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ABSTRACT

This study uses a narrative approach to consider Luke’s lake stories (Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39) as parallel accounts. It is argued that through the use of shared vocabulary, themes, and narrative structuring, Luke displays the journey upon the lake as a unique setting in which Jesus calls Simon and his companions to “put out into the deep water,” and then to journey with him “to the other side of the lake.” Luke’s structuring of these stories is persuasive and artful. Through his choice of vocabulary and the use of devices such as inclusio and the careful placement of direct speech, he narrates Jesus gathering and forming his disciples. Liminality is used in order to clarify the nature of the lake stories as formative discipleship journeys on the lake of Genesaret. On the lake the Lukan Jesus acts as guide or spiritual director, as he seeks to gather and then form a community of disciples who will join him in his jubilee mission (Luke 4:18-19).

Place and progress are important in the lake stories. Luke carefully narrates the movement from the shore of the lake, to a little way from the shore, out into the deep water, and back to shore in the first lake story. In the second lake journey Jesus and his disciples set out, and then arrive at the other side of the lake. Jesus steps onto the shore, encounters, delivers and sends the Gerasene demoniac. He then returns to the Galilean side of the lake. The movement from the shore, across the lake, and to the “other side” is echoed in the overall shape of Luke-Acts. Luke begins and ends in Jerusalem, while Acts moves from Jerusalem and crosses into the Gentile world, ending in Rome.

The discipleship cycles identified in this study give a setting or context for the two lake journeys. These cycles have been usefully considered both as three pairs of parallel episodes, and as six related episodes in temporal sequence. The cycles connect Jesus’ mission, the lake stories, and the choosing and sending of the twelve with the broader discipleship journey in Luke and Acts. The cycles also provide a way to track the disciples’ development and formation, which in the Galilean section of Luke culminates with the sending of the twelve in 9:1-6.

The lake journeys present Simon and his companions with tasks they are to achieve. In Luke
5:1-11 the task is fishing and the fishers put out “into the deep water,” where they work together successfully to complete the task. Jesus then commissions them to catch people alive. In so doing he transforms the first lake journey into a metaphor for the journey of discipleship. In Luke 8:22-39 the journey is to the other side of the lake. It is argued that the disciples are to pilot the boat through the storm to the far side of the lake, and then to confront the demon Legion. The many parallels, connections, gaps, and contrasts between the two lake stories reveal that the disciples’ failure to perform the tasks set before them on the second lake journey are a result of the misplacement of their faith, and that this is manifested in a lack of belief in Jesus and in a lack of co-operative action.

On the far side of the lake Jesus delivers the Gerasene demoniac, but he refuses to allow him to enter the boat with him. Instead, Jesus sends him to his home to declare what God has done for him. The man goes throughout his city proclaiming what Jesus has done for him. In this he anticipates the ministry of the apostles and Paul’s proclamation to the Gentiles in Acts.

Luke employs the contrast between Simon and the healed man both before and after their encounters with Jesus to show just how varied discipleship can be. For Simon, discipleship is abandonment of his former life and a new attachment to Jesus. This reflects the focus in Luke on the twelve and their journey with Jesus. The man is restored to his home, anticipating the pattern of discipleship that develops in Acts. Crucially, although he is sent home (Luke 8:39a) he goes proclaiming throughout the city (8:39b). He thereby demonstrates that discipleship, even for one who returns home, is active and involves the proclamation of what Jesus has done.
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Introduction

1 Introduction

In this study I will argue that the two lake stories in Luke’s Gospel (5:1-11 and 8:22-39) are parallel texts that employ the journey onto and then across the Lake of Genesaret as a metaphor for the broader journey of discipleship in Luke and Acts. The lake journeys are key to the discipleship theme Luke develops through the Galilean phase of his Gospel (4:14-9:50), as well as acting as a kind of liminal space where Jesus attempts to guide the formation of the fishers into disciples who participate in his own mission.¹

The study began with a short question: Why does Luke use λίμνη (lake) when his source, Mark, used ἃλασσα (sea)?² Did Luke make this change because he wanted to say something different, or did he wish to develop the lake journeys in a particular direction? Not only has Luke changed the vocabulary he found in Mark, he chose to retain only two of Mark’s sea stories.³ Luke’s overall geographical schema might explain his retention of only two lake journeys, but the questions persist: Why these two lake journeys? What do they say, and how do they function? And why λίμνη?

¹ Liminality is discussed at in Chapter 2, Section 5. It refers to a period or state of transition.
² Luke uses λίμνη in 5:1, 2; 8:22, 23, 33 (twice) and ἃλασσα in 17:2, 6; 21:25. Mark uses ἃλασσα in 1:16 (twice); 2:13; 3:7; 4:1, 39, 41; 5:1, 13 (twice), 21; 6:47-49; 7:31; 9:42; 11:23. He does not use λίμνη at all. I accept Markan priority and discuss this briefly below in Section 2.6.
³ Luke’s two lake stories are 5:1-11 (the calling of the first disciples) and 8:22-39 (Jesus calms the storm and heals the Gerasene demoniac). Mark has four stories that are based at the Sea of Galilee: 1:16-20 (the calling of the first disciples); 3:7-12 (Jesus and the multitude); 4:35-5:21 (Jesus calms the storm and heals the Gerasene demoniac); 6:45-52 (Jesus walks on the water). The first two take place by the sea but there is no journey on the water. Nevertheless most agree that Mark 1:16-20 is one of the sources for Luke 5:1-11. For example Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke I-X: Introduction, Translation, and Notes, AB 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 560-561; Bovon, Luke, 1:166-167. Mark’s third and fourth sea stories involve journeys on the sea.
The journey motif in Luke has been much discussed, particularly with regard to the Travel Narrative.\(^4\) Where do Luke’s two lake stories fit within that discussion? Though scholars have noted that there are parallels between Luke’s two lake stories, none have followed this through in detail.\(^5\) What happens when the lake stories are read in light of each other? What are the similarities and contrasts in vocabulary, themes, and structures between them? Can reading the lake stories alongside each other help fill in some of the gaps in the narrative, telling us, for example, what motivates Jesus and his disciples to undertake the second lake journey? Given that the first lake story narrates the calling of the first disciples, what does the move onto the lake and its sequel, the crossing over the lake into Gentile territory, indicate about the nature and complexities of discipleship and catching people? What does the journey to the other side of the lake say about Gentile mission? Finally, given the programmatic nature of Luke 4:16-30, what is the relationship between Jesus’ mission and the lake journeys?

This introduction will outline the assumptions made and the approach taken for this study, whilst locating the study within contemporary Lukan scholarship. It begins by looking at historical-critical questions that impinge upon the study. The limitations of the historical-critical approach are then noted and narrative approaches to Gospel studies are introduced. Narrative approaches are of course a vast field, so key elements of the narrative approach employed for this particular study are discussed. Discipleship in Luke is then introduced. The literature review section focuses on key works in key areas of the study before a very brief outline of the study is given to orient the reader to what is to follow.

2 Historical-Critical Issues

Although this study adopts a narrative approach to reading Luke, some attention needs to be given to the standard historical-critical questions asked of texts in NT studies. It will become

\(^4\) Chapter 2, Section 3.

clear throughout this discussion that this study assumes that a sound narrative reading requires some engagement with historical-critical issues.

2.1 Identifying the Genre of Luke’s Gospel

Identifying Gospel genre requires three poles to be held in tension. The first pole is the Gospel of Luke itself. Luke makes specific claims about the nature of his work in his prologue. He claims to writes a διήγησις (narrative), and he qualifies this further as καθεξῆς (an orderly account) (1:1). As the gospel progresses the nature of this orderly account unfolds further. The second pole is the OT and LXX traditions. Lukan quotations and allusions assume a familiarity with the LXX. This in turn exerts an influence on the form as well as on the content of Luke’s Gospel. The third pole is the Greco-Roman literary tradition. This would also be expected to influence the way Luke wrote. It is often pointed out, for example, that Luke’s preface is a self-conscious display of his literary ability and that it demonstrates his familiarity with the literature of his time.


7 Luke 1:1, 3.


The dominant view for most of the last century was that the Gospels are *sui generis*.

The emphasis within critical scholarship on form criticism meant that the role of the evangelists as authors was downplayed. This made the question of genre less important. However, from the 1970s redaction criticism brought the focus back onto the Gospel writers as authors, so that questions about intentionality and genre then began to resurface. While OT and LXX influence was acknowledged and explored, the Gospels did not readily yield to comparisons with OT genres. The result was a renewal of interest in the question of genre in light of Greco-Roman literature.

The main contenders for genre then became biography and historiography, though the case has also been made for other genres such as novel, and for the influence of scientific treatise on the prologue. By 2010 Christopher Hays noted an “increasing agreement” that the Gospels should be categorised as biography. Richard Burridge is the most thorough and convincing proponent of this view. Thomas Phillips helpfully summarises the distinguishing

12 L.W. Hurtado, “Gospels (Genre),” *DJG*, 1st ed., 281. (Both editions of *DJG* were consulted and are so the edition being referenced is given in each case throughout this study in order to eliminate confusion, especially where, for example, the same author has written the same entries in each edition.) Hurtado himself seems to want to hedge his bets, acknowledging both the uniqueness of the Gospels and their affinities with biographies. Hurtado, “Gospels (Genre),” *DJG*, 1st ed., 281. For a good survey see Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 7-11. Though willing to acknowledge the similarities with ancient biographies, some commentators seem reluctant to depart from the *sui generis* view of Gospel genre. E.g. Donald Carson, Douglas J. Moo, and Leon Morris, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (Leicester: Apollos, 1992), 47-48. Burridge argues that meaning is genre-bound. It follows that a work that is indeed *sui generis* is unique and is therefore “incomprehensible.” Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 26 (and passim). Writing of Acts, Richard Pervo observes that with all his efforts to “absolve Christianity of the charge of novelty” it would be strange if Luke were to attempt to create a new genre. Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 137. Pervo’s argument is valid for Luke’s Gospel as well as for Acts. Furthermore, it holds even if other purposes for writing his Gospel are attributed to Luke.

13 Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 12-16.

14 Burridge was accused of giving insufficient attention to the influence of Jewish literature on the Gospels when his work was first published. He has since revisited the question in more detail, though he maintains his position with regard to biography. See *What Are the Gospels?*, 19-21 (for the original treatment) and pp. 300-304 for his updated discussion on Rabbinic biography.

15 Aune states that Luke-Acts is “a popular ‘general history.’” He concedes that Luke could be classified as biography on its own but argues that as part of Luke’s two-volume work it has been “subordinated to a larger literary structure.” Aune, *Literary Environment*, 77.


18 Christopher M. Hays, *Luke’s Wealth Ethics: A Study of their Coherence and Character*, WUNT 275 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 73. He refers to Burridge, *What are the Gospels?*, 185-212. This work is
characteristics of Greco-Roman biographies. They are to be recognised “by their focus on one primary character, their emphasis on that person’s (almost always commendable) character, by their relative lack of interest in formal political and military processes, and by their tendency to conclude quickly after the main character’s death.”

Nevertheless, the view that Luke is a biography is not unanimously held. Joel Green, for example, argues that on its own Luke can be “susceptible to a biographical classification,” but that in light of Acts this classification is harder to sustain. Green argues instead for the many features Luke shares with Greco-Roman historiography. Others, such as Raymond Brown, do not appear to be entirely convinced by the argument for biography. Nevertheless they concede that Luke’s audience would have heard Luke as a “Life of Jesus.” Brown acknowledges further that of all the Gospels Luke is the most like ancient biography. That further supported by Martin, who argues Luke is a student of progymnastic rhetoric, which he employs with great skill. Michael W. Martin, “Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bio?” NTS 54, no. 1 (2008), 18-41. See also Charles H. Talbert, What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels (Fortress: Philadelphia, 1977), 93. Graham Stanton states that “Even if the evangelists were largely ignorant of the tradition of Greek and Roman ‘lives,’ that is how the Gospels were received and listened to in the first decade of their composition.” From the Foreword to Burridge, What are the Gospels?, ix. Smith proposes a typology for Greco-Roman biography that works with an “ancient” and “contemporary” pole, and a “definite” and “indefinite” pole. Under this schema the Gospels would be “contemporary-indefinite.” Justin M. Smith, “Genre, Sub-Genre and Questions of Audience: A Proposed Typology for Greco-Roman Biography,” JGRChJ 4 (2007), 212-214. Smith expands on this in his thesis in Justin M. Smith, “Why Bios?: On the relationship Between Gospel Genre and Implied Audience” (Ph.D. diss., St Andrews, 2011), accessed 2 July 2013, http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/bitstream/10023/2112/6/JustinMSmithPhDThesis.pdf


21 Ibid., 5-10.

22 Ibid., 2-3. Green has reiterated his position in the second edition of DJG. In this he does not address the question of the genre of the other synoptic Gospels and the possibility that, depending on how that question is answered, Luke could then be considered as different in genre to Mark and Matthew. Nor does he discuss the possibility that Luke and Acts could be considered as different genres. Joel B. Green, “Luke, Gospel of,” DJG, 2nd ed., 541-43. Green critiques Burridge for his mathematical analysis of verb subjects. Green, Luke, 5-6 (n. 20). Burridge responds to such criticisms in Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 252-306.

23 Raymond E. Brown, An Introduction to the New Testament, AB (New York: Doubleday, 1997), 103-104. Others take similar, less clear positions, noting the similarities but not quite willing to commit to the ancient biography proposal. For example, “No matter how futile the long scholarly quest to find ancient predecessors and parallels to the Gospels has been . . . it has at least served the function of proving that the Gospel stories about Jesus have affinities with other ancient narratives.” Leyland Ryken, “The Literature of the New Testament,” in A Complete Literary Guide to the Bible, ed. Ryken Leyland, and Tremper Longman III (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 368.
scholars disagree is no surprise, especially as the boundaries between historiography, monograph, and biography are “blurred and flexible,”24 or “loosely defined.”25 Nevertheless, the biography thesis has been widely adopted and its implications for interpretation continue to be explored. Burridge insists that if biography is the genre of the Gospels, “then the key to their interpretation must be the person of their subject, Jesus of Nazareth.”26

Burridge’s work is impressive and convincing. However, he overstates his case when he claims that identifying Gospels as ancient biography means that they are solely occupied with their central figure: “The point of each passage is not about the disciples, but about the biography’s subject—namely, Jesus of Nazareth.”27 This assessment is correct in stating that the Gospels are about Jesus and not about the communities in which and for which they were written.28 Nevertheless, it must be possible to learn something about discipleship from a story of Jesus’ life, a life in which his disciples play a significant role. Likewise Burridge rejects arguments about the purpose of Luke that do not conform to his biography classification. For example, John Squires makes a strong case for God as the primary character in the background of Luke and Acts.29 Green argues that according to Luke-Acts the beginning of Israel’s history is rooted in God’s purpose for Israel through Abraham as found in Genesis, so

24 Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 237. See also 62-66 esp. the diagram on p. 64 for the overlap with history, moral philosophy, religious or philosophical teaching, encomium, story and novel, and political polemic.


26 Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 248.

27 Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 290 (his emphasis).

28 Richard Bauckham, “For Whom were the Gospels Written?,” in Richard Bauckham, ed., The Gospel for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 15-19; Richard A. Burridge, “Gospel, Genre,” DJG, 2nd ed., 336. Also Francis Watson, “Toward a Literal Reading of the Gospels,” in The Gospel for All Christians, 195-218. Härgerland looks at the Gospel of John to determine whether it is an “allegory” for the Johannine community. He finds no relevant parallels for such a proposal in Greek bioi, nor clear signals in the text of John itself that the Gospel should be read in such a way. Tobias Härgerland, “John’s Gospel: A Two-Level Drama?” JSNT 25, no. 3 (2003), 309-322. The above notwithstanding, it is still legitimate to argue that the evangelists wrote with a double perspective. That is, they wrote a biographical account of Jesus’ life, but they wrote from a post-resurrection perspective. At times, therefore, they graced the text with a deeper or symbolic level of meaning. See Earl Hilgert, The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament (Assen: Royal Vangorcum, 1962), 55.

that in Luke-Acts we see “the working out of God’s purpose to bring salvation to all people.” 30 Darrell Bock affirms Squires’ position when he states that, “God’s activity stands at the core of the account.” 31 Burridge, partly on the basis of his verb analysis, rejects such views. 32 Yet the two are not necessarily incompatible. Luke’s biography of Jesus as Son of God articulates “the plan of God as it is worked out in the life of Jesus and the history of the early church.” 33 Or, as Green would have it, “actants who expressly operate as empowered or commissioned by God are in fact acting on his behalf and serving his aim.” 34

A significant proportion of contemporary scholarship supports Burridge’s conclusion that Luke is a biography. This study accepts this assessment, but reiterates that even with regards to a “Life of Jesus” it remains valid to investigate discipleship in Luke. Furthermore, given the blurred boundaries between the two main contenders for genre, biography, and historiography, the difference it makes for this particular study is small. As Green writes of Luke, “the crucial first task . . . is to grapple with its status as a narrative text.” 35 This is, after all, how Luke himself describes it (1:1).


32 Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 189-190. Green’s critique of the statistical approach has already been mentioned. Squires’ assumptions lead him to argue that Luke is attempting to render Christianity comprehensible to Hellenized Christians and that he found historiography amenable to this purpose. It was therefore the almost inevitable genre for Luke to use as he sought to convey an “authentic sense of origins.” Squires, The Plan of God, 191.


genre of Acts, and whether Luke and Acts can or cannot be classified under different genres? The unity of Luke and Acts, along with the designation “Luke-Acts” has become a commonplace in NT scholarship since Henry Cadbury. However, whilst the common authorship of Luke and Acts is taken as a given, the various essays collected together in Andrew Gregory and Kavin Rowe, Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts make a convincing case for considering Luke and Acts as “Luke and Acts” and as “Luke-Acts.” Within that volume Wall’s “Canonical Approach” makes a strong case for reading Luke and Acts within their canonical settings, whilst in the same volume Gregory asserts that in the early history of the Church Luke and Acts were not read together. That is to say that, as well as reading Luke and Acts together, Luke needs to be read as part of the four-fold Gospel corpus, and Acts as an introduction or bridge into the Epistles, as this is how they were read in the early period. Hays summarises the tension between the two reading settings nicely when he states that, “although Luke and Acts were composed by the same author and share a number of themes in common, they are still discrete and freestanding books.” Thus, as Bock points out, the challenge to “Luke-Acts” is “one of nuance, not outright rejection”.


and so must not be overstated. Nevertheless, the question of unity bears on the question of genre. “Luke and Acts” makes conceivable the idea that the two books might belong to different genres. Given the overlap between bibliography and historiography, admitted even by Burridge, it seems reasonable to allow that Luke and Acts may be examples of biography and historiography respectively.44

2.3 Author and Date

Questions of authorship and date are examples of historical-critical issues that continue to be contested but are (arguably) not of great importance to this study.45 The tradition that the Luke whom we know from the letters bearing Paul’s name (Col 4:14; Phlm 24; 2 Tim 4:11) was the author of the third Gospel, as well as his role as companion of Paul and his profession as a physician, is strong.46 The author of the third Gospel will thus be identified as “Luke” in accordance with ancient and scholarly convention. As Green states, “identifying the author as ‘Luke’ does not shape dramatically how we read the text itself.”47 Nevertheless, “the narrative itself suggests that the author was well studied in Israel’s Scriptures and sacred traditions, and had an advanced education in Greek grammar, rhetoric, and literature.”48

A wide range of dates have been suggested for the composition of Luke.49 Critical scholarship last century tended to bracket the possibilities between the fall of Jerusalem at one end, and the collection and widespread circulation of the Pauline letters at the other.50 The fall of

44 E.g. François Bovon, in the Foreword to Gregory and Rowe, Rethinking the Unity, viii.


47 Ibid.

48 Ibid., 540-552.


Jerusalem is usually counted as a marker because Luke’s eschatological discourses (Luke 19:41-44; 21:20-24) require it. The collection and circulation of the Pauline letters is important because many consider Acts to show a lack of familiarity with Paul’s thought and theology, which would have been available to Luke in the Pauline Epistles had they been in wide circulation at the time Luke wrote.\textsuperscript{51} These points would suggest Luke was written between 70 and 90 C.E. However, a strong case can be made for a date in the 60s.\textsuperscript{52} A date somewhere between the mid 60s and mid 80s can be assumed without it making a material difference to the argument of this study, which focuses on the narrative structure of the text.

2.4 Audience and Provenance

Both Luke and Acts are addressed to Theophilus (Luke 1:3 and Acts 1:1). The suggestion that Θεόφιλος ("God-lover") is a symbolic title is plausible.\textsuperscript{53} If, however, it is accepted that Theophilus is a real person, the patron who commissioned the work, for example, it is usually argued that Luke intended and assumed his work would be read and heard by others besides the addressee.\textsuperscript{54} Patron should not be confused with audience.\textsuperscript{55}

The identification of a specific audience or community from which or to whom Luke wrote has proved difficult, as no such audience or community is named in the text.\textsuperscript{56} This renders problematic readings that presume a specific audience. The problem is compounded if the specified audience is believed to be homogeneous.\textsuperscript{57} Richard Bauckham bypasses the problem

\begin{itemize}
\item 51 This view is also contested. See the references in Hays, Luke’s Wealth Ethic, 77 (n. 30).
\item 52 Bock, “Luke, Gospel of,” DJG, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed., 499-500. For another clear summary of the arguments for and against a date in the 60s see Carson, Moo, and Morris, Introduction, 116-117. Bauckham argues that the Gospels are based on eyewitness accounts and are therefore to be dated reasonably early (though this does not mean pre-70 necessarily). Richard Bauckham, Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: The Gospels as Eyewitness Testimony (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), passim.
\item 53 Carson, Moo, and Morris, Introduction, 117.
\item 54 On Theophilus as patron see Alexander, Preface to Luke’s Gospel, 193-200.
\item 55 Green, “Luke, Gospel Of,” DJG, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 549.
\item 57 On the diversity across the early Christian movement see Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?,” 43.
\end{itemize}
by arguing that the Gospels were written for a general (Christian) audience.\textsuperscript{58} Wall concurs, stating that, “the assumption that each Gospel was composed for a particular community and circulated independently prior to the production and canonization of a fourfold Gospel is based upon little hard evidence.”\textsuperscript{59}

Furthermore, if the Gospels are intended for a wider audience rather than a particular (Matthean, Markan, Lukan, Johannine) community, then it can be argued that “those [particular] communities have no hermeneutical relevance.”\textsuperscript{60} It thus follows that the Gospels may give very limited information about the community (or communities) in which they were written.\textsuperscript{61} This suggestion is compatible with identifying the Gospels as biography, a genre that implies a broad readership.\textsuperscript{62} Justin Smith looks specifically at the Gospels as biography and the question of audience. He finds that the Gospels are written with a primary (Christian) and then secondary (general) audience in view.\textsuperscript{63} Similarly, Bauckham proposes that Christian readers of the Gospels would have been expected to pass them on to non-Christian readers.\textsuperscript{64}

Accepting this argument does not mean that nothing can be said about Luke’s audience. Luke assumes an audience familiar with the LXX and with a knowledge of Jesus’ proclamation.\textsuperscript{65} Joseph Fitzmyer amasses evidence for Gentiles forming a major portion of that audience.\textsuperscript{66} However, a strong case has been made for a significant Jewish membership as well.\textsuperscript{67}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{59} Robert W. Wall, “Canonical Criticism,” \textit{DJG}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 106.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?,” 44.
\item \textsuperscript{61} Ibid., 44-45.
\item \textsuperscript{62} Burridge, \textit{What are the Gospels?}, 295-7.
\item \textsuperscript{63} The principle holds even when a patron such as Theophilus (Luke 1:3) is involved. The primary audience (chronologically) could be the patron, with a broader general audience (or audiences) in view beyond that. Smith, “Genre,” 208-10.
\item \textsuperscript{64} Bauckham, “For Whom Were the Gospels Written?,” 10.
\item \textsuperscript{65} Esler, \textit{Community and Gospel}, 25.
\item \textsuperscript{66} Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke}, 1:57-58.
\end{itemize}
there is still no scholarly consensus regarding a particular audience or even on the exact
nature of a broader general audience, the internal evidence supports Green’s suggestion that
the audience for whom Luke wrote might have comprised of: “[F]ollowers of Jesus who were
Greek-speaking Jews, Gentiles and God fearers; people familiar with Judaism from the
synagogue and from Israel’s Scriptures; people broadly acquainted with the geography of the
Mediterranean world; and people who were educated enough to appreciate Luke’s rhetoric
and occasional literary flare.”68 This study assumes the general plausibility of that
reconstruction.

2.5 Purpose

Numerous possibilities have been argued for the purpose of Luke’s Gospel. Following
Maddox, Bock summarises these as “(1) to explain why Jesus had not returned (Conzelmann),
(2) to provide a defence brief for Christianity (Easton, Haenchen), (3) to defend Paul before
Rome (Mattill), (4) to defend Paul before the community (Schneckenburger; Jervell), (5) to
combat Gnosticism (Talbert), (6) to evangelise (O’Neill), (7) to confirm the Word and the
message of salvation (van Unnik, Marshall, O’Toole), (8) to present a theodicy of God’s
faithfulness (Tiede), (9) to provide a sociological legitimation of full fellowship with the
Gentiles and a defence of the new community (Esler).”69 He goes on to comment that the
volume of suggestions reflects “the complexity of the Lukan enterprise.”70

The identification of genre (above) assists here. Burridge demonstrates that while an author
may intend to cover multiple purposes or aims, works of a common genre share a similarity of
purpose.71 For ancient bioi, these purposes can be classified as encomiastic, exemplary,
informative, entertainment, preservation of memory, didactic, apologetic, and polemic.72 He
notes in the canonical Gospels little of the atmosphere of encomium, some elements of

71 Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 121-122.
72 Ibid., 145-147 and 180-183.
exemplary biography (especially Matthew), signs in Luke of entertainment (perceptible when read out loud),

and the preservation of memory. Thus “it is clearly difficult, if not impossible, to restrict the synoptic Gospels to just one purpose.”

As philosophical bioi the Gospels can be expected to contain “didactic, apologetic, and polemical” material. David Aune describes the Gospels as “fundamentally Christian literary propaganda,” with Luke (and Matthew) containing “a prominent didactic element.” Luke 1:4 is overt in wanting to convey to Theophilus the reliability of the Gospel. This would support the apologetic and polemical aspects of biography.

Wall confronts the reality of many of these critical problems succinctly when he states that the Gospels are “anonymous narratives composed without an address or clear statement of purpose.” Audience, provenance, and purpose remain elusive, so that the less specific proposals adopted here are paradoxically, though arguably, of greater heuristic value.

2.6 Synoptic Relations and Sources

Contemporary scholarship has long recognised that Luke drew on various sources (written and possibly oral) in the composition of his Gospel. Luke himself claims as much in his opening sentence (Luke 1:1). Along with the majority of Lukan scholars, this study adopts the two- (or four-) document hypothesis. That is, that Luke and Matthew composed their respective Gospels independently of each other, but that both had access to Mark and “Q,” as

73 On Acts as entertainment see Pervo, Profit with Delight.

74 Burridge, What are the Gospels?, 208-209. At this point he also lists the main contenders for the purpose of Acts as being an apologetic for Paul (either at his trial or in later Jewish/Gentile Christian debate), or to present Christianity itself to a broader Roman audience.

75 Ibid., 210.

76 Ibid., 248.

77 Aune, Literary Environment, 59.

78 Ibid., 62. Smith states that the vast majority of Greco-Roman biography would be considered didactic, with propagandistic functions (encomiastic, peripatetic, and popular-romantic). Smith, “Why Bios?,” 39.


