

**THE AUTHORITY OF SATAN:
AN INVESTIGATION INTO LUKE 12:5**

Robert D. Wismer

**Faculty of Religious Studies
McGill University, Montreal
November 1990**

**A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts.**

© Robert D. Wismer 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Resumé	ii
Preface	iii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1 Review of the History of Interpretation	3
A. Luke 12:5 as a Reference to God	3
i. The Early Church	3
ii. The Sixteenth Century	4
iii. The Nineteenth Century	4
iv. The Twentieth Century	5
B. Luke 12:5 as a Reference to Satan	10
i. The Nineteenth Century	10
ii. The Twentieth Century	12
C. Summary	13
Chapter 2 Redaction-Critical Investigation	16
A. Differences in the Texts	17
i. Matthew 10:26-33//Luke 12:2-9	17
a. Matt. 10:26a	18
b. Luke 12:2-3 and Matt. 10:26b-27	18
c. Luke 12:4-7 and Matt. 10:28-31	20
d. Luke 12:8-9 and Matt. 10:32-33	23

B. Differences in Contexts of the Passages	26
i. Luke 12:1a	27
ii. Luke 12:1b	27
iii. Luke 12:10	29
iv. Luke 12:11-12	31
Chapter 3 Ἐξουσία in Luke	34
A. New Testament Use	36
B. Revelation	36
C. Paul	37
D. The Gospel of John	38
E. The Synoptic Gospels	39
i. Matthew	42
ii. Mark	42
iii. Luke (Acts)	43
F. Conclusions	45
Chapter 4 Satan	46
A. Temptation Story	46
B. Beelzebul Controversy	47
C. The Parable of the Sower	48
D. Luke 10:18-19	49
E. Luke 13:10-17	50
F. Luke 22:3	51
G. Luke 22:31-32	51

H. Acts	52
I. The Power to Cast Into Hell	53
K. Conclusions	58
Chapter 5 Conflict In Luke	60
A. The Disciples as Friends	60
B. Conflict with Enemies	62
Conclusions	66
Bibliography	68

Abstract

The majority of commentators have taken Luke 12:5 as a reference to God, while a few well-known New Testament scholars have taken it to be a reference to Satan. Yet neither position has adequately substantiated its interpretation with reference to the setting in Luke's gospel. We argue that taking it as a reference to Satan makes better sense of the passage within its context. The literature is reviewed to show which commentators, namely Conzelmann, Wink and Lampe, have understood this verse as a reference to Satan. A comparison with the parallel text in Matthew reveals the differences in text and context between Matthew and Luke. These are significant enough to allow for different interpretations of the reference in Matthew and Luke. Focussing on ἐξουσία and Satan shows that Luke uses these concepts in a more developed way, and ascribes authority to Satan in his writings. This interpretation of Luke 12:5 fits in well with the theme of conflict developed in Luke's gospel. The cumulative weight of these arguments points in the direction of Luke 12:5 being a reference to Satan.

Resumé

La majorité des commentateurs ont pris Luc 12:5 comme référence à Dieu, tandis que quelques savants du nouveau testament l'ont pris, comme référence à Satan. Cependant, ni l'un ni l'autre des positions a vérifié suffisamment leur interprétation quant à la monture dans l'évangile de Luc. Nous arguons que de la prendre comme référence à Satan fait plus de sens du passage dans ce contexte. On passe la littérature en revue pour montrer quels commentateurs; Conzelmann, Wink et Lampe en particulier, ont compris ce verset comme référence à Satan. Une comparaison du texte parallèle dans l'évangile de Mathieu révèle les différences en texte et en contexte entre Mathieu et Luc. Des interprétations différentes sont possibles pour cette référence en Mathieu et Luc à cause de ces différences notables. Mettant au point ἐξουσία et Satan montre que Luc utilise ces concepts d'une manière plus développée, et il attribue de l'autorité à Satan. Cette interprétation de Luc 12:5 en est convenable avec le thème du conflit développé dans l'évangile de Luc. Le poids cumulatif de ces arguments indique la direction de Luc 12:5 en tant que référence à Satan.

PREFACE

I would like to thank a number of people who have helped me in making the completion of this thesis possible. Dr. N. Thomas Wright gave me much help and encouragement in the beginning stages. During our many car and train rides home together, he enabled me to see the possibility of a profitable area of investigation in the gospel of Luke. Dr. Frederik Wisse was very gracious in taking me on as a thesis student when Dr. Wright left for Oxford, and has been stimulating and thought provoking. His attention to detail and desire for academic excellence have been an example and challenge to those of us with more human standards. I would like to thank Archbishop Reginald Hollis for his understanding and assistance, and the rector and wardens of the Church of St. James the Apostle for allowing me extra time away from my duties there. Randall Halter translated certain key passages in foreign language commentaries, and was unceasing in his encouragement. I am grateful for the financial assistance made possible through the Anglican diocese of Montreal Development Funds. To my many friends who were patient with me through the long gestation period, thank you. And finally, I dedicate this work to Jennifer. The delightful prospect of being married to her has given me the necessary push to complete this thesis.

INTRODUCTION

When the author of the Gospel of Luke¹ recorded Jesus' instruction to his disciples to "fear the one who has authority to cast into hell" (Luke 12:5), he did not make clear to whom he understood Jesus to be referring. The aim of this dissertation is to answer the question "To whom does Luke understand Jesus to be referring?"

The majority of commentators have attempted to argue that this verse contains a reference to God, while others have argued that the one having authority to cast into hell is Satan. I do not find either line of argument to be convincing. This study begins with a review of the two positions and their supporting arguments, and will then point out the weaknesses of each, moving on to what will hopefully be a more appropriate approach to the problem.

After studying the passage in its context, a wider study of ἐξουσία will be undertaken to see how Luke understands and uses this concept. It will be shown that Luke has a more developed understanding of it than the other gospel writers.

¹ Hereafter simply referred to as Luke.

The next focus of study will be on how Luke presents the person of Satan in his gospel. Again, Luke has the most detailed picture of this adversary compared to the other canonical gospels. The theme of Satan as adversary fits in well with the theme of conflict which is developed in Luke's gospel. Through these avenues of investigation, we hope to gain a more satisfactory understanding of the verse.

What follows is an analysis of the text based primarily on a literary-critical approach. It is the text of Luke as we have it that will be the focus of the study. The redactional process will be referred to in so far as it assists in determining Luke's themes and emphases. The thesis will approach the text on the basis of the hypothesis that Matthew and Luke had at their disposal a copy of Mark as well as a record of sayings of Jesus commonly referred to as Q. The designation Q is used to denote material common to both Matthew and Luke, and assumes written sources to which both authors had access. That these written sources were ever collected into one document is not assumed.

I recognize that the aim of this study is a modest one, that is, to point us towards a better understanding of Luke 12:5, in particular to determine to whom Luke understands Jesus to be referring.

CHAPTER ONE

REVIEW OF THE HISTORY OF INTERPRETATION

A. Luke 12:5 as a Reference to God

i. The Early Church

The early Church Fathers, in dealing with Luke 12:5, either left it as ambiguous or clarified it as a reference to God. They often dealt with a version of it conflated with Matt. 10:28 thus confusing elements which are distinct in Luke and Matthew. The Shepherd of Hermas is the most explicit in showing it to be a reference to God rather than the devil.¹ Justin Martyr, in a discussion of the possibility of the resurrection, leaves it as an ambiguous reference.² Irenaeus, in commenting on the text appears to take it to be a reference to God.³ Tertullian, like Hermas, makes it very clear that Luke 12:5 is to be a admonition to fear God.⁴ Two centuries later, Augustine added his considerable weight to the position of those who took it to be a reference to God. In his

¹The Shepherd, 2.12.6.

²First Apology, 19.6.

³Against Heresies, 3.18.5.

⁴Against Marcion, 4.28.

Exposition on the Psalms (Psalm 64), he explains the sense of the text with reference to the fear which humans owe to God.⁵ In his Treatise on Grace and Free Will, he comes to a similar conclusion.⁶

ii. The Sixteenth Century

Calvin clearly takes Luke 12:5, and its parallel in Matt.

10:28 to be instructions to fear God. He says in A Harmony of the Gospels:

"So this is how we should resolve Christ's words, Recognize that you have been given immortal souls, which being under the judgement of God alone do not come under the authority of men....there is the emphatic repetition in Luke, *Yea, I say unto you fear him*: as if Christ had said, that there is no respect for God in us, when we succumb to the dread of men, but if we revere God, then there is an easy victory in His grasp for us, to prevent any human force distracting us from our calling."

(Calvin, pp. 304-305)

Luther also assumes that this is a reference to the authority of God and hence to fearing God:

"If they will not take our word for it, Christ himself will attend to it strongly enough where he says in the tenth chapter of Matthew, 'Do not fear those who kill the body, and after that have nothing that they can do; rather fear him who after he has killed the body, has power to condemn to hell.' I think it is clear enough here that the soul is taken out of all human hands and is placed under the authority of God alone."

(Luther, p. 106)

⁵Exposition on the Psalms, 64.

⁶On Grace and Free Will, 39.

iii. The Nineteenth Century

F. W. Farrar, in his commentary on Luke first published in 1884, says concerning Luke 12:5 that there can be "no doubt that the reference is to God." He points out, first, that the phrase φοβήθητε τὸν, κ.τ.λ. never means to "be on your guard against". Then he states that we are never told to fear the devil elsewhere in the Scriptures, but only to "defy and resist" him. And finally he notes that the devil is never, in the New Testament, ascribed any power to cast into Gehenna (Farrar, p.274).

In response to these three points, it should first of all be noted that, while the injunction to fear God does not necessarily mean "to be on your guard against", the word φόβος can certainly carry that nuance. This is clear from the assurances to "fear not" either with respect angels (Luke 1:13, 30; 2:10) or Jesus himself (Matt. 14:27). Φόβος is used to describe such things as the disciples' terror at seeing Jesus walking on the water, thinking him to be an apparition, and causing them to cry out (Matt. 14:26). As to the fact that elsewhere in scripture we are counseled to "defy and resist" the devil (James 4:7; 1 Peter 5:9), it need only be said that fearing someone is not incompatible with resisting and defying them. The element of fear can conceivably strengthen and fortify one's resistance. And, finally, while the devil is not specifically ascribed power to cast into hell, he is

ascribed both power and authority, and the limits of that power and authority are left unclear. We are not told that he has not been granted such power.

iv. The Twentieth Century

Farrar's three points were later picked up and expanded, in the same order, by two commentators, Walter Adeney and Alfred Plummer, both publishing in the same year, 1901. Adeney also notes the change in the form of the expression from φοβηθήτε ἀπὸ in vs. 4 to simply φοβήθητε in vs. 5. Highlighting the omission of ἀπὸ in the second phrase, he suggests that the nuance indicates an aversion from those who can kill the body (vs. 4), but not from God (vs. 5; Adeney, p.198). For φοβήθητε in vs. 5, Plummer offers the translation "fear without trying to shun."⁷

The presence of ἀπὸ in Luke 12:4 and its absence in Luke 12:5 is not as significant as it might at first appear. It is true that this same shift was probably present in Q, as it is also found in Matt. 10:28. And while Luke emended the form of the verb in a classicising direction (φοβεῖσθε becomes φοβηθήτε, and φοβήθητε), he has not altered the even more unclassical construction of φοβέομαι with ἀπὸ. This is not a classical

⁷Plummer also makes the observation that this pericope (with the parallel text in Matthew 10:28) along with the parable of the King with Twenty Thousand Men (Luke 14:33ff.) and that of the Unjust Servant (Luke 16:1ff.) form the only passages in the Bible "in which the same words have been interpreted by some of Satan and by others of God" (Plummer, p.319).

construction, nor is it Lukan, but probably a Hebraism (Marshall, 1978, p.513; Liddell and Scott, p. 1946). To determine whether or not this omission of the preposition was significant for Luke, it would be necessary to investigate similar constructions in Luke's writings and in Luke's sources. While φοβέομαι is not used with ἀπὸ elsewhere in Luke's writings, he does use verbs, which have a similar idea or thrust, with and without ἀπὸ, with no apparent shift in meaning. The verb προσέχω, for example, is used 10 times in Luke, seven times without ἀπὸ and three times with ἀπὸ. Its presence or absence does not seem to indicate a shift in meaning in any of these instances. One of Luke's sources, the Septuagint, also employs verbs, including φοβέομαι, with and without ἀπὸ where no shift in meaning is discernible. Deuteronomy is a good example. The verb φοβέομαι is used in 1:29 and 5:5 with ἀπὸ and in 2:4 and 3:2 without ἀπὸ. Also in Ecclesiastes 8:12, the writer uses φοβέομαι with and without ἀπὸ in the same verse, in both instances with God as object:

ὅτι ἔσται ἀγαθὸν τοῖς φοβουμένοις τὸν θεόν
ὅπως φοβῶνται ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ.

