

FAITH AND FAITHFULNESS IN LUKE¹

Christopher Seglenieks

Adjunct Lecturer, Bible College of South Australia

ABSTRACT

The Gospel of Luke presents πίστις as an essential response to Jesus. Lukan faith entails elements of both trust and propositional belief, although the propositional aspect is not focused on doctrinal content so much as an attitude to the message of the Gospel. Luke presents faith as a dichotomy, exemplified by the initial belief or unbelief shown by Mary and Zechariah. Luke omits or modifies instances where Matthew or Mark draw attention to complexity or development, leading to the overall impression that one either has faith or does not. The essential ongoing aspect of faith is faithful action, indicated primarily with the adjective ‘faithful’ (πιστός). For those familiar with the story of Jesus (cf. 1:4), the use of πίστις encourages the audience to certainty in the message conveyed by Luke, a certainty that is to lead to action.

FAITH, AND QUESTIONS OF ITS MEANING AND USE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, HAS BEEN THE SUBJECT OF renewed scholarly interest.² However, that attention has not extended into a focus on the evidence for distinctive patterns of use of the language of faith in each of the Synoptic Gospels. Instead, it is taken that Luke adopts the language of both Mark and Q, with the use of πίστις predominantly uniform across the Synoptics.³ Additionally, Lukan use of πίστις has commonly

¹ I would like to thank the various people who have provided feedback that has helped develop this article, including the ANZATS Luke group, Andrew Waller, and the ABR reviewers, along with the editor Alan Cadwallader.

² Recent work exploring the meaning of πίστις include: Nijay K. Gupta, *Paul and the Language of Faith* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2020); Jeanette H. Pifer, *Faith as Participation: An Exegetical Study of Some Key Pauline Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2019); Matthew W. Bates, *Salvation by Allegiance Alone: Rethinking Faith, Works, and the Gospel of Jesus the King* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017); Jörg Frey, Benjamin Schliesser and Nadine Ueberschaer (eds.), *Glaube: Das Verständnis des Glaubens im frühen Christentum und in seiner jüdischen und hellenistisch-römischen Umwelt* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017); Teresa Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

³ Morgan, *Roman Faith* 374, 392. Similarly, assuming a general equivalence in the use of faith language is Gerhard Barth, “Glaube und Zweifel in den synoptischen

been analysed along with Acts.⁴ Without denying the connection between Luke and Acts, considering Luke independently allows direct comparison to be made with Synoptic parallels to illuminate distinctive Lukan features. Such comparisons enable greater precision regarding the way Luke's Gospel refers to faith, along with setting the use of πίστις in the context of its potential function for the audience. The Gospel provides an initial pattern of using πίστις that Acts builds upon, and a thorough investigation of πίστις in Luke may facilitate greater understanding of Acts in turn. In light of these concerns, what follows is an investigation of how Luke uses πίστις (including verbal and adjectival forms) that will pay attention to the distinctive ways Luke uses these words when analysed alongside Mark and Matthew, as well as pointing to how πίστις might function for the implied audience.

I. THE LANGUAGE OF FAITH

The following investigation analyses the use of πίστις, the primary term for conveying faith within the New Testament. This includes the noun πίστις, the verb πιστεύω and the adjective πιστός, along with the negated forms ἄπιστος and ἀπιστέω; and one compound form, the adjective ὀλιγόπιστος. There is ongoing debate as to the extent to which the use of πίστις in the New Testament conveys relational trust and/or propositional belief, an issue that will be explored further in §II.

It is important to recognise that the study of a word is not to be equated with the study of a concept.⁵ The present study cannot be an exhaustive investigation of the concept of faith in Luke. A concept study would need to consider the range of other words that may be linked to the concept.⁶ The closest conceptual

Evangelien," *ZTK* 72, no. 3 (1975) 282; cf. Schuyler Brown, "The Lukan Use of πίστις/πιστεύω," in idem, *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke* (AnBib 36; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969) 36–48, here 37.

⁴ Thus, Christfried Böttrich, "Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk," in *Glaube* (ed. Jörg Frey, Benjamin Schliesser and Nadine Ueberschaer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017) 399–421; Wolfgang Schenk, "Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk," in *Der Glaube im Neuen Testament: Studien zu Ehren von Hermann Binder anlässlich seines 70. Geburtstags* (ed. Ferdinand Hahn and Hans Klein; Düsseldorf: Neukirchner, 1982) 69–92.

⁵ On confusing word and concept in the context of 'faith,' see Douglas A. Campbell, *The Quest for Paul's Gospel* (London: T&T Clark, 2005) 190. The seminal argument for distinguishing between word studies and concept studies is made by James Barr, *The Semantics of Biblical Language* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961) 206–62.

⁶ The paucity of studies on Lukan faith means that the potential breadth of the Lukan concept has yet to be explored. By way of comparison, the possible breadth of related terms is evident in studies which explore the concept of faith in the Gospel of John, such as Christopher Seglenieks, *Johannine Belief and Graeco-Roman Devotion* (WUNT II 528; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020) 16–118; Pascal-Marie Jerumanis, *Réaliser la communion avec Dieu: Croire, vivre, et demeurer dans l'évangile selon S. Jean* (Paris: Gabalda, 1996) 101–75.

connection is to *πίθω* which can indicate trust and is used in parallel to *ἀπιστέω* in Acts 28:24. While occasionally appearing in Luke, *πίθω* is never used for the relationship between people and either God or Jesus.⁷ Beyond trust, a conceptual study would need to address more data than is possible within this article. Thus, the focus of this study remains upon the *πίστις* word-group, with the awareness that this alone does not convey the entire concept of faith.

