

**“NO OTHER NAME”
LUKE’S RECENTRALIZATION
OF THE CULT OF ISRAEL**

Part 4 (Chapter 3)

**by Gregory Rolan Perry
M.Div., Reformed Theological Seminary
Th.M., Columbia Theological Seminary**

CHAPTER THREE

**“No Other Name”
Recentralizing Israel’s Worship “In the Name of Jesus**

Luke opens his second volume by reminding Theophilus of his “first” (Acts 1:1), a move he will make often to draw parallels between Jesus and his “witnesses” (Acts 1:8). The two volumes are interlocked like puzzle pieces by a recapitulated expansion of the risen Jesus’ appearances and ascension (Luke 24:33-53; Acts 1:1-11). For emphasis, Luke repeats Jesus’ final instructions to his disciples before he was “taken up . . . out of their sight” (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9): “Do not leave Jerusalem, but wait for the gift my father promised . . . you will receive power when the Holy Spirit comes on you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth” (Luke 24:48-49; Acts 1:4, 8).

As readers of Luke’s first volume might have guessed, Jesus’ instructions are prompted “by the Holy Spirit” (Acts 1:2). But how does the promise of the Spirit answer the apostles’ question about restoring the kingdom to Israel? How do “the things” of which Jesus spoke “concerning the kingdom of God” (Acts 1:3) complete Luke’s account of “the things fulfilled among us” (Luke 1:1)? This chapter examines Luke’s “witness” to Jerusalem (Acts 1:12-6:7), especially through Peter’s speeches to his “fellow Jews and all the house of Israel” (Acts 2:14,22,29,36; 3:12,17; 4:8), that in Jesus and in “no other name” Israel’s “salvation” (Luke 2:29-32; Acts 2:21,40; 4:12; 5:31) and “hope” (Acts 2:26; 23:6; 24:15,21; 26:6-7;

28:20) is fulfilled.¹ Luke's argument from Scripture proceeds with: the legitimacy of the apostolic "witness" (Acts 1:1-2:47); their proclamation of Jesus' suffering, resurrection and enthronement as both LORD and Christ (Luke 24:26-27,46-49; Acts 2:22-39; 3:12-26; 4:8-12,24-30; 5:30-32); and the placement of the exalted LORD's saving power and presence "in the name of Jesus" (Acts 3:6,16; 4:10,12,17,30; 5:40-41) at the center of authentic worship in Israel under "the restored tent of David" (Acts 15:16-18)!

The LORD's "Witnesses"

"The Lord has really risen and has appeared to Simon" (Luke 24:34). With these words, the Emmaus travelers ratify the report of the women who "saw the tomb" (first with, then without Jesus' body) (Luke 23:54-24:12), and recognize the restoration of Peter in answer to Jesus' prayer (Luke 22:31-32). On this footing, Peter stands to address "his brothers," a crowd of about 120 names. The number and odd use of "names" (ὀνομάτων; Acts 1:15) mark the significance of this prayer gathering (Acts 1:14) as representative of the twelve tribes among the reforming people of Israel.²

Peter picks up where the risen Jesus left off in the interpretation of Scripture's *necessary* fulfillment (Luke 24:44-49; Acts 1:16). Two necessities (ἔδει; Acts 1:16; δεῖ; Acts 1:21) arise from the coupled citation of Israel's Psalter to structure Peter's speech. First, the apostasy and death of Judas was "foretold by the Holy Spirit through the mouth of David" (Acts 1:16). Second, the vacancy of "his episcopacy" must be filled (Acts 1:21-22). Luke's tailoring of the texts to the events of his narrative is evident both in re-shaping plural pronouns into singular forms to fit Judas and, more importantly, in casting David as a prophet.³ While Acts 1:20 marks the only citation from LXX Psalm 108 (109:8) in the entire New Testament, Luke has alluded to LXX Psalm 68:26 (69:25) before.

