functioned to perpetuate distinctions between Jews and non-Jews, priests and non-priests, men and women, and so on (Cohen 1987: 106; Knipe 1988: 122).

Against the general agreement that Gentiles were regarded as impure, an impurity communicable to Jews, E.P. Sanders insists that in first-century Judaism the Gentiles were not treated as impure, at least where the Temple is concerned, suggesting instead that the basis for their exclusion from the Temple was "an exclusion that functioned like a purity law was a purity law" attributable to their idolatry (1992: 72-76). Sanders is partly right to see that there was not a single law or halaka to designate the Gentiles as impure, but he fails to appreciate the general Jewish sensitivity to Gentiles' impurity, as demonstrated by the proclamation of Antiochus III of Syria (Ant. 12.145), and in the Zadokite priesthood's belief that Gentiles were impure (CD. 11.15; 12.6,9). From the time up to 70CE, the sensitivity was not so much relaxed as intensified because Palestinian history had seen an acceleration of the tension between the Gentile rulers and the Jews through continuous nationalistic movements. Even though the Essene practice was not generally applicable to Jews outside the community (War. 2.150), there is reasonably strong evidence to demonstrate a general Jewish recognition regarding Gentiles' impurity: the debate between the House of Hillel and Shammai concerning a proselyte's purity (m. Pesah. 8.1), and Hyrcanus II's order to Herod prohibiting the intrusion of aliens (ἀλλόφυλοι) on Jews during their period of purification (War. 1.229).

Second, why were Gentiles segregated in the Temple? If Jews saw Gentile idolatry as the sole reason for their exclusion, what about the Jews who were excluded from the Temple precinct (cf. Lev. 21.17-20; m. Sabb. 6.8)? Did Jews think that the idolatry charge was lighter than other Jewish impurity charges such as those pertaining to menstruants, and lepers? How could they then allow an idolatrous Gentile person to enter the Temple precinct? There is no evidence suggesting that
Gentile idolatry was considered less serious than Jewish impurity. Then why was the Temple space divided? The Temple spatial division was not devised according to the degree of contamination by impurity but according to the degree of purity. Jacob Neusner claims that in first-century Judaism uncleanness is not a moral but an ontological category (1993:207-8). So the antonym of unclean is holy and the synonym of unclean is not sinful, but rather ‘outsider’ or ‘Gentile.’ According to the author of Sifra, who cites *m. Neg.* 13.10 and *t. Neg.* 7.9 verbatim, Gentiles are regarded as equivalent to beasts in regard to leprosy’s uncleanness (Neusner 1993:212-214).

The architectural space of the Temple was arranged to divide people according to the ontological concept of holiness which governed the rule of access to the Temple. Gentiles were regarded as impure in terms of ontological concepts of purity rather than moral concepts such as idolatry. The Rabbinic traditions show that Gentiles were not considered as belonging to the Temple. In *m. Kelim* 1.6-9, the place for Gentiles is outside of the land of Israel, and in *t. Meg.* 2.7, there is no reference to Gentiles at all. The Gentile court did not exist in Solomon’s Temple. It was a later development in the second Temple period probably brought on for economic or political reasons. To summarise, Gentiles were ontologically regarded as being ‘out of place’ in the Temple and the *Soreg* was installed to segregate them from Jews, signifying a Jewish in-group strategy, which explicitly claimed their exclusivity from the out-group, the Gentiles.


Here we will concentrate on the language used in relation to the Temple. Language is an important vehicle used to express one’s unique group identity by sharing and transmitting the group’s common knowledge of history, myths and beliefs. This is the case with all societies, both literate and non-literate (DeBernardi 1994:864). Using a common language, a group shares a symbolic universe in which its social relations and social values are socially constructed. In addition, language is a powerful means for the reproduction of social difference (ibid.861). By speaking different languages or dialects of a particular language, different groups maintain and
legitimise their social identity by establishing social boundaries vis-à-vis other social groups.

In the Second-Temple period, Hebrew was used to maintain Jewish national identity, and the ideological use of Hebrew was closely connected with the Jerusalem Temple. In Palestine, before Alexander the Great, Israelites shared Hebrew but tended not to consider it an essential component of their corporate identity (Schwartz 1995:3). Until 332 BCE., Aramaic was used as the lingua franca of the Persian empire, and in the later period it gradually replaced, almost completely, a large number of spoken languages in many eastern Mediterranean areas. Yet by 300 BCE., a whole host of local languages, including Hebrew had lost currency within the region and were spoken only by a small number of people (Schürer 1979:21-23). It is precisely from the third-century BCE onwards that the Hebrew language began to be ideologised, so that its use was no longer a matter of indifference, but came to acquire symbolic weight and social importance. The literary works, coins, documents and so forth in which Hebrew is used can be considered not simply as “evidence” of a linguistic situation, but rather in terms of its ideological function. Hebrew, no longer commonly spoken, became a commodity, consciously manipulated by the leaders of the Jews to evoke the Jews’ distinctiveness from their neighbours, and the leaders’ own distinctiveness from those deemed socially inferior (Schwartz 1995:4).

The underlying modus operandi for this ideological use of Hebrew is closely related to the liturgy of the Jerusalem Temple, which was performed in Hebrew despite the fact that it was no longer commonly spoken. Hebrew was compulsory on the following liturgical occasions: the Scriptural reading (m.Meg.4.4,6,10), ניבי, the blessings and the curses, the priestly blessing, the section of Scriptural reading at the offering of the first-fruits, and the words at the slaughter of a calf, etc (m.Sota.7.2; Alexander 1976). With the production of a significant and wide-ranging body of Hebrew writings in Greco-Roman Palestine, the Temple and the Law became the central symbols of Jewish nationhood and were closely associated with one another, for the Law itself expected the priests of the Temple to be among its authoritative interpreters and the executors of its imposition on the Jewish people (Schwartz 1995:25).
The development of Hebrew as the national symbol is illustrated by the predominant use of Paleo-Hebrew script on the coins of the period, the names of provinces, and official stamps (Meshorer 1982:14-17). The Hasmonean Revolt had tended to magnify the symbolic centrality of the Law and the Temple. It was accompanied by the explicit and unambiguous use of Hebrew as a national symbol. The attribution of symbolic importance to Hebrew may help explain why the earliest Hasmonean coins, minted under John Hyrcanus I, bore legends exclusively in the Hebrew language and in the increasingly incomprehensible Paleo-Hebrew script, accompanied by a distinctive iconography no longer imitated from Hellenistic royal issues and Greek city icons. The silver coins of both the Jewish Revolt (66-70 CE) and that of Bar Kokhba (132-135 CE) bear inscriptions exclusively in Hebrew and in Paleo-Hebrew script (ירושלים הקדשה) [Jerusalem the Holy] on the obverse and "ישראל השכט" [Israelite Shekel] on the reverse; see Keel 1992:364-365, ico.08-09; Betlyon 1992:108, coi.[l] and [m]), at a time when the ability to read this script must have been very rare indeed, even among those literate in Hebrew. The inscriptions are accompanied by appropriate sacred images (a chalice and a stem with three pomegranates in the silver half-shekel of the First Revolt, and the screen of the Temple and the Ark of the Covenant in the silver tetradrachma shekel of the Second Revolt; see BMC Palestine.270.7 and Kreitzer 1996:20), usually connected with the Temple cult.

There seems little doubt that the language of these coins functions practically as a talisman-an important element in the iconography of these powerful and ubiquitous expressions of Judean national defiance. These symbols no doubt shaped the consciousness of Jews in a variety of ways and created the impression that Hebrew was somehow "their" language, but in actual practice, Hebrew probably impinged on their lives rather little (Schwartz 1995:26). Hebrew actually functioned as a social marker with the twofold potential of creating internal cohesion and fostering external distinction-a duality that forms a powerful base for Jewish national identity (Haugen 1972:245)
In addition, the important use of Hebrew as a national identity-marker is well attested in the assertion of Hebrew as the primordial language (Jub. 12.25-27, T.Naph.[Hebrew], Midr. Gen.11; Tg.Yer.Gen.1.11; Rab.Ber.). This assertion was used as a yardstick of cultural identity and to declare Jewish superiority over the rest of their neighbours in the Hellenistic Near East (Mendel 1992:35-50). Why does this subject come up when it does? It is no coincidence that the question of primordial language came up precisely at the time when the Temple, redolent with Jewish ethnic, cultural, and linguistic identities, was under attack by Hellenistic rulers (Jubilees, T.12.P). During the early Hasmonean period, the notion that the Jews were a separate nation with their own religion, culture, customs and land was developed. It was thus clear that language—the main vehicle of such expression—should also be unique and serve as an organ of this national culture and identity since a distinctive language is a clear expression of unique and separate cultural identity (Rubin 1998:312). Even when Aramaic achieved its status as a sacred language, there was strong pressure to preserve Hebrew as ‘Holy Language.’ Aramaic had become the language of private prayer, much to the dismay of the Rabbis, as evident in the words: “one should never pray for his personal needs in Aramaic...Angels do not understand Aramaic’ (b.Sota33a) (Yohalom 1996:33-44).

As we observe the Temple in the second Temple period from political, economic, religious, and social perspectives, we see it had an immense centripetal power in creating Jewish group identity, in maintaining ethnic boundaries, and in affirming exclusivity from other ethnic groups. Within Judaism, the Temple played a central role in dividing and articulating people and space.

III. DATA ON TEMPLE IN LUKE-ACTS

In the New Testament, the words for Temple are ἱερόν and ναός. The word, ἱερόν, occurs most frequently (71 times) in the Gospels and Acts (Mk:9, Mt:11, Lk:14, Ac: 26, Jn:11), whereas the word, ναός, occurs 45 times (Mk:3, Mt:9, Lk.4, Ac:2, Jn:3). Although it is not possible to distinguish clearly between ἱερόν and ναός, there is general agreement that ἱερόν refers mainly to the whole Temple precinct with
its buildings, courts, etc., and to the Temple functionaries, while ναός is used for the place where sacrifices were offered (Schrenk 1965:230-47; Michel 1967:882-89).

Luke uses both terms in relation to the Temple (cf. Ac.17.24; 27), but his more usual term is ἱερόν rather than ναός. Luke also employs the word 'place' (τόπος) to denote the Temple in Ac.6.13,14, 21.28 with the adjective 'holy' (ἅγιος), except in Ac.6.13, in order to emphasise its high degree of spatial sacrality. In describing the Temple in Jerusalem during its ministries of Jesus and his disciples, Luke typically uses ἱερόν in the Gospel (2.27, 37, 46; 4.9; 18.10; 19.45, 47; 20.1; 21.5, 37, 38; 22.52, 53; 24.53) and in Acts (2.46; 3.1, 2, 3, 8, 10; 4.1; 5.20, 21, 24, 25, 42; 21.26, 27, 28, 29, 30; 22.17; 24.6, 12, 18; 25.8; 26.21). Throughout Luke-Acts, Luke specially betrays his sense of the Temple in the use of ναός. In Acts, ναός is used to denote the temple shrines: in 17.24, for pagan temples in general; and, in 19.24, for the Ephesian Artemis temple with ἱερόν (19.27) so as to characterise the pagan temple against the Jewish Temple in the more restricted sense of shrine where the image of the goddess stood. In the Gospel, the word is used of the Jerusalem Temple prior to the birth of Jesus (1.9, 21, 22), and, prior to Jesus’ crucifixion (23.45), so as to characterise the imminent need of the divine agent who will bring the salvation of God in the first chapter and to picture the end of the Temple which symbolises its termination as a source of communication with God. It is plausible to suggest that Luke employs the term ναός to stress the uselessness of the Temple in the salvation plan of God as an illustration of the temple in its pagan sense. In other words, Luke seems to employ deliberately the term ναός to picture the Temple’s failure in the salvation plan of God.

References to the Temple in Luke-Acts lead us to ask how Luke views this prime Jewish institution. In estimating the role of the Temple in Luke-Acts, present Lukan scholarship can be basically divided into three categories: (1) Luke opposes neither the Temple nor Temple worship as such (Jervell, Weinert, Bachmann); (2) Luke is unsympathetic towards the Temple suggesting that it is destined to be rejected, destroyed and replaced by others (Christ: Conzelmann, Baltzer; or Church: Gärtner, Ellis, Haenchen, or house: Elliott); (3) Luke has an ambivalent attitude to the Temple (Esler).
As representative of the first stance, Weinert has consistently argued that the Temple functions positively in the Lukan narratives since it was both the centre of Jewish worship and the earthly locus of all-Jewish life and hope (1982, 1983, 1987). But he overlooks the relationship of the Temple authorities to the Jewish people, hence he easily separates the one from the other for the purpose of defending the true value and validity of its divinely intended purpose. And he fails to deal seriously with Jesus' critical action in the Temple, which ultimately leads to Jesus' execution and death. Even though Luke repeats some points from the Markan narratives, this does not suggest Luke has a positive attitude, especially in view of his broad position in the Gospel and in Acts. Luke never provides a final word to defend the Temple but rather criticises it. The Lukan Jesus is clearly challenging the Temple in both word and action. The Lukan references to the Temple do not automatically designate a positive attitude but merely set up the context of his narratives.

Second, Esler considers Luke's attitude towards the Temple as ambivalent, in that, on the one hand, Luke situates important features of his narrative in the Temple, so that the Temple plays an important role in Luke's symbolic universe, while, on the other hand, he includes negative features, such as Stephen's critique in Acts 7 (1987:133-4). But we should consider the relationship between the significance of the Temple and of house in the symbolic universe to ascertain whether they are in opposition to, or, complement one another. Luke's narrative undermines this key role of the Temple first by acknowledging it, and then by means of a slowly evolving, increasingly negative characterisation of the Temple, which transforms the initially positive conception of the Temple in Luke 1-2 into something quite different in the rest of Luke-Acts. Luke describes Jesus' death as the eventual demise of the Temple as the sacred space (Lk.23). In the Stephen speech (Ac.7), Luke narrates in proleptic fashion the eventual and thoroughgoing theological critique of the Temple. As the narrative develops, a similar pairing of synagogue and house appears, and synagogue and the Temple are antagonistic toward Jesus and his message, so that finally the house will more and more become the centre of Jesus' movement in Luke's portrayal.
Third, Elliott has argued that the Temple is replaced by house as a contrasting institution to the Temple (Elliot 1991:305-32), in that the Temple in Luke-Acts exhibits a high degree of economic power and functions as an instrument of oppression of the poor and powerless. We agree with his basic stance but two questions arise: (1) He collapses any possible distinction between the Jews whom Jesus critiques and the Temple. Though Pharisees never appear in the context of the Temple in Luke, Elliott uses their indictment as ‘lovers of money’ (16.14) as evidence against the Temple. (2) ‘The cleansing of the Temple’ (19.45-6) is made to bear too much hermeneutic weight in its characterisation of the Temple as a ‘den of thieves,’ when Elliott reads back this portrayal into Luke’s earlier chapters.

It seems to us unsatisfactory that most Lukan scholars have begun their investigation into this theme with the simple question of whether the early Christians treated the Temple simply as a convenient place of assembly or whether they shared in its official activities (cf. Barrett 1991:345). These references should be observed within the social context of Luke’s overall framework of the Temple and in respect of the intergroup relations between various social groups. As observed above, the Temple had exerted various centripetal and centrifugal forces on the lives of first-century Jewish people. As the central institution, it played a significant role in controlling and constructing the norms, orders, values, and relations of this society. In such a social context, it will be crucial to observe how the Temple principally functions in Luke’s narratives, and to analyse whether his description is a defence of, or a mere report as it were, or a challenge to, the Temple, within this social context. We will now observe Luke’s attitude to the Temple from the perspective of our architectural model of space, complementing it with other models from social anthropology and social psychology.

**IV. THE TEMPLE IN THE GOSPEL**

In the Gospel, Luke begins by portraying Jesus in the Temple, but while evolving his narrative, he strategically presents a significant challenge to the Temple
by Jesus. Finally he describes the demise of the Temple at the time of Jesus’ death on the cross which ends symbolically its legitimacy in God’s scheme of salvation.

1. The Temple in the Infancy Narratives (Chap.1-2).

In starting his infancy narrative with the Temple, Luke sets up a point of contact with his readers by introducing characters faithful to Jewish piety as exemplified in figures like Zechariah (1.5-23), Simeon who is righteous and devout (2.25-35), and a devout widow Anna (2.36-38). Why does Luke make these pious Temple adherents appear on the stage at the start of his works? One could argue that Luke upholds the significance of the Temple in his symbolic universe, but this prima facie reading cannot be justified within the context of the narratives.

It is significant that Luke employs these pious Jews respectively as the representatives of the Jewish people in the segments of the Temple architectural space. Zechariah, a priest on duty, represents those who belong to the priestly court of the Temple space, while Simeon represents the court of Israelites, and Anna, the court of the Women. For all, however, the Temple is not only the place of ritual but also a space of hope and expectation. What are they expecting to happen? Rabbinic literature indicates that the Shekinah leaves the Temple and dwells on the Mount of Olives for three and a half years with the object of inducing the Israelites to repent, but in vain (m. Abot. 34, Pesiq. 114b, 115a; Pes. Rab. Kah. 31.143b; Midr. Ps. 10.2.26b; see Stra-B. I. 841f.). There is a dispute whether there was the Shekinah in the second Temple (m. Yoma 9b) when the return of the Shekinah is expected at the end of time (Midr. Ps. 90.19.198a; Pes. Rab. Kah. 26.132a; 28.135a). So, in the Temple, Zechariah prophesied: ‘for he has looked favourably on his people and redeemed them’ (1.68), Simeon was ‘looking forward to the consolation of Israel’ (1.25), and Anna spoke about the child Jesus ‘to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem’ (2.38). They are all looking for the redemption of Israel.

By employing these pious figures, Luke expresses the notion that the Temple was unable to provide these pious adherents with the salvation of God. In its
segmented space, the three figures are looking forward to the true redemption of God, which abolishes the Temple’s spatial divisions. Significantly, Zechariah prophesies “the light to those who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death” (1.79a) concerning the life of John the Baptist, and Simeon praises God who “has prepared in the face of all peoples a light for revelation to the Gentiles” (2.31-32a), in encountering the baby Jesus. In the Temple courts, the pious Israelites witness to the Temple’s failure to fulfil the role of social integrity and, in effect, sing a chorus concerning salvation which breaks up the social boundaries of the Temple space and thus brings all people under the gracious sovereignty of God.

In addition, we need to deal with the saying of the boy Jesus in the Temple in 2.49, because he significantly announces the important task of his future ministry in the Temple. The boy Jesus visited the Temple on the feast of Passover with his parents, and he left them in favour of remaining in the Temple and engaging in discussion with the Temple teachers (2.41-51). When his parents found him and rebuked him, he responded resolutely and enigmatically: Τι διεξετε με; οὐκ ἔδειτε ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεί εἶναι με. Many scholars and translators read the phrase ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου as ‘in my Father’s house’ with emphasis on its spatial sense. Based on biblical and extrabiblical parallels, Fitzmyer regards this translation as having the best textual basis (1981:443-444). Luke himself has Jesus refer elsewhere to the Temple as God’s house (19.46). If Luke does not waver in considering the Temple as God’s house (οἶκος) in 19.46, why does he leave out this word in support of the more indirect expression in 2.49? The ambiguity derives from Luke’s use of the plural article τοῖς without a succeeding noun, so he is referring to something which his readers evidently assume.

Two suggestions are attractive. First, Weinert points out that, based on the pilgrimage motif, the word would be translated in a spatial, personal, and dynamic sense, and he prefers to integrate these three meaning by representing it ambiguously as ‘Did you not know that I had to be in my Father’s (company)?’ (1983:19-22). Second, Dennis Sylva insists that “Lk2.49b is a double entendre and that it means ‘did you not know that I must be concerned with my father’s words in the Temple?’”. In comparing 2.49 with 19.45-21.38, he considers this clause as pointing to Jesus’
teaching activity in the Temple (1987). Weinert and Sylva are right to comprehend that the clause connotes double or multiple meanings but they are wrong in suggesting that it is pointing only to Jesus’ teaching ministry in the Temple.

First, in 2.49, Luke uses the verb δέχω “it is necessary” for the first time. Elsewhere he utilises δέχομαι to affirm Jesus’ distinctive role in God’s saving plan (Squires 1993:15ff.). When the child Jesus said to his parents, “Didn’t you know...,” to what is he alluding? They did not understand his words, but Luke assumes that his readers know that it indicates Jesus’ identity and his future ministry which Gabriel’s annunciation and the three canticles have foretold. In particular, Gabriel’s annunciation of Jesus’ identity as Son of the Most High, which is based on 2 Sam 7.12-16 in Lk.1.32-33, strongly affirms Davidic messianism. 2 Sam.7.12-16 and Lk.1.32-33 share themes of Davidic sonship, his kingdom and his house. Jesus’ understanding of his distinctive relationship with God is brought to the fore in 2.49. Jesus is in the Temple, the place of God’s name, and he is there under divine authority. The point is that he must align himself with God’s purpose which is reflected in 2 Sam 7.12-16. If read as though the word πράγμασί αὐτῷ was omitted after τοίς, 2.49b would be understood as pointing out Jesus’ identity as Son of God and his future ministry, as well as the teaching ministry in the Temple by translating it as “Did you not know that I must be concerned with my Father’s affairs?”. Luke never denies that the Temple was an important locus of Jesus’ teaching ministry, as is demonstrated by his portrayal of the Temple as necessary for the fulfilment of Jesus’ ministry. Vv.2.41-52, an important literary divide for relating Jesus’ birth story to his public ministry and thus implying Jesus’ calling and primary affairs, do not describe the Temple as God’s house merely as the locus of divine presence, but purposely suggests that the Temple is the ultimate place of Jesus’ ministry for God’s plan.

Second, what are Jesus’ affairs? Linked to 2 Sam.7, his task is to build up the house for God. In order to achieve this, he has to enter into the social space of the Temple, which the teachers have occupied. When Luke pictures the boy Jesus’ successful interrogation of the teachers of the Law (2.46-47), his intention is not to illustrate the brightness of the boy but to express the way in which he has challenged the honour of the teachers in order to shame their teaching and thus to enter into the
social space of the Temple. Luke proleptically reveals Jesus' future ministry in the Temple as well as his death which will ultimately falsify the Temple’s legitimacy as part of God’s plan, and through which he will build up a house for the people of God. On the other hand, the 'affairs' implied in 2.49 should be understood as his ministry and the message he will bring to the people through his brokerage between them as clients and God as patron. These roles are fundamentally different from those which the Temple teachers had taught to the people.

In the infancy narratives, Luke employs the Temple motif to legitimise the appearance of Jesus, the divine agent, who will delegitimate the segregated Temple space and build up a house for gathering his people.

2. The Temple Incident (Lk.19.45-48).

To develop his understanding of the Temple, Luke carefully redacts the Markan Triumphal entry narrative (Lk.19.28-38//Mk.11.1-10). In order to picture the entry not as a military parade but as a group’s solidarity celebration (Lk.19.37b), Luke minimises Markan political imagery of the entry both (1) by eliminating the cry of Hosanna with the waving of palm branches (Mk.11.8b), which invokes the memories of the first Hanukkah’s celebration of the political and religious independence (2Macc.10.5-8; Pope 1988) and (2) by reducing the Markan scale of welcome of the overall Jerusalem inhabitants (Mk.11.8a-9) to Jesus’ followers, who look back at the mighty works of Jesus which they had seen. While preserving the juxtaposed biblical allusions of Zech.9.9 (the prophetic symbolic action) and Ps.118.26 (a ritual context of the welcome for pilgrims who come to celebrate the feasts in the Temple), Luke draws a clear picture that Jesus is entering not as a political figure but as a messianic pilgrim who announces the fatal failure of the Temple’s authorities and the destruction of the Temple (19.41-44) and will celebrate the true feast of the Passover in his instruction of the Lord’s Supper and in his death.

Related to this different entry-setting, Luke provides a somewhat different picture of the Temple incident (Hooker 1988:13-15). Mark separates the entry from
the Temple incident by mentioning Jesus’ scrutiny (περιβλεψάμενος, Mk.11.11) of
everything which happens in the Temple and his withdrawal to Bethany for the night,
and by sandwiching the incident between the frames of the fig-tree story (Mk.11.12-
14; 11.20-25), which symbolises the divine judgement over the fruitlessness of the
Temple in the messianic age (Telford 1980). But the Lukan Jesus, without any lapse
of time, immediately enters and challenges the Temple by driving out the dealers and
by justifying his radical actions from the Scripture, as presented by the conflated
quotation of Isa.56.6 and Jer.7.11: Γέγραπται, Καὶ ἐσται ὁ οἶκος μου οἶκος
προσευχής, ὑμεῖς δὲ αὐτῶν ἐποίησατε σπήλαιον λῃστῶν (Lk.19.45-46). Luke adapts
Markan wording by notably dropping all mention of the purchasers, the sellers of
doves, the overturning of the market tables, and the interference (Mk.11.15b-16) and
the phrase, πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐθνεσίν.

By observing the incident from an architectural perspective, we can see more
clearly Luke’s attitude to the Temple. Jesus’ Temple demonstration is performed in
the Gentile court which was perhaps originally devised for the worship of God by
Gentiles, just as they worshipped God in the Diaspora synagogues. But it was
transformed into the Temple market. Eppstein has argued that the market system in
the Temple precinct was introduced in 30 CE by Caiaphas, motivated by politico-
economic considerations, and was administered under the priestly family of Caiaphas
(1964). It was a more marginalised, less sacralised, but more inclusive space in the
Temple. In this space, Jesus challenged the way the Temple was being used in order
to delegitimise the sacrality of the Temple.

The following points explain our view. First, in the quotation from Isa.56.7,
Jesus redefines the Temple not as the place of sacrifices but as the house of prayer
(οἶκος προσευχῆς), by transforming the nature of the Temple into that of the
synagogue which was called the prayer house in first-century Judaism (see IV.1). He
reverses the spatial honour in the Temple by upholding the Gentile Court, while
implying that it was not a place for Gentile prayer. By driving out the traders in the
Gentile court, he symbolically expresses his protest against the economic dimension
of the sacrificial system as best, as a non-priest he is able to do. It means that Jesus
denies the sacrificial system of the Temple by falsifying the holy space where the
sacrifices take place. His intention is to recover the essence of the Temple space where people communicate with God without distinction according to their varying degree of holiness and without being diverted by politico-economic interests. Just as in his ministry outside the Temple, so also Jesus announces the inclusion of marginalised people in the salvation of God so as to make the Gentile court a centre of the Temple.

Second, one could argue that Jesus never criticises the sacrificial system of the Temple and that the commercial system for the sacrifices is taken for granted in the Judaism of his time (Sanders 1985:63ff.; Neusner 1989). But we have no evidence that Jesus appreciates the system. Rather by quoting from Jer.7.11, Luke criticises the present sacrificial system in the Temple and in so doing preserves the stark contrast between prayer and marketing. Why was Jesus concerned with the market system in the Temple? From an anthropological point of view, the market system is not a neutral but a social mechanism in which socially constructed and standardised thought and values are channelled to produce a map of social integration around the power system (Douglas & Isherwood 1979:xv, 67). Through the Temple market, the aristocratic priestly group controls the symbolic universe in which the Jewish people should live. From the Temple, they derive the economic, political and social profits necessary to gain power which is again reinvested to reproduce and expand the surplus (see III.1; Evans 1989). The Temple market system is the best example to show the abuse of the Temple by the priestly aristocracy, who used it in order to exploit people and make excessive profit thereby.

Jer.7.11—"Has this house... become a den of robbers in your sight?"—was written in the context of corrupt mercenary activity and the malfunction of Temple worship in the sixth-century BCE. So its quotation in Lk.19.46 is pivotal for understanding the first century Temple situation. Along with the Rabbinic traditions which attest corruption of the priestly group (b.Sahn.41a; y.Sahn.1.1;7.1; b.Sabb.15a; b.Abod.Zar.8b), this prophecy on the lips of Jesus clearly signifies the high priestly group’s abuse of their spiritual calling. In preserving the crucial thrust of the Temple-saying from the Markan source, Luke obviously indicates Jesus’ firm protest against the Temple system.
In view of the first-century social context of priestly corruption discussed above, it is appropriate to label the present Temple as "the den of bandits." The term ληστής presumably refers to the bandits who were produced from the peasants in their socio-economic circumstances (Goodman 1982; Horsley 1979; 1995:258-68; Freyne 1988). It is ironic that the bandits mentioned here are not those who are active in the wilderness but those who are active in the Temple. Jesus announces that the real bandits are the priestly groups who drive the peasants into taking up banditry, and that they have the substantial responsibility for this phenomenon. For Jesus, the Temple is in fact the prime source of alienation, division, exploitation, discrimination and conflict while exerting its centripetal power on the people. Jesus' Temple demonstration is, therefore, a direct challenge to the Temple.

Third, the Temple's centripetal power, which congregates people and economic resources into the central institution, is also replicated in the Temple space. This may be characterised as a transpatial space which differentiates people by analogy and difference, and as a non-distributive space which prevents people from crossing social boundaries in that space. Thus we should ask why Luke omits the phrase, "πᾶν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν" from Mark in the quotation of Isa.56.7. Nolland is right to argue that Luke seems to treat the quotation of Isa.56.7 as a legal stipulation rather than as the prophetic word of the original text by eliminating the phrase and by combining with his switch from 'κληρονομεῖται' to 'καὶ ἔσται' (1993:937). But he misses out an important point in the Lukan omission. Unlike Mk.11.17 with its reference to "all nations", Luke does not insist that the Temple will be the central place for the Gentiles' eschatological pilgrimage to Zion. So Luke significantly fails to uphold the centripetal force of the Temple as the symbolic centre of power. It is no longer the centre around which life is oriented. Indeed, it will become the point of departure for the mission to all people, as Paul departs to his Gentile mission after prayer in the Temple (Ac.22.17-21). Just as Jesus' ministry outside the walls of the Temple (healing, exorcism, and pronouncement of forgiveness of sins) makes God's grace now available to all people by broadening the access to God's power, so the Temple demonstration is a direct challenge to the Temple to make God available to all
groups to whom his grace was institutionally blocked through the vigorous purity law enforced by the Temple authorities.

In the Temple incident, Luke pictures neither a cleansing (cf. Evans 1989) nor an eschatological sign to bring about the new Temple (cf. Sanders 1975:75), but a protest against the overall Temple system by the messianic pilgrim who challenges the present Temple’s honour, while Mark shows an overall cleansing action to create an impression of a new Hanukkah. Luke may have known not only the Roman political sensitivities in the paschal season when the Jews were celebrating the great deliverance of the past and the hope of present liberation from the Roman reign, but also the improbability of the political and religious provocation in the presence of the Roman army stationed in the fortress Antonia (War.5.190-2). Moreover, by denying the centrality of the Temple as the sacred space, Luke prepares for the subsequent activities of Jesus who will teach daily in the Temple and thus enter its social space in order to challenge the social honour of its rulers, which leads to the judgement over them (Lk.20.9-19; 20.45-47) and the prediction of the Temple’s destruction (Lk.21.5-7). For Luke, the Temple is actually falsified in the death of Jesus (Lk.23.45) and is going to be replaced by the house in and from which the salvation of God is effectively actualised and dispersed.

3. The Teaching Activity in the Temple (Lk.19.47-20.19)

Whether to some extent the Jewish leaders would have been shocked by the Temple incident can be illustrated by their hostile attitudes to Jesus, as, for instance, the fact that they are seeking a way to kill Jesus (19.47; 20.1, 19). Against Jesus’ challenge, they take action and attempt to put him to shame by questioning his authority (20.2). It might be implied that they challenge Jesus as an unauthorised rabbi (Stra-B.II.746-754) and they claim their right to authorise (Fitzmyer 1985:1275; Nolland 1993:943). It is more reasonable, however, that τὰς τὰς (20.2) is intended to include both Jesus’ Temple action and his teaching in the Temple (contra Fitzmyer 1985:1273). Accordingly, they seek to kill him as the violator of the Temple by public verdict (m.Sahn.4.1). But their riposte fails to dishonour Jesus, who succinctly
responds by his counter-question based on the Deuteronomic criterion in Dt. 18.15-22, where God promises a prophet like Moses and gives a criterion for distinguishing a true prophet from a false one (20.4). This criterion suggests that a true prophet is εἰς οὐρανοῦ, and a false prophet, εἰς ἀνθρώπων. After silencing them, Jesus tries to shame the Jewish leaders by public verdict through the parable of the wicked tenants in which he explicitly expresses the divine judgement over the Jewish leaders as the wicked tenants, a point similar to the one he had made in relation to the Temple (20.9-16; Snodgrass 1983:45).

After the parable, Jesus comments on it by quoting Ps. 118.22 (LXX) in 20.17-18: "Λίθον δὲν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας," retaining Mk.12.10. The use of Ps 118.22 on the lips of Jesus effectively breaks off the parable and brings the impact of its message to bear upon the Temple authorities. From the background of Dan.2.34f. and 44f., the quotation points to the inescapability of judgement as expressed in v.18 (Stra-B.1.87; Jeremias 1967:276). If the Temple is deemed to be destroyed through God’s judgement, what is intended when Jesus states that “the stone rejected will be the cornerstone?” The opening word, λίθον, without the article develops a new image of stones and builders, but bridges the preceding parable by the word-play of τὰς (the son) and τὰς (stone). What prompts Jesus to identify himself with the stone of Ps.118.22, using the word-play of τὰς-τὰς and thereby to speak of his rejection and exaltation in 20.9-19? How does the Lukan audience understand this saying?

The triple constituents of “stone,” “builders” and “cornerstone” in Ps.118.22 would remind them that the Jerusalem Temple’s edifice of great and beautiful “stones” was proverbial (cf. Lk.21.5; War.5.5.1-3; b.Sukk.51b). The Temple was built of ‘hard, white stones, each of which was about twenty-five cubits in length, and twelve in width’ (Ant.15.11,3). In Rabbinic literature, the word “builders” is often a designation for Jewish religious leaders as the Temple establishment (Stra-B.1.876). Luke would most probably have known that Herod trained priests as masons or carpenters to build the sanctuary (Ant.15.390). It is important to note that the Psalm is the last Hallel related to deliverance through the Davidic messianic figure. If Jesus recognises his calling as the Davidic son of God based on Ps.2.7 in his baptism
(Lk.3.22b), he should understand his sonship in the context of Nathan’s oracle (2Sam.7.12-16) where the Davidic son of God will build a house for God.

If this is so, it is clear that Jesus’ identification with the “stone” of Ps.118.22 had something to do with his messianic task of building a house for God. In the relation of the parable and the quotation, we can assume that Jesus sees himself as the stone. What is the house which is to be built by his death? Biblical scholars have suggested it is the new temple of the Christian community (Kim 1987:134), new Christian leadership (Nolland 1993:953), or the heavenly sanctuary (Fitzmyer 1985:1282). Would they be best to understand here symbolically or abstractly that the rejected stone becomes the cornerstone? Would the Lukan community not have carried its implication to them in concrete terms? Gos.Thom.66, preserved that “Jesus said, ‘Show me the stone which the builders have rejected; that is the cornerstone.’” All this helps us comprehend the actual referent of Ps. 118.22 for Luke.

The word “stone” may have been pictured as one of the stones found to be unsuitable for the building which was ongoing. If the stone rejected by the builders was used for the houses of common people, the cornerstone has its reference to the house. ‘Cornerstone’ (κεφαλή γωνίας) has been interpreted as the keystone crowning the building or installed over the portal, by understanding κεφαλή as denoting the vertical head (Jeremias 1963:274-79). But the word was also used to denote the horizontal end (Ezk.16.25,31[LXX]; Isa.51.20[LXX]; Pap.Oxy.273,1.18). It is more plausible that the cornerstone designates the foundation stone at its farthest corners with which a building is begun (Krämer 1990:268). Our observation is confirmed by Hirschfeld (1995:121). The Palestinian technique of house construction begins with the laying of cornerstones. It is extremely important in that they are firmly fixed to their sites to stabilise the finished structure and determine its direction. As hewn squared stones, they are not sunk deeply into the ground and are large and carefully dressed so that a cord stretched around the cornerstones will allow the workmen to build the walls straight along the cord line.

Architecturally the stones, which are unsuitable for the monumental Temple building because of their size or their shape, would be used for ordinary houses.
Accordingly the stones, which were abandoned by the Temple builders, would have been used to build the more humble houses. If this is so, in considering Jesus’ actual reference to the cornerstone as the Christian community, there is no good reason to deny that it may also more concretely refer to the houses in which the Christian communities were established.

4. The Widow’s Gift (Lk.21.1-6)

In the Lukan context, this pericope is closely related both to the preceding criticism of scribes with the catchword “widow” (χηρας) (20.45-47) and the following prediction of the Temple’s destruction with the catchword “gift” (τα δωρα) (21.5-6). In 21.1-4, Jesus compares the widow’s whole-life gift with the rich person’s contribution of surplus to the Temple treasury. Luke slightly changes the Markan word—πολλα as τα δωρα and πιστη as πενιχραν which indicates one who actually has some minimal resources for livelihood—in order to draw a contrast between the rich person’s abundance (πενισσεωντος) and the widow’s whole life (βιος).

The readings of this narrative can be largely divided into two categories. (1) There are those who regard this pericope as a paradigm for Christian discipleship. They tend to contrast the widow’s commitment to God with the barrenness of the scribal faith and with the facile and pretentious offerings of the rich (Nolland 1993:979; Witherington 1988:18). The serious difficulty with this approach is that Jesus never recommends her offering as an example, as he does for the woman with the ointment (Lk.7.36-50). (2) Other critics would like to read her action as a paradigm for Christian giving in various ways (see Wright’s tabular survey, 1982:257-9). The trouble with these readings is their failure both (a) to connect this narrative to its co-text (Lk.20.45-47) and (b) to pay attention to Jesus’ prolonged criticism of the Temple authorities and Jewish leadership.

The narrative flow of Jesus’ Temple teaching clearly indicates what he is saying in this pericope. Since Lk.20.1ff., Luke cements Jesus’ criticism of the Jewish leaders, including the chief priests (Lk.20.1), Sadducees (20.27), and scribes (20.46).
The thorough failure of Jewish leaders finally leads to the destruction of the Temple (21.5-7). This episode is a part of the polemic against scribes to show how they victimise the most vulnerable members of society by the divine institution they serve. The scribe was the legal expert who served as an interpreter for the people in Jewish society (Saldarini 1988:241-276). Though some of them came from the Pharisees (cf. Ac.23.9), it is probable that Luke presents them as associated with the high priestly groups (cf. Lk.20.1; Sir.38.24-39.11; Jub.4.17-25). Belonging to the retainer class (5% of the population), they served the needs of the governing class and enjoyed social honour, as the Synoptic tradition attests (Mk.12.38.par). In 20.47 Jesus condemns scribes who devour widows’ houses. We do not know how they did this, but we can assume that their general reputation was not far away from that of the priesthood (cf. T.Mos.7.6; see Fitzmyer 1985:1318). Immediately after judging their greater condemnation (20.47b), Jesus points to a vivid example of their victim in the stark contrast between the rich and a widow.

One would contend that Jesus approves the widow’s piety. There are stories and traditions from Hellenism, Judaism, and Buddhism (Fitzmyer 1985:1320), which set a higher value on the small gift of the poor than on the excessive contributions of the rich (Ant.6.149; Lev.Rab.107a). But there is a reasonable doubt as to why Luke would strangely insert at this point an example or paradigm of discipleship, which is certainly unfamiliar to its co-text. Thus it is more plausible to see the episode as consistent with Jesus’ criticism of Jewish leaders, who actually lead the Temple to its destruction. Behind the story, we should read the scribes’ role in advising the widow to offer her whole life to the Temple under construction in order to elevate their own honour. The episode cries out that the devoured widow is impoverished, since she gives her whole life, two lepta, which is equivalent to a day-labourer’s one-day wage. Neither a paradigm for true discipleship nor a prime example of Christian giving can be found in this narrative. Sugirtharajah rightly observes that “Jesus neither appreciated nor commended her action, he was rather grieved at the way the Temple and its authorities manipulated her to part with what little she had” (1991-2:43).

We contend that the real concern of Jesus is with the present Temple system, which lead to the poor widow’s donation. It is the Women’s Court where the treasury
was located (2. Esdr. 20.38; 1 Macc. 14.49). M. Seqal. 2.1, 6.1, 5 refer to thirteen chests marked for various kinds of contributions that would have supplied the financial backbone for the maintenance and functioning of the Temple. The collections from these chests would have been reserved in the Temple treasuries which were located in the inner court of the Temple for the safekeeping of legal documents and private wealth, as well as for the Temple wealth and valuable items accumulated from the tithes and gifts (War. 5.200). Jesus laments that the centripetal power of the Temple actually consumes the whole life of the widow, she being understood as one of those whose house was devoured (Lk. 19.47). Should the Temple treasures not be used to support those who cannot fend for themselves? Does the Torah not protect the widows, the weakest members of society? But the Temple finally devoured the widow’s whole life. She was a victim of the unjust social system.

Despite the widow’s piety, the Temple was destined to be destroyed (21.6). Jesus’ audience would have seen the decoration work of the Jerusalem Temple with its beautiful stones and gifts (Lk. 21.5) that included those like this poor widow’s. At the time when they heard Jesus’ prediction of the Temple’s destruction, how did they think of the Temple treasure vis-à-vis the widow’s gift? They would have thought that her piety was wrongly encouraged by the scribes, because it was destined to support the soon-to-be destroyed Temple. Lukan readers would know of the actual destruction of the Temple. In spite of its splendid adornment with fine stones, the Temple was thrown down and not one stone left upon another (Lk. 19.43-44; 21.5; Gaston 1970:355-60).

To conclude, we should have a moral responsibility to those who have been misguided by a particular interpretation of this episode. As a student of this episode, I have witnessed and heard that not a few poor believers in Korea have offered excessive contributions to the construction of church buildings and have consequently been left in a state of poverty, while they have not been honoured in the Korean Church. This episode still cries out against a misreading which has been used to victimise the pious poor believers at the expense of the social honour of the Church leadership. As evidenced in our model of Korean church architecture in Chap. 2, the building of a beautiful and grand Temple necessarily generated social problems in
first-century Jewish society. The widow should be remembered as one of the victims of exploitation of the poor for the sake of the Temple’s magnificence.

5. Jesus’ Death and the Demise of the Temple-Curtain (Lk.23.44-49).

Luke’s ongoing estimation of the Temple in the Gospel is ultimately confirmed in the cataclysmic event, Jesus’ death, which is intimately related to the rending of the Temple-curtain. We will begin by considering this death as a social drama from an anthropological perspective: as already noted, public action constitutes the diachronic profile of social drama, involving breach, crisis, redressive action, and reintegration or schism (Turner 1974:23-59; see II.3.[1]). I shall then relate this to the rending of the Temple curtain.

Throughout his ministry in the Gospel, Jesus, the social performer, has breached norm-governing social values and relations by having meals with sinners and tax-collectors and by extending the salvation of God to the destitute (Lk.4.16f.). Before the entry into the Temple, his principal antagonists are the Pharisaic group, whose reactions range from simply labelling him as a social deviant (7.34) to plotting more extreme action (6.11). After the entry, the social breach has been deepened to create a social crisis in relation to the Jewish Temple authorities, who have immediately and deliberately planned to kill Jesus (19.47b; 20.19,20; 22.2). Their redressive action is to put him to death in order to resolve the crisis and to legitimise usual social norms and relations. In Girardian terms, he is a perilous source of social illness, which ultimately needs to be purified as the surrogate victim by violence in order healthily to maintain the existing social structure (1977). Accordingly we can see the crucifixion as a public ritual to resolve the breach. There is tension in this drama, however, in that the redressive action fails to reintegrate the Jesus group because of the resurrection, which divinely legitimises the activity of Jesus (24.1-9), and then a new social group is ritually created in Acts.

In the Gospel traditions (Mk.15.33-4. par.), Jesus’ death is simultaneous with and related to the tearing of the veil in the Temple. There are notable differences
between Mark and Luke, reflecting various Lukan redactional interests (Matera 1985:469-85; Fitzmyer 1985:1512). Luke seems to use a second source available to him in v. 46 (the use of Ps.31.5 for Jesus’ cry on the cross from the Markan use of Ps.22.1) and in v. 47 (the different set of words, “δικαιος” attributed to the centurion after Jesus’ death from the Markan “Son of God”). In particular, while Mark describes the ripping of the Temple-curtain (καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ) as occurring after Jesus’ death, Luke conversely represents the tearing of the veil before the death of Jesus. In addition, Luke redacts Mark’s “into two from above to below” to “in the middle” (μέσον).

Lukan scholarship has suggested three possible motivating factors for this redaction. First, Luke was motivated by the desire to avoid the impression that Jesus’ death is the end of the Temple and its cult because of Luke’s positive attitude towards the Temple (Matera 1985:475). Second, Luke intends to establish close contact between the divine and human sphere (Sylva 1986:239-50). Third, Luke wishes to depict the possibility of salvation for Gentiles by abolishing the barrier separating Gentiles from Jews while retaining the positive attitude towards the Temple (Green 1991:551-2). However, these suggestions fail to point out appropriately Luke’s redactional implications.

First, Matera fails plausibly to explain why the rending of the veil is involved in the context of the death of Jesus if Luke wants to avoid the sense of implying a portent of Temple destruction yet at the same time points to a portent of the last days. If anyone familiar with Judaism had heard of the event, they would have interpreted it as the end of the Temple. He also fails to take into account Luke’s underlying motive of the cosmic and social nature of Jesus’ death (Chance 1988:120). Second, Sylva fails to appreciate the previous communication between Jesus and God in 3.22 (baptism), 9.35 (transfiguration) and 23.34 (intercession), and to understand the very nature of Jesus as divine agent, who has already opened the way of communicating with God in his prayer to his followers. Third, Green is right to consider sociologically the Temple’s barrier, which hinders the Gentile’s access to the Temple, but he fails to explain how the rending is directly related to the Gentile access, though we concede its indirect connotation for Gentiles. If Luke has this in mind, he would
have described the demolishing of the Soreg and the fences within the Temple precincts. Green has insisted upon Luke’s positive attitude to the Temple and explained the rending event within the positive context of the Temple in Luke-Acts (1991; 1994b). If Jesus’ death is central to Luke-Acts, we should understand the rending of the Temple-curtain as a prime point of reference for the rest of the Temple texts. The Lukan audience of the first-century would have recognised the rending event as symbolising the judgement and the demise of the Temple. As far as we can discern, by rearranging the Markan order of ‘the rending’ and ‘the death,’ Luke aims to bring into close proximity the series of events which are happening simultaneously in different spheres, in order to emphasise the cosmic and socio-religious connotations of the death of Jesus. As Matthew emphasises the simultaneous nature of the two events by adding “at the moment” (Lóðóu) (27.51), Luke does not have a problem in rearranging the order at the critical moment from his Markan source.

The splitting of the Temple-curtain points significantly to the divine reversal of the social drama to delegitimate the principal social institution of Judaism, the whole Temple system, which centripetally exerts its social, political, economic and religious powers on the people, who worship Yahweh. For Luke the rending is a remarkable divine action (reading ἐσχήθη as a divine passive) and points to the Temple’s demise. Luke expresses its socio-religious connotations by creatively representing the rending of the Temple-curtain as simultaneous with the death of Jesus.

Of the thirteen Temple curtains, the two main ones are at stake because Luke uses the word, ναός, to indicate the sanctuary. In the tabernacle, there were the two curtains, γύρις at the entrance to the holy place and ναός before the most holy place (Exod.26.31,36). In the LXX, καταπέτασμα is used for both curtains. According to Josephus, these two curtains had parallels in the outer and inner curtain of the Herodian Temple, which were Babylonian tapestries, embroidered in four colours and symbolising a panorama of the universe, excluding the signs of the zodiac (Ant.8.75,90; War.5.5.4,5). Which of the Temple curtains is intended in Lk.23.45 has been disputed (Fitzmyer 1985:1518), but Luke gives a clue in his use of “μεσον”. The word appears 24 times in Luke (58 times in NT). The word’s basic meanings are “in
the middle, amid, in the midst of' (Oepke 1967:598), but Luke relates it to a definite theological intention that goes beyond the merely local meaning in use elsewhere (Stänger 1991:412). It serves to underscore something remarkable and central especially in the scenes shaped by Luke (cf. 2.46; 17.11; 22.27; Ac.1.5). It means that Luke’s intention more probably points to the inner curtain because the inner curtain signifies the most essential part of the Temple to represent its nature and its legitimacy.

Accordingly the abrogation of the most inner part of the Temple brings far-reaching socio-religious significance into the text. Architecturally the Temple space was partitioned into the several zones of sacred space according to the degree of the purity and holiness, where each zone was differentiated from the others so as to indicate its accessibility and its function. The architectural map was powerfully replicated in the social map (Neyrey 1991a:274-281). Socially, the Temple was segregated to distinguish between people and thus make the social boundaries in society. Religiously, the Temple was the only place sacrifices were offered as the threshold to God. Furthermore, the Temple as the centre of symbolic power had immense political and economic power, as we have seen earlier. By describing the rending event in the proximity of the death of Jesus, Luke intends to express that the death exterminates the centripetal power of the Temple de jure while the Temple would continue to exert its power de facto. For Luke, the Temple is destroyed de jure but it will be destroyed later de facto.

From the time of the rending, the Temple had lost its legitimacy to exert its centripetal and centrifugal power on the social, economic, political and religious world. For Luke, the Temple sacrifices become meaningless because Jesus has opened access to God once for all through his vicarious death (Ac.2.38; 4.12). There will be no distinctions between people since the Temple’s ultimate barrier has been destroyed by the death of Jesus (Ac.11.34-35). The torn veil of the Temple in Luke is of a piece with the larger Lukan emphasis on the invalidation of the barriers between those peoples previously divided by ritual purity laws of the Temple which consequently segment and articulate hierarchically status and ethnicity (Green 1991:543). It means not only that access to God has been opened to Gentiles but also
that any sort of social divisions within a society is falsified in Jesus. There are no religious and political powers held by the Temple authorities (Ac.4.19-20). The Temple’s economic power is also substantially abrogated in the disciples’ communal life (Ac.2.44-46). It is significant, however, that the Temple is only useful de facto to create the new social group, which has significantly different social norms and social relations derived from the teaching and ministry of Jesus, which will be discussed in chap.5.

To conclude, the rending of the Temple-curtain plays two significant roles in Luke’s narratives: it not only serves to de-legitimise the Temple as the centre of symbolic power, but also to enable Luke to use the Temple as the location where the new social group will be substantially formed by the disciples who make a challenge to its rulers by entering the social space in the Temple. And the social-world of Luke is fundamentally emancipated from the architectural constraints of the Temple, which is deeply and widely replicated in first-century Jewish society: the rending of the Temple-curtain is an ultimate sign of the end of the Temple and its space.