Although Luke has dropped the ἀπὸ when referring to the one whom the disciples should really fear, and emended the form of the verb, it is important to note that Liddell and Scott have said in their lexicon that, with reference to the passive and middle forms of the verb, in Homeric Greek, φοβέομαι is

always used in the sense of "to be put to flight" (p.1946). While it does not seem to add any weight to the argument that Luke understood Jesus to be referring to Satan in this passage, it would be difficult to make a case for Luke 12:5 be a reference to God on the basis of the omission of ἀπὸ.

George B. Caird, in his commentary published in 1963, suggested that God alone is to be feared, and that fear of Him casts out all other fears.

"For the fear of God is of quite a different quality from the fear of man; it is not the fear of danger, but the humble acknowledgement of his sovereignty. To him who has no fear of God, no reverence for his majesty and holiness, no appreciation of his grace and mercy, the presence of God could hardly be other than a consuming fire - and what is that but to be cast into hell" (Caird, pp.160-161).

He really gives us an explanation of what fear means according to traditional Reformed theology rather than making a case for this being a reference to God rather than Satan.

In an article published in 1970, I. Howard Marshall states his position clearly, if not curtly:

"It should be noted in passing (for this is really all the attention it deserves) that the One with this power is undoubtedly God, and not the devil."

(Marshall, 1970, 278)

In his extensive study of Luke 12:4,5 and its parallel in Matt. 10:28, Marshall notes many interesting facts, not all of which are brought to bear on the question of who Jesus is referring to. First, he notes the construction φοβέσθαι ἀπὸ, as did others before him, but does not use this as an argument to support his contention that it is a reference to God.

Apparently, he does not think he has to. Next, he notes the fact that Jesus attempted to reassure those who were "filled with fear in the presence of a divine epiphany (Mk.5:36, 6:50; Lk.5:10; Mt. 28:10)", but that "he also spoke of the necessity to fear and reverence God (Lk.18:2,4 implies this)". Marshall suggests that his position is made especially clear from Mk.9:45,47 "where the use of the passive 'be thrown' (βληθῆναι) is a periphrasis for the action of God." Depending on the context, the passive could be used for God or for Satan. Marshall, by using a text where the subject is not named (Mk.9:45,47) to confirm a text where the object is unclear, puts himself on shaky ground (Marshall, 1970, pp.276-280)! Marshall's article is the most extensive treatment of Luke 12:4,5 to date, but he argues his case mostly from texts outside the Lucan or Matthean material. In his major commentary on Luke published in 1978, he merely reasserts his conclusions from the article (Marshall, 1978, pp. 513-514). In his article he acknowledges that he is arguing against G.W.H.Lampe, who published his comments on this verse in Peake's Bible Commentary, as well as against K. Stendahl, who commented on the parallel verse in Matthew 10:28 in Peake's Bible Commentary as well. Both of these commentators, Lampe on Luke 12:5, and Stendahl on Matthew 10:28, take this to be a reference to fearing Satan and not to fearing God. In his commentary Marshall aligns himself against Grundmann. Grundmann, however, in his commentary published in 1963, argues that Luke gives us a description of God, who has the

authority to cast into hell, while Matthew describes Satan, who rules over the place of destruction, and carries out the punishment. Marshall has misrepresented Grundmann's position on Luke (Grundmann, p. 253).

Joseph A. Fitzmyer (1981) lists more possibilities for the object of the disciples fear than just God or Satan, but in the end he also takes this to be a reference to God. He argues that it is not the Son of Man in judgement, or the devil, or Satan, or Apollyon, the power of evil. He points out, as others have, that the New Testament elsewhere counsels resistance to Satan, not fear. He highlights the luridness of the passage when he says:

"One meets here the typical protological way of thinking, found elsewhere in the New Testament, when an action such as the hurling of people into gehenna is ascribed to God. Modern systematic theology would explain the presence of persons in gehenna in other ways" (Fitzmyer, p. 959).

B. Luke 12:5 as a Reference to Satan

i. The Nineteenth Century

To find commentaries which clearly understand the text to be a reference to Satan rather than to God, one must begin with scholars of the last century. Rudolf Stier, in his The Words of the Lord Jesus, and even more emphatically in the second edition published in English in 1856, takes it as an injunction to fear "that true enemy and murderer of the soul", the devil (Stier, 1856, p.12). Commenting on the parallel passage in Matthew, he wonders "with what ears he can hear

this, who should refer it to the Father in heaven" (Stier, 1862, p.43).

Oosterzee, in his Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke, which was translated into English in 1862, makes a detailed study of the passage and introduces three arguments for considering it to be Satan. First, he understands the various uses of φόβεισθαι to carry the same meaning, which is to be on one's guard against. He notes that the grammatical construction in vs. 4, φοβηθήτε ἀπὸ, is different than that which is found in vs. 5, φοβήθητε δὲ τὸν ἔχοντα, but he is not swayed from his position, citing in defense the use of φοβηθήτε in Matt. 10:26. Oosterzee takes this as an obvious reference to the same object as φοβηθήτε ἀπὸ in Luke 12:4, with the omission of the ἀπὸ. The intention is not to shift to another type of fear, he contends, but to "cherish it in a yet higher degree". Second, he argues that just as men are the slayers of the body, Satan is the slayer of souls. God is never spoken of as one who destroys souls. Oosterzee, here, is dealing with a conflated version, for the Lucan text reads "casts into hell" while Matthew has "destroy in hell". Finally, taking Jesus' designation of his disciples as "friends" to be determinative of the context and tone of the discourse, Oosterzee considers a reference to the Father as "the one who has the authority to cast you into hell" as totally unsuitable (Oosterzee, pp.412-413).

Oosterzee's first point is helpful if it is not made out to be a determinative consideration. It is easier to understand the various instances of φοβέομαι in such a brief space to carry the same meaning or nuance, rather than to posit such a subtle shift as the other position requires. The second point is an argument from silence and not convincing. Although it is true that God is not referred to as a slayer of souls in the Bible, neither is Satan. Finally, a reference to God as "the one who has authority to cast into hell" by Jesus, coming directly after an intimate reference to his disciples as "friends" certainly seems harsh and incongruous. Yet the phrase λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου is an addition by Luke and does not affect the original saying. Oosterzee's problem with this point may reflect nineteenth century sensibilities rather than objective deductions.

John Peter Lange had originally decided that the verse was a reference to Satan in his Life of Jesus, but in his commentary on The Gospel according to Matthew (1867), he specifically reverses his position. He says he had overlooked the differing grammatical constructions, particularly the absence of the ἀπό in the second reference, and that this fact, along with the idea that God holds all power and authority, had convinced him to agree with the majority position (Lange, 1867, p.195).

ii. The Twentieth Century

In 1953, Hans Conzelmann's provocative work Die Mitte Der Zeit

was published.⁸ In this work, Conzelmann sets forth a case for his understanding of Luke's theology and of the structure and outline of his gospel. He mentions in his book that he considers Luke 12:5 to be a reference to Satan, that the ἐξουσίαν in the verse is that of the adversary, but gives no reason for his coming to this conclusion (Conzelmann, p.181). In a similar fashion, Walter Wink in Naming the Powers: The Language of Power in the New Testament (1984), merely states that the reference to authority in Luke 12:5 is a reference to the authority of Satan (Wink, p.9). As has already been noted, Lampe, in his brief comments in Peake's Bible Commentary, also takes this to be a reference to Satan's authority (Lampe, p.834).

C. Summary

This is not a complete list of commentators and commentaries,⁹ but it does provide an overview of some of the better known students of the NT who have dealt with this verse, and supplies a basic outline of the arguments for it being a reference to God and of those for it being a reference to Satan.

⁸The translation, The Theology of St. Luke was published in 1960.

⁹Fitzmyer, in his commentary, lists some 168 commentaries, both ancient and modern, on the gospel of Luke, besides a host of related monographs and articles.

Those who take it to be a reference to Satan list the following reasons for doing so: a) it is easier to read the various instances of φοβέομαι as having the same meaning, i.e. fear as avoidance; b) it is easier to understand Satan to be the one who looks after the job of casting into hell, and the entailing destruction; and c) following a reference to his disciples as "friends", a description of God as one whom they should fear because he has authority to cast into hell is jarring.

Those reading it as a reference to God cite these reasons: a) that φοβέομαι as a positive command is never used in the sense of being on your guard against; b) that we are not told to fear the devil but to resist and defy him, with the assumption that these are mutually exclusive responses; c) that God has all authority and power, and nowhere are we told Satan has been ascribed the authority to cast into hell, and d) that dropping the ἀπὸ is more consistent with God as object. The problem with both sides of the argument is that they tend not to treat the gospel of Luke as a piece of literature in its own right. A more appropriate approach is to bring the tools of literary criticism to this complete and well-constructed book. What needs to be addressed is Luke's view of God and of Satan, his particular use of certain words, and his development of the story and teaching of Jesus. Then, the gospel of Luke, or, for the purposes of this paper, the passage under study, must be subjected to a redaction-critical

analysis. Luke has interacted with his sources, and whatever tell-tale editorial signs are there must be brought to bear on our understanding of the text. Luke must be allowed to speak first. Then it will be appropriate to look for corresponding and verifying evidence further afield in other contemporary literature, but this should come subsequently so that Luke is not told what he can and cannot mean by what he says.

CHAPTER TWO

REDACTION-CRITICAL INVESTIGATION

To get a clear picture of the way in which Luke has presented this saying, and has used it in forming this gospel, it is necessary to study it alongside the parallel passage in Matthew. This will assist us in determining Luke's editorial changes and give us a better idea of what the passage may have looked like in its original form. There is little doubt that Luke 12:2-9 is a Q passage, being so closely paralleled in Matt. 10:26-33. The language of the texts is very close in meaning although many of the actual words used and the nuances conveyed are significantly different, as can be seen from a comparison of the two passages.

Luke 12

(2) Οὐδεν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται (3) ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται, καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν ὁωμάτων
(4) λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχοντων περισσώτερόν τι ποιῆσαι (5) ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τινα φοβηθῆτε φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέεναν ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε (6) οὐχὶ πέντε στρουθία πωλοῦνται ἄσφαρίων δύο, καὶ ἐν ἑξ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλεησμένον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ (7) ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς ρομφαλῆς ὑμῶν πάσαι ἡρίθμηνται, μὴ φοβείσθε πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε

(8) λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ. (9) ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ.