The price of Judas' greedy betrayal affords him "his own place" (τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον; Acts 1:25), but in order to acquire it he must "turn aside" from "the place of this ministry and apostleship" (Acts 1:25). The apostles had left their "own things" (τὰ ἴδια; Luke 18:28) to follow Jesus "for the sake of the kingdom of God" (Luke 18:29), a kingdom for which Judas proved "unfit" (Luke 9:62). As "a guide" for Israel's acting leaders at Jesus'

arrest (Acts 1:16), Judas joins with them in “hypocrisy,” “greed” (Luke 12:1, 15) and “shedding the blood of the prophets” (Luke 11:47-51) to merit with them the covenant curse (Luke 11:42-52; 22:22) of “desolation” (Jer. 22:5) on his “dwelling” (Ps. 69:25), even as Jesus had pronounced upon Israel’s “house” in his lament over Jerusalem (Luke 13:35). Even as Matthias “takes the place” (Acts 1:25) of Judas, the full complement of “the Twelve” awaits the Spirit’s anointing to supplant the temple authorities to “sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Luke 1:52; 22:30).⁴

Luke continues his word play with “the place” (τὸν τόπον) even as “the day of Pentecost was being fulfilled” (Acts 2:1). Three times each year “all the sons of Israel” were to appear before the LORD at “the place where the LORD would choose to place his Name” (Deut. 16:6,11,15,16). The Feast of Weeks (known also as Pentecost in LXX Tobit 2:1; 2 Macc. 12:32)⁵ draws “God-fearing Jews from every nation under heaven” to Jerusalem. A crowd of them gathers in “bewilderment” and “confusion” (Acts 2:6,12) at what they hear: “a sound like the blowing of a violent wind” (Acts 2:2,6), and declarations of “the mighty deeds of God” in their various native languages through untaught Galileans (Acts 2:6-7)! The obvious question is asked: “What does this mean?” (Acts 2:12). Peter, with more confidence than before (c.f. Acts 1:15 and 2:14), steps forward and raises his voice to answer both the question and the prejudicial suggestion that the Galileans were drunk (Acts 2:13).

In direct “peshar” fashion, Peter explains the startling happenings as the fulfillment of Joel 2:28-32. The introductory formula “this is what” (τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ; Acts 2:16) marks the peshar interpretation to emphasize the application of the text to the event at hand, rather than “attempting to exegete the details of the biblical prophecy.”⁶ The slight textual tailoring of the Septuagint’s “afterwards” to “in the last days” (Acts 2:17) and the insertion of “and they will prophesy” (Acts 2:18) indicate the strong eschatological context. The grammatically slight, but theologically bold addition of “God says” (Acts 2:17) leads into the metaphor linking the *apologetic* (Acts 2:14-21) and *kerygmatic* (Acts 2:22-36) portions of Peter’s speech.⁷

The outpouring of the Holy Spirit is attributed first to God by the opening quotation of Joel’s prophesy. However, Luke threads two exact citations from David (LXX Ps. 15:8-11; 109:1) to explain Jesus’ resurrection and ascension as his enthronement (Acts 2:30) to “the right

hand of God” (Acts 2:25,33-34). From there, having received the promised Holy Spirit from “the father,” Jesus “poured out what you now see and hear” (Acts 2:33). This application is bold theologically because it attributes to Jesus that which has been attributed only to God (the LORD) in Israel’s sacred history. Even, as the Holy Spirit descended on Jesus at his baptism by John to inaugurate and empower prophetic ministry (Luke 3:21-23a; 4:17-21), Jesus “baptizes” his followers with the Spirit and fire, as John predicted (Luke 3:16), to authenticate their role as his prophetic witnesses, proclaiming repentance and forgiveness to all who will call on the LORD’s Name (Acts 2:21,38-40).

Luke portrays “the apostles” as: “eyewitnesses and ministers of the word” (Luke 1:2); chosen by the Lord Jesus (Luke 6:12-16); and given “power and authority,” first by Jesus (Luke 9:1-2) then by “the Spirit of Jesus” (Acts 2:1-4,17-21,42-43; 16:6-10), to carry his name in the proclamation of repentance (“in his name”; Luke 24:47) and in the accomplishment of “many wonders and miraculous signs” (“in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, walk!”; Acts 3:6). Their prayers are effective (Acts 1:14,24-26; 2:1-4; 4:24-31), and their decisions among the community carried out (Acts 4:35-37; 5:1-11). This is not true of Israel’s acting leaders the Sanhedrin. Never once does Luke show them quoting or teaching from Scripture. The single scene of a Pharisee at prayer is intended clearly as a parabolic antitype (Luke 18:9-14). Their decisions are overturned consistently (i.e. Acts 5:17-40), and the one case of “the sons of Sceva” attempting to cast out demons “in the name of Jesus” ends in embarrassment (Acts 19:13-16). Not only do “the rulers and elders of the people” not enjoy the anointing of the Spirit, they are shown to be “always resisting the Holy Spirit” (Acts 7:51). Ironically, the one pharisaic prophesy that proves true comes from Gamaliel, who warns the Sanhedrin to take care how they treat Peter and the others lest they find themselves “fighting against God” (Acts 5:39). Paul, Gamaliel’s student, will prove to be doing just that when he is confronted by the exalted Jesus while on his way to carry out the council’s orders (Acts 9:1-6; 22:2-9; 26:9-16).