V. THE THEORY OF INTERGROUP INTERACTION AND ITS PRELIMINARY APPLICATION TO ACTS.

The Temple narratives in Acts are characteristically situated in the interaction between various groups such as the Jewish group, the Hellenists, Judean Christians, and Gentile Christians. Thus we will first consider the theory of intergroup interaction especially in regard to language-use and boundary-markers. We need to remind ourselves that in the first-century Mediterranean world, competition for honour was prevalent in intergroup relations. The in-group/out-group distinction was one of its most central features in their agonistic society (Malina 1993b:47,89) because Mediterranean people had (and have) a strong group-oriented personality, not individual but dyadic (Malina 1993a:63-88). This aspect of group-oriented character

was saliently embedded in their social interactions in various ways: (a) through honor and shame as the pivotal social values (with the fact that one way in which honor is acquired is by actively striving to get the better of one's equals in all aspects of life as long as they are not kin being especially prominent); (b) in limited good as a powerful social perception (all goods exist only in finite and usually indivisible portions, which means that one person or group can only enjoy an accretion of some good at the expense of some other person or group); and (c) in patron-client relations as a mode of social exchange, etc (Malina 1993a; Neyrey 1991). "Coexistence of the pivotal nature of honor and the limited good provides a strong stimulus to the development of ideologies and occasions of intergroup comparison. A group which gets the better of a rival in some contest earns honor for itself while leaving its competitor in a state of shame" (Esler 1998:46-7). It is, thus, to be expected that in social interaction the in-group is always to be supported, respected, and given loyalty, while the out-group is rarely considered worthy of the respect one would give in-group members, and the pain, suffering, and death of an out-group person are not worthy of concern (see Malina 1993b:47-70, 89-101).


According to Sherif, intergroup interaction is brought about in a condition of group identification.

'Whenever individuals belonging to one group interact, collectively or individually, with another group or its members in terms of their group identifications we have a stance of intergroup behaviour' (from Turner & Giles 1981:4).

Such group identifications are derived from belonging to groups characterised by issues such as ethnicity, occupation, nationality, and religion, which serve to categorise one's group vis-à-vis another group. But intergroup interaction presupposes a group in a process of social influence which leads individual members to internalise certain social norms in their attitudes and social behaviour, to see
themselves in appropriate circumstances as embodying these norms, and thus to define their social location in terms of certain selected group affiliation (Tajfel 1982a:4). Thus the social norms, which define acceptable and unacceptable attitudes and behaviour for group members, are crucial to maintain and enhance group identity by bringing order and appropriate behaviour in new and ambiguous situations (Brown 1988:42-48). The early Christians are depicted as having distinctive group norms as a fictive-kinship group vis-à-vis Jewish groups centred on the Temple (see chap.5).

This group identity should not, however, be understood as fixed or inflexible. Since one's group identity is derived from intergroup relations, it may be necessary to maintain or change it, or for it to be modified in various situations in which a group interacts with out-groups. Social identity also acquires meaning only by comparison with other groups. In social comparison, individuals perceive their sense of belonging to a group, whether it is in positive or negative terms. In positive distinctiveness from the out-group, group members will attempt to make themselves superior to members of a relevant out-group on valued dimensions such as social power, honour and so forth, and share a satisfactory or adequate social identity. If, in a given intergroup relation, members of one group perceive their social identity in negative terms, change will be desired and possibly implemented in several ways: social mobility if exit from the group's social location is possible; social change if exit is difficult or impossible; social creativity if access to status and resources within the actual relationship is impossible; social competition if the access is possible (see Esler 1998:50-54).

To be sure, the early Christians did not have a superior position vis-à-vis outgroups, but they were probably aware of positive cognitive alternatives to improve their social position in their interaction with the Jewish Temple authorities. In a pre-industrial, group-oriented ancient Mediterranean society, people were usually expected to remain within existing social categories, and so they would not normally have engineered the group strategy of social mobility, by moving from a low- to a high status group. Another alternative open to the Christian group consisted of effecting a positive re-evaluation vis-à-vis the Jewish group by pursuing the group tactics of social creativity or social competition. Social creativity is a group strategy intended to improve a group's social identity by (1) redefining what was previously
regarded as a weakness into a strength: an example is a Christian’s redefinition of the
death of Jesus on the cross, with the concomitant assertion of his identity as Messiah,
or (2) comparison with an out-group on a new dimension: an example is the Spirit-
inspired community at Pentecost and the new economic way of sharing, caring and
feasting. Social comparison is a strategy used to seek a positive social identity by
changing the current situation: an example is a Christian’s challenge to enter the
social space of another by charismatic preaching, healing, evangelism. To the extent
that this process involves the redistribution of scarce resources like honour, this group
strategy tends to generate conflict and antagonism between the subordinate and
dominant groups (Brown & Turner 1981). Therefore reactions from the dominant
group to maintain or accentuate its positive social identity can be anticipated in two
ways: (1) a strong response to maintain or restore its superiority or distinctiveness
such as the Temple authorities’ persecution; (2) creative cognitive alternatives to
accentuate its positive differences on existing dimensions such as Judean Christians’
institution of the Apostolic decree relating to Gentile Christians (Ac.15, 21) and their
upholding of the Temple sacrifices (Ac.21).

2. Language-Use and Interaction between the Hellenists and the Hebrews.

We can also apply this theory to the intergroup interactions between the
Hellenists and Hebrews (Ac.6-8) and between Judean Christians and Gentile
Christians (Ac.21). In the interaction between Hellenists and Hebrews, the language-
agenda is salient, so that it is particularly important to consider language as a factor in
intergroup relations. LePage and Tabouret-Keller argue that linguistic behaviour ‘is a
series of acts of identity in which speakers reveal both their personal identity and their
search for social roles’ (1985:15). In a multilingual society, linguistic varieties may
index aspects of identity, and language choice is both socially meaningful and
strategic ‘to establish, cross or destroy group boundaries: to create, evoke, or change
interpersonal relations with their accompanying rights and obligations’ (Gal
1988:247). The elaboration of a linguistic style in the defence of identity is often a
characteristic of subcultural groups. Those who stand outside the norms of the social
contract, which is inscribed in linguistic categories (Durkheim 1961:482-7),
frequently reshape language to express their values and to establish ethnic co-identity and to negotiate a different relationship whether it is solitary or exclusive (DeBernardi 1994:874). Varieties of language-use such as idiosyncratic aspects of performance or free variation are also understood as a linguistic expression of social identity, and are associated with national and ethnic identities, all sorts of differences of class, sub-cultural, gender and generational as well as religious worldview (Hudson 1980; Trudgill 1967).

However, the culture of standard language, such as that of ‘BBC English’ in the United Kingdom before the recent introduction of regional accents on the airwaves, is aggressively hegemonic, and dominates linguistic situations by imposing the idea that other linguistic usages are locatable only in relation to it (Siverstein 1987:3). Standard language is used as a power strategy by the dominant group in so far as it expresses, symbolises, and maintains a social order favourable to them (Halliday 1978:172). In the USA, consistent use of the double negative (‘He don’t know nothing’) in ‘black English vernacular’ is stigmatised by educators as ‘bad grammar,’ or as an expression of illogicality, while the double negative is employed in Russian, Spanish, and French without being stigmatised ‘illogical’. Bolinger sums up this situation thus: “Attitudes towards a form of speech are hardly other than attitudes towards the speakers. Inferior people speak in inferior ways...stigmatised” (1980:45). The social prestige or stigma attached to linguistic varieties often supports and expresses the value attached to social identities. The term ‘anti-language’ has been used by Halliday to refer to the argot of socially marginal persons who ‘act out a distinctive social structure’ wherein is inscribed an ‘alternative social reality’ (Halliday 1978:165, 172).

Hebrew as a language was used as the symbol of Jewish superiority to uphold the sacred nature of the Temple. It is highly possible that the term 'Εβραίος, as used of Judean Christians, was derived from their attachment to the Temple as characteristic of their social identity, though their actual vernacular language was
It is plausible to think that the Hellenists were regarded as a subordinate group in Palestinian society in terms of language-use, in that they used Greek, here possibly functioning something like an anti-language, as the means of expressing their social identity as well as of actively creating and maintaining it. As far as intergroup relations go, the Hellenists would perceive their negative social identity but engineer a social strategy along the lines of social creativity (as discussed above) by developing their distinctive theology of which Stephen's speech is the group manifesto: A Temple-critical and pro-Gentile mission.

We can better understand their interaction in terms of social categorisation and stereotyping. Snyder suggests that:

In stereotyping, the individual (1) categorises other individuals, usually on highly visible characteristics such as sex or race (or language, my addition); (2) attributes a set of characteristics to all members of that category; and (3) attributes that set of characteristics to any individual member of that category (1981:183).

Tajfel (1981) suggests that stereotyping serves four major functions: (1) to make a complex environment orderly and predictable; (2) to preserve and defend personal value systems; (3) to offer a social explanation of intergroup relations; (4) and to preserve a positively valued distinction between in-groups and out-groups. As a positively valued distinction is strengthened, group identity is preserved. It is only in contrast with other groups that a group identity can be maintained (Tajfel 1981). In the light of this perspective, we may assume that, in their interaction, the Hebrews

25 Luke reports Ἐβραῖοι διώκεται three times in Ac.21.40, 22.2, and 26.14. Many biblical critics have interpreted this phrase as Aramaic, since Aramaic was a colloquial language in the first-century Palestine while Hebrew was almost a dead language which was preserved only by the religious elites (cf. Haenchen 1971:620; Fitzmyer 1998:701). But this simple view is not sustainable if we consider the large amount of Hebrew writings from Qumran (Wise 1992:436), and Tannaitic Hebrew which is the language of the Mishnah, the oral law, and was recorded in the early part of the third-century CE (Bar-Asher 1987). The LXX and Josephus employ ὑπομνήσει to refer to speaking Aramaic (2Kgs.18.26; Ezr.4.7; Isa.36.11; Dan.2.4; Ant.10.8). If Luke dominantly uses the LXX in his quotation of the Old Testament (Fitzmyer 1992), he would employ ὑπομνήσει to refer to speaking Aramaic. Thus we
categorised the Hellenists on the basis of their most obvious characteristic, Greek use, so as to attribute it to them as social stigma. For the Hebrews, language differentiation was an important means of preserving their positively valued distinctiveness and justifying the existing intergroup relations between them as the dominant group and the Hellenists as the subordinate group in the early Christian community.

One could argue, however, that there were different attitudes towards the Temple within the same broad category of Hellenists: non-Christian Hellenists displayed a pro-Temple attitude, while Christian Hellenists displayed an anti-Temple one. Giles' theory of speech accommodation explains that people are motivated to adjust their speech-styles, or accommodate, as a means of expressing values, attitudes and intentions towards others (1973; 1977). In a process of adjustment of speech-style, two basic actions will be expected: (1) a shift in speech style toward that of another is termed convergence, in which people will reduce linguistic dissimilarities between themselves and others in order to get social approval and to integrate with significant others, (2) a shift away from the others represents divergence, in which non-converging speech is an important medium as a symbolic tactic for maintaining their social identity and cultural distinctiveness. Mutatis mutandis, this theory suggests that the non-Christian Hellenists may have represented convergence to get social approval and to integrate with the dominant group's social norms by attacking Stephen (Ac. 6-7) and Paul (Ac. 9.29), while the Christian Hellenists had a divergent attitude in their social interaction in order to maintain their social identity and cultural distinctiveness as accentuated in Stephen's speech.


From the perspective of intergroup relations, Paul's collection from Gentile Christians can be regarded as a form of social competition through which Paul's group enters the social space of the Jerusalem Christians, that is, 'challenges' them, as a way to allow for the possibility of the use of Hebrew in all three Lukan references (Grintz 1960; Horsley 1989:19-26; Safrai 1991).
of improving its social location vis-à-vis the dominant Judean Christian group (Ac.21). Judean Christians then employ a group strategy to maintain and accentuate their positive social identity in a creative cognitive alternative, by re-iterating the Apostolic decree (Ac.15), through which they accentuate their positive differences from Gentile Christians on existing dimensions.

In this interaction, ethnic boundary-markers are at issue, since such actions make the social identity of a group salient through the processes of intergroup comparison and by virtue of the exigencies of social interaction (Cohen 1985:12). These actions highlight a sense of group identity by preserving an underlying distinctiveness which is positively valued. The boundaries in view are not primordial but relational, and thus are maintained and symbolically created in spite of the drastic cultural and geographical change through the flow of personnel in social intercourse (Cohen 1986:1-19; Barth 1969:9-10). All this means that the Judean Christians’ boundaries are not derived simply from their living in Palestine but that they are symbolically constructed in processes of social interaction. Key stimuli for such interaction are threats to cultural expressions such as circumcision or table-fellowship or involvement by the members of one group with those of another. For example, some ancient Jews creatively responded to the strong Hellenistic cultural influence by abandoning circumcision (Ant. 20.38-48, Syb. Or. 4.163-170, Martial Ep. 7.35,82) or by allegorically interpreting it (Philo Spec. Leg. 1-11; Migr. 92; Quaes. Gen. 3.46-62; Quaes. Ex. 2.2) whereas the majority of Jews strengthened their devotion to the practice (Jub. 15.25-34; 1QH. 18.20; 1QH. 2.7,18). In all three cases, Jews did not necessarily cease to be Jews; rather they maintained and symbolically strengthened their boundaries by incorporating and enclosing different cultural features (Collins 1985; Hall 1992).

Even though boundaries are negotiable, the ethnic group can preserve their social identity through a set of rules controlling interethnic social interactions while employing both prescriptions and proscriptions: a set of prescriptions is structured to govern situations of contact and allow some areas of interaction; a set of proscriptions is organised to prevent interethnic interaction in other areas and subsequently insulate significant parts of the group’s culture from confrontation and modification (Barth...
1969:16). In Acts 15, we can see that Judean Christians manoeuvred their group strategy to allow Gentile Christians into their definition of the people of God and to govern the Gentile Christians' activities in their pagan circumstances (prescription), while insulating their distinctive social identity by re-issuing the Apostolic decree and thereby maintaining the very fact of superiority of social location over Gentile Christian groups (proscription).

In the light of this preliminary observation, we will now investigate Luke’s stance on the Temple through detailed exegesis.

VI. THE TEMPLE IN ACTS.


(1) Pentecostal Events (Ac.2.1-13)

A new social group needs a distinctive social identity, which characteristically differentiates it from the dominant outgroups thus giving it social influence. Luke describes the formation of the Christian group in a distinctive way by the empowering by the Holy Spirit, which had been promised in Lk.24.49 and Ac.1.8: ‘...All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other languages’ (Ac.2.4). Moving from the house (1.13; 2.2) to the Temple precincts (Ac.2.5ff), Luke signifies the meaning of the Pentecostal event in the context of the Temple.

At that time, Jewish people had gathered in the Temple to celebrate the day of Pentecost having travelled from diverse locations. The Old Testament refers to it as a feast to offer the firstfruits of the wheat harvest (Exod.23.16; Deut.16.9-12). At some point in the history of Judaism, Pentecost began to be celebrated as the giving of the Law and renewal of the covenant (Jub.1.5; 1QS.1.7-2.9; Philo Decal.46; b.Shab.88b). Luke probably alludes to the event as the end-time of renewal of the people of God in the new Christian community (Ac.2.36,39) and the Spirit as the fulfilment of the covenant promise (Ac.3.25). But Luke mostly pays attention to the linguistic
phenomena in which devout Diaspora Jews hear Jesus’ followers speaking about God’s deeds of power in their native language (2.5-11). It is more plausible to link the event with the language division at Babel (Gen.11.1-9), but in a particular way in that Luke refers to the Septuagintal version of the Babel story only to describe its reversal in his account of the Pentecostal events (Spina 1991:562). In the LXX, God decided to ‘bewilder’ (συνάξεωμεν) the human language (φωνή) so that they could not understand their speech (γλώσσαν), while Luke writes that Jesus’ followers “began to speak in other tongues (γλώσσας)” and created a sound (φωνής) at which the Jews were “bewildered (συναξόμεθα)” (Ac.2.4-6).

From this perspective it is reasonable to suggest that there is a significant connection between Babel and the Temple in terms of language and architecture. Babel was a tower, a monumental place, on which human beings using a single language gathered to reach heaven. But they were scattered by God who confused their language to prevent them from re-gathering into one place to promote the human sinful agenda of ‘making a name for ourselves’ (Gen.11.4). The Babel tower signifies human rebellion against God aimed at acquiring the divine honour for themselves in a world of limited good. The Temple was the monumental building on the mountain, to which Jews from every nation gathered to worship God and in which one language, Hebrew, was used for the Temple liturgy, though its intelligibility was low to its participants, in order to maintain Jewish social identity (Zerhusen 1995:125). Both Babel and the Temple were devised as monumental buildings to generate human honour and to signify their centripetal powers by symbolising their propinquity to God.

As the Babel builders gathered in one language, the ancient Jews gathered in the Temple in which Hebrew was retained as ‘the Holy Language’ in contrast to other vernacular languages such as Greek or Aramaic (Kaplan 1972:192). Socio-linguistically, it is highly likely that Hebrew was the higher language which was reserved for special formal occasions and was always regarded as superior, more beautiful, more logical and better able to express important thought (Ferguson 1959:329-30; Fishman 1969:29-30). Noteworthy is the fact that linguistic unintelligibility is a common feature in many religions which utilise the temple-type
architecture in their central institutions: such as Latin in the Roman Catholic church before the Second Vatican Council; Sanskrit in Hinduism. In the religious services at Mecca, Quranic Arabic is used despite the fact that a great number have no knowledge of it. Consequently in these religious communities, those who are able to command the higher language are highly respected in terms of social status. This was also true of first-century Judaism. It is highly probable that Hebrew use in the Temple was important not only to maintain and intensify Jewish social identity but also to differentiate the people according to the degree to which people were able to communicate through Hebrew.

How does Luke characterise the Pentecostal event? By using Babel imagery, he ironically equates the Babel tower with the Temple in terms of its centripetal power to make people converge into one high place, linguistic unintelligibility, incompetency to acknowledge the divine grace, barrenness to bear the name of the Lord, and rebellion against the plan of God. Second, he undermines the high prestige of Hebrew as the holy language in the Pentecostal event in which the Spirit empowers the early Christians to speak other languages in order to enable them to make God’s mighty work intelligible. Luke significantly suggests that these foreign languages became the divine language to carry out the message of God’s salvation in Jesus Christ. Empowered by the Holy Spirit, the early Christians were not bent on making a name for themselves, and thus adding to their own social honour. It is striking that other languages are used for listening to the Magnalia Dei (2.11), despite the fact that the praise of God in a variety of tongues and dialects was sanctioned in ancient Judaism, while the recital of the Shema and the Eighteen Benedictions were prescribed only in Hebrew (m.Sota.7.1; see Schürer 1979:454-63).

Third, the linguistic reversal by which all people hear in their native tongues points to the fulfilment of the promise of world-wide salvation in Joel’s prophecy—‘...I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh (2.17a)...Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved (2.21)’—through Jesus as Messiah and Lord. While the Babel builders were scattered with mutual unintelligibility in Gen.11.9, the hearers of the Pentecostal reversal of Babel presumably returned to their homelands having encountered God-given intelligibility to create group solidarity in the world based on
the Christ-event. In each case, there is a scattering, but each is very different in nature. The early Christians enthusiastically engaged in the mission to make intelligible the God of Christ to all (2.17, 21, 39) in order to create one people of God in the name of Jesus. It is no coincidence that the Hellenists who used Greek as a vernacular language became the pioneers of world mission (Ac. 8). Finally, Luke uses the Pentecostal event to delegitimate the Temple's positive social identity in terms of its unintelligible use of Hebrew and to challenge its social space by making Jesus' followers intelligible to establish a bridgehead in the Temple for their consequent activity.

(2) Creating Social Space in the Temple (Ac. 3-5)

From the perspective of intergroup interaction, we observe that the first Christian group engineered their group strategy as a positive social identity by entering the social space of the dominant outgroup through charismatic preaching, healing, and evangelism. In contrast, the dominant group took social actions to maintain or accentuate their positive social identity in a strong reaction aimed at maintaining or restoring their superiority or distinctiveness. After empowerment by the Spirit, the early Christians continued to use the Temple for their witnessing of the resurrected Jesus, which created a conflict with the Temple authorities.

In 3.1, Peter and John entered into the Temple at the time of prayer, which accompanied the evening sacrifice, tamid (Ant. 14.65) and cured the lame man. Having been threatened, they nevertheless continued to go up to the Temple (Ac. 4-5). The typical view of commentators is represented in Witherington's recent comment that it is 'clear evidence that the earliest Christians continued to live as observant Jews, probably still offering sacrifices in the Temple... Luke stresses this fact' (1998: 173), even though these commentators have failed to find evidence that the Christians were involved in the Temple cult including sacrifices. The absence of such evidence points to the opposite view: they used the Temple as a public place to enter the social space of the Temple authorities.
In the first story, the key to clarifying their attitude towards the Temple is their encounter in the Temple with the man lame from birth. Luke, as an able storyteller, deliberately chooses this episode from his sources (cf. 2.43) as the first sequel to Pentecost to show how the Spirit-empowered witnesses function in the Temple (Dunn 1996:39). The lame men’s physical condition signifies that he could not fully participate in Temple worship (Lev.21.17-20; m.Sabb.6.8) and for that reason would also have been debarred from membership of the Qumran community (1QSa.2.5-6). The purity law was the primary reason for his exclusion from the Temple. Thus the Temple functioned to segregate the people from God. This view is evidenced in the word ὄλοκληρον used for ‘perfect health, wholeness’ (Plutarch Stoic. Repugn.30) to which the man is restored (3.16). This word is not used as a technical medical word but as a cultic word in the Temple to refer to an unblemished animal suitable for use in sacrifices (LXX: Isa.1.6; Zech.11.16). Luke appropriately provides a significant topographical shift from the Beautiful Gate to the Court of Israelites, as the man follows Peter and John into the Temple (Ac.3.8). On account of the man’s new wholeness, he was able to move from the threshold to a more sacred space in the Temple. This incident shows that the first activity of the Christian witnesses was to relocate an Israelite’s social status from the stigmatised to the normal in the name of Jesus and so to allow him to cross over the Temple spatial boundary. This incident is also the first symbolic challenge to the status of the Temple as the source of social illness segregating the people of God.

This healing event provides crucial momentum for the effective competition for social space in the Temple. How? From this event, Peter has proclaimed that the crucified Jesus, who should be regarded as the symbol of shame (Deut.20.21) is raised by God to receive honourable designations such as the Holy and Righteous One (3.14), the Author of Life (3.15), a prophet like Moses (3.22), and Messiah (3.20). The Temple authorities would perceive it not as a positive challenge, such as a gesture of praise, but a negative one which threatens them and their status and position. First, the apostles’ teaching of the resurrected Jesus is a provocative attack on them since they were the agents of Jesus’ death and they denied the resurrection of the dead (Ant.18.16; Ac.23.6-8). Second, the disciples’ social influence over the people means
that they have dislodged the priests from honour. It is a serious challenge to the established Temple authorities, an entry into their social space. All this reveals the ongoing agonistic competition usually expected in a limited good, honour-shame value embedded society (Malina 1993a:34-35).

Immediately after the end of Peter’s speech, Luke relates the arrival of the priests, the Temple captain, and the Sadducees, who were a representative profit-group controlling the Temple where they had a vested interest in what went on in its precincts (Ant.13.297; 20.199-203; Saldarini 1988:105-106). There is no doubt that by naming Annas, Caiaphas, John, and Alexander, all of who were of the high-priestly family (4.6), Luke has a specific interest in those who exerted their centripetal power on the Jewish people. Their first reaction was to arrest the challengers, Peter and John, and to ask, “By what power or in what name did you do this?”(4.7). It is basically a question about their social identity and status and echoes the question which they had previously posed to Jesus (Lk.20.2). This is evidenced by their act of stereotyping Jesus’ followers as ‘unschooled’ and ‘ordinary’ (4.13). The purpose of the Sanhedrin’s inquiry was to sustain their group identity despite Peter’s serious challenge to them (4.11) and to preserve their distinctiveness as the Jewish ruling group by both attributing social inferiority to the apostles (4.13) and by warning them not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus (4.18).

In response in Ac.4.8b-12, Peter more emphatically proved God’s vindicating resurrection of Jesus from a quotation from Ps.118.22.

This [Jesus] is the stone despised by you the builders; it has become the cornerstone (Ac.4.11).

By adding “you” before “builders” from the quotation, Luke alludes to these authoritative figures as builders, an allusion that is particularly appropriate in view of their concern with the Temple still in the process of being built, as previously mentioned in Lk.20.17. We may realise how Peter’s quotation is relevant both in that (1) he criticised the Temple authorities’ behaviour against Jesus, and (2) he claimed ‘Jesus has laid the foundation of the Temple’ which he brought into the world through
his person and his saving work. In addition, by refusing to accept the warning of the rulers and appealing against its legitimacy to the Ultimate Judge, God, who is superior to the Sanhedrin, they continually attempted to dishonour the Temple authorities and to create their social space in the Temple by means of competition for honour. Luke succinctly records the public verdict granting their honour as follows: “But many of those who heard the word believed, and their number was 5,000” (4.4).

In Ac.5.17-42, we observe the Christian witnesses’ continuing challenge to the Temple with a further development of the story. The Temple authorities were filled with ζῆλος, due to the apostles’ popularity, which means the apostles were seriously dislodging them from their place of honour. As a result, the authorities arrested the apostles and put them in prison (5.18). But through divine intervention they were released, and were commanded: “Go and stand in the Temple to speak to the people the full message of this life”(5.20). This divine command is of immense significance in providing the decisive clue to Luke’s attitude to the Temple in Acts 3-5 because it makes the earliest witnesses consistently visit the Temple to proclaim “the full message of this life.” Life is a synonym for salvation brought by Jesus (Haenchen 1971:249). Many commentators have neglected this aspect and failed to appreciate its meaning in the Lukan scheme regarding the Temple (Haenchen, Bruce, Witherington). However, Barrett is right to state that the Gospel is described as τά ρήματα τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης and to allude to the occasional description of the Temple as ναός τῆς ζωῆς, house of our life (Lev.Rab.19) in order to indicate that the Gospel realises what the Temple had promised but failed to deliver (1991:284). This proclamation is a crucial challenge to the Temple’s legitimacy as the sacred space. The disciples dislodge the social honour of the Temple as the house of life by claiming Jesus is a true source of life and thus enhance the social position of the Christian group: the very source of life is necessarily derived from the crucified and resurrected Lord, who throughout Acts replaces the Temple with the Christian house community.

The two main events in the continuing competition over honour between the two social groups were the divine deliverance of the apostles from gaol (5.19) and Gamaliel’s persuading the Sanhedrin to let them go (5.34-40), the latter constituting a deliberate refusal to dishonour them (5.38-39). The divine deliverance and the
Sanhedrin's adjudication were significant legitimations of Jesus' followers, consolidating their social space in the Temple, and pointing out the Temple's inability to provide human salvation. It is interesting, therefore, that Luke succinctly describes the apostles' ironic conviction to enter successfully the social space of the Temple: "As they left the council, they rejoiced that they were considered worthy to suffer dishonour (ἀτιμωσθηναί) for the sake of the name" (Ac.5.41). As the leaders of an 'agonistic campaign,' the apostles dislodged the Temple's honour due to its barrenness in relation to bestowing salvific life and created their own social space in the Temple. In so doing, they exemplified how the Temple should serve as the true venue for the service of God which enabled them to inaugurate the proclamation of the salvation of God brought by Jesus, the Messiah in Ac.2-5.

2. Stephen's Speech (Ac.6.1-8.2)

We have previously proposed that the Hellenists had a group strategy of social creativity to enhance their positive social identity vis-à-vis the significant outgroups in a new way. Here we will investigate how this social creativity is expressed. In Ac.6, after introducing the embarrassing intergroup conflict between the Hebrews and the Hellenists, Luke mentions Stephen's charge of blasphemy against the Temple and the Law (vv.11,13) which leads to Stephen's speech (Ac.7) and martyrdom and to the scattering of disciples (Ac.8.1). In dealing with this complex story about Stephen, we will mainly focus on his speech by raising the following questions: (1) Is his speech critical of the Temple?; (2) What does his speech imply about the theological perspective of his group (Hellenists) vis-à-vis the other group (Hebrews)?; (3) Why do the Hellenists have a different social position?

(1) Temple-Criticism in Stephen's Speech (Ac.7.2b-7.53)

The question of whether Stephen's speech is critical of the Temple is of primary importance to the question of Luke's attitude towards that institution. It has been suggested by some that Stephen's speech has nothing to do with criticism of the
Temple (Larsson 1993:394-395; Hill 1992:69-90). This view rests on four critical points: (1) The speech contrasts implicitly the hand-made and the divinely-made, and explicitly the tent of witness and the Temple as a “house.” These two contrasts do not parallel each other. (2) The term οὐκ ἔνοια/οὐκ ἔνοιωμα and ὄλκος are not used consistently in the speech to set up a good and a bad contrast. (3) δέ in v.47 is not an adversative particle to set up a contrast between οὐκ ἔνοιωμα (v.46) and ὄλκος, but rather it points to v.48 with the ἀλλά (yet) to contrast true and false thinking about God’s presence. (4) The sharp contrast between “finding a dwelling place” and “building a house” in 7.46-48a has nothing to do with an opposition between Temples and tents but with the normal Jewish perspective, which would resist any tendency to localise worship exclusively in the Temple.

We can respond to this position at several points. First, a major reason for the failure of these critics to understand what is meant derives from their miscomprehension of the character of the speech as a defence or apology. Luke does not intend to reiterate the content of Stephen’s teaching reflected in the charge itself in his response. Rather, the speech should be understood as a counter-accusation against the Jews who did not believe the Righteous One (7.52) and thus followed their ancestors’ examples. Hill is partly right to notice the importance of Ac.7.51-53: “the real problem with 7.46-50 is their relationship to Stephen’s accusations against the Jews in 7.51-53” (1992:74). However, he is erroneous in his approach to the theme of the people of God when he says: “For the crowning accusation he returns, not to the Temple or even to the death of Jesus, but to…the rejection of Moses and the Law” (1992:75). This understanding makes the speech an apology for the Law! It is a serious misreading of the speech, which is largely unconcerned with the Law (Dunn)

26 It has been argued that Stephen’s charge comes from the lips of false witnesses (μάρτυρες ἀθεότητος) and his activity has nothing to do with Temple-criticism (Hill 1992:57,62; Witherington 1998:258). This reading fails to observe the fact that the secret instigation of Stephen’s opponents is not attributed as ‘false’ in 6.11 where they say, “We have heard him speak blasphemous words against Moses and God”. V.6.1 is not intended to refer to a false story of Stephen but to a plot against Stephen. Is it plausible that Luke records the so-called false reports of false witnesses three times in a limited space (6.11, 13, 14) if we take the triple reports in a form of successive intensification and clarification as serious reports? There is no good reason to doubt that Luke attributes the falseness to the accuser’s witnesses in terms of their plot against a true Christian witness but he consciously extracts the very message of Stephen from the lips of false witnesses.
1997:87; contra. Blomberg 1998:403-4). The charge actually focuses on what Stephen was saying about the Temple (the holy place, as in Ps.24.3), and the Law is only mentioned as a corollary, since so much of the Law had to do with the proper functioning of the Temple. If the counter accusation in 7.51-53 is closely related to 7.46-50, it is a critical accusation against the Jews who worshipped idolatrously in the Temple: Stephen asserts that the Temple has been the focal point of Jewish disobedience (Dunn 1997:91; Witherington 1998:261).

Second, this view does not take into account the contrast between οὐκήπηνη/οὐκήπωμα and οἶκος. This reading of the particle δὲ as relating to v.48 is implausible. It is more natural to read δὲ as an adversative because ἀλλα is usually used for strong adversatives to set up the contrast between v.46 and v.47 (BDF.448.1-2; Barrett 1994:374). In addition, there is a strong correlation between οἶκος and χειροποιήτη. In the speech, we see two kinds of οὐκήπη. The tent of Moloch in v.43 refers to the Canaanite-Phoenician sun god Moloch in the LXX Am.5.27 (Sakkuth in the MT). It is related to the idolatry of Israel in the wilderness, which was a significant sign of rebellion against Yahweh who delivered her from Egypt. ‘The tent of the testimony’ in v.44 refers to the tent in the wilderness, made according to the pattern God had given to Moses (Ex.25.8). Which of the tents is related to the Davidic dwelling place for the God of Jacob in v.46? It clearly points to the tent of testimony. But Luke uses δὲ in v.47 to express Stephen’s lament that Solomon built an οἶκος, the Temple, in contrast to a οὐκήπη.

Stephen uniquely points out the discrepancy between God’s promise to David and Solomon’s building of the Temple. God rejected David’s request to build a house for the ark (2Sam.7.1-2) because God had always had a moveable tent (οὐκήπη) for his dwelling (2Sam7.6-7), and instead promised that David’s house would be continued

27 Cf. Mt.24.6; 1Cor.3.6; 6.11; 10.5, 23.

28 There is a textual variant between οἶκω and θεός in v.46 (Metzger 1971:351-353), but the reading οἶκω is too intrinsically awkward to make sense. One could argue that οἶκω is preferred because the Temple was actually the house for God as well as God’s people (Witherington1998:272). But this reading makes awkward connection with the following clause, for οἶκω cannot well provide the antecedent for αὐτῷ and makes little sense in the context (Bruce 1990:206). The reading for θεός is natural in the co-text (Ac.7.46-47).
through his son and so his kingdom established forever (2Sam.7.12-16). Luke knows that this promise will be fulfilled through Jesus (Lk.1.32-33). But Solomon built a building to localise God in his house. This fundamental failure is criticised by the quotation of Isa.66.1-2 in Ac.7.49-50, which is similar to God’s refusal in 2Sam.7.1-2. By deliberately ignoring God’s promise to Solomon that was made during the building of the Temple (1Kgs.6.11-13), Stephen suggests that the tent for the idol and the present Temple are identical, in his use of χειροποιητής in v.41 for the idol in the wilderness and in v.48 for the Temple. This estimation of Solomon’s work as idolatrous is clearly reflected in Stephen’s total dismissal of the period after Solomon’s Temple, the period which is comprehensively characterised as disobedience to the Holy Spirit, the Law, and the Righteous One (vv.51-53).

Furthermore, Luke alternates from Solomon’s royal line to Nathan’s priestly line in the genealogy of Jesus (Lk.3.23-38). For Luke, Solomon’s hand-made work for the Temple is regarded as the climax of rebellion against God.

Third, the statement in v.48 expresses the crucial criticism of the Temple with which no one would be able to disagree.

άλλ' οὐχ ο ὑψιστός ἐν χειροποιητοῖς κατοικεῖ

It is striking that the word, χειροποιητός, is exclusively used for pagan idols in all the Septuagint’s fourteen instances (Hatch and Redpath 1954:1467). It was also used by Hellenistic Jews to condemn pagan idolatry in that Gentile gods were human artefacts (Ps. Philo.22.5-6; Zeno of Citium, from Clement Strom. 5.11.76; Strabo, Geog. 16.35,37). Luke undoubtedly adopts these uses in Stephen’s word for the golden calf (7.41) and in Paul’s Areopagus address, where Paul’s use of the word χειροποιητός is a close alternate for the word θα σεβόμαστα immediately before (17.23; Esler 1987:134-135). If Luke uses this word to refer to pagan idols in both cases, there is absolutely no doubt that he intends the same meaning in v.48. Hill concedes that any Jew might make a polemic against paganism, about which no Jew would probably be able to disagree (1992:74), but he should know that it was directly targeted toward the very heart of Judaism, the Temple in the Stephen speech: God is no more confined within the Temple than the Parthenon, and needs Jewish lambs and
bulls no more than Greek ones (Barrett 1990: 353). It is reasonable that the context of v.48 should be found in the theme of idolatry that is manifested in the disobedience of Israel’s ancestors, who are the forefathers of Stephen’s opponents: the very notion of God as dwelling in the man-made temple is actually idolatrous. To be sure, the Jewish audience of Stephen would have been shocked to recognise this horrifying attack on the Temple.

Finally, in the speech, we find the verbs-εξερχόμαι (v.7), (ἐξ)ποστέλλω (vv.12,14,34,35), ἐκάγω (vv.36,39)-and the noun ἐλευσίς (v.52) to illustrate how serving God prompts human beings to move away from the given place in which they dwell. Luke deliberately chooses these words to imply the model of the standard life of the people of God such as Christian missionaries. This coincides with his portrayal of the period of the wilderness as an ἐκκλησία in v.38. In the LXX, this word refers to the assembly of Israel (Deut.9.10;18.16; 23.1f.; 31.30; Josh.8.35) but Luke applies it to the Christian community in the house (Acts 5.11; 9.31;20.28) to enhance its positive social identity as characterising the true Israel. As Israel in the wilderness lived with the living oracle and served God in the tent of testimony as the moving dwelling place of God, so the Christian community also received the Holy Spirit and served God in the house that existed and provided for visiting missionaries.

In conclusion, Stephen’s speech expresses a radical and crucial criticism of the Temple, which is unparalleled in the New Testament.

(2) The Selective Persecution of the Hellenists (Ac.8.b)

Does Stephen’s criticism of the Temple provide the key for understanding the incidents around his martyrdom? Is his speech related to the Hellenists’ persecution? Why are the Hellenists persecuted? These questions will help us to understand the social identity of the Hellenist group.

Immediately after Stephen’s death, Luke tells of a great persecution which scattered the whole church in Jerusalem, except for the apostles (Ac.8.1-2). The
word, all (πᾶντες), is a typical Lukan hyperbole which indicates the large numbers on which the incident had an impact. But the underlined specific qualification, 'except for the apostles,' points to the selective persecution of a specific social group. Hill rejects the idea of a selective persecution on the grounds that the apostles are also persecuted by the Jewish authorities (Ac.4-5; 12.1-11; 1992:36). Yet it is seriously misleading to equate all sorts of persecutions and to read later incidents in Acts back into this one (Esler 1995c:120). We need to know that Luke uses the literary divide of "in these days" that the disciples were increasing in number (Ac.6.1) to deal with the Hellenists by separating them from the section relating to the apostles (Ac.2-5). If Ac.2-5 is dealing with the apostles' Temple activity leading to the multiplication of the disciples, Ac.6.1ff. describes the conflict within the Christian community and the non-apostolic activity in the Diaspora synagogues in Jerusalem, which led to Stephen's martyrdom and the persecution of the Hellenists. To respond to the social competition of the Christian group in general, the Temple authorities might have deliberately aimed to persecute the peripheral group and cut it off from its roots so that the apostle group retained the significant social influence on the public (Ac.4.16; 5.13,26,38-39). Nothing is more distinctive of Stephens's group in contrast to the apostles than their direct and radical criticism of the Temple. The attack of the Hellenist group on the most sensitive institution in first-century Judaism would be likely to foster Jewish nationalistic zeal, especially if we take account of the growing social mood reflected in the revolutionary movements (Hengel 1989).

(3) The Hellenists (Ac.6.1)

If the Hellenists were expelled because of their radical stance on the Temple while the apostles were allowed to remain in Jerusalem, it is plausible to ask: are there social and theological differences between the Hellenists and the apostles (Hebrews)?

In the introductory passage of the new phase of early Christian history, Luke describes the social conflict within the newly-established community without any explanation of its causes.
Now during those days when the number of disciples were multiplying, there was a complaint (γογγυσμός) of the Hellenists against the Hebrews because their widows were being overlooked in the daily service (διακονία) (Ac.6.1).

What is the underlying motive of this infra-community conflict? Why were the Hellenists' widows neglected in the daily service? The most promising way of untangling this enigmatic description is to investigate the terms, the Hellenists and the Hebrews from socio-linguistic perspectives (Moule 1958-59:100-102; Haenchen 1971:260; Hengel 1983; Esler 1987:141-145) because they refer to their distinctive social identity. Due to limitations of space, we will refrain from dwelling on the terms, 'Ελληνιστής and 'Εβραῖος. 29 It is certain that both terms are derived from the linguistic features characterising their social identity, but they do not refer merely to their language-use. 'Εβραῖος would not use Hebrew but Aramaic as their vernacular language. Since Luke uses 'Εβραῖος only in 6.1, we can rely on Paul's usage in 1Cor.11.22 and Phil.3.5, where Paul states his identity as a Hebrew in order both (1) to demonstrate his former zeal for the Law and the purity of his Jewish identity and (2) to refute his opponents who claim themselves as Hebrews. Language-use is a mark of one's social identity vis-à-vis out-groups in a multi-lingual society. Moreover, first-century Palestinian Hebrew was the sacred language which was used exclusively in important parts of the Temple liturgy, and thus developed into a significant national symbol to distinguish Jews, who were adherent to the Jewish heritage, from the neighbouring ethnic groups and other Jews who had inclined towards Hellenism since the Maccabean revolt. Just as Paul's claim to be a Hebrew is closely related to his loyalty to Jewish heritage, so it is that 'Εβραῖος in Ac.6.1 refers to the Christian group which retains positive social identity in terms of their loyalty to the Temple and Law.

29 For detailed discussion, see Hengel 1983; Esler 1987:136-138; Brehm 1998. For the identification of the Hellenists: (a) as an ethnic distinction that refers to non-Jews (Cadbury 1933:65; Grundmann 1939:56-58; Blackman 1937:524-25); (b) as a sectarian way to designate their unique views on the Temple and Law (Cullmann 1957:26-28; Simon 1958:89-94; Ellis 1978:118-9; Goppelt 1970:53-4); (c) as referring to geographical distinctions, that is Diaspora Jews (Marshall 1972-73:277; Dunn 1977:235-37).
'Ελληνική is derived from the verb ἐλληνίζειν, which means 'to speak Greek' or 'to live like a Greek' (Hengel 1983: 19). It means that their use of Greek as vernacular language was attached to the Hellenised life-style. They would consist almost entirely of former Diaspora Jews, who had returned to the Holy City for religious reasons (cf. the Theodotus inscription, C.II.1404), including the proselytes (cf. Nicolaus) and possibly God-fearers. Retaining their native Greek tongue, they joined in the Freedmen synagogues in the Greek-speaking worship service. But as a social group at the fringe of this society, their attitude to the Law and Temple would have divided into convergence and divergence (Giles 1973; 1977; Bourhis et al. 1973): the ones who persecuted Stephen (Ac.6.10-14) and Paul (Ac.9.29) had a more loyal sense of attachment to the Temple and Law (Esler 1987: 138), while the Christian Hellenists, knowing of Jesus' critical stance on the Temple, had a critical attitude, as Stephen's speech shows.

Language is a powerful symbol in representing social identity and thus differentiating the in-group from the out-group (III.2, 3). It is likely that in the social interaction between the Hebrews and the Hellenists, the former would maintain their positive social identity and categorise the latter as an inferior group by attributing pejoratively the latter's language-use (a visible set of characteristics) into the social identity in order to preserve their positively valued distinction between in-group and out-group. But the Hellenists engineered a group strategy of social creativity so as to enhance the positive social identity in a new dimension. In doing so, their use of Greek would have played a significant role in creating a different social order, alternative social reality, distinctive world-view, and divergent theological perspective in order to maintain and legitimise their social identity. Their social creativity was strategically expressed in the critical attitude to the Temple in Stephen's speech and their evangelical activity in the Diaspora synagogues. If the two Christian groups had different liturgical services and fellowships, their social differences would have widened further thus leading to the crisis in the daily distribution of food (Ac.6.1).

It is highly plausible that the Hebrews are intimately related to the circumcised party (10.45; 11.2), the Pharisaic believers (15.5), and the Law-zealous Christians (21:20). Luke might identify them as Hebrews in 6.1, but he changes their...
identification according to their agenda, which is represented as circumcision in 11.2, 15.1, 15.5 and as zeal for the Law in 21.20 where Paul’s loyalty to the Law is a central part of the agenda. They have several characteristics in common: zeal for and observance of the Law, the imposition of circumcision on Gentile Christians, their sensitivity to any breach of the Law and to table-fellowship with uncircumcised people. They appear in the crucial stage of the development of the earliest Christian history as raising objections leading to controversies. Their characters would have played a crucial role in 6.1 because we cannot exclude the existence of Gentiles in the early community (cf. Nicolaus as a proselyte). In the activity of the Diaspora synagogues, the Hellenists would have met the God-fearers. As Esler has demonstrated in his persuasive construction of the impact of Gospel on the God-fearers (1987: 156-159), the Hellenists’ campaign may well have resulted in their successful conversion (6.7a). As its sequel, table-fellowship with them was inevitable. Then the counter-campaign of the Hebrews would have begun with its insistence on the necessity of circumcision for salvation, without which mixed table-fellowship could not occur. All this must have culminated in their progressively cutting off their relations with the Hellenists. Though Luke does not mention this fact, he reserves this problem for the Cornelius episode (Ac.10-11).

In a group-oriented Mediterranean society, it is to be expected that for the Hebrews, in-group members were always to be supported, respected, and given loyalty, but the Hellenists’ widows would have been considered unworthy of the respect they would give their own members (Malina 1993b:47-70, 89-101). From this point, we may guess that when considerable numbers of early Christians were gathered in the several house-churches for daily community life, the common disposal of goods might not be enough to meet the demand. The early community probably appointed ministers who managed this problem, and they might have consisted of the Hebrews, who were interested in the Temple, since they might well be in a good position to take charge of the selling of the community’s property and perhaps to establish beneficial relations between the early community and the Temple authorities. We also cannot exclude the possibility that the early Christians benefited from the Jewish institutions of public relief for the poor, the tamhuy (a daily distribution to non-resident poor) and quppah (the weekly dole to resident poor), which are attested
in the Rabbinic traditions (b. Sanh.17; m. Pe'a.8.7; m. Ketub.13.1-2; m. Pesah.10.1; m. Seqal.5.6; Seccombe 1978:140-3; Jeremias 1969:131-4). Those who were involved in the Temple were probably appointed as the community’s treasurers in that they could learn the modus operandi from it, or their connection with the Temple could facilitate the preparation of the community funds. But they strategically neglected the Hellenists’ widows to preserve the Hebrews’ positive social identity.

The murmuring (γογγυσμὸς) of the Hellenists against the Hebrews points to a significant social conflict between the two groups. The word, γογγυσμὸς, is derived from the verb, γογγύζω, to speak colloquially of personal dissatisfaction about an inappropriate situation in a reprehensible way (Hess 1990:256). The verb and its derivatives are usually used with connotations of people speaking against God (Lk.5.30) or Jesus (Lk.15.2; 19.7). In the LXX Ex.15-17 and Num.14-17, they are used to refer to the complaints of Israelites during the wandering in the desert (cf. Ex.16.18; Num.17.25). Luke would know this well, along with Paul (I. Cor.10.10; Phil.2.14). The use of this word in 6.1 indicates that this conflict was not trivial but serious. Accordingly redressive action was necessitated.

The twelve proposed the appointment of the Seven to serve at the table (Ac.6.2-6). The whole community of disciples endorsed the decision of the twelve that the Seven would be assigned to serve at the table. In Luke’s account of the Seven, however, there are some manifest contradictions. First, all the seven had Greek names and they were apparently all Hellenists. Second, nothing is said about their work of engaging in the administration of ministry at tables. Instead, Stephen and later Philip took over the task that the twelve had reserved for themselves and to which they had devoted themselves to proclaiming the Gospel.

From the perspective of the theory of intergroup relations, we see here a situation of perceived illegitimacy of an existing relationship in status, power, domination or any other differentiation, a situation in which a group perceive their status relations to be in conflict with the values of justice, fairness, or equity (Tajfel 1978:75). According to Tajfel, “a combination of illegitimacy and instability in the status relations between groups would become a powerful incitement for attempts to
change the intergroup status quo..." (1978:52) and "the perceived illegitimacy of an intergroup relationship is...socially and psychologically the accepted and acceptable lever for social change and social action in intergroup behaviour" (1978:76).

The twelve attempt to maintain their social identity as a positively valued distinction by devoting themselves to prayer and serving the word (6.4), while perceiving waiting on tables as illegitimate in that it entails sacrificing the word of God (6.2b). To state that 'it is not pleasing to us (Οὐκ ἄρεστόν ἐστιν ἡμᾶς)’ reflects a perceived illegitimacy of intergroup relations. Their statement does not mean that they would not engage in table-service at all but that they were unwilling to wait on tables for the Hellenists. They justified their social status by allocating their time to the prayer and the service of the word which was honourable work for honourable persons in Mediterranean culture, while they differentiated themselves from the Seven who were allocated table-service, a job for women or slaves.

The number seven is significant; Josephus tells us he appointed seven judges in each city in Galilee during his days as an authority figure there (War. 2.570f; Ant. 4.214; e.g. Tacitus, Ann. 3.64). The leader-group in Jewish synagogue communities tended to be formed on analogy with that of the civic authorities, in Palestine by a presbytery and in the Diaspora by a select group of ἀρχιερεῖς (b. Meg. 26a). It is plausible, therefore, to suppose that for Luke, the Seven were representative leaders of the Hellenist house churches, analogous to these leadership groupings above. Luke deliberately devises the Seven to distinguish them from the Twelve.

As seen in the activities of Stephen and Philip, the Seven were charismatic evangelists (6.8; 8.6-7). After the meeting with the Twelve, Luke never informs us of their engaging in table-service, though we assume they actually served the Hellenists. But Luke allocates much space to their activities in proclaiming the word of God (6.8-8.40). Why? To comprehend his oddity, it is plausible to think that the Seven were already devoting themselves to witnessing to the Gospel to Greek-speaking Jews and God-fearers in the Diaspora synagogues. Now in the meeting, their activities were approved as equivalent to those of the Twelve. Thus, table-service was not for the
whole Christian community but only for the Hellenists, to whom the Twelve allocated the Seven so as to avoid spending time on the Hellenists. Thus, in the meeting, the independence of the Hellenist Christian community was sanctioned by separating the administration of the alms-distribution, worship, preaching and proclaiming activities. From a position of perceived illegitimacy (6.1), the Hellenists as the inferior group were motivated to acquire a positively valued distinctiveness from the superior group by seeking the appointment of the Seven equivalent to the Twelve, and by attempting to create new group characteristics that were represented in Stephen’s activity and speech.

Among the Seven, Stephen was Luke’s protagonist especially because he was the first Christian martyr and his martyrdom was a landmark which signalled the expulsion of the Hellenists from Jerusalem and the beginning of the Gentile mission. Luke portrays Stephen as God’s spokesman, the embodiment of his grace and power, worker of the signs and wonders which manifested the empowering witness of Jesus, and at least equal to the apostles (2.43; 4.30; 5.12). Luke intends to depict his protagonist as the representative of the new community, the theological catalyst of the Gentile mission. Stephen’s speech provides a theological rationale for Luke’s narrative of the centrifugal mission towards the world outside of Jerusalem, by affirming that as the Lord of heaven and earth God cannot be bounded to a fixed place (7.48-50, citing Is. 66.1-2). For Luke, the tremendous obstacle to the development of early Christianity according to the programmatic command in Ac.1.8 is the Temple. In breaking through a stalemate in order to begin the world-wide mission, Stephen’s radical criticism of the Temple is an essential apparatus.

It is also vital to ask why Luke deliberately places Philip’s pioneering missionary activities as the sequel to Stephen’s speech, which concentrated on contact with the people who were not accepted by the Temple system in part or in whole. In Luke’s historical viewpoint, the mission to the world, even the mission to Samaria and Judea, is not possible without Stephen’s radical criticism of the Temple-centred belief because the Temple was a strong centripetal power in assembling the people to receive salvation through sacrifices and observance of the Law. For Luke, those who initiated the world-wide mission were not the apostles, whose activities were centred
on the Temple, but the Hellenists who shared Stephen's view as to the irrelevance of the Temple.