Matthew 10

(26) Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς· οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. (27) ὁ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί, καὶ ὁ εἰς τὸ οὐς ἀκούετε κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων. (28) καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεννόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι φοβεῖσθε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέεννῃ. (29) οὐχὶ δύο στρουθία ἀσσαρίου πωλεῖται; καὶ ἐν ἑξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. (30) ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἡριθμημέναι εἰσίν. (31) μὴ οὖν φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε. (32) Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (33) ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσῃται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ ἐγὼ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

A. Differences in the Texts

i. Matthew 10:26 - 33// Luke 12:2-9

The parallel passages in Luke 12:2-9 and Matthew 10:26-33 both consist of three distinct units:

Luke 12:2-3	Matt. 10:26-27
Luke 12:4-7	Matt. 10:28-31
Luke 12:8-9	Matt. 10:32-33

It is not always readily apparent why these units have been put together. Fitzmyer says that the verses do not fit together very well, and that they "stem from diverse contexts in the ministry of Jesus" (Fitzmyer, p. 956). It is likely, however, that they were held together in Q by a common theme of persecution or death, and the need to stand fast in the face of it. By looking at them individually, it should be

possible to cast some light on the redactional variations in each of the authors. The aim of this aspect of the study is to attempt to determine how Luke has used and fashioned his material, and to see how this might help in determining who it is the readers are being counselled to fear. The person being referred to is left unspecified in both Matthew and Luke.

a. Matthew 10:26a

(26) Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς·

Matthew begins his section with a phrase not paralleled by Luke. It seems to have been duplicated here by Matthew from vs. 28 to form a heading for the passage, which falls in the midst of a mission charge. It was not originally attached to vs. 26b (Fitzmyer, p. 956; Marshall. 1978, p. 512).

b. Luke 12:2-3 and Matthew 10:26b-27

Luke 12:2-3

(2) Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. (3) ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται, καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων.

Matthew 10:26b-27

[(26) Μὴ οὖν φοβηθῆτε αὐτούς·] οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν κεκαλυμμένον ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτόν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται. (27) ὃ λέγω ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ, καὶ ὃ εἰς τὸ οὖς ἀκούετε κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων.

Luke 12:2 is almost identical to Matthew 10:26b. Thus the wording is very close to Q. Marshall suggests that "since Luke likes συν- compounds, his use of συγκαλυπτω...is probably

secondary to the simple form in Matthew (Marshall, 1978, p. 512). Luke 12:3 is very similar to Matt. 10:27, with many of the same words, yet the thrust is different. It would appear more likely that Matthew has changed vs. 27 to the imperative tense to agree with the context of the mission charge. Luke has recorded it in the future passive tense. According to Fitzmyer the future passive verbs indicate the more primitive form, but he doesn't think that the verses were originally related, although they were already related in Q (Fitzmyer, p. 956). In seeking to determine which gospel has preserved the more original verse, Marshall says:

"Both forms give a good sense with what follows. Luke has the better link with the immediately preceding verse, since the principle in vs. 2 is better as a justification for the conclusion drawn in Luke than the imperative in Matthew" (Marshall, 1978, p. 513).

This is one of Luke's doublets, being also found at Luke 8:17, a passage parallel to Mark 4:22, and a part of the triple tradition. Fitzmyer says that the doublet in Luke had to do with "the bold proclamation of what the disciples had heard in private (as it is also in Matt. 10:26-27)" (Fitzmyer, p. 957). A closer look at Luke 8:17 and its context, however, reveals that it is not about proclamation but rather about listening, and the inevitability of all being made known. Schweizer says of Luke 12:3 that it "is therefore not a call to the disciples to preach (as in Matt. 10:27)" (p. 205). It seems more likely that Luke would have retained the future passive tenses in both passages, as does Mark 4:22, and that Matthew would have

altered the tense to make it more applicable to the context of his mission charge.

c. Luke 12:4-7 and Matthew 10:28-31

Luke 12:4-7

(4) Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου, μὴ φοβηθῆτε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεινόντων τὸ σῶμα καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα μὴ ἔχόντων περισσότερόν τι ποιῆσαι. (5) ὑποδείξω δὲ ὑμῖν τίνα φοβηθῆτε· φοβήθητε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέεναν. ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, τοῦτον φοβήθητε. (6) οὐχὶ πέντε στρουθία πωλοῦνται ἀσσαρίων δύο; καὶ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιλεησμένον ἐνώπιον τοῦ Θεοῦ. (7) ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς ὑμῶν πᾶσαι ἡρίθμηνται. μὴ φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε.

Matthew 10:28-31

(28) καὶ μὴ φοβεῖσθε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποκτεννόντων τὸ σῶμα, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτεῖναι φοβεῖσθε δὲ μᾶλλον τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέεννῃ. (29) οὐχὶ δύο στρουθία ἀσσαρίου πωλεῖται; καὶ ἓν ἐξ αὐτῶν οὐ πεσεῖται ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν. (30) ὑμῶν δὲ καὶ αἱ τρίχες τῆς κεφαλῆς πᾶσαι ἡριθμημέναι εἰσὶν. (31) μὴ οὖν φοβεῖσθε· πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε.

This section begins with a Lukan introductory phrase λέγω (δὲ) ὑμῖν which is repeated in vs. 5 and again in vs. 8 (see also 7:26 and 11:51). Marshall says the formula "is peculiar to Luke but may have stood in his source, since in Luke Jesus is already addressing the disciples" (Marshall, 1978, p. 513). Luke continues with the tender and familiar address of the disciples as "friends". This is not paralleled in the Matthean passage, and is, in fact, the only place it is found in the Synoptic gospels (cf. John 15:13-15, where in the same context, Jesus speaks of his 'friends' who will share his fate" [Schweizer, p.205]). Grundmann suggests that "it is

used to express the close relationship between Jesus and those who do his will and are entrusted with his secrets" (Grundmann, p.253). This is quite an obvious Lukan addition, hardly something Matthew would have omitted.

This unit of four verses might at first be taken as two separate units of two verses each (Luke 12:4-5 and 6-7; and Matt. 10:28-29 and 30-31). Marshall says that "the strong contrast between vs. 4f. and vs. 6f. is remarkable, and may imply compilation" (Marshall, 1978, p.510). The first two verses point out that a) spiritual destruction is far worse than mere physical termination, and b) the reader should fear the one who can effect that spiritual destruction. The second two verses point out a) the attention and care of God, and b) that the reader need not fear. The first half of the section then (Luke 12:4-5 and Matt. 10:28-29) is an exhortation to fear the greater of two evils, which is spiritual destruction, while the second half (Luke 12:6-7 and Matt. 10:30-31) is an apparent change in tone, encouraging them that God knows all about them and cares for them. There is not such a change in tone as might at first be thought. The whole unit is really held together by the common theme of persecution and fear of death and the need to stand firm in the face of it. The sparrow about which God cares is probably a dead sparrow, bought for eating, yet God still cares for it. The "hairs of the head" is an image of the detail of God's care and attention. This is not a promise of redemption from death, but a more

emphatic statement of God's care which will continue even after death. Schweizer detects a Lukan redaction here in the reference to a fate after death (Schweizer, p.204). The images of the sparrows and of the hair (vss. 6 and 7) support and continue the theme of standing firm in the face of persecution from vss 4 and 5. Even after death God will care for his own, and therefore physical death is to be preferred to spiritual destruction.

The description of the one we are to fear is quite different in Matthew from that in Luke. In Luke, he has authority (τὸν ...ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν, vs. 5), while in Matthew he is the one who is able (τὸν δυνάμενον, vs. 28). In Luke, the one with authority has this authority to cast into hell (ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέεναν) while in Matthew he has power to destroy in hell (ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέενῃ). Lagrange claims that "ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέεναν est plus grec que ἀπολέσαι ἐν τ γ" (Lagrange, p.353). Marshall says that "Matthew speaks of killing the soul, and this formulation is probably original since the language in Luke may be editorial (ἔχω with the infinitive)" (Marshall, 1978, p. 513; cf. Schulz, p. 158). Fitzmyer suggests that Luke omitted the phrase τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυνάμενον ἀποκτεῖναι apparently regarding it as unclear (Fitzmyer, p. 959). Marshall and Schweizer see no reason why Luke would have objected to this body/soul dualism since he uses it in Luke 12:19-23 and in Acts 20:10. It is possible that he did not like the idea of killing the soul, since he speaks of the soul

surviving death in Luke 16:19ff. and in Acts 2:27 (Schweizer, p.646; and Marshall, 1978, p. 513).

d. Luke 12:8-9 and Matthew 10:32-33

Luke 12:8-9

(8) λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν, πᾶς ὃς ἂν ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ. (9) ὁ δὲ ἀρνησάμενός με ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπαρνηθήσεται ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ.

Matthew 10:32-33

(32) Πᾶς οὖν ὅστις ὁμολογήσῃ ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁμολογήσω καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῷ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. (33) ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσῃταί με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀρνήσομαι καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρός μου τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Although Luke has probably added the λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν¹, Matthew shows more evidence of editorial activity in this section. First, it is likely that Matthew has changed "the Son of Man" to Jesus speaking in the first person to make it clearer for his readers who it is they are supposed to confess and who will confess them if they do. Marshall suggests that Matthew "substituted 'I' in the saying for an original 'Son of man' to bring out more forcefully the eschatological role of Jesus" (Marshall, 1978, p. 515). Fitzmyer disagrees, however, saying Luke "has substituted the title 'Son of man' for the more original 'I' of Matt. 10:32" (Fitzmyer, p.956).

¹Marshall suggests that the "opening λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν is probably from Luke's source" and that Matthew's οὖν is editorial (Marshall, 1978, p. 515).

Verse 9 is another Lukan doublet (Luke 9:26) paralleled in Mark 8:38 indicating another verse in the triple tradition. Fitzmyer points out that both Luke 9:26 and Mark 8:38 employ "the Son of man", suggesting that this has influenced Luke's redaction of vs. 8 (Fitzmyer, p. 957). Marshall says that "'Son of man' must have stood in Luke's source, in view of the catchword connection with vs. 10, and it is attested in Mark 8:38....It is thus more likely that 'Son of man' was present in the Q form of the saying, although that does not prove that it was present in the earliest form of the saying" (Marshall, 1978, p. 515). Schweizer is also of the opinion that "Luke probably has preserved the earliest form of the saying" (p.204).

Second, Matthew has probably changed "the angels of God" to "my Father in the heavens" as the one before whom Jesus will confess them if they are faithful. It is highly unlikely that Luke would have altered the designation of the Father. Fitzmyer notes that G. Dalman (Words of Jesus, p. 197) supposes Luke to have altered the verse to avoid "in the presence of God" as found in Matthew (Fitzmyer, p. 960), but Marshall counters that the "phrase is hardly a periphrasis for the name of God since God is named in it - unless we assume that τοῦ Θεοῦ is an addition to the original phrase" (Marshall, 1978, p.515). Fitzmyer agrees that the use of 'the angels of God' "argues for the antiquity of the phrase in Q, which Matthew rather

has changed" (Fitzmyer, p. 957).

Finally, Matthew's sections on confessing and denying are almost exactly symmetrical, while Luke's are not. Matthew states that whoever denies Jesus, Jesus will deny him. Luke, however, uses the future passive again, and records that "he will be denied". Marshall suggests that "the passive construction may have been introduced by Luke in order to avoid a clash with the following verse which states that speaking against the Son of man is forgivable" (Marshall, 1978, p. 516). It seems rather that Matthew has been concerned to tidy things up and to make them more definite. Luke has been content to record the more ambiguous future passive.