The LORD’s Suffering and Glory

At the close of his gospel, Luke sets forth a programmatic statement of the apostolic witness in the words of Jesus:

‘Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things’ (Luke 24:46-48).

There are six components of the Lukan kerygma: 1) Christ *suffered*; 2) Christ was *raised* out of death; 3) this occurred according to the scriptures; 4) the preaching of *repentance* in Jesus’ name to all the nations; 5) those who proclaim are *witnesses*; and 6) witnesses are empowered by the *Holy Spirit* (Luke 24:49).⁸

As we shall see, these elements resonate between the proclamations of Peter, Stephen, and Paul in the speeches of Acts. What are we to make of this? Is Luke freely forming these speeches on the lips of the apostles (Dibelius)?⁹ Or could it be that he is faithfully handing down (as the apostles had done before him) the early kerygma of the Jerusalem church (Dodd)?¹⁰ Two subsequent developments move us toward a *via media*. First, Jervell’s challenge of Dibelius’ skepticism has put us on much firmer ground regarding the early formation of an apostolic tradition.¹¹ Second, scholars will continue to debate various theological schema in Luke-Acts because Conzelmann and Haenchen forcefully demonstrated Luke’s literary-theological intentionality.¹² On this two-fold basis we can surmise that Luke, with great fidelity to his sources, delivered to his readers accurate summaries of apostolic preaching shaved and shaped by the currents of his plot.

Jesus’ prophecy that the apostles will be delivered “to synagogues and prisons and . . . brought before kings and governors all for the sake of my name” (Luke 12:11-12; 21:12-19) comes to fulfillment in the lives and speeches of Peter, John, Stephen, Philip and Paul. Each of them, being “full of the Holy Spirit,” speaks before “rulers and authorities” (Luke 12:11). As we have seen, Jesus instructed the apostles “by the Holy Spirit” (Acts 1:2) and from the Scriptures as to the pattern of their “proclaiming repentance for the forgiveness of sins in his name” (Luke 24:46-48). Luke’s witness to Jerusalem through Peter’s preaching follows the kerygmatic outline closely, but clearly emphasizes Jesus’ resurrection and exaltation as LORD, despite his rejection (Acts 2:36).¹³

Psalm 110:1 (LXX Ps. 109:1) is referenced repeatedly to trumpet Jesus’ exaltation (Acts 2:33-35; 3:21; 5:31). Interestingly enough,

exaltation language all but disappears outside the Jerusalem section in references to the resurrection or visions of the risen Jesus.¹⁴ But, even as Jesus' interpretation of Psalm 110:1 before the temple authorities (Luke 20:41-44) anchors the apostolic preaching of the resurrection, so also does his explanation of his sufferings from the Servant Songs (Ps. 118:22; Isa. 28:16; Luke 20:17; Acts 4:11 and Isa. 53:12; Luke 22:37; Acts 8:32-35).

This messianic-prophetic characterization of Jesus in the language of suffering and exaltation ("lifting up") not only resonates with Isaiah's servant and David's LORD, but it goes to the *bedrock* of Israel's Scripture and formative covenantal events. "God's Servant" forms the link (Acts 3:13,26) in Peter's description of Jesus both as "the prophet like Moses" (Acts 3:22-24) and Abraham's seed of blessing (Acts 3:25-26) sent to announce first to Israel the need to turn back to the LORD in authentic, whole-hearted worship. The most startling characterization of Jesus, however, is accomplished by allusion instead of citation. Not only is Jesus exalted to "the right hand of God" as David's LORD, but his name is "given among men (humankind)" in almost hypostatic presence to heal disease (Acts 3:6,16; 4:10,12) and to offer repentance (Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 4:17-18), and as the exclusive and central object of invocation for Israel's worship and salvation (Acts 4:12)!¹⁵

