
Article:
Jung, D.H. (2017) Fluid Sacredness from a Newly Built Temple in Luke-Acts. Expository Times, 128 (11). pp. 529-537. ISSN 0014-5246

https://doi.org/10.1177/0014524617700348

Fluid Sacredness from a Newly Built Temple in Luke-Acts

Deok Hee Jung

University of Sheffield

Abstract

In Stephen's speech in Acts 7, Luke negates God's indwelling of the Jerusalem Temple. God's presence is not confined to a specific place, but is fluidly revealed to God's people. In Luke-Acts, Jesus and his apostles take over the role of the old Temple so that they become newly built corporeal temples. Luke transfers the presence of the divine from the old Temple to the bodies of Jesus and his followers, and their behaviour produces sanctity around them. As the corporeal temple moves, this generates new sacred space everywhere. Thus, sacredness does not dwell in a fixed place, such as the Temple, but is fluidly expanded across previously restricted place.

Keywords

Temple, body, Jesus, apostles, Luke-Acts, fluid/fixed sacred space, indwelling

Introduction

Sacredness is an attribute of the divine presence. The sanctity of a place is determined by the link between the place and the divine. In this light, the Hebrew Bible provides two significant holy places: the tabernacle and the Temple. These two places symbolize sacred space during the long history of the Israelites. Among them, in particular, the Jerusalem Temple has played an important role as a representative sanctuary for Jews by the first century CE. The Temple was considered sacred space with a substantive indwelling of the supernatural divine presence.[1] This belief, itself, is rooted in the

[1] For general studies of the sacred spaces from a biblical perspective, see Robert L. Cohn, The Shape of Sacred Space:

ancient notion of linking sacred spaces to the presence of the divine. However, the sacred place of the Jews was destroyed in 70 CE. If so, did the destruction mean for Jews the demise of their sacred place as well? Early Christians seem to refute this assumption. They suggest an alternative sacred entity to substitute for the old Temple. It appears in the Pauline letters where Paul associates a substantive indwelling of divinity within the human body rather than in the visible Temple (1 Cor. 3:16–17).[2] In particular, Paul emphasizes that since the body is God's temple, God's Spirit dwells in the body (temple). Just as God's temple is holy, so is the human body. Once again, Paul narrates that the body is 'the temple of the living God' and God walks among them (2 Cor. 6:16). Subsequently, Christians become the dwelling place for God (Eph. 2:20–22; cf. Heb. 8:2). Paul links the human body with a substantive indwelling of the divine. Thus, according to Paul, the human being, as an alternative temple, can be understood as a repository of divinity. To put it another way, a body is the subject of the deity. In this light, Paul's assertion implies that the sacred space is not confined within a specific locale but it can be reproduced through the believers' mobile bodies so that sacredness can be fluidly flowing along God's new temple.

Such a notion, however, is not only Paul's stance. This view appears in Luke-Acts as well. Luke's two-volume book displays that, even though the Jerusalem Temple is destroyed, there is an alternative vehicle to preserve sacredness and establish the divine presence. Luke's well-knitted

---

Four Biblical Studies, AARSR (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1981); Sara Japhet, 'Some Biblical Concepts of Sacred Place', in Benjamin Z. Ḳedar and R. J. Zwi Werblowsky (eds.), Sacred Space: Shrine, City, Land: Proceedings of the International Conference in Memory of Joshua Prawer (New York, NY: New York University Press, 1998).

[2] For comprehensive studies on the Pauline concept of body, see G. K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A* Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God, NSBT 17 (Leicester: Apollos, 2004); Yung Suk Kim, *Christ's* Body in Corinth: The Politics of a Metaphor (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008). Besides its comparion to the Temple, Paul portrays the human body as a social body (1 Cor. 12:12–26). In ancient times, the body was conceived as a microcosm of the larger social microcosm, thereby being used as a basic framework for constructing divine architecture. See Jerome H. Neyrey, 'The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts', in Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.), The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991), 283. This perspective evidently appears in their design of the temple. When ancient peoples constructed the religious temples, they used to make it through the structure of the human body. Vitruvius, a Roman architect, is an example. Weissenrieder, based on an anthropomorphic stance, associates the Temple and the body by alluding to Vitruvius's De architectura. She illustrates that the human body is according to Vitruvius a representational model for the temple, constituting the basis for symmetry and proportion for the construction of a temple. It functions as the measurement for the temple. See Annette Weissenrieder, '"Do You Not Know That You Are God's Temple?": Towards a New Perspective on Paul's Temple Image in 1 Corinthians 3:16', in David L. Balch and Annette Weissenrieder (eds.), Contested Spaces: Houses and Temples in Roman Antiquity and the New Testament, WUNT 285 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012).