In summarizing the redactional and editorial activity of Luke in his recording of this pericope, it is important to note that he has maintained the future passive tenses of verbs which Matthew has changed into present imperatives or future indicatives:

Matthew 10

εἵπατε (vs.27)
κηρύξατε (vs.27)
ἀρνήσομαι (vs.33)

Luke 12

ἀκουσθήσεται (vs.3)
κηρυχθήσεται (vs.3)
ἀπαρνηθήσεται (vs.9)

While λέγω ὑμῖν in Luke 12:4,5 and 8 may have been present in the original, and was deleted by Matthew, Luke has almost certainly added τοῖς φίλοις μου in vs. 4. Luke has also added ὑποδείξω. He maintains the original three charges to

"fear" which Matthew trims down to one. Finally, Luke may have changed "destroy body and soul in hell" (Matt. 10:28) to the more vague and ambiguous "cast into hell" (Luke 12:5). These redactional changes show that Luke has exercised editorial freedom in formulating his passage here in Luke 12:2-9. He is not woodenly taking over material from other sources, but is writing it for a purpose. His addition of τοῖς φίλοις μου, for instance, makes it much more difficult to read 12:5 as a reference to fearing God.

B. Differences in the Contexts of the Passages

While Matt. 10:26-33 seems to form a distinct unit in the midst of a larger context, Luke 12:2-9 is usually taken with the preceding verse and the following three verses to form the pericope Luke 12:1-12.² The contexts for the passages are significantly different. In Matthew, the context is Jesus' extended mission charge to his twelve disciples, a deliberation on the necessity to communicate the nearness of the kingdom of heaven to the towns and villages of Israel, with exorcisms, healings and other signs. It is a prediction of opposition, struggle and sacrifice. In Luke, on the other hand, the context is one of challenge, first to the disciples, but also to the attendant crowd, to live their lives with consistency and integrity. Rather than going out and

²Most commentators agree to this division of the text, cf. Marshall, 1978, p.509; Caird, p.159; Ellis, p.174. T.W.Manson, p.105, suggests that 12:2,3 form the end of Jesus' harangue against the Pharisees which began in Luke 11.

persuading others by words and demonstrations of power, as in Matthew, they are encouraged to develop attitudes and lifestyles that are consistent with their discipleship. There is no mention of going out on a mission. As will become apparent, Luke felt free to bring in verses from other sources to complete the section 12:1-12. He has done this with great skill, developing his portrayal of Jesus' teaching. He adds a verse at the beginning of Luke 12:2-9 and three verses at the end. Before looking at these extra four verses, it will be helpful to see them in their relation to parallels in Mark and Matthew:

Mark	Matthew	Luke
		12:1a
8:15	16:6, 11	12:1b
	10:26-33	12:2-9
3:29	12:32	12:10
13:11	10:19-20	12:11-12

i. Luke 12:1a

The introductory phrase in vs. 1a, ἐν οἷς ἐπισυναχθεισῶν τῶν μυριάδων τοῦ ὄχλου, ὥστε καταπατεῖν ἀλλήλους, ἤρξατο λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ πρῶτον, serves as a transition from Jesus' encounter with the Pharisees to his counsel of his disciples (Fitzmyer, p. 953). It is not found elsewhere, and must be a Lukan creation.

ii. Luke 12:1b

Luke 12:1b is from the triple tradition and is found in Mark 8:15 and Matt. 16:6 and again at Matt. 16:11. In both Mark

and Matthew, the verse is in the context of a crossing of the Sea of Galilee. There is the feeding of the four thousand (Mark 8:1-9//Matt. 15:32-39), a request by some Pharisees for a sign from heaven" (Matthew adds "Sadducees", as well as the phrase "to test him"; Mark 8:11-13//Matt. 16:1-4), and then the crossing of the Sea. While in Luke the warning against "the leaven of the Pharisees" follows Jesus' dinner with a Pharisee which ended with Jesus denouncing them, in Mark and Matthew it follows the request of the Pharisees for a sign.

Luke uses the phrase προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς ἀπὸ to record Jesus' caution to his disciples. Mark uses ὁρᾶτε, βλέπετε ἀπὸ (Mark 8:15) and Matthew uses ὁρᾶτε καὶ προσέχετε ἀπὸ (Matt. 16:6) and προσέχετε δὲ ἀπὸ (Matt. 16:11). Marshall points out that προσέχετε is used with ἑαυτοῖς (Luke 17:3; 21:34; Acts 5:35; 20:28) and with ἀπὸ (Matt. 7:15; 10:17; 16:6,11,12). It is possible that the two constructions are here combined to give emphasis to his instructions. Because of the disciples association with Jesus, they will suffer the same persecution from the religious authorities which Jesus is about to undergo, and so they are given special instructions on singleminded devotion (Danker, 1972, p.146). This same point about the common fate of teacher and student is found in Matt. 10:24,25, the passage immediately preceding the Q passage which is our focus (Matt. 10:26-33).

In Luke, the disciples are to beware of "the leaven of the Pharisees". He has deleted the phrase "and the leaven of Herod" which is found in Mark.³ Matthew adds the phrase "and Sadducees". Mark fails to specify what Jesus is referring to and leaves his readers with a confusing pericope. Matthew points out that he is referring to the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Luke identifies the leaven of the Pharisees as hypocrisy. Fitzmyer finds this strange, since Luke never records Jesus calling the Pharisees "hypocrites", as Matthew does. He asserts that it is "almost certainly an explanation added by the evangelist" (Fitzmyer, p. 953). It certainly sums up the Pharisees and scribes as described in the previous chapter (Marshall, 1978, p. 512), and "is the opposite of the soundness or singlemindedness described in 11:33-36" (Danker, 1972, p.147). Marshall considers the verse to be derived from Q and not from Mark and that Matthew has lost the original context (Marshall, 1978, p. 510). Fitzmyer, however, thinks it more likely that Luke has taken it from his special source "L" (Fitzmyer, p.953).

iii. Luke 12:10

Following Luke 12:8,9, Luke appends a verse about speaking against the Holy Spirit (Luke 12:10). This is another verse from the triple tradition (Mark 3:29//Matt. 12:32//Luke 12:10).

³ Some manuscripts substitute the phrase "and the leaven of the Herodians" (P⁴⁵, W, Θ).

The form of the saying in Matthew and Luke contains a comparison between sinning against the Son of Man and sinning against the Holy Spirit. The Marcan form does not contain this comparison and therefore does not contain the problem of trying to understand the meaning of this rather ambiguous comparison, present in the Matthean and Lukan forms. This comparison makes the Q form much harder to understand. The agreement of Matthew and Luke against Mark is strong evidence of a Q Son of Man saying behind Matthew and Luke. Bultmann takes the Marcan form to be the more original (Bultmann, pp.130-131). Marshall thinks that the Q version was dependent on Mark or on a similar Aramaic saying, although he is aware that others take Mark's version to represent an attempt to ease the difficulties raised by the Q version (Marshall, 1978, p. 518). Fitzmyer suggests that Luke has essentially preserved the wording of the Q saying, being somewhat influenced by Mark, for example, in his use of βλασφημήσαντι (Fitzmyer, p. 962).

The context of the saying presents its own problems. In Mark and Matthew, the saying comes at the end of the Beelzebul controversy, where the scribes (so Mark) or the Pharisees (so Matthew) charge Jesus with collusion with the devil. The "unforgivable sin" would seem to have something to do with attributing Jesus' ministry to the devil. Luke places the verse in a much different setting. Luke 12:10, which says that sinning against the Son of Man is pardonable, stands in

tension with the previous saying in vss. 8 and 9, which threatens final rejection for those who deny Jesus (i.e. the Son of man). Luke may have inserted what was originally an isolated saying into the passage as a corrective. Marshall suggests that the tension with vs. 8f. may not have appeared so great to Luke (Marshall, 1978, p. 519). The catchword connections with what precedes the verse (Son of man, vs. 8) and with what follows it (Holy Spirit, vs. 12) have led some to speculate that it may stand in Luke's gospel as it did in the original Q context (Marshall, 1978, p. 516). But because of its different position in Matthew, other scholars maintain that the collocation is Lukan (Fitzmyer, p. 962). Klostermann thinks vs. 10 would have more easily followed vs. 11-12 (Klostermann, p.134). Schweizer considers vss. 10 - 12 to have already been in the Q discourse. Whatever may be the correct theory, it is most likely that Luke has imported vs. 10 from elsewhere in Q. While vs. 10 does seem to contradict vss. 8 and 9, if Luke did include vs. 10 as a corrective, it would support the tone of the passage set by Jesus' reference to his disciples as friends.

iv. Luke 12:11-12

Luke ends this section with a saying about the Holy Spirit, who will teach them in their hour of need (Luke 12:11-12). This saying is paralleled in Mark 13:11 and Matt. 10:19-20, where it is part of an apocalyptic discourse. It is a Lukan doublet, being found also at Luke 21:14. This second instance

in the Lukan apocalypse is less similar to its counterparts in the Marcan and Matthean apocalypses than is Luke 12:11-12. Fitzmyer thinks that Luke has redacted the Q saying, evident in references to "synagogues", "magistrates", and "authorities" which are absent in Matthew. He goes on to suggest that the reference to the "Holy Spirit" preserves the more original Q wording, which Matthew has modified to "the Spirit of your Father" to agree with his references to the Father in Matt. 10:29, 32 and 33 (Fitzmyer, p. 963). Because of the different wording in Luke 12:12 and Matt. 10:20, Marshall posits the idea that there were two different recensions of Q being used (Marshall, 1978, p. 510). Just as vs. 10 offers a corrective to vss. 8 and 9 so that the Son of Man does not categorically reject those who are misguided about him, vss. 11 and 12 show the role of the Holy Spirit in alleviating anxiety. If anxiety has been heightened by the graphic warning in vss. 4 and 5, Luke is concerned to balance it with a reassurance at the end of this sub-section.

With regards to context of vss. 11 and 12, some think it possible that Luke has preserved the original Q connections because of its link with the heavenly court in vss. 8 and 9, as well as with the reference to $\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\mu\nu\acute{\alpha}\omega$ which follows in vss. 22, 25 and 26, and that Matthew has re-ordered the sayings (Marshall, 1978, p. 510). The connections are strained and artificial, however, and it seems more likely that the setting was supplied by Luke. It appears that Luke has taken

vs. 10 and vss. 11-12 from Q, and reversed their order because he wanted to end with the emphasis on the instructional role of the Holy Spirit.

Luke seems to have preserved much of the Q wording in Luke 12:1-12. However, there are also indications of editorial activity such as the bringing together of originally disparate sayings, and the addition of transitional phrases and explanatory words. What he has produced is both the head-piece for a longer section of teaching on discipleship (Luke 12:1-13:21), as well as a unit designed to respond to the immediately preceding encounter with the Pharisees. His fleshing out of Luke 12:2-9 by the addition of 12:1a and the re-ordering of 12:1b, 12:10 and 12:11-12, show his redactional pen at work. The passage which he has constructed highlights the intimacy of Jesus with his disciples and his desire to relieve their anxiety. A reference to God as one who would cast them into hell seems quite out of place in this Lukan context.

CHAPTER THREE

Ἐξουσία IN LUKE

To determine to whom Luke 12:5 is a reference, it is necessary to see how Luke uses the word Ἐξουσία. This chapter will look at what Ἐξουσία signifies, who is it that can have it, in the New Testament, in early Christian belief and particularly in Luke, and, more specifically, who it is that has the necessary Ἐξουσία to cast into hell?

There is a significant body of literature on the meaning of the word Ἐξουσία and related words and concepts.¹ The intention in this section is to determine the parameters of the use of Ἐξουσία and its linguistic range. This will provide us with the options from which to understand the use of the term in Luke 12:5.