To properly consider Luke's use of *πίστις*, we need to read within the framework of the Gospel's rhetorical purpose.⁸ For the present argument, it is not significant whether Theophilus, to whom the Gospel is addressed, is a symbol for the ideal reader or a real individual, for genre and context point to a wider audience.⁹ While it is impossible to ascertain with precision a concrete audience for the Gospel, through the text we can identify features of the implied audience.¹⁰ Luke's prologue sets out the text's purpose of evoking certainty regarding the story of Jesus, with which the audience is familiar, writing *ἵνα ἐπιγνῶς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν* (1:4). While the historical parallels for Luke's prologue are debated, Luke's primary goal is reinforcing confidence in the message about Jesus for someone who is already familiar with the Jesus story.¹¹ Rather than expecting an explicit summary of ideal faith, we are seeking to describe what the narrative overall seeks to evoke in the audience through the language of *πίστις*. No single scene is likely to exemplify the entirety of faith, but nor should a single failure of a character be equated with a complete absence of faith. This latter point is significant when it is recognised that the narrative has a trajectory that moves towards both the cross but also

⁷ *Πείθω* is only used within the Gospels to refer to trust in God in Matt 27:43. In Luke it is used for inappropriate trust, such as trust in oneself or in weapons (11:22; 18:9), in addition to several instances with the sense of 'persuade, convince' (16:31; 20:6). There is no nominal form used in the NT, while the adjective *ἀπειθής* appears in Luke 1:17, with the sense of 'disobedient.'

⁸ Recognising that the Gospel of Luke has a rhetorical purpose does not require that we use the lens of ancient rhetoric to investigate the text. In rhetorical contexts, *πίστις* had the specialised sense of proof (e.g., Plato, *Phaedrus* 266e), which it does not have in Luke. See George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric & its Christian & Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (2nd ed.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999) 21–22; 143–51.

⁹ The argument for a wide audience for the Gospels based on their genre as *bioi* is made in Richard J. Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). For Luke, familiarity with Mark suggests that the author would expect their work to similarly be read by numerous Christian communities. On the dedication to Theophilus, see parallels to other works that had a wider readership in Sean Adams, "Luke's Preface and its Relationship to Greek Historiography: A Response to Loveday Alexander," *JGRChJ* 3 (2006) 177–91, here 183–5.

¹⁰ The implied reader is the reader that can be reconstructed solely from features in the text itself, on which see James L. Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005) 31–32.

¹¹ On the prologue and genre, see esp. Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1:1–4 and Acts 1:1* (SNTSMS 78; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Adams, "Luke's Preface."

towards Pentecost and the mission of the church in Acts, which are prefigured in Luke 24:44–49. From this Lukan perspective, any response is likely to be incomplete prior to the coming of the Spirit. Yet while the narrative relates events prior to Pentecost, the text is written to evoke a response in a post-Pentecost audience, and thus the shape of πίστις across the narrative will reflect the desired response from the audience.

While the preface highlights a cognitive purpose, the conclusion of the Gospel suggests that mere mental certainty is not the ultimate goal. Rather, certainty is the means towards recruiting the audience into the mission of passing on the message about Jesus (24:44–49; cf. Acts 1:8).¹² In addition to concern for the informational content of the message, an active response is envisioned, given the need to proclaim repentance for forgiveness of sins (24:47). For Luke, repentance cannot be solely a changed attitude as it is made concrete in the form of changed actions (3:10–14).¹³ The importance of practical action is reinforced in the early chapters of Acts as πάντες οἱ πιστεύοντες (2:44; cf. 4:32) are shown acting in a distinctive way (2:42–47; 4:32–37; 5:1–11). The following investigation will consider how Luke’s distinctive use of πίστις contributes to the rhetorical purposes of evoking both confidence in the message and attendant actions.

II. INTRODUCING FAITH

The investigation of faith language in Luke begins with how πίστις is introduced to the reader. While Luke does not use πίστις in such a programmatic fashion as Mark (Mark 1:14–15), the initial uses of πίστις are found in the opening chapter. First, in the story of Zechariah the angel tells Zechariah that “you have not believed (ἐπίστευσας) my words” (1:20). Then Elizabeth says to Mary in 1:45, “blessed is she who believes (ἡ πιστεύσασα) that what was spoken to her from the Lord will happen.” The parallels between the birth narratives of John the Baptist and Jesus are well known, and these two instances form part of those parallels.¹⁴ The similarities include the fact that both are external assessments of

¹² While Luke centres the Twelve in commissioning for mission (9:1–6; 24:33–49), the extension of mission to the 72 (10:1–12) as well as the broader mission depicted in Acts indicate that the wider community of disciples, including the audience, are to take up the mission. John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC; 3 vols.; Waco, TX: Word, 1989–1993) vol. 1, xxxiv; vol. 3, 1220; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 411.

¹³ This concretising of repentance is paralleled by Luke’s concretising of faith, as seen in §VI.

¹⁴ The parallels are discussed in Nolland, *Luke* vol. 1, 13, 17–21, 40–1. Raymond E. Brown (*The Birth of the Messiah* [Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977] 248–53) characterises this as step-parallelism which portrays that Jesus is greater than John. Cf. Karl A. Kuhn, “The Point of the Step-Parallelism in Luke 1–2,” *NTS* 17 (2001) 38–49; François Bovon, *Luke* (Hermeneia; 3 vols.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002–2013) vol. 1, 30.

a character's faith or lack thereof, rather than personal claims to faith, and both come in the context of a message from God delivered by an angel. Yet amidst the parallels there is the crucial difference where Mary is praised for believing while Zechariah is rebuked for unbelief. Just as the broader parallels include differences whereby Jesus is presented as greater than John the Baptist, so 1:20 and 1:45 function as an antithetical parallelism to draw attention to Mary's right response to the message.¹⁵

The response to the message plays a central role, as either accepting or rejecting the message is the basis for ascribing faith or the lack thereof. The focus on the message is indicated by the object of belief in each case, either 'my words' (1:20) or the acceptance of what was spoken (1:45). While different constructions are used, the motivation is contextual rather than indicating any difference between the responses. Zechariah is in conversation with Gabriel, and thus there is no ambiguity with using the dative to refer to the words just spoken as what Zechariah has not believed. With Mary the statement in 1:45 is more removed from the conversation with the angel, and therefore ὅτι is needed to convey what was believed. The similarity in what is believed includes a spoken message (τοῖς λόγοις 1:20; τοῖς λελαλημένοις 1:45) delivered by the angel Gabriel (1:11,19,26), while both messages are linked to God (Gabriel stands before God 1:19; the message is 'from God' 1:45), with concern for the fulfilment of what has been spoken (πληρωθήσονται 1:20; τελείωσις 1:45). Thus, both Zechariah and Mary are used to introduce πίστις as propositional, focused on the acceptance of a message.