80 Carson, Moo, and Morris, Introduction, 118-121.
well as their own material in the form of oral or written tradition. On occasions therefore Luke will be compared with Mark, but as (according to this view) Luke did not draw on Matthew, Matthew will not be discussed in any detail. The focus here is on the final form of the text so Luke’s sources are not something that warrants discussion in detail, hence the adoption of the majority view on sources. It is also accepted that Luke was familiar with, and drew upon, the LXX and that his writing style was strongly influenced by it.

While it is acknowledged that Luke drew on different sources, it is unlikely that Luke imagines his audience to be sitting with scrolls of these other documents before them as they read his Gospel, noting and discussing his deft redactional touches. Literacy levels are estimated to be no more than ten percent in the early Roman Empire, and oral performance of texts to listening audiences was the norm. The majority of the members of early audiences would have heard Luke in a single sitting, probably multiple times, without the opportunity to make comparisons with other documents in the detailed manner undertaken by contemporary scholars. Thus a reading (or, hearing) approach that focuses on the finished form of the text, whereby individual episodes are read in the context of the narrative whole were employed here. Such an approach aligns with the Lukan audience implied above. Redaction criticism


82 “OT” references throughout this study are to the LXX. Where this differs from the MT reference, the MT reference is given in parenthesis.


86 Brown, Introduction, 267. There was no BibleWorks!
and other historical-critical approaches are valuable but must not override the way the text reads as a larger narrative, specifically as a biography of the life of Jesus.

3 Narrative Approaches and Gospel Studies

3.1 Historical-Critical Approaches

Anyone writing an introduction encounters the “problem of beginning.” But without underestimating or undervaluing the immense contributions of earlier scholars such as Cadbury, Hans Conzelmann’s *Die Mitte der Zeit* published in 1954 usefully marks the beginning of the period of modern Lukan scholarship. Conzelmann’s redaction-critical study established Luke as a theologian who, it was claimed, was attempting to explain the delay in the parousia. From here the various critical schools and methods were applied to Luke during the rest of the 20th century. In the wake of the wider literary critical movements, the later decades saw the rise of narrative criticism in biblical studies. These were in due course widely applied to the field of Lukan studies.

87 Green, “The Problem of Beginning,” 61-86.
Historical-critical approaches tend to be atomistic and genetic in orientation.\(^\text{92}\) By “genetic” is meant the attempt to go behind the text to determine some kind of source, or origin,\(^\text{93}\) whether this be written or oral tradition, or what the author intended to convey when writing a work.\(^\text{94}\) By “atomistic” is meant the tendency to work with ever smaller units, whether a line, a phrase, or even a single word. Related to this is the tendency to treat pericopae, sayings, or sources in isolation or as discrete from the rest of the text.\(^\text{95}\) The difficulty with this approach is that insufficient attention is paid to the narrative as a whole and how the text being considered fits and works within that broader narrative.\(^\text{96}\) Also, once the fragments of the original or historical are uncovered, historical-critical approaches often seem unsure what to do with them.

---


93 Ibid., 11-12.


3.2 Narrative Approaches

By contrast, narrative approaches to Gospel studies focus on the final form of the text. They look for connections, themes, links, and coherence. The approach taken here is to be willingly led by the implied author, and to attempt as far as possible to inhabit the narrative world the author has created for the implied reader. The starting assumption of this reading is that, even if and where other sources (oral and literary) are used, Luke has crafted a consistent and coherent narrative (διήγησις in 1:1). This is not to deny that there are seams and gaps, or the possibility of contradictions in the text. However, on encountering

98 Reading Gospel narratives with a particular theme (or themes) in view is also a well established approach. The interpretive approach used may be narrative, but is not necessarily so. For examples of narrative readings, see Jack D. Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991); Sarah Harris, “The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative” (Ph.D. diss., University of Otago, 2011); and Squires, *The Plan of God*. A more historical approach is taken in Floyd V. Filson, “The Journey Motif in Luke-Acts,” in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday*, ed. W. Ward Gasque, and Ralph P. Martin (Toronto, Paternoster, 1970), 68-77. Note also that some of these studies look at a section of Luke, some at the whole Gospel, and others at Luke-Acts. The present study, then, is not unique in focusing on a passage or passages within a section of Luke’s Gospel (here the two lake stories that are located in the Galilean phase of the Gospel), before looking at the implications for the larger narrative of Luke-Acts. Similar to works that look for a theme are those that consider a class or type of character. Two works of this kind warrant mention here are S. John Roth, *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor: Character Types in Luke-Acts*, JSNTS 144 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); and David A. Neale, *None but the Sinners: Religious Categories in the Gospel of Luke*, JSNTSup 58 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991). It is also valid to look at a distinct section for a theme. This is typically seen in Lukan studies in works on the Lukan travel narrative. Narrative examples of such studies referred to in this study include James A. Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth in Luke’s Travel Narrative*, BJLS 88 (Leiden: Brill, 2007); and Moessner, *The Lord of the Banquet*. They can also be historical-critical in nature, such as Chester C. McCown, “Gospel Geography: Fiction, Fact, and Truth,” *JBL* 60, no. 1 (1941), 1-25; and Chester C. McCown, “The Geography of Luke’s Central Section,” *JBL* 57, no. 1 (1938), 51-66.
99 The idea of an “implied author” and “implied reader” have become common place in biblical studies. The implied author, as opposed to the real author, is the author as revealed in the text. Similarly, the implied reader, as opposed to the real reader, is the reader implied in the text. Seymour B. Chatman *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca: Cornell, 1978), 6.
difficulties the reader will adopt a degree of humility and assume that she or he may not understand what the text is doing, how it works, or what the author is saying, before moving to the conclusion that the problem is with the text. To accuse an author of sloppiness or lack of care or unawareness of “the facts” is deemed the exegesis of last resort.\(^{102}\)

### 3.2.1 Intentionality

A major difference between redaction criticism (along with other historical-critical methodologies) on the one hand, and narrative approaches on the other, is the attempt to stay with the text. In the former methodologies readers attempt to surmise what the author’s intentions were by observing how sources have been redacted, and by considering the historical context in which a text was written.\(^{103}\) Nevertheless, we do not have access to the author or to what was in the author’s mind. It can therefore be argued that the author’s intentions are “neither available nor desirable as a standard for judging the success of a literary work.”\(^ {104}\) Readers’ attempts to discern Luke’s intention by trying to peer beyond or behind the text are ultimately fraught with subjectivity. It can be suggested that the window of the text becomes a mirror in which readers see themselves rather than Luke, or Jesus.\(^ {105}\)

But intentionality cannot be so easily dismissed. Kevin Vanhoozer highlights the question of whose intentionality it is that is being discussed. Literary studies tend to focus on the intent of the author or sometimes on the author and reader. In biblical studies the question is a theological one. Is it the intention of the author, reader, God, the canon or those responsible for its formation, or the canonical community whose intention is primary?\(^ {106}\) Vanhoozer


\(^{103}\) These are “internal” and “external” factors, respectively.


concludes that theological reading requires readers to identify the divine intention.\textsuperscript{107} However, it is unclear that this solves the intentionality problem as the divine intention is still (presumably) embedded in the text. Furthermore, if Scripture is indeed a divine and human work, a work of partnership, then even if God is considered the primary partner, the divine intention comes via the human agents. Those human agents wrote in the idiom of the time and in a manner reflective of their own circumstances and personalities. Similarly, canonical intention or the intention of the interpretive community effectively shifts the problem rather than solving it. How do we identify the intention of the canonisers or early interpretive community, and what is it that gives their intentions priority over the intention of authors?\textsuperscript{108}

However, collapsing intentionality completely into the text does not remove the problem either. It then becomes the intentionality of the text that becomes the focus of enquiry. This is problematic as texts do not have intentions. To speak of the intentions of a text is to make “intention” itself into a metaphor.\textsuperscript{109} Thus further questions arise about the nature of the text of Scripture as a metaphor and how it can be read as metaphor. Rather than disappearing into an infinite intentionality regression, Vanhoozer refers to Raymond Gibbs, who suggests that recent developments in philosophy of action have “breathed new life into the concept of authorial intent.”\textsuperscript{110} Gibbs acknowledges that once created, literary works have a life beyond their authors,\textsuperscript{111} but he argues that there is nevertheless no good reason to exclude information external to the text, such as biographical information (or the author’s own comments on a text) from the interpretive process. This is not to say that the meaning of a text is strictly limited to what the author intended to communicate, but that “appeal to an author’s possible communicative intentions is part of what happens when anyone attempts to make sense of human language.”\textsuperscript{112} Meaning and intention must be held in tension. There is nothing to say

\textsuperscript{107} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 328.
\textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 329.
\textsuperscript{110} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{111} Raymond W. Gibbs, \textit{Intentions in the Experience of Meaning} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 246.
\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 248. This is not to buy into the “‘intentions are everything’ view that insists that intention and meaning are exactly equivalent (that is, that “literary meanings are always intentional”). Ibid., 259.
that they are exactly the same thing, or that meanings may not manifest that are beyond the
author’s intentions, only that all texts are “inseparable from some intention or another.”
After all, ordinary readers invariably attribute intention to literature, which is not
independent of the mind which created it and arises from intentional human activity. It is
helpful to grasp that intention is not a psychological event prior to action but an “intrinsic
aspect of the action, making it what it is.”

This argument has the effect of merging or blurring intention as psychological intention and
text. The text becomes primary, with the intent behind the text, including the various
intentions mentioned above (author, divine, canonisers, community) subsumed under or into
the text as we have it. Intentionality is therefore not being devalued, but is now seen as
intrinsic to the text. It is in, rather than behind, the text as it is embodied in the action of
producing the text.

Also relevant to the idea of intentionality is the observation that a text takes on a life of its
own and often develops and works in ways unforeseen, unintended and unrecognised by the
author. Thus, “a poem may mean something different from what the poet intended it to mean;
may mean more than he intended it to mean; may perhaps sometimes mean substantially what
he intended.” Even if authorial intent (whether psychological intention or as action
embodied in the text) could be identified with certainty, it would not necessarily follow that a
text could then be fully comprehended. Nor can it control where and how a text might be
used or valued.

There will always be some slippage between author (or whatever other intention behind the
text is being considered), text, and reader or hearer. This does not mean that no meaning is

_________

113 Ibid., 261 (his emphasis).
114 Ibid., 272.
115 Ibid., 327.
118 Wall locates the quest for singular original meanings in “modernity’s mythology of originality.” Wall,
“Canonical Approach,” 172.
transmitted from author to the reader. It is just that each step in this process amplifies the potential slippage. The emphasis on the embodiment of intention in the action of text production over the psychological intent of authors to communicate via a text is basically a distance-reducing strategy. “Behind” the text (psychological authorial intent) is another step further from the reader than the text itself.

Most narrative readings work to maintain some kind of tension between the three points of “the familiar triangle of (i) author, (ii) work, and (iii) reader.” The above discussion has suggested a partial (at least) collapsing into each other of author and text. Lukan scholars familiar with the “Luke and Acts” and “Luke-Acts” discussion (3.2 above) might find “author and text” and “author-text,” an appropriate analogy here.

### 3.2.2 Reader-response

The discussion thus comes to the point where the role and response of readers needs to be considered further. Reader-response recognises that readers have a role in “making” the text and in enabling the narrative to work. David Newton-De Molina points out that what Redpath says about the relationship between authorial intent and text (above) can be applied to reader-response. That is, “a literary work may mean something different from what a reader understands it to mean; may mean less than a reader understands it to mean…and so on.”

Some versions of reader-response postulate an autonomous text detached from its historical and social milieu, but this does not have to be the case. James Metzger notes that “critics

---

119 This is not to say meaning is singular or that readers and contexts are not relevant.

120 Newton-De Molina, in *On Literary Intention*, vii (his emphasis). This triangle is familiar more recently as the world of the text (the narrative world), the world behind the text (the historical world), and the world in front of the text (the world of the reader). Though as Clivaz notes, when we talk of “the text” we are really speaking about the scribe “who actually wrote and made the texts” and who is both “the final author and a reader of considerable influence.” Claire Clivaz, “Luke, Acts, and the Ancient Reader: The Cultures of Author, Scribes, and Readers in New Testament Exegesis,” in Gregory and Rowe, *Rethinking the Unity*, 154.

121 Newton-De Molina, in *On Literary Intention*, vii.

122 Metzger, *Consumption and Wealth*, 33.

such as M. A. Powell and M. A. Tolbert have always maintained that literary analyses are fully compatible with ‘historical approaches.’”\textsuperscript{124} Edgar McKnight, for example, wants to ground readers’ responses to texts within their social and historical settings.\textsuperscript{125}

Wolfgang Iser represents those who want to move beyond the idea of meaning residing within a text. His reception theory attempts to synthesise the reception of literary texts by readers with its effects on readers. It appreciates that the way readers receive a text is historically conditioned. At the same time, readers’ expectations of a text shift. The understanding of texts is thus shown to be a dynamic process.\textsuperscript{126} Iser describes the shift last century from meaning and the intention of authors to the “impact” of the text on readers and the “processing” that occurs within readers, that is, the \textit{act} of reading.\textsuperscript{127} In his discussion on gaps and blanks Iser makes much of the readers’ role and the process of filling and resolving gaps and blanks. This process is historically conditioned, making the results something of a moveable feast. Nevertheless, Iser is confident in readers’ ability to achieve this task.\textsuperscript{128} Much of what is true of reading is true of hearing. What Iser says about gaps, blanks, and the readers’ role in engaging with texts is applicable to orality.\textsuperscript{129}

\subsection{3.2.3 Author-orientated rhetorical criticism}

A helpful framework for addressing some of these tensions is author-orientated rhetorical criticism.\textsuperscript{130} Keith Reich describes this as “attempting to hear a text, as far as can be
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determined, as the original audience would have heard it.” The label “authorial-orientated rhetorical criticism” sounds more heavily weighted towards the author than the description would suggest. As defined, the approach offers a middle way between “the pitfalls of authorial intent on the one hand and of reader-oriented theories on the other hand.”

Historical and literary context are important to this approach as author and audience have “shared conventions and expectations,” against which “the author can rhetorically shape his or her text.” This aligns with the idea of a “contract” between readers and authors that Burridge argues is established through genre. Reading therefore involves us as readers “joining” the implied audience. Thus the “goal of narrative criticism is to read as the implied reader.”

The idea of an implied author and readers is an attempt to acknowledge the gap between what we know and what we do not know about the historical author and readers on the one hand, and the text as we have it on the other. The gap between implied and real may or may not be wide, but a focus on the author and audience implied in the text relieves some of the tension created by the gap between real and implied parties. Historical plausibility serves as a

131 Ibid. Powell points out that reader-response can express various relationships between reader and text, with the reader over the text (Deconstruction; Transaction; Interpretative Communities), with the text (Affective Stylistics, Phenomenological Criticism), or in the text (Narrative Criticism, Structuralism). Powell, Narrative Criticism, 16.

132 Reich, Figuring Jesus, 28.

133 Ibid.

134 Burridge, What Are the Gospels?, 34. He is following Dubrow who argues that the use of a particular genre in effect signals the “rules” or the “code” that determine how a work should be written and how it should be read. Heather Dubrow, Genre (London: Methuen, 1982), 31. (Though of course codes can be violated and contracts may be broken. Dubrow, Genre, 37.)

135 Reich, Figuring Jesus, 28.

136 Powell, Narrative Criticism, 20.

137 Powell, Narrative Criticism, 8-9, 19-21, 25-27. Chatman, Story and Discourse, 151.

138 Many narrative critics find little substantial difference between real author and readers, and implied author and readers. Elizabeth S. Malbon, “Echoes and Foreshadowings in Mark 4-8: Reading and Rereading,” JBL 112, no. 2 (1993), 212. Nevertheless, the distinction can be useful.

139 Powell notes that a key question for literary criticism is “Who is the reader?” Rhetorical criticism looks at the intended (original) readers, structuralism to the competent readers, Fish and Iser the first-time sequential reader, and later Fish to reading communities. Narrative critics usually use the implied reader with the understanding that the text gives clues as to how the implied reader should respond to the implied author. Powell, Narrative Criticism, 19.
control on the profiling of implied author and readers, limiting the possibilities to those that might have existed or could realistically have been imagined at the time the work was written. Historical-critical and narrative approaches together assist us as readers (or hearers) in discerning what these “shared conventions and expectations” might be. Reader-response alerts us to our own part in the reading and “making” of text and meaning.

3.3 Critiques of Narrative Approaches

The weaknesses of narrative approaches have been widely discussed. Grant Osborne, for example, considers the following dangers when narrative approaches are poorly applied: a dehistoricising tendency; setting aside the author; a denial of intended or referential meaning; reductionist and disjunctive thinking; imposition of modern literary categories upon ancient genres; preoccupation with obscure theories; ignoring the understanding of the early church; rejection of sources behind the book. Nevertheless, he is at pains to emphasise that, when held in appropriate tension with historical approaches, literary approaches to narrative texts are highly appropriate.

Scholars using narrative approaches within biblical studies tend to find or assume unity, coherence, and cohesiveness even when gaps, seams, and inconsistencies are present. Roland Meynet will serve here as an example. He states that the first presupposition of rhetorical analysis is that “biblical texts are composed” and that “they are for the most part well composed.” This assumption has provoked strong reactions from the likes of Steven

140 Moore connects implied readers and reader-response with historical concerns in *Literary Criticism*, 76-77.


143 See for example Moore, *Literary Criticism*, 52-55; Merenlahti, *Poetics*, 3-9, 23-34.

Moore and Merenlahti. Merenlahti argues that the question of literary unity is the wrong question, since “unity” is not objectively measurable, but a way of “perceiving and evaluating texts.” This perception of unity is a matter of interpretation, and the means of interpretation are contextual, and therefore fluid. They “change from one historical and cultural context to another.” Claims for unity (and any other criteria of literary value) are hegemonic as they rest on the opinion of “a community of elect critics.” Hence for Merenlahti, assumptions of literary unity in the Gospels are problematic. Unity and fragmentation are interdependent, so that “both unity and fragmentariness must be seen as particular and historical, not as universal or timeless.” These and similar critiques have led to some loss of confidence in the coherence of biblical texts, and hence in the value of narrative approaches that presuppose relative coherence.

Moore considers the question of meaning and its location. Like Merenlahti, he argues that understandings of what literature means and how it works are culturally determined and therefore fluid. Moore is persuasive in his critique but offers little in the way of improved and workable approaches. As Coleridge observes, Moore “has yet to produce interpretation that matches his theoretical expositions or his accounts of the status quo in NT narrative criticism.” Speaking of Stanley Fish’s challenge to “the naïve-empiricist assumption of the reified literary text,” Moore himself acknowledges that “it can no more inhibit interpretive practice than sceptical philosophies of science inhibit, say, the manufacture of consumer goods.” That is, many of the consumer goods that are manufactured and sold throughout the

145 Merenlahti, Poetics, 3.
146 Ibid.
147 Ibid.
148 Ibid., 23-34.
149 Ibid., 34.
150 Rhoads, “Narrative Criticism,” 268-70.
151 Moore, Literary Criticism, 71-130; Merenlahti, Poetics, passim.
152 Coleridge, Birth of the Lukan Narrative, 21 (n. 1). Coleridge also observes that although Moore is adept at the application of poststructuralist criticism to biblical text and to NT commentators, he nevertheless “seeks to defend a hermeneutic which the poststructuralist criticism underlying his critique has long since abandoned.” Coleridge, Birth of the Lukan Narrative, 19.
153 Moore, Literary Criticism, 119.
world today work perfectly well, despite the fact that the science behind them has been shown to be faulty according to some of the leading minds in the field of the philosophy of science. What Moore is conceding here is that, whilst the theoretical shortcomings of narrative and other reading approaches can be argued, interpreters will (or indeed must) adopt an approach when faced with the task of reading and interpreting. The analogy is apt, and the study continues, despite an awareness of its own conditionedness.

4 Key Elements of Narrative Reading Employed in This Study

Several narrative reading approaches have already been mentioned. However, an overview of key elements of the narrative approach taken here is helpful for readers to orient themselves to what follows. Most of these key elements can be dealt with briefly, but several will require some more detail as they are important to the study and an adequate foundation needs to be laid at this point.

4.1 Sequential Reading, Rereading, and Orality

Narrative sequence is important as readers expect themes, characters, and ideas to develop and to be satisfactorily rounded out in the course of reading or hearing a narrative. Later additions cause readers to revisit, expand, and rethink earlier impressions. Questions and puzzles that are thrown up at one point may be answered or resolved later on. Thus “synthesising” is part of the task of reading. Robert Brawley follows Iser’s notion of “progressive discovery,” whereby a reader “moves through the text sequentially in search of how themes develop and characters gradually take shape.” But it is also reasonable to assume that rereading (or re-hearing) is valid. The possibility of audience familiarity with

155 Iser, How to Do Theory, 66.
Luke, one or more of the other Gospels, or oral tradition means it is valid to some extent to read later developments and material into related material earlier in the narrative. There is a tension here between familiarity with the whole text and how the text unfolds in sequence. Whilst rereading allows for readers having an overview of a narrative, it should not override sequence completely. Finding the balance here is a matter of judgement.

Moore argues that reader-response approaches move interpreters away from the text-as-object toward the text-as-event.158 With an emphasis on the process and experience of the often proposed first-time reader, the reader-response critic better approximates the experience of the hearer of the text.159 But again, and as noted above, the idea of first-time hearer presents some challenges if predominantly Christian initial audiences are proposed. Such hearers would presumably be familiar with the story or issues addressed in the Gospel.160 Moore’s discussion highlights the benefits of sequential reading and rereading in assisting us to “hear” the text. Hearers experience the story as a sequential narrative, but as non-first-time hearers, they may also be akin to re-readers. That is, they are familiar with the narrative,161 so that some level of familiarity with the text can be assumed.

4.2 The “Word Study” Approach

In this study Luke’s Gospel is surveyed for the use of particular vocabulary. Looking at the occurrence of key words or word groups in a Gospel text is acknowledged as an inadequate way on its own to approach the question of the weight or programmatic significance of particular themes, ideas, or characters. It is a method that only “sees” where an author is overt in using particular vocabulary. As Bock states when discussing Jesus as Messiah in Luke, “looking for the use of a specific title may miss references to the concept and its

158 Moore, Literary Criticism, 88. The lack of formatting and structuring in ancient texts placed the burden on the reader or performer. It was expected that the “reader/audience will ‘prepare’ and ‘perform’ the actual reading,” Pieter J. J. Botha, Orality and Literacy in Early Christianity, Biblical Performance Criticism 5 (Eugene: Cascade, 2012), 99. For an overview of the issues involved with orality see P. R. Eddy, “Orality and Oral Transmission,” DJG, 2nd ed., 641-650.

159 Moore, Literary Criticism, 84-88.

160 Ibid., 91-95.

161 This is a positivistic take on Moore’s discussion.
development.” Nevertheless, if it can be demonstrated with such a method that the vocabulary (for example, the key vocabulary in Luke 4:18-19) is integral to the Gospel, and that it is indeed woven through the work as a strong thread, then the importance of that vocabulary has been adequately established, even if the results are less nuanced than a full-scale study. If key vocabulary is tracked sequentially through Luke and a development or trajectory can be discerned, then this is a helpful pointer towards further exploration. This would include a broader look at related vocabulary, themes, concepts and parallels. Despite his reservations towards this approach that we have just noted, Bock himself employs it extensively, and to very good effect.

4.3 Parallels


163 For but one of many examples see his section on “‘Today’ Passages” in ibid., 135.

164 This is not to claim that parallels are absent elsewhere in Luke, only that the focus of this study is on the parallels between Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39. Others will be referred to.


166 For a summary diagram of the “formal patterns” Talbert identifies see Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 63.

167 Talbert claims his observations are valid even without the assumption of a two-source hypothesis and his heavy reliance on redaction criticism. Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 14 (n. 69).


169 Tannehill lists twelve of Talbert’s works in his bibliography. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:313.

Whilst McComiskey interacts with and draws from both Talbert and Tannehill in detail, his approach is more akin to the one taken by Talbert than Tannehill. Authorial intent and the validation of that intent by redaction criticism are key components of McComiskey’s *Literary Structure*. His work is included here because it does interact with and critique some of the assumptions of narrative approaches.

Despite the differences in their approaches and findings, Talbert, Tannehill, and McComiskey agree that there are literary patterns in Luke’s Gospel. Furthermore, there is a general consensus in a number of areas. This consensus extends to the following points:

1. *The criteria used by scholars to detect parallels and correspondences.* These are usefully summarised by McComiskey as: language (same or similar wording),

---


171 For example, McComiskey discusses the importance of the author. McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 346-352. He proposes a comprehensive but complex set of parallels and patterns. Some of the parallels he notes appear forced. Further, McComiskey himself is adamant throughout his work that authorial intent must be established. The above comments on authorial intent and competence notwithstanding, it is hard to credit Luke with intentionally creating such a complex and at times subtle set of parallels and patterns as the one McComiskey proposes. This undermines the internal logic of *Literary Structure*.

172 To note which author uses which terms (and how) would require copious and tedious footnoting. Suffice to say there is much overlap and little to invalidate techniques or observations explored by one and not the others.

173 Clark provides a useful survey of authors who have attempted to set and use criteria for parallels in Clark, *Parallel Lives*, 67-74. Besides Talbert these include Goulder and Radl. Goulder proposes three criteria. These are, “the need to supply catenas, and not single instances... of correspondences; the need for the coincidence of actual Greek words between type and antitype, and the rarer the better; and the need for a convincing motive for the evangelist to have composed his work in the way claimed.” Michael D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964), 10. Radl is concerned with intention. He considers whether parallels are present in the source or are a result of redaction, finding that Luke balances tradition and composition; the shape of the parallels, their number, and their order; lexical parallels, the content and function of those parallels, and the contradictions between Luke and Acts. W. Radl, *Paulus und Jesus im lukantischen Doppelwerk: Untersuchungen zu Parallelmotiven im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte*, EH (Bern: Herbert Lang, 1975), 346-51. Clark proposes “[s]ome clear textual similarity... in content, language, literary form, sequence, structure or theme.” He believes authorial intent must be established. Clark, *Parallel Lives*, 75-80.

174 With minor changes to wording this list comes from McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 10-11.
content, form (form-critical), theme, structure (surface structure of passages), function (of a pericope in its context), sequence (of parallel features or passages). The presence of these features helps to identify parallelism. Where redaction criticism is employed, evidence of redaction that enhances correspondence is further evidence of parallelism. Finally, the number of parallels noted is important. 

2. *The types of literary devices used.* Tannehill identifies type-scene, preview, review, echo, parallelism, and repetition. While each of these is subtly different, they can all be described broadly as “parallels.” McComiskey uses “narrative features” in the identification of parallels. These “features” fall under four headings: (1) Verbal–verbatim repetition of words or phrases; (2) Narrative Techniques—such as reported speech, scenic presentations (as opposed to summaries), narration rather than description, explanation, and comment; (3) Narrative World/Content—including characters and events; (4) Conceptual Content–themes and idea.

3. *The literary functions of these devices and structures.* Talbert claims literary structures are employed to assist memory, to assist meaning, and to conform to aesthetic convention. Tannehill says the function of previews and reviews is to tie a narrative together, aid in the comprehension of plot, interpret events, create expectations, and indicate what is central to the story. The function of echoes and parallels is

---

175 McComiskey also mentions the “disruption of the text” in *Literary Structure*, 10-11, (n. 24). That is, where sources have been rearranged to facilitate parallels. In his opinion this is a valid test, but he has not observed this kind of “disruption” in Luke.