3. The Temple as a Tragic Finale in Paul's Visit

We shall now turn to Luke's final references to the Temple in Ac. 21.26 and 22.17, where Paul makes his final visit to the Temple and faces a trial. In dealing with this section, it is useful to raise the following questions: (1) Why did Paul visit the Temple? (2) Why did James demand that Paul show his commitment to Jewish piety? (3) Who were the Law-zealous believers? (4) What was the result of this intergroup interaction?

In answering these questions, we need to bear in mind the political context of first-century Palestine. Paul arrived in Jerusalem around ca. 57 CE., the tumultuous time leading up to the Jewish War (War. 2.254-65; Ant. 20.160-72; Schürer 1973: 455-470). The mid-50s were a time when Jewish nationalism was accelerating, and its exclusivism made the zealots intolerant of those who were suspected of collaborating with Gentiles. The prolonged governorship of Felix (52-59 CE.) had exacerbated the problem that was already festering at the time of Ventidius Cumanus' slaughter of Galileans en route to Jerusalem in 51 CE (Ant. 20.118-24). Due to the way he acted with impunity in his province, Felix's procuratorship was marked by a series of incidents, such as the assassination of the high priest Jonathan by the sicarii, the appearance of an Egyptian prophet, and a Jewish riot in Caesarea (War. 2.270). Tacitus said that Felix "backed by vast influence (through his brother Pallas' power under Claudius), believed himself free to commit any crime" (Ann. 12.54) and "practised every kind of cruelty and lust..." (Hist. 5.9). His mistreatment of Jews would have incited the political and religious antagonism against Gentiles in Palestine encouraging them to join forces and to plan a general rebellion.

This historical fact would have reinforced Jewish identity in a group-oriented society leading to a stricter definition of the group boundary. Having been persecuted and influenced by Jewish authorities, the Judean Christians would have also tightened
their social boundaries, thus improving their position in relation to the authorities in Jerusalem and distancing themselves from the out-group, which was regarded as a potential threat to their social influence and identity. In this situation, Paul mounted his ambitious visit to Jerusalem.

(1) Paul's Visit to Jerusalem

Having mentioned Paul's willingness to visit the Jerusalem church in Ac.19.21 and 20.16, Luke describes his journey to the city in Ac.21. There is some difficulty as to the reason for his visit. Paul himself provides an explicit intention in his letters. Paul had collected a fund for the poor in Jerusalem from his mission churches (Rom.15.25f.; 1Cor.16.1-4; 2Cor.8-9). Especially in Rom.15.25-31, Paul explains that the purpose of his visit is to deliver the collection, and mentions that this may be considered unacceptable by the Jerusalem church. Paul explicitly states its ultimate socio-theological purpose: "for if the Gentiles have shared in their (the Jews') spiritual goods, they ought also to be in service to them in material goods." Paul thinks of the collection as a gift of generalised reciprocity, which is a social exchange of goods transacted usually within kinship groups. It means that by delivering the collection, Paul intends to confirm the unity between Gentile Christians and Judean Christians (Dunn 1988b). But Luke is notably silent concerning the collection in Ac.21.

Instead, Luke gives an allusion to Paul's intention in Ac.20.16: "Paul was eager to be in Jerusalem, if possible, on the day of Pentecost." Why does he want to arrive at Pentecost? The feast of Pentecost was the day of the annual renewal of the covenant to celebrate the reign of God, and a feast of the 'solidarity' of the people of God. The Diaspora Jews also contributed the annual Temple tax and gifts to the Temple (Nickle 1966:74-99). Much later in the text, Luke mentions Paul's bringing "alms (ἐλεημοσύνες) to my people" in Ac.24.17. This may be a veiled reference to the collection, with Luke implying that Paul intends to celebrate the solidarity between
Gentile Christians and Judean Christians, but it could also be interpreted as not having a connection with the Christian movement at all.

The statement at Ac.24.7 suggests that though Luke knew about the collection, he deliberately disguised it. Why? For Paul, possibly working on the basis of an agreement with the Jerusalem leaders (see Gal.2.1-10), the collection is a significant means to claim the legitimacy of his apostleship, the credibility of his Gentile mission, the acknowledgement of the fellowship between the Gentile church and the Jerusalem church and a way of improving his group’s social location vis-à-vis the dominant Judean Christian group. On the other hand, James would regard the offering of gifts as a positive challenge, as Paul’s seeking to enter the social space of the Jerusalem church as well as a social message aimed at taking honour from the socially established receivers. Perceiving Paul’s challenge, James responds by demanding that he joins and pays for the Nazirites as well as restating the Apostolic Decree (21.20-25). His demand results in Paul’s difficulties in the Temple, nor is there any mention in Acts thereafter that he or his fellow Judean Christians visited Paul in captivity or helped him in any way.

It is a Mediterranean way of dishonouring a significant challenger to respond to another without reciprocating at all through “cheating, theft, robbery, overcharging, and various sorts of appropriation or seizure of another’s goods”, thus promoting the social interest of the in-group to the disadvantage of the out-group (Neyrey 1991b:372). The collection was most probably not fully accepted by the Jerusalem church, as Paul himself feared in Rom.15. So Paul might have failed to carry out his original purpose. Luke, as a Mediterranean person, painstakingly avoids reporting in Ac.21 the failure of a significant campaign in which Paul was dishonoured.

30 For a detailed discussion of Paul’s collection, see D. Georgi (1992) and K.F. Nickle (1966).
James’ Proposal (Ac.21.20-25)

Why does James suggest to Paul that he should join in the Temple rites, despite the fact that his group praises God for his actions among the Gentiles through Paul’s mission? It is likely that James seeks to maintain his group’s positive social identity: loyalty to the Jewish prime identity marker, the Temple and the Law. It is reasonable to suppose that James is considerably supported by the Law-zealous believers (21.20). Their theological line would have dominated in this intergroup interaction.

(i) The Law-zealous Christians

Who are the Law zealous Christians? In Acts, we can see the social groups, who appear in the important phases in which the issue of Gentile Christians surfaces. In Ac.11.2-3, the circumcised believers (οἱ περιτομητὲς) criticised (διεκρίνοντο) Peter, who had eaten with uncircumcised men. For Luke, they are certainly not “a particularly vocal small group within the Jerusalem church” (contra. Witherington 1998:362), but a significantly dominant vocal group because a similar claim appears again in Ac.15 and Ac.21. James reports that this group is comprised of several thousand persons in 21.20. In Ac.15.1, these appear to be an influential propaganda group, possibly belonging to the party of the Pharisees who teach that circumcision and the observance of the Law is a sine qua non for salvation (15.1b, 5b). Luke reveals that in early Christianity there is significant theological diversity, which causes serious conflict. The very word, “ζητήσεως” (debate), is used twice in 15.2 and 15.7 to express the fact that some part within the church has insisted upon the legitimacy of circumcision. This distinctive Christian group would probably have been similar to the Law-zealous (ζηλωτῆς) believers of Ac.21.20. Luke may deliberately use the word, “zeal,” to allude to the contemporary Zealot activity against Jews who associated with Gentiles and were involved in the outrageous violations of covenant holiness, in order to imply that they have a shared zeal for the Temple and Law. The common character of these Judean Christian groups are their strong claims that circumcision is necessary to uphold the legitimacy of Temple and Law in the
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Christian community. Their zeal for the Law also parallels James’ excessive devotion to the Law, which we find underscored in later tradition (Hegesippus, quoted from Eusebius Hist. Eccl.2.23.4-18; Gos. Thom.12). When Paul worries about his campaign in Rom.15.31 and is warned (in the Lukan picture at least) of his fate in Ac.21.11-14, he would have had in mind Judean Christians like these.

Before his in-group, James reports how Paul has been recognised in his group: Paul’s teachings allegedly make Diaspora Jews desert from the Mosaic Law, circumcision, and Jewish customs (Ac.21.21). This estimation is surely enough to treat him as an apostate (Barclay 1998:90). At the onset of their interaction, Paul is charged with being a seriously dangerous person and a threat to the Judean Christians’ group identity. Whether Paul agrees or not, Paul has been stereotyped as an apostate in the Jewish Diaspora. John Barclay has stressed that just like beauty, ‘apostasy’ is “in essence not a matter of fact but a matter of perspective…”(1998:80-81). James demands that Paul should disprove this devastating defamation by his own actions: by participation in the rite of purification and payment for the four men’s expenditure, who are under the Nazirite vow (21.23f).

Why does James want Paul to disprove this rumour by his own actions? How can we make sense of the Lukan narrative in its cultural context? When Paul comes to Jerusalem, James would think that he intends to enter the social space of the Judean Christians, by recalling his considerable success in his mission among the Gentiles, and endorsing the equal status of Gentile Christians with Judean Christians as the one people of God. James’s proposal indicates that he wants to concede the status of Gentile Christians within the limits which the Apostolic decree proscribes, while also proving that Paul as a Jew and their leader shows loyalty to the Temple and Law. This measure, in the Lukan portrayal, would serve to solidify the respective identities of Judean and Gentile Christians.

We will now consider why James reclaims the decree and then turn to his requirement for Paul.
(ii) James and the Apostolic Decree (Ac.21.25)

In Ac.15, the decree is formulated to define the social position of Gentile Christians in terms of circumcision and the Mosaic Law. In the context of the Gentile influx into the Christian community, some groups of Judean Christians brought up the issues of circumcision and observance of the Mosaic Law as the requisite for Gentile Christians’ salvation in order to include them in the renewed covenant people of God (15.1, 5). Paul wants to clarify this problem in discussion with the apostles and the elders in Jerusalem. In the meeting, Peter backs up Paul from his experience of the Cornelius case (Ac.10-11) by stating that (a) God has made no distinction between Gentile Christians and Judean Christians (15.9), and that (b) any imposition of the Law and circumcision on Gentile Christians is to put God on trial and to place an unreasonable and unprecedented yoke on their neck (15.10). Following Peter’s speech, based on the scriptural exegesis of Am.9.11-12 (LXX) with Jer.12.15 (LXX) and Isa.45.21 (MT), James speaks of the incorporation of Gentiles into the people of God with no requirements of circumcision and full observance of the Mosaic Law other than baptism in the name of Jesus (Bauckham 1996b: 167, 170).

But James abruptly formulates the decree in the four stipulations: “Abstention from (1) the pollution of idols (εἰδωλοθυτίων); (2) fornication (πορνείας); (3) strangled things (πνεκτῶν); and (4) blood (αἷματος)” (Ac.15.20, 29; 21.25). The decree is not a compromise or a form of trial (contra the Western text in 15.2) but a piece of halakah, similar to a Rabbinic discussion that decides a question of practice from the scriptural references (Gehardsson 1961:249-61). It assumes the authority to make a decision and promulgate it (Barrett 1998), and thus James had the authority to decide the agenda by issuing a resolution (Ac.15.19-20). Whatever its origin or background, the decree is widely regarded as amounting to an imposition of some part of the Mosaic legislation upon the Gentiles. Gentiles do not have to be converted to an observance of circumcision and the Law, but they do have an obligation to obey

31 For the textual problems, see Metzger 1971:429-34
the requirements that God has given for Gentiles living within Israel (Jervell 1972:144; Wilson 1983:113-116). In this regard, the decree can be seen as cultic in that it has a part in defining the boundaries and nature of the people of God33 (Franklin 1994:48): Gentile Christians should observe the decree as a minimal requirement of the Mosaic Law, which is relevant to Gentiles living with Israel, in order to incorporate them into the renewed covenant people of God without circumcision.

We have observed that when social boundaries are under negotiation, they control interethnic interactions through sets of prescriptions and proscriptions while maintaining the social identity of the groups involved (Barth 1969:16). The decree is both a kind of prescription allowing Gentile Christians into the people of God and a kind of proscription maintaining Judean Christians’ social superiority over the Gentile Christian group so as to protect their positively perceived social identity derived from the Temple, Law, and circumcision. Facing social competition from Gentile Christians, the Judean Christian group has reacted by using a group strategy aimed at maintaining their positive social identity by upholding a creative cognitive alternative, the Apostolic decree. This measure enables them to accentuate their positive differences from Gentile Christians on the basis of a new superiority which is justified in relation to the Law. This means that James institutes the decree to differentiate the status of Judean Christians from that of Gentile Christians within the renewed covenant people of God.

It is plausible to compare the decree with the Jewish proselyte traditions from which the status of Gentile Christians in the decree can be typologically drawn. If salvation was only possible within the covenant community of Israel (Jub.15.26-32; Ant.20.41), the only way of incorporating oneself into the Jewish community was to become a proselyte through circumcision, since no Jewish community in antiquity

33 Wilson, who proposes its ethical implication, fails to see that there is little ethical concern as a whole and that there is no talk of repentance from Gentile’s immorality in the past at all (Evans 1990:93-4).
accepted an uncircumcised male as a proselyte (Cohen 1989:27). Even if a Gentile was circumcised, his status was not regarded as equal to the Jews. Proselytes were decidedly inferior to natives (Philo Vit. Mos. 1.27). The Qumran community prohibits the proselyte from entering the Temple (4Q.53-57; 11QTemple.39.5; 40.6). A proselyte should not say “Our God and the God of our fathers” in his prayers, nor recite the Deuteronomistic formula, “from the land you have sworn unto our fathers to give us” (m. Bik. 1.4). In the eyes of Jews, a Gentile who converted to Judaism became not a Jew but a proselyte, that is, a Jew of a peculiar sort (Cohen 1989:28-29). As the Gentile Christians in Ac.15 were not circumcised, we cannot expect that they were regarded as equal to Judean Christians.

What about uncircumcised Gentiles who had devoted themselves to Yahweh? While Philo refuses to condone any abandonment of the literal observance of Pentateuchal injunctions in the name of allegorical exegesis (Migr. Abr. 89-90) regarding it as negligence (Vit. Mos. 2.17-24), he defines a proselyte as one who is circumcised not in foreskin but in pleasures, desires, and other passions of the soul, and one who renounces polytheism, and worships only the one God (Quaes. Ex. 2.2). These proselytes apparently remain uncircumcised but they follow a philosophic way of Jewish life. The author of Joseph and Asenath describes Asenath as a proselyte of this type. She destroys her idols (9.2; 10.13-14), renounces polytheism, and becomes a servant of the one God (12-13) but the text says nothing about her observance of Jewish laws except for her abstention from sacrifices offered to idols. This monotheistic proselyte who denies idolatry and acknowledges the entire Torah, would be called a Jew, but any Jew should not regard him or her as a Jew in the full sense.

There is a different concept of Gentiles as “righteous Gentiles”, who believe that the Torah was not meant to be universally binding but was instead God’s special gift to Israel, and that Gentiles did not need to conform fully to the Torah to be accounted righteous (cf. Spec. Leg. 2.42-48; Omn. Prob. Lib. 72-74). Rabbi Joshua asserted that “there are also righteous people among the nations who have a portion in

34 There is no firm data regarding initiation, but circumcision was necessary for true conversion while baptism and sacrifices are not attested in the first-century (Mcknight 1991:88).
the world to come" (t. Sanh. 13.2; cf. Sifre. Deut. 32.8; Mek 3; b. Sanh. 59). This Rabbinic ruling might suggest a process, developing over time, of Jewish authorisation of the Gentiles, who identified with the God of Israel though they were not full proselytes. There is sufficient evidence of this sort of Gentile: Ananias’ advice to Izates, in Ant. 21.41; Juvenal’s satirical description of a partial convert to Judaism in Sat. 14.96-106; the existence of Gentile synagogue adherents; the acceptance of Gentile sacrifices in the Temple; the recognition of the legitimacy of Gentile altars to Yahweh apart from the Temple. As far as avoiding idolatry and observing some ethical norms, a Gentile fulfils all that one strand of Rabbinic Judaism requires of him or her (t. Abod. Zar. 8.4.8d; b. Sahn. 56b; Novak 1983). This status was based on conformity to the ‘seven precepts’ which God had enjoined on all humankind through Noah (Sanders 1977: 210). Most versions of the “Noachic laws,” include the prohibition of idolatry in order to be reckoned as a righteous Gentile (p. Yebam. 8.1.8d; b. Abod. Zar. 64b). A Gentile attains the status of a “resident alien” and may live in the land of Israel only after renouncing idolatry (b. Meg. 13a; p. Ned. 3.4.38a and b. Ned. 25a; Sifre. Num. 111; Sifre. Deut. 54; Mek 8 on Exod. 15.11). Although the princes of the royal house of Adiabene studied the Torah but did not practise it before their circumcision and conversion (Ant. 20.2.4.44), Josephus said they had venerated God (Ant. 20.2.3.34; 20.2.4.41). However, if a Gentile destroyed his ancestral gods and declared exclusive loyalty to the Jewish God, his neighbours might have regarded him as a Jew, but there is no sign that the Jews did the same. There is no textual evidence that this sort of Gentile was granted membership into the Jewish community (Cohen 1989: 23).

From these observations, it can be suggested that the status of Gentile Christians in the decree is identified as ‘uncircumcised monotheistic proselytes’ or ‘righteous Gentiles’ in terms of uncircumcision, abandonment of their ancestral gods, worship of the one God, and partial observance of the Law. As far as they remain uncircumcised, they are not fully incorporated into the Jewish community as the covenant people of God. By instituting the decree, James differentiates Judean Christians as the fully incorporated members into the renewed covenant people of

God from Gentile Christians who are merely attached to the community. In Lukan terms, they are just like God-fearers, the synagogue adherents (Callan 1993:293-95). It is significant that James also alludes to them as God-fearers in Ac.15.21, “For from the ancient times Moses has been preached in every city by those who have read his laws every Sabbath in the synagogues.” For James, the decree has a significant part in defining the boundaries and nature of the covenant people of God. While Gentile Christians can be members of the renewed covenant people of God without becoming Jews, they should remain in the status of God-fearers who are asked to keep the minimum requirements of the Mosaic Law.

From the Lukan Paul’s perspective, the decree is nothing less than the Jerusalem church’s unilateral resolution. It is theirs, not his, and he has nothing to do with it because he was not engaged in its promulgation. First, as Luke describes it in 15.6- “the apostles and elders met together to consider this matter”: the meeting itself was not an ecumenical meeting but a Jerusalem church’s meeting. Thus the Lukan expression of ‘the whole church’ in Ac.15.22 should be understood in this respect. Second, the debate (ζητήσεως) was not one between Paul and the Judean Christians, as in 15.2, but an intra-Jerusalem contest. Third, in Jerusalem, Barnabas and Paul were not treated as key actors or official members but merely as reporters who were allowed to report their evidence of divine activity witnessed in their mission. Fourth, it is significant to see that Luke describes Judas and Silas as their men (διά αὐτῶν), who were the Jerusalem church’s members and can be regarded as the special emissaries who carried out special missions. Finally, the Lukan Paul never mentions the decree in his Gentile mission in Acts, nor does historical Paul do so in his letters. This observation is consistent with Paul’s reports in Gal. 2.2 where Paul does not mention his engagement in the decree or the official discussion, but he has nothing less than a private opportunity to report his Gospel, assessing that Gal.2.1 and Ac.15 refer broadly to the same meeting. It is significant that historical Paul never mentions it even in the cases in which he should have benefited had he done so (cf. Gal.2.11-14), and in which he deals with the same or similar issues (1Cor.6.9-11; 10.19-22). As far as we are concerned, there is no clear evidence to support the view that Paul agreed to the imposition of this decree (i.e. imposition) on Gentiles.
Why does James, at least as Luke portrays him, restate the decree in Ac.21.25? We have argued that the group boundary is not fixed but permeable, so as to allow the possibility of negotiation under varying social circumstances. Accordingly, the boundary of Jewishness was not always clearly marked, and the ancient Jews held a wide range of conceptions about the degree to which a Gentile is incorporated into the people of God (Cohen 1989). Facing social competition from Gentile Christians, James uses the decree as a means of negotiation concerning the status of Gentile Christians, to endorse the fellowship between the two social groups, under the condition that Paul accepts his demand. Lukan Paul goes along with James because accepting his proposal is a good opportunity to enhance the positive social identity of his Gentile Christian group and to share the social space.

(3) Paul in the Temple

Would the Lukan Paul think positively about joining with the Judean Nazirites and offering sacrifices? In Ac.13.38-39, Paul claims that the sacrificial system of the Mosaic Law is unable to grant forgiveness of sins, which is now possible through Jesus. And Christ’s death has already secured that forgiveness by the shedding of his own blood (Ac.20.28; cf. the quotation of Isa.53 in Ac.8.32-33). The same idea appears in Paul’s letters (Rom.3.25; 8.3; 1.Cor.15.20, 23; Ep.5.2; see Daly 1978:59-65). But we see that Paul says that he comes to bring “alms” (ἐλεημοσύνας) and to offer sacrifices (Ac.24.17). This is somewhat in contradiction to Luke’s general view. But we can see this statement as the Lukan Paul’s defence strategy on trial before Felix, so that it constitutes a reinterpretation of what he was doing when he was captured in the Temple (24.18). Moreover, Paul mentions the dominical saying he heard when he was praying in the Temple immediately after his conversion: “Haste and get out of Jerusalem quickly because they will not receive your witness concerning me…Go! for I will send you afar to the Gentiles” (22.18b, 21). This suggests that the Temple is not fit to be the instrument of the Gentile mission. Paul should have recognised that the Temple’s function in the universal salvation of God had been terminated by the risen Lord, Jesus. If Luke does want his readers to take
the statement at Ac.24.17 at face value, another possibility is that Paul’s involvement in the Temple sacrifices is not his voluntary choice but his strategy to improve the social identity of his missionary fruits, Gentile Christians. For the sake of his Gospel, as he willingly decided to circumcise Timothy (Ac.16.3), he would enter the Temple to offer sacrifices. It is noteworthy that James’ request at Ac.21.24 is deliberately expressed by two imperatives, ἀγνίζομαι and ἀπάνυμοι (21.24), and it signifies that, regardless of Paul’s stance on the Temple and sacrifices, James takes the initiative to involve Paul in the Temple sacrifices so as to maintain the positively perceived social identity of his group.

Why does James suggest Paul’s involvement in the Nazirite rite? It seems to relate to James’ evaluation of Paul’s ritual condition. The Nazirite rite is essentially one’s voluntary sacrificing act (cf.1Macc.3.46). By means of consecrating one’s hair for a certain period and then offering it on the altar, one symbolically offers oneself to God, and then, one is both the offering and the officiant (Milgrom 1990: 356-57). As a sacrifice in potentia, the Nazirite’s hair, like any other sacrifice, may not be ritually defiled (Lev.7.19; m.Menah.12.1), and hence a Nazirite is forbidden to come into contact with the dead. Like a priest who officiates in the Temple, he must abstain from wine and other grape products (cf. Num.Rab.10.8; b.B.Mes.92a). Though Luke fails to provide information about the Nazirite rite, the four men’s Nazirate was likely to have been defiled for some cause or another, since a Nazirite who had become impure must first undergo the purification process required of all those who have been defiled by a corpse. Once he has been purified, he must shave his hair, offer penitential and purificatory sacrifices, and then begin his Nazirate anew. The Nazirite must rid himself of his defilement, shave his head, and offer a sacrifice which is an equivalent to his hair. Moreover, the Nazirite vow is an expensive ritual, for only rich people could afford to make such a vow, and poor people found themselves liable to sacrifices but were unable to offer them because they could not afford them (cf. Agrippa I in War.2.313-14; m.Nazir.3.6). From the fact that the Nazirite vow was an expensive ritual with quite clear social implications, we have to conclude that it was an ostentatious act, possibly indicating a willingness to show one’s commitment to the Law (Diamond 1997).
From this observation, we can ascertain that it is unlikely that the underlying motive of James’ proposal about Paul’s purification was his impurity which was attributed to those who came from foreign, unclean lands (m. Ohol. 2.3; 17.5; 18.6; contra. Haenchen, 1971:611-2; Witherington, 1998:649). Another possibility is that Luke presents Paul as a Nazirite in Ac.18.18 to show that Paul is even more than merely Law-abiding, against accusations in Ac.18.13 where Corinthian Jews accused Paul of “exhorting people to worship God in ways contrary to the Law,” and he may have to go to the Temple to resolve the vow (Koet 1996:130). But this view is hard to reconcile with the regulation of the Nazirite in Num.6.1-21 that the Nazirite must cut-off his hair within the Temple precinct. It is more likely that, by joining the Nazirite of Judean Christians, Paul is regarded as ritually defiled, and must demonstrate his adherence to the Law to the Law-zealous Christian group, who stereotype him as practising apostasy (21.21). Their evaluation of Paul is strikingly similar to the charges of those that came from Asia and seized on the grounds that: (a) Paul was teaching against the people, the Law, and the Temple, and (b) he had defiled the Temple by bringing a Gentile into it (v.28). The perfect tense of the verb, “has profaned” (κέκολυκέκει), indicates that the accusers saw Paul’s profaning action of the Temple as an ongoing breach of the purity law from the Diaspora mission to the very Temple itself, and possibly that Paul’s campaign in relation to the collection (although not mentioned in Ac.21) was also interpreted as bringing Gentiles into the Temple’s inner-court (ιερόν). By highlighting the similarity of charges between Judean Christians and the accusers in the Temple, Luke deliberately portrays their common front against Paul. Because Paul’s Gentile mission was regarded as a defiling activity, he was forced to undergo the purification appropriate for a defiled Nazirite, thus demonstrating his penitential attitude to the Law and proving his loyalty to it and the Temple. And as the Nazirite vow was an expensive ritual, it is possible that Luke intends his readers to assume that the costs of sacrifices made by Paul came from the collection for the poor. If so, the collection would have been deliberately diverted from the (probably provocative) expression of the unity of Christian kinship group to a devotional act in the Temple, and this fact might have been implied in Paul’s saying—“I came to bring alms to my nation and to offer sacrifices”—on trial before Felix in Ac.24.17.
Upon becoming involved in Temple sacrifices, Paul falls into trouble. Accused of profaning the Temple, Paul is "seized" (ἐπιλαθομένος), and "dragged out" (ἐξελκόν ἐξω) of the Temple in Ac.21.30. James' real position is exposed by implication when Paul is arrested. There are no reports of his offering any aid to Paul. Why? The pain, suffering, and death of an out-group person are not worthy of concern. As a representative of a significant out-group, Paul was not to be supported, or respected as were in-group members. Luke represents Paul's final Temple visit as greeted by progressively intensified hostility, in the course of which the Temple doors are eventually "shut" (ἐκλεισθητος) against him (Ac.21.30). Commentators have suggested that the doors were the ones of the inner court (Marshall 1980:348; Dunn 1996:289, Witherington 1998:655). Although possible, this is probably a misreading of Luke's literary strategy in relation to the Temple because there is no clear indication of Paul's specific location within it. On the other hand, it is far-fetched to assume that Luke wishes to imply that this event led to the final downfall of the Temple in 70 CE (Bruce 1990:450; Tannehill 1990:273). Rather it is Luke's artistic device to represent his final judgement against the Temple: the symbolism of the shutting out of Paul from the very cultic centre of Judaism, the Temple. For Luke, the Temple could not accommodate the divinely chosen instrument for the Gentile mission.

It is interesting to see here that the Judean Christian group might have thought that the Temple would have functioned as a panacea to heal social illness which has been caused by Paul (pestilence [λοιμός], Tertullus' term in Ac.24.5) and to restore the social health of the Judean Christian group by forcing him to offer sacrifices. But the Temple actually demonstrates its inability to play an important role in social integrity. Moreover, the Temple has served as the ultimate reference point in judging Paul as a defiled person by exerting its centripetal power in respect of the purity law on Gentile Christians. The articulated sacred space of the Temple shows its actual power to segregate the people of God by prescribing who is fit to enter the Temple's inner-courts. And Luke probably means to convey that its economic dimension plays a role in the appropriation of some of the collection into the Temple sacrifices. Its actual attitude to Paul and to Gentile Christians is finally represented in its shutting
the door against the most inclusive missionary. Luke shows his conclusive judgement of the Temple: the Temple is not relevant to the universal salvific plan of God to embrace all people (Israelites, Samaritans, and Gentiles in Ac.1.8) in the Risen Lord, Jesus.

In this, Paul's final visit to the Temple, Luke makes it apparent how the Judean Christians who were attached to the Temple, understood the question "Who are the people of God?"—one of the main themes in Luke-Acts (Jervell 1996; Sanders 1987; Wilson 1986)—and why they were unable to play an active role in Luke's description of early Christian history. It is the Temple that serves to separate Gentile Christians from Judean Christians.

VII. CONCLUSION: LUKE'S ATTITUDE TO THE TEMPLE

We have argued that throughout Luke-Acts, Luke's attitude towards the Temple is neither positive, nor ambivalent, but negative. Luke begins to depict the Temple in a somewhat positive tone in the infancy narratives, but implies that the pious within it are looking for something to replace it. In the Temple activity of Jesus, Luke describes the Temple as being challenged and occupied symbolically by Jesus who criticises the actual failure of the Temple and its authorities. In the rending of the Temple curtain, Luke portrays the end of the Temple de jure, though he retains the Temple's function de facto in order to provide the social space for the creative formation of the Christian group in Acts.

In Acts, Luke maintains his view that the Christian Gospel cannot extend to the ends of earth (Ac.1.8) when it is confined to the Temple. The newly formed Christian group challenges the Temple in order to incorporate people into the Christian community. The more creative group, the Hellenists, tries to depart from the Temple by challenging its ultimate legitimacy as the abode of Yahweh (Ac.7.48). Just as the pagan shrines are impotent, so the Temple is unable to accommodate the God of all humankind, the renewed covenant people of God, and the Gospel of the Risen Lord (Ac.22.17). Rather its sacred space imposes the purity laws which
segregate the people. Finally, the Temple has been shut against Paul, the divine instrument of the Gentile mission. Luke portrays the Temple as the social space in which agonistic honour competition takes place between Jesus, his followers, and the Jewish Temple authorities. For Luke, the Temple is, in fact, not fit for the Christian witnesses who embrace the universal salvation of God in Jesus Christ.

If the Temple is not designed for the social space of the Christian group, what kinds of space are suitable for them? We will investigate this question in the following chapters.
Fig. 3.1. Ritmeyer’s reconstruction of Herod’s Temple (1989).

Fig. 3.2. Plan of Herod’s Temple and Courts; (1) Holy of Holies; (2) Holy Place (Nave); (3) Porch; (4) Altar; (5) Nicanor Gate; (6) Beautiful Gate? (After Duling & Perrin 1994:xxi).
CHAPTER FOUR:
SYNAGOGUE IN LUKE-ACTS.

If Luke has portrayed the Temple in a negative light, how does he view the Jewish synagogue? Is it a suitable space to accommodate the renewed covenant people of God, and to actualise their new symbolic world? How does Luke evaluate this uniquely Jewish social institution? Before entering into detailed exegesis, we will first discuss the present scholarly debates on the following questions: (1) Does Luke portray synagogues anachronistically so as to bring the developed synagogue system and architectural type with which he was familiar back into the pre-70 period? (2) What kind of relationship did the synagogue have with the Temple? Was it an independent space or a type of sub-precinct of the Temple? (3) Is the term, 'God-fearers', a Lukan literary invention or a well-established term in first-century Greco-Roman society?

I. CURRENT ISSUES OF THE FIRST-CENTURY SYNAGOGUES


In a series of essays (1990; 1992; 1994; 1995), Howard Kee has argued for the presence of Lukan anachronisms in crafting a narrative that suggests (1) pre-70 Jews were gathering in synagogues, (2) before 70, the synagogue had a formal service programme and an institutional organisation, and (3) before 70, there was systematic and regular attendance at the synagogue on the Sabbath by Jews.36 We can respond to his arguments by examining a variety of literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence.

36 See the responses of various scholars to Kee's arguments: Oster 1993; Riesner 1995; Levine 1996; Atkinson 1997; Cohen 1997; Binder 1997. Also see McKay 1998 for the current trend of the debate.
Philo uses the word προςακυρίη to refer to the buildings in Alexandria or other cities that were vandalised, burned, or desecrated by the mobs in the violence surrounding the year 38CE, and to Jewish buildings in Rome (Legat. 132-152, 156, 165, 191, 346, 371; Flacc. 41-49, 53, 122). He also distinguishes between synagogues and Jewish meetings in Legat. 156-58: “He [Augustus] introduced no changes into their synagogues (προςακυρίς), he did not prevent them from meeting (συνάγεσθαι) for the exposition of the Law.” In Flacc. 45-47, Philo describes the synagogues which existed throughout the Greco-Roman world as the central targets for the Gentiles’ anti-Jewish attacks (cf. Spec. Leg. 2.61-62). In Legat. 346, as Caligula launched a unified assault against the Jews in 40 CE, the culprits turned the synagogues, which were scattered throughout the empire, into Imperial shrines, just as Caligula had planned to do with the Temple. Philo only once uses the term οὐαγγελική for a building, in reference to the Essenes: “they abstained from all other work and proceeded to their sacred places which they called synagogues (οὐαγγελικῆ)” (Omn. Pro. Lib. 81). For Philo, προςακυρίη is the standard term for the synagogue building in Egypt, other Greco-Roman cities and Rome itself, except in Palestine, where he uses συναγωγή to refer to a building, but not a congregation (Riesner 1995:182).

Josephus discusses a dispute over a neighbouring Greek landowner, who left Jews using a synagogue (συναγωγή) with only a narrow and awkward passage in Caesarea Maritima, just prior to the outbreak of the revolt in 66CE (War. 2.285-92). Assembled at the synagogue on a Sabbath, the Jews found that a Gentile was sacrificing birds on the pot beside the entrance, and were enraged by this act beyond endurance. In Ant. 19.300-11, some youths tried to introduce an image of Claudius into a συναγωγή in Dora, and Agrippa I was angered and referred the matter to the governor of Syria by reminding him of the emperor’s decree that Jews could follow their own customs. Josephus also describes a “προςακυρίη” in Tiberias as “a huge building” (μέγες τον ὀχτώμα), where a military council discussed the revolt (Life. 272, 280, 290-303), probably because Tiberias, a totally Hellenised new city, may have
produced something like Diaspora circumstances in terms of its organisation and
ethnic mixture of its population (Hengel 1975:47).

We can conclude, therefore, that the very existence of the synagogue as the
building itself was taken for granted in the first-century Mediterranean world (see also
Juvenal’s use of proseucha as a building, Sat.3.296). For Philo and Josephus, the
geographical aspect is the main factor in the distribution of terminology, which does
not point to a substantial difference in function: συναγωνία for Palestinian synagogues
and προσευχή for Diaspora synagogues (Hüttenmeister 1993:163-81; contra McKay
1998). In the Diaspora, προσευχή was originally used as the formal designation of
Jewish places of worship until the first-century CE and beyond with the exception of
Tiberias just noted. In Palestine the synagogues, originating in the Maccabean period,
were probably called בתי ספר and in Greek συναγωνία, to avoid any confusion with
the Jerusalem Temple, which in Isa.56.7 is called בתי הסדורי (Hengel 1975).

(2) Epigraphic Evidence

The most reliable evidence to support the synagogue as an architectural edifice
is the Theodotus inscription, which was found on the Ophel hill in Old Jerusalem. The
text is well known (CLJ.II.1404):37

Theodotus, son of Vettanos, a priest and
an archisynagogos, son of an archisynagogos
grandson of an archisynagogos, built
the synagogue (συναγωνία) for the reading of
Torah and for teaching the commandments;
Furthermore, the guest-house, and the rooms, and the
water installation for lodging
needy travellers. Its foundation stone was laid

37 The excavation notes, site, plans and photos are available in Weill 1920. For detailed
by his ancestors, the elders, and Simonides

In line four, the term, συναγωγή clearly refers to the architectural structure Theodotus had built. Moreover some of the functions: for ‘reading of Torah, and teaching of commandments,’ correspond to the Lukan portrayal of synagogues (Lk.4.16f; Ac.13.15f). Recently Kee and Mckay have attempted to re-date it by arguing, that it comes from the second-half of the second-century CE, or even later (Kee 1992; 1995; Mckay 1998; see also criticisms, Riesner 1995:192-200; Binder 1997:81-85). But this view is rather implausible. Jews were forbidden to live in Jerusalem for a considerable period after Hadrian’s decree (King 1992:761-62; Smallwood 1976:428-506, 526-538), and it is hard to imagine large numbers of Greek-speaking pilgrims in the post-70 Jerusalem such as to require a guest-house mentioned in this inscription. It is also doubtful whether a wealthy priestly family would have played an active role in Jerusalem for several generations after the destruction of the Temple. This was hardly the time to build a large synagogue complex with accommodation for many pilgrims or to commemorate its erection in a monumental inscription. Rather, the guesthouse and bathing facilities for the Greek-speaking pilgrims almost certainly necessitate a dating to before 70. This inscription provides us with the best evidence for the pre-70 synagogue, by informing us of the formal service of synagogue worship, the instituted officials, and their functions.

Most of the pre-70 inscriptions from Egypt refers to the Jewish meeting-place as προσευχή. Nine inscriptions and three papyri from Egypt mention προσευχή (CIL.II.1422, 1432, 1433, 1440, 1441, 1449, 1443-4; CPJ.1.129, 134, 138; III.1532A; Schürer 1979.2:425-26). And in other inscriptions from Delos (CIL.1.726) and Bosphorus, the usual term is also προσευχή (Levinskaya 1996:208-225). As an exception, an inscription from Berenice dated 42CE uses συναγωγή twice: “...It seemed good to the gathering of the Jews in Berenice to inscribe the names of the contributors to the repair of the synagogues...” (SEG.17.16). Here the reference to the repair of the synagogue is not to the repair of an assembly of people but a building. The term, προσευχή is a specific Jewish term for their places of worship, since it was not borrowed by the Gentiles (Levinskaya 1996:225). Josephus informs us of three decrees important for our study: (1) in Ant.14.235, the decree issued by Lucius to
Sardis confirmed the Jews’ right to a place of their own; (2) in *Ant.* 14.259-61, the decree by the people of Sardis allowed Jews to build their own place of prayer; (3) the decree in *Ant.* 16.164, explicitly refers to thefts from a building and from an ark, the building being named as οἰκήσεως, the functions of which were related to the functions of a synagogue, containing the inviolable “sacred books” and “sacred monies.”

This epigraphic evidence suggests that in the Diaspora, προσευχή is the standard term for a Jewish place of worship and it distinguished from συναγωγή for the assembly of Jews. Evidence for this comes from an Egyptian Jewish papyrus dated from 50 BCE (*CPJ.* L 138): “at the gathering (συναγωγής) which was held in the prayer house (προσευχή).” In Palestine, συναγωγή was used of the architectural structure itself up to the first-century CE, and was thereafter largely supplanted by προσευχή (Hengel 1975:44-51). In the first-century CE, συναγωγή was used mainly for the gathered community, and occasionally for the building, even in the Diaspora.

(3) Archaeological Evidence

L.M. White has suggested that Diaspora synagogues emerged out of private household gatherings by remodelling houses to fit the needs of worshipping communities (1987, 1989, 1990a,b). While it is possible that, at the very earliest stages of Jewish settlement in a Diaspora town, the Jews were of necessity forced to meet in a ‘private house’, it is likely that a specially designated building was soon either purchased or constructed for the community use. But we must doubt this for various reasons: (1) the early inscriptive evidence from Egypt, referring to architectural features such as “gateway” (πυλώνα, *JIE*.24), “exedra” (ἐξέδρα, *JIE*.28) and “sacred precincts” (ιερῶν περίβολον) (*JIE*.9), stand at odds with renovated houses; (2) the various uses of ιερῶν and ιερῶς περίβολους (3Macc.2.28; *War*.7.44-45; *Ant*.13.65-68; Philo *Sept. Leg*.3.171-72; *Flacc*.48; *JIE*.9) indicate that the Diaspora synagogues were consecrated buildings as public edifices, but not private
houses, in the first-century CE (Binder 1997:185). We will examine archaeological data of the indisputable first-century synagogues, Delos and Ostia.

The Delos synagogue (Fig.4.1) consisted of a long, rectangular building (15.5x28.15m), whose facade is orientated towards the east. Scholarly characterisation of it as a domestic residence (Goodenough JSGPR 2.73; Kraabel 1979; Meyers 1996; Kee 1995; White 1990a,b) has failed to notice that domestic buildings on the island uniformly consist of a central, peristyle courtyard surrounded by small rooms, about 5x5m in size—none as big as the Room A/B in GD 80 (Bruneau and Ducat 1983:34-36). The large dimensions of the room clearly indicate that it was erected not as part of a private dwelling, but as an assembly hall within a public building (Mazur 1935:13; Binder 1997:245).

The Ostia synagogue (Fig.4.2), together with its ancillary rooms occupies a large space (36.60x23.50m), whose facade is orientated towards Jerusalem, dating from the middle of the first-century CE (Phase.1) to the fourth-century (Phase.3). A dedication inscription was found on the site (JIWE.1.13):

For the safety of the Emperor. Mindius Faustus with his family built and made (the synagogues) from his own gifts (δομάτων), and set up the ark for the sacred law.

White’s initial proposal of its original form as a private house or insula (1990b) is based upon a mistranslation of δομάτων (‘gifts’) as δωμάτων (‘rooms’) on line 3 (Binder 1997:260-63). He also fails to compare its earliest phase with local domestic architecture, which consists dominantly of insulae and a few peristyle houses surrounded by small rooms (Meiggs 1973:253-262). A comparison of a typical Ostian insula with its earliest phase is even less appropriate, since the former is a multi-storied structure consisting of rows of small rooms connected by a long corridor. Its early structure (1CE) consisted of an entry court with adjoining triclinium, a propyleum, a main hall with benches on three sides, and the well and basin outside the main entrance probably used for ritual cleansing (Squarciapino 1963a, 1963b:201-
203). The findings from the structure’s lowest stratum indicate that the building continually served as a synagogue, from its founding to the later building.

Our chief evidence for first-century Palestinian synagogues comes from Masada (Fig. 4.3), Herodium (Fig. 4.4), and Gamala (Fig. 4.5). All three buildings, equipped with stone benches surrounding the wall, were adjacent to ritual baths and orientated towards Jerusalem, and during the First Revolt they were used by the Zealots (Netzer 1981). Since the first two were originally Herodian palaces and then converted into places of worship, we will focus on the third. The Gamala synagogue is identified as a first-century architectural structure by S. Gutman, for this site has not been reused since abandonment after the Jewish Revolt (1982; 1993). But Kee claims that the synagogue turned out to be nothing more than a private house, since it lacks the distinctive architectural features for a place of worship or for study of Torah (1990:8-9). The main hall’s size, however, is not appropriate to a private house, for it is able to house over one hundred people. The size of the Gamala synagogue (25.5x17 m) is larger than the other two contemporary Zealot-used synagogues (Masada: 10.5x11.6m; Herodium: 15.15x10.6m) (Binder 1997:158).

This building also has significant architectural features to suggest its specific religious uses (Levine 1987): (1) The presence of the nearby mikveh a few steps away outside the front entrance; (2) The rosette and the date palm incised on the lintel of the building; (3) Another adjoining room (capable to accommodate 8-10 persons), equipped with benches and connected to the main hall by a window, is either a study room (Gutman 1993:461-2) or women’s gallery (Ma’oz 1992:341); (4) A cupboard or niche in the northwest corner of the building is a torah-niche; (5) The orientation of the building’s facade towards Jerusalem; (6) The arrangement of the hall’s interior, where benches run along the sides of the building, and rows of columns line the central area with heart-shaped columns and niches, is the closest architectural parallel to the so-called Galilean synagogues of the third-century CE and later (Gutman 1993). In summary, the Gamala synagogue is the most reliably attested first-century synagogue building and was built for this special purpose.
Our examination of a variety of evidence suggests that Luke’s portrayal of synagogues as formal institutions with their own buildings and functionaries is not anachronistic, and all pre-70 architectural evidence of synagogues attests that they are not renovated from private dwellings but represent purpose-built, religious architecture.

2. Synagogue as the Temple Space

The next question here is whether the first-century synagogue was used for civic and/or religious meetings. There is general agreement that the post-70 synagogue served in some respects as a substitute for the Temple (Branham 1995:338), but what of the pre-70 synagogue? Was it conceived as a sacred space in the first-century? In the mindset of the ancients, their world was divided into spheres of the sacred and the profane by constructing the axis mundi, which forms a sort of cosmic centre around which everything revolves and from which a community takes its existential orientation (Eliade 1959:8-65; 1985:105-209). For ancient Jews, the Jerusalem Temple had acted as a sacred vortex between heaven and earth (m. Kelim. 1.8,9; m. Qod. 10). Moreover, as a way of extending the sacrality of a temple shrine, the ancients “sought to live as near as possible to the centre of the world” by dedicating the surrounding sacred precincts (ἱερός περιβάλλων/τεμένιν ἱερά) or more distant sacred places (ἱερός τόπος/ἱερά) to the gods/goddesses, to cause the holiness and power of these divine beings to flow out from the central shrines and into the sacred areas (Eliade 1959:43).

But Jews living in the various parts of Greco-Roman world, unlike their Gentile counterparts, would not build subsidiary shrines or altars, according to the Deuteronomic prohibition (Deut.12.13-14; 16.5-6; Ant. 4.200, 13.54). How might they have solved their dilemma? In the Old Testament, the sacred place as central is dispersed into the extended territories, since the accessibility of the ‘Holy’ does not depend upon one’s presence at a particular locality, but upon one’s being ruled by God’s sovereignty through the Law. The divine power, embedded in the knowledge of Yahweh, has flowed out of the sacred place to cover the land, so the outlying areas
of the land are envisioned as participating in the sacrality of Jerusalem to unify the periphery and the centre (Isa.11.9). Can an extended territory possess any sacrality? The Old Testament suggests not only the existence of various sacred-places and territory, but also the differences between them by using the following term: יִדְרֵיהַ (sacred place: Gen.12.6; Gen.35.1; Deut.12.2), יִדְרֵיהַ (all the land, all the territory of Israel: Josh.11.6, 23; 2Sam.21.5; Deut.19.8; Hos.9.3; Isa.14.2), יִדְרֵיהַ (all Israel) and נָחָ (nation). This distinction indicates the existence of localised sacrality through understanding and obeying Yahweh’s Law (Shils 1965:199f; Crosby 1993). In a setting where Hellenism threatened to assimilate or drastically change the Jewish religion, ancient Jews erected synagogues as the sacred space to give it meaning and to maintain their social identity as the people of God ruled by the Law. By dedicating the synagogue space to Yahweh, the space was passed into the hands of the deity and became a sacred edifice like the courts surrounding the Jerusalem Temple (Binder 199726-27; Branham 1995:345). The synagogue was the institution providing the practical setting and symbolic power to establish effective fences against “pagan” influence.

What sort of relationship did the synagogues have with the Temple? Many scholars have held the view that the early synagogues served as rivals to the Temple cult and had tensions with the priestly group through the Pharisaic scribes in Galilee (Tcherikover 1959:124-125; Gutmann 1981; Flesher 1995:33). But there is no evidence that Pharisees founded or dominated the pre-70 synagogues in any of the first-century material (Neusner 1971.III: 289-290; Cohen 1987:62-69; Sanders 1992:77-82; Grabbe 1995). The synagogues in Egypt appeared a century earlier than the rise of the Pharisees, and the overwhelming bulk of evidence suggests that Jews everywhere hallowed and supported the Temple (Ant.15.248; Philo Legat.186-89; Spec.Leg.170; Ep.Arist.41-120; 3Macc; Sir.45.1-22, 50.1-21), because sacrificial worship was central to first-century Judaism both in Palestine and the Diaspora (Ant.18.312-13, 20.49; Philo Legat.155-158,311,315,356). The Theodotus inscription also suggests no rift between priests and synagogues. Perhaps the best literary evidence for a close link between the Temple and the synagogues comes from Philo’s description of the synagogue service on the Sabbath, from his lost work the
Hypothetica as cited in Eusebius' _Praeparatio Evangelica_ 7.8, in which he states that the holy laws were read to the assembly by a priest or one of the elders. Given the evidence of the sweeping support of Jews for the centralised Temple cult, the synagogues were not in conflict with the Temple, but rather were as an _extension_ of it, to serve as distant Temple courts and its subsidiary sacred precincts that extended spatially the sacrality of the Temple, and to allow Jews everywhere participation in the central cult by looking to the central shrine of the Holy One in Jerusalem (Binder 1997:25-26).

Joan Branham argues that the tentative transference of the Temple's sacrality to the developing synagogue actually resulted in the introduction of the _Temple space_ in the synagogues as a 'surrogate Temple' with its architectural design like that of the Torah shrine. Images of the Temple motif were included to enable Jews to participate in the sanctity associated with the Temple (1995:320). But Branham unfortunately thinks that the emergence of the synagogue as a sacred structure was a post-70 development (1995:345), since she concentrates on the Talmudic sources but misses out the bulk of first-century evidence which we have cited. She does, however, refer to the one inscription (CIJ.2.1433) dating from the second-century BCE which mentions 'a sacred precinct' (ιερὸν περίβολον) and a προσευχή; and she alludes to various Roman decrees issued prior to 70CE (1995:334.no.53, 59). These decrees defined synagogues as an _aedes sacra_ by classifying theft or destruction of funds or documents from their premises as ιεροσυλία (sacrilegium; _Ant._ 16.164,165,168), retaining rights of asylum or sanctuary immune from most intrusions from civil authorities (cf. Philo _Spec._ Leg.1.159; _Omn._ _Pro._ _Lib._ 148-152; _3Macc._ 3.27-29; 4.17-18), and prohibiting any imposition of religious symbols from other traditions on them. It is noteworthy that Josephus applies the term, ιεροσυλῶς, which is used for referring to the Temple-robber, to synagogue-theft in _Ant._ 16.164 (cf. _War._ 1.654; 5.562; _Ant._ 12.359; 17.163). It clearly indicates that in the first-century, synagogues were regarded as a sacred space in an intimate relation to the Temple.

How could the Diaspora Jews, who could not attend the Temple sacrifices regularly, maintain their social identity as the people of God on a regular basis? They would find a ritual link in _Isa._ 56.7 (LXX) in which the Temple is called a 'house of
prayer’ because of the close association between prayer and sacrifices (Isa. 1.11-16; 1Kgs.8.27-28), and thus organise their προσευχή to offer communal prayer on the Sabbath and other sacred days when special sacrifices were being offered in Jerusalem (Kasher 1995:209-210). They would add the reading of scriptures to their ritual programme as a similar activity to that in the Temple (1.Esdr.9.41; Philo’s Hypothetica, cited above). In doing so, the synagogues would stand at the centre of the daily Jewish communal life, with all the communal institutions clustering around them (Kasher 1995:218). While removed from the centralised cult geographically, the synagogues allowed Jews everywhere to be connected with the Temple by serving as spatial vortices.