The attitude to the message, however, cannot be entirely separated from the more implicit idea of trusting the messenger. The use of 'my words' in 1:20 takes a middle ground between a solely content focused 'the words' and a solely person focused 'me.'¹⁶ Gabriel draws attention to his identity as one who ought to be believed (1:19). This builds upon the epiphanic opening of the scene (1:11–13) which draws on a motif of such scenes where the elevated identity of the messenger functions as endorsement of their message.¹⁷ Within the wider narrative, the combination of the identity of a messenger and the acceptance of their message has two important connections. Firstly, it foreshadows Jesus himself as the messenger from God, and thus the need to accept his words. Secondly, the

¹⁵ Nolland (*Luke* vol. 1, 67–8) argues this is deliberate antithetical parallelism.

¹⁶ Morgan (*Roman Faith* 379) notes the focus upon the words rather than the appearance of Gabriel, although linking this to contextual expectations around the creation of πίστις rather than the nature of πίστις. Böttrich ("Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk" 408) focuses on a relational faith and downplays the importance any propositional aspect. Böttrich's argument for a relational focus depends primarily on references from Acts, while the dismissal of the use of ὅτι in 1:45 as having no explicit confession overlooks the way that it nevertheless refers to acceptance of a message.

¹⁷ Similar epiphanic scenes include Luke 2:9–12 and 24:4–8, both of which have the elements of an angelic appearance, a response of fear, and a message given. They reflect earlier scenes such as Dan 8–12, esp. 8:16–17, and Tob 12:15–20, as well as echoing the language of Exod 3:2 LXX. Nolland, *Luke* 1:29.

author self-presents as reliable and therefore as conveying a reliable message that is to be accepted (1:3–4).¹⁸

The attention to πίστις as propositional is notable given recent debate over whether πίστις in the New Testament should be understood primarily as propositional or relational. As Teresa Morgan argues, πίστις in the Graeco-Roman world conveys a primarily relational sense of trust.¹⁹ Propositional elements are often not present, or only implicit and secondary, and Morgan argues that a similarly relational focus is evident in the New Testament.²⁰ However, responses to Morgan's work suggest that she underplays the propositional element in the New Testament use of πίστις, a use also evident in some Graeco-Roman religious contexts.²¹ In Luke 1, attention is drawn to a propositional aspect of faith. Yet the focus is upon an attitude of acceptance rather than the substance of the propositional content. There is no indication that the audience is to believe the contextually specific messages that are believed (or ought to be believed) in Luke 1, for the purpose of Luke is certainty with regard to the broader story of Jesus. Rather, Mary's confident acceptance models the certainty with which the audience is to accept the message of the Gospel itself (1:4).

In light of the closing framework of the Gospel, we can also see how Mary's belief leads to the desired response of participating in the mission. Immediately after her belief is affirmed, Mary declares the message about Jesus in the Magnificat (1:46–55). At the close of the Gospel the disciples are commissioned to proclaim the message of Jesus to all nations (24:45–49; cf. Acts 1:8). Mary's faith leads to proclamation, although following the action of the Spirit in conception (1:35), just as for the disciples their proclamation follows the action of the Spirit at Pentecost (2:4). While the audience is not explicitly called to proclaim, the examples of Mary and the disciples encourage the audience in this direction. The sending of both the 12 and the 72 on a mission with a message to proclaim (9:2, 6; 10:9), along with the trajectory into the mission of the church in Acts, strongly suggest that the audience is to follow Mary in faith that includes proclamation.

Ultimately both Zechariah and Mary are positive examples, for Zechariah accepts the rebuke from Gabriel and, like Mary, he turns to proclamation once

¹⁸ This does not require taking a position on the accuracy of the author's self-depiction, it simply observes the rhetorical function.

¹⁹ Morgan, *Roman Faith* 36–122. Moises Silva ("πιστεύω," *NIDNTTE* 3:760–1) similarly notes ideas of trust or confidence. Rudolf Bultmann ("πιστεύω," *TDNT* 6:177–80) gives 'to rely on, to trust' and occasionally 'to obey', acquiring the sense of 'to believe' during the Hellenistic period.

²⁰ Morgan, *Roman Faith* 30.

²¹ Examples where πίστις reflects a propositional aspect in a Graeco-Roman religious context are found particularly in Plutarch (*Pyth. orac.* 18; *Amatorius* 13; *Quaest. rom.* 11) and Lucian (*Pseudol.* 8; *Philop.* 13, 30; *Icar.* 10). Concerns with Morgan underplaying the propositional aspect in the NT are raised by Francis Watson and Mark Seifrid in "Quaestiones disputatae: Roman Faith and Christian Faith," *NTS* 64 (2018) 243–61.

his speech is restored (1:67–79; cf. 1:63). The overall characterisation of Zechariah is positive, from his description as righteous and blameless (1:6), through his loyal service in the Temple (1:23), and the narrator’s assertion that the Lord’s hand was with him (1:66). Even Zechariah’s questioning echoes that of Abraham (Gen 15:8), drawing connections to a figure often interpreted as a model of faith (Gen 15:6; cf. Rom 4:1–24; Gal 3:5–9; Heb 11:8–10), facilitating the audience’s interpretation of him as coming to faith. The example of Zechariah offers hope for those who are uncertain about Jesus, that they may still accept the message and join in the mission of his disciples. Luke does not say whether Zechariah’s move to faith was instant or a drawn-out process. As will be argued in following sections, not only does Luke appear uninterested in the development of faith, he appears to actively minimise any reference to ongoing or developing faith, instead highlighting faithful action as the ongoing response. By focusing on Zechariah’s active faith rather than its development, the rhetorical effect for the implied audience is to highlight that when they accept the message, they ought to act in accordance with that acceptance.