narrative portrays the bodies of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke and his followers in the Acts of the Apostles as an alternative temple to preserve holiness, thereby creating sacredness through journeys. Paul's understanding of body provides a new framework for Luke's audiences to perceive the conception of sacred space beyond the old destroyed Temple.

Thus, this essay argues that the bodies in which the divine dwells, substitute for the old Temple through spiritual presence and behaviour. In doing so, it explores how sacred space is fluidly expanded through the protagonists in Luke-Acts. In order to unfold this claim, first, it discusses Luke's view on the Temple based on Stephen's speech, and second, it explores Luke's portrayal of Jesus and the apostles as an alternative temple.

Luke's view on the Temple

There can be no doubt that Jews thought that the Jerusalem Temple functioned as the focal point for organizing sacred space. In a similar way to Paul, who firmly perceived the temple as the body of the believers, Luke also seems to be aware of the significance of the Jerusalem temple as a witness to the presence of God. Luke's Gospel begins in the place of the Temple (Luke 1:9) in which Jesus reveals his divine identity (2:46). Jesus calls the Temple 'my Father's house' (2:49). Also, Jesus' entire ministry is directed toward the Temple where he accomplishes the salvific program for the whole of humankind (23:45–47). In Acts, the building functions for the apostles as the space of healing and miracles (Acts 3:1–10), sermons (3:11–26), and prayer (4:23–31). Besides these passages, Acts provides positive statements about the Temple as well (2:46; 5:20–21; 21:26; 22:17: 24:18).[3]

However, we should pay attention to the fact that Luke has ambiguous views on the Temple in both positive and critical respects.[4] Luke's informed audiences who are familiar with the holiness of the Temple might expect stories to glorify the sacredness of the Temple, but there are few accounts

[3] Darrell L. Bock, Acts, ECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 302.

[4] Beverly Roberts Gaventa, The Acts of the Apostles, ANTC (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2003), 133.

of the sacred aspects of the Temple throughout the whole of Luke-Acts. More specifically, we could not find any scenes in which God's divine presence dwells upon the Temple. Rather, Luke's Jesus entitles the Temple as 'a den of robbers' (Luke 19:46). Jesus even proclaims the desolation of Jerusalem (Luke 13:34–35; 19:41–44; 21:20–24). Furthermore, following the death of Jesus, the curtain of the Temple was torn in two (Luke 23:45). Jesus proclaims that the Temple will be crushed (Luke 19:44; 21:6).[5] Even though the Temple holds significance in itself, strictly speaking, the place seems to lose its function as a sacred place. Overall in Acts, the Temple loses its divine authority to make holy the chosen communities. In this light, these passages lead the readers to think that God no longer dwells in the Jerusalem Temple. If so, can we say that Luke's critical depiction of the Temple indicates negation for the presence of God on the Temple? As for this issue, it is necessary to examine Stephen's speech which contains Luke's comprehensive perspective on the Temple, against the presence of the divinity in that place.

Stephen's Speech in Acts 6:8–7:56

Luke introduces Stephen's speech to the council in Acts 7. Before unfolding this speech, Luke reports the background of the story. Stephen is arrested for his false witness 'against this holy place and the law' (Acts 6:13–14). More specifically, Stephen's accusation is a result of his witness against the Temple (v. 14). His provocative denouncing of the Temple is rooted in Jesus' proclamation to destroy the place. In fact, Jesus already foretold of the collapse of the Temple (Luke 21:6). From this preliminary background, Luke's informed audiences might have expected that the main theme of this speech would have been a defence of Jesus' saying, namely, his view on holy places. Of course, as a reply to the Jews' accusation, Stephen advocates that Jesus' teaching is not absurd. For that purpose, Stephen explicates the long history about the ancestors of his opponents.