While Luke uses Ἐξουσία in Luke 12:5, Matthew uses the word δύναμις in the parallel passage in Matthew 10:28. The two words have been distinguished by scholars saying much the same

¹See e.g. G.B.Caird, Principalities and Powers(1956); W.Carr, Angels and Principalities(1981); W. Foerster, Ἐξουσία in TDNT; O. Betz, Ἐξουσία in NIDNTT, and W.Wink, Naming the Powers(1984).

thing in different words. 'Εξουσία is a word of power, or effectiveness. Barrett says it stands for "potential energy" in comparison to δύναμις, which corresponds to "kinetic energy" (Barrett, p.78). Foerster says it is "the 'ability to perform an action' to the extent that there are no hindrances in the way", while δύναμις has the sense of "intrinsic ability" (Foerster, p.562). Wink suggests that it is the right or authorization to exercise power and that "'legitimation' comes closest to catching its meaning" (Wink, p.15).

Conzelmann suggests the meaning "potential power" with δύναμις standing for "actual" power (Conzelmann, p.181). Betz says that it "denotes unrestricted possibility or freedom of action, and then power, authority, right of action" (Betz, p.606). 'Εξουσία is dependent upon δύναμις. The person with ἐξουσία is assumed to have δύναμις, or have had ἐξουσία delegated to them by someone with δύναμις. It can carry the sense of "freedom" or "permission". While it is easy to see why the two words are grouped together, it is necessary to appreciate the specific nuances each can express, and which the respective authors of Matthew and Luke may have intended.

In the LXX and other literature prior to, and contemporaneous with, the writing of the New Testament, ἐξουσία is attributed to God, but not frequently. It also refers to the authority exercised by human rulers and jurisdictions. Furthermore, it is delegated to hostile spiritual forces or beings.

A. New Testament Use

In the New Testament, the noun ἐξουσία is used one hundred and two times and the verb ἐξουσίαζω four times. It is used most frequently in Revelation, Luke and 1 Corinthians. Formally, its usage in the New Testament is closer to the LXX than to the other writings (Foerster, p.565). Ἐξουσία is used of God (Ac.1:7; Rev. 16:9); of Satan (Ac.26:18; Rev. 13:2); of Jesus (Matt. 9:6; Rev. 12:10); of his disciples (Matt. 10:1); of political jurisdictions (Luke 19:17); of the Sanhedrin (Ac. 9:14; 26:10,12); of Pilate (Luke 20:20; Jn. 19:10); of the freedom of self-determination (Ac. 5:4; 1 Cor. 7:37); of the power of kings (Rev. 17:12,13); of the government authorities (Luke 12:11; Rom. 13:1); of the state (Luke 23:7); and of the domain of spirits (Eph. 2:2; Col. 1:13) and spiritual powers (1 Cor. 15:24; Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10, 15; 1 Pet. 3:22). To see how ἐξουσία was used in the New Testament, and, therefore, to have a better perspective from which to understand Luke's use, the rest of this section will examine its use in some of the New Testament writings in more detail.

i. Revelation

In the Revelation of John, God is understood to have the final authority, but the only clear reference to it is where he is described as "the one having authority over the plagues" (Rev. 16:9). He is understood to be the one, however, who gives authority to others. Authority is given to agents of destruction and wrath, for example the pale horse whose rider

is death (6:8), locusts like scorpions (9:3,10), horses (9:19), olive trees and lampstands (11:6), an angel (14:18; 18:1), and the second death (20:6). Authority is also given to his Christ who is then victorious (12:10), and to the saints who persevere (2:26; 22:14). Satan, or the dragon, has received authority, which he gives to the first beast (13:2), causing men to worship the dragon (13:4), an authority extending over "every tribe and people and tongue and nation" (13:7). A second beast appears who also exercises this same authority (13:12), and ten kings are to receive authority and will hand it over to the beast (17:12,13). The defeat of Satan at the hands of Michael and his angels is the sign of the arrival of God's kingdom and Christ's authority:

ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δύναμις
καὶ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν
καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ,
ὅτι ἐβλήθη ὁ κατήγων τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν,
ὁ κατηγορῶν αὐτοὺς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός.

(Rev. 12:10)

It is noteworthy that in the hymns of Revelation which ascribe to God many things close in meaning to ἐξουσία (e.g., ἄγιος, ἄγιος, δόξα, τιμή, δύναμις, θρόνος, μεγάλα, θαυμαστά, σωτηρία, παντοκράτωρ), Rev. 12:10 contains the only occurrence of ἐξουσία and it is applied not to God, but only to his Christ.

ii. Paul

In the Pauline and deutero-Pauline letters, ἐξουσία is used in varied ways. In Paul's letter to the Romans, there is an instance of authority used metaphorically of God (Rom. 9:21),

and clear statements about God being the one who has instituted all authority, and that there is no authority apart from him (Rom. 13:1). Paul is very conscious of having received this authority from God to validate his apostolic ministry (2 Cor. 10:8). This authority was given for the building up of the church (2 Cor 10:8; 13:10), and has concrete ramifications for the apostle (1 Cor. 9:4,5,6,12). In Ephesians, Colossians and Titus, there are a number of instances of ἐξουσία being used in the plural or collective singular to denote powers or principalities. There is no precedent for this in Hellenism or pagan Gnosticism, according to Foerster, although he points out that there is a similar use in some books of the pseudepigrapha, for example Asc. Isa. 1:4; 2:2; Test. Lev. 3:8; Slav. En. 20; Test. Sol. 20:14ff (Foerster, p.571). These are abstract representations of hosts and domains which in Ephesians, Colossians and Titus are used to show the extent of Christ's victory and pre-eminence (Eph. 1:21; 3:10; 6:12; Col. 1:16; 2:10,15; also 1 Cor. 15:24). They have clearly set themselves up against God and his kingdom (Eph. 6:12). Satan is described as τὸν ἄρχοντα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ αἵματος (Eph. 2:2), and the evil realm has τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκοτοῦς (Col. 1:13; cf. Luke 22:53).

iii. The Gospel of John

In the Gospel of John, there are no references to God's having authority, but there are three references to God bestowing authority (5:27; 17:2; 19:11). Jesus, in his confrontation

with Pilate, acknowledges that Pilate has a certain authority, but that what he does have comes, not from Pilate himself, but from God (19:10,11). Jesus claims to possess authority over his own life (10:18), and it is said that he can bestow authority on those who believe on his name to become children of God (1:12).

iv. The Synoptic Gospels

The study of the occurrences of ἐξουσία in the Synoptic gospels is more crucial to our particular study, so it may be helpful to lay it out in table form:

Table 1

References to Authority in the Triple Tradition

1. Authoritative Teaching of Jesus
(Matt. 7:29//Mark 1:22[27]//Luke 4:32[36])
2. Authority of the Son of Man
(Matt. 9:1-8//Mark 2:1-12//Luke 5:17-26)
3. Jesus' Authority Delegated to His Disciples
(Matt. 10:1-42//Mark 6:6-13//Luke 9:1-6)
4. Authority of Jesus Questioned
(Matt. 21:23-27//Mark 11:27-33//Luke 20:1-8)

Table 2

A Reference to Authority in the Double Tradition

1. A Centurion's Authority and Jesus' Authority
(Matt. 8:5-13//Luke 7:1-10)

Table 3

Occurrences Unique to Each Synoptic Gospel

1. Matthew
 - a. People Marvel at Jesus' Authority
(9:8)
 - b. Authority Given to Jesus
(28:18)
2. Mark
 - a. The Twelve Disciples Given Authority by Jesus
(3:15)
 - b. A Nobleman Gives Authority in His Absence
(13:34)
 - (c. Authority of Satan
[Mark 16:14 W text])
3. Luke
 - a. Satan Claims To Have Been Given Authority
(4:6)
 - b. Authority Given to the Disciples by Jesus
(10:19)
 - c. Authority to Cast Into Hell
(12:5)
 - d. Disciples Brought Before Rulers and Authorities
(12:11)
 - e. Authority Over Ten Cities Given to Faithful Servant
(19:17)
 - f. Jesus Handed Over To The Authority of the Governor
(20:20)
 - g. Jesus Acknowledges The Authority of Darkness
(22:53)
 - h. Herod's Authority
(23:7)

It is important to note that there is no clear reference in the Synoptics to God having authority. There are three references to God giving authority. In Matthew 9:18, God is named specifically as the one giving authority, and in Matthew 28:18 and Luke 4:6, it is implied. God is assumed to have authority, but there is no clear articulation of that fact.

All three Synoptics record the incident of Jesus being questioned about his authority by the chief priests and elders for doing "these things", referring to the events surrounding the cleansing of the Temple (Matt. 21:23-27//Mark 11:27-33//Luke 20:1-8). They ask the question in two slightly different ways: i) "By what authority are you doing these things?" and ii) "Who gave you this authority?" Jesus refuses to answer their question, but does so in terms of the former form of the question, rather than the second: "Neither will I tell you by what authority I do these things." Not only is God not portrayed here as possessing authority, but he is not named as the one who has given it. All the passages shared by three Synoptic gospels have to do with Jesus' authority. Jesus' teaching is with authority, unlike that of the scribes; Jesus has authority to forgive sins; Jesus has delegated this authority to his disciples; and he is challenged by the chief priests and scribes to declare from whence his authority has come.

The one passage referring to authority common to both Matthew and Luke (Matt. 8:5-13//Luke 7:1-10), that of the centurion and his claim to have authority, is somewhat problematic. In his discussion of this passage in Luke, Caird points out that the dialogue in Matthew is almost identical, "but the narrative setting is as different as it could be. It is possible that only the dialogue stood in Q, with the briefest indication of attendant circumstances" (Caird, p.

108). It is presumably meant to highlight the nature of Jesus' authority, rather than to make a comment on Roman authority. It is unclear, however, whether the centurion's comparison of himself with Jesus' is meant to portray Jesus being under authority as well as Jesus being in authority over others. In commenting on the variants in the Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac version of Matt. 8:9, which mention only the centurion's possession of authority, Fitzmyer suggests that they "reflect an attempt to cope with the implication of the Greek text, made even more pronounced by Luke's addition of *τασσομενος*, that Jesus too was somehow under authority" (Fitzmyer, p.653). Jeremias argues for an Aramaic original which was misunderstood (Jeremias, 1958, p.30, n.4)².

a. Matthew

The two passages unique to Matthew both involve a statement of Jesus being given authority by God, once recognized by the people (9:8), and once claimed by Jesus himself (28:18).

b. Mark

In the passages unique to Mark, Jesus is seen to be delegating authority to his disciples (3:15), and telling a parable about a nobleman giving authority to his servants in anticipation of his absence (Mk. 13:34). In the passages shared in the

²Cf. T. W. Manson, p.65; Black, pp. 158ff, who support Jeremias. See also S. H. Hooke, *ExpTim* 69(1957)79-80.

Synoptics, as well as those unique to Matthew and Mark, ἐξουσία is used solely of the authority which Jesus has, which he has received, and which he gives to his disciples. The one possible exception is in the reading in Mark 16:14 found in Codex W from the fifth century, and in some Greek manuscripts known to Jerome. They include the phrase: καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ἐκείνοις προσέλεγεν ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ ὅρος τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ. This is of interest because of the idea of Satan having authority which developed in some circles within the early church.

c. Luke - Acts

In the writings of Luke there is a much more extensive and varied use of ἐξουσία. In his gospel, Luke uses the noun sixteen times and the verb once, compared to the ten times each for Matthew and Mark, who only employ the noun. Conzelmann characterizes Luke's use of the word as more "formal", noting the "positive redemptive meaning" of the word in Matthew and Mark in contrast to Luke's wider use which includes the ἐξουσία of the adversary. Conzelmann suggests that the special nuance in Luke's doctrine of Satan is that the power which Satan has granted is limited (p.181). Barrett charges that "Luke is not careful in his use of the word", saying that he seems to treat δύναμις and ἐξουσία as synonymous (p.78). Luke ascribes ἐξουσία to a wide assortment of people. He refers to the ἐξουσία of political figures, such as Roman centurion (7:8), Pilate (20:20), and Herod (23:7).