The introduction of faith in Luke 1 therefore presents three distinctive features of the Lukan use of πίστις. First, faith entails the acceptance of a message that has propositional content, a message conveyed by a reliable messenger. As will be seen in §III, this is balanced by some later instances where relational trust is a greater focus, but Lukan faith cannot be reduced to only trust. For the audience, the opening encourages emulating Mary in accepting the message. Second, faith is depicted as a dichotomy.²² Unlike Matthew or John, this dichotomy is not complicated by later attention to the internal dynamics of faith.²³ In this respect, the Lukan use of πίστις is more like that found in Mark.²⁴ Third, accepting the message is to lead to joining the mission by in turn announcing the message, as faith entails action. Having seen how faith is introduced in the opening chapter, the following sections will explore whether these three distinctives are sustained throughout Luke’s narrative.

²² Schenk (“Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk” 78) argues for a dichotomous view of faith in Luke, thus no role for “change in belief” (*Glaubenswechsel*).

²³ The Lukan use of ὀλιγόπιστος which might problematise this dichotomy will be dealt with in §V. Böttrich (“Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk” 416) sees Luke’s minimal use of ὀλιγόπιστος as indicative of a lack of interest in doubt. Matthew uses ὀλιγόπιστος repeatedly to convey the faith of the disciples which exists but needs to develop further, see Anna Nürnberger, *Zweifelskonzepte im Frühchristentum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2019) 441–559; Christopher Seglenieks, “The Rhetoric of Matthean Small Faith,” *ZNW* 113, no. 1 (2022) 50–68. For John, connections with μένω focus on the ongoing aspect of faith, while other instances of faith language serve to complicate any simplistic ideas of what faith entails (John 2:23–25; 8:30–31); see further Christopher Seglenieks, “Untrustworthy Believers: The Rhetorical Strategy of the Johannine Language of Commitment and Belief,” *NovT* 61, no. 1 (2019).

²⁴ Christopher Marshall (*Faith as a Theme in Mark’s Narrative* [SNTSMS 64; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989] 227) argues there is no internal development of faith in Mark.

III. FAITH AS TRUST OR PROPOSITIONAL BELIEF

The first chapter of Luke uses πιστεύω to refer to the acceptance of a message with propositional content (1:20, 45). Subsequent uses of πιστεύω sustain this focus on a message, as πιστεύουσιν is used in parallel with δέχονται τὸν λόγον (8:13). Similarly, the identity of Jesus as the Christ is the message that the Sanhedrin will not believe (22:67). The idea of acceptance or rejection of a message continues even after the cross, as the disciples fail to accept the report of the women (24:11).²⁵ The refusal to accept a message is implied in the dialogue with the Pharisees, where the Pharisees are aware that they did not believe John the Baptist (20:5). Unlike the previous examples, the focus is not placed on the message, as the object of the verb is a person, possibly indicating personal trust as the primary idea. However, the Pharisee's rejection of John's proclamation of the one coming after him (3:4–6, 15–17), along with their lack of action in keeping with repentance (3:8), suggests that personal trust is not the central focus. Only in 8:50 where believing is contrasted with fear does the verb πιστεύω indicate trust more than propositional belief.

The use of the noun appears to place greater emphasis on trust. Luke's references to faith in the context of healing (Luke 8:48; 17:19; 18:42) have Jesus as the implied object, conveying trust in Jesus alongside belief that he can heal. However, there are two cases where attention is given to the propositional aspect of belief. The first is the centurion, where the faith praised by Jesus is demonstrated in what the centurion affirms about Jesus' identity (7:8–9). His affirmation of Jesus' authority, however, also draws attention to Jesus' reliability as an authoritative messenger, so that, as with Gabriel and Zechariah, both acceptance of the message and trust in the messenger are at stake. The second is the calming of the storm, where Jesus' question to the disciples, Ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν (8:25), leads directly to the disciples' pondering the identity of Jesus. Their failure to show faith at this point is connected to a lack of christological understanding. Thus, πιστεύω and πίστις are used by Luke to convey both relational trust and propositional belief.

The intertwining of trust and propositional belief is evident in the way that even the expression that most readily indicates trust in Jesus, "your faith has saved you" (7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42), is not divorced from propositional

²⁵ It is unlikely that the failure to accept the report of the women should be understood as reflecting unbelief in a broader sense. Uncertainty and a lack of understanding pervade the events of Luke 24, and provide the narrative openings for establishing the connection between Jesus and the Scriptures on the road to Emmaus (24:13–35) and for pointing forward to the coming gift of the Spirit and the mission of the church in the resurrection appearance (24:36–49). Additionally, the apostles do not receive this message directly from the angel as the women do (24:7), and there is no direct condemnation, suggesting the audience is to see this as a relatively minor failing, and one that is rectified through both the appearance of Jesus and then the gift of the Spirit.

ideas.²⁶ While the central idea in each of these stories is trust in Jesus, it is never limited to that. The only instance where there is a simple call for healing which is met by Jesus is also the one with the most distinctive christological titles attributed to Jesus, as “Son of David” (18:38–39), indicating some degree of christological belief alongside trust in Jesus.²⁷ The other three instances all involve more extended interaction with Jesus. In both 8:48 and 17:19, Jesus’ affirmation of saving faith comes not only after the healing, but also after an interaction between Jesus and the one healed. While faith may include the initial trust that led to the healing, what is endorsed is a more complete response including verbal acknowledgement of Jesus’ action (8:47; 17:15–16). The spoken element is not present in 7:36–50, but a corresponding prominence is given to the symbolic actions of the woman, actions that are characterised as love (7:47). Thus, even where trust may be more prominent, the Lukan use of πίστις retains a propositional element, while the proclamatory role of these words and actions reinforce the encouragement of the audience towards such proclamation.

Despite the use of πίστις to indicate acceptance of a message, there is limited attention to the information that is to be believed. Aside from the initial uses of πιστεύω in Luke 1, the object of belief is rarely specified, reflected in a lack of prepositional constructions with the verb. A single use of ἐπί points to belief in all that is written in the prophets rather than a specific confession (Luke 24:25). The uses of the verb in Luke 1:20, 45 and 24:25 reflect a broader focus, that πίστις is the appropriate response to any communication from God. Πίστις is not used either to call for or to express belief in certain facts about Jesus.²⁸ Belief for Luke is propositional, but rather than focusing on the propositional content, the emphasis is on acceptance of that content (the message). Given the aim of certainty regarding the overall Gospel narrative (1:1–4), the author does not hold up summaries of christological content as the object of faith, instead giving the audience examples of a fundamental disposition to the message.²⁹ Πίστις is used to convey this attitude of acceptance of a message, encouraging the audience towards acceptance of the content of this Gospel.