[5] Cf. Matt. 24:2; Mark 13:2; John 2:19–21.

Most of all, Stephen reminds his accusers of two significant sacred places—the tabernacle and the temple (Acts 7:44–47). These two places have been considered by Jews as the distinguished locales where God dwells.[6] First, Stephen refers to the tabernacle. To be sure, that was a sanctuary where God dwelled among the Israelites in the wilderness (Exod. 25:8). It was called the tent of the meeting between God and the Israelites (2 Sam. 7:6). Also, the Jerusalem Temple was considered as a witness of the presence of God in ancient Israel. As for these two places, some scholars discuss the differences in their significance.[7] However, Stephen's point is not the priority between those two sanctuaries. Rather, the primary reason of this illustration is to denote the transition from the tabernacle to the Temple during the Israelites' residence in Canaan. And his firm claim is that God's earthly dwelling is not restricted to a specific place, such as the Jerusalem Temple. Stephen affirms that '…the Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands' (Acts 7:48). To strengthen his assertion, Stephen quotes Isaiah 66:1–2 (cf. 1 Kgs. 8:27; 2 Chr. 6:18). God does not dwell in the handmade house because God is the creator who is able to make all of them by his hands (Acts 7:49–50). He refutes 'a God-in-the-box theology'.[8] Luke's Stephen clarifies that the Jerusalem Temple cannot completely contain God's divine presence because there is more to God's presence than one particular place. For Stephen, God is the creator of the entire universe beyond these handmade buildings.

Given that God does not dwell in the visible Temple and thus is not limited to one single earthly locality, where does God dwell? As for this question, Luke's Stephen provides three clues to solve this matter. First, Luke portrays that God dwells in heaven. His speech ends with the scene in which

---

[6] For studies on the significance of the tabernacle and the temple, see Ronald E. Clements, God and Temple (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1965); Craig R. Koester, The Dwelling of God: The Tabernacle in the Old Testament, Intertestamental Jewish Literature, and the New Testament, CBQMS 22 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1989); Mark K. George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009); Harold W. Attridge, 'Temple, Tabernacle, Time, and Space in John and Hebrews', Early Christianity 1.2 (2010): 261–74.

[7] Koester notes that Stephen favours the Tabernacle more than the stationary temple. Koester, Dwelling of God, 80. Also, see F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 175–6.

[8] Ben Witherington III, The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub, 1998), 273.

he watches 'the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God' (7:56). Heaven is opened to Stephen and here he sees the glory of God in heaven rather than in the Jerusalem Temple.[9] Here Luke employs the rhetorical figure of contentio (antithesis) so that he stresses the contrast between the heavenly God and the earthly Temple.[10] This scene strengthens Stephen's claim in the passage of 7:48. Furthermore, it implies the aspect of an empty Temple on earth without the divine presence. To put it another way, Luke's Stephen declares that the destruction of the empty Temple does not give rise to any serious ideological problem for their religion and faith.

Second, Luke elaborately illustrates that, besides heaven, the heavenly God also dwells anywhere God's people stay on earth. Stephen's overall speech is relevant to God's fluidity through the long history of the Israelites. Stephen narrates that God who is not restricted to a particular locale appears to Abraham in Mesopotamia (7:2), to Joseph in Egypt (7:9), and to Moses in the wilderness of Mt. Sinai (7:30–31). The presence of God is no longer associated with a particular place at all, but instead 'it is related to a cultic community'.[11] This is confirmed by Isaiah's testimony: '[God] dwells in the high and holy place, and also with those who are contrite and humble in spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite' (Isa. 57:15). God's divine presence occurs in the ordinary areas of God's people.