176 These are all listed under the subject index of Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:333-334.

177 Note for example, that “parallels” are listed with “echoes” in ibid., 1:333.


179 This list of features (with minor rewording) is taken from McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 209. Also worth noting are parallels that involve “different kinds of sentences (assertions, questions, imperatives) or the succession of statements which are connected together at different enunciative moments.” Jacques Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach: Narrative and Metaphor (Luke 5:1-11),” in *Signs and Parables: Semiotics and Gospel Texts*, ed. the Entrevernes Group, trans Gary Phillips, PTMS 23 (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978), 191.

180 Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 81.

commentary, theological attribution, reminder, comparison, engagement of the imagination, highlighting, and thematic unification. These functions often operate in combination. In outlining criteria, literary devices, and the function ascribed to these devices, it is important to note that, despite different vocabulary and nuances of understanding, Talbert, Tannehill, and McComiskey are discussing similar features.

4. **That perfect or strict conformity to patterns is not a helpful expectation.** Variations in pattern, gaps, interludes, omissions, asymmetry, disruptions, and variations in the size of parallel elements are all to be expected. Nor does the presence of such irregularities detract from the function and artistry of Luke’s work. LXX and classical examples of this lack of strict conformity are cited as examples influential on Luke’s style. Talbert, for example talks of the principle of balance on the one hand and “symmetrophobia” on the other in Greek and Roman literature.

5. **That audience awareness of structure and literary devices may not have been assumed by the author.** Did the author expect the audience to consciously appreciate or to detect literary structures and devices embedded within the work? Talbert notes a range of answers given to this question, concluding that the effect intended was probably more akin to “rhythm” than to conscious awareness.

6. **That authorial intent does not have to be proved for a structure or device to be present in the text.** Structures, patterns, and literary devices may appear in the text through the deliberate shaping of the text or tradition by the author. This may occur as a result of the sources used or as a result of historical sequence. But authorial intent is not deemed necessary for patterns and devices to have effect. This point is conceded by

---

182 Ibid., 1:46.

183 Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 79.

184 Crudely summarised by Talbert as, “no, by some (upon reflection), yes (upon reflection), yes.” Ibid.

185 Ibid., 80-81. Quoted with approval in McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 81.

186 Though at this point there is disagreement about the validity of interpretation based on “unintentional” or “accidental” devices, patterns, or structures. These may occur, for example, as a result of Luke’s use of sources, or they could simply reflect historical sequence.
McComiskey, as well as Tannehill.¹⁸⁷ Talbert is more closely wedded to intentionality.¹⁸⁸

7. *That an overall structure or pattern should not be allowed to displace the emphasis of an individual pericope or episode.* Hence “features of correspondence need not be the central thrust of the pericopae in which they lie. However, they should be strongly related to it.”¹⁸⁹ And again, “The interpretation of passages should not be hijacked by the structure . . . because the structure cannot contain all the valid interpretations.”¹⁹⁰

8. *That more than one pattern may be present in the text.* Talbert notes that “in antiquity double and even triple architetonic design was not uncommon.”¹⁹¹ Similarly McComiskey writes, “in a highly patterned book, a passage can serve two structural functions.”¹⁹²

### 4.3.1 Parallels and intentionality

Although authorial intent has been discussed earlier it is revisited here specifically with regard to parallels and literary structures.¹⁹³ Talbert and McComiskey argue that evidence of redaction by Luke demonstrates intentionality and is therefore a strong argument for recognising parallels. Test number six of McComiskey’s eleven tests for intentionality of an observed literary device is, “if redaction critical observations yield evidence of Lukan adjustment to include or create the elements that constitute the literary device, the probability of intent is greater insofar as there are no superior reasons for the observed redaction.”¹⁹⁴ The

---


¹⁸⁹ McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 209 (his emphasis).

¹⁹⁰ Ibid., 210.

¹⁹¹ Talbert, *Literary Patterns*, 13 (n. 68) and 30 (n. 1).

¹⁹² McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 133.

¹⁹³ Section 3.2.1.

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 12.

32
counter argument, that passages taken from source material must have reflected Luke’s intent as he chose to include them, is devalued. McComiskey finds it “inconceivable” that Luke would have in his mind all the details of the large blocks of Markan material he adopts for his Gospel. But this argument tends to undervalue the portions of text Luke has taken from sources without modification. Similar assumptions underlie Talbert’s *Literary Patterns*, to which McComiskey is heavily indebted. In contrast, Tannehill states simply, “I am concerned with Luke-Acts in its finished form, not with pre-Lukan tradition.” In line with the discussion on narrative approaches and its bias towards the finished form of the text, this study favours Tannehill’s approach.

McComiskey’s resolve to discard structures or parallels that do not meet his criteria for intentionality falters at times. For example:

The structure reflects Luke’s interpretation of Gospel accounts and is a direct expression of his conscious theological purpose. Consequently, it aids the distinction between theology that Luke intended to communicate and that which was not intended yet is still a valid construal of the text. *This is not to say that the evangelist would not have noticed or approved of the unintended theology. It is simply to say that his specific intent would not have encompassed all theology validly derivable from the text.*

To say that Luke may have approved of his “unintended” theology would seem an admission that strict insistence on authorial intent is problematic. If Luke himself might acknowledge his “not intended” theology, then ought readers not to explore it, especially that which is “validly derivable”? After all, it can be argued that with hindsight, historical perspective, and a wider canonical context we may understand this text better than Luke did, or that changing contexts allow us to see new dimensions in the text. In the case of Luke’s lake

---

195 Ibid., 43.

196 Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:6 (n. 3).


198 McComiskey reiterates the need for intent to be established. McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 13, 43-44, 55, 83-86, 158, 285 and passim.

stories there is strong evidence that Luke did intend some connection between the two stories. Indeed, the survey of McComiskey’s eleven tests of intentionality here follows. It shows that, according to McComiskey’s criteria, these two stories strongly demonstrate intentionality. Each of McComiskey’s criteria (italics) is followed by a brief comment on how Luke’s lake stories measure against the criteria:

1. *The greater the restriction of elements of a correspondence to the relevant passage, the greater the probability of authorial intent.* I will show in due course that the lake setting and associated vocabulary are unique to these episodes within Luke, as is the motif of journey upon and then to the other side of the lake. Luke’s use of λίμνη intensifies the specificity of this language to the lake stories.

2. *The greater the number of reasonable parallel features between parallel passages, the greater is the probability of intent.* The large number and the nature of the parallels between the two lake stories are described in Chapters 3-5 of the study.

3. *The greater the number of parallel passages (or panels) that match a proposed pattern or grouping of features, the greater is the case for intent.* There are only two lake stories. However, as Talbert notes, Luke’s fondness for pairs and duality is well documented.201 Still the two discipleship cycles add to the effect as they increase the number of “panels.”202

4. *An element of correspondence that attracts the reader’s attention contributes to the probability of intent.* The setting and the journeys attract attention, as do the nature

200 These headings are paraphrased from McComiskey, *Literary Structure*, 12-13. The comments are necessarily brief and give only representative examples as the details referred to are discussed in detail in Chapters 3-5 of the study.


202 Chapter 2, Section 4.
miracles that take place: the catching of the fish and then the stilling of the storm, and the commissioning of Simon and the deliverance and then sending of the man.

5. *Parallelism between complex unity, such as combined pericopae, that appears constructive rather than random or coincidental increases the probability of intent.* Two parts to the second lake journey make this more complex than the first but enable the journey to the other side of the lake to be completed with endings that echo one another (first journey: the disciples leave and follow; second journey: the man returns proclaiming).

6. *If redaction critical observations yield evidence of Lukan adjustment to include or create the element that constitutes the literary device, the probability of intent is greater insofar as there are no superior reasons for the observed redaction.* Luke’s departure from his source (Mark) to insert 5:1-11 and the above mentioned use of λίμνη against his Markan source count here.

7. *If the elements of correspondence that constitute the literary device are related to important Lukan themes, the probability of intent is enhanced.* As discipleship journeys the lake stories represent an important theme. The journey motif itself is important in Luke.\(^{203}\)

8. *Intent is more certain if there is no clear historical or genre expectation for the inclusion of the features in question and their sequence, if parallelism of sequence is observed.* Both Luke and Mark are biographies of Jesus. Luke has taken over and modified Mark’s sea of Galilee stories. There is, therefore, a genre expectation that Luke contains sea stories. This then is a point against intentionality.

9. *If a sequence or grouping of features in parallel is uncommon in other relevant literature, then the likelihood of coincidence due to common expression is diminished.* While there are examples of inverse parallelism between the two lake stories they are not prominent or consistent enough to be identified as an organising principle.

---

\(^{203}\) Chapter 2, Section 3.6.
10. If the passages that constitute parallel groupings of passages are contiguous within the groupings, and not distributed broadly throughout the text, then selectivity on the part of the reader is diminished. The material identified as important to the two discipleship cycles is reasonably broadly distributed. However, it does all occur within the same (Galilean) phase of the Gospel.

11. The probability of intent increases as more of the above tests are passed. The validity of the cumulative argument is demonstrated in Chapter 5 of this study.

Luke’s lake stories clearly fulfil nine of McComiskey’s eleven criteria. This suggests that they were intentionally created by Luke as parallel texts. The first of these is programmatic for the theme of discipleship. The second significantly advances the discipleship theme. Furthermore, these two scenes are located within blocks of material that exhibit broad structural parallels. These observations hold true whether Luke was aware of the devices present in his text or not, and whether or not we perceive that other “architectonic” patterns are at work.

4.4 Intertextuality

Intertextuality, particularly the relationship between OT and NT texts, is useful in reading each of the two lake stories against their OT backgrounds. Furthermore, the criteria and methods employed can usefully add to the above discussion of parallels, which are a form of intratextuality. That is, intertextual reading approaches help with intratextual reading. The departure point for this discussion is Richard Hays’ *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul.* This discussion will work towards developing parameters as to what constitutes an intertextual connection and what kind of significance can be read into such connections.

204 On correspondences between “random selections of two pericopes” and blocks of material as a control, see McComiskey, *Literary Structure,* 84-85.


These are useful in their own right but will also find application in considering intratextual parallels, particularly between the two lake stories.

Hays considers Paul’s use of the Hebrew Scriptures but his observations have been usefully applied to the study of Luke. Hays’ intertextual approach begins with the recognition that the OT itself is formed around textual interplay and the reworking of earlier traditions. To understand Paul, Hays argues, requires that he be read against the “inner-biblical exegesis” we find in the OT. Hays draws on literary-critical approaches to intertextuality, arguing for a spacious approach to intertextuality. Rather than seeking “genetic or causal explanations for specific texts” readers should listen for echoes of previous discourses, sensitised by familiarity with the cultural codes the text assumes, and entering the “discursive space” of the culture in which the text lives. Hays limits his study to citation and allusion, seeking to discern the “poetic effects” produced by Paul’s “echoing” of his predecessors.

Hays describes “intertextuality” as “the embedded fragments of an earlier text within a later one.” Others prefer to call this “influence” and “allusion,” arguing that intertextuality looks at words and phrases within a text that are current in the culture that produces the text. Where intertextuality focuses on the text or readers (rather than the author), influence and allusion (“intertextuality” for Hays) look for more specific connections between a more limited number of texts. Stanley Porter is concerned with the proliferation of terminology, particularly between the two lake stories. 

---

207 For a recent example see Harris, “Shepherd King.”

208 Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 14. This type of process and reworking is well recognised by scholars discussing jubilee and Sabbath. For example, Robert B. Sloan, The Favourable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilee Theology in the Gospel of Luke (Austin: Schola, 1979), 12-27.

209 Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 15.

210 Ibid., 18.

211 Hayse, Echoes of Scripture, 14-15. Sommer critiques Hays for defining intertextuality too narrowly, though he concedes that Hays recognises the term is used more broadly by others. Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 206-207 (n. 7). Compare Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 17 to Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 211-12.

212 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 7.
especially that coming out of literary criticism, and its imprecise definition and application in NT scholarship. 213 He defines citation as “formal correspondence with actual words found in antecedent texts,” and allusion as “the nonformal invocation by an author of a text (or person, event, etc.) that the author could reasonably have been expected to know.” 214 This study will treat “quotation” and “citation” as synonyms, and “allusion” and “echo” as synonyms, and will adopt Porter’s definitions for these terms. 215 “Intertextuality” therefore, becomes an umbrella term for these phenomena. When it comes to looking for, and at, parallels between the two lake stories and other Lukan and LXX passages, the question is really, “Can we see that one text has been shaped or influenced by another?”

One of the challenges for readers who listen for echoes is discerning real echoes from imagined. Hays offers seven tests, or “rules of thumb.” They are: 216

1. Availability: the availability of the source to the author and readers.
2. Volume: the “degree of explicit repetition of words or syntactical patterns.” 217
3. Recurrence: how often the texts are invoked.
4. Thematic coherence: how well the intertext fits with the argument being developed.
5. Historical plausibility: could the alleged meaning or effect be intended and could the readers have understood it?
6. History of interpretation: “one of the least reliable guides for interpretation.” 218

---


215 Porter also allows that these terms be used synonymously. Ibid.

216 Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 29-32. I have summarised these as generic principles. Hays is, of course, discussing Paul and his writings.

217 Ibid., 30.

218 Ibid., 31.
7. Satisfaction: with or without other criteria, does the proposed intertextual allusion or echo make sense? This is a difficult test but finally the most important.

Hays observes that Paul’s primary concern is not with the original intention of OT texts. He also demonstrates that there is an element of playfulness in Paul’s use of Scripture. Nevertheless, that use of Scripture is grounded in “a secure sense of the community of God’s grace.” Paul’s quotations may appear random and eclectic, but they need to be understood as “allusive recollections of the wider narrative setting from which they are taken.” In the final analysis the authority of an earlier text does not make invalid the creative use of that text by a later biblical author.

Hays’ approach to intertextuality invites us to step into the less certain but more creative, imaginative, and spacious world of allusion, metaphor, and story. This freedom is especially helpful with a text such as Luke 4:16-30, where we encounter specific citations of OT texts (Luke 4:18-19 and Isaiah 61:1 and 58:6), as well as evocative allusions to some classic OT narratives and characters (Luke 4:25-27 and the Elijah and Elisha narratives). Hays also cautions us against clinging tenaciously to fixed or singular “backgrounds” to these citations and allusions.

Hays’ work has been much discussed and critiqued. Porter, for example, argues that of Hays’ seven criteria for detecting echoes, the first three are inadequate and the last four are actually criteria for the interpretation of echoes, rather than for their identification. Therefore, “it is not clear that the term ‘echo’ provides a way forward in understanding how the Old Testament may be used in the New.” Nevertheless, Hays’ criteria, used broadly for intertextuality, whether echo or citation, are helpful, as Litwak has demonstrated.

________________________________________________________________________

219 Ibid., 156.
220 Ibid., 157-158.
221 Ibid., 178.
223 Ibid., 83-4.
224 Litwak, Echoes of Scripture.
last four criteria are more useful for interpretation than identification can be argued, but as aids for interpretation they are indeed useful, the limitations he notes notwithstanding.225

Ziva Ben-Porat defines literary allusion as “a device for the simultaneous activation of two texts.”226 She identifies four stages in the interpretation of allusion.227 First, the reader recognises a marker. Second, this identification evokes a text. Third, this results in a modification of the interpretation in the alluding text. Fourth, the evoked text as a whole is activated, connecting it to the alluding text. Thus “properties of the source text outside of the marked sign may prove relevant for the alluding text.”228 Closely linked to allusion is influence. This is a broader connection that works between authors, whole works, or traditions.229 This last point about relevant aspects of the text outside the marked sign works with Hays’ point about “discursive space.”230 The process is relevant for citation as well, though obviously it would start at Ben-Porat’s stage two. Both Hays and Ben-Porat are really talking about broader literary context here. Ben-Porat’s description of the process, and Hays’ tests (having noted their limitations) serve well for intertextual echoes and allusions. For this study they are also useful for intratextual echoes and allusions that mark parallels such as those between the first and second of Luke’s lake stories.

Hays encourages us to look at the ways NT writers engaged with the OT. He bids us entertain the idea that a NT author (Paul, or Luke) will read, evoke, or even playfully allude to Scripture in ways that reflect that author’s own perspective and concerns, while leaving room for our own creative readings of NT texts and the OT/LXX texts to which they allude. Similarly John Roth highlights the importance of appreciating that Luke’s intertext was the

225 Litwak (following Brawley) considers Hays’ first two criteria (availability and volume) to be sufficient to validate echoes. Hays’ last five criteria are acknowledged as valid, but, as there is “significant overlap” between them, they can be subsumed under the first two criteria and are therefore unnecessary. Ibid., 63.


227 Ibid., 110-111. “Allusion” here is “intertextuality” for Hays.

228 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 13. Sommer is here commenting on Ben-Porat, “Poetics,” 110-111.

229 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 14-15. Litwak believes that there need not be a direct quotation to establish the volume of an intertext. Volume is conveyed by clearly parallel narratives, explicit quotations marked by Luke, significant verbal echoes, and subtle echoes. Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 64.

230 Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 15.
LXX. He demonstrates how Luke uses OT character types to say something crucial about Jesus, while at the same time winning the confidence of his audience that will enable them to “go with him” to places the LXX does not. That is, that Jesus is God’s eschatological agent, and against the LXX, accepts “sinners.”

A final note on “parallelomania” needs be added to this section. Samuel Sandmel defines this term as “that extravagance among scholars which first overdoes the supposed similarity between passages and then proceeds to describe source and derivation as if implying literary connection flowing in an inevitable or predetermined direction.” As Sandmel defines it, parallelomania is something to be avoided. However, there are several points that need to be noted here. First, Sandmel is discussing intertextual parallels. That is, the parallels between different works. Second, he does not dispute that there may be parallels, that there may be literary dependence, and that the direction of that dependence may be established. Rather, he is cautioning against the overzealous application of this approach. The caution is well sounded.

The other points in his article are solid, if unremarkable: the study of parallels involves the study of specific detail, not just abstract ideas; overlap between texts is to be expected in some cases, so that “even true parallels may be of no great significance of themselves”; it may be the distinctives that are important rather than the parallels; parallels may be “significant or merely routine”; parallels may be exact, with some of these devoid of significance; there may be seeming but only imperfect parallels; and there may be “statements that can be called parallels only by taking them out of context.” Sandmel is discussing

231 Roth, The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor, 23-26.
232 Ibid., 176.
234 Ibid., 2-5.
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236 Ibid., 3-5.
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238 Ibid., 7.
intertextuality but his cautions are also relevant to the evaluation of intratextuality as discussed above.\textsuperscript{239}

4.5 Other Literary Patterns and Structures: Chiasmus, Inclusio

Narrative readings pay close attention to the literary structure of texts. Parallelism, chiasmus, and inclusio are among the most important of the various devices and features that convey meaning in NT narrative.\textsuperscript{240} The three are interrelated as they all involve intratextuality. Parallelism has been discussed above.\textsuperscript{241} Chiasmus and inclusio are discussed here.

4.5.1 Chiasmus and inclusio

A chiasm is present where the order of parallel elements of material occurs in reverse order to the series that it parallels: A B B\textsuperscript{1} A\textsuperscript{1}.\textsuperscript{242} It is “a specific and unique form of parallelism where corresponding parallel elements are structured in unique order.”\textsuperscript{243} An odd number of parts will lead to an element standing at the centre: A B C B\textsuperscript{1} A\textsuperscript{1}. Extended chiasm reflects the same structure, but may encompass entire passages or even books. The structural centre of a chiasm is the focal point,\textsuperscript{244} often serving as the “hinge” or “turning point.”\textsuperscript{245} The centre may serve as

\textsuperscript{239} Above, Section 4.3.


\textsuperscript{241} Section 4.3.


\textsuperscript{243} Siew, The War, 37. For a survey and introduction to the history of scholarship on chiasmus, see Meynet, Rhetorical Analysis, 44-166.


\textsuperscript{245} William W. Klein, Craig Bloomerger, and Robert L. Hubbard, Introduction to Biblical Interpretation (Dallas: Word, 1993), 238.
both focal point and transition. In extended chiasm, the secondary emphasis often falls on the “frames,” A and A'. Nils Lund notes that a chiasm is essentially about the ordering of ideas. It can be formed by identical or related wording. Importantly for Chapter 5 of this study, it is possible for chiasmus to be one of several literary patterns working simultaneously.

On the question of intention, Lund concedes that this structuring may not have been intended by the author. Others insist on authorial intention. Writing on internal repetitions, Green achieves an appropriate balance between acknowledging authorial intent and emphasis upon the final form of the text when he states that “authorial intentions are less material than are the manifold interpretive responses supported by the narrative itself.”

Relevant to the present investigation is the point that extended chiasmus will have parallel elements but will also show thematic development. For example, Joanna Dewey argues for Mark 2:1-3:6 as a “single literary unit with a tight and well-worked out concentric or chiastic structure: A B C B' A' (Mark 2:1-12, 13-17, 18-22, 23-28; 3:1-6).” But there is a readily observable and clear development or intensification in the opposition to Jesus through this sequence of pericopae. In Mark 2:6-7 the scribes question Jesus “in their hearts”; in Mark 2:16-17 the scribes of the Pharisees question the disciples about Jesus; in Mark 2:18 the people question Jesus directly; in Mark 2:24 the Pharisees question Jesus about the disciples; and in Mark 3:2 they are watching to see if Jesus will cure on the Sabbath. When he does,

250 Lund, “The Presence of Chiasmus,” 81-82. Though elsewhere he considers intention to be important. Ibid., 235.
252 Green, “Internal Repetition,” 284 and 296.
they go out and conspire with the Herodians to kill him.\textsuperscript{254} Note also that parallel elements may function as contrast or comparison.\textsuperscript{255}

Various sets of criteria have been proposed for the legitimate identification of chiasmus. For example, Craig Blomberg has nine “criteria,”\textsuperscript{256} whilst Lund has seven “laws.”\textsuperscript{257} For macro-chiasmus Blomberg’s criteria provide a good guide.\textsuperscript{258} They can be paraphrased as follows:

1. No other obvious structure is readily observable.
2. The corresponding elements between the two halves of the chiasm must be obvious— even to commentators who are not looking for chiasmus.
3. As themes tend to reappear anyway, parallels need to be grammatical and verbal as well as conceptual in most (if not all) cases.
4. The verbal parallels must show imagery or terminology that is central rather than peripheral to the text.
5. Verbal and conceptual elements must not be found (“regularly”) elsewhere throughout the chiasm. This is where many proposals fall down.
6. Multiple pairs in opposite parts of the passages are required to convince that the common elements do not simply arise from themes or unconscious use of language. Multiple features in each section improves the case further.
7. The outline should divide the text at its natural (paragraph) breaks.
8. The centre of the chiasm must be worthy of the position. That is, it must be of “theological or ethical significance.”\textsuperscript{259} Even better, it will be echoed in the first and last section (A A\textsuperscript{1}).
9. Ruptures in the outline are to be avoided “if at all possible.”

\textsuperscript{254} Cohn notes linear logic with repetition of key words within a chiastic structure in Robert Cohn, “The Literary Logic of 1 Kings 17-19,” \textit{JBL} 101, no. 3 (1982), 334-36.


\textsuperscript{256} Blomberg, “The Structure of 2 Corinthians,” 5-7.


\textsuperscript{258} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{259} Ibid., 7.
Blomberg admits it is rare for chiastic structures to fulfill all nine of these criteria comprehensively. Antonius Siew accepts these guidelines except for no. 7. Following Stanley Porter and Jeffrey Reed, he questions why a chiastic analysis would be necessary if the elements align with natural breaks.\(^{260}\) Siew presumes that by “natural breaks” Porter and Reed mean “those breaks that are easily detected by a casual reading of the text.”\(^{261}\) Also, the requirement that the elements align with natural breaks would appear to contradict Blomberg’s first principle, that there must be a problem perceiving the structure of the text without recourse to chiasm.\(^{262}\) The first criterion, that no other structure is clearly observable, is not helpful as it also contradicts the assertion that multiple patterns may be at work.\(^{263}\) These reservations notwithstanding, Blomberg’s guidelines are useful in identifying the presence of chiasmus.

Inclusio is the framing or bracketing of a poem or passage by the use of the same or similar line or wording at the beginning and the end.\(^{264}\) This can be more loosely described as, “a technique in which the author at the end of a discussion returns to the point he made at the beginning.”\(^{265}\) The effect is to bracket or bookend a passage, marking the material in between as a coherent entity. The key word or phrase or idea that forms the inclusio also guides the reader towards one of the main or the central ideas of the material contained therein. Inclusio will be noted at various points in this study.


\(^{261}\) Siew, *The War*, 52 (n. 206).

\(^{262}\) Ibid., 52-53.

\(^{263}\) Section 4.3, above.

\(^{264}\) Klein, Blomberg and Hubbard, *Introduction*, 240.

\(^{265}\) Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral*, 39.
4.6 Symbol, Metaphor, and Allegory

Literary devices and figures of speech (similes and metaphors), images, signs, symbols, and motifs establish a “special communication between the implied author and implied reader.” Such devices and figures are crucial to this study.

4.6.1 Symbol

A symbol can be defined as “an image that stands for something in addition to its literal meaning.” Mark Powell notes that animals, numbers, entire actions, or events can be symbolic. This is highly relevant to the two lake stories, where, as will be shown, numbers, animals, actions, and events are indeed heavily symbolic. Chapters 3 and 4 of this study will show that the lake stories are replete with images, signs, symbols, and motifs, as well as being metaphorical journeys.

4.6.2 Metaphor

Metaphor is “an implied comparison.” It works to extend established language use (“literal” meaning) in a way that is “novel or logically odd.” It aims to provoke reaction by this incongruity, and to provide “a model, or picture, or frame of reference, according to which hearers now ‘see’ the point in question in a new way.” Janice Soskice defines metaphor as “that figure of speech whereby we speak about one thing in terms which are suggestive of another.” Erin Heim commends this definition as useful for biblical studies on the basis that

266 Powell, Narrative Criticism, 28.
267 Ryken, Wilhoit, and Logman, DBI, xiv.
268 Powell, Narrative Criticism, 29.
269 Ryken, Wilhoit, and Logman, DBI, xiv. Simile is the same as metaphor but adds “like” or “as.”
“(1) it is tightly focused on treating metaphor as a phenomenon of language, (2) it attaches metaphorical meaning closely to notions of textuality and, (3) it allows for metaphors to be present in all types of grammatical structure.”

As Ian Paul notes, “all language about ‘imagery’ or ‘symbol’ in Scripture is in fact referring to metaphor.” The reading being undertaken of the two lake stories in this study attempts to recognise the symbolic or metaphorical elements, overtones, and connotations present within the two lake stories.

### 4.6.3 Identifying metaphors

Nijay Gupta offers a useful set of seven principles for the identification and then interpretation of metaphors. The first principle for detection is “figurativeness.” The reader asks if the text makes sense when read literally. This would appear to rule out a metaphorical reading of Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39 as the two Lukan lake stories can be read as realistic accounts. However, following Peter Macky, Gupta allows for “twice-true” metaphors. These are “statements that can be true literally as well as metaphorically.” This is exactly what is being proposed for reading Luke’s lake stories. Interestingly, Macky comments that in the Bible twice-true metaphors tend to be longer stories rather than brief sayings. He gives John 9 (the healing of the blind man) and Luke 10:29-37 (the good Samaritan) as examples. Luke’s lake stories are similarly longer stories. In John 9 it is Jesus’ reported speech (John 9:39) that transforms the story of the healing of the blind man into a twice-true metaphor.

---


275 The study of metaphor is a vast field, as noted in Soskice, Metaphor, 15. Soskice’s definition will be adopted for this study.