²⁶ Σῶζω is often used in the context of healing, but its meaning is not limited to physical healing, as indicated by the use in 7:50 where healing does not feature. It may indicate broader restoration, including social and spiritual dimensions. See MiJa Wi, *The Path to Salvation in Luke's Gospel: What Must We Do?* (LNTS 607; London: T&T Clark, 2019) 63–80; Mark Allan Powell, “Salvation in Luke-Acts,” *Word & World* 12, no. 1 (1992) 5–10.

²⁷ In this context, the title has messianic and royal implications. Nolland, *Luke* vol. 3, 900; Morris, *Luke* 287.

²⁸ Böttrich (“Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk,” 408) notes the absence of any confessions of faith.

²⁹ Schenk defines Lukan faith as “Annahme der Heilsbotschaft von Gottes Handeln in Jesus.” Schenk, “Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk” 71.

IV. FAITH AS DICHOTOMOUS AND OBJECTIFIED

The second characteristic of Lukan faith that was identified in Luke 1 is a dichotomous picture of faith. This continues as the characters within the narrative either possess faith or lack it—those who are healed are often said to have πίστις (Luke 7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42), whereas on other occasions Jesus questions the absence of πίστις (Luke 8:25; 18:8). At no point is πίστις used to denote a point between these two poles. Πίστις is used as the object of verbs such as ἔχω (17:6), ὁράω (5:20), and εὐρίσκω (7:9; 18:8), indicating it is something that can be possessed, observed, or even a status that is acquired. An objectified faith contributes to the dichotomy, as a person either possesses πίστις or does not. This dichotomous picture does not align well with the declared purpose of the Gospel in providing certainty to someone already aware of the story (1:4), however a resolution of this mismatch must await the consideration of faithfulness in §VI.

The dichotomous and objectified presentation is continued in the strong preference Luke exhibits for using the noun πίστις over the verb πιστεύω, as the noun more readily conveys faith as something either present or absent.³⁰ While the verb is used twice in Chapter one, in both cases πιστεύω refers to a response to a specific angelic message, rather than the response to Jesus and his message which is the concern of the rest of the narrative. Luke has the highest frequency of πίστις in the Gospels, with it appearing less frequently in Mark and Matthew, while it never appears in John.³¹ Such statistics are not themselves an argument, but they alert us to a pattern that warrants further investigation. When Synoptic parallels are considered, the difference in frequency appears to be deliberate. There are several cases where Luke omits the verb πιστεύω compared to parallel passages in Matthew and/or Mark.³² In Luke 7:1–10 Luke uses πίστις in Jesus' initial response to the faith of the centurion, but does not have the second

³⁰ Πίστις becomes even more objectified in the Pastoral Epistles as the content of what is believed (1 Tim 1:2; 3:9; 4:1,6; 2 Tim 1:13; 3:8; 4:7; Titus 1:4). See Philip H. Towner, *The Goal of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles* (JSNTSup 34; Sheffield Academic, 1989) 121–41, although Morgan (*Roman Faith*, 322–30) rejects reading ἡ πίστις as “the faith.” Ἡ πίστις never has the sense of the content of faith in Luke, and thus it does not provide evidence for establishing any connection between Luke and the Pastorals. On such connections see Jean-Daniel Kaestli, ‘Luke–Acts and the Pastoral Epistles: The Thesis of a Common Authorship’, in *Luke’s Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (ed. C. M. Tuckett; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995) 110–26.

³¹ Luke 5:20; 7:9, 50; 8:25, 48; 17:5, 6, 19; 18:8, 42; 22:32. The noun appears in Matthew 8x; Mark 5x; Luke 11x; and John 0x. The verb appears in Matthew 11x; Mark 10x; Luke 8x; and John 98x. Cf. Schenk, “Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk” 76–7.

³² The following arguments presume Markan priority. Matthean priority would not substantially undermine the argument, while Lukan priority, rarely advocated, would only weaken the argument in so far as it could not be argued that Luke has changed his source material, but the distinctives of the Lukan presentation in light of the other Gospels would remain. Luke 7:1–10 is the only non-Markan comparison.

reference to his faith using the verb, as in Matt 8:13.³³ There are two examples from the triple tradition where Matthew follows Mark in using πιστεύω (Mark 9:42/Matt 18:6; Mark 13:21/Matt 24:23). In Luke 17:2 the statement of Mark 9:42 is reordered, and πιστεύω is dropped. In Luke 21:8 there is a similar warning to Mark 13:21/Matt 24:23, but instead of a warning not to believe, Luke follows Matthew's expanded warning in Matt 24:26. Matthew, along with the warning μὴ πιστεύσητε also says μὴ ἐξέλθητε, while Luke has μὴ πορευθῆτε without mention of believing, suggesting a concern for future actions rather than a disposition of trust/belief. In each of these cases, it appears that Luke has intentionally omitted an instance of πιστεύω.

The preference for πίστις over πιστεύω cannot be explained as Lukan stylistic preference, for this preference is an anomaly when considered alongside patterns of other nouns and cognate verbs. Luke uses the noun γνῶσις twice (1:77; 11:52), yet γινώσκω is used 28 times. The pattern continues with other ideas related to responding to Jesus, preferring ἀγαπάω (13x) over ἀγάπη (1x), and μετανοέω (9x) over μετάνοια (5x). Luke primarily uses verbs rather than nouns for aspects of responding to Jesus. The exception to this pattern is the preference for πίστις over πιστεύω. Rather than a stylistic preference for nouns over verbs, these comparisons point to a deliberate Lukan emphasis on the noun rather than the verb.