How did space in the early synagogues equate to Temple space? While the sacred nature of the early synagogues is not seen as dramatically as in later structures, it is nonetheless visible. The exploration of the architectural precursors to the Palestinian synagogues is significant for defining their nature in the first-century CE. While several suggestions have been offered as the model so far: the Roman basilica (Kohl and Watzinger 1916); the Roman triclinium (Netzer 1981); the Greek temple’s audience hall (πρόναος; Foerster 1982, 1992); the Greek council halls (Yadin 1982), James Strange observes a significant architectural difference between the various Greco-Roman assembly halls and the typical Galilean synagogues. While the former place rows of columns behind the backs of gathered spectators or participants, the latter have distinctive arrangements, which place a row of columns between the benches against the walls and the central worship space (1997). Why did the pre-70 Jews organise this peculiar spatial arrangement in their synagogues? Reminding us of Josephus’ description that the inner courts of the Temple were adorned with colonnades or cloisters (War 5.200-226; Ant. 11.108), Strange succinctly elucidates the viewpoint of the participants of the sacrifices in the Temple: “…as one watched the sacred proceedings in the Court of the Priests from the vantage of the Court of Israel, one would be watching between columns” (1995:75-6). And he suggests that the builders of the Galilean synagogues had copied a similar arrangement seen in the Second Temple. Reinforcing Strange’s view, Binder suggests that the synagogues’ benches being along the walls had a counterpart in the Temple, which is a common feature of the Near Eastern temples of this period (cf. 11QTemple.37.8-10; Binder
This observation leads us to account for the use of the term συναγωγή in Palestine. The LXX frequently uses this word when referring to the assembly gathered before the tabernacle (Schrage 1971:805). So Josephus did not hesitate to employ the term ἱερόν for the synagogues (War. 7.44-45 for a synagogue in Antioch; War. 4.406-409; Ant. 13.65-68; Ap. 1.209-212) because this same word is commonly used of the Temple courts (Ant. 8.95-97; War. 6.224; 5.184).

Second, all the identified pre-70 synagogues have their orientation towards the Jerusalem Temple. At Gamala, the facade of the synagogue is orientated towards Jerusalem, suggesting that the congregations worshipping in the structure prayed in the direction of the Holy City (1Kgs. 8.30, 44, 48; 2Chr. 6.34, 38; Dan. 6.10; 1Esdr. 4.58). The worshippers, while entering the synagogue with their backs toward Jerusalem, later turned around and faced the Holy City when offering their prayers (Foerster 1992:289-319; Hachlili 1988:167). Hence, given the orientation of the building, it is possible that the later synagogal custom of praying in the direction of Jerusalem was already being practised in the Gamala synagogue. The existing structures of synagogues at Masada and Herodium were chosen for their eastern orientation, though the former of these buildings is not on a perfect west-east axis; but neither was the Temple (see the plan in NEAEHL. 2.718). Philo also notes that the Therapeutae concluded some of their services with their faces and whole body turned to the east in prayer (Vit. Cont. 89). It is reflected in a divergent Rabbinic halacha, that “one should only place the entrance to synagogues in the east, for we find in the Temple the entrance faced the east” (t. Meg. 3.22; see Foerster 1992).

Third, mikveh, which are located near three of the synagogues (Gamala, Masada, and Herodium), suggest that purity requirements were connected with the structures so as to maintain the sacred sphere (Renfrew 1994:51). At Masada, the back room in the synagogue used as a genizah also apparently functioned as the abode of a priest or someone who collected tithes for the priests. In the Gamala synagogue, the use of the Jewish symbols such as the rosette (as a symbol of Solomon’s Temple; 1Kgs. 6.29-35) and palm motifs (as being inscribed on the stones of the inner court of the Temple; Ezek. 40-41; 1Kgs. 6-7), which have been found among the ruins of the Temple mount and occurred on Hasmonaean and Herodian coins (Ma’oz, 1982a:39;
Hachlili, 1988:80), clearly indicate the synagogue’s association with the central cultic location.

As we have observed, the evidence surveyed strongly supports the notion that synagogues served as sacred precincts to the central sanctuary in Jerusalem. If so, we can reasonably apply the spatial characteristics of the Temple to the synagogues.

3. God-Fearers

The Lukan references to God-fearers (φοβούμενοι/οἴκομένοι τὸν θεόν) come quite frequently in Acts (10.2,22,35; 13.16,26,43,50; 16.14; 17.4,17; 18.7). Before Kraabel, the scholarly discussion of God-fearers generally agreed that Luke used ‘God-fearers’ as a semi-technical term, which described a category of Gentiles who worshipped God, without a full conversion to Judaism and continued on the fringes of first-century synagogues (Levinskaya 1996:52-56). Recently the debate has turned to the presence of God-fearers in the first-century synagogues as Luke describes it.

Citing a lack of corroborating inscriptive evidence from Diaspora synagogues, Thomas Kraabel has raised a doubt over the historical reality of God-fearers: for him, they are a Lukan literary invention “to help show how Christianity had become a Gentile religion legitimately and without losing its Old Testament roots” (1981:120-22). This argument of Kraabel has produced a flurry of responses, mostly in the aftermath of the publication of an inscription from Aphrodisias (Asia Minor) where Jews, proselytes and God-fearers (θεοοικείς in the inscription) are clearly delineated as separate groups (Reynolds & Tannenbaum 1987; Feldman 1986; Overman 1992; Tannenbaum 1986; Levinskaya 1996, Wilcox 1981). The inscription, however, dates to the third century CE, and so the assumption needs to be re-examined for the first-century synagogue context.

In the LXX, there are at least five references to οἱ φοβούμενοι (2Chrn.5.6; Ps.115.9-11; 118.2-4; 135.19-20; Mal.3.16). The phrase, οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν, is strikingly used, possibly to refer to non-Jews in the Psalms, and to Jews in Malachi.
In 2Chron.5.6, we have a remarkable implication, in that the LXX not only mentions 'those fearing' but also distinguishes them from the Israelites, while the Hebrew text has no mention of them. The phrase, σεβοµένοι τὸν θεόν, appears seven times in the LXX to describe the attitude of Jews to Yahweh (Jos.4.24; 22.25; Isa.29.13; 66.14; Jon.1.9), to other gods (Jos.24.33b), and to indicate the disposition of Job, a non-Jew, to God (Job.1.9). These data alone are enough to suggest that Luke did not invent the phrase, 'God-fearers' (Esler 1987:37; Overman 1992:49).

Besides the apologetic tones of Josephus (Ap.2.124, 2.282; Ant.3.217, 318-319, War.2.454, 463) and Philo (Vit.Mos.2.20, 2.41-44), Gentiles themselves also voice the credible evidence of God-fearers. Seneca the Younger complains that “the customs of this accursed race have gained such influence that they are now received throughout all the world. The vanquished have given their laws to their victors” (Sup.6.11). Juvenal satirises against “Sabbath-fearing” (metuens sabbata) Romans who even keep the Jewish food laws (Sat.14.96-106), and Epictetus mentions the Jewish contrasting viewpoint over “a man halting between two faiths” and proselytes (Diss.2.9.19-20). These Gentiles can be classified according to the various degrees to which they adhered to Judaism (see Cohen 1989). Josephus makes a clear distinction between God-fearers and proselytes: while he mentions Fulvia as a Jewish proselyte (προσελληθείσαν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις; Ant.18.82), he refers to Nero’s wife, Poppea, who obviously had a commitment to other deities, as “worshipper of God” (θεοσβής). His term θεοσβής is remarkably similar to one of Luke’s expressions for the God-fearers, σεβοµένοι τὸν θεόν (Ac.16.14; 18.7). Since Josephus also employs exactly the same expression in Ant.14.110 where he uses σεβοµένοι τὸν θεόν without the definite article to designate God-fearers who contribute to the Temple’s wealth, the two referents should be identified with each other (Trebilco 1991:147-48). He also describes the Gentiles’ attraction to the synagogue ceremonies in War.7.45.

There are several earlier inscriptions than the Aphrodisias inscriptions to support the existence of God-fearers in the synagogues. An Athribis inscription reads that “Ptolemy son of Epikydes, chief of police, and the Jews in Athribis (dedicated) the προσευχή to the Most High God” (JIE.27, second-century BCE). Epikydes may be a Gentile patron of the Jews in Athribis, and his position in the office of ‘chief police’
would not have prevented him from adopting some Jewish customs, unlike the case of Julia Severa of Acmonia (DF.33). Our second piece of inscriptive evidence is a manumission inscription from Panticapaeum (CIJ.1.683a, I CE): “I free in the προσευχή, my household slave (Elpias), so that he will be undisturbed and unassailable by any of my heirs, on condition that he shows diligence towards the προσευχή under the guardianship of the congregation of the Jews, and reveres God (θεὸν ἀβέβλων).” Since the phrase, ‘θεὸν ἀβέβλων,’ is grammatically awkward in a condition for the slave’s release, the debate for its emendation as θεοκηθέων (God-fearer) is open to the researchers (see Levinskaya 1990b; 1996: 74-76). Whatever words are to be required, the conditions of the release clearly indicate that Elpias was a Gentile, required to become a God-fearer, since Jews or proselytes would not have required of him reverence to God and attendance at the synagogue service (Treblilco 1991: 155-157). Four other inscriptions from Phanagoria and Panticapaeum make similar demands on eight more released slaves (CIJ.1.638, 684, 691 and no. 6 inscription in Levinskaya 1996:237-38).

All this literary and epigraphic evidence is sufficient enough to support Luke’s depiction of the God-fearers in the synagogues. It is interesting that prior to Ac.13.45-46, Luke exclusively uses the term, σεβομένοι τν θεόν, five times, while using, φοβομένοι τν θεόν, thereafter five times. The word φοβομένος (τν θεόν) is used of Cornelius in Ac.10.35. This switch of terms derives from the fact that, in the earlier material, the Jewish mission with Jewish terminology is uppermost; while after 13.46 the mission to the Gentiles with their familiar terminology, increasingly appears (Wilcox 1981: 118), with φοβομένος Cornelius being a precursor of things to come. In conclusion, Luke does not invent the term, God-fearers, and merely highlights their role in the very history of early Christianity, as the bridge to link the Christian message with the Gentile world, as well as the seedbed of the Gentile mission (Esler 1987:36-45).

38 Levinskaya amasses much evidence from the Bosphoran kingdom that shows the presence of a considerable number of God-fearers, who participated in the Jewish communities (1996:227-246).
II. DATA OF SYNAGOGUE IN LUKE-ACTS

Of the 56 occurrences of συναγωγή in the New Testament 15 are in Luke and 19 in Acts; προσευχή also appears in Ac. 16.13,16. Among the total of forty-five occurrences, beside the six instances which refer to the synagogue office (Lk. 8.41; 8.49; 13.14; Ac. 13.15; 18.8; 18.17), Luke’s usage can generally be summarised into several categories. In the Gospel: (1) Jesus’ teaching or preaching in synagogues (Lk. 4.15; 4.44; 6.6; 13.10); (2) his comments regarding synagogue discipline (Lk. 12.11; 21.12); (3) his woes on the Pharisees and the scribes, who prefer to sit at the honourable places in the synagogues (Lk. 11.43; 20.46); (4) his movement to and from the synagogue (Lk. 4.16; 4.38); (5) the Capernaum centurion’s gift for the building of a synagogue (Lk. 7.5); (6) the references to the people in synagogues (Lk. 4.20; 4.28; 4.33). In Acts: (1) the Freedmen synagogue in Jerusalem (Ac. 6.9); (2) Paul’s persecuting activities in the synagogue prior to his conversion (Ac. 9.2; 22.19; 26.11); (3) the subsequent preaching activities of Paul in the synagogues (Ac. 9.20 [Damascus]; 13.5 [Cyprus]; 13.14,43 [Pisidian Antioch]; 41.1 [Iconium]; 16.13,16 [Philippi]; 17.1 [Thessalonika]; 17.10 [Beroea]; 17.17 [Athens]; 18.4,7 [Corinth]; 18.19,26, 19.8 [Ephesus]) 24.12 [in general]; (3) James’ allusion to the synagogue service around the world (Ac. 15.21).

In all references to synagogues, Luke generally presupposes the existence of synagogue buildings, whether they refer either to Jewish communities or to their architectural edifices. His reference to the synagogue in Lk. 7.5 (a verse from the account of the healing of the centurion’s slave in Capernaum), is undoubtedly directed to the building of a synagogue structure. In this passage, Jewish elders appeal to Jesus by saying, “he loves our people, and it is he who built our synagogue for us (συναγωγή...φιλοκατοικία).” This synagogue is a building rather than a house, as attested in archaeological evidence in Capernaum (Tsaferis & Peleg 1986). The subsequent rebuilding of the synagogue on the same site, around the end of the fourth-century CE, indicates how its sacred nature as a sanctuary had persisted on the same spot, as commonly in the Near East (Oppenheim 1965:131). In Ac. 18.7 where Paul leaves the Corinthian synagogue and goes to the house of Titius Justus, he decisively demonstrates the synagogue building. Although Luke may be accused of depicting
excessively stereotyped synagogues as the context for the Pauline mission to a degree which goes beyond historical reality (Esler 1987:42-43), the presence of synagogue buildings in the first-century, in and around Palestine itself, is not a Lukan invention.

### III. SYNAGOGUE IN THE GOSPEL

1. **The Nazareth Manifesto (Lk.4.16-31).**

   Luke’s first reference to synagogues, in Lk.4.15, is a literary milestone to presage Jesus’ inaugural ministry in the Nazareth synagogue in Lk.4.16-31. Unlike Mark, Luke begins with a relatively lengthy preparation for the appearance of his prime protagonist, Jesus, on the public stage; a preparation which signifies the honour of Jesus as the legitimate son of God through his genealogy and his test (Rohrbaugh 1995). Mark and Matthew set up Jesus’ inaugural message by stating that “As the time has come (πεπλήρωται) and the Kingdom of God has drawn near, repent and believe in the gospel (εὐαγγέλιον)” (Mk.1.15). Luke deliberately situates this synagogue event at the outset of Jesus’ public ministry, to provide the context in which Jesus delivers his inaugural address, which characterises programmatically and paradigmatically the major characteristic features of his ministry: “The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to evangelise (εὐαγγελίσασθαι) to the destitute (πτωχοίς). He has sent me to proclaim release to the enslaved and the recovering of sight to the blind, to set free the oppressed, and to proclaim the year of the Lord’s favour… ‘Today this scripture has been fulfilled (πέπληρωται) in your hearing’” (Lk.4.18-19, 21b).

   In his redaction, Luke retains Mark’s basic words, εὐαγγέλιον and πεπλήρωται, but reformulates their contents: εὐαγγέλιον is transformed into the verb, εὐαγγελίσασθαι, to signify the actor and to make firm its reality; in addition, the subject of πεπλήρωται is changed from the temporal meaning to the actual liberating

39 We will translate the term, πτωχός, as “destitute” or “beggar” rather than “poor”, since these terms carry more fully the meaning of the socio-political constraints, as well as economic and religious connotations (Esler 1987:164-200).
activities. Accordingly, the Kingdom of God is concretely characterised, in the proclaimer’s activities to the destitute in the Isaian context, and there is no place for the imperative—to repent and believe—but only for the indicatives to give a focus on the destitute as the recipients of the good news in his ministry. All this establishes Jesus’ identity marker, which proves him to be ‘the Coming One,’ and which is characterised as his social profile in Lk.7.22. In the whole narrative (Lk.4.16-30), Luke frames the quotation of the Isaian texts (Isa.61.1-2 and 52.7) in a chiastic structure by verbs, “stood up,” “was handed,” “unrolled”(vv.16-17); and “rolled up,” “handed,” and “sat down” (v.20), to highlight this manifesto of the Jesus’ ministry. Matthew, however, follows the Markan language and order. Luke also mentions the Zarephath widow and Naaman, to expand the scope of the recipients of the favour of God to Gentiles in vv.25-30.

Why does Luke represent Jesus’ inaugural message in the Isaian context? In Isa.52.7 (LXX), the messages of an evangelising (εὐαγγελίζω) messenger are climactically narrated to proclaim the breakthrough of the divine rule: announcing peace, bringing good news, proclaiming salvation, and speaking of God’s reign. This announcement of the reign of God is an announcement of victory, since the power of chaos has been overcome (51.9) and the rulers are defeated (52.5). As the gospel of the enthronement of Melchizedek in 1QM.17.6f. and 11QMelch.16 uses Isa.52.7 and 61.1f to proclaim a decisive victory over Belial, who has been dethroned, Luke elaborately adopts these Isaian texts to announce the inbreaking of the divine rule in Jesus’ ministry, to actualise the liberating power of the divine rule (Betz 1991:58).

Who are the πτωχοί who will primarily receive the gospel of Jesus? Why does Jesus choose to give the place of honour to a deprived group such as the beggars, the captives, the blind, and the oppressed, in the programmatic declaration of his salvation? In the Old Testament, ניצָם basically refers to someone deprived of his inherited rights of land, which have been given by God (cf. Ex.23.6). In the Psalms, ומ is predominantly used to designate the person in prayer who is crying out in his self-defence: the humble pious ones (cf. Ps.25.9). In the exile, the entire Israelite community collectively becomes ניצָם or נַעֲרֵי, to whom is given God’s promise of deliverance (Deutero-Isaiah). In early Judaism, the Qumran community understood
itself as πΝω who lived in hope of the eschatological redemption, thus enhancing their social identity as the collective elect vis-à-vis the out-groups: the wicked (cf. 1QpHap.12.2ff; 4QpPs.2.9ff; 1QH.14.3, 18.14f; 1QM.14.7). The poor are conceptually characterised in proximity to 'righteous' and 'holy'. But this Qumran concept cannot be applied to the Lukan text, since in the Qumran community those who are afflicted in the flesh, those with injured feet or hands, the lame, blind, and deaf, dumb were excluded from the whole assembly (1QSa.2.5-7; 1QM.7.4-6).

In the Isaian context, Luke might not have used the term, πΝωχός, to remind of the exiled Israelites but to recall those to whom God's sovereign protection is necessitated by the inbreaking rule of Yahweh in his contemporary context: the enslaved, the blind, and the captives. In the Gospel, Luke uses pervasively πΝωχός in association with other deprived people like the blind, captive, deaf, hungry, lame, lepers, maimed, mournful, oppressed, persecuted, and ulcerated (4.18; 6.20; 7.22; 14.13,14; 16.20/22). In each case, πΝωχός stands at the head or the end in the list to represent them all (Green 1995:79ff). Accordingly we need to consider πΝωχός in its association with these people in the first-century Mediterranean context.

In Greek, πΝωχός means the 'destitute' who secure the necessities of life through begging: definitely without having any possessions (Merklein 1993:193). Esler rightly argues that they were the beggars or the homeless who lay in a situation of absolute destitution, not aided by any other forms of assistance—including the benefit of free corn supply as at Rome (1987:169-180). In Palestine where the distribution of wealth was a prime cause of the social problem (chap.3.II.2), they may have been in debt to the rich, have sold their inherited land, and seen their status declining to that of urban beggars, or even enslavement or debt bondage to the wealthy. In ancient Mediterranean society, however, one's economic level was deeply embedded in the social, political, and religious system (Malina 1986:148-52). In this kind of society, it is quite misleading to use 'quantity of goods' as a criterion of poverty. Some are evidently poor, yet not evidently conscious of being deprived. The basic problem of poverty turns on the kind of social involvement that exists between individuals.
Mary Douglas and Baron Isherwood argue that “[I]ncome is a means of access to a social system. The significance of low income is that it restricts such access. Below a certain level it may virtually exclude people from participating fully in the life of the community of which they are members. In relation to that community they may then be said to be in poverty” (1979:63). Wealth forms a reciprocal social space, almost exclusively with those who have a similar life-style, so that each is well linked with the others without impediment. To be wealthy means to be well integrated in a web of mutual involvement of the rich community, which is hard to break, whereas to be poor is to be isolated (ibid.118). This is much more the case with an honour-laden society, in which the status of honour determines the in-group/out-group and the level of their social interaction. Honour is a measure of social standing that embraces wealth as well as other social factors, like access to education, family heritage, ethnicity, occupation, and religious purity. All those who are associated with the πτωχοί, have the lowest social status, and live on the fringe of Greco-Roman society.

The level of one’s wealth would not necessarily bring about one’s social status (Judge 1982; Finley 1985:49). Zacchaeus has been socially stigmatised in his society despite his wealth (Lk.19.2,7). His case points to the religious implication of πτωχοί. Rabbinic literature exhibits a negative attitude to the destitute, because they could not engage in study of the Law (b.Yoma.35b). Joshua b. Levi regarded the destitute as non-existent for society, and classified them in the same group as the dead, lepers, the blind and the childless (bNed.46b; jNed.9.2). The destitute represented all those who had the lowest socio-religious status. In Jewish society, those in association with the πτωχοί are all the impure. One may wonder about Lazarus in Lk.16.19ff., since Luke obviously designates him as πτωχός (16.20). To be sure, Lazarus is regarded as an impure person in his society, but he is ultimately revealed as the son of Abraham, the righteous. In Luke’s symbolic world, Lazarus is a representative example of a πτωχός, who experiences a reversal of status in the Kingdom of God, which Jesus brings into the world (cf. Lk.22.25-27). This religious implication of the beggar as impure helps us to understand why Luke illustrates the two Gentiles, a Zarephath widow and Naaman as the representatives of the recipients of God’s favour. Employing the
religiously marginalised, Luke elaborately expands the concept of the πτωχός to Gentiles, who had obviously been excluded from the Jewish religious community.

We conclude that Luke uses the word, πτωχός, to represent all those who were excluded from social involvement in the dominant social group of Jewish society, due to economic, social, and religious destitution. They had been regarded as excluded from the covenant people of God, from the dominant social group, but Luke creates their social space through the ministry of the divine agent, Jesus, who creates, maintains, and legitimises their social identity in a new dimension.

If the inaugural address represents the nature of the ongoing ministry of Jesus to the destitute who had been excluded from socio-religious involvement, why does Luke place Jesus’ first public activity in the setting of the synagogue? Luke’s description of the synagogue worship at Nazareth—holy scriptures kept in the synagogue (Lk.4.17; Ant. 16.164); Jesus standing to read and his sitting to teach (Lk/4/16,20; Philo. Spec.Leg.2.62); and synagogue attendants called ἅραξ (Lk. 4.20; CPJ. I. 138)—is compatible with tradition (Oster 1993: 201-2). We have previously argued for the sacred nature of first-century synagogues as distant Temple-precincts, and that the architecture of the Galilean-type synagogue was derived from the Temple courts (Strange 1997). Jacob Neusner notes the significant shift from a locative, cosmologically-centred religion to a utopian, community-centred religion, by transforming speech into ritual and so creating the surrogate of ritual deeds in the replacement of cultic sacrifice with ritual speech acts (1979:139, 176), one of which was the reading of the Law on the Sabbath by a priest or elder, as noted by Philo. We can assume, therefore, that the congregations are able to participate in the context of the ritual speech of the synagogue, in that making the reading table in the synagogue hall the focal point of the worship, Jesus’ activities of reading and preaching in the synagogue nicely match the ritual acts in the Temple from the viewpoints of function and architecture.

As surrogate Temple courts, the synagogue should, architecturally, maintain the relatively high degree of spatial logic in which the purity laws play a governing role to divide the people into the several subgroups as replicated in the architectural
structure of the Temple courts. The deprived people such as the beggars, the blind, the captives, the oppressed, and the Gentiles, should have been marginalised in the synagogues, even if they were permitted access.\(^\text{40}\) In this context, Luke’s report of Jesus’ inaugural address in the synagogue is of paramount significance, since it challenges the rationale of the synagogue and the Temple by declaring that God’s favour rests upon the deprived and marginalised social groups. As the overall framework of the Gospel reveals that Jesus’ journey to the Jerusalem Temple represents its central part, Luke constructs this synagogue scene as a paradigmatic challenge to the Temple which employs the reality of territoriality to differentiate among the people of God. By launching his pervasive campaign of the inclusive salvation of God in the distant Temple court at his hometown of Nazareth, the Lukan Jesus inaugurates his successful challenge to the Temple, that is, his creation of a social space for the destitute. His synagogue message clearly represents that the synagogue should no longer be the boundary-making space, but boundary-breaking space.

From the honour-shame model, we can see this incident as an agonistic social interaction between Jesus and the synagogue adherents. Jesus first claims a social space for the destitute by declaring and announces his own honour, “Today this has been fulfilled in your hearing” (4.21). His opponents are overwhelmed by his claims at first, but soon respond by saying, “Is not this Joseph’s son?” (4.22). This question is absolutely a negative riposte, to imply that: “We know well who you are: the son of a menial family, and that your claims are all out of keeping with your proper place in the ascribed honour” (Rohrbaugh 1995). This means that he should not have told them this kind of world-overturning message, with its boundary-crossing consequences. Jesus would have known immediately that he had been insulted, and that a failure to respond would undermine every claim he would try to make.

So he offers a counter-riposte. First, he counter-attacks them by showing his ability to perceive what they are saying. A well-known maxim in antiquity, “Doctor, cure yourself!”(4.23), means the request of verification for honour which is relevant to

\(^{40}\) There is a verse in Juvenal (Sat.3.296) which implies beggars were allowed to enter the
his claim, rather than an appeal that one must not benefit others while refusing the same benefits to one’s own relations (Noorda 1982). This proverb is a request in form, but is understood to function almost as an insult (Plutarch Quo Ado, 32.71F). Second, they want him to prove his honour by doing in his hometown what he had done in Capernaum, of which Luke does not inform us before, but alludes to it later in Lk.4.31-37, where the other Galileans respond to him favourably. It implies that they would not respond to him in the same way. Thus Jesus tells them in an authentic tone (‘Αμήν) that no prophet is accepted in his native place (Lk.4.24). This means that though they want to see the honourable things, they do not know how much honour they were given when they were given the priority to hear God’s gracious words. In other words, they have no shame about their inability to understand what is honourable or not. Finally, Jesus highlights his counter-attack by offering the two examples of the Zarephath widow and Naaman (1Kgs.17-18 and 2Kgs.5), to whom God’s favour was given far beyond the native sons of Israel, to dishonour Israel’s exclusive claim to God’s favour and to create social space for those who have no claim to belong to the people of God. The townspeople in the synagogue know unmistakably that they have been insulted, and so they respond in a negative way, by driving him out of the synagogue and the town, and trying to kill him (4.29-30).

In this story, Luke shows that the social space of the synagogue, like that of the Temple, cannot tolerate the inclusive message of the salvation for the impure, nor allow them to share the social space. Luke deliberately places this incident as a kind of significant dress-rehearsal to inaugurate the public activity of Jesus, to reveal that Jesus’ ongoing ministry is to evangelise the deprived and marginalised social groups, and to create room for them in the space in which the Temple’s territoriality has exerted its centripetal and centrifugal social powers. And Jesus’ campaign begins in a distant Temple space oriented toward the central sanctuary, but his fate also is anticipated in the response of his home town synagogue adherents.
Luke shows that Jesus continues to worship on the Sabbath and establishes his custom of attending the synagogues each Sabbath (Lk.4.16), to work for his Nazareth manifesto. We will pass over the synagogue narratives in which Jesus heals the man who has an unclean spirit (4.31-37), and where he heals a man with a withered hand (6.6-11). We will choose the healing story of the crippled woman in the synagogue on the Sabbath (13.10-17) for several reasons: (1) This and some other narratives have similar features concerning the healing of the sick and/or the controversy over the Sabbath; (2) Our passage comes from Luke’s special source, and is Jesus’ final presence in the synagogue in the Gospel; (3) It is placed in the Lukan special section, the journey to Jerusalem (9.51-18.34).

While teaching in a synagogue on the Sabbath, Jesus encounters a woman with a spirit that had bound her to a crippling disease for eighteen years (13.10-11). This event provides the backdrop for an agonistic interrogation of Jesus by the synagogue-ruler. The Sabbath is at stake at the centre of the agonistic interaction. What is wrong with healing in the synagogue on the Sabbath? First, there is significant connection between the synagogue and the Sabbath. Lee Levine suggests that the synagogues emerged out of local gatherings at the city gate, which functioned as the primary civic centre in Near Eastern societies through the Persian period (1995). In these cultic sites at the gates, a local deity was invited to enter through the gates at the annual celebrations, and took up habitation in the Temple located in the city. So the gates were lesser sacred precincts surrounding a central cultic location (Barnett 1981). Based on these observations, we find two biblical examples of ‘inviting God into the Temple’, in Solomon’s dedication of the Temple (Ps.24.7) and in Ezra’s Torah-reading ceremony, which took place at the Water Gate in Jerusalem at the renewal of Sukkoth (Neh.8-10; Binder 1997:382). The Sukkoth ceremony especially was subsequently performed every seven years, first at the Water Gate and then within the Temple courts (1Esdr.9.38; Ant.11.154-58).

Correspondingly, the Hellenisation of Palestinian cities led to the shift of the central civic centre from the gates to the agoras. In Jerusalem, the central agora was
constructed in the Temple courts, with the architectural addition of stoas to the Temple edifice, and with the functional accretion to the Temple courts of all major civic activities. This shift in the movement of the local congregations from the city gates into synagogue buildings corresponds to the derivation of the Galilean synagogue architecture from the Court of Israel (Strange 1997). The local meeting every seventh day in the synagogues also corresponds to the Torah-reading ceremony held every seventh year by the national convocation in the Temple courts (Binder 1997:382). We have cited already Philo’s account of the Sabbath synagogue service, which centred upon a reading of the Law. Accordingly the Sabbath is an indispensable institution to provide the raison d'etre of the synagogue.

Second, the Sabbath enjoys a distinctive status and honour in the Jewish social-world. Sabbath-keeping and Jewish identity are one concept in Judaism. Even when attacked on the Sabbath, they refused to resist on this day (Ant.12.6.1; War. 2.17.20; 18.1; 1Macc.2.33-38; 2Macc.5.25 -26; Jub.50.13), and thus the observance of the Sabbath led to the exemption of Jews from military service (Ant.14.10.12). Israel’s observance of the Sabbath is understood to be a sign of its covenantal relationship with Yahweh (Deut.5.15; Ezek.20.12,20). In the Second Temple period, Sabbath regulations were articulated by scribes, who worked to spell out the duties of God’s people by defining the terms and limits of God’s revealed commands (Jub.2.29-30; 50.6-13; CD.10.14-11.18).

The author of Jubilees (150 BCE) delineates the Sabbath as an especially holy day to be observed only by Israelites and not made for any other people (2.30). He strongly maintains the death penalty for any transgression of the Sabbath regulations (2.25-27; cf. Exod.Rab.25.11; Deut.Rab.1.21). The Damascus Document (100 BCE), prescribes rigid Sabbath observances (6.18) to prohibit various areas of life: walking (10.21), eating (10.22), drinking (10.23), drawing water (11.2), voluntary fasting (11.4-5), opening of a sealed vessel (11.9), wearing of perfume (11.9-10), lifting of stone or dust at home (11.10b-11a), aiding a beast in birthing (11.13a), lifting an animal that has fallen into a pit (11.13-14), lifting a person who has fallen into a place full of water (11.16-17), and having sexual relations in the city of sanctuary (12.1).
These strict demands are similar to the Sabbath *halakah* of Judaism outside the community (cf. *Jub.* 50.6-13; Hasel 1992:854).

Problems arose when the prohibition of work on the Sabbath was perceived to conflict with other commands, or with considerations of practicality such as: cases of human life in danger (cf. 1Macc. 2.29-41), the Temple service (cf. Num. 28.9-10), and circumcision. The extent to which considerations of practicality were allowed to influence Sabbath regulations varied considerably with different interpreters, since questions of proper observance were a matter of interpretation. Accordingly, each group pressed the claims of its own interpretation to represent the will of God on others, though such claims were terrestrially unenforceable. But in the absence of a life-threatening situation, our scrupulous *archisynagogos* might well find cause for offence.

Bearing in mind these observations, we will see, from the honour-shame model, this story as the ongoing social interaction of Jesus with the synagogue authorities in relation to the Sabbath. One may look at this interaction in which Jesus undergoes a severe challenge to his established social honour as the synagogue-teacher which has been taken for granted throughout his ongoing synagogue activity (Malina & Neyrey 1991a:49-50). But our case is much more relevant when we see that Jesus challenges the taken-for-granted honour of the synagogue, which represents the collective social-value of the synagogue community, since Jesus provokes his opponents quite seriously. From this viewpoint of honour-competition, our story falls into the mode of negative challenge-riposte: (1) Jesus’ challenge to the synagogue’s honour in order to create the social space for his inclusive gospel (vv.12-13); (2) a counter-challenge by the synagogue-ruler (v.14); (3) Jesus’ riposte (vv.15-16); and (4) the public verdict which produces shame of Jesus’ opponents (v.17) (cf. Malina 1993a:34-37).
(1) Jesus’ Claim for Honour (vv.12-13)

When Jesus sees the woman in need, he takes the initiative for her restoration, and thus says, “Woman. You are set free from your infirmity (ἀποθεοτεῖσθαι)” (12b). Immediately, she recovers from illness and glorifies God, since the perfect passive, “ἀπολέλυσαν,” indicates divine release. In thinking of healing, modern readers are often misled by individualistic and scientific understanding, and disregard the cultural differences between us and the ancient Mediterranean (Pilch 1991: 182). In the ancient Mediterranean world, health is a state of complete fortune, not the restoration of individual performance. In medical anthropology, while the concept, ‘disease,’ refers to individual biomedical abnormalities in the structure or function of one’s physiological system, the concept, ‘illness,’ refers to a socio-cultural perception of certain socially devalued states. For example, leprosy is not simply the modern Hansen’s Disease, but rather some kind of repellent skin condition with negative social consequences, so it is an illness. When an intervention affects an illness, that activity is called “healing”, while therapy as “curing” can have an effect on disease, which is rare in Luke-Acts (Pilch 1991:190-92). One’s illness has a paramount influence on one’s kin or fictive group (cf. Lk.7.11-16; Ac.16.24), as well as on one’s social network (cf.Ac.3.1ff.). Healing essentially involves the provision of social meaning for one’s life problem that accompanies human misfortunes. So all illness needs to be healed. Moreover, spirit-possession, like our woman, is a serious social illness, by which means she is socially devalued and marked off by her group.

In the Gospel, Jesus’ ‘licence to practise’ as a folk-healer, is tacitly granted and acknowledged by each local community. Jesus generally has no social power in his social-world (Malina 1986:83), but power to heal the spirit-possessed illness is the capacity to produce social value based on what is necessary for the group’s fortune (Pilch 1991:198). Having noticed the woman, Jesus strategically heals her. Due to her serious illness, not only would she have suffered physically, but she would also have been excluded from social involvement in normal synagogue worship and Temple sacrifices. Surely she would not have been regarded as a daughter of Abraham. But Jesus deliberately heals her physical and social illness on the Sabbath, even though he is teaching in the synagogue. This healing activity is strategically
aimed at generating new social values by which Jesus challenges established values, in order to create his new social group according to his messianic programme (Lk.4.18-19). Her glorifying God is a sign of honour for God’s messenger.

(2) Counter-Challenge by the Synagogue-Ruler (v.14)

Luke’s reader cannot not fail to expect the counter-challenge from the synagogue-ruler (ἀρχισυνάγωγος), whose basic task is to see to the physical arrangement of the worship service and to deal with any disturbance to the worship order. His irritation emerges when he says to the crowd that healing has to be done on six days of the week, but not on the Sabbath. His words mean that the sacred Sabbath worship in synagogue should not be desecrated by such healing activity. Here we need to read between the lines. First, his saying is directed towards the crowd, but not to Jesus or the woman. As the representative of the synagogue members, he calls for collective support to dishonour the challenger, who seriously breaks the established synagogue order of the Sabbath. This is because a public verdict is decisive in an honour contest. Second, he implicitly blames the woman who abruptly comes into the synagogue on the Sabbath: she might have not qualified to attend the synagogue Sabbath worship. Having perceived Jesus’ challenge in the healing activity, he now reacts, seeking to put Jesus to shame, by upholding the honourable status of the Sabbath in order to prevent the defilement of the synagogue’s sacred space.

(3) Jesus’ Riposte (vv.15-16)

Against his counter-challenge, Jesus responds sternly, “You hypocrites!” and attacks these who loose (λύει) their animals from the manger on the Sabbath, but do not allow a daughter of Abraham to be set free (λύθην) from Satanic bondage. In the two previous Sabbath controversies in Lk.6.1-11, Luke designates Jesus as “Lord (Κύριος) of the Sabbath,” and subsequently reminds us of his antithetic question, “is it legitimate (ξεκατερίνω) to do good or to do harm on the Sabbath, to save life or to destroy it?”(Lk.6.9). This is in order to indicate that man-made halakah should not rule on the
Sabbath, but rather that the Lord of the Sabbath determines the true meaning of the Sabbath. Although different in content and context, Luke leads his reader to bear in mind that our story is one incident of a continuous agonistic competition of honour over the Sabbath matter. The labelling “hypocrites” is a peculiarly powerful insult in ripostes. In an honour-laden world, “hypocrisy” is considered a constant plague, since people continually deceive others by hiding their inner evil thoughts behind a facade of orthopraxis (Lk. 6.42; 12.1, 56; 13.15). They are like actors (literally ὄποκριτάκες), who shed their authentic selves to play another role. The Lukan Jesus defines his opponents’ objection as a hypocritical act by noting that while loosing their domestic animals to lead them to drinking water, they do not unbind a daughter of Abraham, who has been “bound” for eighteen long years by satanic affliction.

The Sabbath activities of Jesus in the synagogue are neither hurtful provocations nor mere protests against Rabbinic halakah, but are part of Jesus’ essential proclamation of the inbreaking of the divine rule, in which God’s subjects enjoy the original blessing of the Sabbath such as rest, joy, shalom, salvation, and sovereignty, on the recurring, weekly, proleptic “day of the Lord.” Accordingly, the Sabbath healing of Jesus indicates repeatedly that Jesus restores the Sabbath so as to set it free from any distorting religious traditions, which perpetuate chronic social infirmity. The woman is healed, not only from her disability, but also from her social illness, to enjoy God’s favour on the Sabbath. But the synagogue reveals its hypocrisy by seeking to prevent her from enjoying the Sabbath as the true divine instrument to untie social bonds, because of its sacred nature as a distant Temple space.

(4) Public Verdict (v. 17)

Finally, Luke records that Jesus’ opponents are said to have been shamed (κατασχυνωντο), while the public verdict endorses the successful challenge of Jesus in the crowd’s delighting in the glorious happening (ἐνδόξως). Glory (δόξα) has a similar semantic meaning in this culture to honour (τιμή). Luke clearly distinguishes the crowd from Jesus’ opponents in the synagogue congregation. This means that the
archisynagogos' call for support fails and a social space for the gospel is sanctioned by the public verdict.

In this episode, Luke describes Jesus’ successful campaign to create social space for deprived and marginalised people in the synagogue space. Jesus strategically delegitimises the synagogue’s social values relating to the Sabbath so as to produce his own authentic social values for his social group. This synagogue activity of Jesus shows the inefficiency of the synagogue as God’s salvific instrument in its failure to give God’s liberating sabbath (נְוֵי, Deut.5.15) on the Sabbath day to people released from satanic power.

3. Jesus’ Criticism of the Synagogue

Jesus’ allusion to the synagogue discipline (Lk.12.11; 21.12) and his severe criticism towards the Pharisees and the scribes, who prefer to sit at the honourable places in synagogues (Lk.11.43; 20.46), are not aimed at the specific local synagogues, but at the community in general. We may deduce from these passages the general stamp of the synagogue on Luke’s community. Unlike Mark, who records only one criticism of the scribes (12.39), Luke reports Jesus’ criticism towards Pharisees and scribes, who love to have the seats of honour (πρωτοκαθεδριάς) in the synagogues (Lk.11.43; Lk.20.46). Although “πρωτοκαθεδριάς” is literally “first seats”, the translators of the NRSV appreciate well its cultural context when they translate it as “the seat of honour.” While we have no evidence to illustrate such a seat in the synagogues, later Rabbinic literature connects it with the rabbis (Str-B.1.382, 915-18). The knowledge we gain from this discourse is that not only the market-place and the dining room but also the synagogue would have been important arenas for social interaction in which significant honour competition occurred. Jesus tells us how the synagogues are exploited by the Jewish leadership to elevate their social status. His pejorative expressions of “woe” and “beware” towards the Pharisees and scribes can be understood as considerable criticism of synagogues, which have been transformed, unfortunately, from honourable and sacred locus for the
words of God into shameful and 'secular' places for honour-competition by the Jewish leadership.

The two exhortations to fearless confession when they are questioned before the synagogues and the administrative authorities (Lk.11.43; 21.12) show that the synagogue has been stamped as an institution opposed to the ministry of Jesus (4.28-9; 6.1-11; 13.10-17) and the Christian witnesses (Ac.6.9; 9.2; 22.19; 26.11). So Luke comprehends not only that synagogues do not acknowledge, but also persecute the Gospel. Their genuine raison d'être is exploited by their leadership, who divert it into the maintenance of their social status.

IV. PAUL'S SYNAGOGUE ACTIVITY IN ACTS

In Paul's synagogue missionary activity, it is an interesting irony to find that the challenger (the persecutor) becomes the challenged (the persecuted). Paul confesses his persecuting activity against Christ-followers to Jesus—"I imprisoned and beat (φυλακίζω καὶ δέρων) those who believed in you, throughout synagogues" (Ac.22.19)—and to Agrippa in the court—"In all the synagogues I tried to force them to blaspheme (ἡνίκα ἐζητο θαλασφημεῖν)" (Ac.26.11). His persecution aims to put Christ and his followers to shame by making them commend an act of blasphemy that is a major public insult to their honour. After the conversion on the road to Damascus, his campaign against the Christ movement is radically and immediately transformed into service to honour Christ by proclaiming in the synagogues in Damascus that Jesus is the Son of God and the Messiah (Ac.9.20-22). The Damascus Jews are bewildered by Paul and then they plot to kill him (9.23). This aspect of Paul's activity in the Damascus synagogues is Luke's epitome of the subsequent synagogue ministry of Paul. In the following missionary activity of the Lukan Paul, the synagogue is the primary platform for creating social space for Christ, but it is also the place where he faces persecution. Like Jesus, the pattern of ministry—proclamation on the Sabbath in synagogues leading to opposition or rejection—is repeatedly witnessed in Ac.13.14-52; 14.1-7; 17.1-9; 17.10-15; 18.4-7; 19.8-10.
Among his synagogue activities, we will discuss the incident in Pisidian Antioch in detail, because it provides us with important information about the important substance of the Lukan Paul's synagogue message. Then we shall survey the other stories in brief, which illustrate Paul's strategy to win the God-fearers in the synagogues and to establish the house-churches to replace the synagogues.

1. Synagogue at Pisidian Antioch (Ac.13.14-52)

In comparison with other synagogue narratives, Luke gives considerable space to characterise Paul's synagogue message to the Jews and God-fearers in Ac. 13.14-52. Like the Nazareth synagogue incident, it features the following: (a) the first substantial speech of Paul which makes intelligible the nature of his ongoing synagogue mission, and (b) his first rejection by the synagogue community. From the honour-shame model, we can divide the whole narrative as follows: (a) Paul's claim (vv. 13-43); (b) the challenge by the Jews (vv. 44-45); (c) Paul's riposte (vv. 46-48); (d) the public verdict (vv. 48-49); (e) the Jews' counter challenge (vv. 50-52); (f) Paul's positive rejection (vv. 51-52).

(1) Paul's Claim (vv. 13-41)

Assuming Paul's social status to be that of an honourable teacher, Luke prepares the synagogue setting for Paul's speech. In this period, the regular procedure of synagogue worship seems to have been as follows: (a) the recitation of the Shema; (b) the saying of the prayer (the Tephillah); (c) the reading of the Torah and the Prophets; and (d) an exposition or homily (cf. m. Ber. 1.4; 4.3; 3.5; Str-B.IV.153-88). Following this pattern, Paul delivers his first speech, which involves his entering the social space of the synagogue and his attempt to win corporate honour for Christ-followers.
As a whole, the speech is structured in three parts: (a) a recital of salvation history (vv. 16b-25); (b) a proclamation of the Christ-event to contemporary Jews (vv. 26-37); (c) the concluding exhortation to believe in Jesus for the forgiveness of sins and justification (vv. 38-41) (Pesch 1986: 30-31). The designation of the audience—Israelites (v. 16), brothers (vv. 26, 38)—indicates that the speech is directed to both Israel and God-fearers, to embrace them equally in one group, by emphasising the continuity of Israel’s glorious past and the openness to the Gentiles. Their designations are changed during the narrative from: “you Israelites and God-fearers” (v. 16), to: “my brothers and God-fearers” (v. 26), and finally to: “my brothers” (v. 38), to signify their invitation to enter salvation-history in Jesus. Evoking the emotional identifications of the audiences step by step, the speech is deliberately elaborated to create the sense of belonging to the social group, which is newly created by Jesus Christ.

In the first step (vv. 16-25), Paul first recalls Israel’s election as the people of God and her deliverance from Egypt so as to exalt the Diaspora Jew’s pedigreed social identity vis-à-vis the dominant Gentile group. Then he attempts to incorporate the two social groups into one privileged social identity: as the renewed covenant people of God in Jesus Christ (vv. 16-19). As soon as possible, the speech introduces David from whom he is able to make a direct leap to Jesus (v. 23), in whom God’s salvific acts in Jewish history have reached their climax. All this constitutes a positive challenge to achieve some share in the social space of the synagogues or to gain a beneficial foothold (Malina 1993a: 35).

In the second step (vv. 26-37), the title “You Israelites” becomes “my brothers.” The change corresponds to the historical overview of the Jewish synagogue community, to which Paul himself has belonged while the God-fearers have remained on the fringe. Here, Paul deliberately draws the two distinctive social groups together,
to participate in the history of the Christ-event in which the salvation of God has been fulfilled in the person and ministry of Jesus, through his vocation as the messenger of God (v.26b), his condemnation by the Jerusalem leadership (vv.27-29), and his resurrection (vv.30-37). In doing so, Paul employs three prophecies as the main proof texts of the divine action which raised Jesus from the dead (Ps.2.7; Isa.55.3; Ps.16.10). Paul, however, does not call them “my brothers” (v.38b) until he introduces the Christ-event. To call them “brothers” at the junction of the Christ-event is potentially to challenge the synagogue community. By referring to the God-fearers as ‘Brothers’, Paul lets them experience the considerable social power of the gospel since it is probable that they would not have been called brothers by Jews (see chap.3.VI.3).

In the final step (vv.38-41), Paul proclaims the forgiveness of sins and the justification by faith through Jesus, which the Law of Moses was unable to give (v.38-39). This is the climax of Paul’s speech. The language, of justification and faith in Christ, certainly echoes the prominent basic message of Paul in his letters to the Galatians and Romans; but the speech as a whole is quite far from Paul in the letters, since there he would more typically have spoken of deliverance from the power of sin, or of freedom from the Law itself (cf. Rom.6.7; 8.2-3; cf. Vielhauer 1966:41-42). This is the only time in Acts when Paul’s teaching about justification by faith is mentioned. But it is unjustifiable simply to assume that the way Paul addresses Christians in his letters would be exactly identical to the way he would address non-Christians in his missionary preaching. As a typical conclusion in the Acts speech (2.38; 5.31; 10.43), rather than in the Pauline letters, the calls for repentance are awkwardly introduced in an intriguing form:

(a) the forgiveness of sins through Jesus (v.38a).
(b) the inability of the Mosaic Law to give justification (v.38b).
(a’) justification by faith in Jesus (v.39).

referring to holy things and the further text referring to the holy one are allowed to interact (Johnson 1992:238).
The forgiveness of sins (a) is a prominent Lukan way of expressing an effect of the Christ-event which is absent in Paul's uncontested letters (but cf. Col.1.14; Eph.1.7). This is consciously linked with justification by the contrast between the Law of Moses (b) and faith in Jesus (a') (Fitzmyer 1998:508), and then line (b) is further emphasised by these two antithetical lines, (a) and (a'). In structuring the Lukan Paul's speech in this form, Luke intends to provide the Law of Moses in a cameo place, in order to indicate its inability to gain salvation for the Jews and the God-fearers. This is a way of putting forward a challenge which seeks to dislodge the Law from its social space in the synagogue, as well as a claim to introduce the gospel into that space. The speech could have finished at this point. An unusual note of warning against disregard for the message in a quotation from Hab.1.5 (vv.40-41), is an additional challenge aimed at enhancing the social status of the gospel in the synagogue.

(2) Challenge of Jews (vv.42-45)

In vv.42-43, while the people urge Paul to speak the message (ρήματα ταῦτα), Paul instead persuades Jews and the proselytes to continue in the grace of God. And on the next Sabbath, if Luke does not exaggerate, almost the whole city gathers to hear the Word (λόγον τοῦ κυρίου; v.44). Given the Jews' more typical hostile response to Paul's preaching elsewhere (cf. 9.22-23, 29; 14.19; 17.5,13; 18.6), the response here is strikingly positive. We may assume that Paul's words are sanctioned by the public, and that his mission to create a social space for the gospel in the synagogue is successfully accomplished. We should note, however, that from the onset of his speech, Paul distinguishes the synagogue congregations into two groups, Israelites and God-fearers; and from the next Sabbath meeting, Jews are represented as Paul's opponents, while Gentiles are the receivers of the Word of God. If so, it is quite awkward that many Jews and proselytes simply followed the missionaries. To solve this, we need to look at the junction between the people (v.42) and Jews/proselytes (v.43); and question why Paul persuades them to continue in the grace of God. Although the word "followed (ηκολοοθησαυ)" is a standard expression used for "to follow Jesus" in the Gospel (5.11; 9.11; 22.39), the appearance of the exhortation
"continue in the grace of God" is not a typical Lukan pattern, since it usually appears in the farewell greetings in Acts (14.26; 15.40; 20.32). Therefore, v. 43 is an indication that the Jews interrogate the missionaries about their message, and then the missionaries persuade them to accept the continuity of the divine grace that was revealed in Jesus. This interpretation makes sense of the subsequent opposition of the Jews (v. 45).

The Jews, who see the crowds in the synagogue, were filled with jealousy (ἐπιθυμησαν ζηλου) and talked contradictorily (ἀντέλεγον) and blasphemously (βλασφημοῦντες) about what was spoken by Paul. These three words of "zeal", "contradicted" and "blaspheming" are all potential weapons used in the negative action of the challengers (Malina 1993a: 38). The word, "ζηλος," is an extremely negative word, which is used to express the opposing of God's will in Ac. 5.17; 7.9; 17.5; 21.20; 21.20; 22.13. The word, "ἀντίλεγον," is used five times in Luke-Acts to refer to: those who were opposed to the Baptist's sign (Lk. 2.34); Sadducees, who were opposed to the resurrection (Lk. 20.27); Jews who were opposed to Paul (Ac. 28.19) and Christianity, which was spoken against everywhere (Ac. 28.22). The word, "βλασφημέω," is an expression frequently used against Christ and his followers by Jews in many instances in Luke-Acts (Lk. 5.21, 12.10, 22.65, 23.39, Ac. 6.11, 13.45, 18.6, 19.37, 26.11). There is no doubt, therefore, that Luke employs these words to give a standard picture of Jewish opposition. It is also an irony that Jews had zealously contradicted, with blasphemous attitudes, the Word of the Lord in the synagogue, where they should zealously have submitted with attitudes of veneration to the Word, which was spoken to them weekly.