He alone of the synoptic writers uses ἐξουσία in the plural, referring to the disciples being brought before τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας (12:11). Leaving out of consideration Luke 12:5 for the moment, Luke also uses ἐξουσία of Satan (4:6) and of the spiritual force of darkness (22:53). In Luke, there is only one reference to God either having or giving authority, and that is the authority which Satan claims to have been given, presumably by God (4:6).

To compare the conception of divine authority in the four gospels, Mark does not refer to God as either having or giving it, Matthew and John portray him as giving it to Jesus, and Luke has him giving it not to Jesus but to Satan. While in John ἐξουσία is graphically portrayed as being the gift of God, even when it will be used in the condemnation and death of Jesus (19:10-11), only in Luke is ἐξουσία seen in a negative or misappropriated sense. Satan is presented as one who has authority and with it seeks to tempt Jesus from his mission (4:6). And in the arrest of Jesus, the force and domain of darkness is recognized to have an authority (22:53; cf. Col. 1:13).

In the Acts of the Apostles, ἐξουσία is used seven times. Three times it refers to the authority of the chief priests (9:14; 26:10,12), once it refers to the autonomy of Ananias (5:4), and once it refers to the the authority of Peter and John which Simon Magus wishes to purchase (8:19). As in his

gospel, Luke includes a reference to the authority of Satan (τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ, 26:18), but in distinction from his gospel, he does attribute authority to God, by which God has fixed the times and seasons (1:7).

B. Conclusions

From the above investigations, it can be concluded that it is an oversimplification to say that God has all the authority and, therefore, that Luke 12:5 must be a reference to God. The witness of the New Testament, and particularly of Luke, is that others also have authority. Ἐξουσία was handed over to Jesus, who passed it on to his disciples. Political and religious leaders have and exercise authority, and spiritual forces arrayed against God and the Son of Man claim an authority recognized by the writers of at least some New Testament books. Luke more than any of the gospels provides us with many recipients of authority. Primarily, it is Jesus who has received this authority, who exercises it, and passes it on to his disciples, so that they might defeat the power of the enemy (10:19). The rulers and leaders with whom Jesus comes into contact have an authority which they exercise. Then, also, the realm of darkness has an authority, as does it's prince, Satan, who has presumably received it from God. But only in his second book, the Acts of the Apostles, does Luke explicitly refer to God himself having authority.

CHAPTER FOUR

SATAN

Luke, compared to the other synoptic gospels, presents a very distinctive view of the evil one. All three synoptics share the portrayal of Satan in the following pericopes: i) the Temptation Story (Matt. 4:1-11//Mark 1:12-13//Luke 4:1-13), ii) the Beelzebul Controversy (Matt. 12:22-30[and 9:32-34]//Mark 3:22-27//Luke 11:14-15), and iii) the Parable of the Sower (Matt. 13:1-23//Mark 4:1-20//Luke 8:4-15). These passages were common to Mark and possibly Q, and confluations of all three are found in Matthew and Luke. What is of particular interest to the focus of this section, however, are the redactional elements in Luke and the material unique to his gospel.

A. Temptation Story

(Mark 1:12-13//Matt. 4:1-11//Luke 4:1-13)

Mark's temptation story is a mere sketch of two verses. He does not enumerate Satan's challenges or Jesus' responses. He alone designates the tempter as "Satan" (σατανᾶς), while Matthew and Luke use "the devil" (διαβόλος), suggesting that this is the original Q wording. Matthew and Luke record the story in similar terms, yet there are two points to be noticed here. First, in Luke, the devil offers Jesus the authority

(ἐξουσία) of all the kingdoms of the world, claiming that this has been delivered to him (vs. 6). This addition of Luke's highlights his interest in authority, which manifests itself in the theme of conflict surrounding Jesus, and Luke's willingness to perceive Satan as being in possession of authority.

Second, Luke tells us that the devil, rather than simply leaving him, departs "until an opportune time" (ἄχρι καιροῦ; vs. 13). Conzelmann builds and elaborate theory on the basis of this phrase. Picking up the view of older commentators (J. Weiss, J. Wellhausen), he suggests that this begins a Satan-free period in Jesus' ministry. While it is not necessary to follow Conzelmann's understanding of this text, his treatment does show Luke's interest in Satan's strategy and modus operandi.

B. Beelzebul Controversy

(Mark 3:22-27//Matt. 12:22-30[9:32-34]//Luke 11:14-23)

In this pericope, all three Synoptics use the titles "Satan" and "the prince of darkness" (ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων). After Jesus refutes charges that he is possessed by, or in league with, Beelzebul, he relates the parable of the strong man sitting securely in his house. To plunder the house, the strong man must first be dealt with. Matthew and Mark record Jesus as saying that one must first bind the strong man (ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον δῆσῃ τὸν ἰσχυρόν). Luke, on the other hand, uses

much stronger language. The strong man is "fully armed" (καθωπλισμένος), "guarding" (φυλάσσει) his "court-yard" or "palace" (αὐλήν instead of οἰκίαν as in Matthew and Mark). The one intent on plundering the palace is described as "one stronger" (ἰσχυρότερος), who "assails" (ἐπελθὼν) and "conquers" (νικήσει) him, taking away the armour in which he trusted (τὴν πανοπλίαν αὐτοῦ αἶρει ἐφ' ἣ ἐπεποίθει) and divides his spoil (καὶ τὰ σκῦλα αὐτοῦ διαδίδωσιν). This more graphic and descriptive account will be seen to be characteristic of Luke's more detailed conception of the evil one, and the struggle between Satan and the Son of God.

C. The Parable of the Sower

(Mark 4:1-20//Matt. 13:1-23//Luke 8:4-15)

In the Parable of the Sower, a few factors stand out which highlight Luke's conception of the evil one. In the parable itself, all three writers record that some seed fell on the path, and birds came and ate it. Luke adds that before it was devoured, it was "trodden under foot" (καὶ κατεπατήθη). In the interpretation, the one who devours the seed on the path is named as "Satan" in Mark, "the evil one" in Matthew, and "the devil" in Luke. Their descriptions of the activity of Satan are merely variations on a theme, but Luke alone adds the diabolical purpose behind the devouring: "that they may not believe and be saved" (ἵνα μὴ πιστεύσαντες σωθῶσιν; vs. 12).

In summary, Matthew and Mark give a very limited picture of the evil one and the provenance of his activity. Luke, on the other hand, gives many more indications of who Satan is, where he is and what he is doing. In Luke, Satan offers authority to Jesus, claiming that it has been given to him. In the Beelzebul passage, Luke uses stronger and more descriptive language of Satan. And, finally, Luke articulates Satan's purpose in devouring the seed, which is "that they may not believe". Besides these distinctives in the passages shared with Mark and Matthew, Luke presents other aspects of Satan.

D. Luke 10:18-19

When the seventy disciples return from their mission, they rejoice and boast that even the demons were subject to them in Jesus' name. Jesus' response was:

ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ. (Luke 10:18,19)

It is unclear if the phrase ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ is meant to modify "Satan", or "lightning". The first option would portray Satan as first of all being in heaven and then falling out of it. The second option would present a vaguer picture of Satan, not assuming he was in heaven, but that he fell in the same way that a star falls from the sky. The former, "I saw Satan falling from heaven, as a star" would fit the story of Job where Satan is inhabiting the heavenly courts, and the

apocryphal story of the fall of Satan when he is defeated by Michael. For this reason it is to be preferred.

Jesus' response also ascribes a certain power (δύναμις) to the enemy. This power of the enemy is recognized by Jesus, but it is now to be overcome by the authority given by Jesus to his disciples. There seems to be a categorical jump from snakes and scorpions to the host of spiritual enemies, but Schweizer, in his commentary, cites a passage from Sifre Deuteronomy 193 which speaks of serpents, scorpions and evil spirits as "a combination from which the redeemer will one day free the human race" (Schweizer, p. 178). Luke, in this passage, gives a picture of the power of Satan and the fall of Satan. Luke also shows how the disciples, in their ministry, have been given an authority which is greater than Satan's power, so that nothing shall hurt them.

E. Luke 13:10-17

Although it is implied in the other gospels, only in Luke is Satan, in distinction from evil spirits, explicitly credited with causing physical ailments. Luke 13:10-17 tells the story of the Crippled Woman Healed on the Sabbath. At the beginning of the passage she is described thus: "A woman was there who had been crippled by a spirit for eighteen years" (vs. 11).

Jesus then tells her that she is set free from her infirmity. The synagogue ruler is indignant at this "healing", and in Jesus' response the woman is referred to as "ταύτην δὲ

θυγατέρα Ἀβραὰμ οὖσαν, ἣν ἔδωκεν ὁ σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη" (vs. 16). This is described as a "healing" and not an exorcism, but the sickness is attributed to a spirit, and the ultimate responsibility is laid at Satan's door (vs.16). He is obviously seen as someone who is adversely affecting and afflicting human beings.

F. Luke 22:3

Εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν τὸν καλούμενον Ἰσκαριώτην, ὄντα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα.

The next reference to Satan is in Luke 22:3, the beginning of the Passion Narrative, where it is said that Satan entered Judas. Satan may have fallen from heaven, and the authority of the disciples may have been declared to be sufficient to overcome the power of the enemy, but Satan is still able to possess one of them. Luke again presents Satan as one with malicious intentions and influence.

G. Luke 22:31-32

(31) Σίμων Σίμων, ἰδοὺ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς τοῦ σιναῖσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον· (32) ἐγὼ δὲ ἔδεήθην περὶ σοῦ ἵνα μὴ ἐκλίπῃ ἡ πίστις σου καὶ σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου.

The Lucan Jesus here warns Peter about the satanic trial which will test all the disciples, and reassures Peter of his prayers for him in particular. The "you" of vs. 31 is plural (ὑμᾶς), but the "you" in vs. 32 is singular(σοῦ). Satan's demand is for all of the apostolic band, and Peter is given a

key role in strengthening them in the ensuing battle. H. Stahlin understands the verb ἐξητήσατο to mean "demand the surrender of" the disciples (Stahlin, p.194). Fitzmyer states that "the satanic plot that will bring about the passion of Jesus will test the fidelity of the apostles;" (Fitzmyer, p.1424). Satan's role in distracting the disciples of Jesus from their faith is shown explicitly by Luke. Satan's desire to sift them like wheat is a satanic testing or temptation which is very reminiscent of Job.

H. Acts

Not only is Satan present in the passion of Jesus, but in the early church he makes his presence felt as well. Peter challenges Ananias in Acts 5:3 "Why has Satan filled your heart?" Later, Peter, summarizing the gospel for Cornelius and his household, tells his listeners how Jesus had had to confront his adversary:

Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὃς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διῆλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου

Acts 10:38

This is an indication of the power/authority struggle going on in Jesus' ministry, a struggle with all the hosts of evil, and focussed especially on Satan, the chief of demons.

Finally, as Luke records Paul's commissioning by Jesus on the Damascus road, he couches it in the same confrontational terms, this time between Satan and God rather than Satan and

Jesus:

(17b) εἰς οὓς ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω σε (18) ἀνοῖξαι ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι ἀπὸ σκοτόυς εἰς φῶς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν Θεόν,

Acts 26:17b-18a

This bold acknowledgement of the authority of Satan by Luke should caution us against reading Luke 12:5 too quickly as a reference to God.