A deliberate emphasis on the noun over the verb requires explanation. The greater frequency of the noun compared to Matthew and Mark suggests that Luke paints πίστις as objectified, simultaneously de-emphasising the ongoing nature of faith. Such an objectified presentation ought not be overemphasised, as Morgan cautions that in Graeco-Roman use the noun would not have been perceived as inactive or abstract.³⁴ Nevertheless, the Lukan preference for the noun enables the author to sustain the picture seen in Chapter one, that one either has πίστις or does not, without drawing attention to the growth or development of faith.

The intentional avoidance of depicting faith as ongoing and developing is clearest with the disciples' failure to heal in Luke 9:37–42 (par. Mark 9:14–29). Luke omits several instances of the verb found in Mark 9:23–24.³⁵ More than simply removing the verb, Luke omits where Mark explicitly presents faith as ongoing and capable of development, the cry Πιστεύω βοήθει μου τῆ ἀπιστίᾳ (Mark 9:24). While Matthew 17:14–20 likewise omits the words of Mark 9:23–24, Matthew uses the reference to faith like a mustard seed alongside Jesus' critique of the disciples ὀλιγοπιστία, thereby presenting the faith of the disciples

³³ If John 4:43–54 is taken as parallel to this story, the Johannine emphasis on faith highlights further the minimised attention to faith in the Lukan account.

³⁴ Morgan, *Roman Faith* 395.

³⁵ On Luke 9:37–42, Joseph Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke* [AB; 2 vols.; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981] vol. 1, 807) observes that faith is more an element in Mark but draws no further conclusions.

as in need of growth.³⁶ Thus, both Matthew and Mark use this story to present faith as having the capacity for growth, an aspect which Luke avoids. The Synoptic parallels suggest that Luke deliberately avoids using the verb to describe belief, which adds to the case that Luke uses πίστις in a way that avoids drawing attention to either an ongoing aspect or development within belief.

Although uses of the verb do not contribute to the objectified presentation of faith, when the verb is used the emphasis is on the presence or absence of belief, rather than an ongoing aspect. Only once is attention drawn to an ongoing aspect to belief, referring to οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν (8:13, see further §VI). The avoidance of a dynamic presentation of faith is sustained through the verb forms used in the Gospel. Of the eight uses of πιστεύω in Luke, five are aorist, one future, with only one present participle and a present infinitive. A preference for the aorist is not in itself remarkable, being the default tense for narrative. Nevertheless, Luke predominantly presents believing as a complete act, effectively choosing not to draw attention to an ongoing aspect.³⁷ This appears to be a deliberate choice in Luke 8:50, where the call to believe is perfective whereas it is imperfective in Mark 5:36. The author's choice to use the aorist presents the event as an undifferentiated state of affairs, thereby minimising any attention to how the event may have unfolded.³⁸ While this is the only instance

³⁶ Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew* (WBC; 2 vols.; Waco, TX: Word, 1993–1995) vol. 2, 505. The Lukan use of the saying about faith like a mustard seed appears in a different context with a different purpose in Luke 17:5–6, see §V.

³⁷ Laying aside the issue of tense in the indicative mood, the choice between the aorist and the present or imperfect is primarily a choice between perfective aspect and imperfective aspect. Perfective aspect portrays the event as bounded—a complete, undifferentiated whole with beginning, middle and end in view. Imperfective aspect portrays the event as unbounded, most often focussing on the middle phase of the event without reference to its beginning or end. As such, to choose the present or imperfect is to choose to portray the event as an ongoing, continual or habitual state of affairs. Nicholas J. Ellis, Michael G. Aubrey and Mark Dubis, “The Greek Verbal System and Aspect Prominence: Revising our Taxonomy and Nomenclature,” *JETS* 59 (2016) 33–62. Luke had the option to use a perfective or imperfective verb form. By choosing the perfective form, he is at the same time choosing not to present the state of affairs as ongoing, continual or habitual (so far as it depends on the verb itself). It should be noted that some Greek scholars hold to the view that the choice between verbs forms also reflects the event's discourse prominence. Stanley E. Porter, “Prominence: An Overview,” in *The Linguist as Pedagogue* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Matthew Brook O'Donnell; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009) 58–59. Because this view is largely unique to a subset of Post-Classical Greek scholarship and has met with significant criticism, it has not been taken up here. See Jody A. Barnard, “Is Verbal Aspect a Prominence Indicator? An Evaluation of Stanley Porter's Proposal with Special Reference to the Gospel of Luke,” *FN* 19 (2006) 3–29; Steven E. Runge, “Markedness: Contrasting Porter's Model with the Linguists Cited as Support,” *BBR* 26:1 (2016) 43–56; Benjamin L. Merkle, “The Abused Aspect: Neglecting the Influence of a Verb's Lexical Meaning on Tense-Form Choice,” *BBR* 26:1 (2016) 57–74.

³⁸ On Luke 8:50, Darrell Bock (*Luke* [BECNT; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994] vol. 1, 800) suggests that Luke's tone is more urgent than Mark's, emphasising the need for faith. This is based upon understanding the aorist as inceptive, a call to begin to

of Luke changing the tense used in his Markan source material, it comes within a broader shift from imperfective to perfective verb forms, as Mark has eight present forms to two aorists.³⁹ Surprisingly, the two Lukan uses of ἀπιστέω are imperfective (24:11,41), however the ongoing disbelief of the disciples has a narrative function in providing an opportunity for further teaching. Building on the Lukan preference for the noun over the verb, the shift towards perfective verb forms demonstrates that Luke deliberately avoids presenting belief with an ongoing aspect, at least in terms of either trust or propositional belief, for, as will be seen, the concern is for ongoing action.⁴⁰

The argument that the Lukan use of use of πίστις presents a simple idea of faith without concern for development is strengthened by considering the results of πίστις. For Luke, the results of πίστις are primarily depicted as present benefits. Luke repeatedly uses the phrase ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε (Luke 8:48; 17:19; 18:42) to present faith as the prerequisite for miraculous healing.⁴¹ The focus on present benefits paints a picture that as soon as one has ‘faith’ one also has access to the benefits of faith. Thus, the issue is whether one has faith, rather than any possible developments of faith that may take place.