(3) Paul's Riposte (vv. 46-47)

Paul's denunciation appears in the context of a bitter dispute over Israel's identity, and over its relation to the Gentiles. Having been insulted by the Jews' blasphemy, Paul sternly says to them that they are themselves judged unworthy of eternal life (13.46). Rejecting Paul's mission, they are opposed by God, who sends his servant to the Gentiles to whom light and salvation are brought (Isa. 13.47; 49.6). It is
a serious insult to be judged to be unworthy of eternal life. In addition, the turning to
the Gentiles significantly shames them, since it means that they are judged to be
irrelevant to the grace of God. Their social identity as the people of God has been
irretrievably rejected. They have been grossly dishonoured. It is a typical Lukan
pattern to express the negative result of Paul’s mission in synagogues: ‘as the Jews
reject it, Paul turns to the Gentiles in consequence, and the Gentiles receive it’ (13.45-
48; cf. Rom. 1.16; 9.24; 10.12). We may not assume that Paul permanently turns his
back on his fellow Jews and goes exclusively to the Gentiles, but it is the Jewish
rejection of Paul’s mission which forces him to keep moving into new territory, as
God overrules human animosity to achieve his richer purpose (cf. 2.23; Dunn

(4) Public Verdict (vv.48-49)

Luke reports that the Gentiles (probably God-fearers) are glad and praised
(εὐδοκαζον) the Word of the Lord, and contrasts how the two ethnically distinguishable
groups respond to the Gospel. In the agonistic competition of honour, the gospel is
upheld, and Paul wins over many. The Word spreads throughout the region.

(5) The Jews’ Counter-Challenge (v.50)

The game is not finished yet. The Jewish community in Pisidian Antioch in
Luke’s presentation at least, though a minority ethnic group, was considerably
influential in the surrounding society and its tradition and practice were not easily to
be despised, or ignored. This is seen in several points: that (1) news of what had
happened in the synagogue quickly spread across the whole city and attracted crowds,
presumably to the same place; (2) the God-fearing women were of high standing in
that city; and (3) the local Jews were able to incite the leading citizens. It is not so
much Paul’s message which caused the offence to the bulk of Jews in the city, as the
surprising appeal of the Jews to Antiochene urban society, which feared an untried
and untested new sect upsetting and undermining the good standing and good
relations which the Jewish community had established for itself within the city. Jews mobilised their social power through their patronage networks to drive Paul out of their territory and to cut off the roots of the gospel, which seriously threatened the social status of the synagogue.

(6) Paul's Positive Reaction (vv.51-52)

Having been rejected, Paul and his companions show an action of “shaking the dust off their feet in the protest against them.” It is Jesus’ injunction in Lk.10.11 which signifies a responsibility to disown their fellow Jews who had rejected the Word of the Lord. It is a way of symbolising the severance of all association with Jews. Ancient Jews returning to Palestine from pagan territory were expected to do the same (Str-B.I.571). It is a new kind of purity law, which was modified by the Christian missionaries in order to delineate the parting line between those who accepted the good news, and those who opposed it.

2. The God-Fearers’ Response to the Gospel.

As in the Gospel, the synagogue in Acts also shows its inability to accommodate the salvation of God through Jesus. Having been challenged to create social space for the gospel, it has consistently rejected Paul’s mission. Yet Luke also reports the warm response of the God-fearers to Paul’s mission in synagogues, to link the Christian missionaries and the Gentiles to form the Christian community.

In Philipii, Paul meets Lydia, the Thyatiran purple dealer and God-fearer, in the προοδευτή, outside the city gate by the river Gangites (16.14). She is baptised with her household, and then provides Paul and his companions with a dwelling place as the platform from which Paul could launch his missionary activity to the city. In Thessalonika, Paul visits the synagogue on the Sabbath and interrogates the Jews from the scriptures, to prove that suffering and resurrection are the necessary determinants to prove the Messiah (17.2-3). His argument wins many God-fearers and high-
standing women (17.4). Thereafter, we may see the jealous reaction of the Jews (vv.5ff). In Beroea, Paul succeeds in convincing a considerable number of high standing Gentiles among the synagogue congregations (17.10-12). In Corinth, Paul also enters into a synagogue to argue that the Messiah is Jesus (18.5). Although these interactions are in a similar pattern to that of Pisidian Antioch, it is remarkable that Paul wins not only the God-fearer, Titius Justus (18.7), but also the ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων, Crispus and Sosthenes (18.8, 17).

From our brief survey, we may make several observations of Luke’s presentation of Paul’s mission. First, most, if not all, the God-fearers have relatively high social standing in their society: the anonymous God-fearers in Pisidian Antioch (13.50), Thessalonika (17.4), and Beroea (17.12), Lydia (16.14), Titus Justus (18.7). Luke’s portrayal of their social status is well supported by inscriptive evidence (Klauck 1981:32f). Kuhn and Stegemann have found that one God-fearer belonged to the Roman equestrian rank, from their examination of some 731 inscriptions. They concluded that in the Hellenistic Diaspora, the God-fearers’ social status was proportionally higher than that of the proselytes who, for the most part, came from the lowest strata of the society, such as slaves (1966-67). The Aphrodisias inscription also attests to the fact that nine of the God-fearers were city councillors, which indicates that the Jews attracted wealthy people, inasmuch as this office implied heavy financial obligations and that they, as benefactors, contributed to the synagogue community’s programme to build up a community soup kitchen (Reynolds & Tannenbaum 1987:5-7). At Pisidian Antioch, Luke records the turning-point in Jewish relations with their well-disposed Gentile neighbours, who provided the security for their status and a certain social stability.

Second, the synagogue community perceived the Christian mission to the God-fearers as a serious threat to their social network with the surrounding society. Levinskaya rightly points out that the conversion of God-fearers would have been seen as a serious threat to the stability of various Jewish communities in the Diaspora, if they were of some social status and had provided the key social stabilising link between Jews and Greco-Roman society (1996:117-126). In the Pauline mission-fields, the God-fearers are portrayed as having close relations with Jews in frequenting
their synagogues. They are the first group among Gentiles to hear the Christian message, and they often, but not always, show themselves to be very receptive to it. In the Lukan picture, they are either the backbone of the Christian communities, or a serious detriment to the spread of Christian mission. Before the Christian mission, in the course of centuries of living among the Gentiles, the Jews had achieved a certain status. Now it is abruptly challenged by Paul, who is aiming at success among people whose social links with the Jewish community have secured Jewish life in the Gentile milieu. The Jewish community is forced to take measures to fight for its influence over the God-fearers. As a response to the Christian mission, the Jews intensify relations with their sympathisers. Martin Goodman finds evidence of a Jewish mission to win gentile sympathisers in the first-century though the intensity of this mission varied from place to place throughout the period (1994: 87). Such an effort to win the God-fearers is a significant indication of the extent to which the Christian gospel was intruding upon the social space of the synagogues and then dislodging them from the sacred space of the synagogue by incorporating them into a Christian group. Even more, conversion of the ἄρχωνάγωγοι such as Crispus and Sosthenes at Corinth would have had a tremendous impact on the synagogue community, signifying a considerable loss of honour in the honour-competition with the Christian missionaries.

Third, why are the God-fearers in Acts attracted to the Christian message and away from the synagogue community? Esler investigates the modus operandi of the God-fearers' incorporation into the Christian community in the context of their experiences of the Jerusalem Temple, and suggests that, as a marginalised group which stands on the boundary of Judaism, they are dissatisfied with the Temple sacrificial system. The encounter with the Christian gospel offers them instead a sense of belonging to the people of God (1987: 154-159). We have argued that the synagogue architecturally and functionally acted as a distant Temple precinct in the Diaspora as shown for example that the earliest phase of the Ostia synagogue had some affinities with the Galilean-type synagogues in terms of its row of columns between benches against the wall (Binder 1997: 266). Although there was no fence in the first-century synagogue like the Soreg in the Temple, we may assume that if the synagogue architecturally adopted the Court of Israel in the Temple, there was also
some divider to differentiate the God-fearers from the Jews, since they are not fully incorporated into the Jewish synagogue community. The centripetal force of the sacred institution would have generated ambivalent attitudes to the Temple and synagogues among the God-fearers. On the one hand, they revered the God of Judaism to a considerable degree, and they visited the Temple or offered the sacrifices or contributed to the local Jewish community as patrons or benefactors. On the other hand, they were institutionally marginalised in the synagogues to the extent that they stood on the boundary of Judaism (Goodman 1994:86-87). How would they have felt in the weekly synagogal worship? Unlike their Gentile society, in the synagogue they would have been graded as second-class citizens. In their ongoing participation in synagogue worship, they would have repeatedly perceived the illegitimacy of their social status.

Viewed from the perspective of inter-group relations, their sense of belonging to the synagogue community would have been quite different from the Jews in terms of all three dimensions: cognitive, evaluative, and emotional (Tajfel 1978:28). Their social identity as a group would have been unstable. As far as the God-fearers stood on the boundary of Judaism, they would have perceived their illegitimacy in status, power, and domination, a perceived illegitimacy which would have involved “group members’ perceptions of unjust and unfair relations between their own and other group(s)—in the way groups view and respond to one another”(Caddick 1982:137). A combination of illegitimacy and instability in status relations between groups would become a powerful incitement for an attempt to change the intergroup status quo (Tajfel 1978:52). In such a state of perceived inferiority, their hearing the Christian message provided not only the distinctive sense of belonging to the renewed covenantal people of God through Jesus without the differentiation of status, which was maximised in the participation of Christian table fellowship, but also supplied momentum for social mobility, in which, “pursuing...a movement from lower to higher status, one is simply to leave their group and join the other” (Esler 1998:50-51). When they have willingly followed Paul from the synagogue after encountering the gospel, the Christian message for salvation to the Gentiles (Ac.13:38-39) would have been undoubtedly perceived as their effective cognitive alternative to synagogue membership. The gospel did not require the observance of various distinctive Jewish
ethnic regulations such as circumcision, Sabbath observance, and sacrifices. This Christian message provided the momentum for social mobility.

The members of Luke's community probably experienced exclusion from the Temple and the synagogues, although the former institution no doubt became less significant in this respect the later Acts was written after 70 CE. This experience would have been salient for the God-fearers who predominated in his community. Possibly, Luke also came from this group and converted to the Christian church from out of the synagogue. The bitter experiences in the Temple and the synagogues might have provided an important motive in his negative portrayal of the synagogues. After conversion to the gospel, they would have contributed to the newly formed social group: for example, by providing hospitality for Christian missionaries and Christian travellers from other cities, or by becoming influential patrons and benefactors for the establishment of the Christian house churches.

V. CONCLUSION.

As a form of subsidiary Temple space, the synagogues in Luke-Acts refused to allow the Gospel to enter their social space. So Luke's overall picture of the synagogue is delineated with gloomy colours, since the pattern of challenge-rejection dominates in his portrayal. Why does Luke pessimistically view the synagogue in the development of earliest Christianity? Luke focuses on the synagogue as the place of worship on the Sabbath for his readers. From our architectural viewpoint, its social logic of space is non-distributive and serves to uphold the Temple-oriented purity law and the Sabbath regulations to a relatively high degree. The synagogues institutionally exclude impure people, the socially marginalised and deprived, from their space. So it could not accommodate the inclusive message of the gospel in which the inclusive salvation of God creates the social space for those who have been excluded from the Temple and synagogue. For Luke, however, the synagogue does play a positive role in one respect: it is a forum in which the Christ followers recruit the God-fearers, who then play an important role in establishing the social network for the Christian group while the gospel is taking root in the Gentile world. The
synagogue's spatial logic is in fact irrelevant to the Christian group in assisting them to maintain and legitimise their social identity. Its irrelevance points to another space, the house, to which we will now turn.
VI. FIGURES

Fig. 4.1. Plan of the Delos Synagogue (Bruneau & Ducat GD 80).
A/B: Assembly Hall separated by a dividing-wall with three portals.
C: the remains of a portico framed by an 18 m long stylobate upon which columns rested. Two stylobates (b & c) are probably the remains of stairs leading to the portico.
D: a complex of chambers.
Fig. 4.2. Reconstruction of the first-century synagogue at Ostia (Rutgers 1996:76).
Fig. 4.3. Plan of the Masada synagogue (Netzer 1989:207).
Loc.1042: An assembly hall with rows of benches lining the walls.
Loc.1043: A chamber used for either the residence of an attending priest or a Genizah in which the fragments of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel were found buried in the pits.
A triclinium was converted to the synagogue for the Zealots with the addition of benches on four sides.
Fig. 4.5. Plan of the Gamala synagogue (Gutman & Rapel 1994:101).
Loc. 1001 & 1002: An assembly hall.
Loc. 1004-1006, 1008-1009: Benches with platforms at the top.
Loc. 1010: A study room.
Loc. 1020: Exedra.
Loc. 1060: Mikveht.
CHAPTER FIVE:
HOUSE IN LUKE-ACTS

How does Luke portray the house? Do its architectural features have an essential relevance to the distinctive features of the gospel and the Christian group? Why does Luke almost exclusively use family imagery in the house setting to express the gospel and Christian community, which is not used in relation to the Temple and synagogue? How important are house and family for the social identity of the early Christian group? What sort of factors in his community’s experience might have been rendered in these pictures? To answer these questions, we will proceed in the following order: (1) the theoretical framework of house and family in the Mediterranean; (2) the social reality of the house in ancient Mediterranean society; (3) the Christian house-churches in the Pauline communities for a comparison with Lukan pictures of house-churches; (4) an overview of the characteristic themes and a detailed exegesis of the Lukan texts.

I. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE ON THE HOUSE AND FAMILY

From the beginning, the early Christian groups had interacted with the dominant outgroups, Judean and Gentile, thus provoking group conflict which either leads to a strong or a weak sense of belonging (Tajfel 1978:39). In a group-oriented society, one’s sense of social identity is indispensably related to group membership by which one redefines who one is or is not (Malina 1993a:63-89; cf. Brown 1988:192-200). This sense of belonging to a group has three dimensions: (a) ‘cognitive’-simple recognition of belonging to a group; (b) ‘evaluative’-positive or negative assessments of belonging; (c) ‘emotional’-attitudes towards insiders and outsiders of the group (Tajfel 1978:28). In this respect, we would expect that no group would play a more primary role in establishing one’s sense of belonging than family in the powerfully collective and agonistic Mediterranean society, in which, without the family, one is less than nothing (Grunlan and Mayers 1979:184-5). In this society family is the primary social institution, through which people enter into social life, by which
wealth, social status, honour were transmitted, and in which the individual finds support, solidarity and protection (Garnsey and Saller 1991:151-2). The Christian group is marked by kinship logic and precepts, and creates a sense of social identity through the use of family imagery like father, son, brethren, house-church, and fictive kinship (Esler 1997).

How does this social matrix—house and family—play a part in the intergroup relations with Judeans and Gentiles? The Christian groups we meet in the New Testament have neither a central temple, local shrines, nor images of gods. Their meeting place is the humble house. They have no institutional rituals like sacrifices, circumcision, or festivals like Passover, and have no power and influence in a society vis-à-vis dominant outgroups. In these social circumstances, we would expect them strategically to respond to their position through group differentiation which effectively attacks the basis for perceived inferiority (Tajfel 1978:67-76). Side-stepping the main dimensions of group comparison, their potential group strategy would be the assertion that true positive values are the antithesis of those espoused by the dominant group (Brown 1988:250-1), by affirming and inverting the social values of family and house to express the Kingdom of God, and re-valuing their own rituals like baptism and eucharist that create and solidify the members as united by fictive kinship. And they would modify or reinvent the existing social norms embedded in the pivotal value of honour, the patronage system, and reciprocity at the economic level, to create, maintain, and legitimise their social identity.

The Christian communities in the New Testament period came together as heterogeneous groups consisting of people of different social status, ethnic origins, and gender through missionary activities. Gentiles typically belonged to voluntary associations (collegia, thiasoi, philosophiai), which displayed social homogeneity to some degree, as bound by a type of fictive kinship under patrons. They usually had their own building for regular meetings, which was separated from the members' houses (Wilson 1996; Duling 1995:162-64). Gathering in houses and incorporating members from different social strata, early Christians displayed the social dynamic of family life, through conjunction of numerous strands of fictive family imagery which
provided a rich sense of family, thus powerfully contributing to the socialisation of the new believers into the Christian group (Esler 1997:136).

Religious conversion is sociologically characterised by a radical separation and incorporation into a new group, and it necessarily brings the converts into a process of radical socialisation, through which they fundamentally change their identity and modus vivendi (Berger & Luckmann 1967:149-182). In the process of conversion as a reconstruction of social identity, there is a fundamental need for an emotional dependence upon "significant others," who play a similar role to that of father or mother, holding a meaningful place in the group into which one is about to enter, and mediate a "plausibility structure" of a symbolic universe for the new social reality (Berger & Luckmann 1967:177-78). The social psychological perspective of reference-group theory emphasises that individuals develop a real or imagined reference group—an anchor for their sense of self and other—for constructive social relations in their socialisation and refer to that reference group when evaluating people, situations, and life-design (Sherif and Sherif 1969). The dynamic of reference group orientation involves an ongoing monitoring of one’s self-identity and the social group’s plausibility structure, with its symbolic universe, which routinises the social-world in which people act. In the process of a convert’s socialisation, the worth of the Christian fictive kinship group will be demonstrated by converts and, if it is plausible, it will effectively and powerfully play the role of reference group providing social identity as well as solidarity.

1. Family in Ancient Mediterranean Society

It may be risky to speak of ‘the family in antiquity’ in general terms, but the notion is serviceable if we make clear that we are working at a particular level of abstraction. In anthropological terms, family is not determined by biology, but is socially constructed in a social web of relations based on birth, either real or fictive, and marriage (Barnard 1994). A Tuscan village scribe defined family in physical terms: those who live “under the same roof,” or “all those who stay and sleep together in one and the same residence and who survive together on the same bread and wine.”
(Wallace-Hadrill 1994:92; cf. Cicero Off.1.54-55). This physical definition assumes the powerful authority of the *paterfamilias* and the harmony of family within the household members (Dixon 1991; 1992; cf. Plutarch, Mor.140D). Roman family members were not limited to the nuclear family but extended to the conjugated family, including the agnates and cognates of the *paterfamilias* as well as friendship, including slaves (Garnsey & Saller 1987:127-29; cf. Cicero Off.1.54-55; Ps.Aristotle, Oec.1.2.1-3; Theophrastus Oec.2). Thus the Roman family can be defined as “people living under the protection of the *paterfamilias*,” who provides social support and provision, whether it is the nuclear or conjugated, or the extended family. The *potestas* of the *paterfamilias* did not refer solely to his authority and power over the family, but also involved care and protection of the family members (Lassen 1992:258-260; Gielen 1990:146-158). For a man could not help everybody in a limited good society, and accordingly he had to concentrate upon parents, brothers, relatives, and close friends (Cicero Off.1.52-58; cf. Ps.Aristotle, Oec.3.4). These were fundamental factors to the converts in antiquity, who were also threatened or even abandoned, because of their adoption of Christian faith.

What kind of family-type did the early Christian group form? John Elliott is concerned with the connection between social estrangement and the Christian community as a home or a family in terms of the contrast between πάροικοι and the οἶκος of God (1993). However, this is more a theological construction than a social reality. Since Christian congregations normally developed from a household and grew through the conversion of neighbourhood, it seems natural to consider it a fictive kinship rather than a *familia Dei* (Sandnes 1994:37). The early Christians can be referred to using the anthropological term, a ‘fictive kinship,’ which is based not on blood-ties but on social relationship, to cite a later example, such as *compadrazgo* (godparenthood), established on the occasion of ritual observance, especially Christian baptism (Pitt-Rivers 1957-58; Nuitini & Bell 1980, 1984). In the face-to-face Mediterranean society, this relationship is used both to solidify social relationships horizontally among members of the same neighbourhood and social status and also to integrate the status structure by means of vertical ties between individuals in different socio-economic positions (Mintz and Wolf 1950). The alliance-building potential of godparenthood derives from the broader social pattern of patron-client relationship. A
variety of voluntary associations in Greco-Roman society established their fictive kinship through the patron-client relationship (see Kloppenborg and Wilson 1996), for which godparenthood offers an interesting comparison, though it only began to be practised in a later period.

New Testament scholars have frequently investigated the ideal of brotherhood as the characteristic of the early Christian community by sharply dividing between household as the patriarchal model and brotherhood as the egalitarian model (Schüssler-Fiorenza 1983; Schäfer 1989; Aasgaard 1997). But this view oversimplifies ancient family life in terms of potestas, authority and submissiveness and overlooks the role of household for belonging, social solidarity and hospitality. Presenting early Christianity as an egalitarian community can easily lead to an over-idealistic presentation of the life-pattern among believers by overlooking the social reality in the Christian community, which clearly presupposes an existing family structure. Modern notion of egalitarianism which have developed as a result of the French Revolution also tend to be anachronistically imposed on ancient data.

Karl Sandnes appropriately suggests that the ideal of friendship provides a more comprehensive concept of family (1997), since it gathers together the interrelationship between various family members such as parents, children, brothers, sisters, friends, and patron-client, to express the sense of belonging to family and social integration between them. Plutarch applies much of the friendship terminology to the family relationship between brothers (Frat. Amor. 2/479A; 5/480B; 19-20/490D-F), and between spouses (Amat. 21/767E; Conj. Praec. 20/140F). Aristotle describes basically two different types of friendship (Nic. Eth. 8-9): the friendship between equals and that between unequals. First, friendship between equals is based upon love but not expediency, and is fully expressed in the proverb, “amity is equality” (Nic. Eth. 8.5.5; 9.8.2), and is a verb, “living together” (Nic. Eth. 8.6.4; 9.10.3-4; Rh. 2.12.13). Friends spent their time together involved in activities such as “eating at the same table (ὑμοτραπέτων), drinking libations together, and lodging under the same roof (ὑμοφωφίων)” (Strabo Geog. 9.3.5). There is no marked difference between being a friend and a family-member because one ought to consider the household and relatives of a friend as one’s true kinsmen (Stobaeus Anth. 4.27.4).
Second is the friendship between unequals. This friendship refers to relationships between members of a household (Ps. Aristotle, Oec. 1.3; see Hands 1968:26-48; Bolkestein 1967:157-162) and between people of different social standing. This is a friendship of utility and pleasure (Nic. Eth. 8.12.7), based not on love but mutual gain that springs from opposites (Nic. Eth. 8.3.1-3). Having utility and pleasure as motives, the principle of this friendship is a balanced reciprocity based on the principle of “giving for a return” (Millet 1989:37-43), and may degenerate into complaints: “the superior should receive the larger share of honour, the needy one the larger share profit” (Nic. Eth. 8.14.2; Cicero Amic. 17.61; 18/65; 13.46; 9/30-31; 8/26).

There was a significant criticism of the principle of “giving for a return”: love of one’s friends should lead to giving even when return was not expected. Cicero notices that people eagerly lend their service not to those who really need it, but to those from whom they can expect greater returns (Off. 1.49). Aristotle argues that friendship consisted more in giving than in receiving, considering not the expectation of a return, but simple affection as the mark of real friendship (Nic. Eth. 8.3.4; 11.2-3; Plutarch Amor. Prolis. 3/495B; 4/496C). This friendship can be considered to exist in a patron-client relationship since clients may be called friends but with a gradation of the friendship involved, with superior or inferior friends (Sailer 1989). Patronage was a standard move in the game of seeking security in a society marked by limited goods. For his social welfare and security the client was dependent upon his patron and was obliged to defend and increase the power and prestige of his patron vis-à-vis public opinion, as well as ministering to his patron’s needs. The patron’s obligation is compared to that of a father’s towards his son, and similarly the client is to his patron in the same manner as to a blood relative (Halicarnassus Rom. Ant. 2.10.1,4).

This concept of friendship between unequals helps to explain the fact of conversion through households and the social structure of the early Christian community as fictive kinship (Sandnes 1994:93-111). It also provides fresh insight into the social contexts of relationships between father and son (i.e. God-Jesus, God-believers), and between friends (Jesus-believers, believer-believer) (Moxnes 1997a:31-36; Sandnes 1994:86-91). Since the social dynamics of the patron-client relationship, as the friendship between unequals is criticised by Jesus (cf. Lk. 22.24-
27), Luke portrays the Christian group as actualising the ideals of friendship between equals in the structure of friendship between unequals. Luke reports that the ethical teaching of Jesus was based upon the principle of assistance motivated by love and grace, not utility (Lk. 6.38), while the Christian group also has a different mode of a reciprocal system which is characterised in the following terms: sharing, hospitality, mutual aid, generosity (cf. Ac. 2.44-46; Moxnes 1988). All this is characteristic of generalised reciprocity, that type of economy and social transaction found among kinsmen or within a family. This means that even though their group formation had an affinity to friendship between unequals, early Christians strategically abandoned the predominant exchange mode of balanced reciprocity and invented new social values based on generalised reciprocity so as to create, maintain, and legitimise a positive social identity in contrast to the surrounding dominant social groups.

Accordingly, we will employ the friendship concept in the study of family in Luke-Acts, since it comprehensively illustrates the social ideal and social reality of family in antiquity and it does not involve the modern idea of egalitarianism.

2. The House in the Mediterranean World.

Is the house significantly interrelated to the social identity of early Christians? The Romans judged a man by the physical aspect of his house, and so the domus was a clear indication of his social status and identity (Treggiari 1997; Wallace-Hadrill 1994). The house was an effective means of conveying social structure, and its symbolic system reinforced the social values of persons, places, and objects in and around the house (Bourdieu 1965; 1973; 1977). Domestic architecture was a key physical index to understand the social identity of the family occupying it since it was the chief stronghold of social, symbolic values attached to houses, which were basic to that society (Douglas 1972b; du Boulay 1974:17). But we assume that though the early Christians gathered in various types of house, they created and invented their own social values of domestic architecture.
Domestic architecture in Palestine during the Roman period had a wide variety of forms, even though the two basic traditional architectural features of the Palestinian house—the simple house and the courtyard house—continued (Mazar 1990: 246-48; 485-89). The differences of architectural style reflected very distinct social and economic levels, as well as the occupants’ way of life in the house.

(i) The simple house was the modest dwelling used by the vast majority of the country’s inhabitants consisting of a four-roomed structure built either behind or in front of an open courtyard (Meyers 1982; Hirschfeld 1995: 24-44). One of the dwellings discovered below the Gamala synagogue was the ‘Wall house,’ measuring about 180 m² with two entrances, and consisting of four living rooms with a shop (Fig. 5.1). A two-winged farmhouse was discovered at the Umm Rihan site from the first-century CE (Fig. 5.2), and includes a spacious courtyard and two built wings in its northeastern corner respectively with three-rooms and one room adjacent to a tower (ibid: 40).

(ii) The complex house is often an expansion of the simple house by means of new, attached wings, dwelling units built around three or more sides of the outer courtyard to accommodate the members of a growing extended family (Fig. 5.3.a,b). An urban two-storey apartment house, created by the construction of adjoining dwelling units around a common courtyard, was found in Umm el-Jimal (second-third century CE. ibid:45-48)—five or six separate dwelling units are distinguishable on each story, each apparently the residence of a single family (Fig.5.4). Many farmhouses of the Roman period were gradually enlarged by new residential wings, storerooms, barns, and sheepfolds, due to the expansion of family and its improved economic circumstances: Kalandiya (in the highlands north of Jerusalem, Fig.5.5); Qasr e-Leja (on the western outskirts of Samaria) Ramat Hanadiv (on the southern Carmel range, Fig.5.6), all from the first-century CE (ibid:50-54).
(iii) The courtyard house had a central courtyard surrounded on all four sides by the wings of the dwelling structure, offering complete privacy for the inhabitants’ activities.

(a) Traditional courtyard houses were found in both urban and rural areas: a two-storey house with a medium-sized courtyard house at Samaria-Sebaste (the third-second century BCE, ibid:1995:57); the Herodian House, the Burnt House, the Great Mansion (Fig.5.7) at Jerusalem from the Second Temple period, all of these consisting of miqveth (ibid:58-62); Mount Gerizim in Samaria and Marisa in Judaea; the so-called ‘Fresco House’ at Gamala; the so-called ‘Triple Courtyard House’ at Capernaum (Corbo 1976:176-94); Dor (Raban 1993:364), Bethsaida (Kuhn & Arav 1991:100-1). These houses were inhabited in Palestine by the same family or by related families, and their dwellers were families with a good economic situation (Canaan 1933:40-42).

(b) The atrium or peristyle house is one of the characteristic examples of the Greco-Roman architectural tradition in Palestine. It has been found at only four sites of the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, excluding the palaces of the Hasmonean and Herodian rulers: Tel Anafa, Sepphoris (Strange 1992:334), Tell Judeidah, and Khirbet el-Muraq (Fig.5.8). These mansions had many rooms, enough to house a large family with a good number of servants, as well as to receive clients and friends, and to conduct commercial transactions and social gatherings (Arav 1989). They are an important indication of the economic and social level of well-to-do families in the first-century and their resemblance to the upper classes of other parts of the Empire. They also witness to the Judean elites’ accumulation of land and wealth, as well as to the disintegration of the traditional Israelite peasant family into a nucleated or scattered family mode because of their intensive deprivation and indebtedness which induced them to give up their ancestors’ lands (Fiensy 1991; Oakman 1994).

(iv) The house with shops (tabernae) is another typical house in the Roman empire and Palestine (cf. Bet Zur; see Sellers 1933:20), and consisted of one room facing the street, connected to an interior room that was used as living quarters (Hirschfeld 1995:98-99).
In Palestine, there are no examples of big apartment buildings (insulae), which were very common in other cities of the Roman Empire (Packer 1967: 83-85). Unlike public buildings in Palestine, domestic architecture has not been documented sufficiently yet to illustrate the ordinary life of people in our period. However, the present-day architecture within Hebron Hill, the Arab resident areas, remains a basic architectural expression which may be seen as the continuation of a very ancient building tradition, which has remained relatively unchanged for thousands years (see Hirschfeld 1995: 109-212; Canaan 1933: 33-47). Many houses are predominantly two-storied: the lower storey is often used for domestic and workshop activities, and the upper storey is used as living quarters with incorporation of shops or workshops.

(2) The Urban House in Greco-Roman Society

The urban house in ancient Mediterranean society is well preserved in the archaeological remains of Pompeii, Herculaneum, and Ostia, which provide us with germane Roman samples of the domestic context in Acts.

(i) Atrium-Peristyle House

The atrium-peristyle house is a typical Roman house for the wealthy, in which an axial line runs to the depth of the house from the door through fauces, atrium with impluvium in its centre, and tablinum with wide opening on the atrium and often also a wide window on the peristyle garden behind, with its four neatly symmetrical colonnades around (Fig. 5.9). Atrium and peristyle form the essential matrix of this type of house, with such practical functions as letting in light, air, and water, as well as more significant social functions such as giving dignity to the house and providing a good index of the social standing of the householder (Vitruvius Archit. 6.3). The

---

The Roman house was different from the Greek one (cf. Olynthos, Priene and the Roman colony, Cosa), which was characterised as having equal plots of land and limited luxury, which points to a relatively equal economic and social reality (Walker 1983: 82-3; Jameson 1990).
traditional ‘atrium-form’ has an arrangement of the principal rooms around a central area which is roofed with a central rectangular opening (‘compluvium’) as a collection-point for rainwater. This provides the domestic area of daily activities in a relatively cold climate (Varro Ling.4.45). The atrium became the place of the salutatio, the central social ritual of patron-client relations.

In the second-century BCE, an essential change to the atrium house occurred in Pompeii: the addition of a peristylium—an inner garden surrounded by columns and rooms—and the transformation of a high room from the atrium into an inner courtyard with columns (Wallace-Hadrill 1997:238-240). Because the peristyle creates a secondary nucleus in the house, visitors can be restricted to the primary nucleus (atrium), and excluded from the second and its surrounding rooms. The spatial solidarity of the house is greatly reduced, and patterns of space availability are transformed to increase the non-distributive dimension due to its complex hierarchical relations of space (Hillier and Hanson 1989). Lower status visitors (clients) are restricted to the atrium space, while the privileged (friends) are invited to the more lavishly equipped entertainment spaces of the peristyle area.

The Roman house was a vital interface between public and private life for generating and activating the social network that provided the underpinning for the householder’s activities outside the house (Treggiari 1997). A public figure did not go home to shield himself from public gaze (Velleius.2.14.3). The closure of the doors is an exceptional gesture of mourning (Tacitus Ann.2.82; Hist.1.62). In shaping social space in the house to enhance social standing in a highly competitive society (Cicero Off.1.138-139), Roman domestic architecture was obsessively concerned with distinctions of social ranks between the grand and the humble (Vitruvius Archit.5.1-3; Seneca Ben.6.33.4-34.5; Wallace-Hadrill 1994:3-11).

While Roman social hierarchy was reflected in the size and construction of housing, we should not be seduced by a superficial assumption that every large house necessarily contained or even belonged to, wealthy people, and that every small shop was inhabited by poor people, since the distribution of house sizes is a very different matter from that of wealth within society (Wallace-Hadrill 1994:83-85; 1997:219).
We must take account of the spread of the atrium-peristyle house like ripples throughout the different levels of housing and people who want to imitate the social elite’s life (Wallace-Hadrill 1994:86, 173-174). Pompeii is an average Roman town with neither Roman senatorial families nor the urban slums of Rome (Foss 1994:58). The atrium itself cannot, thus, be the social index of status, and the simple equation of atrium style with high social standing is quite misleading.

(ii) Insulae and Tabernae

The best starting-point for the discussion of insulae and tabernae is the rental inscription (CIL. IV. 138) from the Insula Arriana Polliana at Pompeii. The text of the inscription is as follows (Pirson 1997:167):

“In the Insula Arriana Polliana of Cn. Alleius Nigidius Maius tabernae with their pergulae and cenaculum equestria and domus will be let out from July 1st onward. For letting consult Primus, slave of Cn. Alleius Nigidius Maius.”

The tabernae referred to the humble dwellings of the poor such as shops, workshops or taverns (Horace Carm. 1.4.13-14; Ulpian Dig. 50.16.183). The tabernae were provided with cooking-facilities, latrines and niches for beds set into the walls of back rooms, with household-shrines which indicated the need of the inhabitants to define their dwelling as an independent household (Foss 1997; Wallace-Hadrill 1994:110). Pergula refers to mezzanine floors which were often attached to tabernae, and was synonymous with an inferior social standing embedded in one’s housing conditions (Trimalchio Sat. 74). Cenaculum was the upper part of a house (Varro Ling. 5.162), and it was used with a social connotation similar to pergulae. In the inscription the apartments are, however, described as cenaculum equestria because the landlord obviously attempted to differentiate his cenaculum from the otherwise poor dwellings in order to find wealthier tenants (Suetonius Vit. 7; the Sarno Bath Complex at Pompeii). At Pompeii and Herculaneum, some large private houses were emodeled to be divided into smaller apartments (cf. the House of Pansa, the Villa of the Mysteries, the House of the Bicentenary, The Casa a Gratio). It is misleading to
assume, however, that the circumstances of economically prosperous towns like Pompeii and Herculaneum necessarily apply to Ostia and other cities around the Roman empire.

Ostia was composed of great blocks of planned apartment-houses (Fig. 5.10), and each building was constructed to run several (four) stories in height: the ground floors usually contained shops or workshops and those above, apartments (two-rooms) and single rooms. In this kind of building, the higher one went, the worse conditions became (Packer 1967:86). The most famous building is the House of Diana, in which a group of Mithraists took over one of the back rooms on the ground floor for worship. This illustrates the adoption of residential or commercial space for religious activities. Some Christian groups may have gathered in very similar circumstances (cf. San Clemente in Rome as an example of a titulus house). There was also other multi-unit housing in the elongated design available, some with four living units of four or five rooms and a corridor each on the ground floor without central space (cf. the Garden House complex at Ostia) (Osiek & Balch 1997:20). In an ancient city like Rome or Ostia, the great majority of people were crowded together in big apartment-houses near the city-centre, which ranged from 100 persons, to 280 or even to 328. Only 3% of populations lived in a domus, while 90% of the free population and an even higher percentage of the slave population in the cities of the empire packed into apartment blocks (Frier 1980; Packer 1967; MacMullen 1974:62f). Baths and latrines were provided by the imperial government and were usually public. The typical ordinary life of the inhabitants must have been lived almost entirely outside his apartment because the average Roman domicile served only as a place to sleep and store possessions (Packer 1967:87).

Some argue that the archaeological remains of insulae at Ostia, which were Trajanic or a later period, cannot provide relevant information for the social setting of the earliest Christian churches (Koloski-Ostrow 1990:104; Osiek & Balch 1997:21). Although there is no archaeological evidence for four- or five-storey, low-rent apartment housing (insulae) in pre-Neronian Rome and Ostia, there is sufficient literary evidence of apartment buildings (Strabo Geog.5.3.7; Martial Ep.1.117, 7.20; Juvenal Sat.3.198-202; 3.6-7; 3.215-220; Tacitus Ann.15.43; Suetonius Nero.16.1).
Seneca refers to the contrast between a house with a dining room large enough for a large meeting and a tenement, where the walls were crumbled and cracked and were out of line (Ira. 3.35.5). So the multifamily apartment house (insula) as high as five stories, existed in Rome during the first-century CE (Clarke 1991: 26). And the Sarno Bath complex at Pompeii (VIII.2.17-21), which dated to 62 BCE, indicates that the construction technique and materials had already been developed before the first-century CE. Augustus proscribed the construction of new buildings closer than 70 feet to their neighbours, as a precaution against fires and collapses.

Finally, the shop with house was quite common in the Roman empire (Packer 1975). At Ostia, most shops were individual rooms which served their proprietors as both work-areas and living quarters, and they consisted of one (back-room), two (back-room and mezzanines) or three rooms. The lower floors of factory buildings usually consisted of two rooms, while the upper floors were usually composed of flats, which had an average living space of two rooms apiece. Along the facades of residences were plastered trade signs, which at Pompeii and Herculaneum reveal that various kinds of shops were incorporated in most houses (Casa del Menandro; the Case del Meleagro; Casa del Gran Portale; Casa del Bicentenario). Unlike the case of Ostia, the shops seems to have been run by slaves or freedmen who acted as legal agents for the owner, so committing him to legal responsibility for their financial contracts (Harris 1980). The symbolic contrast between noble patronage and sordid trade was made visible in the nature of the houses that were linked to the street outside. We may conjecture, therefore, that the shop with house was a conventional social setting for Paul’s missionary activity as an artisan (Hock 1980).

3. Christian House-Churches

(1) The Pauline House-Churches

Several studies have been made of the Pauline house-churches. Robert Banks defines the Pauline communities as a family, or the body of Christ, which implies harmony between brothers (1980). It is not clear, however, how the house-churches
and family could contribute to the characteristic features of Pauline ecclesiology. Based on the Pauline phrase ἡ κατ’ ὁλ.or οἶκον ἐκκλησία, Hans-Josef Klauck explores the centrality of the household for the development of several concepts of early Christian theology which are essential to the understanding of “ἐκκλησία” (1981). But Banks and Klauck ignore Filson’s suggestions that “the New Testament church would be better understood if more attention were paid to the actual physical condition…” (1939:105-106).

Gerd Theissen characterises the leadership structure of the Corinthian community as a “patriarchalism of love”, based on the patron-client relations between the believers in the context of the atrium-peristyle house in which the hierarchical social order is retained while mutual support and intimacy are being nurtured by patrons who serve as leaders of community in the house-churches (1982). Murphy-O’Connor (1983) sets up the atrium house as the place of meeting for the Corinthian community, and emphasises the communal meal divided into the two categories which is much relied on by Theissen: the first-class believers who occupied the triclinium and were served the best type of food and the second-class believers who gathered in the atrium and were offered the poorer food. However, assuming the atrium-peristyle as the only Christian meeting place is misleading, since it hardly reflects the possible use of various houses by the members of the community, if they consisted of people who came from different social strata.

Contrary to the major scholarly opinion that the houses of early Christianity were patronised by well-to-do social elites (Dassmann & Schöllgen 1984; Meeks 1983; Strobel 1965), Robert Jewett maintains the plausibility of tenement house-churches in the Pauline communities at Thessalonica, Philippi, Galatia, and Rome where the Christians, who came from an entirely urban underclass of slaves and poor freedmen/women, met in the living or working spaces of apartment buildings without a patron (1993). These tenement churches had a brotherly and collective leadership rather than a hierarchical one and practised “agapaic communalism” rather than love-patriarchalism (1994). His thesis is a fine example for illustrating how architectural
"models play an unconscious role in controlling the imagination of interpreters, thus influencing their construction of ancient texts" (1993:23), and is reinforced by Hock's insights into the artisan missionary mode of Paul. Finally, Philip Esler distinctively incorporates the house and family into social identity theory, and propounds the view that the social context of the house contributed to create, maintain, and legitimise the social identity of the early Christians vis-à-vis Judeans and Gentiles (1996a,b; 1997).

(2) Some Suggestions

It is unreasonable sweepingly to apply one architectural model to Luke-Acts because Luke refers to various types of domestic dwelling. Not only can each house generally be identified with the kind of family which it accommodated, but also each house would have a different logic of space, and each family system a different social logic. Even for the case of the atrium-peristyle house, several considerations are needed. Would Christians really accommodate themselves in this kind of house without hesitation, given that its social space expressed highly articulated social rituals related to honour competition? If the Christian group formed around patterns of fictive kinship, patron-client relations would have played an important role among the group members. Would they strongly hold to these relationships or abandon them and create their own social values? Who did play the role of patron in the Christian community? Was the standard for the patron based on wealth, social status, or other factors? Were Christian patrons really people of high social standing? The family in Mediterranean society was fundamentally based on patriarchal authority. Was there a kind of differentiation between social status, and gender? Would they eat together at the table? When they gathered in a private house, who would play a leadership role? How many of them belonged to the wealthy group who owned an atrium-peristyle house?

These questions can be summed-up in one question: When Christians built up their community based on the model of the family, how did they react to the

43 For similar suggestions, see Filson 1939; Branick 1989; Vogler 1982; Lorenzen
contemporary social-world? The Christian movement is perhaps best seen not a conservative or introversionist but a conversionist movement in society (Esler 1987:46-70). Luke says that the Christians were charged in Thessalonica as those "...who have been turning the people’s inhabited place upside down (τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀναστατώσαντες)” (Ac.17.6). The word οἰκουμένη is quite different from "κόσμος", and the charge means that the Christian movement transformed the existing social logic of domestic space to bring new social values and social relations. Tertullus accused Paul of being “pestilence” (λοιμός) in Ac.24.5, which means that Paul had contagiously influenced the transformation of the people’s customs and worldview. In this respect, Christians challenged social values and invented their own traditions so as to create, maintain, and legitimise their social identity vis-à-vis Judeans and Gentiles. The Christians would willingly modify and ultimately abandon the legacy of a cultural tradition and so illustrate a more dynamic shift in social relations within the Christian congregations. It is neither a radical abandonment of, nor a passive preservation of social values which leads to an inevitable osmosis, but a creative ‘invention of tradition’ to justify a new social-world by appealing to constructive images of tradition (Hobsbawm & Ranger 1983).

II. RELATED THEMES TO HOUSE

1. Data on ὀίκια and ὀίκος.

Though Luke uses other words to refer to house—κατάλυμα (Lk.2.7; 22.11), ὑπερών (Ac.1.13; 9.37,39; 20.8), πανδοχεῖον (Lk.10.34), ταβέρνας (Ac.28.15), his standard terms are ὀίκια and ὀίκος. In the Greco-Roman world, the terms were interchangeably used to refer to house as dwelling place and the material possessions of the household or the members of the household who were under the authority of the paterfamilias, including slaves and friends (Aristotle Pol.1253b.4-7; Xenophon Oec.1.5). In Luke-Acts, ὀίκια occur 37 times (Lk:25, Ac:12, NT:93), and ὀίκος, 58 times (Lk:33, Ac:25, NT:115, excluding the variant reading of Ac.16.33). ὀίκος is

1987; Birkey 1991; Maier 1991.
more common than ὀἶκος in Luke-Acts, while ὀἶκια is predominant in Mark (18/13) and Matthew (26/10).

(1) Luke uses both terms to refer to private homes (Lk. 1.23, 40, 56; 4.38; 5.24, 25, 29; 7.10, 36, 37; 8.27, 39; 9.61; 14.1; 15.6; 18.14; 19.5; 22.54; Ac. 9.11, 17; 10.6, 17, 22, 30, 32; 11.11-14; 16.15, 32, 34; 17.5; 18.7; 21.8) and the gathering place of the Christian community (Ac. 8.3; 12.12 for the ὀἶκια of Mary). The expressions of κατ’ ὀίκον (2.46; 5.42) and κατ’ ὀίκους (8.3; 20.20) are used as technical terms to indicate that the Christians met “in private homes.” In several instances, Luke uses the two terms for house alongside each another with no distinction between them usually in reference to a single house (Lk. 7.6, 10; 7.36, 37, 44; 8.41, 51; 10.5a, b, 7a; 15.6, 8; Ac. 16.32, 34). He differently uses the meanings of ὀίκος between house and family (Lk. 19.5 with v. 9; Ac. 10.22, 30; 11.12f. with Ac. 10.2; 11.4; Ac. 16.15b with v. 15a). While Mark uses only ὀἶκια in the sense of household/family, Luke uses only ὀίκος in the expression “…and his (whole) house” (Lk. 11.17//Mk. 3.25; Lk. 4.24//Mk. 6.4; Lk. 19.9; Ac. 10.2; 11.14; 16.15a, 31; 18.8).

(2) Otherwise, ὀίκος is used to refer to a person’s body figuratively which is called the dwelling of a demon (Lk. 11.24; cf. Philo Det. 33; Seneca Ep. 20.3.14), one’s possession/belongings (Ac. 7.10, based on Gen. 45.8), and Jerusalem including the buildings and their inhabitants (Lk. 13.35a.; cf. Jer. 12.7; 22.5; 1 Enoch. 89; T. Levi 10.4). The meaning descendants/lineage of ὀίκος is used in the expressions of “the house of David” (Lk. 1.27, 69; 2.4), or “house of Jacob” (Lk. 1.33; Ac. 7.46) or “house of Israel” (Ac. 2.36; 7.42).

(3) Luke also uses ὀίκος to indicate the Temple as the house of God only in Old Testament quotations (Lk. 19.46a.b//Mk. 11.17a.b; Ac. 7.49) or allusions (Lk. 6.4//Mk. 2.26; Lk. 11.51; Ac. 7.47) following the LXX (cf. Euripides Ph. 1372; Herodotus Hist. 8.143). However, Luke neither uses ὀίκος to call the Christian community God’s house or the house of Yahweh, nor to convey the idea of the Church as the Temple of God (1Cor. 3.16f.; 6.19; 2Cor. 6.16; Eph. 2.19-22), all of
which are present in the Qumran community (1QS.5.6; 8.5,9; 9.6; CD.3.19; 1QH.7.8f).

(4) In the Gospel, of twenty-four instances of oikía or oikocos meaning house in parallel Markan passages, Luke takes up the same words nine times (oikía:
Mk.1.29//Lk.4.38; 2.15//5.29; 6.10//9.4; 10.29//18.29b; oikocos: Mk. 2.11//Lk.5.24;
2.26//6.4; 5.19//8.39; 11.17//19.46), or replaces each other twice (oikía by oikocos:
Mk.3.25//Lk.11.17, or vice versa: Mk.5.38//Lk.8.51), from the Markan sources. On
five occasions (Mk.7.17,24; 9.28,33; 10.10), Luke removes the Markan idea of the
messianic secret, but he uses his special sources to suggest that the house is the open
locus of salvation for the marginalised people and for hospitality.

We have shown that Luke uses synonymously the terms, oikía and oikocos
(contra, Vos 1995), to express the social concretisation of the gospel in domestic
space. By using the domestic context of social relations and values more than Mark,
Luke demonstrates how the gospel was spread and how the early Christian groups
were established by means of the house and household in the hostile environment of
the circum-Mediterranean world, in order to enhance the social identity of Christians,
while restricting its application to the Temple (unlike other writers).

2. Important Topics of House

There are a number of important issues, which bring out the substantial
features of Luke's understanding of house, but we will deal with the following topics:
η βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, meals, hospitality, rituals, sinners.

(1) Ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ

The term, η βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, is the most studied theme of the public
proclamation of Jesus (cf. Jeremias 1971:96-108; Beasley-Murray 1986; Perrin 1963;
1976; Schnackenburg 1963). It is the least understood in relation to house, however.
In Judaism, the term primarily meant God’s reign or his kingship rather than ‘kingdom’ (Richardson 1958:84f.). In Jewish phraseology, נכרא is to be ‘revealed’ or ‘appear’ (Sib. Or.3.46-8; T.Mos.10.1; Jub.1.28), while Jesus says that it comes (Lk.19.11). The revelation or appearance of the kingdom in Judaism is the revelation of God himself in glory and power (Isa.60; 1QM.12.7-16; 14.1-8), but Jesus did not speak in the same way. Its essential feature in Luke’s Gospel is the metaphor of entering into the divine reign (Lk.11.52; 13.24; 16.16; 18.17; 18.24-25; 24.26; Aalen 1962:216-7). This ‘entering idea’ implies that βασιλεία refers both to sovereignty and territory under the God’s reign.

If we consider ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ in the context of the ancient Mediterranean social-world, it can be more concretely understood as the patronage of God, since patronage can denote the full range of rulership from the domestic area to imperial rule over subject kingdoms through brokerage (Moxnes 1991:242-246). Just as one gains resources from one’s patron through brokers in a limited good society, Luke expresses the view that the Father will provide for every need of the disciples in his βασιλεία through his son’s brokerage (Lk.11.9-13; 12.22-32). Likewise, just as the patronage system generates social relationships between those different positions of power, so too βασιλεία is described as making available a social relationship between God and the disciples through Jesus’ brokerage (Lk.10.9; 11.20; 12.32; 17.21; 22.30).

In Lk.13.22-40, Luke portrays the βασιλεία in the concrete sense of domestic architecture. For Luke, the house is a space, where the patronage of God is effectively actualised to make available the goods of salvation (Aalen 1962:216-7). Luke consistently explains it in a domestic context (6.20; 7.28; 8.10ff.; 9.2; 9.60,62; 9.9,11; 10.17; 12.31-32; 13.18, 20, 28-29; 14.15; 18.16-17, 24-25, 29; 19.11; 21.31; 22.16-30), while he does not use the term in the context of the Temple and synagogue, except in Ac.19.8 where Paul’s unusual long-term activity in Ephesus is described (cf. Mk.12.34). The Lukan parables express the secret of βασιλεία in terms of domestic metaphors—seed, lamp, mustard seed, and yeast—and use domestic life and household management as Jesus’ most useful analogies for the patronage of God in the phrases like “in the same manner” and “just as” to apply life within the family to life in ‘another’ family under the patronage of God. And throughout all the teachings
of Jesus, the household serves as the appropriate symbol of social life under the patronage of God (Lk. 9.46-48; 11.14-23; 12.22-48; 13.20-21; 14.1-24; 18.15-17). These characteristic Lukan affinities between βασιλεία and house point to the ancient Mediterranean social web of the patronage system to which domestic life is intimately connected (Gellner and Waterbury 1977; Sailer 1982; Wallace-Hadrill 1989).

