

INTRODUCTION

A wide selection of critical commentaries on the Gospel of Luke has been available for several decades;¹ and although the Lucan Gospel's companion volume, the Acts of the Apostles, is not covered by a comparable range and depth of exegetical comment, it cannot seriously claim to be a victim of neglect.² As the attention these commentaries give in particular to the Lucan exorcism stories differs in no obvious way from the care they bestow on other kinds of materials in Luke's writings, potential readers of the present study may wonder what could possibly be provided here that is not already available in the best commentaries. This question deserves a considered reply. It also leads very naturally into other matters – the precise topic and aims of the present study, for instance, and how it is similar to and different from other works of scholarship on related subjects – which likewise ought to be addressed in an introduction to this sort of work.

Like modern critical commentaries on other writings of the New Testament, those devoted to the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles prove on close inspection to be richly interdiscursive events; for they not only tend to fulfil their obligation to engage with the ancient text in its original language but also either assume or explicitly interact with an impressive range of other discourses, for the most part modern scholarly ones, including but not limited to other commentaries on the same text. Indeed, as a set of hermeneutical gestures ranging from cool self-awareness to conspicuous self-unmasking increasingly finds expression in the writing of textual scholars in various disciplines,³ most of the

¹ See the commentary section of the bibliography in J. B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, 1997), pp. xxvi–ii.

² Historical-critical coverage of the Acts of the Apostles has been improved considerably by the recent publication of C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC, 2 vols (Edinburgh, 1994, 1998); and J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 31 (New York, 1998).

³ On the prominence of these gestures in one influential school of contemporary critical theory, see H. A. Veenser, 'The New Historicism', in *The New Historicism Reader* (London,

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

2 Introduction

present generation's commentators on Luke and Acts would probably acknowledge that their own exegetical judgements are powerfully conditioned by other works of scholarship.⁴ And prominent amongst those other works are monographs such as those in the present series.

For purposes of the present study, the most significant aspect of this commentary–monograph dialectic is the relationship between recent exegetical commentaries on Luke and Acts on the one hand, and monographs and related studies (e.g., articles in journals and edited collections of essays) devoted specifically to exorcism in these writings on the other. More particularly, and as the scholarly references and bibliographies in recent commentaries on Luke and Acts well illustrate, neither monographs nor published articles on the Lucan exorcism stories occupy a conspicuous position in the analytical discourses presupposed in the commentary literature. For instance, in the second volume of John Nolland's outstanding commentary on the Gospel of Luke, the thirteen items in the bibliography for Luke 9.37–43a – the Lucan Gospel's third exorcism narrative – consist of five studies dealing with one topically related aspect or another of the Gospel of *Mark*, four that deal with the interrelations of all three Synoptic accounts of the same event, two that treat the broader subject of Jesus' miracles, one that belongs to the more general field of Gospel scholarship, and most important of all only one devoted to the specifically Lucan perspective on exorcism.⁵ Similar observations could be made regarding the scholarly references and bibliographies provided in other commentators' treatments of any of the four stories analysed in the present study.⁶

The point of these remarks is, of course, not that Nolland or any other modern commentator on Luke's writings is at fault for this state of affairs, but rather that up to recent times – indeed, up to the very present – the distinctively Lucan rendition of the exorcism stories has attracted relatively little interest from scholars in New Testament studies and related disciplines. As the probable causes of this neglect are undoubtedly

1994), pp. 6–7, 15–16; on their role in recent anthropological theory, see C. Geertz, *Available Light: Anthropological Reflections on Philosophical Topics* (Princeton, 2000), pp. 95–107.

⁴ See e.g. L. C. A. Alexander, review of *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, by C. K. Barrett; and of *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, by B. Witherington, III, *JTS* 52/2 (2001), 691–3.

⁵ J. Nolland, *Luke*, WBC 35 (Dallas, 1993), II, p. 505.

⁶ E.g. the sole work cited by Nolland on exorcism in Luke–Acts (i.e., W. Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukianischen Redaktion*, ÖBS 3 (Klosterneuburg, 1981)) is absent from the bibliographic references and notes in both F. Bovon, *L'Évangile selon saint Luc (1,1–9, 50)*, CNT 3A (Geneva, 1991), pp. 9–18, 211–12; and Fitzmyer, *Acts*, pp. 175–87, 590–1, neither of which cites a work of comparable focus and depth on the same topic.