I. The Power to Cast Into Hell

It was noted in Chapter Two that Matthew and Luke each describe the one the disciples are to fear in different terms. Matthew describes him as τὸν δυνάμενον ... ἀπολέσαι ἐν γέεννῃ (Matt.10:28), while Luke's phrase is ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν γέενναν (Luke 12:5). Commentators on Luke's gospel seem to have taken this authority to cast into hell as conclusive evidence that the reference is to God. They appear to think that to ascribe this capacity to anyone other than God would threaten his supreme position of authority and sovereignty. However, God's supreme authority is not in question. Luke does not imply that the one they are to fear has all power and authority, but refers only to the authority "to cast into hell". It is this qualifier, this notion of casting into hell, that will be the focus in this section. The question is whether this is to be taken as a sign of ultimate authority, or whether it can refer to a delegated authority to carry out a specific task.

In the same chapter as Luke records Jesus' injunction to fear him who has authority to cast into hell, he records a parable where someone is "casting" a guilty person into jail (Luke 12:57-59). While it would be unwise to put too much weight on the teaching of one parable, if it can be shown that Luke deliberately recorded a judge delegating to a subordinate the task of casting the guilty into jail, it would provide one more reason to exercise caution in limiting the authority in Luke 12:5 to God. In this parable there is an example of an incident where the responsibility of carrying out a judgement, in this case the throwing of the accused into prison, is portrayed as distinct from the prerogative of judging. It is a Q passage (Matt. 5:25-26//Luke 12:57-59), but has been placed in different contexts in the two gospels. In Luke, the parable is found within a larger section on discipleship addressed to both disciples and the crowd (Luke 12:1-13:21). In Matthew it is part of the so-called antitheses in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5:17-48). It follows Jesus' teaching on the need to be reconciled to a brother before offering one's gifts (Matt. 5:21-24). In Luke, it is preceded by teachings on the division which Jesus will provoke (Luke 12:49-53) and the disciples' need to interpret the signs of the times (Luke 12:54-55). Fitzmyer does not think the passage fits the context in Luke. He says the teaching "may be a completely unrelated topic" and "wholly unrelated to the foregoing context in the Lucan travel account" (Fitzmyer, pp.1001-2). Talbert points out that Luke employs the parable

to counsel escape from the enemy, while Matthew encourages reconciliation (Talbert, p. 140). Gundry terms Matthew's "a parable of reconciliation rather than of eschatology", as it is in Luke (Gundry, p. 87). If Luke's emphasis is on the Judgement in the eschaton, then this parable would support a theory which posited Satan being given the task of carrying out God's punishment. In that case it would be much easier to read Luke 12:5 as a reference to Satan.

Luke employs the construction $\delta\acute{o}\varsigma \epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\chi\theta\alpha\iota$. Marshall suggests that $\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\omega\mu\iota \epsilon\rho\gamma\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ is a Latinism meaning "take pains to do something" and that it is probably Lukan (Marshall, 1978, p. 546). $\acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\sigma\omega$ means "to be reconciled" but the middle form, as used here, means "to depart" (cf. Acts 19:12), emphasized by the following preposition $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$. It seems that Luke has deliberately chosen the middle voice, as well as the perfect tense, which implies that the adversary will go away and not come back (Marshall, 1978, p. 551). Matthew has changed this phrase to the more positive and reconciliatory $\acute{\iota}\sigma\theta\iota \epsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron\omega\nu$, "make friends with", and moved it to the beginning of the parable, thereby putting reconciliation at the forefront of the teaching (Gundry, p. 86). Luke's emphasis is upon the diligence in avoiding compromise, a thrust similar to Luke 12:1-12.

The Lukan parable speaks of four people with whom the accused will have to deal on the way to jail: an accuser ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$), a

magistrate (ἄρχων), a judge (κριτής), and a jailer (πράκτωρ). Caird argues that "God himself plays the triple part of prosecutor, judge and constable" (Caird, 1965-66, 37). It is probable that the magistrate and the judge represent God, but less likely for the accuser. Geldenhuys claims that "Ἀρχων without the article refers to the idea of authority and thus God is ultimately meant as the supreme Bearer of real Authority" (Geldenhuys, p. 369). Klostermann takes the accuser to be Satan (Klostermann, p. 141). The word used here for the accuser, ἀντίδικος, is the same as is used to describe the devil in 1 Peter 5:8.

The identity of the jailer is also open to various possibilities. He is the one with the responsibility of casting the guilty into the dungeon. He has not passed judgement himself, but has been given the task of carrying out the sentence. Both Luke's use of the term πράκτωρ, and Matthew's use of ὑπηρέτης in the parallel passage indicate someone who carries out the sentence passed by the court. This is someone subordinate to, but authorized by, a higher power. He does not have the power or authority in and of himself. The terms, however, do carry somewhat different connotations. Luke's redaction seems to have "made use of more technical Roman judicial terms in contrast to the Matthean form" (Fitzmyer, p. 1001; see also Klostermann, p. 141). Marshall claims that πράκτωρ "is generally taken to be the official in a Roman judicial system, whereas ὑπηρέτης

...is the Jewish synagogue official" (Marshall, 1978, p. 551; see also Jeremias, 1972, p.27)). There is also an alternative understanding in which the ὑπηρέτης is taken to be the court official responsible for executing the sentence in both Hellenistic and Jewish practice, and the πράκτωρ is seen to have "the more restricted sense of the official who dealt with the debts and was in charge of the debtors prison" (Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, p. 704; see also Rengstorff, p.539). This distinction would make sense in Luke's parable where it is more likely the πράκτωρ who would cast the debtor into the cell. In any case, it is quite possible to understand the jailer as representing Satan. This is supported by Grundmann's comments on Luke 12:5//Matt. 10:28 where he argues that Satan is the one who rules over the place of destruction and carries out the punishment (Grundmann, p.253).

Another instance in which Satan functions as a jailer is found in Revelation 2:10. There the writer warns of Satan casting the faithful into prison:

ἰδοὺ μέλλει βάλλειν ὁ διάβολος ἐξ ὑμῶν εἰς φυλακὴν
Rev. 2:10

What is implied is that Satan has enough authority and control over the Christian community to be able to cast some into prison. The Christians "must recognize that while the persecution would be carried out by Roman authorities, it was in reality the devil himself who was responsible for their plight" (Mounce, p.93). This suggests that Satan may also have

authority to cast into hell and for that reason he should be feared (cf. Luke 12:5).

The thought of Satan having power to influence humans and even to have a role within God's plan of salvation is brought out in a number of places in the New Testament. In 1 Cor. 5:5 Paul instructs the Corinthian church that a person is to be delivered to Satan with the hope that in the end he might be saved, or more specifically, that his spirit might be saved. In 1 Tim. 1:19,20 the writer says:

(19) ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν, ἣν τινες ἀπώσαμένοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν, (20) ὃν ἐστὶν Ὑμέναιος καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος, οὓς παρέδωκα τῷ σατανᾷ, ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν.

Elsewhere in Luke's writing, this picture of Satan being allowed a place and a role in God's economy is brought out. In Acts 2:23, Luke records Peter's statement that Jesus was delivered up "according to the definite plan and foreknowledge of God". If this is read in light of Luke 22:3, then it is plausible to see that Luke ascribes an active role in God's plan to Satan. That this could include Satan acting as the one who has been given the authority to cast into hell (Luke 12:5) is not an unreasonable assumption.

J. Conclusions

Luke presents to his readers a developed conception of the great adversary. He is called by various names: Satan, the devil, the enemy, Beelzebul, and the prince of demons. He can

afflict people so that they need supernatural healing; he demands to have the apostles that he might sift them like wheat. He enters Judas and Ananias. He is ascribed power as well as authority, both in Luke's gospel and in the Acts of the Apostles. This developed conception of the evil one stands in contrast to the other Synoptics, and is like that in the writings of the Qumran community (cf. 1QS 1:18,23; 2:19; 3:23; 4:12; 1QM 13:5f.; 14:9; 17:5ff.; CD 2:4). Luke, more than the other Synoptics, gives us a developed view of Satan, and of the conflict between Satan and Jesus. He paints a more graphic picture in the parable of the Binding of the Strong Man (Luke 11:14-23), and tells of the authority given to the disciples to ensure their victory in the battle against the power of the enemy (Luke 10:17ff.). As in other places in the New Testament, Luke shows how Satan is used in the divine scheme. In Luke's gospel a reference to Satan having authority would not at all be incongruous and would indeed fit very well into his narrative.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONFLICT IN LUKE

Conflict is certainly a theme in the gospel of Luke as shown by the growing body of literature dealing with the issue.¹ Jesus comes into conflict with those around him, as will his disciples. Part of his instructions to his followers is to warn them and counsel them how to respond to this inevitability. In this final section, it is this theme of conflict that will be looked at, and in particular at Jesus' descriptions of his disciples, his Father and his enemies. It will be shown how the descriptions used by Jesus give indications of where the true conflict lies, and how these point in the direction of Luke 12:5 being a reference to Satan and not to God. The true conflict is not with any earthly opponents, as the disciples might be tempted to think, but with their spiritual opponent, Satan, and in Luke, Jesus takes pains to instruct them about their conduct in this conflict.

A. The Disciples as Friends

The way in which the disciples are addressed by Jesus is

¹See, for example, J. B. Tyson, "Conflict as a Literary Theme in the Gospel of Luke," in New Synoptic Studies. Ed. Wm. Farmer. See also R. Brawley, Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation.

significant. By his use of τοῖς φίλοις μου (Lk.12:4), Luke sets the tone of the passage in a very deliberate and definite way. As has been mentioned previously, this is the only place in the Synoptic gospels where Jesus addresses his disciples with this intimate form of address. Ellis says it refers to "those who will suffer for his sake" (p.175). Jesus is portrayed as nurturing a special, intimate and trusting relationship with his disciples. It is hard to conceive of Luke at this point having Jesus refer to God as one of whom the disciples should be afraid. Coming so shortly after his unique and tender form of addressing his disciples, it is jarring to say the least.

The way in which God is characterized by Jesus in Luke 12:6 and 7 is also significant. Luke portrays Jesus seeking to develop a trusting relationship between the disciples and their heavenly Father. If Luke 12:5 refers to God, then the description of him as one they should fear seems inconsistent. The rest of the immediate context describes God as one who remembers even the sparrows and who numbers the very hairs of the heads of the disciples (Luke 12:6,7). This is picked up and expanded upon later in the chapter where the disciples are instructed not to "be anxious", a concept parallel to not being afraid. In Luke 12:22-31, God is portrayed feeding the ravens and clothing the lilies. If God will do such things, then how much more will he take care of those who trust in him. Then follow the tender words in Luke 12:32: "Fear not,

little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom". The phrase "little flock" (τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον) is unique in the New Testament, and reflects the concept of God's special relationship with, and care for, the disciples of Jesus which began in Luke 12:4. In Luke 12:30 and 32, the gospel uses the term "Father" when referring to God. Their Father knows that they need food and clothing, and it is His good pleasure to give them the kingdom. In light of such a presentation of the character of the Father, a reference to him as the one who might well cast them into hell is incongruous.

It is worth noting that Jesus, in Luke 12:4, uses the same phrase "fear not" as the angelic messengers use in the introductory chapters of Luke's gospel. In the Birth Narratives, Luke has angels speaking these comforting words at Luke 1:13; 1:30; and 2:10. Thereafter, Jesus takes over this role which had been the domain of the angels (5:10; 8:50; 12:4; 12:7; and 12:32). Each case involves reassurance to those who have been unsettled by the revelation or appearance of a divine messenger or epiphany. They are gently rebuked for their expression of fear. Only once in the gospel of Luke is it considered appropriate to fear, and that is the verse under consideration in this study. It would be quite unusual if after the numerous injunctions to "fear not" at the visit of a heavenly being, the disciples were then counselled to fear God after all. It makes much more sense if the passage is

understood as a caution to fear the evil one.