V. POSSIBLE OBJECTIONS

There are two instances where Luke may present a more complex picture of faith, including concern for either developing faith or an ongoing aspect of faith. The first of these is the apostles’ desire for increased faith (Luke 17:5–6), which suggests that faith may be quantifiable. The first interpretative issue relates to

have faith. While the aorist imperative can be inceptive, here Jesus is addressing the synagogue ruler who has already demonstrated some form of faith in coming to Jesus seeking healing (Luke 8:41–42).

³⁹ This excludes the longer ending (Mark 16:9–16), which includes four further aorist forms. Mark is known to use the present more frequently, notably the historic present, which may contribute to a greater frequency of present forms of πιστεύω in Mark. However, none of the Markan instances of πιστεύω are historic presents, see Frans Neiryneck (ed.), *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark with a Cumulative List* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1974) 224–27.

⁴⁰ The avoidance of an ongoing aspect is, as with the avoidance of the verb, a feature of Lukan use of πιστεύω rather than a stylistic pattern. Only half of Luke’s uses of γινώσκω are aorist, while other key verbs appear much less often in the aorist (ἀκολουθέω 5 of 17, ἀγαπάω 1 of 13, μετανοέω 3 of 9). Meanwhile, in the LXX πιστεύω appears in the aorist about half the time (44 of 81). The Lukan avoidance of verb forms that emphasise the ongoing aspect of belief cannot be explained either by a broader pattern of verb use or by the influence of the LXX. Thus, we must argue that Luke deliberately presents belief in this way.

⁴¹ Böttrich, “Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk,” 409. François Bovon (*Luke the Theologian* [2nd edn; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006] 277) states that “Luke cannot conceive of a miracle in which the faith of the human is absent.” Terrence McCaughey (“Paradigms of Faith in the Gospel of St Luke,” *ITQ* 45:3 [1978] 177–84), observes that while the phrase originates with Mark, Luke uses it with non-Markan material (17:19) and with a distinct emphasis on a response of joy and gratitude.

whether the apostles' request *Πρόσθεξ ἡμῖν πίστιν* asks for the gift of faith where none is present or for the increase of their existing faith. Luke Timothy Johnson argues that it is a request for the gift of faith based upon the dative rather than genitive personal pronoun.⁴² While a genitive pronoun would indicate the increase of faith, the dative does not prove the opposite (cf. Lev 26:21 LXX), and the syntax of the question is not decisive. The second issue is that Jesus' response, describing the potential inherent in faith as small as a mustard seed, is in the form of a mixed conditional. While the protasis suggests the apostles have faith, the apodosis may cast doubt on that assumption.⁴³ The connection between verses 5 and 6 requires that if the conditional suggests the disciples have no faith, then their request is for such faith; conversely if Jesus assumes they have faith, they are asking for its increase.

As both these issues appear open to interpretation, context must be the arbiter. The apostles' request comes after Jesus has set challenging expectations for those who would follow him (17:1–4, cf. 16:14–31), and thus they appeal for the ability to comply with Jesus' expectations. As Jesus' response continues in 17:7–10, he assumes that the apostles should be able to do as he has instructed, implying that the apostles have faith.⁴⁴ If the disciples already have faith, then declaring the power of the smallest faith suggests that to be concerned with the 'amount' of faith is to ask the wrong question.⁴⁵ The inclusion of this story, therefore, serves as a correction to those who might conceive of faith as quantifiable, reinforcing Luke's presentation of faith as a dichotomy.

The second case that may indicate a concern for ongoing faith comes when Jesus prays that the faith of Peter might not fail (22:32).⁴⁶ Faith is therefore portrayed as potentially fallible. Jesus does not want Peter to be a case where faith does not survive testing as in 8:13. Peter only demonstrates a limited failure by denying Jesus (Luke 22:54–62), but he returns to faith, implicitly in Luke 24:12, explicitly in Acts 2:14–36. Peter's failure is one of failing to express his faith outwardly. Peter's distress (24:62) helps indicate that the audience is not to

⁴² Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991) 259; cf. N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1965) 51–52. Arguing a request for increased faith include: David Garland, *Luke* (ZECNT; Grand Rapids: Zondervan; 2011) 680–1; Nolland, *Luke* vol. 2, 838. James L. Boyer ("Second Class Conditions in New Testament Greek," *GTJ* 3:1 [1982] 81–88, here 86–7) argues it merely indicates the potential of faith.

⁴³ Arguing for the conditional assuming faith: Leon L. Morris, *The Gospel of Luke* (TNTC; Downers Grove, IL: IVP, 1988) 273. For doubting faith: Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 613; Johnson, *Luke* 259.

⁴⁴ More broadly, Luke presents the disciples not as without faith, but as failing to exercise it (Luke 8:25, cf. Mark 4:40). Garland, *Luke* 680–81.

⁴⁵ Böttrich ("Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk" 417–8) argues that this story highlights the potential inherent in even little faith, rather than functioning as a rebuke. While 8:12–13 indicates that some faith may not be permanent, the need for continuing faith is not the same as a need for greater faith. Cf. Schenk, "Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk" 82.

⁴⁶ Böttrich, "Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk" 414–15.

accept such a divide between faith and action in its own response. As will be seen in §VI below, Luke's concern for ongoing faith is a concern for ongoing outward action. Rather than complicating the dichotomous paradigm of faith, Peter's failure points towards the function of Luke's dichotomy. If faith is dichotomous, action cannot be something that faith progresses towards; instead a faith that is not expressed outwardly is not faith.