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

3

numerous and complex, I have no intention of surveying them all here; among them, however, is one that I do very much intend to challenge in the present study, namely the abiding scholarly tendency to read the exorcism stories in Luke's Gospel chiefly as units of Synoptic tradition rather than as integral parts of the two-volume narrative Luke-Acts.⁷ Although interpreters who lean in this direction by no means ignore the exorcism materials in Acts altogether, they exemplify in numerous ways the conviction that Luke's view of exorcism is seen most clearly in the changes he made in the relevant traditions of his assumed sources (normally taken to be Mark and 'Q').⁸ As suggested at the end of this Introduction and implied repeatedly in the analysis that follows, this type of approach seriously underestimates the co-textual⁹ and structural impact of Luke's second volume on the significance of everything in his first, not least the exorcism stories.

For purposes of the immediate discussion, however, the various causes of scholarly lack of interest are less significant than the mere fact of it. The only comprehensive and detailed study of the topic is Walter Kirschläger's 1981 work *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Redaktion*.¹⁰ As noted in an appropriately brief *Forschungsgeschichte* in that work, no work of monographic proportions had been devoted to the matter prior to the writing of Kirschläger's volume.¹¹ To be sure, both prior to Kirschläger's work and in the last couple of decades, numerous books and articles have been published that have one topical interface or another with the matters explored here;¹² but an accurate observation made by Kirschläger about his

⁷ The tendency is apparent, e.g., both in Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken*, which devotes far more attention to Luke's assumed redaction of Mark (e.g. pp. 55–8, 93–101) than to the intratextual relations between the material in the Gospel and that in Acts (noted in passing but not developed on pp. 259, 273); and in G. H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Miracle Worker: A Historical and Theological Study* (Downers Grove, IL, 1999), pp. 175–8, whose brief treatment of the exorcisms in Acts interprets them not as part of a strong gesture of re-framing but rather as a confirmation of what is already communicated in the Gospel.

⁸ Twelftree (*Jesus the Miracle Worker*, pp. 167–88), e.g., in rating the differences between the Lucan and Marcan presentations as among the most important issues for understanding the miracles of Jesus in Luke, addresses these at length (pp. 173–9) but leaves questions about the unity of Luke-Acts and their potential relevance to understanding the Lucan perspective outside the discussion.

⁹ As discussed under 'Co-text' in the next chapter, this term is increasingly used in discourse analysis to refer to the specifically linguistic structures that surround a given segment of text and constrain its potential meaning.

¹⁰ For details see n. 6 above.

¹¹ Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken*, p. 10.

¹² See, e.g., S. R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demon in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis, 1989); H.-J. Klauck, *Magie und Heidentum in der Apostelgeschichte*

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

4 Introduction

scholarly precursors in 1981 also holds true for more recent contributions on related topics: namely, in each case exorcism in Luke-Acts is handled only in a cursory way.¹³

Accordingly, both for its potential utility in setting the stage for my own analysis and for its unique position in scholarship on my chosen topic, Kirschläger's study deserves special consideration here. Particularly in regard to topical boundaries, the first point worth noting about Kirschläger's work is that although it stands far closer to the present study than does any other previous contribution to scholarship, the limits which it sets for itself within the Lucan materials are considerably more encompassing than those I choose to work within here. More specifically, in contrast to Kirschläger's study, which covers every unit that contributes to exorcism as a theme,¹⁴ the focus of the present work falls solely on narrative episodes whose climax includes the expulsion of one demonic being or more from a human victim of possession.

This particular difference in conceptualisation, moreover, has a couple of consequences that are worth making explicit. On the one hand, as the present study is not designed to cover all the Lucan materials of whatever genre pertaining to exorcism *as a theme*, it need not be read as an attempt to overcome Kirschläger or beat him at his own topical game. Despite their similarities, the two works are sufficiently different in topic to allow this kind of exegetical one-upmanship to be avoided; and whatever positive results my own study may achieve, Kirschläger's work will remain after the publication of this one the only comprehensive treatment of exorcism in Luke-Acts as a thematic phenomenon. On the other hand – and here, I fear, at least the appearance of one-upmanship is impossible to avoid – having