B. Conflict with Enemies

Jesus' command to fear the one who has authority to cast into hell is the second half of a contrast. The disciples' fear of this one (Luke 12:5) is to replace their natural fear of those who can only kill the body (Luke 12:4). To understand properly who Luke might have in mind in Luke 12:5, it is helpful to look more closely at the identities of the enemies in Luke 12:4.

Luke may have had a more specific group in mind when he recorded Jesus' cautionary words in Luke 12:4. It seems probable that only the Romans had the authority to put people to death, and so it is possible that Luke would have understood Jesus to be making a reference to the Romans as the threat to the lives of the disciples. But it is unlikely that Luke was highlighting the Romans, as he is quite silent on them in the rest of his gospel. Even in the passion narrative, they are portrayed as passive pawns of the Jewish leaders. The only reference to someone being put to death up to this point in Luke's gospel is the beheading of John the Baptist by Herod the tetrarch (9:7-9).

The passage under consideration (12:1-12) is preceded by a section on conflict with the Pharisees (11:37-52). This section ends with the Pharisees lying in wait for Jesus. Then

in Luke 12:1, a transition verse, Luke records Jesus specifically cautioning his disciples against the Pharisees and their hypocrisy. But that Luke intended the Pharisees to be the group understood by the reference in Luke 12:4 is unlikely because not only is there no reference to them killing anyone, but, as Conzelmann points out, the Pharisees drop out of sight during the Trial and Passion sections of Luke's gospel. He suggests that the opponents in Luke's gospel are, for the most part, the chief priests and the scribes (Luke 22:2; Conzelmann, p.78).

It is possible that Luke had the rulers of the Jews in mind when he included Luke 12:4. Certainly, that is the sense of the passages where Jesus predicts his death (9:22). It also fits in well with the prediction that follows in Luke 12:11, that they will be brought before "synagogues and the rulers and the authorities".

It is possible that Luke has in mind the distinction between the earthly and the spiritual realm. Human enemies are able to kill you. Yet, as violent and as terrifying as that might be, they cannot cast anyone into hell. Nevertheless, there is one who can do just that. Thus it is necessary to fear that one more than, or instead of, those whose realm of influence is restricted to this world. In light of the fact that Jesus' discourse is about enemies, Satan fits the reference better than does God, since Luke does not portray God as our enemy.

Luke attempts to show that the real conflict is not with the Jews or their leaders, but with a much subtler and more dangerous enemy, Satan. In Luke's portrayal, Jesus certainly comes into conflict with those around him, especially the Jewish leaders. Yet in Luke 12:5 Jesus points out that the true enemies are not the Jews. Jesus does not say "Beware of the Pharisees" but rather "Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees which is hypocrisy". The Pharisees are not a real danger to the disciples. They can do no more harm than any other human opponent. But if the disciples were to become like Pharisees, ie. hypocritical, they would be harmed indeed. This corresponds to the role of the devil as seen in Luke 4 where his role is that of Tempter, tempting Jesus to compromise the integrity of his mission. It would be entirely consistent for Jesus to caution his disciples to fear this Satan who would tempt them to compromise their faith through hypocrisy.

Jesus' reference to his disciples as τοῖς φίλοις μου (Luke 12:4), his characterization of his Father as the protector and provider (Luke 12:6,7), and the setting of this verse within the context of Jesus' warning about enemies give cumulative support to the position that Luke 12:5 is a reference to Satan. That Luke deliberately constructed this passage out of verses from other contexts, intentionally bringing them together, reinforces that view.

CONCLUSIONS

Although the weight of scholarship has read Luke 12:5 as a reference to God, a few notable exceptions have understood it to be a reference to Satan. Scholars such as Stier, Oosterzee and Lange (although he later changed his mind) in the last century, and Lampe, Conzelmann and Wink in this century have come to the conclusion that the evidence points to Satan as the one Jesus was cautioning his disciples to fear.

Luke 12:5 is a Q passage, and from a comparison with Matthew 10:28, Luke's editorial activity can be detected and studied. He was apparently a competent editor and gathered his material and constructed his work so that it would present a particular message. Unfortunately, he left us a verse which must be considered less than clear in light of the division in scholarly opinion over its proper interpretation. In Luke 12:1-12, Luke has arranged his material to place this injunction to fear the one who can cast into hell within a setting in which the disciples are addressed as friends, God is characterized as caring and enemies are identified. While Satan is not named, the context points to it being a reference to the disciple's heavenly enemy in distinction from their earthly enemy.

The word ἐξουσία plays an important role in the definition or description of the one who is to be feared. In Luke, this word is applied to many more people and categories than any of the other synoptic gospels. Satan is ascribed authority in a couple of places, and so it would come as no great surprise if this reference to authority also applied to Satan.

The picture that Luke gives of Satan is more complete and graphic than the other synoptics. Satan claims authority, and is seen to have influence in this earthly realm, and even possibly a place in the will of God. The presentation we have from Luke is reminiscent of the picture of Satan that is given in Job.

Finally, the description of Jesus' disciples as friends, the picture of God as one who is minutely concerned for the disciples, and the reality of enemy opposition, make the position that Luke 12:5 is a reference to God very tenuous. To see it as a reference to Satan makes better sense of the passage. The aim of this thesis has been a modest one, and in New Testament scholarship it is virtually impossible to arrive at a conclusion with absolute certainty. However, the evidence points to Satan as the one Luke has intended us to fear, and not God.

Bibliography

- Adeney, W. F.
1901. St. Luke. Edinburgh: T.C. & E.C. Jack, Ltd.
- Augustine.
1888 "Expositions on the Book of Psalms: Psalm 64," in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st Series. Vol. 8. Ed. A. Cleveland Coxe. New York: The Christian Literature Company. Pp.263-267.
- 1887 "Treatise on Grace and Free Will," in Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers. 1st Series. Vol. 5. Ed. Philip Schaff. Trans. P. Holmes and R.E.Wallis. Translation revised by B.B. Warfield. New York: The Christian Literature Company. Pp.443-465.
- Barrett, C.K.
1947. The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition. London: SPCK.
- Betz, O.
1976. "εὐαγγέλιον," in The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology. Vol. 2. Ed. Colin Brown. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Black, M.
1967. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. 3rd Ed. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Brawley, R.
1987. Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology and Conciliation. SBL Monograph Series 23. Atlanta: Scholars.
- Bruce, F.F.
1972. New Testament History. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Bultmann, R.
1968. History of the Synoptic Tradition. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Caird, G.B.
1965-66. "Expounding the Parables: 1. The Defendant (Matt. 5:25f., Luke 12:58f.)." ExpT 77 (1965-1966)36-39.
1963. The Gospel of St. Luke. London: A. & C. Black.
1956. Principalities and Powers: A Study in Pauline Theology. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Calvin, J.
1972. A Harmony of the Gospels, Vol. 1. Trans. A.W. Morrison. Ed. D.W. Torrance and T.F. Torrance. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Carr, W.
1981. Angels and Principalities. Cambridge: University Press.
- Cassidy, R. J.
1978. Jesus, Politics and Society. Maryknoll: Orbis.
- Conzelmann, H.
1960. The Theology of St. Luke. Trans. G. Buswell. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dalman, G.
1909. The Words of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Lanier, F.W.
1976. Luke. Philadelphia: Fortress.
1972. Jesus and the New Age. A Commentary on the Third Gospel. St. Louis: Clayton Publishing House.
- Ellis E. E.
1974. The Gospel of Luke. London: Oliphants.
- Fairar, F.W.
1884. The Gospel According to St. Luke in Greek. Cambridge: University Press.
- Fitzmyer, J. A.
1985. The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV). Garden City: Doubleday.
1981. The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX). Garden City: Doubleday.
- Forster, W.
1971. "στανάς" in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. VII. Ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Pp. 151-163.

1964. "ἐξουσία" in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. II. Ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Pp. 560-575.
- Gaston, L.
1986. "Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative in Luke and Acts," in Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Ed. P. Richardson with D. Granskou. Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.
- Geldenhuis, N.
1951. Commentary on the Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Grundmann, W.
1963. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Berlin.
- Gundry, R.H.
1982. Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Hermas.
1885 "Shepherd," in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 2. Ed. A. Cleveland Coxe. Trans. F. Crombie. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company, 1885. Pp. 9-55.
- Hooke, S.H.
1957. "Jesus and the Centurion: Matthew 8:5-10." ExpT 69(1957-1958)79-80.
- Irenaeus.
1885 "Against Heresies," in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 1. Ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. New York: The Christian Literature Company. Pp. 315-567.
- Jeremias, J.
1972. The Parables of Jesus. Trans. S.H.Hooke. 3rd rev. ed. London: SCM.
1958. Jesus' Promise to the Nations. London: SCM.
- Justin.
1885 "The First Apology," in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 1. Ed. Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. New York: The Christian Literature Company. Pp. 163-187.
- Klostermann, E.
1975. Das Lukasevangelium. Handbuch zum neuen Testament 5. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.

- Lagrange, M.J.
1921. Evangile selon Saint Luc. Paris.
- Lampe, G.W.H.
1962. "Luke." in Peake's Commentary on the Bible.
Ed. Matthew Black. London: Thomas Nelson and
Sons, Ltd. Pp. 820-843.
- Lange, J. P.
1867. Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the
Gospel of Matthew. Vol. 1. Trans. Alfred
Edersheim. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
1861. The Life of Jesus.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott.
1940. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised and
Augmented by Henry Stuart Jones with the
assistance of Roderick McKenzie. Vol. 2.
Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Luther.
1968. The Christian in Society. Ed. W. I. Brandt.
Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press.
- Manson, T. W.
1949. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM.
- Marshall, I. H.
1978. The Gospel of Luke. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
1970. "Uncomfortable Words VI. 'Fear him who can
destroy both soul and body in hell'
(Mt. 10:28 RSV)." ExpTimes 81/9
(1970)276-280.
- Morris, L.
1974. The Gospel According to Luke. London: Inter
Varsity Press.
- Mounce, R. H.
1977. The Book of Revelation. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- van Oosterzee, J.J.
1862. Theological and Homiletical Commentary on the
Gospel of St. Luke. Vol. 1. Ed. J.P. Lange.
Trans. Sophia Taylor. Edinburgh: T. & T.
Clark.
- Flummer, Alfred.
1901. The Gospel According to St. Luke. 4th ed.
New York: Scribners.

- Rengstorff, K. H.
1972. ὁ κηρύκτης. in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. VIII. Ed. Gerhard Friedrich. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Pp. 530-544.
- Sanders, J. T.
1987. The Jews in Luke-Acts. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Schweizer, E.
1984. The Good News According to Luke. Trans. David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox.
- Stahlin, G.
1964. ἐξαίρεσις in Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Vol. I. Ed. G. Kittel. Trans. G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. Pp. 194-195.
- Stendahl, K.
1962. "Matthew." in Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Ed. Matthew Black. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, Ltd. Pp. 769-798.
- Stier, R.
1856. The Words of the Lord Jesus.
- Talbert, C. H.
1984. Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel. New York: Cross Road.
- Tertullian.
1985. "Against Marcion," in The Ante-Nicene Fathers. Vol. 3. Ed. A. Cleveland Coxe. Trans. P. Holmes. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Publishing Company. Pp. 269-474.
- Thompson, G.H.P.
1972. The Gospel According to Luke. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tyson, J. B.
1983. "Conflict as a Literary Theme in the Gospel of Luke," in New Synoptic Studies. Ed. W. Farmer. Macon: Mercer University Press.
- Vermes, G.
1975. The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. 2nd ed. New York: Penguin.

- Weiss, J.
1917. Lukas (in Die drei alteren Evangelien), revised
by W.Bousset.
- Wellhausen, J.
1904. Das Evangelium Lucae. Berlin.
- Wink, W.
1984. Naming the Powers: A Study in the Language of
Power. Philadelphia: Fortress.