The LORD's Name

Deuteronomy 12:5 (c.f. Exodus 20:24) serves as the *locus classicus* of a turning point in Israel's understanding of the LORD. The phrasings "to cause my name," "to place my name," "to choose to put my name," "the place where my name shall be" certainly predated Solomon's temple, but also found use in the hands of Exilic editors to *re-centralize*, and *re-mobilize* the worship of reforming Israel.¹⁶ The theological development is stated succinctly by von Rad:

"It is not Yahweh himself who is present at the shrine, but only his Name as the guarantee of his will to save; *to it and it only* Israel has to hold fast as the sufficient form in which Yahweh (the LORD) reveals himself."¹⁷

Israel is called to worship a God who cannot be contained by even "the highest heavens," much less the earth or the temple or any other

dwellings “made by human hands” (1 Kgs 8:27; Isa. 66:1-2; Acts 7:48-50). The employment of the LORD’s name in the characterization of the exalted LORD Jesus raises with new clarity and ultimacy the apostolic call of Israel, especially Jerusalem (Acts 4:16), to faith and repentance “in his name” (Acts 3:16,19). “The name of Jesus” represents the One received into heaven, yet present in mighty acts of power to save through his prophets (Acts 4:30). “The place where the LORD chooses to put his name” is the place of prayer (Acts 3:1; 4:24-31); the place of the Spirit of revelation in the word and mighty acts of God (Acts 3:6-10,16; 4:8-10,16-18,30-31; 5:12,32); the place of repentance for the forgiveness of sins through the name (Acts 2:21,38; 3:19-20; 4:12; 5:31); the place of service to God in worship and service to one another in common concern under the apostle’s leadership (Acts 2:42-47; 4:32-37; 5:1-12 ‘antitype’).¹⁸ “In the name of Jesus” and “no other name” the worship of Israel is *re-centralized*, but also *re-mobilized* as a “tent of witness” first in Jerusalem, then among diaspora Israel, and ultimately in “all the nations.” “The name of Jesus” cannot be localized, domesticated or contained in “human-made houses” or traditions (Acts 4:17-20; 5:17-29)!¹⁹

1. Recentralizing the Worship of Israel

The healing of the lame man at ‘the temple gate’ (Acts 3:1-10) precipitates multiple explanations from Peter (and John) to “all the people” (Acts 3:11-26; 5:21), the temple authorities (Acts 4:2, 7-12,19-20; 5:27-32), and “their own people” (Acts 4:23-30). The odd wording of Acts 3:16 summarizes the apostles’ report. Through Peter, Luke casts “the name” as the *subject* which accomplishes the man’s healing when trusted as the *object* of the man’s faith: “by faith *in his name* — it is *the name of Jesus* which has strengthened this man whom you see and know — even the faith which through it gave to him the wholeness of this one present before you all.”²⁰

Disqualifying any “power” or “piety” the apostles might have in themselves (Acts 3:12), Peter names Jesus as the source of their “power and authority” (Acts 3:16; 4:10,30). Luke intends Peter’s preaching in Solomon’s Colonnade (Acts 3:11; 5:12) as an articulation of “the apostle’s teaching” (Acts 2:42) and an interpretation of the “wonders and signs” (Acts 2:43) illustrated in the lame man’s healing. As in Peter’s paradigmatic Pentecost sermon, the explanation of the miraculous event (*apologia*) —

“By the name of Jesus” — necessarily leads to the proclamation of God’s saving power in Jesus (*kerygma*):

1. *The Christ suffered* (Acts 3:18; 4:10; 5:30). “Men of Israel” (3:12), “brothers” (3:17), “rulers and elders of the people” (4:8), “all the people of Israel” (4:10,27), *you* “handed over” (3:13), “disowned” (3:13,14), and “put to death” (3:14; 4:10; 5:30) “the holy and righteous one” (3:14), “the prince of life” (3:15).
2. But “the *God* of our fathers” (Acts 3:13; 5:30) has “*raised up*,” “glorified” and “exalted” him (3:13,15; 4:10; 5:30-31).
3. “We are *witnesses* of this fact” (Acts 3:15; 4:33; 5:32).
4. “So is *the Holy Spirit*” (Acts 4:31; 5:32).
5. “Therefore, *repent* and turn back that your sins may be wiped out” (Acts 3:19,26; 5:31).
6. Then, “the *restoration* of all things” (Acts 3:19,21) will come when Jesus returns from heaven (3:20-21).