277 Ibid., 172.
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Similarly I would argue that when Jesus is reported as saying “from now on you will be catching people” (Luke 5:10) that the first lake story is transformed into a twice-true metaphor.280

The second step in identification is assessing the “quality” of the metaphor. Within any culture metaphors sit somewhere between “new” to “conventional” through to “dead.”281 Arguably, dead metaphors are not metaphors at all, so quality is important.282 A good indicator here is frequency of use.283 Certainly the metaphor of fishing was a conventional metaphor within the biblical tradition. The way Luke employs this metaphor sits within the broad range of ways the ship and journey upon the sea were employed in ancient literature.284 However, Luke builds on the way Mark employs the lake as metaphor in his Gospel.285 Thus, Luke’s use of the lake as metaphor for discipleship is not a new metaphor, but it is certainly not a dead one either.286

Gupta’s next five principles are intended to assist in the interpretation of metaphors.287 Number three, “exposure,” asks if the metaphor was available to the author and audience and if they were familiar with the source domain.288 Clearly, since the source domain is fishing or

280 The second lake story also fits the twice-true category but in that instance there are a number of clues that the story has a metaphorical dimension. (These are explored throughout Chapter 4 of this study.) Both lake stories can be considered “dual-direction metaphors” as “there is some reflection back upon the symbol from the subject.” Ibid., 60-64 (also 26, 280).

281 Some have sought to refine the description of the movement of a metaphor along the path from “new” to “dead.” See for example, Gregory W. Dawes, The Body in Question: Metaphor and Meaning in the Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33 (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 73-76; Reidar Aasgaard, ‘My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!’: Christian Siblingship in Paul, JSNTSup 265 (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 26-27; Macky, The Centrality of Metaphors, 72-80. For the purpose of this study however, this simple categorisation is adequate.


285 E.g., Ched Myers, Binding the Strong Man: A Political Reading of Mark’s Story of Jesus (Maryknoll, New York: Orbis, 1988), 194-195.

286 As the first of the Gospels and one of Luke’s main sources, Mark provides the closest and most direct comparison.

287 Gupta, “Interpreting Metaphors,” 173-175. Gupta’s article applies these principles to Romans 5:2, where the establishment of the source domain is one of the key issues. Ibid., 171. In the case of the lake stories in Luke the source domain is obviously fishing or the natural world.

288 Ibid., 174. What Gupta calls the “source domain” is similar to what Dawes calls a “model” and Macky a
the natural world, they were in this case. Next is analogy. Is the metaphorical term or phrase used in similar ways elsewhere? Gupta states that identifying “analogous source-target domain pairings from the same author, especially in the same text, is ideal.” The lake stories pass this test, especially given that the first lake story is overtly transmuted into a metaphor when Luke has Jesus say to Simon that he will henceforth catch people alive (5:10). This transmutation of the first lake story is a strong lead to readers to see the second lake story as metaphorical as well.

Fifth is contextual coherence. This means “finding, if possible, a thematic thread that establishes the metaphor within its literary context.” Discipleship and the movement onto and then to the other side of the lake are that thread in this instance. Sixth is the history of interpretation. The argument here that the two lake stories are closely related is new, but the stories’ relevance to discipleship is not. Finally comes intertextual influence, which Gupta states is not always applicable. As noted, the Markan influence on the lake stories is strong. According to Gupta’s seven principles then, Luke’s lake stories warrant investigation as “twice-true” metaphors for discipleship.

4.6.4 Realistic narrative, metaphorical journey

Despite the extraordinary events they contain, the two lake stories are told in a realistic manner. That is to say, the settings and characters and much of the detail are realistic and need to be read as such. The initial cue for a metaphorical reading of the lake stories (as mentioned above) comes from within the Lukan text. Following the superabundant catch of fish in 5:6 Jesus announces to the fishers in 5:10 that they will “catch people.” Thus it is Jesus himself who, from within the narrative, initiates the metaphorisation of the episode. The more-than-natural ferocity of the storm in Luke 8:22-25, and the echoes between that story and the first lake journey (which is clearly already metaphorical) indicate that the second lake story—

---
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potentially at least—is similarly symbolic in character. Luke employs the journey on the lake as an open (as opposed to a closed) metaphor.\textsuperscript{293} The challenge with metaphorical or symbolic readings, especially extended open metaphors such as Luke’s two lake stories, is to avoid both over-interpretation \textit{and} under-interpretation of the metaphors or symbolism within the text.\textsuperscript{294}

In Chapters 3 and 4 the two lake stories will be explored as narrative texts. They will also be read as symbolic or metaphorical accounts. The implication of this reading on two levels is explored. The exegesis of Luke’s lake stories enters the dynamics of the narrative as a realistic (though somewhat extraordinary) account. It also considers how this first lake journey might function as a metaphor for the first steps of the discipleship journey, a reading that the story itself requires. The heading “Realistic Narrative, Metaphorical Journey” (see 5.6.4) orients the reader to the two levels of reading being explored.

The idea of reading Luke’s lake stories on two levels is not new. For example, of 5:1-11 Green writes that readers recognise both a “realistic account” as well as the “parabolic nature” of the episode.\textsuperscript{295} Similarly Hans Klein reads the episode on two levels. It is a story, he notes, not about fish, but about people. The story shows that without Jesus’ word the work of mission is futile, but with Jesus’ word it is abundantly successful, even when undertaken at the wrong time and place, so that those who are commissioned experience the unexpected.\textsuperscript{296} The second lake story will also been read as a metaphor in Chapter 4 of this study. The study reads both lake stories as two-level narratives.

\section*{4.6.5 Allegory}

Thus far “metaphorical” and “symbolic” have been used to refer to the two levels of meaning in the lake stories. “Allegorical” has been avoided, as for many years this was considered an outmoded and anachronistic interpretive method, due primarily to its over-enthusiastic

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{293} “Paul is a nurse” is an example of an open metaphor as it invites the reader or hearer to consider what aspects of Paul are nurse-like. “Paul is as gentle as a nurse” is an example of a closed metaphor, as the metaphor states the aspect of Paul that is nurse-like. Aasgaard, “My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!,” 26.

\textsuperscript{294} Siew, The War, 25.

\textsuperscript{295} Green, \textit{Luke}, 232.

\textsuperscript{296} Hans Klein, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, RNT (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht), 210.
\end{flushleft}
application by the Church Fathers. However, the discerning of an allegorical level in a text, if judiciously applied, has undergone something of a comeback in parable studies. In his survey of the history of allegorical interpretation of the parables, Blomberg states that “it is not that no elements in the parables stand for things other than themselves; it is a question of how many do so and to what they refer.” Allegorizing beyond the main characters in a story may still be frowned on, but such limitations may be arbitrary. They may be said at least to be a matter of judgement. “The error of pre-modern interpreters lay in overzealous and anachronistic use of allegory, not in the method per se.”

To say that an element “stands for,” or is “symbolic of” something else, is in fact a form of allegorization. Bloomberg goes as far as to say that “any narrative with both a literal and a metaphorical meaning is in essence allegorical.” Demonstrating further the familial relationship between allegory and metaphor, David Parris distinguishes between the two by stating that an allegory is comprised of more than one metaphor. The difference between allegory and metaphor, then, is more one of degree or complexity than of kind.

Parris cautions that to approach a parable as an allegory reduces it to “a collection of propositional truths contained in its multiple references and misses the function of the narrative whole of the parable, which projects a world which the reader or hearer is to enter.” Similarly, this reading of Luke’s lake stories, though it has symbolic, metaphorical,

297 The reading of the Gospels specifically as allegories for their communities is discussed (and rejected) under above. Introduction, Section 2.1. This is to be distinguished from the present discussion on the allegorical nature of texts in general.

298 For a good overview of the history and current state of parable studies, including Blomberg and Snider, see David P. Parris, “Imitating the Parables: Allegory, Narrative, and the Role of Mimesis,” JSNT 25, no. 1 (2002), 35-39.

299 Craig L. Blomberg, Interpreting the Parables (Leicester: Apollos, 1990), 42.

300 Klyne R. Snodgrass, “Parables”, DJG, 1st ed., 598.

301 Blomberg, Interpreting the Parables, 42.

302 Ibid., 47.

303 Ibid., 42 (his emphasis).

304 Parris, “Imitating the Parables,” 35.
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or allegorical aspects, is a narrative reading of the whole of each of the lake stories within their narrative context, Luke-Acts, or Luke and Acts. Maintaining the tension between the symbolism integral to the lake stories and their place within a broader realistic biographical narrative facilitates the reading of these texts as both realistic narrative and metaphorical journey.

What I am arguing is that, despite the fact that the lake stories are not parables, there is an allegorical element present in the text. Any reading that claims the Gospels “mean something” in effect does this. Take for example Chester McCown on Luke’s Travel Narrative:

[T]he frequent references to ‘following Jesus’ through sufferings show what this last journey of Jesus meant to the early Christians. It was a journey fraught with the most extraordinary consequences for Jesus and all those who acknowledged him as Master. Finally, it symbolized and prefigured the eventual spread of the gospel among the Gentiles. For the author it was a mystical, as well as a real, travel narrative, a journey of the Christian spirit and the Christian message.306

With “mystical, as well as real” McCown is suggesting a two-level reading, one that is in part symbolic or, if exercised in a circumspect manner, allegorical. This study is overt in exploring these two levels.

Is this then an allegorical reading of Luke’s lake stories? Arguably, yes. However the claimed referents to which the text itself points are not arbitrary but arise from the text itself. In keeping with a text-guided narrative approach, symbolic meanings have not been attached to every detail of the story, but only to those details that can be reasonably assigned meaning from the narrative thrust of the text but without falling, it is hoped, into the trap of over-interpretation.307


307 Introduction, Section 6.1.
4.7 Sea-Storm Type-Scenes

Noting similarities with Greco-Roman and Jewish literature containing accounts of sea voyages, some commentators have read Luke 8:22-25 as a sea-storm story or “type-scene.” Because there is no storm in 5:1-11 that story has not been similarly identified. The classification of only one of the lake stories as a sea-storm or sea-voyage has the potential to undermine the thesis that the two lake stories are parallel texts. The discrepancy in classification needs to be addressed. This section considers Charles Talbert’s essay, “The Theology of Sea-Storms in Luke-Acts”308 Pamela Thimmes, Studies in the Biblical Sea-Storm Type Scene,309 and Vernon K. Robins, “By Land and By Sea: The We-Passages and Ancient Sea Voyages.”310

Talbert’s essay discusses Luke 8:22-25 and Acts 27 as sea-storm type-scenes.311 He begins by cataloguing sea voyage stories in Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christian literature.312 He then lists the “numerous elements” of sea-storm type-scenes as:

1. Warning not to sail.
2. Sailing in a bad season.
3. Unusually chaotic winds.
4. Darkness during the storm.
5. Horrendous waves.
6. Sailors scurrying about.
7. Cargo or tackle thrown overboard.
8. Control of the ship given up and its being driven by the wind and the waves.
9. The ship’s frame or hull breaking up.


10. Passengers abandoning all hope.
11. The ship wrecking on rocks or a shallow beach.
12. Survivors drifting on planks.
13. Swimming to shore or another ship.
14. Helpful, simple folk on shore.\textsuperscript{313}

The discussion on Acts 27 identifies where the various elements from this list are found in
that story.\textsuperscript{314} He goes on to relate Luke 8:22-25 to some extra-biblical literature. However,
while these are sea-travel stories, not all involve sea-storms. Talbert does not discuss Luke
5:1-11 in relation to sea-storm type-scenes. Similarly, his discussion of the divine plan in

Of Talbert’s fourteen elements (above) only four are present in Luke 8:22-25: unusually
chaotic winds (3); the presence of horrendous waves (5) is also strongly implied; the
scurrying about of the sailors is suggested (6); and the crew (rather than the passengers) seem
to have abandoned hope (10). It is of course not required that every one of the available
elements be included for a story to be considered a type-scene. Such scenes typically draw on
only some of the available elements of the type.\textsuperscript{316} This means that, for example, not all sea-
storm stories end in shipwreck. Also, type-scenes will typically employ some elements of the
type in modified form.\textsuperscript{317} But of Talbert’s fourteen elements only four have been identified as
present, so that Luke 8:22-25 struggles to qualify as a sea-voyage, according to his criteria.

\textsuperscript{313} Ibid., 177-178. Alter describes type-scenes as “recurrent narrative episodes . . . dependant on the
manipulation of a fixed constellations of predetermined motifs.” Alter, \textit{Art of Biblical Narrative}, 51.

\textsuperscript{314} The list does not distinguish between Greek, Roman, Jewish, and Christian literature, though after each
entry he gives examples of where the elements occur, drawing from all four categories. His “Christian”
category excludes the NT, while Jonah features under “Jewish.”

\textsuperscript{315} Of the divine plan Luke 8:22-25 demonstrates that “Jesus possesses divine power over wind and storm, an
authority he uses for the benefit of his ‘sent ones,’ both before and after Easter.” Talbert, “Sea-Storms,” 195.

\textsuperscript{316} Alter, \textit{Art of Biblical Narrative}, 48-52.

\textsuperscript{317} The abandonment of hope by the crew (the disciples) in this story, rather than the passengers, would be a
good example of variation for effect. In this case the effect would be surprise and it would point to the
disciples’ lack of courage. The group includes at least some professional fishers and yet they are as terrified
as passengers unfamiliar with boats, water, and storms. Jesus’ \textit{ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;} (“where is your faith?”)
(8:25) is consistent with such a reading.
Luke 8:22-25 attributes to Jesus the authority and power over the natural elements that the LXX attributes to YHWH.\textsuperscript{318} The question, found on the lips of the disciples (8:25), is the question of identity: “τίς ἂρα οὐτός ἐστιν ὦτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπέτασε καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ;” (“Who then is this, that commands even the winds and the water, and they obey him?”) Talbert’s answer to this question is that “Jesus is the one with YHWH’s power.”\textsuperscript{319} In arriving at this conclusion he reads this episode against Ps 88:9 (MT: 89:9) “You rule the raging of the sea; when its waves rise, you still them” and Ps 106:29-30 (MT 107:29-30) “He made the storm be still, and the waves of the sea were hushed. Then they were glad because they had quiet, and he brought them to their desired haven.”\textsuperscript{320} Of these only Ps 106:29-30 (107:29-30 MT) could qualify as part of a sea-storm type-scene in its OT (LXX) context, whilst Ps 88:9 (89:9 MT) deals with more exalted themes.

Talbert goes on to argue that as Elijah foreshadows Elisha in the OT/LXX, so Luke’s Gospel foreshadows Acts, and Jesus foreshadows Paul.\textsuperscript{321} At this point Talbert considers foreshadowing through prophesy and foreshadowing through dreams and visions. This is relevant to Acts 27 but Luke 8:22-25 receives no mention. Rather, Luke 8:22-25 (actually 8:22-39) is cited as an instance of “foreshadowing through demonstration” showing that Jesus has authority over the sea and over demons in Gentile territory. Acts is the outworking of this, showing “the protection of the Lord’s servants on the sea (Acts 27) and in terms of authority over the demonic in Gentile territory (Acts 16:16-18; 19:13-20).”\textsuperscript{322}

Talbert then draws up a set of parallels between Luke 9:51-19:46 and Acts 19:21-21:17.\textsuperscript{323} However, there is no list of parallels between Luke 8 and Acts 27. Rather, he claims parallels between Paul’s escapes from storm, shipwreck, and snakebite, and Jesus’ resurrection. This would appear to undermine his argument that Luke 8:22-25 and Acts 27 are both sea-storm

\textsuperscript{318} Talbert, “Sea-Storms,” 178.
\textsuperscript{319} Ibid., 186.
\textsuperscript{320} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{321} Ibid., 191-193.
\textsuperscript{322} Ibid., 192.
\textsuperscript{323} Ibid., 193-194.
type-scenes. If they were both cast as such, and if Luke foreshadows Acts, then we might expect that Talbert would be comparing the escape of the disciples (or Jesus) from the storm in Luke 8 with the escape of Paul from the storm in Acts 27, given that these two texts are the subject of his essay.

Talbert’s essay includes much useful material but it also shows the difficulty of applying the sea-storm type-scene category to Luke 8:22-25. In fact it highlights how different Luke 8:22-25 is to Acts 27:1-28:16. This, and other weaknesses in the article pointed out above, show that Talbert’s article does not undermine our contention that Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39 are parallel lake journeys.

Thimmes also summarises the elements of sea-storm type-scenes. Her “Appendix 1” headed “Comparison of Conventional Motifs” distils her earlier analysis and discussion. It consists of three columns, one each for Greek, Roman, and biblical sea-storm stories. These three columns serve to illustrate the similarities and differences between Greek, Roman, and biblical sea-storm stories. There are few elements from the Greek and Roman sea-storm stories that correspond closely with Luke 8:22-25. Thimmes lists the elements of biblical sea-storm stories as follows. The comment following each point indicates whether the motif is present in Luke 8:22-25:

1. *The journey is launched for practical reasons, escape, business, movement from one locale to another*. No reason for the crossing is given.
2. *Geographic markers designate where the voyage begins*. No beginning location is identified, but the destination is clearly marked.
3. *God or Jesus is always in control over nature, people’s lives, and their safety*. Yes.
4. *A storm develops—hurricane, earthquake—threatening the ship and all on board*. Yes.
5. *A description of the storm: waves beat into the boat, the storm intensifies over time*. Yes.
7. *An important character in the drama is asleep during the storm*. Yes.
8. *Prayer to gods/God for rescue, or beg Jesus for help*. Yes.

---
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10. Twice reference to evil or pollution on board. No.
11. Attempts to placate gods/God by casting lots or praying. No.
12. Passengers “cry out” for help. Yes, if the disciples (rather than Jesus) are “passengers.”
13. In the Gospels: Jesus questions disciples’ faith. Yes.
14. Winds stilled, sea calmed by eliminating the pollution, by power of God, exorcism, or a character’s personal power. Yes.
15. Those on board respond: prayer, acclamation, fear, astonishment, or question. Yes.

Of Thimmes’ sixteen conventional motifs only four are absent from Luke 8:22-25. Three of these are related to her analysis of the Jonah story (numbers 9, 10, 11 above) and there is no geographic marker designating where the voyage begins (2). However, there is a clear designation of the destination of the voyage. Given the importance of this journey to the “other side” as Gentile territory this is in keeping with the thrust of the story as Luke tells it. It is also consistent with the practice of modifying elements of a type-scene for effect. However, the argument is somewhat circular since her analyses of biblical sea-storm type-scenes includes Luke 8:22-25. We then, unsurprisingly, find the elements she has identified in Luke 8:22-25 in her list of elements.

Like Talbert, Thimmes designates Luke 5:1-11 as a “miracle story” rather than a sea-storm type-scene. Subjecting that passage to the same list of “conventional motifs” is revealing. Again, I have indicated “yes,” “no,” and comments after each point:

1. Journey is launched for practical reasons, escape, business, movement from one local to another. Yes.
2. Geographic marker designates where the voyage begins. Yes.
3. God/Jesus always in control over nature, people’s lives, their safety. Yes, over nature, as seen in the haul of fish.
4. A storm develops—hurricane, earthquake—threatening the ship and all on board. No.

---
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5. A description of the storm: waves beat into the boat, the storm intensifies over time. No.
6. Fear. Yes, though the fear is a result of the catch not a storm.
7. An important character in the drama is asleep during the storm. No.
9. Sometimes jettison goods on board. No, though Simon asks Jesus to depart.
10. Twice reference to evil/pollution on board. Simon declares himself a “sinful man,” but only once.
11. Attempts to placate gods/God by casting lots, praying. No, though Simon falls before Jesus.
12. Passengers “cry out” for help. Those in Simon’s boat signal to those in the other boat.
13. In the Gospel: Jesus questions disciples’ faith. No.
14. Winds stilled, sea calmed by eliminating the pollution, by power of God, exorcism, or a character’s personal power. No, though Simon’s distress is reversed. Although he has asked Jesus to depart from him he follows Jesus.
15. Those on board respond: prayer, acclamation, fear, astonishment, or question. Yes.

Despite this being a miracle story, nine of the elements Thimmes identifies are present. But the major impediment to the classification of 5:1-11 as a sea-storm account is that there is no storm. Or is there? In her discussion of Gospel sea-storm type-scenes (which remember excludes Luke 5:1-11), Thimmes suggests that the sea-storms in the Gospels pose no real threat to those travelling with Jesus. Because Jesus is with them their safe arrival is assured. Rather, the “stormy conditions that are really dangerous are the relations between Jesus and the disciples. The sea-storm simply serves as a foil for relational storms: the danger of misunderstanding, the jeopardy of reacting in fear rather than faith, and the risk of naming Jesus and knowing what it means.” The second lake story, therefore, in Thimmes’ view, can be read as a metaphor for the ambiguity, fear, and tension in the relationship between Jesus and the disciples. Could this not also be applied to Luke 5:1-11? Thimmes’ suggestion might work for the second lake story, but Luke 5:5 notwithstanding, it is a stretch to read later

326 Ibid., (emphasis added). See also ibid. 142. Note also that it is a metaphorical reading that is being proposed by Thimmes.
tension or friction between Jesus and the disciples in Luke 8 into the account of the calling of the first disciples in 5:1-11. Even with the sequential (re)reading introduced above it seems over-subtle that the “storm” with its literal/metaphorical interplay in chapter 8 should be read back into the earlier lake journey in Luke 5. Besides this, 5:1-11 does not feature conflict or failure in its relational dimension between Jesus and the disciples. It is true that Simon (and James and John) are “amazed” (5:9) and “afraid” (5:10), and that Simon asks Jesus to depart from him (5:8). However, this reads more like a commission story than a conflict account, and the resolution of the story (5:11) is overwhelmingly positive. Hence it is best considered a commission story.

As for the fact that Luke 8:22-25 (and 5:1-11) are set on the λίμνη (lake) and not the θάλασσα (sea), Thimmes describes Luke’s use of λίμνη as “more precise and realistic.” This is a reasonable suggestion, but given the significance of this detail to her work the matter does not seem to have been adequately addressed. Thimmes advances her argument by noting that ἀνάγω (setting sail) is a favorite Lukan term, being used in 8:22 and thirteen times in Acts. By this she establishes a parallel between 8:22-25 and the sea-storm type-scenes in Acts. However, the connection is tenuous. Except for Acts 27-28, ἀνάγω in Acts is not associated with detailed voyage accounts. Rather, the references are all to straight-forward journeys. In most cases no details at all are given about the journey (Acts 13:13; 18:21; 20:13), several contain the barest detail (Acts 16:11; 18:21; 21:1), and in one there is no sea journey at all (Acts 20:3). None feature sea-storms. By contrast, Acts 27 contains a detailed description of a series of voyages noting geography, itinerary, sailing conditions, sea-storm, jettison of cargo, loss of hope, angelic visitation, shipwreck, destruction of the vessel, arrival at shore (some by swimming, others on planks), kindness from natives, a snake bite (survived by Paul), and healing. The uses of ἀνάγω in vv. 10 and 11 of Acts 28 are part of a continuation of this sea-

327 Though in the context of a discussion about the possibility of this account’s origins as a post-resurrection story, Fitzmyer suggests Simon’s response “reflects a guilt-feeling.” Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:561-562. However, there are no clues that this is the case in the text.
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voyage series, narrating in brief detail Paul’s movements with his companions from the island of Publius through Syracuse, Phegium, Puteoli, and then to Rome. By any reckoning Acts 27 is a classic sea-storm type-scene and would have been readily recognised as such to any reader or hearer familiar with such stories.


Vernon Robbins argues that the “we” passages in Acts are in keeping with the narration of sea voyages in antiquity.331 He summarises the characteristic elements of a sea voyage.332 Of the twelve elements only one, the presence of a storm that threatens to sink the boat, is clearly present in Luke 8:22-25. Robbins notes that “virtually all” of the elements are present in the “we” passages in Acts.333 He goes on to look at structure and parallels, claiming that the travel narrative in Luke is parallel to the “we” journey passages in Acts.334 As Luke’s lake stories sit outside the Lukan travel narrative they do not, by Robins’ reckoning, parallel the sea voyages in Acts. Therefore the Lukan lake stories are unlikely to be sea voyage type-scenes. However, Robbins’ work has been critiqued by Colin Hemer, who states that Robbins’ examples “are not necessarily representative, nor are they always taken correctly in context, nor are they subject to control, nor do they prove the conclusions he draws from them.”335 Recently Green has restated simply that the “we-passages” in Acts suggest Luke was one of Paul’s travelling companions.336

332 Ibid., 230.
333 Ibid., 230-234.
334 Ibid., 234.
On the balance of evidence it must be concluded that neither of the lake stories in Luke can be classified as sea voyages. Luke 5:1-11 has not been recognised as such and 8:22-25 does not contain a sufficient number of the elements of sea-storm type-scenes to be counted as such. Even a cursory look at Acts 27 (which does qualify as a sea voyage) reveals that the two stories are very different. The low number of sea-storm motifs in Luke 8:22-25 shows that Luke was not trying to pattern this account on the sea-storm type-scene. Acts 27 shows that Luke was familiar with the form of the sea-storm type-scene as found in Greco-Roman literature, and that, had he wanted to employ that form here, we might expect more of the standard elements.

It is therefore not necessary to conclude that Luke 8:22-25 is a sea-storm type-scene and that 5:1-11 is not. Hence we can proceed to compare these two passages to each other.

4.8 Discipleship

Luke 6:17 demonstrates that the larger group of disciples is to be distinguished from the throngs of people. The crowds (ὄχλος), or throngs, are “the curious,” whilst the disciples are “convinced believers.” The sending of the seventy (or seventy-two), in 10:1-12 cautions readers against making sharp distinctions between the twelve and the larger group of disciples. Any two-tier proposal for reading discipleship in Luke must reckon with 10:1-12. This is relevant, for example, to the proposal that an inner group of disciples are called to renounce possessions and live an itinerant life, while the “ordinary” disciple is not called to adhere to such strict requirements. Luke emphasises the fact that the twelve joined Jesus on his travels (esp. 6:17; 7:11; 8:22, 22:39) but 8:1-3 and 23:49, 55 demonstrate that others

337 The make-up of this larger group of disciples includes the common people (6:13), a variety of men and women (8:2-3; 23:49, 55; 24:13, 18, 33), and tax collectors (19:1-10). Michael J. Wilkins, “Disciples and Discipleship,” DJG, 2nd ed., 205.

338 Ibid., 209. On the crowds and the people see Chapter 3, Section 6.1.

joined the group for at least some of their journeying. Luke 9:58-62 places a severe expectation on followers, including an itinerant lifestyle.

Michael Wilkins summarises the comprehensive orbit of discipleship in Luke as including family (14:26), wealth, one’s own life (14:26), and in fact anything at all (14:33). Being a disciple means entering the narrow gate (13:22-30) and following only Jesus (14:27; 9:23). Love and undivided faith are required (as in 10:25-37).

Discipleship in Luke means following Jesus and being σὺν αὐτῷ (“with him”). While some follow literally, others do so “in a more figurative sense.” As is often noted, Luke has added πας (everything) to his Markan source in 5:11 to stress the cost to the first disciples of following Jesus. The sense of movement implied in ἀκολουθέω (following) in 5:11 subtly meshes with the effect Luke creates with the journey to Jerusalem in Luke 9-19. Interestingly, the Gerasene demoniac in Luke 8:26-39 is denied the chance to follow literally, but is sent home to διηγέομαι (give an orderly account) of what God has done for him (8:39). Luke’s treatment of wealth and poverty, possessions, and money is extensive. It is a key aspect of discipleship. Given 5:11, where “ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ” (“they left


346 He introduces these themes overtly in 1:52-53 (the Magnificat); 3:10-14 (the exhortation of John the Baptist); 4:3-4 (the first temptation); and 4:16-31 (Jesus at Nazareth), especially in vv. 18, 25-26.
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everything to follow him”) completes the account of the calling of the first disciples, Luke has here established from the outset a strong link between discipleship and possessions. The reader is thus drawn to re-examine the earlier material on wealth and possessions and to ponder discipleship in light of this. As mentioned, discipleship involves more than possessions and wealth, so that the πᾶς (everything) in 5:11 includes family, home, social status, business interests, and wealth. Martin Hengel helpfully emphasises that discipleship is ultimately about more than a particular way of life. Rather, the call to follow and be a disciple is the call to “service to the cause of the approaching Kingdom of God.”