Third, based on the second point, the speech implies that sacred space is not fixed but fluid. Stephen's preaching provides a significant point: '"But I will judge the nation that they serve", said God, "and after that they shall come out and worship me in this place" (ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ)' (Acts 7:7). If so, where is 'this place' (τόπος) spoken by Stephen? As for this inquiry, Keener rightly relates the τόπος for worship to Stephen's later use of the term in v. 33: 'for the place where you are

[9] Gaventa, Acts, 131.

[10] Mikeal C. Parsons, Acts, PCNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 102.

[11] Clements, God and Temple, 120.

standing is holy ground (γῆ ἁγία)'.[12] As we discussed above, the presence of the divine is an essential condition for a sacred space. Accordingly, the τόπος for worship can be said to be where God stays with the community of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:4; 4:31).[13] This perspective suggests that wherever Spirit-impelled peoples are standing can be holy (γῆ ἁγία). According to this claim, there is no place that is inherently sacred or profane. Rather, regardless of its intrinsic attribute, what makes one place holy is determined by the presence of God upon people and then the place. In this light, as Japhet points out, 'the idea that God dwells in heaven and reveals himself to human beings on earth deprives any particular geographical site of all intrinsic sanctity'.[14] Likewise, God's sacredness is fluid, not fixed in a limited area.[15] A holy space for God's people will be fluidly established.

These three points allow the reader to get an answer to a hidden inquiry within Stephen's speech. By quoting Isa. 66:1–2, Stephen raises a serious question: 'What kind of house will you build for me...or what is the place of my rest?' (7:49). Considering his negative perspective toward the Jerusalem Temple, the 'house' can be substituted by Spirit-inspired people, including Stephen (6:5). As for this point, Beale suggests to carefully observe Isaiah 66:2b which is omitted in v. 49: 'But this is the one to whom I will look, to the humble and contrite in spirit, who trembles at my word' (Isa.

[12] Craig S. Keener, Acts: An Exegetical Commentary, 4 vols. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012–2015), vol. 2, 1360. But there are various claims for the definition of this term, such as, 'Jesus' in Neyrey, 'The Symbolic Universe of Luke-Acts', 293, 295; 'the place of the temple' in Todd C. Penner, In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 309.

[13] Keener, Acts, vol. 2, 1360.

[14] Japhet, 'Sacred Place', 69.

[15] The discussion on sacred space—whether it is fixed or fluid—has been an important issue for the scholars in comparative religions. Mircea Eliade notes that a sacred place (centre) is constructed through God's irruption and then hierophany. Subsequently, a place is deemed sacred when a divine power dwells in the place. He identifies the sacred space with a substantive indwelling of the supernatural divinity. Mircea Eliade, The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion (New York: Harcourt, Brace Jovanovich, 1959), 20-65. However, Jonathan Z. Smith refutes Eliade's claim of linking sacred space to the presence of the divine. He asserts that there is nothing that is inherently sacred or profane places. According to him, groups of believers sacralise certain places with religious meaning and then acting upon those senses, thereby create sacred space. Smith emphasizes on peoples' behaviours rather than inert places. Jonathan Z. Smith, To Take Place: Toward Theory in Ritual (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 1987), 1–23. Also see Jeanne Halgren Kilde, Sacred Power, Sacred Space: An Introduction to Christian Architecture and Worship (New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 1–11.

66:2b).[16] Reading this passage with Isaiah 57:15, Isaiah's point can be interpreted to mean that God will dwell, not on the handmade Temple, but with those who are humble and contrite in the Holy Spirit. Subsequently, those who are favoured by God will be an alternative temple through a substantive indwelling of the deity upon them. Furthermore, through God's indwelling on the body, sacred space can be fluidly expanded beyond a specifically designated place. Thus, for Luke, the 'house' in v. 49 should be formulated through the mobile bodies of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke and the Spirit-impelled witnesses in the Acts of the Apostles.