Jesus’ qualification for entry into the reign of God is like that of a child who receives his/her parent’s care. It strongly alludes to the key role of family for inheritance and socialisation. Thus Jesus redefines the very concept of the people of God in terms of fictive kinship under the patronage of God the Father. Jesus says, “My mother and my brothers are those who hear God’s word and do it” (Lk. 8.21). This redefinition conforms to the Mediterranean ideal of family: unity and obedience under the potestas of the paterfamilias (Saller 1984; Lassen 1997).

He also calls God his father and calls for his disciples to call God their father (Lk. 10.21-22; 11.2-4; 22.42; 23.34; 23.46). God as Father recalls an earthly father caring for his children in his and their prayers. While the Jewish tradition portrayed God as a Father to his people (Jeremias 1967:11-29; Hamerton-Kelly 1979:20-51), Jesus’ use of “father” in prayers marks a new dimension by addressing God as Father. The Aramaic abba is an everyday family word (Jeremias 1967:96-97; Luz 1985:339-41), probably with a colloquial favour. This implies that the disciples are considered as children of the Father, God. This representation of the familial relationship points to the patron-client system in that God is portrayed as the Patron, and Jesus as the Broker, Jesus’ followers as clients, so as to form a fictive kinship group under the patronage of God. In this regard, the kinship institution provides a pertinent way of representing a model for the Christian community (Elliott 1991:227).

(2) Hospitality

In LXX and the New Testament, hospitality is most often associated with "ξένος," which means literally stranger, foreigner, even enemy and is equated with Christian brothers and sisters (Rom.16.23; Mt.25.35; Koenig 1985). In Mediterranean
culture, hospitality is a social process by which the status of someone who is an outsider is changed from stranger to guest. There are three stages in the process (Malina 1986a:181-87): (1) evaluation and testing of the stranger to see whether incorporation as a guest is possible without undue threat to the purity lines of the group to which one belongs; (2) incorporation of the stranger as a guest under the patronage of a host and hospitality imposing obligations upon both host and guest; (3) the departure of the guest as a stranger now transformed into either a friend or enemy depending on whether honour has been satisfied or infringed. Thus hospitality is a powerful means to establish social relations with other groups whether of a friendly or hostile kind.

Hospitality in antiquity was a sacred duty because it opened up the possibility of a potential occasion for an encounter involving divine revelation with a stranger from another, unknown world (for Abraham, Sarah, Lot, Rebekah, Rahab, and Job). The notorious biblical examples of inhospitality are the cases of the people of Sodom (Gen.19) and those of Gibeah (Judg.19), who were punished by divine and human judgement. This sacred implication is also attested in the New Testament traditions in the recommended behaviour of Jesus’ messengers, as they shake the dust off their feet when hospitality is refused (Lk.9.5, 10.11; Ac.13.51). In his ministry Jesus is dependent upon hospitality by which he enters the social space of a society, reveals the patronage of God, and creates his followers or his enemies (Lk.7.36-50; 8.1-3; 9.58; 10.38-42). Hospitality is a presupposition of the early Christian mission (Ac.10-11; 16.1,15; 17.5; 18.1,7,20; 21.4,7,8,16; 28.2,7; cf. Rom.15.24; 16.23; 1Cor.16.6-7, 10-11; Gal.4.14; Col.4.10; Phlm.22; 3John 5-8; for its abuse, Did.11.3-6 and 12.2-5).

(3) Rituals: Baptism and Meals

In a group-oriented society, rituals are social programs which create, maintain, and legitimise social identity and a sense of social location for a particular group (Douglas 1972:42,78). Through them group members experience the community’s repertoire of significant pasts and community boundaries are affirmed and reinforced (Cohen 1985:50). Without shrines, temples, sacrifices, public festivals, how could the
earliest Christian group provide social identity to its members? It is striking, however, that they were called “a pervasive, uncontrolled superstition,” which was a way characterising someone else’s abhorrent rituals (Pliny Ep. 10.96.8; cf. Tacitus Ann. 15.44.3; Suetonius Nero. 16.3).

(i) Baptism: incorporating into a fictive kinship

From an anthropological view, a rite of passage has three stages: (1) separation from; (2) liminality towards; and (3) re-aggregation into society. Ritually-speaking, the participant is in a dangerous zone at the second stage, and so s/he needs to be redressed by the liminality-breaker, who (a) communicates the community’s sacred symbols, (b) deconstructs the ludicrous and recombines the social order, and (c) simplifies the social structure of relationships between members such as the hierarchical authority of the elders over initiand, and communitas among initiands (Turner 1969). In this regard, Christian baptism is a rite of passage separating an initiand from the one-referent social group and incorporating him or her into another one, the Christian community.

Early Christian baptism is substantially different from John’s baptism, which is not an initiatory rite but a revival rite to bring about a messianic consciousness within the parameters of repentance demanded even for the Pharisees (Lk. 3.7-14; 7.29-30). The cessation of John’s baptism is anticipated in the baptism of the Spirit as the mark of the renewed people of God (Ac. 1.5, 22; 10.37; 13.24). Like the proselyte rite of Jewish circumcision which marks the entry into the covenant people of God in the name of Abraham, baptism is an initiatory rite to permit entry into a new fictive kinship “in the name of Jesus Christ” (Ac. 3.38; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5). In the name of Jesus, baptism becomes a preliminary sign of receiving the forgiveness of sins, the gifts of the Holy Spirit (2.38), and of being incorporated into the Christian community (2.41), for those who have already made the step toward repentance. It is an application of a familiar Semitic phrase (נָשָׁבֵּיתָ) to indicate that Jesus is “the fundamental reference of the rite” (Hartman 1973-4; 1992:586). The beginnings of Christian baptism go hand in hand with the recognition of Jesus’ brokerage through
his resurrected status as Christ and Lord in making the Christian fictive-kinship (Pokorny 1980-81). This christological baptismal formula (ἐις τὸ θνήμα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ) (cf. Ac.2.38; 8.16; 10.48; 19.5) implies that the resurrected Jesus is in association with the Father, who accepts the people into his family through his son, and with the Holy Spirit, by whom the Christians are empowered and who dwells in Christians, the kinship members (cf. Mt.28.19).

(ii) Meal

The Meal is more important in Luke-Acts than Mark\(^{44}\). In his Gospel, Luke records meals on sixteen occasions. From Mark (seven occasions), Luke changes four cases and omits two cases which are related to the purity laws (Mk.7.1-23) and overlap with Mk.6.30-44 (8.1-10)//Lk.9.10-17. The general scholarly assumption is that the Lukan meal motif is his literary invention (cf. Smith 1987; 1989). While the meal scenes in Luke-Acts could have been influenced by the Greco-Roman literary tradition of meals (Plato’s Symposion, Plutarch’s Symposiaca, Xenophon’s Symposion, and Athenaeus’ Deipnosophistae), it is most unlikely that meals in Luke’s social-world would not have reflected the most important actual “generative matrix” for the social construction of the Jesus movement and the early Christian community (Mack 1988: 80-83; Corley 1993b:17-19).

In ancient Mediterranean society, communal dining was a catalyst for structuring and regulating social relationships and provided a generative matrix for honour competition as well as the give and take of social reciprocity which solidified relations. Thus meals were an excellent social mechanism to enhance one’s social status and to grant honour. Accordingly, social relations played out between people at an elite dinner always involved aspects of rank or status, and sometimes uncomfortable tensions resulted. For instance, prospective invitees risked being

---

uninvited. A standard satirical character is the social parasite who angles for dinner invitations in the hope of gaining a standing invitation and eventual access to a patron (Martial Ep. 2.27; 2.14; 5.50; 7.20). Potential hosts also risked rejection of their invitations, or at least the chance that their social occasion might be a failure. Refusal to dine on the part of guest was a sign of that guest’s advancement in society, and of the host’s lower status (Juvenal. Sat. 5.11; Horace. Sat. 2.8; Martial. Ep. 5.44.7-11; Pliny Ep. 1.15). The hospes as guest was obliged by reciprocity to play the hospes as host, and return the favour of a meal. Dinner was a kind of gift-exchange (Martial Ep. 5.50; D'Arms 1984:331-334). During a meal, the food served was not the same for all participants but was dependent upon the social worthiness of the guests (Martial. Ep. 3.60; 4.68; Juvenal. Sat. 5.24-36, 49-91; Pliny Ep. 2.6.2-3). Jesus’ teaching about dinner invitation without expectation of return should be understood in this social context (Lk. 14.12-14).

The order of reclining at table was an important element of the ritual because it encapsulated the host’s attempt at world-building, from the place of the guest of honour (locus consularis) to the lowest place on the lectus imus (Fig. 5.11). Of the three couches, Lectus Medius was regarded as the most honourable and Lectus Imus was the place of the host and his family. Of the three places on the couch, that on the left was assigned to guest of highest rank and that on the right was assigned to those with the lowest esteem. Diners reclined on the couch, supporting themselves on their left elbows, which rested on cushions (Foss 1994:1). Knowledge of proper social ordering at banquets was a necessary and powerful tool to run a successful event, and if properly wielded, could advance or solidify the status of the host himself. For if “the distinctions of orders and dignity become confused, nothing is more unequal than the resulting equality” (Pliny. Ep. 9.5.3). In Plutarch’s Quaestiones Conviviales (Mor. 615C-619A), participants debate how to arrange the guests at table so as to obtain the most pleasant and satisfactory dining experience without offending anyone’s social pride. Paying strict attention to rank and person in the order of a dinner-party (as Augustus did, Suetonius. Aug. 74) contributed to the social stability of the state. All the participants should know their place and be content with it (D'Arms

This is why Jesus warns those who compete for the places of honour (Lk.14.7-11).

Slaves cooked and served for wealthy households and their guests. Slaves have been called "a human prop essential to the support of upper-class Roman convivial comforts" (D'Arms 1991:171). Household slaves had their own social hierarchy, and this hierarchy was expressed nowhere as clearly as in a formal dinner (Wallace-Hadrill 1988:78-79; D'Arms 1991:172-174). Slaves also might provide 'dinner-theatre' entertainment for the guests while they served. As the original 'nobodies' and lacking social identity, slaves were not allowed to eat what, how or when they liked. It is striking when Jesus speaks of himself as a waiter at the dinner in which a highly agonistic competition for honour is taking place (Lk.22.24,27).

This overview of the Greco-Roman meal practice points to the relevance of anthropological studies of food for understanding patterns of social structure (Goody 1982). Marshall Sahlins says that "...food is thus employed instrumentally as a starting, a sustaining, or a destroying mechanism of sociability" (1972:215). How does food work in social relations? Mary Douglas suggests that food functions in society much like a code with an encoded message to convey an ordered system which represents the social system of the particular context (1975:249,273). No society permits people "to eat everything, everywhere, with everyone, and in all situations" (Cohen 1968:508). A meal is therefore a structured social ritual which reflects social structure, exhibits the pattern of social relations concerning social ranking, group solidarity, and social reciprocity, and specifies who may eat what, with whom, when, and where, and plays a constructive role in making social boundaries, dividing who is included and who is excluded, defining the social group, and organising a socially structured hierarchy (Douglas 1972:61).

In Jewish society, the biblical prohibitions on certain animals as unclean (Lev.11; Num.28-29) constitute an elaborate and conceptually coherent system of purity laws regulating the purity or pollution of food, human bodies, their activities and associations according to the degrees of holiness based on the Temple (Douglas 1975; 1993; 1996:193-212). The food laws are about what goes inside bodies by
using the animals as an analogy to the human body and society. Defining food as forbidden defines the people who have analogous categories in society, and then prohibiting the eating of inedible food means forbidding fellowship with the people who are analogous to that food. Food—whether it is classified into forbidden, edible, and inedible—does not of itself indicate what kinds of human beings it belongs to. But human beings, who socially construct this classification system of food, are also inventing a strong ordering of their fellows and social world in an analogy to the food classified (Douglas 1996:145-160).

The social context of meals in Luke-Acts is that of Jesus and his followers within the Mediterranean social-world, in which social conflicts continually take place in confrontations with significant other groups, Judeans and Gentiles. Using the meal motif within this context, Luke’s strategy is largely twofold: (a) creating and solidifying a new fictive kinship; (b) criticising and transforming the social norms of contemporary society.

Why does Luke very often portray Jesus’ meals with Pharisees as the setting in which he pronounces his salvation and creates new social norms in contrast to contemporary social values (Lk.7.36-50; 11.37ff;14.1-24)? Like the Greco-Roman clubs and associations, various Jewish groups such as Essenes, Pharisees, and the Therapeutae, also shared communal meals as a major component of their group identity (Philo Vita.Cont.40-89; 1QSa.2.11-22; Neusner 1979:67-96). The Pharisees were extraordinarily concerned with the boundaries of the meal fellowship. Neusner has argued: “Of the 341 individual House legal pericopae, no fewer than 229...directly or indirectly concern table-fellowship” (1973:86). For them, food and meals formed a mediating link between the Temple with its altar and the private home and its table. They extended at least some of the rigorous purity regulations pertaining to the Temple, its priesthood and sacrifices, to the ordinary Jewish household (Neusner 1979; 1982).

Anthropologists have noted that the less (or more) structured a meal was, the more (or fewer) people would be open to alterations in its patterns of cuisine, preparation and etiquette, and that the meal as a structured social event is resistant to
change (Douglas and Nicod 1974; Goody 1982:44-48). Changes in meal patterns or cuisine are a form of social protest against the social structures those meal patterns and cuisines represent (Klosinski 1988:37). Luke describes that Jesus not only refused to fast (Lk. 5.33-39) but also ate with tax-collectors and sinners despite the furious criticism of Pharisees and scribes (Lk. 5.27-32; 7.34; 15.1-2; 19.1-10). And Jesus transformed the meal etiquette (Lk. 14.7-14; 22.24-27). This Lukan strategy of meal, which signifies a change in the meal pattern and cuisine of the Jewish and Greco-Roman societies, is, therefore, a clear sign of the subversion of contemporary social values of honour, prestige, and power. The effectiveness of a meal in symbolising exclusion from outside society and inclusion in a special group helps to explain the reason why Jesus is frequently represented as seated at table with company in Luke, whether they are Pharisees or sinners or his disciples.

While protesting against socially established norms, the Lukan Jesus strategically takes meals with socially marginalised peoples to proclaim the patronage of God: tax-collectors and sinners being the primary beneficiaries. For them, having meals with Jesus is a magnificent social event, inviting them to enter into a inclusive fictive kinship group under the patronage of God through the broker, Jesus. And Luke pictures the early Christian community having common meals through which group solidarity and social support are maintained through generalised reciprocity and hospitality (Ac. 2.42-47; 4.32-34). A pattern of “from hunger to satisfaction” (Lk. 1.53; 6.1-5; 6.21-25; 9.12-17; 15.14-24; 16.19-31) is a characteristic Lukan motif, which shows significant social solidarity and security within the new social group.

(4) Sinners, Tax-Collectors, and Pharisees

One of the most distinctive features of Jesus’ ministry is the offering of salvation to sinners (ἀμαρτωλοί). Jesus associates with sinners (Lk. 5.30; 7.34), seeks out the sinner as one who was lost (Lk. 15.7,10), and pronounces that his prime ministry is “not to call the righteous, but sinners to repent” (Lk. 5.32). Apart from triple tradition (Mk. 2.15,16//Mt. 9.10,11,13//Lk. 5. 30,32) and Q passage
(Lk.7.34//Mt.11.19), eight incidents are found only in Luke (Lk.5.8; 6.32,33,34(x2); 7.37,39; 13.2; 15.1,2,7,10; 18.13; 19.7; 24.7), and Luke never uses this term in Acts.

There are numerous scholarly views as to the meaning of “sinners”: (1) ‘am ha-aretz who have offended the Pharisees’ purity laws and their rigorous observance of the Law (Jeremias 1971:108-21: Perrin 1967:102-3); (2) the wicked who sinned willingly and did not repent, like the tax-collectors (Sanders 1985:200-8); (3) those who are denied the Jews’ covenant status as recipients of God’s saving righteousness (Dunn 1990:61-88; 1997:156-175). But in the Jewish factional context, the term “sinner” was used to designate those who were outside the group boundary; it meant the “wicked” who were unacceptable to those inside (Sir.41.5-10; Ps.Sol.3-4; Enoch.22.10-14; 91-104). In early Judaism, “sinner” was more or less a synonym for Gentiles (Ps.9.17; Tob.13.8; Jub.23.23-24), but as Judaism developed, boundaries were drawn within the people of Israel as well to designate those for whom a particular faction showed disapproval: for apostate Jews (1Macc.1.34; 2.44; 480), Jews who wrongly reckoned the months and the feasts (Enoch.82.4-7), Jews who did not hold to the sectarian interpretation of the Qumran community (CD.4.8; 1QS.5.7-11; 1QH.7.12), Jewish opponents of the “devout” (Ps.Sol.1.8; 2.3; 7.2; 8.12-13; 17.5-8; 23) or Jews with a different interpretation of ritual purity requirements (T.Mos.7.3, 9-10).

In Luke, the term “sinners” is used in two categories to describe (1) those who are opposed to God and his will (6.32-34; 13.2; 24.7) and (2) those outside of their group to whom Jesus offers the gospel of salvation (Lk.5.30-32; 7.34-39; 15.1-10; 18.13; 19.7). In the second category, the Pharisees are placed in contrast with “sinners” and the tax-collectors—an obviously identifiable group of people held up for specific criticism by the Pharisees. Thus we need to see them through the eyes of Pharisees. After being driven out from the political arena by Herod’s repression, the Pharisees sought a new social program based on adherence to the covenant, which capitalised on the strict observance of the Law: tithing, purity laws, the Sabbath and festival observance, and other food laws (Neusner 1973). These traditions were primarily related not to the Temple cult but to domestic affairs to set out a fitting agenda of holiness for powerless people. Particular attention was clearly given to
matters of ritual purity at meals, and they encouraged people to eat ordinary food at their own tables as if they were priests in the Temple, in order to extend priestly laws to the laity (Neusner 1971.III:143-179; contra Sanders 1990:131-254). It was a sacralisation programme to convert the house into a Temple space. Pharisees were the prime rivals of Jesus in competition for a house-mission. The Pharisaic traditions regulating higher standards of ritual purity went, however, too far beyond the biblical prescriptions and were then attacked by their opponents (Ant.13.10.6; 1QH.4.10; Mk.7.6-13). If a certain group of people seemed not to observe their traditions, they labelled them as "sinners" (see Dunn 1997:160-170). The more members of the Jewish community moved away from Pharisaic standards, the more likely the Pharisees would dub them sinners.

Tax-collectors were the primary prey of Pharisaic labelling of "sinners". The reason for that labelling was probably due to the tax-system of Greco-Roman society. The yearly leasing of rights to the "tax-collector" (τελωνης) was introduced into Palestine by the Romans (Smallwood 1976:31-44). A tax-collector paid in advance the sum required during the course of the year and then collected actively because he had to make up deficit. An enormous amount of capital was needed to purchase the tax-lease of an entire region, and so the tax-collectors in the Gospel would have been employees of a Roman leasing company (Michel 1972:97f.). The tax-collectors were well-to-do Jews like Zacchaeus (Lk.19.2). Levi would be a sub-employee, one of those who collected the taxes at tollbooths or tax-offices (Lk.5.27).

Negative views toward the tax-collectors are well reflected in Lk.3.12-13, where John tells them to collect no more than is "appointed," and Lk.18.11, where the Pharisee contrasts himself with other people, who are "rapacious, unjust, adulterers, or even tax-collectors." Greco-Roman literature shows they were lumped together with beggars, thieves, and robbers (Cicero Off.15-51; Dio Chrysostom Orat.14.14; Dio.Laert..36.2; Lucian Pseudol.30). Rabbinic writings link them with robbers, murderers, and sinners (m.Tohar.7.6; m.B.Qam.10.2; m.Ned.3.4) and lists tax-collecting as one of the despised trades which no observant Jew should follow (b.Sanh.25.b). A tax-collector who wanted to join a Pharisee guild had to give up his profession and pay just compensation to all those he had cheated (Herrenbrück
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Despite their bad reputation, there are signs that some tax-collectors, surprisingly, enjoyed positions of relatively high status and wealth within Roman Palestine, and they were integrated socially and religiously within Judaism (Herrenbrück 1990:162-227). Josephus refers to John the tax-collector in Caesarea as a member of a Jewish delegation with nobles in negotiation with Gessius Florus concerning a synagogue. They also worked for collection of alms (mokhsin) which was considerably respected in the first-century (m. Ned 3.4). Perhaps it is best, however, to view these as exceptions to the general position.

Why are sinners and tax-collectors attracted to the Gospel? They would have perceived the patronage of God as a powerful alternative to the existing social values inasmuch as it breaks the social boundaries to create a new fictive kinship through Jesus’ brokerage. Anthropologically we understand that choosing one’s message is an agonistic struggle to define not what one is and what one is not. A choice is an act of allegiance as well as of protest against the undesired society (Douglas 1996:77-125). In a market situation, the choice of commodities is not only between kinds of goods but also between kinds of society in which one wants to live. Everything that a customer chooses to buy is part of a project to choose other people to be with who will help him/her to make the kind of society s/he thinks s/he will like the best. Thus choosing one means rejecting one. Commodities are chosen because they would not be tolerated in the rejected form of community and are therefore the preferred form. The protest is inherent in one’s selection. So choosing the one way of life is rejecting other ways of life.

How does Jesus as a social performer win the shoppers who are wandering in the social market? Pierre Bourdieu’s theory of aesthetic judgement has proposed that the choice of goods is influenced by the leadership of those who are endowed not with ‘economic capital’ but with ‘symbolic capital’, which leads to the judgement of goods according to their educational, aesthetic and ideological propensity (1979). The recognition of symbolic capital requires the leader to possess certain kinds of legitimacy and acceptability. If the leaders’ claims are accepted by their audience, they are thence endowed with symbolic capital. Thus bearing symbolic capital and nothing else, these leaders are able to challenge or subvert the established social order,
and then the struggle is on between them and those want to maintain it. Jesus, who is empowered by the Holy Spirit, holds symbolic capital which brings a different orientation compared with the dominant social values. Thus he is able to incorporate the socially marginalised people into his kinship group by offering an alternative choice of social goods.

Thus Luke characterises Pharisees as serving his purpose in providing a social foil for Jesus’ attitude toward sinners. By offering the patronage of God to sinners and tax-collectors, who were excluded from the house of God by the Pharisaic standards, Jesus renders illegitimate the Pharisaic social program of house and incorporates the marginalised into God’s house through his brokerage. For Luke, sinners and tax-collectors provide a suitable opportunity of highlighting the significance of the very nature of the family and house in which the socially homeless can settle down in the Father’s house (cf. the Prodigal son). Thus in Acts Luke appropriately drops the term ἀμαρτωλοί, because the Christ-event creates a new inclusive social group, but the Pharisaic Christian followers function as antagonists against the inclusive Christian group (Ac.15).

III. HOUSE IN THE GOSPEL

1. The Magnificat (Lk.1.46-55)

In portraying the birth narrative, Luke characteristically sets up the scene in a house (1.23,40,56; 2.7), which is not noble but humble, to announce the humble origin of the Lord. Since there is no mention of the conjugated family or relatives, we assume Luke wants his readers to imagine that the houses of Zechariah and Mary would be traditional Palestinian simple houses. And the stable (κατάλυμα), in which Jesus was born, is either the simple house or the rural farmhouse. These houses have a relatively low degree of spatial and social logic and therefore allow transpatial interaction. These domestic settings are significantly harmonised with the Magnificat, which illustrates the revolutionary nature of salvation which Jesus brings. This stands in contrast to the Lukan urban social context, which has active tensions between social
elites and non-elites and between the rich and poor (Moxnes 1994). The social stratification of urban society is symbolically represented in its architectural structures: monuments, streets, market places, and the contrasted domestic division between the elites and the non-elites, and accordingly the spatial logic of society is well replicated in its social relationships, which are characterised by the patronage system and balanced reciprocity (Laurence 1994).

This urban context is reflected in the Magnificat proclaiming the revolutionary nature of the salvation of Jesus which inverts the social values of the urban elites on the lips of the Palestinian peasant girl. The carefully constructed climax of the hymn appears in vv.51-53 which set forth Yahweh's mighty works by using six verbs in the aorist tense (Ἐφόντησεν, διεσκόρπισεν, καθέλεν, ὑψώσεν, ἐνέπλησεν, ἐξαπέστειλεν) as referring to God's past redemptive deeds towards Israel (cf. Dt.5.15) and by betraying creative literary artistry with a contrasting chiasm between powerful (δυνάστας)/humble (τάπεινος), hungry (πελώντας)/rich (πλουτωντας). Interpreting prospectively the significance of the life of Jesus, the characteristic Lukan motif of reversal of status is proleptically announced to express the new social order in which the Greco-Roman pivotal value of honour (v.51), its social relationship of patronage (v.52), and its social interaction of reciprocity (v.53) are overthrown: The Lord shall scatter the proud, put down the powerful, lift up the humble, fill the hungry, and empty the rich. By placing the Magnificat in the Palestinian rural domestic space at the outset of Luke-Acts, Luke strategically challenges the ideologies of the Jewish Temple authorities and Greco-Roman rulers, who are deeply engaged in the contemporary Mediterranean urban social-world, in order to legitimise the social identity of his house-church.

2. Jesus' Meal with the Sinners: The Call of Levi (Lk.5.27-39)

The healing episode of the paralytic in Lk.5.17-26 paves the way for Jesus' association with sinners. Setting up the social interaction with the Jewish leadership...
in the urban courtyard house,\textsuperscript{45} in which the spatial logic of society is dominated by the hierarchical patronage system, Jesus’ saying, “your sins are forgiven (ἀφεσονται)” (v.20b) develops the first dispute between himself and the group of Pharisees and Scribes about his power to cure and to forgive sins. Here we have a visible violation of the social norms of Jewish society aimed at challenging the strict bearers of those norms. The word, ἁμαρτία, signifies primarily a failure to achieve an expected behaviour, whether culpable or unintentional, in various relationships (Fiedler 1990: 66). So committing sins against God means breaking the relationship with God. Thus ancient Jews thought that sin was generally connected with sickness as the visible sign of a disruption of God’s patronage (Ex.20.5; 2Sam.11; 1QapGen 20.16-29; b.Neb.41a; Stra-B, I:495). The Pharisees undoubtedly perceive the challenge because the divine passive formula implies a claim to make performative statements in God’s name. The Pharisees claim that God alone can forgive and Jesus is speaking blasphemy (v.21), so they might repudiate Jesus’ role as a broker of God.

Perceiving their challenge (v.22a), Jesus accordingly demonstrates his authority to forgive sins by curing of the paralytic (v.25). For the Pharisees, the sinner should have been left shackled by sin. They are content to leave the paralytic bound to his sin and infirmity. But Jesus makes it an opportunity for a provocative action challenging their social norms. For Luke, Jesus holds the symbolic capital which enables him to challenge the established social order and to lead people to choose the good he offers in a competition-ridden society. The word, ἀφεσον, refers to re-establishing the relationship. Jesus’ claim means that he is the Broker who enables the sinner to re-establish his/her relationship with the Patron. Luke aptly records the reintegration phase of the social drama in two ways: (a) the paralytic after having recovered is reintegrated into his home (v.25); (b) Jesus the social performer also creates the communitas with the public in the house (v.26). Jesus is granted his honour by public verdict and creates his social space, and on the other hand, his opponents’ honour is diminished as one would expect in this limited good society.

\textsuperscript{45} Luke replaces the reinforced clay roof of a common Palestinian rural house with the tiled roof of a Mediterranean urban courtyard house, making the scene more intelligible to Greco-Roman readers (Dalman 1942:74-75,87,119; Hirschfeld 1995:237-248).
The house provides the social space for the socio-religiously marginalised people who need to enjoy general reciprocity with the God-Patron through Jesus’ brokerage.

As a sequel, the following stories of Levi more concretely substantiate Jesus’ provocative claim to forgive sins. In them Luke gets into his stride with a view signalling Jesus’ meals with sinners, which is an important means of creating a new social relationship under God’s patronage. This story is the first meal with sinners and represents a paradigm which illustrates the inclusive nature of Jesus’ ministry, who “comes to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance” through meals (Lk. 5.32).

In his redaction of the Markan source, Luke has greatly deleted the Markan introductory setting (Mk. 2.13), in order to continue Jesus’ house mission to forgive sins and to develop the story-line directly into Levi’s house. Luke adds the phrases “left everything” (v. 28b) and “repentance” (μετάνοιαν, v. 32b) to imply Levi’s radical discipleship in accordance with the examples of Simon Peter and Abraham (Lk. 5.4-11; Gen. 21.1; cf. Neale 1993: 110-1). Luke alters Mark’s dinner (κατακείσθαι) to “a great banquet” (δοχή μεγάλη, v. 29a) to make his readers understand that Levi was wealthy and the Hellenistic context of a banquet. Luke inserts Levi’s name to emphasise the consequences of Levi’s repentance (v. 29a), by clarifying Mark’s ambiguity over “τῇ οἰκίᾳ αὐτοῦ,” which would refer either to Jesus’ house or Levi’s house (Malbon 1985: 282-284). Luke does not follow Mark’s “ἀμαρτωλοί” but deliberately changes it to “ἄλλων” (others) (v. 29b) since he does not regard them as “sinners” who have been forgiven in the previous story and invited to Jesus’ meal (v. 32) (contra Nolland 1989: 245) These Lukan redactions highlight his strategy in relation to meals, which constitute a social drama through which the tax-collectors and sinners, who are originally far from the covenant of Israel, are incorporated into the Christian fictive-kinship group by re-establishing their broken relationship with God the Patron.

What a shock to Pharisees when Jesus eats with these sinners and tax-collectors! From our previous discussion, we know that the tax-collectors were recognised as breaking the covenant of Israel, and that Pharisees should have
scrupulously avoided ritual contamination from contact with morally suspect people like tax-collectors and sinners. In a group-oriented Mediterranean society, the meal is a code used for constructing social relationship by way of regulating who is included and who is excluded. As a social performer, Jesus strategically overturns the established social norms in order to cause a social crisis by responding willingly to Levi’s invitation and having a dinner with social outcasts.

It is natural to expect the reactive complaints from the Pharisaic group: “Why do you eat and drink with tax-collectors and sinners?” (v.30b). Their criticism is more intensified in v.33 where they sharply stereotype Jesus’ group as an impious group that has festive eating and drinking in a time of repentance, in contrast with their own group and John’s group, which frequently fast and pray. Their labelling is vividly echoed on the lips of Jesus: “a glutton and a drunkard, and friend of tax-collectors and sinners” (Lk.7.34). This denunciatory designation “a glutton and a drunkard (φάγως καὶ οἶνοπότης) has verbal links with Dt.21.20 (LXX: σωμβολοκοπῶν οἶνοφλυγεῖ). The passage in Deuteronomy outlines the procedure for dealing with ‘a stubborn and rebellious son’, who refuses to obey his parents and threatens the welfare of the community as a whole. Accordingly Jesus’ provocative practices of welcoming the excluded into meals can be regarded as rebellion and sedition by strict adherents to social boundaries, who see themselves as the covenant people of God (Kee 1996:391). And another label, “ψίλος τελωνῶν καὶ áμαρτωλῶν”, implies that the Pharisees treat Jesus as the crony of renowned social deviants in Jewish society in order to degrade his social status. As a whole, they define Jesus as a rebellious social deviant who threatens the well-being of Israelites as the covenant people. Labelling one as a deviant depends on the perceptions and judgements of others in society since the social order shared by members of society is perceived to be at risk of dishonour and the deviant is perceived as jeopardising those who have interests in that social order (Malina and Neyrey 1991c:100; Barclay 1995). This labelling implies how intensively the Lukan Jesus practises meal fellowship in his house-mission to recruit the socially stigmatised people into his fictive-kinship group under God as patron.

Against their attack, Jesus clarifies his social identity by casting doubt on the legitimacy of theirs. Jesus quotes a proverb, “It is not the healthy who need a
physician but the sick” (v.31) as an analogy to the righteous and sinners. The word “sick” is figuratively used to refer to the socially stigmatised people in Jewish society (Fitzmyer 1981:592). Jesus identifies himself as a social practitioner who cures social illness, a type of illness which cannot be separated from the complex context of social, political, economical, and religious institutions in contemporary Jewish culture, which imposes hierarchical social boundaries replicated in the Temple spatial structure. As a social doctor endowed with symbolic capital, Jesus challenges the established social order by introducing a new relationship under the patronage of God through his brokerage. To heal social illness, he strategically has meals with the sick, thus incorporating them into the new kinship group.

Jesus creates a new modus vivendi which is not characterised by the pious devotion to fasting and prayer but by the celebration of new social relations through which he creates the people of God (Lk.5.34-39). Refusal to fast is an explicit protest against established social norms, which are dominantly governed by the Temple purity laws. It is a kind of customer’s revolt, involving a choice to live in another sort of society (Douglas 1996:106-125). Whereas people do not know what they want, they are very clear about what they do not want. Protest against fasts is an affirmative action which involves choosing other group boundaries and distinguishing one group from other contending groups in dispute (Neyrey 1991b:375). On the other hand, meals are chosen as a modus vivendi because they would not be tolerated with guests such as Jesus picks in the rejected dominant forms of society and are therefore permissible in the preferred form of society. Gathering to eat and drink is a performative action which creates a new social order in which the meal as a ritual legitimises the social identity, social values, and social relations of these protestors. This is the reason why Jesus responds to his opponents in terms of the two different realities: the new against the old garment, wine, wineskins. Choosing one modus vivendi is reactive but at the same time it is assertive in announcing one’s allegiance.

For the Lukan community, Jesus’ meals with the sinners are viewed as an “acted parable” of his message of God’s salvation to the socially stigmatised people and contribute to the legitimisation of their heterogeneous association which crosses over the social boundaries of status, ethnos, gender. Luke’s expression of Jesus as the
Friend (φίλος) makes his readers readily understand Jesus' social identity in the context of the patron-client relationships. This patronage-Christology vividly explains how Jesus formulates their community as a fictive-kinship and strongly evokes social intimacy in the context of social interaction with the significant outgroups like Jews and Gentiles. In Levi's house Jesus rejects the established social norms of Jewish society and reveals a new paradigm of life-style under the patronage of God so as to bring socially stigmatised people into his newly created kinship group. Thus Levi's house is a significant paradigm for the Christian house-churches in which the variegated heterogeneous people across various social boundaries enjoy one fictive-kinship.

3. The Woman with Ointment (Lk.7.36-50)

In a complementary manner to the healing of the paralytic, this story shows, during a meal with a Pharisee, how great is the forgiveness of sin brought by Jesus the Broker. Luke elaborates upon his sources more than other writers who record similar anointing stories (Mk.14.3-9//Mt.26.6-13; Jn.12.1-8). While Mark situates it in the story of Simon, the leper at Bethany, perhaps to solve the issue of costly expenditure on the remembrance of Jesus’ death in the early church, Luke skilfully restructures the incident in the context of social interaction with Pharisees at a meal to illustrate how Jesus’ forgiveness of sin legitimises the social identity of his community in order to address the critical attitudes to the house-church leaders who accepted hospitality from the converts who have been notorious sinners in their society. Luke employs the Pharisees as the subjects of pedagogy in Jesus’ house-mission to challenge their false attitudes to sinners.

In setting up the stage of a social drama (Turner 1974), Luke, in contrast to the other evangelists, portrays Jesus’ teaching in the context of a symposium in which Jesus and the Pharisee recline (κατέσκασεν· λέγων) at table together (Smith 1987:614). Luke also gives an impression of the architectural space of the atrium house to which the traditional Greco-Roman banquet is rather fitted than into Mark’s humble Palestinian house: that the invited anonymous woman could gain access to the triclinium points to
the distinctive spatial overlap of the Roman house between private and public (Wallace-Hadrill 1994:8ff). The social logic of this space is relatively hierarchical, but Luke describes his Jesus as challenging and transforming it in a new form under the patronage of God.

The breach with existing social norms is introduced by the awkward appearance of a woman as an invited guest, who comes from another group which is indisputably unfitted to the host's social status. Luke characterises the women as a "sinner in the city", i.e., a woman with a bad reputation (v.37), which more than likely suggests her identity as a prostitute (Schüssler-Fiorenza 1983:129-30; Witherington 1984:54). This identification indicates that she is a lower-class working freedwoman who may have earned her freedom by prostituting herself, one of the few avenues open to her (Corley 1993b:52). Her successful trade is indicated both by her infamous reputation and the kind of costly ointment she uses to anoint Jesus (v.37). Her behaviour toward Jesus also shows her erotic profession since the series of her actions—washing, drying, kissing, anointing Jesus' feet—are actions that only slaves or prostitutes would perform in the context of a meal (v.38). She is undoubtedly a social deviant who is "out of place" in the Pharisaic group.

In this chreia, the woman plays the character model who provides the main subject to be discussed at the symposium. The crisis is intensified by the Pharisee, who considers that Jesus would not allow a woman such as this to touch him if he were really a prophet (v.39). Jesus as chief guest takes up the role of redressive action by addressing the parable of the two debts (vv.40-43). By inserting the parable as an analogy for the forgiveness of sin, Luke nicely elaborates the incident so as to set up the characteristic contrast between a sinner and a Pharisee. In this parable, the sinner is expressed by a legal term, "debtor" (ΧΡΗΣΘΗΛΗΣ), in contrast to "creditor" (ΣΧΩΛΗΣ), as referring to a person owing money or commodities (v.41). In first-century Palestine society, the peasants relied heavily on borrowing from creditors who were usually from the ruling class (Goodman 1982). Debt is a key factor which impacted on the traditional composition of the Palestine family (Guijarro 1997:43-45). Probably the woman is one of the victims of the economic disaster of a peasant family, who has been pushed out into the public market as a prostitute. Using the
parable, the Lukan Jesus criticises the present social relation based on the Temple-centred distributive system and suggests a new social relation based on the generalised reciprocity under the patronage of God, the Benefactor. For Lukan readers, the parable is lively good news evoking a joyful sense of belonging to Jesus' fictive-kinship. The Pharisee would have realised the very distinctive nature of the forgiveness of God which Jesus brings through his brokering, if he knows the prosbul debt system that Hillel instituted to guarantee the creditor's security against the long-term interests of peasant debtors (m. Seb. 10). But Simon does not offer the usual banquet niceties to his guest and disregards Jesus (vv. 44-46).

In this story, Luke produces an ironical conclusion: the woman as the one who breaches social norms is aggregated into the patronage of God, while Simon the Pharisee raises the question about Jesus' redressive act. The women's sins "have been forgiven" (ἀφεθεὶς τάξις, perfect tense) in certain past time. Her act is an expression of gratitude for something previously achieved, with the verb "to love" (ἀγαπᾶω) here meaning, "to thank" (Fitzmyer 1981: 687). Her tears are a sign not of nascent penitence nor even joy over her newfound forgiveness, but of something else. The parable suggests that the women's great "debts" were already released as a presupposition of her forgiveness which leads to her gratitude. In Luke, the technical term for "debtor" (ὀφείλέτης) is used to refer to sinner (Lk. 13.4), and the term ὀφείλειημα is interchangeably replaced with the sin in Lk. 11.4 to express the indebtedness to God or to other humans. It means that in the presumed previous association with Jesus which Luke does not record, the woman had already been released from the sphere of the old social-world which forced upon her indebtedness to God, and had been incorporated into the new patronage of God through the broker Jesus. The woman's acts are an expression of gratitude celebrating her belonging to the fictive-kinship established by Jesus. Thus v. 48 should not be read as a fresh forgiveness of the woman's sins but as a confirmation of the woman's previous forgiveness on the public stage. The Christians' new group boundaries and social relations are maintained and legitimised to invert the social logic of the Pharisaic house by announcing the forgiveness of sins to the sinner.
4. House as Central Mission Field (Lk.9.1-6; 10.1-16)

In the messages of the sending out the Twelve and the Seventy (Lk.9.1-6/10.1-16), the house is the central place of their missionary activity. These missions are something of a dress rehearsal for the post-Pentecost activity in the houses of early Christianity. In redacting the Markan source, Luke both adds "κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ" (9.2), "εὐαγγελίζεσθε" (9.6) and omits, "μετανοοῦν" (Mk.6.12c), to give an impression that the missionaries of the early house-churches understand their preaching and their activities from the point of view of the tradition of Isa.61.1ff. and 52.7, as appears in Jesus’ Nazareth manifesto (Stuhlmacher 1991:20). In redacting Q, Luke especially emphasises “staying in the same house” (Lk.10.7a.c) and connects this sending story to the woe on Galilean towns (Lk.10.13-16). Generally their activities are specified in the house: the greeting of the house (10.5), eating and drinking (10.7), staying in whatever house they enter (10.7), and receiving hospitality (10.7). In and from the house, missionaries proclaim the good news of the patronage of God (9.2,6; 10.9), heal the sick (9.6; 10.9), and exorcise demons (10.17).

In sending his emissaries to Palestinian villages, the Lukan Jesus qualifies his emissaries in two points: (1) they are empowered with symbolic capital to exorcise demons and to cure diseases (Lk.9.1b), in order to make the people follow them in the choice of goods under the patronage of God through Jesus’ brokership, which is different from that which derives from the Temple; (2) they need to be destitute (Lk.9.3; 10.4) as embodying the modus vivendi of generalised reciprocity under the patronage of God. In the Lukan beatitudes (Lk.6.20-23), Jesus highlights his followers’ honour in becoming voluntary marginals who break with their familial honour and inheritance. So they are destitute (Neyrey 1995). In Lk.9.57-62, the Lukan Jesus demands that would-be followers cut themselves off radically from familial duties and join his wandering missionary group.

Endowed with symbolic capital, Jesus’ emissaries enter into the villages to seek hospitality, which (as already noted) is a social process which changes the
outsiders' status from strangers to guests (Malina 1986a:182-187). Why does Jesus command them to enter the house? As strangers who come from another social-world under the patronage of God, they are liable to be treated as outlaws who could despoil or destroy the purity-lines of a given community by their 'impurity'. So they need to be examined as to whether or not they are fitted to the purity lines of the village. The appearance of a stranger in a village is a challenge to its inhabitants. To secure entrance into the social space of the village, the followers need to find a host who will serve as the local patron and protect them against their unsecured status in the village, since to offend the guest is to offend the host. But if hospitality is refused, Jesus commands them to shake the dust off their feet as a powerful symbolic action of insult. Bearing their symbolic capital, the followers would be allowed to enter the village and to interact with the inhabitants. Successful entrance into the patron’s house guarantees the followers’ capacity to preach the good news of the patronage of God. But a guest could infringe the requirements of hospitality by insulting the host or by refusing what is offered. Jesus commands them to remain in the house for as long as they stay in the village and to eat whatever the host provides: a warning to avoid breaching the protocols of hospitality. The guest will leave the host either as friend or enemy. If as friend, Jesus’ followers will honour the host with the good news and salvation. If as enemy, they will each have to take revenge. Jesus’ woes upon the Galilean towns can be understood as his judgement on their inhospitality. The reports of disciples (Lk.9.10; 10.17-20) prove their mission successful by entering the social space of numerous houses. The house is honoured as the bearer of the patronage of God.

For the Lukan readers, it is highly likely that these house-mission stories legitimised their social identity as the honourable members of a house-church, which sent and supported missionaries to other regions, and which provided hospitality in the house to the travelling missionaries. Since all the Christian groups in Luke-Acts are communities small enough to meet in somebody’s private home, certain socio-theological ramifications arise from this reality. In contrast to public monumental buildings, domestic space expresses social intimacy and solidarity while fulfilling a vital need of human social identity in terms of physical proximity and social homogeneity (Heidegger 1978:161). It facilitates social diversity both by
decentralising established social relations and norms inherent in public buildings like
the Temple and synagogues, and by creating social dynamics which overcome
territorial, ethnic, socio-economical restraints. Choosing the house as the missionary
centre is not an inevitable choice due to the economic deficiency or poor social
standing, but rather a strategic deployment for spreading the good news effectively,
and creating a distinctive social identity.

5. Jesus’ Teaching on Prayer (Lk.11.1-13)

If prayer is a meaningful act of communication directed to God who supports,
maintains, and controls the very existence of the one praying (Malina 1980), prayer is
inconceivable in this culture without the patronage of God and vice versa. It
represents how one conceives of God and what kind of relationship one has with God.
In Lk.11.1-13, 18.1-8, prayers are richly embedded in the Mediterranean family life of
peasants and are deeply rooted in the father-son relationship (Jeremias 1973; 1978).
So we need to consider prayers in the context of the Mediterranean familial and
patron-client relationships.

In Lk.10.21-22, Jesus announces his brokership in his prayer to the Father as
his Patron, and praises (Ἐξουσιοδοτεōµω) his patron for showing his favour, since
infants are enabled to gain access to the resources of the patron while the wise and
intelligent are blocked from them. Finally Jesus declares the exclusive relationship
between the patron and the clients through his authorised and monopolised brokerage,
by using a Mediterranean-style proverb about the father-son relationship: “No one
knows who is a son except a father, or who is a father except a son and anyone to
whom a son chooses to make him known” (v.22).46 Thus Jesus, the broker, is able to
provide the way of mediating his followers to the Patron, God, in the prayer (Lk.11.1-4).
Luke presents the Lord’s prayer as emblematic of that which distinguishes the

46 Frequently the English versions like NRSV and NIV, etc, read ὁ υἱὸς and ὁ πατήρ
as “the Son” and “the Father” by imposing anachronistically the Johannine concept or later
Christian doctrine on the Lukan text, which have no capitals while the Greek articles stand
for the generic categories of proverbs (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1992:94).
social identity of the Jesus groups from that of the Baptist group (Lk.11.1) and the
prayers of Jesus and his followers are undoubtedly different from those of Jews (the
Eighteen Benedictions, the Qaddish) and Gentiles (cf. Mt.6.7-8). As a hallmark of the
Jesus’ group, the Lord’s prayer illustrates who are the followers of Jesus and how they
perceive their relationship with God.

The address to “Father” (v.2), derived from the Aramaic word “Abba”, is
distinctive Jesus’ way of addressing God (Lk.10.21; 23.34,46), and its inclusion in early
Christian usage (Mk.14.36; Rom.8.15; Gal.4.6) demonstrates its prominence in the
self-understanding of Jesus vis-à-vis God. The idea of God as “Father” is well-
established in Jewish usage (Isa.63.16; IChron.29.10; Ps.89.27; Sir.23.1,4; 51.10), but
the term “Abba” is not typically found in Jewish direct addressing of God in prayers.
The word was originally a nursery word with the meaning “Dad” or “Papa” but in
New Testament times was used as a form of address for old men (Kuhn 1991:1).
Several scholars argue that it was used of God without specific association with child
language in the Apocryphal and Qumran literature (Vermes 1973:210; Barr 1988a,b;
Schuller 1992), but they generally fail to incorporate the pivotal social dynamics of
ancient Mediterranean society, the patron-client relationship, into its meaning.

In this society, the concept of father formed part of a patriarchal structure in
which the father was the protector, sustainer, supporter, and helper, and was not
confined to the biological father but even extended to one’s philosophical teacher
(Epictetus Diss.3.22.81ff), king, gods; in these cases the patron was a kind of social
father (Pitt-Rovers 1957-8). Although Jesus uses familial language in his teaching of
prayer, it refers not to reality but is used as a metaphor, which is an efficient way of
communicating religious belief and social values by providing “a partial
understanding of one kind of experience in terms of another kind of experience”
(Lakoff and Johnson 1980:154). As the Christian group spread throughout the first-
century Mediterranean world, family metaphors constituted one of the ways in which
to speak about their new social-world (Esler 1997; Lassen 1997). So it is reasonable
that Luke understands the vocative use of father to refer to the Patron, God, who can
be accessed through his son’s brokerage.
Father as the Patron is evoked as an ultimate provider and protector in the subsequent petitions of the prayer. The first petition, “hallowed be your name” is expressed by the divine passive verb to honour the patron who will perform exclusive patronage acts for his clients. One’s name denotes the essential property of the one who bears it (Origen Orat. 24.2), and then the social status and standing to which honour refers. In this first petition, the disciples participate in the social ritual of patronage to praise and honour the patron, just as Roman clients went to offer “salutatio” to his patron’s house in the early morning in order both to serve the patron’s needs as well as to meet his own needs. The second petition, “your Kingdom come” is an act of awareness of the patronage of God which Jesus the broker brings, and in which the petitioners are ready to serve the patron’s needs whatever and whatever they are.

After honouring the patron, the clients ask the patron’s help and protection in the resource-limited and conflict-ridden Mediterranean society. Their petitions concretely reflect the circumstances of the first-century Mediterranean peasants—daily bread, debts, and trial—from which the fragility and precariousness of their life were powerfully derived. These are the essential components of existence with which any generous patrons should concern themselves. In the bread-petition (v.3), the bread is a basic for daily life. It does not refer to wheat bread for the wealthy but to barley or sorghum bread for the poor, since most peasants ate black bread while the rich ate white bread made of sifted flours (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1992:351). The word, “ἐπιοῦσιος” has been given too much attention by biblical scholarship (Fitzmyer 1985:904-6; Nolland 1993:615-6). The word is actually unknown in Greek literature and extrabiblical texts but its meaning is generally agreed to be “for the morrow” or “forthcoming.” Luke makes it clear by inserting “τὸ καθ’ ἕμεραν” (day to day). The “tomorrow’s bread desired “each day” is a petition for subsistence (Origen Orat.27.7) and an enjoyment of the patronage of God since life under patronage is something like a never-ending feast, just as the Israelite enjoyed manna (Ex.16.4).

It is necessary, however, to capture the peasant’s view of time: neither yesterday nor tomorrow is of concern but only the need of the immediate present.
Their daily subsistence is a very important concern. The ideal of the peasant’s life is self-sufficiency, having everything necessary for life, depending for nothing upon outsiders, and getting not too far ahead of one’s neighbour. Too much and too little have destructive consequences for one’s life. Any surplus or accumulation will be subjected to the envy of one’s neighbour and to inimical gossip, which makes one shamed. The right to subsistence is the active moral principle in peasant society for preserving one’s status (Malina 1993a:110). Exploitation beyond the point of minimal subsistence is a standard principal cause of peasant rebellion. For a peasant family, daily bread is the primary resource for life. Buying luxury or capitalising surplus are not for them but for the rich. Korean peasants had experienced in every year “Boree-kogae” (barley hump), i.e., spring famine just before the barley harvest in the early summer. This expression reflected their primary concern as the subsistence of the family. Imagine how the Lukan bread petition appeals to peasants!