Following 5:11 Luke continues to explore and develop the themes of discipleship and of wealth and possessions through Jesus’ teaching and parables, as well as through the narrative. The discipleship theme is introduced here because it is important to the two lake stories. The commissioning of the disciples in these stories apparently involves quite different relationships to wealth, as well as to other aspects identified as important (family, income, social status, business interests). In Luke 5 the disciples leave everything and follow (5:11). In Luke 8 the demoniac is sent back to his home and city (8:39). This might cause us to revisit

---


349 See 5:27-32 (the calling of Levi) esp. vv. 28; 6:20-26 (the sermon on the plain) esp. v. 20 and 24; 8:4-15 (the parable of the sower) esp. vv. 7 and 14; 9:1-6 (the commissioning of the twelve) esp. v. 3; 9:10-17 (the feeding of the five-thousand) esp. v. 13; 9:57-62 (would-be followers) esp. v. 58; 10:1-12 (the sending of the seventy(-two)) esp. v. 4; 11:1-4 (the Lord’s prayer) esp. v. 4; 12:13-21 (the rich fool); 12:22-34 (do not worry); 14:1-24 (the man with dropsy, when read as an indictment against avarice of the Pharisees as in Willi Braun, *Feasting and Social Rhetoric in Luke 14*, SNTSMS 85 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); 14:25-33 (the cost of discipleship); 16:1-13 (the parable of the dishonest trader); 16:14-15 (the Pharisees as lovers of money); 16:19-31 (Jesus and Lazarus); 18:30-30 (the rich ruler); 19:1-10 (Jesus and Zacchaeus); 19:11-27 (the parable of the pounds); 20:9-19 (the parable of the wicked tenants); 20:20-26 (the question about paying taxes); 20:47-21:4 (Jesus denounces the scribes and the widow’s offering); 22:14-23 esp. v. 19 (the institution of the Lord’s supper—if an economic dimension is included in the breaking of the bread).
Hengel’s claim, recognising that discipleship is indeed ultimately about advancing the kingdom of God,\(^{350}\) in the particular circumstances to which each person is called.

### 5 Literature Review

No detailed study of Luke’s lake stories as parallel texts has been undertaken to date. This means there are no full-length works or articles specifically on this topic. Of the numerous works in the secondary literature relevant to this study, those most relevant to methodology have been discussed above. Here, the location of the present study within the body of secondary literature on Luke’s lake stories is more accurately defined.

**Narrative reading.** This introduction has shown that the narrative approach adopted for this study sits within the broad spectrum of such studies that have appeared in recent decades. Many of these look at a particular theme or form within Luke, or Luke-Acts, before considering the wider implications of the theme or passages for Luke or for Luke-Acts. This study adopts that approach. The method employed for this study can be located between Green’s commentary on Luke, and Tannehill’s study on Luke-Acts.\(^{351}\) Tannehill shows the value of careful attention to the final form of the text. He also demonstrates how themes or characters can be followed through the narrative by tracking key words or features, while at the same time looking more broadly to the context the narrative provides. Green balances a similar narrative sensitivity in a commentary form. This means his study must work in a more sequential manner, but he consistently manages to illuminate the section of Luke he is working within with the broader sweep of the Lukan narrative. He also provides the requisite level of historical background, blending this with sociological insights that have come from the likes of Jerome Neyrey’s, *The Social World of Luke-Acts*.\(^{352}\)

\(^{350}\) Hengel, *The Charismatic Leader*, 73.
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Parallels. Of the various studies that are mentioned above on parallels, Green’s article “Internal Repetition,” is indicative of the approach taken in this study.\(^{353}\) The article by Jeffrey Siker also warrants mention because of the patterned relationship he identifies between Luke 4:16-30 and 7:1-22.\(^{354}\) Siker diagrams this as a chiasm. However, the passages are not contiguous, so they are more accurately described as a series of inverse parallels. The chiastic pattern is less important to this study than the way Siker identifies the parallels by looking for themes and vocabulary that link two related passages in Luke that are separated by some distance from each other. A similar approach is used in this study of Luke’s lake stories. Furthermore, the two passages Siker is discussing form one of the three pairs of passages that comprise the two discipleship cycles the present study identifies.\(^{355}\)

Why Are there No Previous Studies of the Two Lake Stories? This study proposes that the lake stories in Luke can usefully be studied in light of each other. Why is it that such a study has not been undertaken before? The rise of critical scholarship, as outlined above, has paid close attention to form. “Lake story” is not a recognised form, so Luke 5:1-11, and 8:22-39 have tended to be categorised differently. Luke 5:1-11 has been treated as a nature miracle,\(^{356}\) or as a call or commission story,\(^{357}\) for example. Luke 8:22-25 can be classified as a miracle story or as an exorcism,\(^{358}\) while 8:25-39 is obviously an exorcism.\(^{359}\) Or, 8:22-39 can be read as a sea-voyage account, whereas 5:1-11 has not been labeled as such.\(^{360}\) Redaction criticism added another layer of complexity to the analysis. In 5:1-11 this meant discussing the pre- or post-resurrection setting of the source material, and the relationship between Luke’s version

\(^{353}\) Green, “Internal Repetition,” 283-299.


\(^{355}\) Chapter 2, Section 4.


\(^{360}\) Introduction, Section 4.7.
and that of his sources, including the relationship with the account in John 21:1-11. For 8:22-39 the comparison with Mark or Mark and Matthew, depending on the source theory being applied, has occupied much of the discussion. The net result of the attention to form- and redaction-criticism is that the two lake stories in Luke have not been considered together in any detail.

The narrative approach adopted for this study notes the different forms of the lake stories but is able to explore the similarities in form, vocabulary, and structure, how they work, and how these two related passages are embedded within the wider Lukan perspective and narrative.

**Military-Political Reading.** A number of commentators read the demon Legion in Luke 8:26-39 (and parallels) as a metaphor for the power of Rome. By this reading the crossing over to the other side of the lake represents Jesus confronting Roman political oppression. The man in the story, who is possessed by a legion of demons, represents the people under subjugation to the power of the Roman occupiers and their legions of soldiers. René Girard’s concept of the scapegoat, Frantz Fanon’s work on political oppression, and Walter Wink’s writing on the principalities and powers have all been usefully brought to bear on this passage. The interrelationships between the psychological, sociological and spiritual powers as Wink describes them, is usefully introduced by M. Newheart.

---
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364 For example, Garroway argues that Luke shows Legion as acting out the oppression of the occupying forces. Joshua Garroway, “The Invasion of a Mustard Seed: A Reading of Mark 5:1-20,” *JSNT* 32, no. 1 (2009), 63.
368 M. W. Newheart, “*My Name is Legion*: The Story and Soul of the Gerasene Demonic” (Collegeville: Liturgical, 2004).
There are several points that strongly suggest the military-political reading is valid. First, there is the use of λεγιών (Legion), which is an “exclusively military term.” Other vocabulary throughout the passage has military associations. Second, there are strong echoes of Exodus 14 in 8:25-39. As the Egyptian army is drowned by God in the Sea of Reeds, so the pigs containing the demons (representing the Roman occupying forces) are drowned by the Son of God in the Lake of Genesaret.

The man is one of the αἰχμάλωτος (captives) of 4:18. Luke matches his detailed picture of the man’s plight before his encounter with Jesus with an equally detailed and poignant description of his new-found δόξεσις (release) and experience of being healed, or σῴζω (saved). As Green says of the man, “his foremost characteristic is his bondage to and release from demonic power (cf. 4:18-19).”

Todd Klutz looks at the exorcism stories in Luke against various ancient sources on demonology, spirit affliction and exorcistic healing. He also considers some of the emerging knowledge of religious experience, shamanism, health care in antiquity, ritual performance and ancient Jewish systems of impurity. His study then advocates purity versus impurity as a thematic key for reading of Luke 8:26-39. Klutz’s study is helpful, and I note that he does not repudiate the military dimensions of the text. In fact, he gives a good account of them. Klutz’s reading based on purity and impurity, and a military-political reading are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Part of the problem of being occupied, from a Jewish perspective, was the impurity of association with the Roman occupiers, as well as all the practical limitations that


370 These are noted when they occur in Chapter 4, below.
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this imposed for observing the various religious and social practices associated with Jewish faith. The strong emphasis on impurity in the text is compatible with a military-political reading. However, in this study I have chosen not to pursue a political reading of Luke 8:26-39 as it has been well covered in the works mentioned here.

**Journey and Discipleship.** The journey motif extends beyond the central section of Luke. \(^{374}\) The excursus in Chapter 2 will show that the Galilean section is full of movement and journeying. \(^{375}\) The place of the lake stories is not discussed in any detail elsewhere in the literature in relation to this motif. The important point for this study is the link between the journey motif and discipleship. \(^{376}\) Luke 5:1-11 is obviously a discipleship journey. However, Luke 8:22-39 has not been recognised as such because the role the disciples play here is minimal. This study locates Luke’s lake stories within the journey and discipleship motifs. When seen in this context the connections as well as the gaps and omissions between the two stories become clear.

**Liminality.** Following on from this is the nature of the Lukan lake journeys. Here, I use liminality to consider Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39 as formative discipleship journeys. This has not been done before. It also nuances the discipleship and journey motifs as liminal journeys that are—in a sense—outside normal space and time. Liminal journeys often present barriers or tests that must be overcome in order for the liminal phase to be passed through. The journey is less about the destination than what happens on the journey. \(^{377}\)

5.1 Previous Work Particularly Relevant to this Study

**Earl Hilgert.** Hilgert undertakes to survey the ship as a symbol in the NT. \(^{378}\) Surveying the ship as a symbol in Greek, Roman, Hebrew, and Jewish literature and art, Hilgert notes

---


\(^{375}\) Chapter 2, Section 3.5.


\(^{377}\) Liminality will be introduced further in Chapter 2, Section 5.

\(^{378}\) Hilgert, *The Ship*. 68
considerable overlap between Greek and Roman use of the ship symbol. Summarising his findings on Roman literature and art he comments: “In almost every development of the ship symbol, Roman art copied the Greeks. This demonstrates the vitality, popularity, and widespread use of that figure to represent the two basic ideas of the voyage of the soul to the hereafter and the course of human life, with its corollary of the ship of state.”379 His survey of Palestinian-Jewish literature and art concludes similarly that, “in Palestinian Jewish literature and art from the second century B.C. through the first century of our era, the theme of ship = life, ship = nation, ship = world, and the ship as a conveyance to the hereafter probably all appear.”380

Hilgert shows that ship symbolism in the OT stands out for the fact that it did not follow Egyptian, Mesopotamian, and classical literature and art. Instead, the OT usually links the ship to unfriendly powers.381 Despite this, Jewish-Hellenism showed little hesitation in appropriating ship symbolism from the Roman world, and overlaying it with Jewish piety.382 Hilgert concludes from this that the ship may well have been used figuratively in the NT,383 before going on to propose and explore the metaphorical dimensions of the NT material related to ships and the sea. His study is firmly wedded to the idea that the Gospels are allegories of the church communities from which they come.384 This leads him quite naturally to read the ship as a symbol of the Church. Hilgert acknowledges the tentativeness of his suggestions and conclusions.385 Nevertheless, he tends to over-interpret the detail of ship and other symbol he discusses, including Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39.386

379 Ibid., 25.
380 Ibid., 40.
381 Ibid., 26. Hilgert cites and discusses a range of passages. LXX examples include Deut 28:68; Judg 5:17, 2 Chr 20:35-37; Ps 47:8 (48:8 MT); 103:26 (104:26 MT); 106:23 (107:23 MT) (the sea itself, rather than ships excited wonder); Prov 30:19; Isa 2:12, 16; 23:1; 33:21; 60:9; Ezek 27:4-9, 25-36; Jonah1:3. Ibid., 26-29.
382 Ibid., 31.
383 Ibid., 71.
384 Introduction, Section 2.4.
385 Hilgert, The Ship, 89 and 123.
386 To cite a couple of examples, of Mark 4:35-5:21 Hilgert suggests that the boat represents the Jewish-Christian Church. Hence Jesus leaves the boat on arrival at the other side of the lake and then refuses to let the delivered demoniac return with him on the boat as Gentiles do not join the Jewish-Christian Church.
Hilgert demonstrates the diverse use of the ship as a symbol in the literature before and about the same time as the writing of the NT Gospels. He shows that there was ample precedent for the creative metaphorical use of the ship and of the sea-voyage. At the same time, the fact that in Luke these are lake journeys, rather than sea voyages raises the question of the transferability of the ship and other symbolism Hilgert describes. The strong connection Hilgert shows between the ship and the sea emphasises Luke’s choice to refer to the Lake of Genesaret as a lake (λίμνη). I propose that as a competent author, Luke was aware of the association between ships and the sea. Perhaps the historical baggage of the ship and sea symbol that Hilgert describes was one of the reasons he chose to set the lake stories on the lake of Genesaret, rather than the sea.

Wilhelm H. Wuellner. In The Meaning of “Fishers of Men,” 387 Wuellner undertakes a historical-critical survey of literal fishing, before considering the interpretation of the phrase “fishers of men” and the implications of this for divine-human relationships. 388 The phrase “fishers of men,” he argues, “serves in the form of a metaphor as a job or test description for followers of Jesus.” 389 Wuellner shows that fishing metaphors were widely known and used throughout the ancient Near-East, in biblical and rabbinical traditions, as well as in Hellenistic literary and iconographic literary traditions. 390 Wuellner seeks to identify the transformation of the meaning of the metaphor as it is passed down through the various traditions. 391

The historical material Wuellner looks at is helpful. He provides a detailed survey of the ancient fishing industry and practice. He shows that there were several types of fishers. On the

---------------------------

Hilgert, The Ship, 81-83. (A. M. Farrer, also notes this example of over-interpretation in his review of The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament, by Earl Hilgert, in JTS 15 (1964), 152-153.) Another example of over-interpretation is the suggestion that the rupture of the nets in Luke 5:6 is symbolic for the controversy between the Jews and early Gentiles in the Church. Hilgert himself recognises the difficulty with the proposal, noting that there is no disagreement in the story. Hilgert, The Ship, 109.


388 Ibid., 1-3.

389 Ibid., 2.

390 Ibid., 11-63.

391 Ibid., 2.
one hand there were well organised partnerships who owned equipment, and boats, and hired others. These would be working under contract for a “tax collector.” On the other hand, there was the “hired servant or sailor.”\footnote{Ibid., 61.}\footnote{Ibid., 64.} Wuellner argues that the men Jesus calls in the gospels are to be identified with the first group on the basis of “the partnership between them, and Mark’s reference to Zebedee’s hired servant-fishermen.”

At the beginning of this discussion on the possible intertextual background for the fishing for people metaphor, Wuellner notes that Jesus was unique in how and in what context he used the metaphor.\footnote{Ibid., 630.} By the end of his survey, he concludes that the key concept being invoked is that of “partnership” with Jesus in his eschatological mission.

This study finds partnership is indeed a crucial aspect of “catching people alive,” as Luke shows it in his lake stories. However, like the study by Hilgert (discussed above), Wuellner’s work assumes that the metaphor requires a referent outside the Gospel in which it is found in order to be comprehensible. This “scholarly disposition to reach at whispers of intertextuality” is critiqued by Blake Wassell and Stephen Llewelyn in their discussion on Mark 1:17.\footnote{Blake E. Wassell, and Stephen R. Llewelyn, “‘Fishers of Humans,’ the Contemporary Theory of Metaphor, and Conceptual Blending Theory,” \textit{JBL} 133, no. 3 (2014), 628.}\footnote{Ibid., 632.}\footnote{Ibid., 633.} Wassell and Llewelyn describe the use of the fishing metaphor in antiquity as “amorphous,” noting that the target domain of fishing as a metaphor can be found in a wide range of fields. These include teaching, mission, judgement and warfare. Furthermore, the fishing metaphor can be construed “negatively or positively even within the same target domain.” They propose therefore, that the “primary linguistic context for the conceptual metaphor underlying the expression ‘fishers of humans’” is to be found in Mark.\footnote{Ibid., 633.} The argument is taken to its logical conclusion when they state that intertextuality is “an unnecessary and restrictive assumption in the case of the expression ‘fishers for humans.’” Wassell and Llewelyn are
not arguing that intertextuality is invalid or unimportant, but that in this particular case the Gospel of Mark provides sufficient guidance for the interpretation of the fishing metaphor.

This conclusion is relevant to Luke’s version of the story. The present study will show that Luke provides ample intratextual context and content for understanding the metaphor in Luke 5:1-11 itself, and that the metaphor is subsequently developed in Luke 8:22-39 and then throughout Luke and Acts.

6 The Need for this Study

Despite the ample secondary literature on Luke’s lake stories, no detailed study of Luke’s lake stories as parallel texts has yet been undertaken. Is there a prima facie case that this would be worthwhile? If the lake stories are more closely related, themed, and structured than has previously been realised, then reading them as parallel texts might help to fill in some of the gaps. For example, what is the motivation for the second lake journey? When Jesus questions the disciples’ faith in 8:25, what is he expecting from them? And what does it mean for Gentile mission in 8:39 that the delivered demoniac goes throughout his city proclaiming what Jesus has done for him? If the journey on and then across the lake is both a realistic story and a metaphorical journey in a unique geographic and literary setting, then the lake stories may be important for an understanding of the discipleship theme in Luke and potentially in Acts.

7 Chapter Outline

Chapter 1 locates Jesus’ preparation for ministry and his inaugural sermon in 4:16-30 in the Lukan narrative. The premise here is that the invitation to discipleship will in some way be the invitation to join Jesus in his mission as outlined in Luke 4. The chapter focuses on the aspects of this passage that are particularly relevant: the indications that it is programmatic for Jesus’ ministry in this Gospel and that the release Jesus proclaims (4:18-19) will ultimately extend to the Gentiles, and what that means in light of the OT jubilee. Chapter 2 discusses the relevant context and background against which Luke’s lake stories will be read. It begins with a summary of some of the key indicators that the two lake stories are related metaphorical and
parallel accounts. The case is made that the Luke uses the lake journey as a metaphor for the journey of discipleship. Lukan geography and the journey motif in Luke are discussed, along with the way that discipleship fits into the journey motif. Next, some of the literary structures and patterns around and within the lake stories are considered. Finally, the lake journeys as liminal, formational journeys of discipleship, are introduced.

Chapter 3 discusses Luke 5:1-11. The text is read as a realistic narrative and as a metaphorical journey. Simon and Jesus are the key characters in this story. Attention is given to the commission form of the story, to Simon’s response to Jesus, and to the way Jesus—from within the narrative—transforms the whole story into a metaphor for discipleship. Chapter 4 looks at Luke 8:22-39. As this second lake story is in two parts (8:22-25 and 8:29-39) the relationship between these two parts is discussed. Various parallels and connections with Luke 5:1-11 are noted. As Chapter 4 progresses through the second lake story it becomes clear that the disciples’ performance has not met the expectations of the Lukan Jesus. This is made evident by reading the account of the calming of the storm and the deliverance of the Gerasene demoniac, in light of the various parallels that emerge as the second lake story is considered in light of the first.

Having looked at each of the lake stories on their own terms, Chapter 5 looks at the implications of reading the two lake stories as parallel texts. Much of the material for this discussion has by now been assembled. Here the significance, function, and narrative impact of the previous findings are explored. The failure of the disciples in the second lake story is given further attention. The sending and proclaiming of the delivered demoniac in 8:39 is also taken up in more detail. Included in the discussion are the structures, parallels, and patterns in and around the lake stories, along with the themes of encounter and transformation. Simon Peter and the delivered demoniac are compared and contrasted. The discussion then faces the apparently paradoxical nature of the commissions of Simon Peter (abandonment) and the demoniac (homecoming). The Conclusion restates the basic argument and findings, and suggests opportunities for further research to which this study points.
Chapter 1: JESUS AT NAZARETH

1 Introduction

This chapter, along with Chapter 2, aims to provide an overview or framework within which the Lukan lake stories can be read. I propose that the lake stories arise out of and express Jesus’ mission as it is set out in Luke 4:16-30. In turn, Luke 4:16-30 needs to be read in light of the material that precedes it, particularly the temptation account (4:1-13). Once this context has been set and Luke 4:16-30 considered in somewhat more detail, the disciples’ mission can be seen in subsequent chapters of the study to be a natural extension of Jesus’ mission as they venture out on the lake of Gennesaret and then across to the other side. Chapter 4 will then argue that the delivered demoniac in Luke 8 also shares in that mission.

When the place, function, and importance of 4:16-30 are discussed below, the focus is on aspects of the text that are relevant to the lake stories. Jesus’ reading from Isaiah (Luke 4:18-19) receives particular attention. Limitations of the “word study” approach notwithstanding, passages sharing vocabulary with 4:18-19 in Luke are surveyed. The premise is that, as 4:18-19 is programmatic, occurrences of this specific vocabulary indicate the general thrust of what the Lukan text is saying and doing. The lake stories will be considered in light of the survey findings, even where specific vocabulary from 4:18-19 is not present. Where vocabulary from 4:18-19 is found within the lake stories it will be accorded more weight within the discussion. The broader themes of 4:16-30 must not be allowed to fall from sight in this exercise. This is especially true where a theme would not arise obviously from 4:18-19 alone. For example, the emphasis in 4:16-30 on Jesus’ mission to the Gentiles is important, despite not being immediately apparent in 4:18-19.

1 Introduction, Section 4.4.
2 Locating Luke 4:16-30 within the Narrative

2.1 The Ministry of John the Baptist: Luke 3:1-20

Luke’s prologue emphasises Jesus as the one anticipated by the waiting faithful. John the Baptist is also prominent in Luke 1 and 2. Luke’s narrative proper begins in Chapter 3. In Luke 3:2-6 the ministry of John is interpreted and anticipated through the quotation of Isa 40:3-5 which is a message of hope to the Babylonian exiles. John is the one who will prepare the way for Jesus so that ὄψεται πᾶσα σάρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (“all flesh shall see the salvation of God”) (3:6). Luke 3:1-3 gives John and his ministry a firm social, political, religious, and geographical context. The powers of the day are named in detail along with their dominions. In the political realm Tiberius is Emperor, Pontius Pilate governs Judea, Herod rules Galilee, his brother Philip is Tetrach of Ituraea and Trachonitis, and Lysanias rules Abilene. In the Jewish/religious world Annas and Caiaphas control the high-priesthood. Meanwhile, far away from all of these, the word of God comes to John son of Zechariah in the desert. Despite what the prologue tells us about Zechariah and his place within the Temple institution, John (about whom so much has been foretold) was raised in the wilderness (1:80) and comes from there to begin his ministry. The desert setting, along with 1:76, immediately confirms John as a prophet in the OT tradition. His ministry takes place εἰς πᾶσαν [τὴν] περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου (“in all the region around the Jordan”) (3:3). The mention of the Jordan wilderness area recalls the exodus and conquest in the OT. It serves to heighten anticipation around John’s mission. John comes as one of the prophets of old to challenge the people and to call them to ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας (“bear fruits worthy of repentance”) (v. 8) as he prepares the way for the one who is coming (v. 16).

---

2 For OT parallels of “geo-political” and “chronological” markers see Green, Luke, 163. For these verses as political critique and perceived threat see Green, Luke, 163-64 and Ben Witherington III, “John the Baptist,” in DJG, 1st ed., 385.

3 These OT echoes “certify” John as a prophet. Green, Luke, 166.


5 On the link between prophet, wilderness, and Jordan, see Green, Luke, 163.

6 On wilderness see ibid., 167.
John’s message is a stinging critique of the social order. In true prophetic style he calls the people to repentance (v. 3), threatens them with judgement (v. 7-9), and warns them that Abrahamic lineage offers no refuge from the coming wrath (v. 8-9). Luke 3:10-14 names three groups who respond to John’s message, asking of him what they must do. First are the crowds, the general peasant population (v. 10-11). Next are the tax collectors, Jews in collusion with the Romans (v. 12-13). Finally, the soldiers who are probably Romans, but if not, they are in the direct service of the Roman Empire (v. 14). John’s response to each group is that they should practice economic justice through the redistribution of goods (the crowds) or the restraint of greed (tax collectors and soldiers). In so doing he fulfils his own mandate to prepare (ἔτοιμάζω) a people and the way of the Lord (1:17; 3:4).

In response to this, Προσδοκῶντος δὲ τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ διαλογιζομένων πάντων ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν περί τοῦ Ἰωάννου, μὴ ποτε αὐτὸς εἶναι ὁ Χριστός ("the people were filled with expectation, and all were questioning in their hearts concerning John, whether he might be the Messiah") (v. 15). John, however, refuses to take up the mantle of Messiah, pointing instead to the coming one (v. 16) who is greater and who will baptise not in water but with the Holy Spirit and with fire. He will continue the work of sifting and sorting and of judgement that John has already begun (v. 17). The summary of John’s ministry (3:18) suggests this was the sort of message and ministry John exercised generally, as he proclaimed good news (εὐαγγελίζω) to the people.

John’s βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν ("baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins") (v. 3) is essentially a call to the people to realign their lives with the purpose of God, as John prepares the way for so that δῆσαι πᾶσα σάρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ ("all flesh shall see the salvation of God") (v. 6). The outworking of this turning and realignment involves the

---

7 It is unclear whether the soldiers were Romans or Jews. See Green, Luke, 180. Fitzmyer believes they were not Romans. Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:470.


9 Green notes that as a result of John’s ministry the winnowing process is already complete in this image. Christ simply gathers together (and burns) what has already been sorted. Green, Luke, 182.

10 Similarly, 4:15 describes the general pattern of Jesus’ ministry.
practice of social justice (vv. 10-14) and leads people into unpopulated and unfamiliar places (v. 3) that connect them with God’s past acts of deliverance.\(^{11}\) The call is for a distinctive way of living. The movement is towards the edge of society and away from the geo-political centres of power (hence the contrast between the wilderness of v. 2 and the dominions of v. 1). The call undermines the assumed ethnic basis of entitlement to membership in God’s chosen people.\(^{12}\)

Luke 3:1-3 and the imprisonment of John by Herod over the matter of Herodias (itself a political issue) in 3:19-20 forms an inclusio of sorts around these verses on John. It reminds the reader of the import of the political landscape within which this story takes place. It is an inclusio “of sorts” because, of the people and powers mentioned in vv. 1-2, only Herod and John are mentioned in vv. 18-20. Readers are left to ponder what part the earlier-mentioned characters will have to play as the drama unfolds. Thus, in typical Lukan fashion, some aspects of the story are nicely resolved or fulfilled, while others are left open.\(^{13}\) John is clearly portrayed as a prophet of the old school.\(^{14}\) He comes out of the desert proclaiming repentance and release (v. 3) and he calls for economic justice (vv. 10-14). The people wonder whether he might be the Messiah (v. 15).\(^{15}\) In light of this and of the prologue the reader is looking to see if or how Jesus will fulfil John’s expectations.\(^{16}\)


\(^{13}\) Tannehill notes that by the end of Acts “the purpose of God,” which he sees as the unifying theme of the narrative of Luke-Acts, is itself only partly fulfilled. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:2-3.

\(^{14}\) John and Elijah are connected in 1:17 and 9:19.