Peter makes the singular choice clear: “There is salvation in *no one else*; for there is *no other name* under heaven given among humankind, by which we *must* be saved” (Acts 4:12). All other worship is idolatry. No other worship is acceptable. The authentic worship of Israel is to be gathered around the name of Jesus.²¹

2. Remobilizing the Witness of Israel

This “notable sign” (Acts 4:16) gains such prominence for the apostles among “the crowds” in Jerusalem and its surrounding towns (Acts 3:11; 4:4; 5:15-16) that the temple authorities issue them a strict “gag order:” “not to speak or teach at all *in the name of Jesus*” (Acts 4:17-18; 5:28,40). The Sanhedrin’s lack of legitimate authority is illustrated by the apostle’s obedience to “God” (Acts 4:19-20; 5:28-29), and by “an angel of the LORD” (Acts 5:19) who tells the apostles to continue telling the people “all the words of this life” (Acts 5:20). Consequently, the apostle’s disobedience to the Sanhedrin gains them two jailings (Acts 4:4; 5:18) and

one flogging (Acts 5:40), numbering them among those “worthy of suffering disgrace for *the name*” (Acts 5:41).

The Spirit’s descent on the apostles and “their own” (Acts 4:23) in “the place where they gathered together” (Acts 4:31) dramatically contradicts the threats and punishments issued by the Sanhedrin, authenticating and emboldening “the apostles’ teaching” (Acts 2:42) of “the word of God” (Acts 4:31). Undoubtedly, Luke wants to underscore the ongoing legitimacy of the temple by reporting its customary use by Peter, John and the others for prayer (Acts 3:1) and teaching (Acts 3:11; 5:12, 25). But Luke also reports their gathering for *the apostle’s teaching, prayer, the fellowship and the breaking of bread* together “from house to house” (Acts 2:46; 5:42) in order to emphasize that the legitimacy of Israel’s “place” of worship is determined by the presence of the Spirit, name and word through the new leaders of Israel!

Summation

The four basic ingredients of worship given in repeated summaries of community life among the reforming people of Israel (Acts 2:42-47; 4:31-35; 5:42) share something in common with “the name” which forms the center of their worship. *Neither the object, nor the means of Israel’s worship are bound by location!*²² The stage is now set. The basis for the extension of the reforming people of God first to diaspora Israel, then to the nations, is established. The Spirit has descended and “the name” has been replaced in David’s once fallen tent to bear authentic witness to the remnant of Israel and to “all the gentiles who are called by the name” (Acts 15:16-18)! “No other name” resonates with “no other gods” to offer Israel a compelling *apologia* “to seek the (*central*) place the LORD shall choose to cause his name to dwell” (Deut. 12:11), namely in the person of the risen Jesus, and to *mobilize* its worship of the LORD Jesus in “David’s tent of witness” for “the glory of Israel and a light of revelation to all nations” (Luke 2:32).

Endnotes — Chapter Three

-
1. Our reading recognizes Acts 1:1-11 as a prologue, which, while dependent on Luke 1:1-4, sets forth the geographic architecture of the progress of the word from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth.

Acts 1:12-2:47 functions as a “preface” and 3:1-6:7 narrates the Spirit’s work through the apostles in Jerusalem. In many ways Stephen’s ministry and speech, while taking place in Jerusalem, function as a “bridge” to Paul’s ministry and the expansion of the word out from Jerusalem. Therefore, we will examine Stephen’s speech alongside Paul’s paradigmatic synagogue sermon at Pisidian Antioch in the next chapter.