The debt-petition (v.4a) reflects a strong sense of the misfortune of the peasants. To write off debts, they needed desperately the patron’s special generosity, which provided much more than their basic subsistence. We may assume that the majority of the followers of Jesus would have experienced indebtedness since they came from the low strata of society. So this petition would have evoked a strong sense of social security which only the patron could have provided in the precarious social circumstances of a peasant’s socio-economic status. Since debts (δόμολήματα) are used as a counterpart to sin and each term suggests an interpretation of the other, this petition also implies the need of the continual maintenance of the patronage relationship with God the Father. Finally the trial-petition is best understood in the light of the foreclosure experience of the peasants (see Oakman 1999). It has terrible consequences for their life: the loss of land and status. So trial here refers to something to test the fidelity to and dependence on the patronage of God. Breaking the patron-client relationship means losing social security and solidarity.

As Oakman has argued (1999), the Lord’s prayer is a compendium of the relationship of Galilean peasants (and Luke’s readers) with God under his patronage as well as a badge for the social identity of the Christian fictive-kinship. The Lukan readers presumably enjoyed the patronage of God and the brokerage of Jesus in their
worship and eucharistic celebration by reciting the Lord's prayer. If the Lukan community is heterogeneously comprised of people who mainly come from a low social status and the destitute with a minority of the wealthy and those of high social standing, the prayer would have played a significant role in re-socialising them into the social relations and social norms of the patronage of God. It is really a powerful apparatus for the Christian group to establish the social identity which comes from belonging to Jesus' fictive-kinship group.

In Lk.11.5-8, Jesus first sets up a supposed situation to teach the attitudes of the petitioner to the patron. The house referred to is either a simple rural house or an urban apartment house, in either case an impressive device to evoke enough emotional attachment of the audience to their social circumstances. The members of this house should not be shamed. The extraordinary situation of the sleeper makes him unable to help his friend's need, but on the account of his "shamelessness" (ἀναιδεία, v.8), the negative quality of lacking sensitivity of shame to one's public honour, he will comply with his friend's need. But whose shamelessness? The petitioner or the sleeper? Luke ambiguously places the "αὐτοῦ" after "ἀναιδεία" but his cryptic expression of the "αὐτοῦ" intends to give double referents to the word. Luke deliberately redacts his sources to give such a double meaning by adding Lk.11.9-13, which is a commentary on the parable. The friend is pictured in the guise of beggars who ask, search, knock on the door, while the petitioner's position is explained in the imagery of a father who cares for his children. The sleeper would be shamed by refusing hospitality. In the gossip-networked village, he is vulnerable to his neighbours' whispering about his shameful behaviour (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1992:351). Otherwise, the friend's shamelessness should be avoided by providing for his needs. Asking, searching, and knocking constitute a positive challenge to the sleeper. If the request is refused, the visitor will be shamed, but if accepted, he will share social space with members of household, and the ongoing relationship will be continued. By the parable, Jesus asserts that the Patron is honourable who avoids shamelessness. As a patron would be shamed if he could not comply with his client's needs, so God will be shamed if he cannot respond appropriately to a believer's needs. The house-community receives assurance of the generous providence of the Patron in their prayer to God the Patron.
6. New Economy of the Patronage of God

In Mediterranean antiquity, the house was the main area of the economy (οἰκονομία) which managed relationships and norms within and between households (cf. Xenophon). Highlighting the house-economy based on generalised reciprocity, Luke describes Jesus' teachings about the sharing of goods both to criticise the contemporary mode of transactions—balanced reciprocity—which excludes the destitute and the social outgroups according to the group's purity lines, and to characterise the new social relations in the patronage of God which includes socially marginalised people. Luke substantiates his moral economy in Lk.10.25-37; 12.13-21; 16.19-31, in which Jesus teaches how his followers must handle their goods.

In Lk.10.25-37, Luke alters the interrogator from Mark's scribes (Mk.12.28) to a lawyer who tests (ἐκτελέσας) the qualification for the inheritance of eternal life (10.25). His question is perceived as a challenge to Jesus, and then Jesus poses a counter question. The lawyer's riposte is basically to uphold Moses' Law according to his profession as a Torah scholar. In this interaction, the main issue is certainly focused on group identity: who really is one's neighbour? To identify one's neighbour is to know one's purity lines, which are a barometer of social relations in a group-oriented society, and which provide solidarity, security and support only to one's ingroup members, while the outgroup members were negatively subjected to lies and deceit which were legitimate and honourable in this context (Malina 1993a:43; Carney 1975:137-234; also cf. the lies of Judith to Hoioernes). In this society, the word, "love" (ἀγάπαω) is a group-oriented action to mean "attachment to one's group," as in treating one as one's family. Accordingly, the word "hate" means "dis-attachment, non-attachment, indifference" (Malina and Rohrbaugh 1992:57). The lawyer would want to justify his purity line as clean enough to enter the social space of the patronage of God, but Jesus implies his inadequacy as far as he maintains his ingroup identity. Thus Luke drops his Markan source, which portrays positively Jesus' interrogator, but interpolates the parable of the Good Samaritan (10.29-37).
To illustrate the main issue, Luke introduces a certain man who was robbed on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho. Around him, the three characters appear in order: priest, Levite, and Samaritan. In this parable, the issue is not a halachic discussion concerning a clash between corpse-impurity and a law requiring love of neighbour (contra Bauckham 1998). Luke elaborately avoids this issue by making the victim half-dead to highlight the question of ‘neighbour’. Yet the situation is exactly a matter of life and death. Without help, he will die. Luke also deliberately describes the man as stripped in order to imply that it would not be easy to determine whether he was an Israelite or a Samaritan (Esler 2000). The priest and the Levite pass by. Their privileged social status in Jewish society was intimately associated with the Temple cult in which animal categories replicate the people’s categories. As a wounded animal was not permitted for the Temple sacrifices, so wounded people do not have a claim on the priest and Levite. The victim is not their neighbour, who can be attached to their kinship line, but may belong to an outgroup in terms of the Temple purity law. What about the Samaritan? He is not included in the Torah map of people. In Jewish society, he is regarded as a Gentile (Sir.50.25-26; Jn.4.9) or as swine (m.Seb.8.10). The Samaritans were apparently regarded as an outgroup by Jews. This Samaritan willingly helps the victim whoever he is. His concerns for the victim are notably described by Luke (vv.34-35). He is committed to guaranteeing the recovery of the victim. He shows his full attachment to the victim. In the parable, the whole issue of ethnicity and purity is deliberately disregarded by the Samaritan (Esler 2000). In the end, Jesus pushes the challenge to the lawyer who has to face the unexpected conclusion: the Samaritan is honoured in his response. The lawyer’s challenge has failed and his honour has been besmirched. Luke does not record his final riposte but leaves it to his audience to evaluate.

In this parable, Jesus challenges the exclusive ingroup line of Jewish society through a Samaritan who breaks through social boundaries to widen the scope of group boundaries through the practice of generalised reciprocity. A similar issue of loving one’s neighbour is re-discussed in Lk.18.18-30. Asking a similar question of inheriting eternal life, a rich young ruler fails to comply with Jesus’ demand to love his neighbour because of his excessive possession of wealth. Developing the thrust of
the parable, Luke expands its horizon to the use of one's wealth. Earlier in Lk.6.27, Jesus says "love your enemies." This is a striking statement in the context of ancient Mediterranean group-oriented society. In a highly agonistic interaction with the outgoups, to love enemies, to abandon taking revenge against them, and to practise general reciprocity with them is to allow them to enter into the group's social space. This new social norm includes those who are normally excluded from the social relations, namely the destitute. On the other hand, Jesus pronounces woes over the rich who have received consolation, are full now, and are laughing now (6.24-25). These characteristics are the marks of the false disciples. Why? Because they are honoured by the standard of established social values.

It is also interesting that Luke deliberately contrasts the social logic of space between the Temple and inn (παραδοξοίοι). The ancient inn was notoriously dirty and run by persons of low social status. Only people without social connections would stay at a public inn (Casson 1974:204). Luke uses this kind of space to render illegitimate the Temple purity law in contrast to the new patronage of God and to legitimate the creative social norm to love enemies through generalised reciprocity, which is suggested as a new moral economy under God's patronage.

Luke illustrates this moral economy further in the parable of the rich fool (Lk.12.13-21). Jesus refuses to adjudicate a dispute between brothers over division of the family property and warns against greed (πλησινεία). He then tells a parable about the rich fool who tries to store up treasures abundantly (for a similar motif, see Sir.11.19-20; Eccl.2.1-11; Job 31.24-38). Jesus' critical labelling as "fool" ("Αφρων) is a Mediterranean peasant evaluation of the rich who accumulate possessions and store up surplus (Oakman 1991:159). In a limited good society, the more one accumulates, the less someone else receives. Surplus should be distributed to one's clients or community or one is shamed. The institutionalised envy of peasants would monitor the rich to determine whether s/he is honourable or not. In an honour-oriented society, an honourable name is acquired through beneficence, not through the fact of possession or the keeping of what one has acquired. Wealth is an effective means to honour one's name but any other use of it is considered foolish. So Jesus, who knows peasant values well, castigates the status of the rich as shameful in the
patronage of God in which the generalised reciprocity is characterised, since the accumulation of wealth is a characteristic feature of the distributive mode of the Temple economy in which social relations are asymmetrical and stratified in favour of the elites. Luke betrays his keen interest concerning the right or wrong ways of using the house, which is the significant place where the generalised reciprocity is strategically practised to include the destitute. But the rich fool tries to transform the house into the centralised place to store grain for periods of scarcity and hunger in order to secure his social status or to sell off grain at a vast profit when famine comes (e.g. Dio Chrysostom Orat. 46.8). His scheme to build a big storage facility represents the social logic of space—segmented and hierarchical social structure, but it is falsified by Jesus. Similarly Luke criticises the inhospitality of the rich who leave the beggar, Lazarus to starve miserably and die (Lk. 16.19-31).

A Korean poet, Chi-Ha Kim, has written the following poem:

Heaven is bab
As we cannot get heaven alone
We should share bab with one another
As all share the light of the heavenly stars
We should share and eat bab together
Heaven is bab
When we eat and swallow bab
Heaven dwells in our body
Bab is heaven
Yes, bab is the matter
We should eat together

For Korean people, heaven means actually God since they call God "Hanũnnym" or "Hanannym," which means the heavenly Lord. Thus Kim sings that God is bab (boiled rice, a main food of Korean people). On the occasion when people share and eat bab together, they believe God dwells among his people. It is a time of peace. The Chinese character for peace (wa) consists of two words: one is rice and the other is a mouth. Unless we share bab together with all people, there is no peace.
When every mouth is filled with their daily food, we have peace brought by God. But when a few monopolise food, peace is broken since many destitute will cry out for the justice of God.

For Luke, without generalised reciprocity to the destitute and the outgroups, it is impossible to enter the patronage of God. Although Luke is not totally negative to the rich since they can serve as agents of the patronage of God, he is very critical of the abuse of possessions, whenever wealth is used to elevate only one’s social status or to solidify one’s ingroup while not showing hospitality to the destitute. The elite-directed moral economy is a characteristic feature of Lukan social norms (Oakman 1991:176-178). In these stories, Luke distinctively relates the qualification of the inheritor of eternal life to the concept of neighbourliness. These stories highlight the social identity of Luke’s house-community by legitimising his readers’ sense of belonging to the patronage of God as well as their practice of generalised reciprocity.

7. Parable of the Narrow Door (Lk.13.22-30)

On the journey to Jerusalem, someone asks who will be saved. Jesus answers awkwardly: “Strive to enter through the narrow door…” (vv.24-25). In Lk.10.25-37 and 18.18-30, Luke explains entry into salvation in terms of loving one’s neighbour through the moral economy under the patronage of God. Here Luke develops this issue to illustrate its practical incongruity in an architectural setting.

From Q, Luke replaces “gate” (πύλη) in Mt 7.13 with the more domestic word “door” (θύρα) to set up the idea of a banquet in a house, while also reducing the “two ways” in Matthew to his one door (Kloppenborg 1987:223-4). He keeps the word, “στεφάνης” to characterise the exclusive nature of the banquet in contrast to the usual open meals of Jesus. “Door” refers primarily to the entrance to a house, whereas “gate” denotes a gate on a larger architectural structure like Temple or city. The doors of the houses in the Vesuvian cities were unequivocally small and narrow. But the narrowness of the door is not a reference to the physical size but to the social scale of the meal. The meal in v.29 is not an open but a closed banquet. The invitees of the
meal are clearly within the ingroup boundaries of the social group. In Greco-Roman meals, many social parasites angled for dinner invitations in the hope of gaining a standing invitation and eventual access to a patron (cf. Martial Ep. 2.27). On the occasion of a special dinner, the servants of the host checked the invitations at the door. To be refused an invitation to dinner signifies serious damage to one’s social status.

Why are some not invited? The host says “I do not know where you come from” (v.25). In a group-oriented society, the question of “where are you from?” refers to the scrutiny for one’s social status and social group. People are thus identified and stereotyped by the social groups to which they belong. They appeal to their association with the host. They are the ones who ate and drank with Jesus (presumably) in their houses and who have been taught by Jesus in their streets (v.26). In the Lukan context, they are those who invited Jesus into their house and listened to the teaching of Jesus about the kingdom of God (7.36; 11.37; 14.1) and were commanded to share their wealth with the poor (6.24-26; 12.16; 16.19; 18.18), but were irritated with Jesus when he welcomed sinners and the tax-collectors (5.30; 15.2). Their experiences in the host’s ministry cannot guarantee their belonging to the social group. What they have to strive for is to break down social boundaries and to share with the poor and sinners. The host actually issues the deviance accusation, “all you evildoers!” (v.27), that may equate their enjoyable life with balanced reciprocity or the accumulation of wealth, which produced social injustice in first-century Palestine, and in any context in which Luke was writing. It is striking, however, that the invitees at the messianic meal come not just from Israel but also from all the nations. They have presumably complied with the moral economy of the new patronage when they had experienced Jesus’ brokerage. For Luke’s readers, they are the members of the Lukan house-church, who are successfully re-created as Jesus’ fictive kinship group by the brokerage ministries of Jesus and his followers.

This parable is not intended to deal with the “realm of personal ethical challenge” (Nolland 1993:736) or to describe “the difficulties of salvation” (Perrin 1976:161), but to highlight the group-boundary of the inclusive social group, in order to legitimate the social identity of the Christian house-church. The house is
representative of the patronage of God where the existing group boundaries, which excluded the destitute and supported balanced reciprocity or the national tithe and taxation system, are rejected, while new group-boundaries are affirmed.

Another way of entering the patronage of God is by becoming an infant. Jesus says, in quite an astonishing way, to his Mediterranean audiences: "...whosoever does not receive the Kingdom of God as a child (παιδίον) will never enter it" (Lk.18.17//Mk.10.15). Why does a little child become the symbol of the ideal entrant into the Kingdom (that is, divine patronage) in the Gospel traditions? The ethnocentric and anachronistic projections of innocent, trusting, imaginative and delightful children into this story have failed to recognise the real thrust of the saying (Hobbs 1990; Postman 1988:148). In Judaism, the predominant idea related to children was not so much innocence as discipline (Oepke 1967b:646; Pilch 1993). Children were regarded as sinners lacking the knowledge of the Law (Jeremias 1963:190f.). In the Greco-Roman world 'child' was the standard way of addressing a slave as a dehumanising device (Francis 1996:67). The Greek term, παιδίς, refers to a child in terms of age (Mt.2.16), as son in terms of descent, or slave or servant in terms of social position. Malina summarises Mediterranean attitudes to children in contrast with those of the American: they were seen as untrustworthy, selfish, demanding, gratified and indulgent, manipulative, cunning, and in danger of spoiling (1993b:56-58). Children in the ancient Mediterranean world were also characterised as lacking sensitivity to honour and shame since they were thought to be adults still in the making (Francis 1996:65f). So what was dominantly demanded of children was the obligation owed within the primary social group, the family, to protect the honour of the family (Deut.21.18-21; Sir.3.2-16). This is not to say that children were not loved and valued, only to say that they were thought to be greatly in need of protection, nurture, and education by their parents and dependant on them.

In Lk.9.47-48 (Mk.9.36-37), Jesus elevates the status of children in the context of the disciple's honour competition. Luke makes it clear by placing the child 'at his (Jesus) side' (v.47) rather than 'in the midst' of the disciples (Mk.9.36). A squabble over honour status is a typical characteristic of ancient Mediterranean social groups in which those who are the least or the greatest is always a matter of serious concern.
This notable reversal of the expected social status challenges the usual assumptions about what is honourable in a very fundamental way so as to criticise the established social norms. In Lk.18.15-27, Luke significantly changes the Markan word for “παιδία” to “βρέφη” (babies) in v.15 to represent children as those who have the greatest need of parents’ protection and provision. Children’s absolute dependence on their parents is characterised as the absolute condition of entering into the patronage of God in v.17. The points in v.17 are that the patronage of God will be granted to those who are in need of the favour of the Patron: the destitute, sinners, socially marginalised and stigmatised people. The child’s relationship with his/her parents seems to support the imagery of βασιλεία as house in which Christian fictive-kinship community is lived. It also characterises the social identity of house-churches vis-à-vis the outgroups, Judeans and Gentiles.

8. New Social Relations in Meals (Lk.14)

Although important contributions have been made (Rohrbaugh 1991; Braun 1995; Jeremias 1963; Crossan 1973), the significant ramifications of the house in Lk.14 have not been adequately considered. Luke 14 is the Lukan exhibition of the transformed symbolic universe under the patronage of God and comprehends the essential components of the Mediterranean social contexts: purity, honour, reciprocity, meals, and the pre-industrial urban system. Our interest lies in how Luke integrates his materials to maintain and legitimise the social identity of the house-church where the issues in question is a live one in his community. Especially the parable of the Narrow Door provides a crucial insight for a proper understanding of its setting in a house under the patronage of God: the invitees in the messianic meal in the house. What one must strive to do is spelled out in Lk.14.

Luke 14 is divided into three parts: (1) Healing a man with dropsy at the Sabbath meal (14.1-6); (2) Criticising the social order at the elite’s meal (14.7-14); (3) the parable of the Great Dinner (14.15-24). In the first part, the introduction of a man

47 An anthropological term of grace, see Pilch and Malina 1993:76.
with dropsy into a Sabbath meal in a Pharisee’s house creates tension between Jesus, a social performer, and the Pharisaeic group, which strongly maintain established social norms. By healing the man, Jesus causes affront to the host in protest at the Pharisaeic group’s social norms implicit in the meal, and draws from his symbolic capital to challenge and subvert the established social order and then propose an alternative social order, to enhance the people’s choice (Douglas 1996:29-30).

In the second part, the Lukan characterisation of the Pharisaees as lovers of the honour-seats in banquets and synagogues (Lk.20.46; 11.43) is projected into this story to provide the occasion in which Jesus criticises the social order which has been actively upheld by the local elite: competition over honour and practice of social reciprocity, which are the characteristic features of the elite’s meals. Arranging seats at a meal in a particular way is an important ritual by the host for building up his social-world, and affirming the invitees’ social status. Competition over the most honourable seats implies a claim to a high social rank in a group. But on occasions when the most distinguished was invited to a meal, the usual competition could cause disastrous results as far as the honour of various persons present are concerned. Applying the motif of status-reversal as between the humble and the exalted in this parable, Luke links it to that between the last and the first in the parable of the Narrow Door to imply who will be humbled or exalted in the messianic banquet (14.7-11). And Jesus also criticises another feature of elite meal practices: the obligation of return invitations between social equals (14.12-14). In an elite society, meals are a kind of balanced social reciprocity, and are necessary for maintaining social relations and status between social equals by keeping strict boundaries toward outsiders. A failure to reciprocate in kind leads to lack of honour and loss of status as a friend. But Jesus offers his alternative social order which includes the socially stigmatised and marginalised people in their meals. Subverting the elite’s social roles, Jesus challenges the potential hosts to shed their present social networks, since inviting socially stigmatised people into their meals will have significant social consequences on their whole modus vivendi: they could be disapproved of and ostracised by their social equals.
In the final part, Luke further substantiates this new social value and order in the parable which shows a vivid picture of the social consequences the potential host would face in elite circles. We will deal with it in more detail.

Unlike other versions (Mt.22.1-13; Gosp. Thom.64.1-2), Luke sets this parable in the context of the urban system of the pre-industrial city (Rohrbaugh 1991). In the ancient world, the geographical differentiation between cities and villages was not sharp but was inherently interrelated within the single regional system (Leeds 1979). But their stratification of social structure was quite different, since the urban system controlled the villages through centralised land distribution, taxation, monopolised use of goods, and services without mutual flows of population and capital. A small, literate elite lived in the city centres, and engaged in the local cult, administration, coinage, writing, and taxation for the entire region, while a large, mostly illiterate non-elite provided the goods and service the elite required, and were kept out of cities and fanned out towards the periphery where various outcast groups were to be found. At the outskirts of the city lived the poorest occupants frequently in walled off sections in which occupational or ethnic groups lived and worked separately without social interaction outside of these boundaries (Sjoberg 1960:97-100). Gates in the internal city walls controlled interaction between various groups and were locked at night to prevent access to elite areas by the non-elites. Outside the city walls lived beggars, prostitutes, those practising despised occupations like tanning, and landless peasants who drifted toward the city seeking day-labouring opportunities.

In the parable of the Great Dinner, the host is portrayed as a member of the urban elite, who has considerable social and economic means and lives in the atrium-peristyle house. Inviting his guests as social equals, he sends his servants to summon those who have been previously invited. Such double invitations were common within the upper urban elites (cf. Esth.5.8; 6.14; Lam.Rab.4.2; Philo Opif.78; Apuleius Met.3.12; Kim 1973) to allow potential guests to find out who was coming, whether all social rituals have been done properly, and whether the social obligation to offer in return is relevant (Rohrbaugh 1991:141). But the original invitees all make three kinds of excuse: scrutiny of newly purchased land, the test of ten newly bought oxen, and marriage obligations (vv.18-20). The excuses are a typical and traditional Middle
Eastern way of signalling social disapproval of the arrangements being made (Bailey 1980:91-98). The first kind is that of an absentee landowner living in the city, and the second is offered by a person with considerable lands since the ten oxen are sufficient to plough about 110 acres (Schottroff and Stegemann 1986:101) while an average subsistence plot is 1.5 acres per adult (Oakman 1986:61). But no Middle Easterner would have bought either land or oxen without thorough inspection before the transaction (Bailey 1980:96). The third is the newlywed who wishes to decline the new social reciprocal obligation that accepting this dinner invitation would entail.

What is wrong with the host? Refusal to dine on the part of a guest is a sign of the guest’s social advancement or of the host’s lower status. Here none of the guests comes because none would risk coming to a dinner shunned by significant others. Though Luke does not tell us, it is obvious that our host is disapproved of by his social peers. Why? We may assume from the previous section (14.7-14) that the host has been re-socialised into the social values of the patronage of God in which generalised reciprocity between social unequals is practised. Presumably the host engages in social contacts with non-elites, which means crossing the lines of social status, and furthermore, he would be likely to arrange the dinner seats differently from socially recognised conventions and would thus shame one or more of his peers. This dinner is originally planned to confirm his social status despite the fact that he followed the new social order Jesus offers, but his intention is declined by his social peers.

Having been gravely shamed, he would have engaged in the usual Mediterranean tactics of revenge, but here he adopts a very different social strategy of bringing the non-elites into his house to establish social relations with them through the meal, in order to deliberately sever social ties with his peers. The angered host sends his servant (cf. vocatores or nomenclatores who worked on invitations and overall management; Foss 1994) to “the streets and lanes of the city” for the second set of invitees (v. 21), and again to “the roads and hedges” for the third set of invitees (v. 23), which are all from the non-elites. The streets (πλατεῖας) in the pre-industrial city refer to the public squares which served as the normal locations for communication with the non-elite, while the lanes (ρώμεσις) describe the narrow streets.
and alleys along which the poorest lived. ‘Roads’ (ὀδοὺς) is the usual term for roads which run to the area outside the city, while the hedges (φραγμούς) designate the fences or hedges built to enclose fields which are common features of the walled-off area of the city inhabited by outcasts who are not permitted to live within the city (Rohrbaugh 1991:144). The host’s brave decision to invite members of the non-elite and outcasts is well reflected in the word “compel” (ἀναγκαζεῖ) which means “persistent recommending against one’s will.” The invitees would recognise that the invitation is a bizarre breach of the urban system that institutionally prevents non-elite access to the elite area for reasons other than business, especially in the evening when the city gates will be locked. It is a physical breach of socially loaded space sufficient to cause grave scandal in the gossip network. Finally, the host declares his resolution which breaks him off from the social networks with his elite peers (v.24).

Within the wider Lukan context, this parable is addressed to the social elites who have to strive to enter by the narrow door (13.22-30). The Pharisaic host is one of them. This parable is a vivid example illustrating what they have to do. As Jesus calls for a protest against their present social values and relations in 14.7-14, now he shows a pedagogic picture of what they have to do in the patronage of God. To do this, they have to be ready to pay a price. Thus the Lukan Jesus announces the price of following Jesus as an appendix (14.25-35).

In Luke 14, Luke uses a meal to create an opportunity to transform the social relations and values and to challenge the established logic of space in order to create the social space of the house under the patronage of God. So Jesus exposes the different purity lines of his social group by recruiting people, like the man with dropsy, into the patronage of God through his brokerage and by virtue of his symbolic capital, and by transforming the festive Sabbath meals (Life.54.279; m.Sabb.4.2-1; Str-B.I:611-15; II.2-3-3) into the messianic banquet, which is proleptically experienced by the social non-elites in the everyday meal in the house-church. The house in view is a courtyard or the atrium-peristyle house where the highly specialised, hierarchical spatial logic operates within the rigid social order of purity lines. In the patronage of God, that spatial logic must be transformed into an inclusive, non-distributive space in order to incorporate social outcasts. One could
contend, like Braun (1995:43-61), that the subversive nature of this meal is reiterated from Cynic practices, but this view fails to note the more characteristic Lukan social ethic, which shows favour to the destitute and the social non-elites which is lost if we read his Gospel as an aesthetic literary artefact (Esler 1998b). Luke intensively employs domestic meal imagery to validate the characteristic social identity of his house-church.

9. Zacchaeus' Story (Lk.19.1-10)

In the parable of Pharisee and tax-collector (Lk.18.9-14), Luke sets up the two characters to make a spatial contrast between the Temple and house. In setting the story in the Temple space, the Temple purity lines are characteristically projected into their prayers to epitomise the socio-religious life of Judaism as representing those at the centre and those on the periphery (Mottu 1974:199-202). It is in the Temple that the Pharisee is able to justify himself (cf. Lk.11.39-52), while the tax-collector regards himself as a sinner. However, in the end of the story, the tax-collector goes home (οἶκος) “having been justified” (δεικνυόμενος) in the Temple (Esler 1991:174; contra Elliott 1991:213-4) while the self-justified Pharisee remains in the Temple. The tax-collector, even though he has been justified, would not want to stay in the Temple where he would not be regarded as righteous according to its purity lines. Thus he goes down to his house which represents a creative form of group integration and which transforms the discrete praxes of the Temple into a pure praxis of reciprocity that includes everyone who is “out of” the Temple. Luke highlights a spatial shift from the Temple to the house, because the segmented space of the Temple divides people into those who are ‘in’ and those who are ‘out’ (Mottu 1974:201). For Luke, the Temple is a social space for all who apparently exalt themselves but are actually humiliated, while the house is the place for all who humble themselves but are actually exalted. In this story, Luke legitimises not only the inclusion of the tax-collectors and sinners in the house but also the social identity of the house-church as the locus of those who have been justified.
After this parable, Luke introduces his final episode about a tax-collector, the Zacchaeus’ story (Lk.19.1-10), to give an impression that the anonymous tax-collector’s justification is publicly verified in Zacchaeus’ house. Placed immediately before Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem, this story also signifies the very nature of Jesus’ ministry, which is announced in the story of Levi, Jesus’ first encounter with a tax-collector: “to call sinners to repentance” (Lk.5.32).

To highlight the social dimension of Zacchaeus’ salvation, Luke first characterises his position in the community: the chief tax-collector with considerable possessions (v.2) and a sinner (v.7). As we have seen, his profession and possessions would have stereotyped him as a sinner in his society (O’Hanlon 1981: 9). Despite his social and economic status, he would have been socially marginalised in the social space of the elite. Thus his short stature symbolically characterises his poor social reputation. His desire to see (LSEty) Jesus refers not merely to visual perception but the personal sense of coming to know Jesus (v.3), because he would have heard of Jesus who was socially acknowledged as the friend of tax-collectors and sinners. His eager desire is reciprocated by Jesus who unexpectedly requests his hospitality. Luke expresses Jesus’ proposal not as an accidental encounter but as a divinely planned appointment through use of the term, “δεί”.

But it is awkward that Jesus seeks hospitality from a man with a poor reputation if he wishes to make an impact in the village. If anyone accepts hospitality from a person whose wealth is ill-gotten, he/she becomes a partner with that person in his crimes (Derrett 1970:281-82). A well-known talmudic story illustrated how far Jesus’ acceptance of hospitality from a socially recognised sinner would have shocked his opponents. A wealthy tax-collector, Bar Ma’jan, attempted to provide a splendid banquet for the city elites in order to gain social approval for his social advancement, but they uniformly declined his invitation (j.Sahn.6.23c). Refusal of an invitation to a meal is a sign of social ostracism, the designation of someone as excluded from an identified group (Douglas 1975:249-75). Despite public grumbling, Jesus receives Zacchaeus’ hospitality. The Lukan characteristic exaggeration, “all”(πάντες) shows that all the city murmurs against Jesus’ being the sinner’s guest (v.7). Jesus strategically seeks this hospitality to legitimate his social identity as the friend of
sinners by identifying himself with Zacchaeus in the face of village's concern with social boundaries.

However, Luke shows the actual social status of Zacchaeus in the patronage of God so as to invert local social norms. Jesus' social performance is a far more creative alternative which transforms the human situation he has encountered. Zacchaeus, presumably in the midst of the meal, announces that he will share his possessions with the poor and make fourfold restitution for any previous frauds (cf. Ex. 22.1; 2 Sam. 12.6). The present tense verbs, διδόμενος and ἀποδίδομεν, point to his interactive action with Jesus rather than indicating his regular practice (contra. Neale 1993: 184-8; White 1979: 89-96; Fitzmyer 1985: 1220-1). As the Lukan Jesus comes to call sinners to repentance (Lk. 5.32), Luke concretely exhibits how the tax-collector responds to the call of Jesus to legitimise his association with Jesus. This story also legitimates the social identity of Christian house-churches against potential defamation for incorporating people who had a bad social reputation. Accordingly, Jesus proclaims that "Today salvation has come to this house, because he too is a son of Abraham" (v. 9). Why does he proclaim 'salvation has come to this house (οἶκω)? This public acknowledgement of one as "a son of Abraham" in Jewish society entails social approval which lets one enter the covenant people of God. Zacchaeus becomes a member of the divine family. Jesus' public announcement also implies significantly the whole transformation of the social logic of the domestic space as the locus of salvation. Before the encounter with Jesus, Zacchaeus would have accumulated his wealth by practising negative reciprocity in his house, which is possibly a courtyard or an atrium house. The destitute would not have been given access to his house, which would have had a highly non-distributive social structure. But now his house is transformed so as to be open to the destitute and the non-elites and to provide a site for the practice of generalised reciprocity. It is Jesus' strategy to reform the rich. In the encounter with Jesus, Zacchaeus is transformed from a wealthy man and chief tax-collector to a social benefactor who is willing generously to put his money at the service of the needy. His house has become one of the models of a house-church in which a wealthy benefactor offers his house and wealth to the needs of the community. In this story, Luke shows the socially lost being found by Jesus. Jesus
eagerly seeks them through his campaign of meals with the rich, and this has become
the model of his house-church in the patronage of God.

10. The Lord’s Supper and Diakonia (Lk.22.7-30)

The Lord’s Supper is a ceremony of the Jesus group, which institutes their
social values and structures in an arranged pattern of social roles and social
relationship between members “which are generally well recognised and are regularly
at work in a given society” (McVann 1991:335). Accordingly Luke, unlike the other
Synoptists, shows his great sense of the group-oriented social value of honour by
placing who will serve and who will be served in its context.

In Lk.22.14-20, Luke uses his own source which is different from Mark (see
O’Toole 1992; Nolland 1993:1041-49), and his account of the eucharistic words
(22.19-20) is very similar to Paul’s. Luke begins with Jesus’ statement that he “had
earnestly desired” to have the Passover celebration with his close followers (v.15).
This obviously points to the unique nature of the Passover meal, which is more a
family festival than many other meal (m.Pesah.10; Stra-B.1:41-76; Jeremias 1967:15-
88). Luke characteristically highlights the very purpose of the meal as expressing
group recognition as fictive-kinship. Before his suffering, Jesus expresses the deepest
emotional attachment to his surrogate family which has followed him throughout his
ministry.

Second, Luke, along with Paul (1Cor.11.24.25), records the phase, “Do this in
remembrance of me” in connection with the bread-saying (v.19b). The action of
breaking and giving bread is a symbolic gesture to signify his salvific death on the
Cross, and the words, “for you,” spoken at the breaking of the bread, draws the
disciples into participation with the vicarious, reconciling self-sacrifice of Jesus in
their continuous “ἀνάμνησις.” The anamnesis motif has been certainly influenced by
the significant and broad meanings of the word “remembrance” (הָמָן) in the Old
Testament, in the sense of re-presentation of the past which never remains as a mere past but is actualised in the present by a ritual of remembrance (Eliade 1974). Its clear connection with the Passover meal itself can be found in Deut. 16.3, “that you may remember the day of your departure from the land of Egypt all the days of your life.”

As Jesus has substituted himself for the Passover lamb, so the memento of him is to replace the ἀνάμνησις of the Passover itself. As Israelites remembered their past salvation in the Passover meal, Jesus’ followers were enabled to think back and reflect upon the ministry and the death of Jesus in their ongoing eucharistic common meals for maintaining their social identity of a fictive-kinship group through Jesus’ brokerage.

It is also the promise of his presence at the table of the disciples, which is well pictured in the Emmaus story where the Risen Jesus is recognised in the remembrance of the eucharist (Lk. 24.13-35). The term, “the breaking of the bread” (v. 35), is a Lukan standard expression for the eucharist (Ac. 2.42,46; 20.7,11; 24.30). This story has been described as a “recognition” (ἀναγνώρισις) story which means ‘a change from ignorance to knowledge’ in relation to Greco-Roman literature (Aristotle Poet. 11; Plutarch Vita. Rom. 28; see Esler 1995b: 1), but Luke vividly pictures the social embodiment of the divine presence at the eucharist. Throughout the story, Luke emphasises the two unnamed disciples’ lack of awareness concerning the Risen Jesus as well as his destiny, but after the meal, not only do they recognise him but also they become witnesses of the resurrection. Luke dramatically shows how the remembrance of Jesus works on human recognition of the divine presence. It is a paradigm of the eucharistic remembrance in which the past is actualised in the present.

Third, Luke sees in the cup-saying an eschatological fulfilment of the prophetic promise of a “new covenant” (Jer. 31.31), while Mark typologically views

---

48 For the textual problem of Lk. 22.19b-20, we simply follow scholars who accept the longer text (Jeremias 1967: 133-53; Marshall 1980: 36-38).
49 The widespread ancient Hellenistic commemorative meals for the dead were celebrated “in remembrance” of the founder (cf. Dio. Laert. 10.16-22; Cicero Fin. 2.101; Chenderlin 1982: 143-45), but they were also widespread in Palestine from the biblical period to the Rabbinic period (see. Ex. 12.14; 13.3,8; Dt. 16.3; Jub. 49.7ff, m. Pesah. 10.5). For the terminological similarity of “breaking of bread” in the context of funeral rites, see Jer. 16.7; Lam. 4.4; Ezek. 24.17,22; Klauck 1992: 369).
Jesus' death as a repetition of the Old Testament covenant sacrifice (Ex. 24.8). A covenant established by Jesus' blood is *ipso facto* a different covenant from the Mosaic covenant, and significantly alludes to the new covenant of Jeremiah (Marshall 1980b: 45-46, 91-92). Thus the cup-saying has both a vertical dimension of sealing the new covenant people under his brokerage to God the Father, and a horizontal dimension of bringing the commemorators together into the new covenant community, Christian fictive-kinship (Lk. 22.29-30). So the eucharist is the solidarity-celebration of the house-churches, which celebrate a full communion with their Patron as well as with all members under the patronage of God.

The eucharist is the sole institution in Luke-Acts which Jesus inaugurates. It is the climax and paradigmatic meal in Luke-Acts, which has a twofold significance: It looks back to Jesus' meals in which he associated with sinners, as a reminder of the forgiveness through his brokerage, while it also looks forward to the messianic banquet (22.16,18; Hofius 1967: 18-19). Thus this meal is instituted as the essential part of the ongoing common meals of the disciples to celebrate the sacrificial salvation.

As a solidarity-celebration, the eucharist expresses the new social values and relations of Jesus' fictive-kinship, and so Luke appropriately appends them in Lk. 22.24-30, where the crucial reminder of the *diaconia* is immediately mentioned in relation to the disciples' dispute about honour and status. Luke significantly changes the Markan context (Mk. 10.42-45) to a meal context (v. 27) in immediate relation with the Lord's Supper. Some have argued that the flow of thought in vv. 24-30 does not have a negative tone in relation to the benefactor but a positive one, since the disciples are treated as benefactors in their quarrel (ὁ λογείκα) (Lull 1986; Nelson 1994:132ff.). But this view fails to take seriously Mediterranean social values which undergird the overall passage of vv. 24-30. In v. 25b, Luke clarifies Mark's "great ones" (10.42b) in the language of patronage and benefactor (εὐεργεταῖ), which was often attributed to gods and kings in Greco-Roman society (Herodotus Hist. 8.85; Xenophon Hist. Grae. 6.1.4; Plato Grg. 506c; 2Macc. 4.2; 3Macc. 3.19; Philo Omn. Prob. Lib. 118; Flacc. 81; Josephus War 3.459). Using patron-language, Luke criticises the established social values and relations based on honour-ratings and
patronage to affirm new social values and social relations under the patronage of God. (cf. 14.7-14). And not to be missed is the fact that Luke never depicts the disciples in an ideal way before Easter.

Against the disciples’ honour competition (v.24), Jesus provides an actual picture of the patronage system in which Gentile governors act as public benefactors by bestowing gifts on the city and benefactions upon clients in return for public honour (v.25). In Mediterranean society, the words, κυριεύωσιν and ἐξουσιάζοντες, are characteristic indices of a patron. In contrast, the Lukan Jesus exemplifies himself as a table-waiter (v.27), which is typically recognised as the role of the slave, who has been called a “human recipe” essential to support the elite’s convivial comforts (D’Arms 1991:171)50 So a reversal of status is expected under the patronage of God: the youngest is contrasted with the greatest and equivalently the one who serves with the one who was served. Thus the Lukan Jesus redefines the social values in declaring that the servant is greater than the benefactors. Luke’s readers would have been greatly struck by these words.

For Luke, the word, “younger” (νεώτερος), refers to the newcomer who enters into the Christian community. If the newcomer is baptised under the patronage of a prominent member, the greatest should refer to the community leaders. The typical pattern of leadership in the surrounding culture has negative ramifications, so that Jesus is recommending something extraordinary in an honour-oriented society: the leaders are appointed to serve those who are like “nobodies” in the community. This reversal at the table suggests the significant substitution of generalised reciprocity within the familial relationship for the balanced reciprocity common to the established patronage system. As the disciples are appointed to the leadership, so they have to be table-waiters like their master, Jesus. Such social values would have been astonishing in a Greco-Roman house, where the wealthier the house, the farther they “segregated”

50 Various slaves were involved in the Roman elite’s dinner. Vocatores and nomenclatores worked on invitations and overall management; store-masters (cellarii) made sure that groceries had been purchased. Kitchen slaves (focarii and focariae) and specialised cooks proceeded to transform dirty, raw food into clean, cooked food, which they then served in the dining room. Slaves also might provide ‘dinner-theatre’ entertainment for the guests
the kitchen and its slaves from the dining rooms. For “nobodies” to be served regularly at Christian ritual meals by the “leader” (Lk.22.26) would indeed have stimulated a crisis in the house-community. So every common meal in the house-church, in which the eucharist was practised together, would have been a vivid reminder of the need for the Christian leadership to revitalise their servanthood.

Luke significantly describes the Lord’s Supper and the diakonia in a domestic context in stark contrast with the Temple, the official centre of the Passover. The room referred to in v.11 is the guest house (κατάλυμα), a public inn where groups of travellers would spend the night under one roof. In Jerusalem during the times of Jesus, public inns for the Jewish feasts would have been developed to accommodate pilgrims. We may conjecture that a wealthy follower of Jesus could have provided a room for Jesus’ group, but this is unlikely since Luke does not make any allusion to Jesus’ house ministry in Jerusalem, which might have afforded an opportunity to gain a benefactor who would offer a room. Thus any conjecture which links putative property of Jesus’ group in Jerusalem to κατάλυμα is implausible whether such a conjecture is based either on the report of Epihanius of Salamis (c.315-403 CE.) or of Hadrian’s visit to Jerusalem in 130 CE (Pixner 1997; Murphy-O’Conner 1995) or an upper room built into the walls of the Temple’s outer court (Thurston 1968:21-22), or a Jerusalem disciple (Klauck 1981:48; Malina and Rohrbaugh 1992:155, 267; Blue 1994:133).

Luke mentions Jesus and his disciples spending every night on the Mount of Olives after arriving in Jerusalem (Lk.21.37). So it is plausible to think that Jesus’ group might reserve in advance a room in a public inn, and this room might also have been used by the disciples after Easter (Lk.24.33,49; Ac.1.13). Moreover, the expression, “carrying a jug of water” implies the man’s low social status since this was normally a task for women in the ancient Middle East (cf. Gen.24.11; Jn.4.7), and denotes more likely that the man is the house-master of the inn, since ancient inns were run by persons who were of the lowest social status. Having no social connections in Jerusalem, Jesus and his disciples plan to spend the Passover night at a

while they served: singing, playing musical instruments, reciting verse, dancing, acrobatics, and playing farce (Foss 1995).
public inn in spite of its possibly unsavoury connotations, since this was available to accommodate those who had no social network in the city. This particular building was presumably like many of the houses in Palestine, in which each room of the upper floors and the roof would have been accessible by a corbelled stairway on the exterior. The social logic of this space is inclusive in that it offers welcome to any sort of people. In this room, Jesus institutes the Lord’s Supper to celebrate his kinship group under the patronage of God and transforms the social values of the society into a new social value that the one who serves is greater than the one who is served. In the Lukan house-church, the members’ social identity must have been celebrated in every eucharistic meal in contrast with the practices of outgroups.

In the Gospel, the house is pictured as the centre of the saving mission of Jesus towards socially marginalised and stigmatised people who were excluded from the Temple space, and as the spatial foundation of the alternative social relations and social values under the patronage of God which are critical of and subversive to the established social order. In Acts we will mainly observe how the house is used to describe the mission of the earliest Christian groups.

IV. HOUSE IN ACTS

While the Temple is the architectural setting for the opening and ending of the Gospel (Lk.1.8-9; 24.53), the house is portrayed as the space in which Acts begins and ends (Ac.1.13; 28.30). This contrast signifies the take-over of space by the Christian symbolic world. The house was the modus operandi of the Christian mission, through which the Christian communities put down their roots in the Mediterranean world (cf. Ac.20.20). The Gospel establishes its foundation in domestic space in order first to undermine established social values which shape the symbolic world of Greco-Roman society and then to construct its own symbolic world (Fox 1989:89).
1. Christian Community in Jerusalem (Ac.1-12)

After the experience of Easter and Ascension, the disciples gather in their lodging place in Jerusalem. The word ὑπερῶν reminds us of ἀνάγαιον in Lk.22.12, since the article, τό, is anaphoric. The κατάλωμα was probably used continually by the Galilean disciples during their difficult interim period between Passover and Pentecost (1.13; 1.15f.; 2.1f.). The word ὑπερῶν is used only in Acts to refer to the place for the meeting of the Christian groups who have not the means to live in a good-sized house (9.37,39; 20.8). It is a very distinctive use of space for the disciples to gather in a public inn, which is considered as the dwelling of people of a low social status.\(^{51}\) Based on this humble space in contrast with the splendid status of the Temple, the new group of the earliest Christians challenges the Temple’s social space. Thus Luke uses his characteristic expression, ἐτῷ τῷ αὐτῷ, for the early Christian meeting (1.15, 2.1,47) to indicate their established social identity as ἐκκλησία (5.11; 8.1,3). This expression is a Semitism carrying the idea of joining or belonging to the community and congregation, similar to the Qumran idiom ἔτη ἕτη, in order to signify that the early Christians like the Qumran community, formed a dissident community within Judaism (cf. 1QS.5.7;8.19; 10.17; Wilcox 1965:93-100; Black 1967:10). In the New Testament this phrase is used as a quasi-technical term to refer to the assembly of the Christian community (ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ; cf.1Cor 11.18, 20), which signifies the unity of the Christian body and their fellowship (cf. 14.23; Metzger, 1971:305). Thus the early Christian scribes frequently rendered the phrase ἐτῷ τῷ αὐτῷ into ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ as an equivalent phrase, in order to avoid the inherent difficulty of conceiving what it referred to (Wilcox 1965:97f; Moulton and Howard 1979:473).\(^{52}\) Accordingly, Luke describes how Jesus’ followers creatively use the ordinary house for creating a new social group and their own alternative social values and relations in order to indicate a reversal of the sacred space, which leads to the house being used for the sake of the gospel in the earliest parts of Acts.

---

\(^{51}\) Second Temple Pharisaism used second-floor halls and dining rooms as the locus for study and ἡμύρων (m.Sabb.1.4; Safran & Stern 1976:731), but this is quite different from the earliest Christians, who also used impure space, in terms of their social logic of space.

\(^{52}\) The Apostolic Fathers continually used the phrase, ἐτῷ τῷ αὐτῷ, in the first- and second-century (Barn.4.10; 1Clem.34.7; Ignatius, Eph.13.1; Mag.7.1; Phil.6.2; Justin Apol.1.67.3).
In 1.12-26 Luke describes the Christian group as forming a new independent, self-governing, community as an equivalent of the Jewish council (Pesch 1987:87). The number 120 is a Jewish numerical symbol (m.Sanh.1.6; m.Abott.3.6; 1QS.6.3f.; 1QSa.2.22; CD.13.1f.), in that a minimum of 120 Jewish men was required to establish a community with its own council which needed twelve leaders. Luke’s main concern is not to record the exact numbers of believers but to picture how the first Christian council is constituted by focusing on its leadership, while Paul reports the number 500 as co-witnesses of the resurrection (1Cor.15.6). Luke also deliberately differentiates the Christian group from the Jewish community by including women as a significant part of the new community otherwise forbidden to them. By using his distinctive word “ομοθυμάδου”(v.14), Luke also characterises the community in terms of fictive-kinship to suggest that they live together according to the ancient ideal of the family: harmony under patriarchal leadership. They pray for God’s help in electing their leadership. Peter’s address to the believers, “Αυτοί εστίν ἡ ἀδελφοί (v.16), is familial language deployed in a gender inclusive manner (Witherington 1998:120) to characterise the Christian group as a fictive-kinship community.

In Ac.2.1-5, Luke deliberately chooses the day of Pentecost to mark the end of the long period of waiting for the Holy Spirit and to celebrate the coming of the Spirit. In Judaism, it was generally held that the Spirit of prophecy had been withdrawn from Israel, after the last prophet because of the nation’s sin (t.Sota.13.2-4; b.Sahn.65b; b.Yoma.21b; 1Macc.4.46;9.27;14.41; 2Bar.85.3) but it would be poured out on all the restored Israelites at the end based on Joel 2.28-32 (Num.Rab.15.25; Midr.Gen.140; see, Schweizer 1968:411). It is notable, however, that the promise of the coming of the Spirit upon the restored people is fulfilled in the humble lodgers at the inn so as to make them powerful witnesses of the Magnalia Dei. Luke highlights the social logic of humble space when he reports how the pilgrims could hear the xenoglossy, since a public inn may effectively play the role of a broadcasting post in a gossip-based communication system. Luke implies a way of propagandising the gospel to the ends
of the earth. It is a revolutionary event which subverts the social honour of the Temple space in order to honour the domestic space. For Luke, the empowering of the Holy Spirit is a necessary passage for the Christian group, who have a significant assignment to witness to Jesus to the ends of the earth (1.8). The broker, Jesus, has ascended to the heavenly place and reminds them of the promise of the Father who will send the Holy Spirit (1.4-5), as symbolic capital, which will enable them to follow the new trend in the choice of goods in the face of the reigning fashion which conforms to the tastes of the establishment (Bourdieu 1979). It is the gift of the Patron to his brokers who will criticise the pretensions of the established bearers of social norms and stand out against their social powers.

In Ac. 2.37-47, the early Christian community recruits new members from the Temple. Luke portrays the responses of the audience to the apostles who have symbolic capital (v. 37) and which leads to their baptism (v. 41). The choice of their preaching implies both social allegiance to the alternative Christian symbolic universe and social protest against the established Jewish social-world. In v. 37 the phase "stung in the heart" is an expression of remorse which reflects their social protest against the society to which they had belonged: their responsibility for the crucifixion, while the clause, "Brother, what shall we do?" is a strong volitional expression to reveal their social allegiance to the society to which the preachers belong. The word "Brother" is part of inclusive familial language which evokes the emotion of social attachment to a family. In order to be incorporated into the group, they need baptism in the name of Jesus Christ (v. 38). Baptism in Acts is an initiating rite to permit entry into Christian fictive-kinship by the fundamental reference to the broker, Jesus, who mediates the forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Spirit. In a group-oriented Jewish society, conversion would have entailed serious alienation from significant social groups and the Christian fictive-kin would have played an important role in re-socialising the converts.

Thus Luke mentions the multiplication of the believers: three thousand (v. 41), many (v. 47b), five thousand (4.4). Whether these reports are true or typical.

---

53 This word is found almost only in Acts except Rom. 15.6, to describe the unity of believers (2.46; 4.25; 5.12; 8.6; 15.25) and their opponents (7.57; 12.20; 18.12; 19.29).
exaggeration, Luke's real concern is not the numbers but the thoroughgoing re-
socialisation of them in the house-community. Today we frequently hear of the
multiplication of believers in the third-world church, but their re-socialisation
programs are usually either poor or have a one-sided emphasis on the spiritual
dimension. It is significant that Luke describes the program for new believers in the
whole dimension of life: spiritual, intellectual, communal, social, and material, since
the conversion is not a once-for-all event but an ongoing process involving one's
whole life, as summarised in vv.42-47: teaching, fellowship, the breaking of bread,
and the prayers. Some would blame Luke for his idyllic description of the earliest
Christian community (cf. Conzelmann 1987:30-31; Pesch 1986:131) or defend it on
the basis of correspondence to the historical reality (Bartchy 1991; Capper 1995). To
decide whether it is real or ideal is not our concern here, for the contrast 'ideal' versus
'real' is far too sharp. Luke generalises the distinctive features grounded in the best
things to legitimise his community's social identity. Nevertheless he does not forget
to record that reality was sometimes different (cf.5.1-11; 6.1f.; see the balanced

The grammar of Acts 2.42 (conjugatio periphrastica) as well as the many
verbs in an iterative sense suggest a continued or repeated fellowship as an everyday
phenomenon. Teaching is a crucial means to re-socialise newcomers according to the
new social relations and social values of the patronage of God. This venue should be
the Temple since the private house is unable to accommodate the large bands of the
disciples. Prayers are offered both in the Temple and house. But if the prayer is based
on the Lord's Prayer (Lk.11.1ff), it is a significant means for displaying the
distinctiveness of the house-church vis-à-vis the Temple to enhance the social identity
of fictive kinship under the patronage of God. The fellowship and the breaking of
bread are practised in the house (v.46). Luke's expression, κατ' οἶκον ("from house
to house," ) indicates a number of house-communities in Jerusalem (8.1,3; 12.12). The
expression of the 'breaking of bread' refers to the eucharistic meal, in which the early
Christians celebrate their solidarity in Jesus to enhance a deep sense of belonging to
the Jesus fictive-kinship. The eucharist was celebrated in the context of a common
meal by a broad stream of early Christianity through to the fourth century, and early
Christian sources point toward the "single Christian sacrament of table-fellowship"
against the attempt to separate the sacramental celebration from the common meal (Reicke 1951; cf. Panikulam 1979; Klauck 1982).