\(^{15}\) Commentators tend to emphasise this question and response as related to the eschatological dimensions of John’s message (vv. 8-9) rather than the ethical dimension (vv. 10-14). E.g. Green, *Luke*, 180; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:471. Given the emphasis in Luke on right use of possessions and on ethics (along with the hope for a Messiah/deliverer and the severe economic circumstances), it would appear that both aspects of John’s preaching provoked the people’s speculation about John. See Luke 1:73 for expectation.

\(^{16}\) Yoder makes the point that Jesus’ ministry takes up the social-political dimensions of John’s message. There is no suggestion that John got this wrong, though Jesus may have expressed this in a way John did not anticipate. John H. Yoder, *The Politics of Jesus: Vicit Agnus Noster* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 21-24.

Following the account of John the Baptist Luke leads us through the anointing (3:21-22), accreditation (3:23-38), and preparation of Jesus for ministry (4:1-11). These verses lead in to 4:16-30, where Jesus will be rejected in Nazareth. Luke is at pains to make it clear that Jesus is the one anticipated in the prologue and who is ἰσχυρότερος (stronger than) John (3:16). His endorsement of Jesus is unequivocal. Jesus’ baptism and the events that accompany it, his genealogy, his sojourn into the wilderness under the impulse of the Spirit, and the summary account of his early ministry in Galilee (4:14-15) make his rejection in his hometown of Nazareth all the more disturbing. The joyful hope ignited in the reader through the prologue now becomes an uncomfortable memory, and Simeon’s warning (2:34-35) takes on a weight disproportional to its size.

2.2.1 The baptism of Jesus: Luke 3:21-22

Luke’s focus here is on the accreditation of Jesus as God’s son and agent. The events described take place ἐν τῷ βαπτισθῆναι ἅπαντα τὸν λαὸν καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος (“when all the people had been baptised, and when Jesus also had been baptised”) (v. 21). The account marks a transition from John’s ministry to that of Jesus. John’s demise is foreshadowed in v. 20, but the implication of the text is that Jesus is baptised by John, thereby endorsing John and his ministry. Jesus is also identifying with the people, who are being prepared for the generous and universal salvation of God. This salvation is proclaimed by John (3:4-6 || Isa 40:3-5) and heralded in the prologue of the Gospel. In preparation for this universal salvation John exhorts the people to ποιήσατε οὖν καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας (“bear fruit worthy of repentance”) (3:8, cf. 10-15).

---


18 I read Jesus’ baptism as an endorsement of John. Fitzmyer acknowledges this as a possibility but prefers the suggestion that Jesus’ baptism suggests he is a “sort of disciple of John.” Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:481-482. This seems less likely given the prologue’s emphasis on Jesus being greater than John and John’s own acknowledgement of Jesus’ superiority (3:16). Fitzmyer’s commitment to the prologue as a later development in the text may help to explain his preference.

Luke 3:21 sees a shift in focus from baptism to prayer and then to the remarkable events that follow.  

Jesus here moves from passive acceptance of baptism to active prayer. The heavens open and the way is now clear for his prayers to be answered and his baptism to be acknowledged. The descent of the dove in bodily form (v. 22) signals the empowering Jesus needs for what lies ahead.  

The voice from heaven reassures him of the Father’s approval, while making it clear to readers that this is ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός “my [God’s] son, the beloved” (v. 22). The text is ambiguous on who hears and sees what at Jesus’ baptism. The fact that Luke does not state whether the people heard the voice or saw the dove suggests his purpose is to clarify Jesus’ identity and certify his accreditation for ministry to his readers.  

Jesus is actually endowed with the Spirit (hence σωματικός, “in bodily form”) and is the beloved Son who enjoys the Father’s approval. This is “an unimpeachable sanction of Jesus with regard to his identity and mission,” and functions as such within and beyond the narrative.  

At the same time it is the relationship defined here that will be tested in the wilderness. Commentators debate the OT background for the Father’s affirmation in 3:22. If, as John Yoder points out, Psalm 2:7 and Isaiah 41:2b are in view then they combine themes of enthronement and suffering servanthood. Yet Jesus’ submission to baptism indicates continuity between the ministry of John and Jesus. Having heard John speak with prophetic

20 On prayer at key points in the narrative see Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:56.

21 The OT background of the dove as an image for the Spirit is debated. Some suggest Genesis 8:11 (where the dove is a herald of hope or good news), while other suggestions have been given. Fitzmyer surveys various suggestions but finds that none of them are entirely convincing. He concludes, however, that it is “clearly . . . a sign of the presence of the Spirit to Jesus.” Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:484.


23 Though “bodily form” implies public visibility.


25 Ibid.


force about judgement and ethics, readers will watch Jesus carefully to see how he will take up and develop these various themes.28

2.2.2 Jesus’ genealogy: Luke 3:23-38

The genealogy of Jesus raises a plethora of questions over historicity and presents big challenges to attempts to harmonise Luke and Matthew’s Gospels with each other and with OT accounts.29 The more fruitful question to pursue here has to do with literary function. Green notes that genealogies establish a person’s place within the kinship group. The genealogy functions “like all genealogies . . . to determine who has access to an in-group.”30 Because of the huge “social power” attached to such genealogies the construction of such lists was often subject to “genealogical amnesia” so that lists could be modified to suit changing social circumstances.31 This list serves to demonstrate that Jesus stood firmly within the covenant community with its story of deliverance and election.32

At the same time ὡς ἐνομίζετο (“as it was supposed”) (v. 23) adds an ironic twist to this account as readers of Luke’s story know that Jesus is actually the Son of God. This has been made explicit most recently at 3:22, where the pronouncement from heaven confirms as reliable the angel Gabriel’s earlier word to Mary (1:35). In the temptation account to follow, the devil will question Jesus’ status as God’s son (4:3, 9) so that, while accreditation through this genealogy appears to legitimate Jesus, v. 23 serves to remind readers that Jesus accreditation reaches far beyond ancestry. Jesus is descended from God directly (by conception) as well as by human descent right back through Adam to God. Thus Luke implies that in every way Jesus is Son of

28 Luke 7:18-19 is often seen as evidence that the Lukan John struggled to see the continuity between his own message and expectation and the ministry of Jesus.


32 The stylized nature of these accounts is highlighted by the use of numerical patterns. The listing of names in groups of sevens or tens is common. Fitzmyer notes that Luke lists 78 names, making Jesus the 77th generation. However, variations between MSS undermine the significance of this pattern. Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:490-94. Also, as Green points out, Luke appears to make nothing of these numerical patterns. Green, Luke, 189 (n. 21). See also Huffman, “Genealogy,” DJG, 1st ed., 256.
God “in a more direct sense than through descent from Adam.”33 The tracing of ancestry right back through Adam to God emphasises the universality of God’s offer of salvation.34 In the wilderness temptation this sonship will be tested.

There is an inside-outside knowledge dynamic at work here. Those within the narrative have a limited perspective. For the reader or hearer, Luke, as narrator, offers an omniscient perspective. This heightens the irony of Jesus’ rejection in his hometown of Nazareth. When people ask ὁυκὶ νιὸς ἣτω αὐτῷ (is this not Joseph’s son?) (4:22), the answer is, ὡς ἐνομίζετο (as it was supposed) (3:23). Jesus is actually God’s Son (3:22, 23-38).35 The rejection of Jesus is therefore all the more of an indictment upon the people of Nazareth. To reject Joseph’s son is one thing, to reject God’s son is quite another.

2.2.3 The wilderness temptation: Luke 4:1-13

The temptation account forms a “prelude” to Jesus’ ministry.36 Placing it before Jesus’ ministry commences shows that the opposition Jesus will encounter is both human (as in 4:16-30) and demonic (4:1-13). The demonic aspect will become manifest throughout Luke in healings, exorcisms, and in the forces of nature.37 I will argue that the dual nature of this opposition is well demonstrated in Luke 8:22-39, where the forces of nature (the storm on the lake) take on a demonic aspect before Jesus then confronts the demon Legion himself, as well as the resistance of the people of the region of the Gerasenes.

The three quotations in this passage all come from Deuteronomy chs. 6-8,38 suggesting continuity between Jesus and “figures from Israel’s history whom God approved.”39 Its

33 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:55 (n.18).
35 “The baptism and genealogy should be read together . . . as making a single emphatic statement.” They function to show Jesus is the Son of God as well as what sort of son he is. Johnson, Luke, 70.
37 Green, Luke, 78.
39 Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 115.
ecclesiological function is to show followers of Jesus (disciples) how they should live in faithfulness to God. As Jesus’ first explicit quotations of Scripture, Litwak argues, they help frame the entire Lukan narrative.  

The temptations can be read as a visionary experience, or as a “legendary” or “mythological” story. Bell acknowledges these elements but claims that Jesus, having fasted, is “able to access deeper levels of reality where the usual categories of time and space no longer apply.” Hence Jesus is able to ascend to the pinnacle of the Temple and see all the kingdoms of the world. A case can be made, Bell states, for “demoting the devil from the realm of ‘supernature’ to the realm of ‘the world.’ But the world in which we live is multi-layered, and it is in the deeper levels of the reality of the world that the spiritual battle takes place.” Bell’s description here is suggestive of the liminal nature of the lake stories to which this study refers.

Besides these inter- and intra-textual themes, vocabulary, and forms, the real-world (extra-textual) context must be considered. The political situation and the general unrest of Jesus’ and of Luke’s time comes through strongly in the temptation accounts. Luke, being aware of the aspirations of the people to whom he wrote, needed to carefully locate and articulate Jesus with regard to these issues for his audience. He uses the temptations in part to clarify the choices Jesus faced and the path he chose to take in the face of those choices. The echoes of

40 Ibid.
41 Hengel, The Charismatic Leader, 64.
43 Ibid.
44 Liminality is introduced below in Chapter 2, Section 5.
45 On balancing a strict literary approach (that looks to Deut and the wilderness theme for understanding of the temptations) with “the contemporary-historical approach” to fill “the specific background,” see Kirk, J. Andrew, “The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative: A Contemporary Perspective,” EvQ 44, no. 1 (1972), 3.
47 Peasant revolts employed violence as the “strategy of choice,” so that Jesus might very well have been
OT narratives (Adam, Deut, Moses) mean that Luke connects his answer to these issues in Israel’s story.

The first temptation centres around Jesus’ trust in God to supply his needs. After all, he is God’s son (4:3). The political and economic dimension is discernible here as the one who can feed the masses in the wilderness could soon become king. Ched Myers argues that the quotation from Deut 8:3 (Luke 4:4) connects the lesson of the manna—take only what you need, share your surplus—with trust in YHWH. This reading resonates strongly with the jubilee echoes in Luke 4:18-19.

The second temptation has Jesus offered the world’s kingdoms from Satan rather than from God (4:6). The qualifier, “if you will bow down and worship me” (4:7), shows the underlying test is one of allegiance. To worship Satan at this point would give Jesus access to the world’s kingdoms without suffering or the cross. The test is certainly one of allegiance, but commentators espousing the more political readings helpfully capture what the temptation in the test is: to take up political power. The Lukan Jesus’ mission and vision were certainly “political” in calling for a community of people to live in a distinct way. However, the liminal journeys on the lake are journeys outside the prevailing political reality to allow for the formation of something new and different.


52 Below, Section 4.4.

53 E.g. Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:59.

In the third temptation Jesus is again being invited to “test” or “prove” that he is God’s son (4:9). By throwing himself from the Temple, he will force God’s hand (Luke 4:10-11 || Ps 90:11-12 (91:11-12 MT)). Jesus would thus accredit himself before the people as a miracle or wonder-worker. This might be for his own benefit, or for the benefit of those who would witness such a public display. However, such an accreditation suggests the opportunity for Jesus to arrive publicly as a political or messianic freedom-fighter, ready, Zealot-style, to liberate Israel from Roman occupation. Jesus rejects this.

Luke is adamant that Jesus’ fidelity as the Son of God means he will not take the path offered by the now departed devil. The temptations mark the path Jesus rejects. At Nazareth (4:16-

55 Many commentators believe Luke places the temptation to leap down from the high point of the Temple last because Jerusalem, as the city of Jesus’ destiny (9:51), is so important to his narrative schema. It is climactic to the temptation narrative just as the trial, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus are climactic to Luke’s Gospel and take place in (or around) Jerusalem. So for example Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching (New York: Paulist, 1989), 152-153.


59 Yoder maintains that whether or not the Zealots were a formally constituted or recognised group—or simply a movement or series of rebellions in Jesus’ day (or in Luke’s day)—is irrelevant to the fact that violent political reform was an option for Jesus. Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, 56-58. This point should be kept in mind whenever the terms “Zealot” or “Zealot options” are used here.

60 Yoder argues convincingly that Jesus was political and could be considered revolutionary, but was at the same time non-violent. Yoder, The Politics of Jesus, passim (but see for example p. 42 (n. 36) where he critiques Brandon and pp. 46-48, where he emphasises again the “option” Jesus refused—that of “messianic violence”). Where Yoder talks about the “quietest” or “Essene” option as opposed to the “violent” or “Zealot” option, Kirk sees the “quietest” option as “Sadducean,” retaining the Zealots as his model of the revolutionary option. Cassidy discusses these groups in Cassidy, Jesus, Politics, and Society, 121-127. For a more up-to-date introduction on the Zealots and other revolutionary groups see Heard and Yamazaki-Ransom, “Revolutionary Movements,” DJG, 2nd ed., 789-799.

61 This is not to say that the period between the temptations and 22:3 will be free from the activity of Satan (as famously claimed in Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. E. Buswell (London: SCM, 1982), 28), but that all the trials Jesus has undergone throughout his ministry (22:28) are represented or anticipated in Luke 4 and culminate in his trial and death. As Graham Twelftree points out, Satan’s departure at 4:13 means the reader expects him and looks for him to reappear, which he and various “evil spiritual beings” do at various points in the subsequent narrative (4:33-37; 6:18; 7:21; 8:2, 26-39; 9:37-43; 11:14; 13:11, 32). Graham H. Twelftree, “Demons, Devil, Satan,” DJG, 1st ed., 170.
30), the path that Jesus is anointed to follow becomes clear, defining his mission, and therefore discipleship.

2.2.4 Jesus returns and begins his ministry in Galilee: Luke 4:14-15

These verses form a brief transition between Jesus’ accreditation and formation, and the programmatic Nazareth sermon that is to follow. Along with 4:43-44 the episode frames Jesus’ teaching in between, which in turn highlights the contrast between his rejection in 4:16-30 and his acceptance in Capernaum in 4:31-42. The return to Galilee marks the return from the liminality of the wilderness experience. His being filled with the Spirit emphasises his overcoming of the devil in the wilderness and his preparedness to take up his part in the plan of God. His spreading fame signals the universal scope of his mission. His teaching in the synagogues and the praises of “everyone” join together to form a hopeful and triumphant note on which his Galilean ministry can be launched. The contrast between all of this and the people turning against him at Nazareth suggest that Luke has contrived to emphasise the contrast. The tenor here is very positive, so that the subsequent rejection comes as something of a shock for the reader.

3 Luke 4:16-30 as Programmatic

Despite the wide acknowledgement that Luke 4:16-30 is programmatic it is worth revisiting the basis for the assertion and then considering how 4:16-30 plays out in the rest of Luke’s Gospel. The importance of the passage cannot be overstated. As a mission statement for Jesus it is essential to understanding the discipleship to which he calls others. The work here will pay dividends in Chapters 2, 3, and 4 as the lake stories are considered.

63 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:60.
64 Green, Luke, 205-206.
3.1 Literary Features

3.1.1 Location within the Narrative

The material preceding Luke 4:16-30 has been surveyed above. The Nazareth account is followed by Jesus’ ministry in Capernaum. This consists of the healing of the man with the unclean spirit (4:31-37), the healing of Simon’s mother-in-law (4:38-39), and then the healing and deliverance of others (4:40-41). Jesus then goes out into the desert where he is sought by the crowds (4:42). He delivers a pithy summary of his mission (4:43), which is followed by another Lukan summary (4:44). Both the summary statement and Jesus’ mission statement link back into the Nazareth episode. The summary statement describes Jesus’ on-going proclamation of his message in the synagogues, while Jesus summarises his mission as the proclamation of the kingdom of God.65 This is followed by the calling of the first disciples in 5:1-11.

Although Luke 4:14-15 implies that Jesus has been active in speaking elsewhere, 4:16-30 contains the first directly reported public speech by the adult Jesus.66 This is “the first episode reported with scenic detail in Jesus’ public ministry.”67 Luke reports Jesus’ presence and activities in synagogues at various places,68 but only here does he give us the content of Jesus’ synagogue teaching. This implies that Jesus’ message in Nazareth is representative of his message elsewhere, and κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ (“as was his custom”) further suggests that his speaking in the synagogue and the contents of the message are typical.69 Subsequent references to synagogues in the narrative remind the reader of this passage. As Green notes, the material from 3:21 is tied together with references to the Spirit (Luke 3:22; 4:1 (twice),

65 Note the equating of the kingdom of God with the Isaiah quotation. Thus τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (“the kingdom of God”) becomes shorthand for ἀφεσις, etc.

66 In the wilderness Jesus speaks with the devil (4:1-13). However, the mythic nature of this whole account renders it somewhat different. The prologue reports direct speech of Jesus as a child (2:49).


69 Ibid., 209. Though Kuecker insists that it is attendance at the Nazareth synagogue that is being stressed here. Kuecker, The Spirit, 86-88.
14, 18). This goes with the emphasis on Jesus’ sonship. Subsequent summaries refer back to this event (7:21-22; Acts 10:38).

3.1.2 Literary Structures and Features

**Jesus as prophet.** Luke 1-2 paints key characters as OT-style righteous people. These OT echoes in the prologue are followed by quotations from the book of Isaiah. In 3:4-6 Luke uses Isa 40:3-5 in describing John’s ministry. In 4:18-19 Luke uses Isa 61:1-2a and 58:6 in describing Jesus’ ministry. The Deuteronomy quotations in 4:1-13 further this linking, firmly grounding Luke’s narrative in Israel’s story. The Elijah and Elisha references especially create an expectation that Jesus’ ministry will be reminiscent of that of the prophets in some way. Jesus is shown to be like, but superior to Elijah and Elisha. This “like, but superior to” approach is one Luke has employed in his prologue, where Jesus is like, but superior to John. Green notes that Luke shapes the Elijah and Elisha accounts to have strong parallels with other sections of his narrative. The emphasis is on the neediness of Israel, the divine mandate under which the prophets worked, and the exceptional character of the recipients of these ministries.

**Movement.** Luke 4:16-30 is bracketed by “he came” (ἔρχομαι) (4:16) and “he went” (πορεύω) (4:30). All that happens between is located in and around Nazareth. This bracketing suggests

76 Green, *Luke*, 209. There is a similar inclusio around the temptations with 4:1 and 4:14. In 4:1 Jesus is full of the Spirit, returns, and is led into the desert; in 4:14 Jesus returns in the power of the spirit into Galilee. As 4:14 forms the first part of the inclusion around the Nazareth episode the structure is even more tightly
that it is the whole of 4:16-30 that is programmatic, and not just 4:18-19. Nazareth is specified as the location in v. 16, where Luke says Jesus went to the synagogue on the Sabbath. Jesus is thus located within a tradition and a set of customs, as well as within a geographical place. He is a pious and observant Jew from a pious and observant Jewish family.77

**Threefold interaction-response.** The three-fold interaction-response pattern the passage exhibits is also noteworthy.78 First, Jesus stands and reads (4:16c-20a) and the people’s eyes are fixed upon him (4:20b). Next, he claims the Scripture has been fulfilled σήμερον (today) in the people’s hearing (4:21). The people are amazed so that they wonder οὐχὶ ὡς ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ; (“is this not Joseph’s son?”) (4:22). Finally, Jesus quotes a proverb, anticipates the people’s response, and compares his own ministry to that of Elijah and Elisha (vv. 23-27). This time the people are enraged and attempt to kill him (vv. 28-29).79 It is not just the words of the prophet Isaiah that are important here. How the people respond to these words and how Jesus engages with them in this encounter are also programmatic, as Luke introduces here the theme of opposition and controversy. While this has already been hinted at in the prologue (esp. 1:51-55; 2:34) as well as in the wilderness, it is here present in the people of Jesus’ hometown. The three-fold pattern echoes the three-fold dialogue pattern in the temptation account.80 Both of these exchanges are unusual, but where the wilderness temptations have a visionary, liminal, or dreamlike quality about them, this account is very concrete and realistic.

The three-fold exchange in the synagogue has Jesus pushing the exchange along by his provocative comments. The Devil’s departure until an opportune time (4:13) following Jesus’ refusal to cast himself from the high point of the Temple (4:9-12) is mirrored by Jesus’ passing through the crowd of people who attempted to throw him off the cliff outside of the town (4:30). The attempt to thwart Jesus in the wilderness temptation even before his ministry related.

---

77 See also 2:21-24; 41-52.


79 Could this be really what the Devil is attempting to do in 4:9-12?

80 Chapter 1, Section 2.2.3.
gets underway remains as an undercurrent that surfaces again in the people’s opposition in the Nazareth account.

**The Focus on the Isaiah Quotation.** While the Nazareth episode is crafted and must be read as a whole, the careful framing of the Isaiah quotation focuses our attention on its message. Green describes this framing as follows:  

\[81\]

A (vv. 16b-17) he stood up (to read)...he was handed...he unrolled  
B (vv. 18-19) citation from Isaiah  
A¹ (v. 20) he rolled up...he handed...he sat down.

The effect of this framing is to emphasise the theologically dense and tightly structured Isaianic quotation and to focus attention upon it. Further, it highlights Jesus as the initiator and active agent within the story as he stands, unrolls, finds, reads, hands back, and sits down. The lack (in A¹) of a correspondent to ἀναγιγνώσκω (to read) (in A) creates an unfulfilled expectation. This expectation is highlighted by Luke’s description of the attentive and expectant gaze of those present as Jesus sits to speak (4:20).

### 3.2 The Isaiah Quotation (Luke 4:18-19)

The quotation combines text from Isa 61:1-2a and 58:6. The omission of the ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως (“day of vengeance”) ( Isa 61:2) indicates further the universalism of Jesus’
mission. The composite quotation allows for the repetition of ἀφεσὶς (release). This double appearance of ἀφεσὶς (release) is a strong indicator that the Isaiah passages from which these texts come are a prophetic reworking of jubilee themes.

Tannehill lists four types of material as particularly important for giving unity and focus to biblical narrative. They are: OT quotations; commission statements; previews and reviews within the narrative; and disclosure of God’s purpose by reliable characters. Jesus’ quotation of Isaiah in 4:18-19 fulfils the first three criteria, while creating an expectation that the fourth will be fulfilled in due course. Tannehill says of the passage, “[A]s Scripture, it is viewed as testimony to God’s purpose. As a statement by Jesus, it comes from the character of highest authority within the programmatic narrative. It is a statement of what the Lord has sent Jesus to do, i.e., a statement of Jesus’ commission, which should lead us to expect that it is also a preview of what Jesus will in fact be doing in the following narrative.”


As will be shown below, there are echoes of Luke 4:16-30 (and especially 4:18-19) throughout Luke. However, Luke ch. 7 (and especially 7:18-35) contains some particularly strong parallels. These are considered briefly below because they enrich our reading of Luke 4:16-30. There is also a patterned relationship between Luke 4 and 7 observed by Siker. This is similar to the one between Luke 5 and 8 that will be described in Chapter 5 of the study.

85 David J. Bosh, Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1991), 111. The universalism of Jesus’ ministry offers a more satisfying explanation for this omission than seeing this as the arrival of the “acceptable year” with the “day of vengeance” still to come. This is claimed for example in Samuel O. Abogunrin, “Jesus’ Sevenfold Programmatic Declaration at Nazareth: An Exegesis of Luke 4:15-30 from an African Perspective,” Black Theology 1, no. 2 (2003), 235.

86 This is a sufficient explanation without needing a particular hermeneutical technique. Koet suggests something similar to gezerah shavah (which he describes as texts with common link words used to elucidate one another), being “the second of Hillel’s seven rules in the early period of midrashic interpretation” employed here. Koet, Five Studies, 29-30.

87 Ibid., 30.

88 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:21-22.

89 Ibid., 1:61.
Note the following parallels between Luke 4 and 7:

i) Both contain quotations from the prophet Isaiah. Green describes 7:22 as “a symphony of Isaianic echoes” especially of Isa 61:1. He emphasises the proximity of 7:22 to 4:18-19. Bosch notes that both Isaiah quotations come from passages where vengeance is included, but that this theme is pointedly absent in Luke, as 7:23 illustrates.

ii) In both passages Jesus uses proverbs to stir up and to counter opposition. In 4:23 ἰατρέ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν (“doctor cure yourself”) is described within the narrative by Jesus as a proverb. In 7:18-35 it is harder to identify which of Jesus’ sayings are proverbial but there are several that sound like proverbs or wisdom sayings. Fitzmyer identifies v. 35 (ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς, “wisdom is vindicated by her children”) as an “added wisdom saying.” He is less assertive about v. 32b (ἡυλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε, “We played the flute for you, and you did not dance; we wailed and you did not weep”) but cites several studies that suggest such sayings are to be found in other literature available at the time. Ronald Piper, however, does consider 7:29-30 a wisdom saying.

iii) Both chapters narrate diverse responses to Jesus’ ministry. These responses are prompted by the scope and breadth of the inclusion Jesus exercises towards Gentiles and towards

---


95 Positive: 4:14-15, 22, 32, 36-37, 42; 7:16-17, 38 and negative 4:29; 7:34, 39, 49.
“sinners.”96 This is important because in Luke 8 Jesus delivers a Gentile, while in Luke 5 Peter declares himself a sinner. The motif of offence or misunderstanding is particularly notable in these accounts.97 It will manifest again in the response of the people in Luke 8 to the man’s deliverance. At the root of this offence in Luke 4 is the struggle the people of Nazareth have with the universal scope of Jesus’ outlook. That is, with the inclusion of Gentiles suggested by 4:23-29. In Luke 7 it is John who struggles to grasp the nature of Jesus’ mission. The contrast between John’s fiery denouncements in 3:7-20 and Jesus’ welcoming of and ministry to those John challenges (compare Luke 4 and 7) are one explanation for this apparent dissonance.98 Luke 7:29 then highlights the division between the people on the one hand, and the Pharisees and lawyers on the other. This takes concrete form in the refusal of the latter to partake in the baptism of John (7:30). Luke 7:31-35 is Jesus’ commentary on this situation. The story of the sinful woman and Jesus at the Pharisees’ house (7:36-50) continues the theme of different responses, with the response of the Jewish leadership being negative, while that of “sinners” (represented in the woman) is positive.99

iv) Siker details a patterned series of parallels between Luke 4:16-30 and 7:1-22. Something very similar will be identified between Luke 5 and 8 in Chapter 5 of this study so it is worth looking at this pattern here. Siker describes this as follows:100


97 Luke 4:28-29 (the townspeople of Nazareth attempt to throw Jesus from a cliff); 7:19-20 (John’s disciples question Jesus’ identity on John’s behalf), 7:23 (Jesus exhorts John, via John’s messengers, not to take offence at him), 7:30 (those refusing John’s baptism show they have “rejected God’s purpose”), 7:33-34 (Jesus alludes to inconsistent responses to himself and to John).

98 Kuecker’s reading convincingly dissipates some of the apparent tension. Kuecker, The Spirit, 71-75.

99 Luke 7:34, 37, 39. See also the discussion on the people’s response, which overlaps with this and includes material from Keucher.