Newly Built Temples: Jesus and Apostles (Luke 4:21–22; Acts 2:1–4)

The final scene of Stephen's speech provides a clue to indicate the holy body, Jesus. Stephen 'saw the glory of God and Jesus standing at the right hand of God' (7:55). In the following passage of v. 56, Stephen once again emphasizes Jesus. Likewise, Luke implicitly connotes that the 'house' newly built for God is Jesus. Luke implies that God dwells in Jesus. This assertion is strengthened by James' testimony in the council at Jerusalem (Acts 15:16–17). James declares that the fallen dwelling of David will be rebuilt and set up into the newly built temple, quoting Amos 9:11–12.[17] As Pervo correctly points out, the rebuilt house indicates the body of Christ as the eschatological new temple.[18] Subsequently, God dwells in Jesus as the locus of the divine dwelling.

This point is significant for reading Luke-Acts. Indeed, God's divine presence on Jesus appears from the beginning of Jesus' ministry. When Jesus is baptized, he receives the Holy Spirit through the opened heaven. Interestingly, Luke portrays that the Spirit descended upon Jesus in bodily form (σωματικῷ εἴδει) like a dove (Luke 3:22).[19] The Greek term σωματικός occurs only here in the entire

[16] Beale, Temple and Church, 135–7, 220–1.

[17] 'On that day I will raise up the booth of David that is fallen, and repair its breaches, and raise up its ruins, and rebuild it as in the days of old; in order that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations who are called by my name, says the LORD who does this' (Amos 9:11–12).

[18] Richard I. Pervo, Acts: A Commentary (Minneapolis, MI: Fortress, 2009), 375.

[19] Four Gospels provides various illustrations of the Spirit's arrival (Mark 1:10, Matt. 3:16, Luke 3:22, John 1:32). In

New Testament. Unlike other Gospels, the Lukan Holy Spirit comes to Jesus as a visible experience.[20] Through this corporeal form of God, Luke lucidly clarifies that an embodied God dwells in Jesus and depicts an overlap between a deity and Jesus.[21] This bodily arrival of the Spirit denotes the fluidity of the selfhood of God's bodily form.[22] And then a heavenly voice of God comes into Jesus (3:21–22). Through this episode, Luke intends to link the profane space of human existence and the ideal sacred space of heaven. In doing so, Jesus becomes a sacred centre as the point of contact between heaven and earth. To use Eliade's term, Jesus becomes a 'pole' which represents a cosmic axis around which territory became sacred.[23] Thus Jesus, the centre of the world, becomes the most sacred place in its own right. However, the divine axis is not restricted in a static place where Jesus was baptized but rather to Jesus' movable body.[24] Here, the body of Jesus is redressed as a portable temple. To put it another way, Jesus can be characterized as a metaphorical temple.

In Acts, Jesus' ministry is succeeded by his disciples. Just before the ascension into heaven, Jesus commands them to be his witness (Acts 1:8). Then Jesus promises the Holy Spirit to them (1:5, 8). In Acts 2:3, the Spirit arrives in the form of the divided tongues of fire from heaven.[25] Once again, Luke portrays the bodily arrival of the Spirit, as it was in Luke 3, denoting the corporeal form of God and thus affirms the apostles' new identity as a new temple. As seen in Jesus' baptism, the Holy Spirit plays an important role as a qualifier for them to become an alternative temple. The Holy

---

Mark, the Spirit descends on Jesus (καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν), in Matthew the Spirit descends on Jesus (ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν), and in John the Spirit remains on Jesus (ἔμεινεν ἐπ' αὐτόν).

[20] Bock, Acts, 338.

[21] Benjamin D. Sommer, The Bodies of God and the World of Ancient Israel (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 133.

[22] Ibid., 133. Sommer claims that God has multiple bodies and fluid selves. Sommer refers to this aspect as a fluid concept of the divine corporeality in his book, arguing that 'a single deity could exist simultaneously in several bodies' in his book 12.

[23] Eliade, Sacred and Profane, 33.

[24] Unlike other Gospel writers, Luke does not clarify the place of baptism. It might be Luke's intention to make his readers just concentrates on the event itself.

[25] Beale interprets the tongues of Pentecost as a theophany of a latter-Sinai sanctuary. Beale, Temple and Church, 204-6.