des Lukas, SBS 167 (Stuttgart, 1996); P. J. Achtemeier, 'The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch', in C. H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh, 1978), pp. 153–67; U. Busse, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus: Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*, FB 24 (Stuttgart, 1979); J. D. G. Dunn and G. H. Twelftree, 'Demon-Possession and Exorcism in the New Testament', *Churchman* 94/3 (1980), 210–25; H. C. Kee, *Medicine, Miracle, and Magic in New Testament Times*, SNTSMS 55 (Cambridge, 1986); G. Theissen, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichte: Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, SNT 8 (Gütersloh, 1974); J. A. Fitzmyer, 'Satan and Demons in Luke-Acts', in *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching* (London, 1989), pp. 146–74; G. H. Twelftree, *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus*, WUNT 54 (Tübingen, 1993); J. M. Hull, *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*, SBT 2/28 (London, 1974).

¹³ See Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken*, pp. 11–14, commenting on earlier works by T. Schramm, M. Limbeck, U. Busse, H. M. Miller and P. J. Achtemeier.

¹⁴ I.e., Luke 4.31–37, 38–39, 40–41, 42–44; 6.12–16, 17–19; 7.21, 33; 8.1–3, 22–25, 26–39; 9.1–6, 37–43a, 49–50; 10.17–20; 11.14–23, 24–26; 13.10–17, 32; Acts 5.16; 8.7; 16.16–18; 19.11–16.

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Introduction*

5

chosen as I have to interpret a much smaller corpus of generically similar passages, I have given myself much greater space than Kirschläger gives himself for contextualizing the exorcism stories in relation to their ancient cultural milieu. As the interpreter's understanding of the Lucan stories' original context of culture pervasively influences the meanings they assign to these texts, Kirschläger's treatment of this level of the stories' environment invites closer scrutiny.

First of all, and precisely in view of how decisive both real and imagined (i.e., historically reconstructed) contexts of reading are for every act of interpretation,¹⁵ a simple but potentially significant observation should be made about the size and proportion of Kirschläger's discussion of these matters vis-à-vis the more strictly textual aspects of his analysis. To be precise, by attempting to cover the exorcism theme's cultural context in an excursus only ten pages long, Kirschläger devotes less than five per cent of his entire study to the analysis of ancient comparative materials and their potential significance for contextualising the Lucan passages.¹⁶ Consequently, although Kirschläger is admirably able in that space to demonstrate the inadequacy of Jewish Scripture as an explanatory resource for the demonological and exorcistic assumptions of Luke-Acts,¹⁷ he neither formulates the hermeneutically critical questions which that insight inspires – for instance, where then do Luke's assumptions in these areas come from? What kinds of ancient sources can be used properly to illuminate them? And how do these assumptions relate to beliefs and practices attested in the numerous corpora of apotropaic and exorcistic incantations that have survived from a wide range of ancient Near Eastern and Late Antique contexts?¹⁸ – nor therefore can he contextualise the Lucan materials with an appropriate measure of complexity. By contrast, the chapters below address each of these questions at one or more points in my cultural analyses, in ways that allow the Lucan narratives to be embedded in a web of frequently overlooked but significant intertextual relationships.

¹⁵ See, e.g., B. K. Blount, *Cultural Interpretation: Reorienting New Testament Criticism* (Minneapolis, 1995), pp. 12–16.

¹⁶ Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken*, pp. 45–54.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 46–7.

¹⁸ Perhaps because Kirschläger's study allows such little space for comparative analysis of extrabiblical sources, it can only deal briefly (p. 46) and in very general terms with the ancient Near Eastern and Late Antique incantatory traditions, leaving two of the most topically relevant corpora of these – R. C. Thompson (ed.), *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, Luzac's Semitic Texts and Translation Series 14 (London, 1903–4); and C. D. Isbell (ed.), *Corpus of the Aramaic Incantation Bowls*, SBLDS 17 (Missoula, 1975) – completely unmentioned.

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

6 Introduction

One further aspect of Kirschläger's treatment of the Lucan materials' *Umwelt* invites comment. In addressing an important difficulty that I likewise must discuss, namely, why Jewish and pagan literary sources from earlier than the second century CE say so very little about exorcism, Kirschläger makes the following observation (pp. 53–4):

Es neben der 'offiziellen' religiösen Strömung auch eine breite Tradition des Volksglaubens gab, der bisweilen bis in das Grenzgebiet des *Aberglaubens* reichte. Freilich fehlen hier die Textbelege, weil diese Überlieferungen mündlich weitergegeben und nicht aufgezeichnet wurden (*italics mine*).