VI. FAITHFUL ACTION

The third feature identified in the faith of Luke 1 is action, and to explore faith as action in Luke we must examine the role of the adjective πιστός. As with the noun, Luke uses πιστός the most of any of the Gospels, along with one instance of ὀλιγόπιστος (12:28). The adjective is primarily used to reflect outward actions that accord with what one ought to do and is found in three parables (12:35–48; 16:1–13; 19:11–27). These three parables together present faithfulness as the practical outworking of faith.⁴⁷ In broader use, πιστός can simply indicate trustworthy or reliable, but when describing a personal subject often refers to such reliability expressed in practical action.⁴⁸ The use of ὀλιγόπιστος in Luke could be read as conveying the quantifiability of faith, but it is better understood alongside the use of πιστός. While it appears in the call for the disciples not to be anxious over material things, in contrast to the Matthean parallel (Matt 6:30), Luke moves the focus immediately to practical action (12:32–34). To describe the disciples as ὀλιγόπιστος fits within the Lukan pattern of assuming that while the disciples have πίστις they need to exercise it (8:25, 17:6–10).⁴⁹ The focus on practical action aligns with the Lukan adaptation of the apocalyptic discourse, where the warning focuses on action rather than attitude (21:8). In Chapter 1, the action connected to faith was primarily proclamation, but the use of πιστός points to a broader range of actions expected of those who have πίστις. Additionally, the Lukan use of πιστός conveys the idea of an ongoing aspect of faith, and therefore the position suggested by the analysis of the noun and verb must be nuanced. Rather than Luke having no concern for πίστις as ongoing, his concern is not with an ongoing internal dimension, but that ongoing actions are evident.⁵⁰

The idea that faith should result in faithful actions is not limited to the use of πιστός. Having seen the importance of faithfulness, we can return to see how

⁴⁷ Morgan, *Roman Faith* 375. The idea of faith as action rather than simply interior belief is evident in the use of πίστις in the Graeco-Roman world, as seen in Morgan, *Roman Faith* 36–122.

⁴⁸ See for example: LXX Deut 7:9; 32:4; 1 Kgdms 2:35; 2 Esdras 23:13; Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. rom.* 8.21.2; 13.10.1; Plutarch, *Frat. amor.* 21; Xenophon, *Anab.* 1.4.15

⁴⁹ Green, *Luke* 493.

⁵⁰ On Lukan faith as active and ethical see Böttrich, "Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk" 418–20.

πίστις/πιστεύω are used to encourage acting in accord with faith. The most prominent example is the explanation of the parable of the sower (8:11–15). This parable appears in both Mark and Matthew, but only in Luke is πίστις included. In 8:13, those who respond to Jesus for a short time but abandon him are described as οἱ πρὸς καιρὸν πιστεύουσιν.⁵¹ While this might be read as referring to a time-limited internal response, when read in context there is a practical dimension evident.

The context for the parable draws attention to an active response to Jesus. The story of the forgiven woman precedes the parable, within which is one of the characteristic declarations “your faith has saved you” (7:50). Yet we do not hear her thoughts or words, and thus no attention is drawn to a propositional aspect of belief. Instead, her actions are the focus, actions interpreted by Jesus as a practical demonstration of love (7:47), and thus the outworking of faith (7:50; cf. 5:18–20).⁵² The audience is thus prepared for the idea that belief involves actions, and the connections would be evoked by the repetition of both πίστις and σῶζω in 8:12. Following the explanation of the parable comes further teaching from Jesus, identifying his family as those who “hear the word of God and do it.” (8:21). As the parable is explained in terms of hearing the word of God (ἀκούω 4x in 8:11–15), the focus of hearing goes beyond internal acceptance to highlight acting in accord with the message.

The parable of the sower as received from Mark has a focus on an ongoing response to the word of God. By setting it in this action-oriented context, Luke draws attention to the active nature of the ongoing response. The final focus on bearing fruit reinforces the active focus, for earlier uses of fruit in a metaphorical sense refer to the quality of a person’s actions (3:8, 9; 6:43–44). The cognitive dimension to the ongoing response is not excluded, as Luke describes the ideal response as ‘holding fast to the word’ (τὸν λόγον κατέχουσιν 8:15). Yet to hold fast is to bear fruit (καρποφοροῦσιν), with the internal state enabling the outward action (8:15).⁵³ The purpose of this parable is initially to encourage adherence to the message, but importantly to move beyond an inward disposition to outward action. The preceding story of the woman illustrates that saving faith is active faith, while Jesus’ question in 8:21 effectively asks the audience whether

⁵¹ Schenk (“Glaube im lukanischen Doppelwerk” 81–2) sees this instance as programmatic, with the aorist understood as inceptive belief and the present as ongoing belief. However, this depends largely on evidence from Acts rather than Luke.

⁵² Similarly, in 5:20, Jesus declares faith based upon actions rather than words. In that instance, faith is attributed to the group rather than an individual, as the group participate in the action. While it is unusual for πίστις to be applied to a group in Luke, in 5:17–26 the focus is not on the positive response of the men, but on Jesus’ interactions with his audience. Their positive response is the background against which the hostility of the scribes and Pharisees is displayed.

⁵³ Nolland (*Luke* vol. 1, 388) speaks of faith that follows through on the implications of the word.

they will follow through on the implications of the parable to be not only hearers but doers.

Recognising this purpose of moving the audience towards active faith gives insight into the function of the dichotomy of faith/unbelief. By presenting faith in absolute terms, it facilitates holding action as an integral part of what the author seeks to evoke through the language of πίστις. Where a greater attention to development of faith could allow for perceiving faithful action as a later stage in faith, a goal but not a necessity, for Luke there is only faith or no faith, where faith includes action. For an audience familiar with the Jesus story, as Theophilus is, Luke calls them not to greater certainty alone, but to certainty that leads to action. This is not fundamentally a different sort of faith to the other evangelists. Matthew uses ὀλιγόπιστος to critique the disciples when they fail to express their faith (Matt 6:30, 8:26; 14:31; 16:8), while John connects abiding to bearing fruit (15:1–8, 16), suggesting a process that leads to an external result. Luke's presentation adds an urgency to the active response. There is only faith or unbelief and having faith means being faithful.

VII. CONCLUSION

Luke begins his Gospel with a paradigm of faith that is sustained throughout the narrative. For Luke, faith is a combination of propositional belief and relational trust. The emphasis of the propositional dimensions falls primarily on an attitude to the divinely originated message rather than acceptance of specific facts, encouraging the audience to a similar acceptance of the message of the Gospel. Relational trust is evident, notably trust in an authoritative messenger, just as the audience is to trust the Gospel author who has portrayed himself as reliable. This faith is presented as a dichotomy where one either has faith or not, with minimal attention to the internal dynamics of faith. The dichotomy facilitates the incorporation of faithful action as necessary and as the ongoing aspect of faith. Luke calls his audience to a faith that entails a confident acceptance of God's message alongside trust in Jesus—a faith that is known and expressed in action.