Spirit, emanating from the transcendent space of divine perfection, endows the gathered people to be Spirit-impelled bodies, thereby constituting a new temple. Like Jesus, they become a sacred centre as the point of contact between heaven and the earth. Through this hierophany, Luke elaborately sheds light on the apostolic bodies within the house: 'they were all together in one place' (2:1). In particular, Luke highlights the house (οἶκος) (2:2). Even though this house might not be directly correlated with the 'house' in 7:49, it is true that this house serves as a distinguished place in which a divine power dwells through God's irruption. The Holy Spirit from heaven fills the entire house and spiritually saturates the bodies. Luke links here the ideal sacred space (heaven) and the profane realm (earth). However, the sanctity is not restricted to a static place (οἶκος) but to their movable bodies. As a result, the Spirit-impelled bodies will function as the new temples through their missionary journeys beyond the stationary place.

Likewise, Luke displays a new paradigm about sacred place (the temple) through Luke-Acts. God dwells in Jesus and his followers as the bodily form of the Spirit in Luke 4:21–22 and Acts 2:1–4. These two episodes affirm their new identity and role. The bodies of Jesus and his followers will substitute for the human-constructed temple and everywhere they stay would be a holy place. Sacredness within the body evolved into sacred space across the world. So the human body can be a means by which the divine presence is expanded throughout the world. Regarding this point, Bruce Malina claims:

> Sacred place is located in the group, not in some impersonal space like a temple. The group is the central location of importance, whether the Body of Christ, the church, for Christians, or the synagogue gathering for Jews…Discourse within these groups, whether words of a portable Torah, the story of Jesus, or the exhortations of the philosopher-teacher, becomes the mobile, portable, exportable focus of sacred place, in fact more important than the fixed and eternal sacred place of strong group/high grid societies.[26]

[26] Bruce J. Malina, Christian Origins and Cultural Anthropology: Practical Models for Biblical Interpretation (Atlanta, GA: John Knox Press, 1986), 38.

Moreover, through the entire narrative of Luke-Acts, Luke illustrates religious practices performed by Jesus and his disciples, thereby creating sacred space. Their spiritual practices can substitute for the distinct role of the 'officially sacred' place, the old Temple.[27] These practices strengthen their identity as a newly built temple. The embodied temples and their bodily behaviour become central components of the production and the enactment of sacred space.[28] The divine is reproduced by their religious practices. In doing so, 'the sanctity of space is corporeally enacted and physically sensed as sacred'.[29] Through this process, the boundary between sacred and profane in the world is dissolved by their bodily practices. As corporeal-and-mobile temples, their spiritual practices involved in prayer, ritual, healing, pilgrimage, and proclamation are central to the expansion of sacred space. These practices appear well in Luke-Acts.

Sacred Space around the New Temple

Luke narrates that Jesus takes over the role of the Jerusalem temple in his first book. Jesus' spiritual behaviour corresponds to the rituals which had been practiced in the old Temple. Luke portrays that Jesus moves around the Judean land, not fixed in a specific place. Ironically, Jesus has nowhere to lay his head (Luke 9:58). He went on through cities and villages, proclaiming and bringing the good news of the kingdom of God (4:15; 8:1; 13:22; cf. Acts 10:38). As a newly embodied temple, Jesus' ministry involves prayer, proclamation, healing, teaching, and sacrifice through the Crucifixion. Jesus' body is central to the enactment of sacred space and Jesus' bodily practices—words and deeds—substitute for the rituals that were carried out in an officially sacred temple.

During his ministry, reports about Jesus filled with the power of the Spirit spread throughout the surrounding countryside (4:14). Word of Jesus' practices reached every place (4:37). Around Jesus,

[27] The term 'the Officially Sacred' is taken from Banu Gökarıksel, 'Beyond the Officially Sacred: Religion, Secularism, and the Body in the Production of Subjectivity', Social and Cultural Geography 10.6 (2009): 657-74.

[28] Julian Holloway, 'Make-Believe: Spiritual Practice, Embodiment, and Sacred Space', Environment and Planning 35.11 (2003): 1964.