Alongside the official religious current there was also a broad tradition of popular belief, which from time to time extended into the border area of *superstition*. Admittedly the textual evidence is missing here, for these traditions were transmitted orally and not recorded.

On a strictly denotative level and in the context of Kirschläger's work, these two sentences contribute to the formulation of a valid argument: as Morton Smith and others have also observed, the paucity of literary evidence outside the New Testament regarding exorcism prior to the second century CE almost certainly says less about how familiar exorcistic practices were to the masses of the Mediterranean world in the immediately preceding centuries than about the elitism of the surviving literature from this period. However, on the level of evaluative connotations and ideological effects, these sentences also exemplify a widespread and regrettable scholarly habit which, although it is now increasingly being undermined by new approaches to studying the religions of others, has proved its tenacity and persists to the present time. The habit I have in mind here is the tendency to use a particular set of abstract categories of classification – ideas such as 'superstition', 'magic', and 'primitive mentality' – which, though employed in a spirit of scholarly analysis, carry a heavy load of ideological baggage that puts the interpreter in a position inimical to interpretative clarity:¹⁹ namely, either high above the

¹⁹ For further discussion of the difficulty, see esp. N. Janowitz, *Magic in the Roman World: Pagans, Jews and Christians*, Religion in the First Christian Centuries (London, 2001), pp. 1–8, 16–20; W. J. Lyons and A. M. Reimer, 'The Demonic Virus and Qumran Studies: Some Preventative Measures', *DSD* 5/1 (1998), 16–32; G. Poupon, 'L'accusation de magie dans les Actes apocryphes', in F. Bovon (ed.), *Les actes apocryphes des apôtres* (Geneva, 1981), pp. 71–85; A. F. Segal, 'Hellenistic Magic: Some Questions of Definition', in R. van den Broek and M. J. Vermaseren (eds), *Studies in Gnosticism and Hellenistic*

whole scramble of ancient magico-religious discourses and the historically particular conditions of their production, which of course cannot be imagined vividly from afar; or under the spell of the deviance-labelling rhetoric used by the ancient antagonists themselves, whose vocabulary (γῶης, μάγος, δεισιδαιμονία, etc.) was designed less for facilitating historical understanding than for winning ideological contests.

But more importantly, although less problematic ways of talking about folk illness and religious healing *were* available when Kirschläger wrote these lines,²⁰ my chief aim at this juncture is not so much to criticise his choice of words as to highlight a contrasting feature of my own discussion in the ensuing chapters. Precisely because terms such as ‘magic’ and ‘superstition’ often serve as translation equivalents for the highly pejorative lexis used by ancient antagonists in the heat of religious conflict,²¹ they are not used in the chapters below except where no better term can be found for representing the meanings conveyed in the deviance-labelling rhetoric of the ancient sources. Thereby, in my various discussions of the Lucan stories’ cultural context, I am able to avoid the pitfalls of implying either that all ancient demonological belief and exorcistic practice – Jesus’ and Paul’s included – were based on ‘protological thinking’;²² or that while this judgement largely holds true for the inherited conglomerate of ancient Jewish and pagan assumptions, Jesus and his followers somehow lifted their inheritance above all this, say, by giving it eschatological meaning that it previously lacked.²³

Religions, EPRO 91 (Leiden, 1981), pp. 349–75; J. Z. Smith, ‘Trading Places’, in M. Meyer and P. Mirecki (eds), *Ancient Magic and Ritual Power*, Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 129 (Leiden, 1995), pp. 13–27; D. Aune, ‘Magic in Early Christianity’, *ANRW* II.23.2, pp. 1507–57; Garrett, *Demise of the Devil*, pp. 2–5, 11–36; F. Graf, *La magie dans l’antiquité gréco-romaine: Idéologie et pratique* (Paris, 1994), pp. 17–29; J. G. Gager, ‘Introduction’, in *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 22–5.

²⁰ See, e.g., F. Boas, *The Mind of Primitive Man*, rev. edn (New York, 1938; repr., 1965), pp. 128–9, 135–6; and E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period*, II, *The Archaeological Evidence from the Diaspora* (New York, 1953), p. 156.