100 Siker, “First to the Gentiles,” 86-89.
Siker’s observations are listed in order here because he goes on to demonstrate a patterned relationship between the two texts. The paralleled themes are matched in reverse order, while both end on the theme of taking offence. This pattern is described by Siker as follows:\textsuperscript{101}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{pattern.png}
\end{figure}

While more could be made of this pattern it is enough for our purpose to note its existence and that it serves to further bind the two related texts to one another.\textsuperscript{102}

---

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid., 89 (fig. 5).

\textsuperscript{102} Beyond expounding the parallels and noting (and diagramming) the inverse parallel relationship, Siker makes very little of the pattern. He does not claim that it is chiastic, for example.
3.4 Themes and Vocabulary Elsewhere in Luke

Vocabulary is an initial indicator of the importance of themes.\textsuperscript{103} It needs to be asserted first though, that links with 4:18-19 can be shown even in the absence of key vocabulary, as thematic connections between texts can be demonstrated even where a direct linguistic link is absent. For example, neither ἄφεσις or αἰχμάλωτος occur in 8:22-39. However, Chapter 4 will show that the man in 8:26-39 is most certainly an example of a captive who experiences release.

Luke 4:18-19 fuses two portions from the prophet Isaiah into a reading delivered by Jesus. That the use of a composite quotation is due to inaccuracy of memory or sloppiness of habit is an unsatisfying explanation in light of the apparent care Luke has taken in presenting his narrative, especially here in 4:16-30. It thus seems more likely that Luke wished to exclude the vengeance material from Isaiah, and that there are ideas and vocabulary from both of the passages that he has spliced together that he wished to include. Why then does he include vocabulary that is not repeated elsewhere in his Gospel? Can a theme be adequately recognised without its specific vocabulary? It is helpful here to note the use of cognate terms.\textsuperscript{104} For example, adding the verb αἰχμαλωτίζω to the analysis means Luke 21:24 is also considered in the discussion.\textsuperscript{105} Going beyond the semantic field Luke could be surveyed for vocabulary that obviously belongs with αἰχμάλωτος (captive), vocabulary such as δέω (bondage) in 13:16, or δεσμεύω (bind) in 8:39. This is important as the Gospel writers employ specific vocabulary in order to express ideas or concepts in the crafting of a narrative, rather than focusing on specific vocabulary in its own right. The ideas expressed in these examples are clearly compatible, even if the vocabulary is subtly or substantially different.

\textsuperscript{103} Introduction, Section 4.2.

\textsuperscript{104} This is the approach taken for example in the articles in the \textit{NIDNTT}.

\textsuperscript{105} Also Rom 7:23; 2 Cor 10:5; 2 Tim 3:6 (as well as Jdg 5:12; 1 Kgs 8:46; 2 Kgs 24:14; 2 Chr 28:8, 17; 30:9; Ps 70:1; 105:46; Lam 1:1). \textit{NIDNTT} 3:590-591.
A related approach is to look to Acts, where several scenes recall divine acts of rescue in the LXX, such as the Exodus.\(^\text{106}\) Roth believes the connection is tenuous,\(^\text{107}\) but despite his objections there are captives in Acts, and it is reasonable to allow that some of the material in Luke 4:18-19 may not be specifically picked up until Luke’s second volume.

The above suggestions amount to looking at the wider context for connections and resonances with the vocabulary of Luke 4:18-19. The following require us to look more closely at Luke 4:18-19 itself. Several of them then direct the reader back to the Old Testament.

It will be argued below that πτωχός forms the header to the composite Isaiah quotation, meaning that the captives, the blind, and the oppressed are all to be counted among the πτωχός.\(^\text{108}\) By this argument the captive and the oppressed, as well as the blind, are well covered in Luke.\(^\text{109}\) A similar logic under-girds the observation that αἰχμαλώτος appears in the phrase αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν (“release to the captives”) and therefore wherever ἄφεσις (release) occurs captives may be present. (After all, to be released from something requires one to first be captured by it.) Roth takes this a step further, noting the link between release and sin in Luke. He then wonders if Luke is making non-literal symbols from “the captives” and “the oppressed” to stand for people “captive” to sin and “shattered” by evil.\(^\text{110}\) Luke, he suggests, borrows from the LXX images of the captive and shattered to give added nuance to the power of sin in Luke-Acts.\(^\text{111}\) He notes that 4:18 is a grouping of similar characters types from the OT and is designed to elicit sympathy from the LXX reader. As the types are given no intratextual definition readers are expected to supply this from the narrator’s intertext, the


\(^{107}\) He notes the lack of specific verbal links with Luke 4:18; the absence of Jesus’ involvement; that not everyone in these scenes is rescued; and the silence about Paul’s fate in Acts. Roth, The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor, 163.

\(^{108}\) Ibid., 17.

\(^{109}\) Though the absence of “the poor” in Acts then requires some explaining, hence Johnson’s, Literary Function. It might be suggested that the poor are present in the oppressed, the captives, and the blind.

\(^{110}\) Roth, The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor, 163.

\(^{111}\) Ibid., 164.
LXX. He also holds that such lists are neither exhaustive nor fixed. This observation supports the suggestion that the specific vocabulary used in 4:18-19 tends to fuse together. Complementary to this approach is the suggestion that 4:18-19 connects back to the Old Testament jubilee. By this argument it would work well for the quotation to look back to the jubilee through the words of the prophet Isaiah, and for some at least of the vocabulary to look forward into Luke-Acts.

The above discussion demonstrates that the absence of specific vocabulary outside of 4:18-19 is not fatal to the argument that Luke 4:18-19 is programmatic for the mission of Jesus in Luke. It also means that passages such as 8:26-30 can be confidently read as examples of Jesus bringing αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν (“release to the captives”), and that jubilee can be taken as part of the matrix of the OT context for such events and for Jesus’ ministry.

The following survey of key vocabulary in 4:18-19 and its use in Luke’s Gospel will demonstrate that the vocabulary (and associated themes) are integral to Luke. It will also show that there is a tendency for these terms to fuse together as a result of their association with one another throughout Luke, and their concentration in summary statements. It then becomes apparent that even when a particular term is absent from a pericope (or indeed is not found again in Luke) it may still be essential to the text being considered. The tracing of this vocabulary also fills out our understanding of what Jesus’ mission is about, and therefore of what discipleship entails.

3.4.1 εὐαγγελίζω (proclaim good news)

Luke uses εὐαγγελίζω (proclaim good news) ten times in his Gospel. It appears in each section of the Gospel, though it is most concentrated in the Galilean phase. It is important in the prologue where the angel Gabriel uses it to describe the arrival of its two main characters, John (1:19) and Jesus (2:10). It is then critical to Luke’s summary passages. Luke employs it
as a comprehensive term for describing the activity of John (3:18), Jesus (4:18) and then the disciples (9:6). It is used to describe the radical shift that has occurred with the coming of the kingdom in Jesus to his opponents (16:6). Finally, it describes a typical “day in the life of” Jesus (20:1) and so echoes the various summary statements, as well as Jesus’ manifesto in 4:18-19. Luke’s use of εὐαγγελίζω for such key events in his Gospel suggests it is an important key to reading Luke.

Luke maintains a steadfast preference for the verb εὐαγγελίζω over the noun εὐαγγέλιον, as found in his sources.115 Given the importance of 4:18-19 it is reasonable to suppose that he does this in order to link the use of εὐαγγελίζω with the Isaiah quotation in the Nazareth manifesto. Thus, εὐαγγελίζω implies the bringing of good news to the poor as described in 4:18-19 whenever it occurs elsewhere in Luke. The Isaiah quotations of 4:18-19 shape the telling of the whole of Luke’s Gospel. Readers might reasonably look to see how Jesus comes to the fishers at the lake as good news (5:1-11). By Chapter 8 they might well look to see the disciples engaged in the sharing of the good news as well.

3.4.2 πτωχός (the poor)

Luke also uses πτωχός ten times in his Gospel. It appears three times in the Galilean phase,116 six times in the central section,117 and once in the Jerusalem phase.118 The poor first appear here in 4:18. The “poor” passages form a strong, vital, and integrated thread running through Luke. Roth describes how the “the poor” appear as character types in Luke.119 They are placed at the end or (more frequently) at the beginning of lists.120 This suggests that Luke uses πτωχός

115 Luke uses εὐαγγελίζω over εὐαγγέλιον exclusively in his Gospel (ten times) and fifteen times in Acts (but εὐαγγέλιον appears only twice in Acts).


119 Roth, The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor; 152-164.

120 For example, of 7:22 Green says that “the poor” is placed in the “final, emphatic position.” Green, Luke, 297.
or eis πτωχοί as a summary, or catch-all term, denoting all who need “release.” It tends to subsume the other groups that come after or before it. This adds weight to the argument that the poor are not just the materially poor. Rather, they include all those who are impoverished in any way that results in their social isolation. Thus the sick and the demon possessed, as well as the materially poor are all πτωχοί. Luke matches πτωχοί references closely (though not exactly) with reference to the πλούσιος (rich). Luke also places the rich at the beginning or end of lists, as they too are a character type.

As a collective noun the poor denote the voiceless and nameless mass of poor people. When used as an adjective πτωχός identifies one as a member of this group. Despite being named in 16:20, even Lazarus is no exception to this rule. He exists only in a story told by Jesus and he remains in character, being silent and passive throughout his story. The widow at the Temple (21:1-4) is an individual but she is a representative individual. The fact that she is a widow as well as poor serves to show how destitute and powerless she is. Her story also reveals why she is destitute. Others have taken advantage of her vulnerability (20:47). Note also that Jesus has no interaction with this widow. Having observed her (21:2) he turns from her to those with him to comment on her plight (21:3-4).

The question “Who are the poor in Luke?” has received much scholarly attention. Practically all agree that πτωχός in Luke is more than a literal designation for those who are materially poor.
poor, though most are quick to add that Luke certainly includes such people among the poor. Peter Davids captures this well when he suggests that πτωχός is a metaphor but that even as a metaphor it is “not entirely metaphorical; it always contains an element of real suffering and insecurity, even if the suffering is not necessarily economic.”\textsuperscript{127} The poor then are “those who are actually experiencing oppression or helplessness . . . or those identifying with this group by giving up their own security and generously sharing what they have.”\textsuperscript{128} Green notes that both “materialist” and “spiritual” readings have proved inadequate, concluding that being poor in Luke means diminished social status.\textsuperscript{129} The poor are those “beyond the boundaries of God’s people.”\textsuperscript{130} Being among the poor may include economic poverty, but the story of Zacchaeus cautions against the strict equation of πτωχός with material poverty. Zacchaeus is socially isolated because of his occupation as a tax collector (19:2), an occupation associated with “sinners” in Luke.\textsuperscript{131} Luke states that Zacchaeus is rich (πλούσιος), but despite his material wealth, Luke shows him to be among the poor by having Jesus come to him. The balance of the passages about the poor, along with Luke’s dire warnings about wealth, remain in tension with 19:1-10.

The “poor” passages form a coherent thread or theme through Luke’s Gospel. By taking a wider view of who the poor are, much more of Luke’s material could have been included. For example, the story of the Rich Fool (12:13-21) and the Parable of the Dishonest Manager (16:1-13) are two “rich” passages that do not include the poor by name. If the poor are indeed the marginalised and not just the materially poor, then every account in which Jesus heals or delivers can be included as an example of good news to the poor (4:18). However, for the purpose of showing that Luke’s use of πτωχός in 4:18 is in fact programmatic this more narrowly defined survey is sufficient.

\textsuperscript{127} Peter H. Davids, “Rich and Poor,” \textit{DJG}, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed., 706.

\textsuperscript{128} Ibid., 707.

\textsuperscript{129} Similarly “‘rich’ is not just an economic term.” Green, \textit{Luke}, 267.

\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 211 (but see 59-61, 210-211, 229).

\textsuperscript{131} Tax collectors and sinners appear together in 5:30; 7:34; 15:1. Levi is actually a “chief tax collector” (ἀρχιτελώνης), which presumably was even worse.
Noteworthy here is the snowballing effect of these passages. This becomes apparent if with each new “poor” passage we ask “What does this add?” as Roth suggests. The poor passages accrue key words and themes, creating an ever more complex picture. Later repetitions add layers and depth of meaning, whilst earlier understandings are revised and expanded.

3.4.3 ἀποστέλλω (send)

In Luke’s Gospel ἀποστέλλω appears twenty-six times. Often it is used simply to describe the ordering or instructing of persons to change locations in order to perform a task; elsewhere, however, ἀποστέλλω is theologically loaded. This tends to be the case when it occurs in close proximity to other key words from 4:18-19 such as κηρύσσω, εὐαγγελίζω, and ἀφεσις. This is important to note because ἀποστέλλω does not occur in either of the lake stories. However, these other key words do. This means the idea or theme of being sent is present, even where ἀποστέλλω is not. The man in 8:38 is sent away, but Luke uses ἀπολύω here. In Luke 5 the disciples ἀκολουθέω rather than being sent. However, following this, Jesus’ disciples become the most sent characters in the narrative, being sent nine times. They are always sent by Jesus. Jesus is sent four times, always by God, and always in programmatic or summary statements. The use of ἀποστέλλω in the programmatic Isaiah quotation in 4:18 on the lips of Jesus, along with the summary statement setting of 4:43 and the similarly weighty

132 Roth, The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor, 64-68.
133 Introduction, Section 4.4.
135 Green believes that Luke does not use “send” as a technical term. He also notes the connection between ἀπόστολος and ἀποστέλλω. Green, Luke, 358. See also Hengel, The Charismatic Leader, 82-83. It is certainly a judgement call here but Luke 7:3, 20; 9:52; 13:34; 14:17, 32; 19:14, 29, 32; 20:10; 22:8, 35 could be classed as the more mechanical uses of ἀποστέλλω.
137 This count includes the messengers of 9:52. It also counts ἀποστέλλω in both 10:1 and 3, though both refer to the one sending.
words of 9:48, mean the significance of Jesus’ sending outweighs that of the disciples. Nevertheless, being sent is critical to discipleship and, despite the absence of ἀποστέλλω to both lake stories, the theme is present.

Broadly speaking, sending in Luke involves Jesus, his disciples, and others in healing and declaring the kingdom. Often this involves those who are sent placing themselves in vulnerable situations whilst being reliant on the hospitality of others. Jesus’ rejection at Nazareth (4:28-29), the instructions given for missionary journeys (9:3-5; 10:4-12), and Israel’s story (11:39; 13:34) all caution that being sent by Jesus may mean rejection.

3.4.4 κηρύσσω (proclaim)

Luke uses κηρύσσω nine times in his Gospel where it features in summary and programmatic passages. Along with ἀποστέλλω and ἀφέσις, it makes a double appearance in 4:18-19, indicating it is very important. As κηρύσσω appears in one of the lake stories a more detailed discussion of its use elsewhere in Luke is included here. This forms part of the groundwork for later in the study where it will be argued that the delivered demoniac in Luke 8:26-39 is a disciple, the first Gentile disciple. The fact that the man goes proclaiming (κηρύσσω) what Jesus has done for him to the people of his city (8:39) is key to establishing this.

The proclamation of John the Baptist (3:3). Luke 3:1-20 opens the Galilean phase of the Gospel, describing in detail the setting (3:1-2), purpose (3:3-6), and content (3:7-17) of John’s ministry. Luke 3:18 is a summary statement. The narrative then flashes forward to indicate how John’s ministry will be ended by Herod (3:19-20). Luke 3:3 acts as a header. Having set the geo-political scene (3:1-2), Luke here orients the reader to the general and overall thrust of John’s activity. This he describes as κηρύσσων βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (“proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins”) (3:3). John’s

138 Luke 3:3; 4:18, 19, 44; 8:1, 39; 9:2; 24:47.
139 Chapter 5, Section 3.
140 Acts 10:37 also uses κηρύσσω (proclaim) in summarising John’s ministry.
proclamation emphasises imminent eschatological judgement. It picks up on the similar (but unusual) use of κηρύσσω in Isaiah 61:1.141

**Jesus at Nazareth (4:18-19).** The opening description of Jesus’ preaching and public (adult) ministry includes κηρύσσω (proclaim) twice.142 It is a key verb in the composite Isaiah quotation Luke places on Jesus’ lips. As 3:3 does of John, this passage introduces the nature and content of Jesus’ ministry, of which proclamation is an integral part. Jesus will κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει ("proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind") (4:18). He will κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν ("proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord") (4:19). Despite the different tone of the opening messages of John and Jesus, the use of κηρύσσω for both implies continuity between the role and message of both.

**Jesus’ synagogue preaching (4:44).** Luke 4:44 reads, καὶ ἦν κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας. (“And he was proclaiming in the synagogues of Judea.”) Luke 4:42-44 forms a bridge linking Jesus’ public ministry in the synagogues of Nazareth and Capernaum with the subsequent material. It does this by describing his departure from those regions εἰς ἔρημον τόπον (“to a deserted place”) (4:42) and then anticipating his future movement εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας (“in the synagogues of Judea”) (4:44).143 In v. 42 the narrative setting is given. V. 43 is a tight summary statement where Jesus succinctly describes his mission: ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (“I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also”).144 He effectively reiterates this by then stating


142 There is an artful progression from listening and asking questions in the Temple as a twelve-year-old boy (2:46) to this point.

143 The break between chapters 4 and 5 is made clear by the ἐγένετο δὲ ἔτη (“one day”) of 5:1 and the shift in setting to the Lake of Gennesaret. See discussion on 5:1 in Chapter 3, Section 6.1.

144 Note the “divine δεῖ” in 4:43.
that he has been ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀπεστάλην ("sent for this purpose"). Coming so soon after 4:18-19, and being the first summary statement thereafter, the use of κηρύσσω here reinforces its importance as a key verbal descriptor of Jesus’ ministry. The subject of this proclamation is the kingdom of God (4:43). This (again) suggests strongly that the kingdom of God and the message of 4:18-19 are synonymous.145

Jesus’ mission and companions (8:1). Luke 8:1 gives another compact summary statement of Jesus’ mission and purpose, this one narrated to us by Luke. Here again Jesus is said to be moving through the cities and villages κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ ("proclaiming and announcing good news of the kingdom of God"). This is very nearly an identical statement to the one in 4:43, but κηρύσσω is now joined by εὐαγγελίζω. The overlapping vocabulary shows that in every possible way Jesus heralds and enacts the kingdom of God.146 With this fourth use of κηρύσσω in such a strategic narrative setting the reader must take κηρύσσω to be one of the key verbs Luke uses to describe Jesus’ mission.147 This again would support the assertion that 4:18-19, with its double use of κηρύσσω, is programmatic for Jesus’ mission in this Gospel, and therefore is a key discipleship indicator.

The healed demoniac proclaims Jesus (8:39). The next occurrence of κηρύσσω is in the account of the formerly deranged Gentile. This man is sent to his city to διηγέομαι (declare) what God has done for him (8:39). Luke narrates his obedience as going through the city and κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ("proclaiming what Jesus had done for him") (8:39). The use of κηρύσσω here, especially in light of Jesus’ instruction to διηγέομαι, pointedly marks this man as sharing in Jesus’ mission.

145 See the discussion of ἀποστέλλω above (Chapter 1, Section 3.4.3) for a similar conclusion.

146 Especially given the events Luke has narrated between 4:42 and 8:1.

147 That is, appearing in his opening address (twice), and first and second subsequent summary statements. All of these are located in the Galilean phase of a Gospel that purports to be διήγησις (an account) (1:1).
The mission of the twelve (9:2). Jesus begins calling disciples in 5:1-11. In 6:13 he ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δώδεκα, σὺς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὄνόμασεν (“chose twelve of them, whom he also named apostles”). However, it is not until 9:1-2 that the twelve are given authority and sent to κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι (“proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal”).\(^{148}\) The disciples are being sent on a mission that is essentially an extension of Jesus’ mission. Thus we can infer that this mission includes the elements of Jesus’ proclamation.\(^{149}\) The disciples are to διήρχοντο κατὰ τὰς κώμας...πανταχοῦ (“go through the villages . . . everywhere”) (9:6). Luke uses πανταχοῦ here for the region of Galilee.\(^{150}\)

The warning against hypocrisy (12:1-3). The object of κηρύσσω here is the hypocrisy (ὑπόκρισις) of the Pharisees. Its use here is dark and ironic. Its relevance to 4:18-19 is only by means of contrast between the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and Jesus’ mission in 4:18-19.

Jesus appears to his disciples (24:47). This final use of κηρύσσω stands out for several reasons. First, verbal parallels between 24:47 and 3:3 mean the two verses at opposite ends of the Gospel tie together, while the other occurrences of κηρύσσω round out and develop the theme between them, enriching the term as it appears at either end of the Gospel story. Our initial reading of what it means to proclaim repentance and the forgiveness of sins—as announced by John—has been thoroughly reworked by the proclamations of Jesus, the

---

148 Jesus has already demonstrated that proclamation involves healing (4:38-40; 5:12-16, 17-26; 6:6-11; 7:1-10; 7:22; 8:40-56). Its placement alongside τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ as the subject of κηρύσσω (proclaim) confirms it as a kingdom activity. Besides healing (9:2) and the curing of diseases (9:1) Jesus also confers δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια (“power and authority over all demons”) (9:1). So far Jesus has demonstrated his own authority over demons by delivering persons possessed by demons/unclean spirits (4:31-37, 41; 6:18; 7:21; 8:2, 26-33. 8:22-25 can be added if the storm is taken as demonic in some sense). Elsewhere healing and demon possession are linked (4:40-41; 6:18-19; 7:21; 8:2). The effect is to broaden rather than narrow the reader’s understanding of the kingdom of God and therefore of the weight of its proclamation.


Gerasene demoniac, the disciples, and Jesus himself. However, in this commission to the disciples the original phrase is recalled.

Second, this proclamation is now the task given to the disciples. It is now extended to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ (“all the nations, beginning in Jerusalem”). The broadening scope of this mission is earlier intimated in the account of the proclamation of the demoniac (8:39). It anticipates the explosion of the proclamation of μετάνοιαν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν (“repentance and the forgiveness of sins”) (3:3; 24:47), αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστείλαι τεθραυσμένους εν ἀφέσει (“release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, and to let the oppressed go free”) (4:18) and ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν (“the acceptable year of the Lord”) (4:19), τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (“the kingdom of God”) (4:43; 8:1; 9:2) and ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς (“what Jesus had done”) (8:39) beyond the orbit of the Gospel, which, though not exclusively located in Israel is certainly centred there.

It is worth noting again that (excluding 12:3) all the uses of κηρύσσω in Luke occur in key passages. The first (3:3) is programmatic for John’s ministry. The second (4:18-19) is programmatic for Jesus’ ministry. The third and fourth (4:43; 8:1) are summary passages for Jesus’ ministry. The fifth (8:39) inaugurates the future Gentile mission of the Church. The sixth (9:2) marks the sending of the twelve and their commission to join Jesus in his mission. The seventh (24:47) is the commission of the eleven to universal mission at the end of the Gospel. Luke’s κηρύσσω passages present the very strongest argument for 4:18-19 (and hence 4:16-30) as programmatic for his story of Jesus.

151 That is, “the eleven and those with them” (24:47).

152 Luke 8:22-39; 9:52; 17:11. The Israel-centric emphasis is reinforced by the Temple location and material, especially in the prologue (2:27, 37, 46), temptations (4:9), and Jerusalem section (19:45, 47; 20:1; 21:5, 37f; 22:52f; 24:53).
3.4.5 αἰχμάλωτος (the captive)

This is the only appearance of αἰχμάλωτος in the NT. However, in the LXX it appears twenty times. There it describes exile, oppression, captivity, being stripped (of clothing), or carried off (of animals).\(^{153}\) Roth summarises the captive in the LXX as having no personality, a non-actor (being rather acted upon), powerless, at the mercy of their captors, not predisposed to faith, faceless, nameless, and powerless. Where the reference is to Israel, then Israel has sinned, is in captivity, and is helpless and dependent on God for salvation. Israel takes on the connotations of the weakness of captives in general.\(^{154}\) The one-off use of αἰχμάλωτος (captive) here is puzzling, especially when other key vocabulary from 4:18-19 is repeated within this passage (ἀφεσις, ἀποστέλλω, κηρύσσω) and then throughout Luke or Luke-Acts, often in key or summary passages.\(^{155}\) Nevertheless, as argued above, it can still be seen that the captives are present throughout Luke, even in the absence of the term αἰχμάλωτος (captive). The man in Luke 8 is a case in point.\(^{156}\)

3.4.6 θραύω (oppress)

θραύω appears seventeen times in the LXX, but like αἰχμάλωτος only here in the NT. It occurs in the phrase ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει (“let the oppressed go free”). In light of the above discussion it is argued that where ἀφεσις occurs, the shattered or oppressed can be assumed to be present. Looking at the term in the LXX, Roth notes that this group is not presented as characters per se, except in Isa 58:6, where they are nameless and faceless. The shattered one has lost the capacity to be an actor, and is rather a figure to be acted upon. He or

---

153 Exod 22:9, 13 (22:14 MT); Num 21:29; Esth 2:6; Job 12:17, 19; 41:24; Amos 6:7; 7:11, 17; Nah 3:10; Isa 5:13; 14:2; 23:1; 46:2; 52:2; 61:1; Ezek 12:4; 30:18.

154 Roth, *The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor*, 101.

155 Similarly θραύω (oppress).

156 See also Luke 8:43-48, 13:16, and 23:32-43. To these could be added all of Luke’s healing and exorcism stories, and beyond that those captive to wealth or poverty or social convention such as women and children. Characters such as slaves within parables could also be added. Those held back from discipleship by fear or social pressure or expectation would form another group. The Jewish and Roman authorities would form another group. In fact, all of the people Jesus meets, ministers to, is in conflict with, could be labelled as captives.
she has suffered defeat and destruction, is helpless, and is at the mercy of others, human and
divine. The image is one derived from warfare.\textsuperscript{157} Davids contends that in Luke this group
includes those oppressed by demons.\textsuperscript{158} Davids’ point and Roth’s description will prove
relevant in the discussion on the Gerasene demoniac.

3.4.7 \textit{άφεσις} (release or forgiveness)

Luke uses \textit{άφεσις} five times in his Gospel.\textsuperscript{159} In the prologue Zechariah prophesies that John
will give the knowledge of salvation to his people “by the forgiveness (\textit{άφεσις}) of their sins”
(1:77). The second use of \textit{άφεσις} occurs in 3:3 where it forms an integral part of a narrated
summary of John’s mission. This is packed with key Lukan vocabulary (\textit{κηρύσσω}, \textit{άφεσις}, and
\textit{άμαρτία}) that connects Jesus and John. In 4:18 Luke uses \textit{άφεσις} twice. In this case it is not
clear that release is from sin. The verse suggests rather a status change from captive to
released, and from oppressed to free. In the context of the surrounding vocabulary, and in
light of the jubilee background of these verses and the jubilee connections of the Isaiah
passages Luke is quoting, \textit{άφεσις} here reads as much like release from oppression as
forgiveness of sins.\textsuperscript{160} The final use of \textit{άφεσις} is in 24:47, where it is embedded in the phrase
\textit{μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν} (“repentance for the forgiveness of sins”). In this phrase \textit{άφεσις}
echoes 1:77 and especially 3:3. The phrase is nearly identical in 3:3, \textit{γνῶσιν σωτηρίας τῶν λαῶν
αὐτῶν ἐν ἄφεσει ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν} (“knowledge of salvation to his people by the forgiveness of
their sins”).

Luke uses \textit{άφεσις} at key points in his Gospel and for key characters. It is reasonable to look for
this key component of Jesus’ ministry (4:18-19) in the two lake stories. In Luke 5 Simon
declares himself to be \textit{ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός} (“a sinful man”), whist in 8:26-39 the Gerasene

\textsuperscript{157} Roth, \textit{The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor}, 103.