[29] Ibid., 1964-5.

many crowds would gather to hear Jesus and to be cured of their diseases (5:15; 6:17; 8:4; 9:11; 11:29; 12:1; 14:25; 15:1; 21:38). They came together around Jesus, instead of the Jerusalem Temple, and numerous people from town after town came to him to listen to Jesus' proclamation. And in each place, through Jesus' behaviour, the gathered people glorified God (5:25, 26; 7:16; 18:43) and praised God (19:37). From Jesus, power came out by which Jesus healed them (6:17–19). As Stewart notes, these events produce Jesus' 'gathering space'.[30] Jesus creates the new sacred space of the Kingdom of God in gathering crowds around himself.[31] Jesus continuously generates sacred space everywhere from a substantive indwelling of divinity throughout his journey to Jerusalem.

Furthermore, Jesus sent the Twelve to enlarge the sacred space. Like Jesus, they go through the villages (9:6), expanding the kingdom of God (10:1–20). Jesus' disciples play an important role in expanding Jesus' gathering space. In doing so, the word about Jesus spread throughout Judea and all the surrounding countryside (7:17). Consequently, sacredness is broadly pervasive in the Judean land. As well as through the disciples, Jesus is proclaimed through other peoples too (8:39). And beyond the Jerusalem temple, Jesus becomes the focal point for organizing sacred space. Particularly, after the resurrection, Jesus' appearance more apparently displays his fluidity.[32] Luke vividly portrays that Jesus' risen body constantly moves from the tomb to the road to Emmaus, to Simon, to the eleven, and to heaven (24:1–53). Luke illustrates the rapid process of enlarging sacredness through Jesus' moving body. Finally, in Luke's final scene, Jesus ascends to heaven, the space of divine perfection. This is a symbolic scene in which two spiritual centres—heaven and Jesus—meet. To summarize, through Jesus' body, new fluid sacred space is formulated wherever he performs divine practices.

---

[30] The term 'Gathering space' is taken from Eric C. Stewart, Gathered around Jesus: An Alternative Spatial Practice in the Gospel of Mark (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2009), 219. He claims that the Markan Jesus represents alternative spatial practices to the temple, thereby creating gathering spaces with the crowds in his book 211.

[31] Ibid., 219.

[32] Neyrey, based on the texts in the Fourth Gospel, claims that Jesus' risen body becomes a newly embodied 'temple' or holy space wherever Jesus chooses to appear. Jerome H. Neyrey, 'Spaces and Places, Whence and Whither, Homes and Rooms: "Territoriality" in the Fourth Gospel', BTB 32.2 (2002): 66.

Jesus says to the Pharisees that the kingdom of God is no longer 'here' or 'there' but the kingdom is among people (Luke 17:21). In other words, the kingdom of God is not in a fixed place but within (ἐντὸς) humankind. This passage reveals Jesus' own understanding of the human body. And this passage suggests the point that Jesus' followers would be an alternative temple through which to transmit the presence of the deity within themselves into the profane world. Just as God dwells in Jesus, so does Jesus dwell in the apostolic bodies. Subsequently, Luke, through a sequential Acts narrative, provides a new facet of fluid sacred space through Jesus' followers. Even though Jesus ascends into heaven, Jesus' ambassadors as a new temple take over the task commanded by Jesus in Acts 1. Luke illustrates their various spiritual practices: wonders and signs (Acts 2:43; 5:12–16), proclamation (3:11–26), prayer (4:31), teaching (5:42), and praise (16:25). And they were assigned to make the sanctity become fluidly enlarged.

From the beginning of Acts, Jesus encourages his followers to depart from Jerusalem (1:8). Subsequently, it is inevitable for the disciples to enlarge the space just as Jesus enlarges divine space. After the Pentecost event, the sacred space extends outward from the fixed locus, the Jerusalem Temple.[33] Especially, after Stephen's martyrdom, they were scattered 'from place to place, proclaiming the word' (8:4). Ironically, persecution encourages the movement to spread without any encumbrances. They are not fixed in a specific locus (5:42; 8:1, 4, 40; 9:32; 13:6; 20:20; 26:26). To vividly illustrate the mobility of early missionary bodies, Luke repeatedly employs the term διέρχομαι, 'go through'.[34] Around the apostles, the crowds gather to participate in spiritual practices (3:11; 5:12, 16; 13:44; 28:15). Here, the concept, 'gathering space', appears again. Especially, they proclaim the gospel from house to house instead of in the temple.[35] Unlike the static Jerusalem

[33] Of course, even though the features of sacredness normally appear out of the temple, Luke occasionally depicts the Temple as a holy place for proclamation (5:42), purification (21:26), and prayer (22:17).