²¹ See e.g. Acts 8.9, 11; 13.6, 8; *Acts of Peter* 6.17; 9.31; *Acts of Andrew* A.10.11–30 (in *NTAp*, II, pp. 404–5); *Acts of John* 43; and *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* 4.4; 7.3. As noted by Poupon, ‘L’accusation de magie’, p. 71, in the apocryphal Acts Christians and their opponents accuse one another so frequently of practising magic (and thus of relying on demonic power) that such allegations constitute a major theme in this literature. On the terminology’s negative connotations in other contexts, see Graf, *La magie dans l’antiquité gréco-romaine*, pp. 46–73.

²² The phrase is used e.g. in J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28 (New York, 1981), p. 545, where it is defined as an inability ‘to ascribe physical or psychic disorders to proper secondary causes’; people who think this way therefore attribute these disorders ‘to beings of an intermediate spirit-world’.

²³ The latter view is that articulated in Kee, *Medicine, Miracle and Magic*, pp. 127–30.

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)8 *Introduction*

As Kirschläger's work is the uncontested authority on exorcism in Luke–Acts, it has had unique opportunity to influence the views of commentators and other exegetes who have had to wrestle with the Lucan exorcism stories. Not surprisingly, therefore, the same tendencies noted above in regard to Kirschläger's treatment of the exorcism theme's cultural context can be observed in the major commentaries published in more recent years. Comparative texts are of course frequently mentioned in these studies but rarely analysed in detail or compared with the Lucan passages in a way that produces a meaningful set of similarities and differences; and terms such as 'magic', 'superstition', and 'protological thinking' continue to be used in ways that both ignore the serious theoretical objections long voiced against these categories and bring more confusion than light to the business of interpretation. Thus, in relation to Kirschläger and the numerous commentators his work has influenced, the present study constitutes a significant shift in regard to how the Lucan materials' cultural context is handled.

As discussed in the next chapter, context is treated in the present study as consisting not only of the text's cultural environment – that is, the system of meaning potential and semantic-behavioural conventions to which an individual language user has access – but also of the text's situation, which consists of the more immediate constraints that influence the user's linguistic choices and determine what kinds of selections might be considered relevant or rhetorically effective. Although ideas of context in general have not been conceptualised in precisely this way by most New Testament scholars, broadly analogous concepts have been around for some time; and here, at least partly in order to position my own analysis in relation both to Kirschläger's and to more recent developments in Lucan studies, I want to offer some observations on the way his study in particular understands the relationship between the exorcism theme and the Lucan writings' context of situation.

The aspects of the Lucan situation that hold greatest interest for Kirschläger are the date of the writings' composition and the ethnic background of the author and audience. In brief, Kirschläger understands the author of Luke–Acts to have been an educated Gentile who came to Christ straight from a pagan background and, some time between 70 and 90 CE, composed his two volumes for a community of Gentile Christians.²⁴ Kirschläger's interpretation of the Lucan situation as marked by an essentially Gentile, non-Jewish tenor required no rigorous defence in 1981; for at that time it was the view most widely accepted in the standard

²⁴ Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken*, pp. 9–10 n. 4.

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

9

commentaries on Luke and Acts and in the major works of New Testament introduction.²⁵ Since that time, however, confidence in the adequacy of this scenario has been gradually eroded by a stream of monographs, new commentaries, and scholarly essays which, though by no means uniform in outlook, have tended to see the main participants in the Lucan discourse as either Jews, Gentiles who had attached themselves to Jewish synagogues before joining the Christ cult, or some combination of these two.²⁶ Consequently, although little can be said against Kirschläger for merely inhaling the scholarly air that in 1981 surrounded him on almost every side, the more recent scholarship on the Lucan writings' relationship with the Judaisms of the first century CE has created a discursive space in which it is now appropriate to ask what light the exorcism theme (or more specifically the exorcism stories) in particular sheds on these matters; accordingly, once all four exorcism stories have been analysed below in their immediate co-texts, this question is given focused attention, being treated in my final chapter under the heading of 'Macrostructural co-text and implied situation'.