Finally the fellowship (κοινωνία) is an inclusive expression to refer to all the aspects of communal life. Luke expands it in vv.44-46 to express the typical features of sharing and caring in the ancient family life as practised in the house-community through generalised reciprocity. The expressions, “all things in common” and “spent much time together,” are a clear echo of the Greco-Roman ideal of friendship between equals. In the oikonomia literature in antiquity, koinonia and its cognates were quite often connected with familial relationships between brothers (Plutarch Frat. Amor.2/478D; 5/480C; 12/484D), between parents and children (Xenophon Oec.7.11-13; Aristotle Nic. Eth.8.10.4); between friends (Aristotle Nic. Eth.9.9,10; 10.3;12.1. cf.8.12.1; Plutarch Frat. Amor.20/491A), and between husband and wife in marriage (Theophrastus Oec.3; Ps.Aristotle Oec.1.3). The phrase ἄπαντα κοινά is a well-known proverb in antiquity (Aristotle Nic. Eth.8.9.1-2; 9.8.2; Pol.2.1.1-4; 2.4; Plutarch Frat. Amor.20/490E; Conj. Praec.34/143A; Amat.11/755D; 21/767E; Terence Adel.803; M.Rufus XIV.p.95.8-9; Hierocles according to Stob.IV.22.24; Cicero Off.1.51.54; Dio Halicarnassus Rom. Ant.2.25.1-3; Dio Chrysostom Orat.3.110; Lucian Tox.6). These texts suggest that the nature of the Christian fellowship is intimately based on familial relationships. Sharing meals and time play important roles in enhancing social support and social intimacy. Accordingly Luke describes Christian fellowship as a sharing fellowship of brothers and sisters within fictive-kinship according to the ideal household relationship in Greco-Roman antiquity (Sandnes 1994:141).

Luke’s distinctive point against the Greco-Roman tradition of friendship and family relationships should not be missed, however. Given the normal expectation of “having things in common” between members of Mediterranean kin groups and patronage systems, the remarkable feature of the Christian fellowship is the radical inclusiveness of the Christian community which consisted of a heterogeneous group across the social boundaries of status, age, gender, while the Greco-Roman ideal is supposed to take place among people of the same social status, friends of equal position kept within social boundaries (Cicero Off.1.42-46; Bartchy 1991:317;
Mitchell 1992:258-264). As Jesus crosses the social boundaries in his associations with sinners and tax-collectors, the first Christians follow their Broker in realising his teaching in their house-community.

Luke also provides a vivid picture of one of the house-churches in Jerusalem, which Peter first visits after his dramatic release (12.1-11). In this house, the early Christians devote themselves to prayer at times of crisis (12.1). From the references to a female servant and a gateway (πύλαν) (v.13), commentators have assumed that it is a large house like the peristyle (Blue 1994:136; Witherington 1998:386; cf. Barrett 1994:584). But Rhoda might have been the only slave in the house and would have known Peter intimately since she could have served Peter when he had visited the house-church. Owning a female slave is not an index of high social status since even houses of low status owned one or two slaves in antiquity. The reference to the gate and Rhoda's "run in" (v.14) suggests the front courtyard as a buffer between the house and the street. So it is an urban house where the early Christian had regularly gathered. And Luke does not idealise the early Christian community in that he refers to the existence of a Christian slave in a Christian house. The ideal of egalitarian community between people of different status is a modern but not an ancient concept. Luke also acknowledges various house-churches in Jerusalem which form separate communities while keeping up social connections. Peter's instruction to tell of his release to James and the brethren (12.17), who were presumably meeting elsewhere, points to various meeting places and would indicate a reference to a division in the early church in Jerusalem (contra, Blue 1994:136; see Stuhlmacher 1981:71; Esler 1987:143-145).

Luke establishes the house as the alternative to the Temple in the early parts of Acts so as to highlight its status as the *modus operandi* of the Christian mission. The Lukan readers would have sufficiently recognised that the Temple and its social-world were replaced by the house before the out-reach from Jerusalem.

2. The Cornelius Story (Ac.10.1-11.18)
In Acts, the Cornelius story is a turning point, which signals a significant step for cross-ethnic mission. Luke carefully arranges his materials to prepare for this breakthrough of the geographical and ethnic boundaries according to his programmatic statement in Ac.1.8. In order to go beyond the boundaries, Luke needs to take into account the two significant stories of Paul and Peter to prepare for the full-scale Gentile mission. These two stories are so important for Luke legitimising the mission to the Gentile that he repeats them several times in Acts: Paul’s conversion (9.1ff.; 22.1ff.; 26.1ff.) and Peter’s story (10.1ff.; 11.1ff.; 15.7-9).

Paul appears first as an important witness to Stephen’s execution (7.58) and then as the arch-persecutor of the Christian house-community (8.3). His activities extend to Damascus within the territoriality of the Temple authorities (9.1-2). It is ironic, however, that his conversion transforms the house-church persecutor to the house-church builder (cf.20.20). While Paul himself offers a different explanation, namely that he received his mission and gospel directly from God (cf. Gal.1.16), Luke describes the crucial role of the significant other, Ananias, in Paul’s conversion, as acting as a broker of the Risen Lord to re-socialise the recent convert into the new symbolic world. Luke carefully introduces his hero in order to prepare the Gentile house-mission in the second-half of Acts. After his house-ministry at Lydda and Joppa (Ac.9.32-42), Peter appears in the decisive breakthrough for the Gentile mission (10.1-48). Although Luke relates the conversion of Cornelius on the surface, he also shows that this conversion is deeply anchored in the different kind of conversion of Peter in order to illustrate the necessary transformation of Peter’s symbolic world for the Gentile mission: without Peter’s change of view, Cornelius’ conversion would be impossible.

(1) Cornelius (Ac.10.1-8)

Luke introduces his first God-fearer, Cornelius, as one of six centurions within the Italian Cohort, which was stationed in Syria before 69 CE (ILS.9168; CIL 6.3528; 11.6117), and as a devout man performing standard acts of piety in terms of alms and
prayer with all his household (v.2). For Luke, God-fearers are important figures who live in the liminal social space between Judaism and the Gentile world, but contribute to the rooting of the Christian house-community in the Gentile world, as the bridgehead for the Gentile mission, providing contact-points for establishing the gospel in an alien world. So Luke needs to legitimise their inclusion in the Christian group in a domestic setting, where the ethnic boundary is easier to cross over than in public spaces.

Thus Luke makes Cornelius an example to illustrate the acceptable state of the God-fearers. Cornelius would probably have visited the Temple but would have felt social alienation there, since as a bystander he could not have access to the social space of the covenant people of God and could not participate directly in the sacrifices. So he devotes himself to piety in his house with all his household at the time of the Temple liturgy. He receives significant divine approval from an angel of God who visited his house: “your prayers and alms have ascended as a memorial before God” (10.4,31). The world, \( \mu\nu\gamma\iota\mu\omicron\delta\omega\omicron\upsilon\rho\iota\upsilon \), with the ascent motif, has cultic overtones to refer figuratively to memorial offerings in Lev.2.1-3, 2.9, 5.12, 6.15, in which the portion of the grain offering was burned before God on the altar (cf. Sir.36.16f.; Tob.12.12; 1QS.8.1-9). It is a striking sign that Cornelius’ alms and prayer in his house are accepted by God who treats them as equivalent to the sacrifices at the Temple (Esler 1987:162). Luke regards the Gentile domestic, secular space as an equivalent to the Jewish Temple sacred space. Thus to incorporate this Gentile domestic space into the social space of the renewed covenant people of God, the encounter with the new broker, Peter, becomes a necessary step.

(2) Divine Reversal of the Space (Ac.10.9-23)

Geographically Joppa was a coastal Hellenistic town which was extremely open to Greco-Roman culture (Schürer.II. 1979:114), and Caesarea Maritima was a thoroughly Hellenised city, being the seat of Roman political power. Luke adeptly sets this story in these Hellenised territories, where social intercourse between a Gentile and a Christian leader would have raised the social problem in a significant
way. Furthermore, Luke places Peter in a more scandalous space, the house of a tanner, people who were despised as unclean by scrupulous Jews because of their ongoing contact with the hides of dead animals (Str-B. II.695; m Ketub. 7.10; b. Pesah. 65a; Qidd. 82b; Jeremias 1989: 310). Thus we may guess that Peter and his followers, the circumcised believers, have broken social boundary to a considerable degree in that they are willing to come into contact with despised people in Jewish society, just like Jesus, while they deliberately prohibit associating with Gentiles. In this regard, Luke adroitly reserves the issue of food in his Markan source (Mk. 7.1-5, 15-23), in order to use it in relation to the issue of social intercourse with Gentiles across social and ethnic boundaries, though he would deal with it later in Lk. 11.38.

Hence the Lukan Peter receives heavenly visions which pave the way for his groundbreaking association with Gentiles. These visions reveal the divine abrogation of Jewish dietary laws, the law which regulates the consumption of clean and unclean food, and human associations according to the degree of their holiness in the Temple (Douglas 1972: 41-57; 1975; Esler 1987: 73-76). Luke rightly understands the relation between food and human beings, in that food is a social code which carries messages regulating social relations—who are included and excluded, boundaries and transactions across the boundaries (Douglas 1975: 273). Peter sees all sorts of creatures including both clean and unclean in the vision (v. 12), and hears a command, "sacrifice and eat (θῦσαι καὶ φάγε)" (v. 13), which has strikingly cultic overtones in that they refer to sacrificial acts by priests. Most commentators have unreasonably interpreted the Greek word, θῦσαι, here as having the non-religious meaning: slaughter (cf. Fitzmyer 1998: 455). In the Greek world, the sacrifices referred to by θῦσαι originated in the domestic family meal in which parts of the slaughtered animal were burned and offered to the goddess of the hearth, while the offerings of sacrifices which were totally given to the deity, like the burnt offering and blood offering, were never spoken of as θῦσαι but always using ἐντεύμων and σφάζω or σφαγεῖς (Thyen 1994: 161). Accordingly the LXX normally renders ἔττω (slaughter) by σφάζω and τυσις (sacrifice) by θῦσαι 140 times. So it is in Simon’s house, not in the Temple, that Peter is commanded by God to fulfil the sacrificial act. Luke significantly describes the house as having displaced the Temple in the divine command: the Temple space is dethroned by the domestic space.
Peter's objection to eating the impure foods is repeatedly met by divine disapproval, "Do not call profane those things which God has purified" (v.15). Though Luke does not report when and how God has invalidated the dietary prohibition of the Law, the verb ἐκκαθαρίσω is intended to refer to Christ's death and its effects on the Temple curtain torn in two, which symbolises the ultimate end of the Temple holiness (Lk.23.45), as the Jewish tradition states that in the messianic age all the animals previously called unclean would be declared clean (Midr.Ps.146/4). For Luke, the tanner's house which is regarded as unclean space becomes a sacred space, but also the hierarchically partitioned social logic of the Temple space, which segregates between its space and people who belong to that space, is annulled by divine authority in the domestic space in which the social logic of space is very accessible.

(3) Social Interaction between Judean Christians and Gentiles (Ac. 10.17-43)

How puzzling is the vision! Luke shows that divine intervention is again a necessity because of Peter’s reluctance and resistance to its message (vv.17, 19-20). Also important is Peter's being told to go with those approaching, who are Gentiles, without hesitancy. Comprehending the emissaries of Cornelius as the divinely betokened guests (v.22), he gives them lodging for the night since it is certainly less problematic to provide hospitality to a Gentile who would not be bothered by non-kosher food. The house of the tanner with gate ("τωμαλων") and second stair (vv.17,20) have been assumed to be a courtyard house or a large building with a gatehouse (cf. Witherington 1998:350f.), but this is unlikely since a tanner would probably not have had such a house. It is more plausible that it is a two-storied small house making use of lower storey partly or exclusively as a shop facing the courtyard or street (Hirschfeld 1995:98-99). The social logic of the house is more open to strangers and is able to incorporate more extensive links to unrelated persons. As the vision and the command at 10.21 show, domestic reciprocity in this house has superseded the social logic of the Temple space which would be replicated in every Jewish domestic space according to the Temple-centred purity laws.
Not only does Peter invite Gentiles into his social space but he also enters into the social space of Gentiles “without objection” (v.29). In Cornelius’ house, Peter explains that divine instruction renders conventional Jewish purity rules illegitimate (v.28). Peter with a stern note advises Cornelius and his associates: “It is not legitimate for a Jew to adhere to or to visit someone of alien descent.” Whether the first-century Jews associated with Gentiles including commensality is one of the hot debates in New Testament scholarship. 54 We have no space to deal with this issue, but one should separate the public sphere which is accessible to all from the private sphere in which spatial boundaries prevent access to all. Although in the Roman house, the distinction between private and public did not exist, the degree of accessibility to the private space (triclinium, oecus, inner cubiculum) from the public sphere (atrium, tablinum, peristyle) within the house is adeptly controlled by the owner according to intimacy with guests (Wallace-Hadrill 1994; 1997). To enter one’s more private space in the Roman house is an expression for associating with or adhering to one. In addition, in a group-oriented society, one’s association with the other who is not of his own group in terms of social status or ethnic origin, is not determined by the individual on a case-by-case basis but intimately governed by public approval in relation to the social norms of the group to which one belongs. This is why the circumcised group accuses Peter of associating with and eating with uncircumcised men, since their identity is closely related to their social norms which one expected to dictate members’ behaviour (11.3). And it is why circumcised believers accompany him as witnesses (10.45; 11.12). But they do not blame Peter for his action in baptising them, though baptism is a crucial rite, the accepting of Cornelius into the social space of Christian group. Peter would have been invited into the more private space in the Cornelius house, which is most likely an atrium-peristyle house, to recognise the impartiality of God to every one in every nation and to proclaim the gospel (vv.34-43). In summarising Peter’s sermon, Luke records his characteristic hyperbole, πᾶς, seven times to stress the inclusiveness of salvation.

54 The different opinions can be briefly summarised: (a) limited social intercourse with Gentiles, especially, God-fearers (Dunn 1983; 1990); (b) such intercourse was prohibited in the first-century (Esler 1987; 1994; 1998); (c) despite strict prohibitions, historical reality points to wider social intercourse with Gentiles if their meat and wine were avoided (Sanders 1990b).
During the sermon, the Holy Spirit is poured upon the entire household. It is a striking event which no one expects to happen to Gentiles. This act confirms the impartiality of God, the Patron who grants his patronal gift to his new clients, Gentiles as well as Jews. It is necessary, therefore, for Peter to baptise them in the name of Jesus because God has, by his initiative, incorporated them into his household. New Christian fictive-kinship is established in the Gentile house by baptism. It is the Cornelius household in which his physical family, relatives, close friends, and very possibly his slaves, and devout soldiers, are integrated so as to form an hierarchical familial structure. Luke shows paradigmatically how the Christian house-church is planted in Gentile territory through this kind of extended household in the ancient Mediterranean group-oriented society where one’s family is the primary reference of one’s social life. This household is a basic model for creating a group comprised of various social groups across the social boundaries of status, *ethnos*, age, and gender. The hierarchical and heterogeneous patriarchal familial structure is transformed into homogeneous Christian fictive-kinship, and accordingly the hierarchically segmented social space of the house is transformed into the inclusive social space so as to break up spatial boundaries. The final mention of the hospitality they offer to Peter indicates that the house is beginning to work as the mission centre through domestic reciprocity for the Christian wandering missionaries.

Reading this story, the Lukan readers would recognise that the Temple with its exclusivistic purity code concerning food, persons, ethnic and geographical boundaries, is superseded by domestic social space with its inclusive dietary and social code consistent with an inclusive concept of the redemptive community. For Luke, ethnic boundaries are considered an obstacle to his description of the spread of the Gospel beyond the geographical boundary of Israel. To overcome them, he needs to deal with the troublesome Jewish purity rules before the full-scale Gentile mission. Ethnic boundaries disappear at the same time as distinctive ethnic dietary rules, since the social codes regulating food and eating are correlated with the social norms governing commensality and social association within a social group (Douglas
If the Lukan house-church consisted of a mixed ethnic group of Jews and Gentiles (Esler 1987:31-45), this story has an important relevance for legitimising their cross-ethnic social intercourse and for creating a strong sense of belonging to the divinely approved community, against the Jewish group which keeps the discarded dietary rules to mark social identity and boundaries.

3. The House-church in Philippi (Ac.16.11-40)

When Paul visits the proselyte in Philippi, he converts a female God-fearer, Lydia (v.14). Luke makes Lydia a paradigmatic model in Paul’s mission-field, in that she provides her house as a meeting place and offers hospitality to the itinerant missionaries. Paul, with his symbolic capital, leads Lydia to choose the new good which is fundamentally different from the existing social order of Judaism and the Gentile religions she has tasted. Her conversion is a choice of a good, which involved both social protest against the old as well as social adhering to the new. Domestic structure provides the important setting for the first conversion story in the major urban centres of Roman territory leading to baptism, hospitality, and the formation of the house-church.

Lydia is described as a purple cloth dealer (πορφυρόπωλης) from Thyatira (cf. CIG.2519), and it is supposed that she is a freedwoman rather than a divorced woman (ND.2.3:32). It is unlikely, however, that she was someone in imperial service with Caesar’s household (ND.2.3:28-32), who traded under an imperial monopoly, because this dates from later than our period (ND.2.3:26) and it was for the Tyrian murex not for the Thyatira rubia (ND.3.17:53-55). While the Tyrian murex was produced from the Mediterranean purple-fish (mollusks) and was an ancient luxury (War.6.8.3) provided to royal and wealthy households, the Thyatira rubia in which Lydia dealt was a less expensive dye from the madder-roots, the so-called Turkey red (CIG.3496-98). Her name might mean ‘the one from Lydia,’ such as is given to a slave (Barrett 1998:782). So any effort to relate her to a social elite (Gill 1994:114; Blue 1994:182; Witherington 1998:492) is misguided. It is reasonable, however, to suppose that she was a wealthy woman who owned slaves, though there is no indication as to how far
her household extended. Thus we can infer from these considerations that her house is not an atrium-peristyle but a typical urban house with shop, the space in which is relatively open to social interaction, across social boundaries.

In her house, she and her household are baptised by Paul and thus incorporated into the new fictive-kinship which supersedes her old social networks. The conversion of the householder marks the genesis of this house-church (v.40) and the social framework of the Christian house-church is based on the character of the social relations of an extended household (Klauck 1981:71). After baptism, Lydia beseeches Paul to stay in her house. Hospitality in antiquity transformed the outsider from a stranger to friend or enemy, and it is necessary for strangers to enter into a village’s social space in order to secure their protection (Malina 1986a:181-187). Offering hospitality is not simply a courteous gesture but a request for social approval involved in belonging to a significant social group (Pesch 1986:106). To refuse hospitality would always entail a serious breach of social relationships in antiquity. For Paul, hospitality is a necessity for his performance in an alien social environment, since otherwise he would usually have had to lodge in public inns where protection was not guaranteed (Haenchen 1971:495; Hock 1980:29-31). It is more needed especially in Philippi where the pride of a Roman military colony, Roman antipathy to any Oriental religion, and anti-Jewish sentiment, are prevalent as the following story reveals (vv.20-24). Lydia’s house as a meeting place would contribute to the embryo and the development of the house-church at Philippi. It is striking that the gospel rapidly transforms not only the social relations of the domestic space from balanced reciprocity to generalised reciprocity to create the social identity of the house-church, but also the nature of Christian social relations from a hierarchical social structure to an inclusive one (brothers and sisters, v.40).

In addition, Luke reports the incident of the Philippian gaoler, in which a gaoler (δεσμοφύλαξ) is converted and baptised with his whole household after Paul’s miraculous release from chains (Ac.16.25-34). Here we see a pattern similar to that of Cornelius, since the conversion of the householder leads to the baptism of all the household into the household of God (vv.30-34). By four times emphasising that his whole household followed him (16.31, 32, 33, 34), Luke highlights the importance of
the role of the householder in the formation of the Christian group. In this case, the issue of the inclusion of the infants in the baptism has been raised (see Jeremias 1960, 1963b; Aland 1963; Beasley-Murray 1962; Howard 1970; Scott 1986; Brooks 1987).

The words, oikía/oikoc, do not themselves refer to the broad family but the people included should be decided within the individual texts. It should be noted, however, that in a group-oriented society in antiquity, the authority of the householder was indisputable over the children in religious issues since the ancient family was a kind of religious community. Thus Paul promises salvation to the gaoler’s whole household if he believes (v.31). Origen speaks of the children becoming followers of Christ along with their parents and the church growing into a multitude (Cels. 3.10).

This narrative is an excellent example of a common pattern of house-church growth in early Christianity in the group-oriented Mediterranean world (Sandnes 1994:95). After the baptism, the common meal follows (v.34) to celebrate inclusion within, as well as solidarity among, the one household of God.

Here Luke highlights the house in which the Gospel is preached, baptism is practised to formulate a new fictive-kinship of God, and hospitality enhances its group solidarity. Luke significantly shows how the house is used for embedding the Gospel in the Gentile world.

4. The Corinthian House-Church (Ac.18.1-17)

In Corinth, we see an example of how the Christian house-church developed in a specific region of the Pauline mission field. At the first stage, Luke introduces Paul’s significant encounter with Aquila and Priscilla, which leads to their co-work in craft and mission. Aquila had been expelled from Rome in 49 CE., by Claudius’ edict (v.2; Suetonius Claud.25.4; Orosius Hist.6.6.15-16), probably because he was involved in strife caused by the impact of the Christ-movement on Judaism in Rome (Fitzmyer 1998:619-20; Barrett 1998:860-61). At Corinth, he probably settled into a house with a shop in the market street. By inviting Paul into his house, they work together and preach the gospel during the week in the shop and visit the synagogue on the Sabbath. So we can assume that Paul’s primary locus for the missionary work in
Corinth is a shop in which he would meet with and propagate the gospel to a wide variety of people of varying social strata, and that he strategically capitalises upon urban social mobility for the sake of the gospel (Hock 1980).

The trade Paul is engaged in is highly likely to be that of the tentmaker (σημεωποιός). He would sew linen tents for private customers who used tents on the beach, as sunshades in the atrium, or as market stalls, in opposition to the traditional view that he worked primarily at making military leather-tents, since these were sewn mainly by imperial slaves and freedmen or soldiers (Vegetius Militari.2.11; Lampe 1987a). It is highly improbable that travelling artisans like Paul and Aquila would have been contracted as suppliers to the military apparatus. More probably we should envisage Aquila as operating a small shop in front of his house. Thus Aquila is not a wealthy trader owning one or more houses around the Mediterranean major cities and running a large scale business with several workers (contra. Lüdemann 1987:209; Blue 1994:175), but works in a trade linked to the poorest strata of society like most independent artisans, since only a few craftsmen, who work for luxury items in goldsmiths and jewellers, were wealthier (Lampe 1987b:158-64). So Aquila’s house is highly likely a low status house with a shop where the social logic of space enables communication with people across social boundaries. While it would not be big enough to accommodate many of the believers, it would play an important role as the initial meeting place in Corinth.

The second stage of the Corinthian house-church occurs with the conversion of prominent figures of the synagogues, Titius Justus and Crispus (vv.7-8). A somewhat different accent is given to the second stage in vv.5ff., where Luke distinguishes it from the synagogue ministry that took place every Sabbath (v.4) by referring to the arrival of Silas and Timothy and by using the verb οὐκείσκετο, which is an imperfect, to denote Paul’s exclusive devotion to the proclaiming of the word (v.5). We should not conjecturally extrapolate from the Pauline references to the funds from Philippi (Phil.4.14-15; 2Cor.11.9), which enable Paul exclusively to devote himself to his preaching without work (cf. Witherington 1998:548). Rather Luke deliberately highlights Paul’s intensification of the ongoing missionary work in the synagogue with the help of co-workers and expresses both the rejection of the fundamental and
distinctive Christian message by the Jews and its influential reception by prominent figures like Crispus. Thus Luke implies that many of the Corinthians become believers following him (Theissen 1982:75; Haenchen 1971:535). The demonstrative action of shaking the dust from his clothes is a symbolic way of disavowing any responsibility in relation to the Corinthian Jews and indicates the decisive closing of his brokerage to them.

Whereas the synagogue is the locus of the rejection of the gospel, Luke ironically emphasises the extent to which the house is the site of its reception which creates social space for the gospel, by highlighting the physical proximity between the synagogue and the house Paul enters. Titius Justus would probably have been a benefactor of the Jewish community before his conversion. If his house is located in the urban centre of Corinth, he would be a wealthy God-fearer since owning a fine house was one of the leading indicators and symbols of wealth and status in Roman society (Garnsey & Saller 1987:121f). His house seems to be relatively big enough to accommodate the entire Christian community since there is no indication of something like the hall of Tyrannus (19.9). For Luke’s Jewish readers, the synagogue is replaced by the house to serve the word of God even though the synagogue was instituted for just that task.

How can Paul successfully recruit new believers in Corinth? From the perspective of the intergroup comparison, when exit from a group is possible, a movement from the one group to the other group is called social mobility, while if exit is difficult or impossible, social change (social competition or social creativity) will occur (for a brief summary, Esler 1998:49-55). Even though social mobility in a group-oriented society is unusual, the synagogue adherents including Jews and Gentiles willingly move from their social group to the Christian house-church. Their mobility would have been prompted by the distinctive and fundamental character of the house-church as a family. Within the synagogue, they would have been constrained by the high degree of Jewish social boundaries aimed at differentiating people according to purity lines. The social logic of the synagogue is highly hierarchical so as to exclude the outgroup and to differentiate people even within the ingroup. In contrast, the house-church would have revealed an alternative potential to
enhance group cohesion across social boundaries. Moreover, Paul, as the significant other in their conversion, would have shown his social flexibility by identifying with people up and down the social ladder (cf. 1Cor.12.23; 9.22). While he would deliberately step down the social ladder to identify with those of lower status, the conversion of the leading figures of the synagogue would create the Christian group’s sense of superiority over the synagogue. Since the Jews’ degradation as a social group is so great, it leads to their public attack on Paul (v.12ff).

In the house, Christian fictive-kinship would have produced social integration. Luke edits his social drama to show how the Christian house-church is created in the context of the intergroup relations with the synagogue. In the crisis, which is generated by Paul’s proclaiming that the Messiah is Jesus, the negative reaction of the Jews is extremely hostile. Schism is hard to avoid in forming a new social group like this. From the dominical instruction, “there are many in this city who are my people,” we are sure of the successful fruits of Paul’s long-staying ministry in Corinth (v.10-11).

In conclusion, the house in Corinth becomes the initial meeting place to propagate the gospel (the house of Aquila), as well as the social space which replaces the synagogue and creates the fictive-kinship of God (the house of Justus), and the missionary base-centre from which the house-church can be reproduced.

5. The Ephesian House-Church (Ac.19.8-10; 20.17-38)

In Ephesus, Luke records a similar pattern to Corinth: the primary connection of Priscilla and Aquila (18.18,26), the rejection of Jews in the synagogue (20.9a), and taking disciples from the synagogue (20.9b). Obviously different is the reference to the σχολή of Tyrannus (20.9c) where for years Paul continually holds daily dialogues concerning the patronage of God. The term, σχολή, refers to a lecture hall (cf. Plutarch Rec. Rat.42A; Epictetus Diss.3.21.11; Aristotle Pol.1313B; contra. ND.1.82:129-30). Paul probably rents this hall from 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. when Mediterranean people enjoyed a meal and then a siesta (Martial Ep.4.8.3), as the
Western text indicates (Metzger 1971:470). It is time outside normal working hours. From this consideration, we assume that unlike at Corinth, he is not successful in persuading the wealthy people to provide a house, and that the Ephesian Christians are poor people who have no sufficient private domestic space which can be used for teaching as Paul has used elsewhere. Most likely Paul would have worked in the shop with Aquila and proclaimed the patronage of God to his customers, and invited them to the hall at the times when the wealthy people would decline to attend at the expense of their rest time since they would spend the morning on leisure.

In Acts, we fail to find Paul’s success in gaining a wealthy benefactor in Ephesus as he does elsewhere, but the poor Christian house-church would have played an important role in propagating the gospel to the areas around Ephesus, as Revelation reveals (Rev.2-3). But Luke reports that Paul’s farewell address is addressed to the Ephesian elders who have experienced difficult times during his stay (20.17-35). The address is uniquely directed towards the Christian leaders in Acts and serves to create social solidarity within the Christian house-church as the Pastoral epistles do (see Wilson 1979:117f). This address is a manifesto for the house-church leadership (cf.Ac.20.20) to illustrate how they as pastors should serve the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ (v.29). It is significant that Luke identifies the house-church as the church of God for the first time. It is parallel to the ἐκκλησία τοῦ Κυρίου in the LXX (Dt.23.2-4; 1Chr.28.8; Mic.2.5) but it has a different character by virtue of the unique brokerage of the Son who proclaims the new ἐκκλησία of God. In the address, Paul summarises his missionary activity in two categories: in public (synagogue and the σταυρός) and in private from house to house (κατ’ οίκους)(v.20). In pasturing the flock, they are told that the principal virtue of the pastor is to support the weak through generalised reciprocity as Paul shows through his example according to Jesus’ word: “It is more honourable (μακαρίων) to give than to receive” (v.35). To practise this kind of reciprocity is not easy since leadership is demanded in order to supply his/her basic subsistence as well as to support the other members. The Ephesus community seems not to have had a wealthy benefactor but Paul and his co-workers built up the house-church by practising generalised reciprocity which enhances the sense of belonging to a family. It is a principal modus operandi of the house-church to establish the social
identity of the group of Christ-followers vis-à-vis other social groups like Jews and Gentiles.

6. The House-Church at Troas (Ac.20.6-12)

The Troas episode provides two distinctive pieces of information concerning the early Christian house-church. First is the Christian calendar, since the text refers to the early Christian liturgical gathering on Sunday to celebrate the Eucharist, whether Luke uses Jewish or Roman reckoning of time (Barrett 1998:950). It is the first unambiguous reference to the early Christians having a distinctive liturgical meeting to differentiate their social identity from the Jews. Second is the reference to the meeting place in the ἐπερῷον (v.8) with τριστέγων (v.9). These words suggest an insula, the predominant domicile in the Roman urban areas where poor people from low social strata mainly lived. Troas was an important port city serving as a nodal point to connect northern Asia Minor with Macedonia, and it would have attracted a variety of people of low status to work. It is likely that the majority of the believers lived in insulae rather than in the domus. Without a benefactor who could provide resources for the meeting, the house-church would consist of people who engaged in manual labour, as probably indicated by the case of Eutychus who sinks into a deep sleep on the window ledge.

The eucharist in this kind of house-church would be characterised as “agapaic communalism”, involving self-sufficient rather than “patriarchal love” (Jewett 1993), and the spatial logic of the house-church suggests an inclusive model which is open toward people across social boundaries. By combining the first day of the week, an upper room, and the breaking bread in this narrative (Lk.22.12; 24.30-35; Ac.1.13), Luke is portraying this meeting as a paradigmatic image of the early urban Christian fellowship. Luke makes clear that the house-church has a powerful means of enhancing social identity vis-à-vis Jews by adopting a different liturgy, different time, and different place to meet, which reflect its alternative purity lines. They meet in a house of low social status on a working day evening to have an inclusive eucharistic meal.
The usual assumption that the early Christians met in a good size of house provided by wealthy Christian patrons is too simplistic. In Acts, those of high social status, who are able to provide their house for Christian meetings are not predominant but only Cornelius and Titius Justus can be identified. The stereotyped assumption that the primary goal of Paul is to win persons of social and economic standing, who were considered as key figures for the future of the Christian fellowship (Gielen 1990:77-84) is misleading and wrongly pushes our understanding of the early Christian group in the direction of an elite-centred evangelistic movement. The owners of the houses in Acts are not mainly the wealthy (contra Balch & Osiek 1997:16-17; Blue 1994; Gill 1994; Lorenzen 1987; Maier 1991; Meeks 1983; Strobel 1965; Vogler 1982; Witherington 1998). Luke reveals his ability to comprehend the heterogeneous circumstances of the Christian groups varying according to region. In Acts we meet house owners who belong more to the lower ranks of society than to high social status. And in ancient Mediterranean society, one’s economic resources did not automatically guarantee one’s social standing since social status was a complex combination of social factors combined with wealth (Finley 1985:45-61).

7. Paul at Rome (Ac.28.16-31)

Luke’s final reference to the house is a Roman house in which Paul stays as a captive de jure but as a missionary de facto (vv.16, 23, 30). It is obviously not solitary confinement in a military camp because he is allowed to live by himself with unrestricted access to outsiders in private rented accommodation, probably in the near vicinity of the Castra Praetoria, but it is not clear what kind of house is meant. The size of Paul’s residence is implied in the fact that it contains sufficient space to accommodate the Jewish leaders “in great numbers” in v.28. Thus one infers 40-50 persons from the number of synagogues in Rome and the size of the oldest Jewish community located in the Trans Tiberinum (Tajra 1989:192). But this reference should be interpreted to mean that the Jewish leaders visit on more than the first occasion. The circumstances of the rental market in ancient Rome point to this assumption because the villas at Ostia and Alba brought in revenues of HS 20,000;
HS 50,000 and HS 60,000 (the average daily wage for a labourer at Rome was 3 sestertii [HS]) and the upper storeys of the insula were let for 2,000 HS per year (Packer 1967:86). A second view is that Paul is lodging in a boarding house as the Vulgate renders the word, “ξενών” at v.23 as hospitium (Casson 1974:204). This type of house is suited to people who have to spend more than a few days in a place and lack of social connections, and occupants usually sleep in tiny rooms. It is a highly improbable option because Luke’s description refers to Paul’s free activity in accepting visitors and talking about the gospel (Rapske 1994:237).

The third option is a higher room in a tenement apartment (insula). Rapske, who declines to support the second view because of Paul’s dietary observance, inclines to choose the insula because Paul would not violate Jewish laws (1994:238-9). This is unlikely because Paul in his missionary travels must have lodged in public inns before finding hospitality. And a serious problem to his option is the cost of such accommodation. Although we have no idea how much money Paul had at his disposal, it is improbable that he could have supported all the cost from his followers given his longstanding principle of self-support. It is our contention, therefore, that Paul would have been allowed to work at his trade. Luke’s reference to chains in v.20 describes Paul’s earlier stage, but his long stay for two whole years points to more consideration from the Roman officials due to his status as a Roman citizen and possibly their recognition of the feebleness of Paul’s indictment under Roman law. As various manuscripts of the Western text add that Paul lived “outside the camp” (Metzger 1971:501), Paul may have lived in the quarter of tentmakers in Rome where the Praetorian Guard could keep closely in touch with him. In vv.30-31, Luke deliberately implies combination of financial independence, unrestricted access to the visitors, proclaiming and teaching activities, and boldness, Paul totally devotes himself to his mission just as he had practised it before. Therefore, Luke implies that Paul is dwelling in a shop with an attached room.

The flexible spatial logic of the house allows inclusive communication among people and across social boundaries. Accordingly, Luke matches this inclusive space with the unhindered propagation of the patronage of God brought by the Lord Jesus Christ. Luke ends his final passage by highlighting humorously the divine irony that
the blocked broker, Paul, is brokering the patronage of God in the unblocked domestic space. Luke’s ending signifies that the patronage of God and the work and person of Jesus Christ are being spread without restraint to the ends of the earth through the house. The inclusiveness of the gospel is powerfully reproduced in the inclusive social space through the characteristic features of hospitality and generalised reciprocity. At the end of Acts, we see that the house has been significantly and comprehensively substituted for the Temple and synagogue in the history of the salvation of God. The social identity of the house-church is significantly created, maintained, and legitimised in order to enhance the sense of belonging to the fictive-kinship of God through the brokerage of Jesus.

In sum, Luke uses the house to create social space for the Christian group and makes it the *modus operandi* to implant the gospel in alien circumstances in Acts. The house is portrayed as the alternative space for Christians substituting for the sacred spaces of the synagogues and the Temple. Finally the house is depicted as an effective social means of proclaiming the patronage of God in spite of its limited size.
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EPILOGUE:
RELEVANCE OF THE LUKAN HOUSE-CHURCH
FOR THE KOREAN CHURCH TODAY

1. Luke and His Community.

Our exegetical investigation in Chapters 3-5 suggests a new way of estimating Luke’s attitude to the Temple, synagogue and house in Luke-Acts from the perspective of an architectural space model. We have argued that the architectural settings of the Temple, synagogues, and the house, are intimately related to Lukan theology in a constructive but not deterministic way. Luke portrays the Temple and synagogues negatively as spaces whose occupants reject the Gospel brought by the brokers, Jesus and his followers, who are seeking to introduce the patronage of God to the socially marginalised, stigmatised people and Gentiles. This negative reaction is linked to the inherent social logic of space and hierarchical segmented social structures in the Temple and synagogue. On the other hand, Luke depicts the house as the social space for the renewed people of God, which generates an inclusive social framework under divine patronage. By employing the language of family in a domestic context, Luke offers an alternative model of social values and relations to the members of his house-church, who form a fictive-kinship group consisting of people of varying social status, economic standing, ethnicity, sex, and age. And Luke substantially promotes their social identity by redefining them as the new household of God through the brokerage of Jesus (Lk.8.19-21; 11.1-4). They are the humiliated and impoverished (Lk.6.20-23), who have broken their old family ties (Lk.14.25-26). Thus they need an alternative family which brings social security and solidarity in a group-oriented society. Moreover Luke calls them “little flock” (Lk.12.32), which is a stock image for Israel and Judah in the Old Testament (Jer.13.17; Ezk.34; Zech.10.3). But Luke applies this expression to the Jesus group which strives to live under the patronage of God (Lk.12.31), and betrays a self-conscious awareness of his community as a small group gathered in the house church rather than highlighting the remnant tradition (Esler 1987:26, 54).
Living in a Greco-Roman city in 80s-90s C.E., the members would have struggled to cope with significant social pressures within and without their community, in order to explain and justify their social identity as a new creative social group in the social milieu of honour/shame laden group-oriented Mediterranean urban society. Since these Christians gathered regularly in a humble domestic space, they would have felt social inferiority in their social interaction with the significant out-groups of Israelites and Gentiles, in terms of their social influence, prestige, and integrity. Their lack of an identifiable sacred public space like Temple, shrine, synagogue or gymnasium, which are visible marks of a significant social group in their surrounding world, together with the inclusion of socially stigmatised people in the community (Lk.6.12-16; 7.36-35; 14.15-24; 15.1-32; 18.9-14; 19.1-10), would make them vulnerable to criticism as people who are given to superstition or who are social trouble-makers (cf. Ac.16.20; 19.13; 19.25ff.; 24.5). Within the community, the members would probably not have fully accommodated the new modus vivendi under the patronage of God through possible misunderstanding of the teaching of Jesus and by adherence to the old modus vivendi of their surrounding society. Many tensions would be prominent in the house-church: for example, tension between the destitute and the rich over sharing social good (Lk.10.29-37; 12.13-21; 16.19-31; 18.18-30); competition for honour and leadership (Lk.6.20-23; 9.46-48; 14.7-14; 22.24-30); and struggles over the legacy of the Jewish inheritance in areas like circumcision and the Sabbath (Lk.5.17-26; 6.1-11; 13.10-17; Ac.10.1-11.18; 15.1-21).

So Luke would have needed to shore up the social identity of his house-church, by re-socialising them in the new social relations and values of the patronage of God, which have a revolutionary character in their surrounding world. Thus Luke, in his preface which is dedicated to Theophilus who might be a significant member of his community, announces the primary purpose of his work as ἄσφαλεω (reassurance), in relation to his instruction (Lk.1.4). For Luke, the house is the significant alternative to the Temple and synagogue, through which the patronage of God is spread and in which new social relations and values are created, maintained, and legitimised. It was those who belonged to this alternative and would "turn upside down" (ἀναστατώ) the established social order and structure (οἶκουμενή), in which Greco-Roman society is deeply embedded (Ac.17.6).
2. The Present Korean Church.\textsuperscript{55}

Our study also aims to serve the contemporary Korean church by bringing into prominence the lesson of the Lukan house-church. As we have observed in Chapter 2, the problems of the Korean church are significantly derived from its architectural structure, which is characteristically similar to the Temple and synagogue. Just as its architects have uncritically adopted the western architectural tradition of the Gothic or Romanesque styles that developed after Constantine, Korean Protestant theology has also followed in the steps of Western theological traditions, which are very alien to the Korean situation. Accordingly, the Korean church and its theology have failed to serve Korean society appropriately (Kim 1992:272-334; Lee 1991). To the extent that the Korean church has adopted Luke-Acts as part of the Word of God, it needs to hear Luke’s voice and to capitalise upon its message in Korean society. There are four major areas of concern, which I will now explore.

First, as we have seen in Chapters 3-4, the Temple space segmented people according to purity lines. In a similar way, the Korean church has a tendency to divide people into a Christian ingroup and a non-Christian outgroup. This sense of group identity leads the church to concentrate on the social solidarity of its own ingroup without concern for socially marginalised and stigmatised people, and the destitute. For the church, non-Christians are only objects of evangelism, not of social concern. Owing to the current economic crisis in Korea, there are many unemployed, destitute, and disabled in need of assistance. They cry out for help! The church has few institutions to assist them, but is struggling to maintain its investment on buildings and organisation. Based on the model of Jesus’ inclusive ministry encapsulated in his Nazareth manifesto (Lk.4.16ff), the church should pay dutiful attention to the poor, including prisoners, the disabled, and the oppressed (τεθραυσμένους). At present, however, most Korean Protestant churches hand over concern to social activists or specialised mission groups, while they interpret the Gospel message in a spiritualised
sense and institutionally stereotype those who are concerned with these people as left-wingers.

Secondly, the church itself has been dismembered into 87 major denominations after the Liberation (ARKC 1991:215-216). The Presbyterian church actually has 57 denominations. The main reason for these divisions is explicitly attributed by the denominations to its own purity concerns, in areas such as the debates on participation in Shinto worship, differing theological stances in relation to Karl Barth, Bultmann, the W.C.C., etc., but the underlying cause can be found in power struggles between and within denominations (Kim 1992:246-260). In conservative circles, if one accepts the theology of Barth, one will be stereotyped as a liberal theologian, which is a fatal theological stigma in that circle. So conservative churches still do not allow preachers, who come from other denominations, to preach to their church members. It is no coincidence that most of the conservative churches adopt Gothic or Romanesque styles of architecture. This is strong evidence that temple-style church architecture generates a strong sense of ingroup identity by excluding significant outgroups from its social and architectural space. These exclusive features are strikingly similar to those of Temple and synagogues, whose leaders rejected Jesus, his followers, and their message.

Thirdly, the Korean church also segments its members within the local church. Its articulated spatial arrangement creates a hierarchical ecclesiastical structure, which classifies believers into a social ladder of status within the church according to the newly developed Christian purity law. Within a mega-church, these status divisions are more visibly replicated in church space than in a small church that might express status divisions more conceptually. Let me recount my own experience in Deagu Dongboo church. When its new building was erected, there were four specified rooms, to be used respectively for senior pastor, ministers, presbyters, and church officers. Because of the increase in numbers, new rooms for anointed deacons and Kwon-sa have been created. In addition, one anointed deacon insisted that the church should create a room for the conductors of choirs, since he was himself devoted to a

55 Although I illustrate the more negative aspects of the Korean church in regard to
choir! I have frequently experienced how each room develops its own social boundaries and social identity to distinguish its occupants from the others. One day when I needed to use an office computer, one officer told me, “Would you use the computer in your room?” I felt this deeply as an instance of ingroup mentality, which was created or encouraged by spatial segmentation. And if I, as a minister, felt a strong sense of ingroup/outgroup differentiation, how would the majority of members have experienced it? They would have felt themselves marginalised or de-centred in the church space. Just as the message of the Lukan Gospel appealed to the marginalised to challenge these aspects of the Temple and synagogue and so won over the God-fearers, a church which has these temple-like features in its ecclesiastical and architectural structure is vulnerable to the mission of para-church and quasi-heretical sectarian movements, which are able to penetrate into the church and attract church members by criticising these aspects of its identity.

Fourthly, Luke’s message for a Korean church is that the social logic of the Temple space was consonant with institutions like Sabbath, circumcision, and the possible prohibition on table-fellowship, that prevented the message of Jesus and his followers being heard. Even within the early Christian group, the Hebrews (Ac.6) neglected the Hellenists, and the circumcised believers (Ac.11, 15, 22) were opposed to the inclusive message of Peter and Paul. From Jesus’ healing ministry in the synagogue on the Sabbath, we learn that the strict observance of the Lord’s day as the Sabbath is a long way from the ministry and teaching of Jesus. Its way, which lets the Sabbath really be the Sabbath, is to reveal how the divine favour is shown to marginalised people. Piety-centred Christian life has the potential to oppose the inclusive message and ministry of Jesus. I have witnessed a case in which a man’s mistress was denied baptism in spite of her confession of faith and faithful attendance at meetings. And another mistress was deprived of her deaconship. The Korean Church also needs to accept the message of Christians who come from different theological traditions and to ignore its purity lines wherever they impede belief in Jesus and God.

its architecture in this study, lots of positive aspects, which I have not mentioned, also exist.
3. Lukan House-Church Model for Korean Church.

As Luke creates the social identity of his house-church vis-à-vis the Temple and synagogue, his strategy also has a relevance for transforming the Korean church today. Unfortunately, as far as I know, no Korean theologian has yet considered renewal of the church from the perspective of the social ramifications of its architecture. But we may refer to two examples, which reveal attempts to evangelise the poor and social outcasts in a humble spatial context. First, the Minjoong church\(^{56}\) shows a deep concern for the urban poor, by practising communal life, sharing, and voluntary participation in worship and the sacraments (KTSI 1988). As its theology understands ‘Minjoong’ as meaning the oppressed, the poor, and the working class, this church has antithetically developed as an alternative-church to the institutionalised church in Korea. Yet its influence is confined to a specific class of people due to its ideological and factional nature, it has inherently a danger of exclusivity in favour of the poor (Lee 1991:158f). Second, “Dail community” practises its activity of sharing food to the urban poor, the homeless, and the elderly people with no dependants, in a prostitute quarter of Seoul (Choi 1995). It is notable in that it has no designated community buildings. It is a non-denominational, non-ideological movement. As its name, “Da” (diversity) and “il” (unity), implies, it practises common meals in which all sorts of people can participate by sharing food. Its operation in one of the most stigmatised of urban spaces especially signifies its boundary-breaking, inclusive and evangelical nature, whereby the ‘haves’ enter its space and share with the ‘have-nots’. Without its own buildings, it forms spontaneously and temporarily its own space in a particular area. But it is also an alternative community movement to the established church. Although these two Christian movements significantly challenge the dominant Korean church, they are limited because of their nature as independent, and/or as engaged on antithetical activity.

\(^{56}\) Its number was estimated in 1988 at 63 churches settled mainly in the urban industrial or slum quarter (KTSI 1988).
From an architectural perspective, we can serve the renewal of the church by offering some brief suggestions, which derive from Luke-Acts. Here we do not claim that the Korean Protestant church has to destroy or abandon its existing buildings in order to imitate Luke’s house-church. This is surely an unrealistic alternative. It will be a more realistic challenge to suggest a way of transforming the spatial nature of the existing church buildings into inclusive and distributive sociopetal space in accordance with the Lukan theology of the house, just as the Lukan Jesus transformed the nature of the atrium-peristyle house into an inclusive solidarity space, in which the socially marginalised and poor people were incorporated into the household of God under his patronage (cf. Lk.14). Thus the following suggestions will be appropriate to the Korean church today.

First, the church should open its space to local society outside usual times of its meetings so as to be used for education, social care, ceremonies such as weddings and funerals, musical performances, and artistic exhibitions. To the extent that God dwells everywhere, the church is no longer a sacred space like the Temple or synagogue. The spatial lines of purity between the sacred and the secular are no longer sustained in the Christian social-world from a Lukan perspective. By abolishing the boundary lines, the church can more effectively serve its surrounding society, and become a point of contact with local people.

Second, as far as the existing buildings can be used for communal meetings, the church should stop applying its financial resources for building new meeting places, which tend mostly to be more grand and more beautiful than the old ones. Investment in new church building is the foremost obstacle which prevents the church from engaging in evangelism, world mission, and social care (McGavern 1970:192-93). How much energy, time, finance, and personnel are invested in building and keeping a building in good repair, which never concerned the early Church! If a church grows in numbers, its most effective multiplication strategy will be to divide the church into several branches, which become seedbeds for evangelism and social concern. Moreover, there is nothing to prevent people gathering in private houses to make palpable the image of the “household of God”, the essence of the early church according to Luke.
Third, the church needs to make its meeting space more distributive, non-hierarchical, and more sociopetal so as to embody the social identity of the family of God. The pulpit platform should be lowered and given less prominence, while the sacramental space should made more visible and expansive. It is preferable that pews are flexible and not fixed in order to allow a more distributive spatial availability. By removing fixed pews, the church can effectively use the relatively huge space which will result in various ways for evoking social integration (cf. small-group meetings), and for serving public needs (cf. various kinds of social education). The church also needs to abandon or reduce designated and restricted space like the elder's room, deacon's room, the Kown-sa's room, and specific purpose space, like the choir rehearsal room. And it needs to create sociopetal space for common meals and fellowship. As a common space for all members, church space should be available to all believers without any internal distinctions based on such as social status, age, sex, race, and religious rank (pastor, elder, deacon, etc).

Due to limits of space, we can offer only these brief suggestions for church architectural renewal. But more substantial investigations of this agenda are urgently needed. If there is a dialectical relationship between church architecture and the socio-theological reality of the church, the transformation of the former will contribute to the significant renewal of the church so as to embody the teaching of Jesus and the examples of the early Christians portrayed in Luke-Acts. To be sure, they will bring a renewal of the church by themselves. Finally we hope that by becoming more similar to the Lukan house-church, the Korean church will serve God and his people with all humility and tears by way of “not shrinking from doing anything helpful” and “from declaring the whole purpose of God,” as Paul confesses retrospectively concerning his ministry to the Ephesian house-church (Ac.20.18-35).
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