[34] This term appears in 8:4, 40; 9:32, 38; 10:38; 11:19, 22; 12:10; 13:6, 14; 14:24; 15:3, 41; 16:6; 17:23; 18:23, 27; 19:1, 21; 20:2, 25.

[35] Besides the temple, early Christians used to gather at house-churches. Douglas R. Edwards, Religion & Power: Pagans, Jews, and Christians in the Greek East (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 87. As for house churches, see Neyrey, 'Symbolic Universe'; idem, '"Teaching You in Public and from House to House" (Acts 20.20):

Temple, existence of multiple house-churches demonstrates the ubiquitous sanctity presented upon the places where they go through (διέρχομαι). The bodily behaviours based on the faith become central components of the production and the enactment of sacred space.

Wherever the apostles stay, the gathering space is characterized by the sacred response of gathered people: they glorify God and then great grace was upon them all (4:21, 33); they receive the Holy Spirit (10:44–46); they praise the word of the Lord (13:48); they rejoice (16:34); they join the apostles' work (17:4); they believe the gospel (17:12); they are baptized (16:33;18:8); and they praise the name of the Lord Jesus (19:17). In a sense, the scenes that normally would have appeared in the temple are displayed in scattered places. And the sacredness even pervaded in the realm of the Gentiles, such as through an Ethiopian (8:26–40) and a Roman centurion (10:1–48). Moreover, their movement transforms even the Roman imperial space into holy space (28:1–28).[36] Luke narrates that early Christians moved from place to place. They were subjected from neither any specific geographic hub nor ritual centre. Their centrifugal movement does not need to be confined to a fixed locus. God's presence in their bodies is not restricted to a specific place, but is fluidly revealed to God's people everywhere. Thus the sacredness continues to be spread (6:7; 9:31; 12:24; 16:5; 19:20; 28:30–31).

Conclusion

Unpacking a Cultural Stereotype', JSNT 26.1 (2003); John H. Elliott, 'Temple Versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions', in Jerome H. Neyrey (ed.), The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 1991). As for the house church, Kilde notes that 'Biblical scholars, classicists, and archaeologists agree that the meeting of Christians, like those of other religious groups, generally took place in the homes of patrons, that is, in Greco-Roman houses. The phrase "meeting from house to house," found repeatedly in the Gospel texts, well characterized the practices of early Christians. The physical realities of those spaces, and the homes in particular, along with the cultural customs of the period, strongly influenced emerging Christian practice'. Kilde, Sacred Power, Sacred Space, 18.

[36] Laura S. Nasrallah, Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture: The Second-Century Church Amid the Spaces of Empire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 67; Osman Umurhan and Todd Penner, 'Luke and Juvenal at the Crossroads: Space, Movement, and Morality in the Roman Empire', in Stanley E. Porter and Andrew Pitts (eds.), Texts and Editions for New Testament Study: Christian Origins and Greco-Roman Culture: Social and Literary Contexts for the New Testament (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 189.

Luke's Stephen negates God's dwelling in the Jerusalem Temple. The divine does not necessarily indwell specific places such as a sanctuary. Rather, Luke's portrayal of the new temple—Jesus and his apostles—splendidly performs the divine role throughout Luke-Acts. Luke affirms a substantive indwelling of the divine presence within the moving human body. Consequently, sacred space which is produced through their practices can be fluidly established, not fixed. Luke illustrates how the sacredness becomes fluid space through the body and the bodily actions of Jesus and the apostles. Luke's portrayal of the new temple strengthens early Christian identity and encourages their universal mission from the officially sacred locus toward the entire world. In the process, the communities as the new temple become alternative missionary centres for ministry.