The need for a fresh analysis of Luke's exorcism stories is heightened by several other developments that have significantly changed the character of New Testament studies since Kirschläger published his work. For instance, in contrast to Kirschläger himself, who assumed the validity of the two-source hypothesis and took a primarily redaction-critical approach to the exorcism passages,²⁷ a growing number of scholarly works on the Gospels and Acts are experimenting with methods adapted from literary criticism and the social sciences, with questions about the ancient

²⁵ See, e.g., W. Schmithals, *Die Apostelgeschichte des Lukas*, Zürcher Bibelkommentare (Zürich, 1982), p. 17; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts*, NICNT, rev. edn (Grand Rapids, 1988), p. 314. For a survey of the scholarly positions up to the late 1980s, see W. W. Gasque, *A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*, 2nd edn (Peabody, 1989), p. 347.

²⁶ See, e.g., D. P. Moessner and D. L. Tiede, 'Conclusion: "And some were persuaded . . ."', in D. P. Moessner (ed.), *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (Harrisburg, 1999), pp. 362–3; J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis, 1972), pp. 163–5, 173–5; R. L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*, SBLMS 33 (Atlanta, 1987), p. 157; P. F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*, SNTSMS 57 (Cambridge, 1987), pp. 36–45; J. B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, 1992), pp. 33–6; W. Radl, *Das Lukas-Evangelium*, ErFor 261 (Darmstadt, 1988), pp. 23–4; D. L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia, 1980), pp. 7–8, 107–11; J. G. Gager, 'Jews, Gentiles, and Synagogues in the Book of Acts', *HTR* 79/1–3 (1986), pp. 97–9; M. Salmon, 'Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism', in J. B. Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis, 1988), pp. 76–81; Bovon, *Luc (1,1–9,50)*, p. 27; J. Wenham, 'The Identification of Luke', *EvQ* 63/1 (1991), pp. 7–8.

²⁷ Kirschläger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken*, pp. 18–22.

Cambridge University Press

0521838045 - The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading

Todd Klutz

Excerpt

[More information](#)

10 Introduction

author's Christian sources often being either backgrounded or completely bracketed.²⁸ Many of these studies, moreover, are utilising methods that allow the literary-critical and social-scientific tools to be integrated, creating opportunities for texts and contexts to be brought into mutually illuminating dialogues that earlier methods did not consistently facilitate.²⁹ Clearly, all these methods and the influence they are exerting on the discipline cannot be discussed in detail here; instead, it is sufficient to point out that by focusing more analytical energy on how the Lucan exorcism stories relate to their immediate and schematic co-texts within Luke-Acts than on how their author modified the Gospel of Mark and his other assumed sources, the methods used in the present study produce a significantly different set of meanings and contextual scenarios than those normally produced by redaction criticism.

Although the type of discourse analysis I have chosen to apply to the Lucan narratives is fully explained in the next chapter, it has two features in particular which, as they belong to the ongoing process of methodological ferment noted above and facilitate several fresh findings below, deserve at least brief mention here. The features in question revolve around the analysis of intertextuality and verbal aspect,³⁰ whose contributions to the Lucan narratives' relevance and force are estimated in the chapters below to be greater than the existing commentary literature and other studies have suggested. By contributing both meaning and salience to some of the Lucan stories' most prominent themes, these same findings also impinge on the contextual questions noted above; for the richest source of clues to the ancient text's original situation remains the particular configuration of prominent themes in the text itself.

Three other recent developments in New Testament studies and related disciplines contribute to the need for a study such as the one undertaken in the present work. First, Graham Twelftree's *Jesus the Exorcist: A Contribution to the Study of the Historical Jesus* (1993), though marred by an underestimation of the importance of the interface between demonology

²⁸ See e.g. J. B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, 1986), pp. 6–9. For more recent examples see (on literary approaches) E. A. Castelli et al. (eds), *The Postmodern Bible* (New Haven, 1995); and (on social-scientific analyses) P. F. Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity: Social-Scientific Studies of the New Testament in Its Context* (London, 1995).

²⁹ Desire to integrate social-scientific and textualist methods has played a key role in the development of socio-rhetorical criticism, on which see esp. V. K. Robbins, 'Social-Scientific Criticism and Literary Studies: Prospects for Cooperation in Biblical Interpretation', in Esler (ed.), *Modelling Early Christianity*, pp. 274–89; and *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, 1996), pp. 1–2.

³⁰ Definitions and recent scholarly literature are provided in the next chapter under 'Verbal aspect' and 'Intertextuality'.