2. See the previous chapter’s discussion of “the Restoring People” and Luke T. Johnson, *Acts*, 34, for a discussion of the unique use of “names” and the number 120 as “the minimum size a city would need in order to have a synagogue.”
3. Williams notes the dual use of δεῖ (Acts 1:16,21) both before and after the coupled quotation of the Psalter to mark the structure of Peter’s interpretation of the two events and texts. For a full discussion see, David J. Williams, *Acts*. NIBC 5. Ed. by W. Ward Gasque (Peabody: Hendrikson, 1985), 31-33.
4. For a discussion of Luke’s literary word play on “the place,” see Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*. SPC 5. Ed. by Daniel J. Harrington, S. J. (Collegeville: Michael Glazier, 1992), 36, 40.
5. The relationship between the Feast of Weeks and Pentecost is discussed in Luke Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 41.
6. For a more complete discussion of peshar interpretative method, see Richard N. Longenecker, *Acts of the Apostles*. The Expositor’s Bible Commentary. Ed. By Frank Gaebelin. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 277.
7. Longenecker notes the *apologia* and *kerygma* sections of Peter’s sermons. See Richard Longenecker, *Acts of the Apostles*, 276.
8. See C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937), 24-42.
9. The groundbreaking 1949 essay, “The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography,” is reprinted in Martin Dibelius, trans. Mary Ling, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Scribner’s, 1956), 138-85, see also 1-25.

-
10. See C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (New York: Willett, Clark & Co., 1937), 24-42.
 11. See J. Jervell, "The Problem of Traditions in Acts," in *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972).
 12. While one may not agree with the Conzelmann-Haenchen consensus regarding the theology of Luke-Acts, no one can deny their influence in sensitizing NT scholars as to the presence of any such theological scheme. For a full review see H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* and E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles*, esp. 90-132.
 13. For a detailed summary of Luke's use of OT texts in the apostolic speeches of Acts 2-5, see Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern*, 209-213.
 14. For a detailed summary of the use of OT texts in Acts 2 - 5, see Darrell Bock, *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern*, 209-213.
 15. VonRad wrote, "Deuteronomy never speaks of the city of Jerusalem, but only of the "place" at which the Name will dwell . . . what is decidedly new is the assumption of a constant and almost material presence of the Name at the shrine . . . it may be established in a particular place, the conception is definite and within fixed limits; *it verges closely upon a hypostasis.*" See G. Von Rad, *Studies on Deuteronomy*. 38. See also J. G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*. JSOT Supplement Series 33. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984. He argues with Von Rad for the view that the Name was not originally tied to Jerusalem or even tied to one particular shrine. Note well 1 Kgs 9:6-7; Jeremiah 7:12-15!
 16. For a discussion of the background and development of Deuteronomistic name theology and a full accounting of the Name phraseology, see "The Concept of God and the Divine Abode" and Appendix A. II. in Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (London: Oxford, 1972), 190-209 and 324-326.

-
17. See “Deuteronomy’s Name Theology and the Priestly Document’s ‘Kabod’ Theology,” pp. 37-44, esp. 38, in *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Studies in Biblical Theology 9. London: SCM, 1953.
 18. Peterson writes, “When the sermons in Acts proclaim the risen and glorified Christ as the source of life and blessing for Israel and the nations, the implication is that he is to be the centre of true worship.” For a discussion of the dual role of the Temple and early Jewish Christian community as *the place* of public prayer and divine revelation, see David Peterson, *Engaging With God: A Biblical Theology of Worship* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 136-139.
 19. The fact that “the name” as a christological designation “appears almost exclusively in materials that reflect the Jewish Christian mission” marks it as an early theological development in the Church. For a comprehensive review of early Jewish Christian literature and its Jewish contemporaries, regarding “the name,” the eschatological prophet like Moses, the Isaianic Servant and other christological designations, see Richard N. Longenecker, *The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity*. Studies in Biblical Theology. Second Series 17. Naperville: Alec Allenson, 1970, p. 44.
 20. My translation was helped greatly by Luke Johnson’s discussion of the difficult, if not “garbled” Greek. See Luke Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 68.
 21. For a full discussion of the *centralizing* language of Deuteronomistic name theology see “The Altar Law and the Centralization of the Cult,” in J. G. McConville, *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*, 21-38; and the classic study, “Deuteronomy’s Name Theology and the Priestly Document’s ‘Kabod’ Theology,” in Gerhard von Rad, *Studies in Deuteronomy*, 37-44.
 22. Weinfield writes, “The centralization of the cult was in itself, of course, a sweeping innovation in the history of the Israelite cultus, but its consequences were . . . decisively more revolutionary in nature, in that they involved the collapse of an entire system of concepts which for centuries had been regarded as sacrosanct. *With the elimination of the provincial cultus Israelite religious life was completely wrested from the control of priest and temple.*” What

Weinfeld describes in terms of the “secularization” or “demythologization” of the cult with the advent of “name theology,” I have termed the “re-mobilization” of Israel’s worship life. See Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 190.