\textsuperscript{158} Davids, “Rich and Poor,” \textit{DJG}, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed., 707.

\textsuperscript{159} The verb (\textit{ἀφίημι}) is used thirty-one times.

\textsuperscript{160} The Isaiah quotations and their connection to the jubilee are discussed below at Section 4.
demoniac is released from the oppression of Legion. This is consistent with the ἀφεσις as release and as forgiveness in Luke, as will be later argued.

3.4.8 τυφλός (blind) 161

Luke uses τυφλός eight times in his Gospel. 162 On the surface the reference is to literal blindness. However, 6:39 is a parabolic saying that uses literal blindness to speak of metaphorical blindness. In light of a wider survey of vocabulary related to sight and blindness Chad Hartsock argues that sight in Luke 4 is in fact part literal and part metaphorical. He also shows that as Luke-Acts unfolds the language about sight moves from being predominantly literal to almost completely metaphorical. 163 “Jesus will heal the physically blind, but certainly he has in mind spiritual blindness as well.”164 If blindness and recovery of sight (below) have a metaphorical aspect to them, then it can be argued that wherever Jesus is seen to be acting out his mission (4:18-19) he is bringing sight to the blind.

3.4.9 ἀνάβλεψις (recovery of Sight)

Sight and seeing are common in Luke. βλέπω appears sixteen times in fourteen verses and ὁράω in seventy-five verses. However Luke 4:18 and Isa 61:1 are the only appearances of ἀνάβλεψις in the Old and New Testaments. The exact phrase τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν (“recovery of sight to the blind”) appears in both. Luke has much on sight and blindness, both literal and metaphorical. 165 The particular significance of ἀνάβλεψις here is its connection with τυφλός and its roots in Isa 61:1.

161 Roth summarises that, despite their vulnerability to unjust treatment, the blind in the LXX are portrayed as divinely appointed targets of human magnanimity who are ultimately to be healed by God or God’s agent, and who are fated for eschatological wholeness. Roth: The Blind, the Lame, and the Poor, 106.

162 Luke 4:18; 6:39 (twice); 7:21, 22; 14:13, 21, 18:35.


165 For example, does giving sight to the blind at 7:22 mean enlightening John’s disciples? Green, Luke, 297.
3.4.10 ἐνιαυτός (year)

This is used only ἐνιαυτός in Luke. This is an example of the “more general” use of “year,” denoting “a period of time other than a calendar year.” Used along with δεκτός (see below) the idea seems to be “the acceptable time.”

3.4.11 δεκτός (acceptable)

Luke uses δεκτός only in 4:19 and 4:24 in his Gospel. The repetition of δεκτός within 4:16-30 helps tie 4:18-19 into the material that follows. It underscores the theme of fulfilment (4:21). At the same time it plays on the reversal of the people’s acceptance of Jesus (4:22, cf. 4:28). While this is ἐνιαυτόν κυρίου δεκτόν, Jesus is not acceptable to his people. This is because his message and presence bear the burden of prophetic critique.

3.5 Literary Function

Having looked in some more detail at the key vocabulary in 4:18-19, and building upon that, the literary function of 4:16-30 will now be considered. First, this episode is critical to Luke’s Gospel as it forms a programmatic statement of Jesus’ mission and ministry. The quotation from Isa 61:1-2a and 58:6 serves to outline the program, shape, and purpose of Jesus’ ministry. It is also the first detailed account given of Jesus’ active ministry, following as it does from the general summary statement in vv. 15-16. Through the words of the prophet Isaiah, Luke has Jesus explicitly declared his purpose to his fellow synagogue attendees (characters within the story), and to his hearers, or readers (those watching or listening in from outside the story). With the benefit of the prologue (Luke chs. 1-2) readers are better

166 “ἐνιαυτός, οὐ, ἕ,” BDAG, 336. This reading is consistent with the jubilee reading of these verses. Reading the ἐνιαυτός as a literal calendar year skews interpreting the jubilee here towards a literal 50th (or 49th) year jubilee as in Lev 25.


prepared to hear Jesus’ announcement in the synagogue than the Nazareth locals within the story. The townspeople of Nazareth are hampered by their familiarity with Jesus and his family, though some at least of the events narrated in Luke 1-2 may be assumed to be available to them.\textsuperscript{169}

Second, the synagogue sermon itself is an “exemplar” of Jesus’ teaching and proclamation throughout Galilee (4:14-15).\textsuperscript{170} Luke says that Jesus regularly ministered and taught in the synagogues,\textsuperscript{171} but only here is the content of this teaching reported. The implication is that Jesus’ message here is typical of what he says elsewhere in similar settings. Third, it links Jesus and the Spirit with the purpose and plan of God. The close connection between Jesus and the Spirit in the early chapters of Luke provides accreditation for Jesus and his mission.\textsuperscript{172} Jesus acts in the power of the Spirit and in accordance with God’s plan and purpose.

Fourth, it shows Jesus to be the son of God. Because it follows on from the announcement and then the testing and defining of Jesus’ sonship (3:21-4:13), it begins to flesh out what that sonship will entail: being anointed by the Spirit, announcing God’s jubilee, and being sent to the poor, the captive, the blind, and the oppressed. It means a ministry of release and sight-giving to these people. As Tannehill would have it, “4:18-19 functions as a disclosure of what it means for Jesus to be Son of God, for it refers back to the moment when the Spirit descends on him and the divine voice declares him to be God’s Son (3:22).”\textsuperscript{173} Fifth, as exemplar of his preaching and summary or programme of Jesus’ mission, the passage acts as a counterpoint to the wilderness temptations. In 4:1-13 the Spirit leads Jesus into the desert, where the devil offers Jesus an alternative way of being Son of God. Here we find out how Jesus might have been diverted.

\textsuperscript{169} Public awareness of John’s and Jesus’ early lives is reported and implied throughout these chapters. See for example 1:65-66; 2:17-18, 38, 47, 52.

\textsuperscript{170} Green, \textit{Luke}, 207.


\textsuperscript{172} Luke 3:16, 22; 4:1, 18.

\textsuperscript{173} Tannehill, \textit{Narrative Unity}, 1:63.
Sixth, Luke 4:20-30 indicates (at least in part) the response to Jesus’ mission and ministry. The passage describes an initially favorable reaction (4:20-22) that, following Jesus’ comments in 4:23-27, turns hostile (4:28-29). However, the nature of the people’s response is debated. Joachim Jeremias (followed by others) reads the initial reaction (4:22) as hostile and thus the whole episode as a negative reaction to Jesus. This reading seems forced. John Nolland reads the testimony (witness) of the people (4:22a) as a Lukan perspective on the episode rather than the perspective of the people from within the episode. The testimony of the people stands as a testimony to Jesus as messianic prophet. This despite their rejection of him that follows this witness. Luke, argues Nolland, is concerned to commend Jesus to Theophilus (and others) in an independent or legal sense. As 4:22 tells us something about Jesus rather than about the state of his hearers, it is not about the spiritual responsiveness of Jesus’ hearers. There is therefore no turning or changing of attitude. Their rejection of him underlines the impartiality of their witness to him. In response to Nolland, it seems arbitrary to say that the story is about Jesus and not about Jesus’ hearers. The narrative concerns both. Also, to argue as Nolland does that the townsfolk’s impartiality led them to reject Jesus seems odd. Rejection would more likely suggest they were partial against him.

The view favoured here, that the response is initially positive and then turns, is usually explained on the basis of the Elijah and Elisha material in 4:25-27. However, B. Koet argues that 4:16-30 is a call to repentance, and that this is why the townsfolk take offence. But in making this argument he over-reads meanings and nuances of words developed later in the

178 Ibid., 226-228.
179 Ibid., 229.
180 Koet, Five Studies, 42. Jesus’ claim (4:25-27) is that “a prophet is not directly an advantage to his own people, but rather spurs his people to conversion.” Ibid., 50.
narrative back into this passage. Others see Jesus’ reading of Isaiah and his self-appropriation of that passage as a messianic claim that is rejected by the people of his hometown due to “grossly inadequate evidence.” More helpful is the suggestion that the shift in the people’s attitude to Jesus is due to the fact that he allows the people of his hometown no special claim over him. Rather, he goes to all in need, especially those at the margins. Tannehill suggests this when he says Jesus departs from Nazareth not because he is rejected “but he is rejected because he announces that it is God’s will and his mission to go elsewhere.” Drawing on social identity theory, Aaron Kuecker states that “the Nazareth incident can be interpreted compellingly as Jesus’ refusal to be bound by the entitlement claims of his own Nazareth subgroup.” His argument is that πάντως ἐρεῖτέ μοι (“no doubt you will say to me”) shows Jesus operating as interpreter of his own social context. He is not here rejecting the people of Nazareth per se, but rather their social assumptions, particularly the assumption that, as members of the same sub-group, they are entitled to the benefits he (Jesus) confers. The Elijah and Elisha sayings included by Luke (4:25-27) clarify the proverb (4:23) by narrating the people’s unwillingness to hear the prophets, an unwillingness which stems from the lack of respect for in-group identity that prophets typically exhibit. (Prophets often critique the in-group.) It is not the case, argues Kuecker, that Elijah and Elisha ministered among other peoples because the people of Israel

181 For example, his discussion on ἀφεσις as forgiveness of sins (Ibid., 33-35) imports this meaning from elsewhere in Luke-Acts. The immediate context, while not precluding this meaning, points in the direction of the jubilee style reading of ἀφεσις as release from bondage, poverty, captivity etc. in all forms. Green argues similarly for a broader reading of ἀφεσις (Green, Luke, 211-212). Another example is Koet’s discussion of the phrase “in your ears,” (Koet, Five Studies, 38-39) where quite specific meanings and echoes from OT texts are imported into the subject text. Again, Green offers a similar critique in Green, Luke, 218 (n. 54).


183 See for example Green, Luke, 218.


185 Kuecker, The Spirit, 80 (his emphasis).

186 Kuecker, The Spirit, 83.
rejected them. Rather, the encounters were the result of divine sending. Elijah and Elisha granted non-Israelites the benefits of their ministries and showed that prophets “are unbound by typical identity boundaries.” The issue then is that Jesus’ mission reaches beyond Nazareth and ultimately beyond Israel. It is therefore in line with the indications of the universal nature of his mission as implied in the prologue and as captured in the quotations from Isaiah, as well as the Elijah and Elisha allusions here. It is also consistent with the two lake stories as Jesus makes disciples first among the people of Galilee (5:1-11) and then of a Gentile (8:26-39).

What Luke describes is an initial attentiveness and receptiveness turning to resistance as Jesus’ mission becomes clearer to his townsfolk. This hostility finally erupts into anger and an attempt on his life. His passing through the crowds at the end of this episode (v. 30) ultimately foreshadows his resurrection. Immediately following Jesus’ rejection in Nazareth the location shifts to Capernaum (4:31-43). The response to Jesus here is very different from the one he has received in Nazareth, demonstrating that there are some who will receive Jesus and his ministry.

3.5.1 Summary

Luke’s placement of 4:16-30 within the narrative is of critical importance. It follows the summary statement about Jesus’ preaching and itinerant ministry (4:14-15) and the wilderness temptations (4:1-13). Thus it gives content to Jesus’ teaching (4:15), indicates what Jesus will do, and sets up the pattern of announcement and opposition to that announcement. Within biblical narrative opening addresses are crucial to understanding key characters. Although these are not the first reported words of Jesus in Luke’s Gospel they are the first words he

187 Ibid., 93-94. Kuecker shows that honour and shame readings of this text neglect that the collective takes pride in and is boosted by the success of one of its members. Ibid., 89.


189 Chapters 3 and 4 of the study.


192 Alter, Art of Biblical Narrative, 69.
4 Luke 4:16-30 as Jubilee Text

Luke 4:18-19 incorporates a strong jubilee motif. This comes to Luke from the Pentateuch via the prophet Isaiah. It is then outworked throughout Luke’s Gospel and into Acts. As jubilee is transmitted through these stages it comes to take on a present-future look in Luke’s work, meshing with Jesus’ mission as inaugurator of the kingdom of God. This is important to understanding the mission of Jesus and therefore of the disciples. Looking ahead to Chapter 5 of this study, it raises a particularly interesting set of questions about Luke’s lake stories. In the first of these (5:1-11) Simon and those with him leave everything to follow Jesus. In the second (8:22-39), the delivered man returns home. There are many strong jubilee themes in the second story, yet these are very scant in the first. If jubilee is part of how Luke frames Jesus’ mission in 4:16-30, and that is programmatic, how can it be apparently absent and then very obviously present in two lake stories that this study argues are closely related?

A discussion on the jubilee in Luke is required at this point in order to trace the trajectory of the jubilee through the OT and forward into Luke and Acts. Discipleship, and specifically the two lake stories in Luke, can then be read against Luke’s appropriation of the jubilee

Table 2: The Jubilee Trajectory: From Pentateuch through to Luke-Acts, Including the Two Lake Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key References</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pentateuch</strong></td>
<td>Lev 25</td>
<td>Redistribution of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Release of slaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Forgiveness of debt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Literal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intensified Sabbath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberty and return</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄφεσις (LXX) translates ῥήμα and ἀφελέ in MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prophets</strong></td>
<td>Isa 35:5; 58:6; 61:1-2</td>
<td>Eschatological recasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jubilee as metaphor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἄφεσις (LXX) translates ῥήμα in MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Inter-
Testamental**                  | 11Q Melch                                            | Draws on Pentateuch and prophets                                       |
|                                     |                                                      | Shows jubilee as eschatological hope was alive in NT era              |
| **Jesus in Nazareth**               | Luke 4:18-19                                       | κηρύσσω                                                                  |
|                                     | || Isa 58:6; 61:1-2                                  | ἄφεσις                                                                  |
|                                     |                                                      | ἐνιαυτὸν ἡμέρας σπλήντον                                               |
|                                     |                                                      | Programmatic text                                                       |
|                                     |                                                      | 4:25-27 anticipates Gentile ministry                                   |
| **First Lake Journey**              | Luke 5:1-11                                         | No obvious jubilee themes or vocabulary                                |
|                                     |                                                      | Discipleship as abandonment                                            |
| **Jesus and John**                  | Luke 7:18-23                                       | Restates 4:18-19                                                        |
|                                     | || Isa 35:5; 61:1                                    | Includes deliverance from demonic power                                |
| **Second Lake Journey**             | Luke 8:22-39                                       | Captive released                                                       |
|                                     | || 4:16-30                                           | Gentile mission                                                        |
|                                     |                                                      | Man as (Gentile) proclaimer of Jesus’ jubilee ministry to Gentiles     |
|                                     |                                                      | Redistribution                                                           |
|                                     |                                                      | Cosmic scope                                                            |
|                                     |                                                      | Jubilee contextualised                                                  |
motif. Table 2 summarises the jubilee trajectory from the Pentateuch, through the OT prophets, and into Luke-Acts.

4.1 Jubilee in the Pentateuch

Specific provisions for the jubilee are set out in detail in Leviticus 25. However, the Pentateuch contains a complex set of interrelated passages dealing with Sabbath and jubilee. The Year of Jubilee has been described as an “intensified Sabbath Year.” It was to be announced on the Day of Atonement (Lev 25:9) and was to follow a “Sabbath of Sabbaths” (that is, seven times seven years) (Lev 25:8, 10). The jubilee contained three main provisions drawn from Sabbath law. The first was the release of slaves. The second was the cancellation of debts. The third was the fallowing of the land. Jubilee added to these Sabbath provisions the returning of all land according to its original Mosaic distribution (Lev 25:10, 13-17).

Most scholars believe Israel never implemented the jubilee. A voluntary and regular redistribution of wealth on a scale such as Lev 25 describes was probably not very attractive to those who had accumulated land and property and so held the power to advocate for the practice. Also, as people became separated from their ancestral land-holdings over successive generations, implementation would have become impractical, even if the will was there. This would have been the situation from the time of Solomon (if it had not occurred prior to this)

196 The most important of these are usually identified as: Exod 21:2-6; 23:10-12; Lev 25, 27; Deut 15:1-18; 31:9-13.


201 Numbers 36:4 specifically mentions the jubilee.

202 The matter is discussed in John E. Hartly, Leviticus, WBC (Dallas: Word, 1992), 428-430; and in Milgrom, Leviticus 23-27, 2257-2270.
with all the social disruption associated with that period (Mic 2:2; Isa 5:8). However, as a metaphor or eschatological motif jubilee was taken up in the prophets.

Christopher Wright summarises the main concerns of the jubilee as the preservation of the extended family and the land. The two main components of jubilee were liberty and return. “It was these two components of the jubilee, freedom, and restoration, that entered the metaphoric and eschatological use of the jubilee in prophetic and later NT thought.” The proclamation of the jubilee on the Day of Atonement linked the jubilee with the forgiveness of sin. This becomes important in Luke’s Gospel where ἄφεσις and ἀφίημι are associated with both forgiveness of sins or debts, and jubilee.

4.2 Jubilee in the Prophets

The concrete jubilee provisions of the Pentateuch become “allusive echoes” in the prophets, particularly in Second Isaiah. In Isa 42:1-7 (a Servant Passage) it is a restorative plan for the weak and oppressed. In Isa 58 (esp. vv. 6-7) it consists of liberation of the oppressed and a stress on kinship obligations. In Isa 61:1 the prophet uses רֶדוֹר ו (liberty), a specific jubilee word from Leviticus 25:10. In his work on Isa 40-66 Benjamin Sommer discusses the links

203 Wright, “Jubilee, Year of,” 1025-1030.
204 Ibid., 1025.
205 Ibid., 1026.
206 Ibid., 1029.
208 Wright, “Jubilee, Year of,” 1028.
between Lev 25:10 and Isa 61:1. Besides the common vocabulary (רָדַר וְרָדָר), he notes some of the broader parallels that make the allusion in the Isaiah text to the one in Leviticus so evocative: like a debt slave, Israel has lost its land and has been sent to live elsewhere. After a 50-year period of alienation from their land the Edict of Cyrus then allowed the people to return to their ancestral land from Babylon. Commenting on the prophet’s use of the jubilee motif Sommer states:

As he alludes to the older passage, the prophet employs its motifs metaphorically: while Leviticus spoke of people who were literally, concretely indigent and bound to their master’s land, the prophet uses the words ‘captive’ and ‘those in chains’ to refer to the Judeans who were exiled but neither economically disadvantaged nor politically oppressed. He transforms a social and economic institution into an eschatological or political trope.

Wright also connects Isa 35:5 with the jubilee motif. Isa 35 combines future hope with a vision of justice for the oppressed in the present. It anticipates redemption and return alongside the transformation of nature. As noted earlier the aspects of Isaiah’s vision that include vengeance in these texts (35:4b; 61:2b) have not been carried over by Luke. Several other passages are suggested as allusions to the jubilee. Jeremiah 34 describes King Zedekiah’s proclamation of liberty. However, this does not appear to be a regular event but a one-off occurrence. It may therefore be closer to Deut 15 than it is to Lev 25. Sommer argues that in Jeremiah רָדַר וְרָדָר means “released from slavery by royal decree” rather than jubilee, whereas Ezek 46:17 “seems to assume a deror that follows a regular cycle” and so is dependent on Lev 25. Isa 37:30 (= 2 Kings 19:29) and 49:8-9 have also been suggested as expressing the jubilee motif in Isaiah.

211 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 141.
212 Ibid.
213 Wright, “Jubilee, Year of,” 1028.
214 Jeremiah uses רָדַר וְרָדָר in 34:8, 15, 17.
215 Sommer, A Prophet Reads Scripture, 276 (n. 21).
216 Ibid., 276 (n. 22).
In response to the question of how conscious Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel were of the jubilee in their writings Koet (helpfully) observes that “texts such as Lev 25, Deut 15, Jer 35 and Isa 61 are (re) interpretations and actualizations of the same roots and intentions.”²¹⁸ That is, knowledge of jubilee in earlier texts, or the intention to draw upon the theme does not have to be demonstrated for the idea to be present in the later text. As taken up by the prophets the jubilee moves towards an eschatological vision of hope and away from a literal one-year period with specifically set provisions.

4.3 Jubilee in Extra-Biblical and Inter-Testamental Literature

11Q Melchizedeck weaves together images from Isa 52:7; 61:1-3, Lev 25, and Deut 15. This is done in a manner that lends emphasis to its jubilee motifs. It relates these texts to a heavenly redeemer who will come to deliver and vindicate the “sons of light.”²¹⁹ Other relevant texts include Jub. 1:21-25 and Sanh. 97b. In m. Shev. 10.3 Rabbi Hillel is credited with the invention of perozbol. This turned over the supervision of private loans to the rabbinic courts so that debts could be collected after the sabbatical year. This was initiated to mitigate lenders’ reluctance to lend to the poor as the jubilee approached, and the debt was to be forgiven. (See also Josephus, Ant. 3.12.3.)²²⁰ The evidence is then that the jubilee was a live hope (or metaphor) in the period that Luke was written.


²¹⁸ Koet, *Five Studies*, 31-32 (n. 23, his emphasis).


²²¹ Wright, “Jubilee, Year of,” 1028.
as the anointed eschatological agent or bringer of ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν (“the acceptable year of the Lord”) in the language of the prophet Isaiah (61:2/Luke 4:19). The two key OT words for jubilee are בְּשָׂנָה (with שְׂנָה = “year of jubilee”) and דְּרֹור ו. The LXX translates these with ἄφεσις. Thus in the LXX, ἄφεσις means “liberty” or “release” and is often (though not exclusively) associated with jubilee. In Luke 4:18-19, ἄφεσις occurs twice as a result of the juxtaposition of the two Isaiah texts. This two-fold appearance of ἄφεσις serves to emphasise the jubilee link. It forms the key link-word to the jubilee motif in the OT.222 Similarly, where the other Gospel writers show a strong preference for the noun εὐαγγέλιον,223 Luke’s use of the verb εὐαγγελίζω in 4:18 also comes from Isa 61:1. This is another strong verbal link to the OT jubilee.

Beyond the specific vocabulary employed here are the ideas of liberty and release the Isaiah quotation expresses. The jubilee origins of Luke 4:18-19 are significant because the Nazareth sermon is programmatic for Jesus’ mission in Luke’s Gospel. Thus, jubilee is found at the heart of the mission of proclaiming the good news (εὐαγγελίζω) for which Jesus has been anointed (4:18).

Jacques Matthey helpfully describes how Luke expands the OT jubilee in three ways.224 First, Jesus removed the ethnic and geographical boundaries of the jubilee. No longer was the jubilee to be a once in 49-year event only for Israel. Second, the economic focus of the jubilee expands into all areas of life. It enlarges beyond remission of debt and the recovery of land

222 Sloan, The Favourable Year of the Lord, 36-37. On ἄφεσις and ἀφίημι from Koet, Five Studies, 31 (n. 22) (with modifications to the notation style only): ἄφεσις is the translation of בְּשָׂנָה (Lev 25:28 (twice), 30, 31, 33, 40, 50, 52, 54; 27:18 [twice]; Num 36:4) and שְׂנָה (Lev 25:10; Jer 34 (41 LXX): 8, 15, 17 (twice). In Lev 25:10 and 27:17, 18, 23, 24 בְּשָׂנָה is translated by ἐνιαυτὸν . . . ἄφεσις and in Lev 25:11, 12, 13 by ἀφέσεως σημασία. The technical term for the Sabbath year in Deut 15 נפשׁ and the verb שָׁנָה are also translated by (a combination with) ἄφεσις (cf. Exod 23:11; Deut 15:1, 2 (twice), 3, 9; 31:10.

223 Mark uses the noun ten times but not the verb. Matthew uses the noun four times and the verb once. As noted above (3.4.1) Luke uses εὐαγγελίζω exclusively in his Gospel (ten times), and fifteen times time in Acts (though εὐαγγέλιον appears twice in Acts).

and freedom so that liberation and freedom become the hallmarks of the whole of life. Third, the jubilee is no longer limited to a specific time or cycle. This means instead that “at every moment of life the jubilee or liberation principle can and thus should mark all our activities and relations. The Nazareth proclamation proclaims a permanent year of favour.” Matthey captures well the generosity and scope of Jesus’ jubilee proclamation. At the same time, the danger in claiming jubilee is a “motif” is to downplay its concreteness.


It was shown above that Luke 4:16-30 shares a number of features with Luke 7, especially with vv. 18-35. Luke 7 serves to reiterate both Jesus’ mission statement in 4:18-19 and the jubilee vision that mission statement contains. This becomes particularly relevant for reading Luke 8:26-39. The man in that story is a Gentile who is captive to demonic power but is released. Luke 4 and 7 has shown Jesus’ ministry to be inclusive of Gentiles. His subsequent rejection by the people of the region of the Gerasenes (8:37) echoes his rejection by the people of his own hometown of Nazareth (4:28-29).

Luke 7 also includes the specific mention of deliverance from evil spirits (7:21) as a sign that Jesus is the ὁ ἐρχόμενος (“the coming one”) (7:19, 20). Luke thus explicitly broadens the scope of Jesus’ jubilee ministry (4:18-19) to include those who, like the Gerasene demoniac, are oppressed by evil spirits. This θεραπεύω (healing) (7:21), ἀφεσις (4:18), σῴζω (healing/salvation) (8:36) signals the arrival of the ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν (4:19). Indeed, it is taking place ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ (“in that very hour”) (7:21a).


226 Perrin, Jesus and the Temple, 141-144. For an insightful and imaginative reading of Jesus’ conscious and concrete outworking of the jubilee, see ibid, 134-148.

227 Section 3.3.
4.6 Jubilee in Acts

The argument for jubilee in Luke is strengthened by its presence in Acts. Wright notes several indicators of its presence. First is Luke’s use of ἀποκαθιστάνω (restore) (Acts 1:6) and ἀποκατάστασις (restoration) (Acts 3:21). In both these texts the idea is that of an eschatological restoration. The question posed to Jesus by the disciples in Acts 1:6 does not elicit a direct response, but Peter’s speech in Acts 3:21 indicates a universal restoration is to come. Luke Johnson notes that the expectation of the “restoration of all things” is connected with Elijah in texts such as Mal 3:22-23 (4:5-6 MT) and Luke 1:17. Sirach 48:9-10 speaks of “Elijah turning hearts of fathers toward his son” and “restoring the tribes of Jacob.” The tradition is also found in Mark 9:12 and Matt 17:11. In his consideration of what the “all things” are that will be restored, Ben Witherington lists Israel, the land, the law, the Scriptures, and universal restoration as options. He argues that the latter fits the context best. In his discussion of Acts 1:6, where the disciples’ question is on the nation of Israel, Bock cites OT references of hope for the nation of Israel. He then observes the broadening of that hope throughout Luke’s work to include the Gentiles. Bock reads Acts 3:21 as reference to universal completion or restoration.

The second indicator of jubilee in Acts discussed by Wright is the sharing of goods and resources in the early Christian community (Acts 2:43-47; 4:32-37). One of the key characteristics Luke describes is the redistribution of goods according to need. This suggests a community of disciples that has found a way of outworking the jubilee vision within their contemporary context. Wright notes further the verbal parallels between Acts 4:34 and Deut 15:4.

228 Wright, Mission of God, 302-303.
233 Most agree that the community of goods in Acts did not extend beyond this early period in Acts, but Gonzalez provides a more nuanced and detailed historical assessment in Gonzalez, Faith and Wealth, 92ff.
4.7 Summary

The linking thread running through jubilee from the Pentateuch to Luke-Acts is that of liberty and return. In the Pentateuch it is liberty of persons and the release of land, slaves, and debt. As Wright notes, the essential concern is with the preservation of the extended family and ancestral land. This entered the NT as freedom of persons and morphed from a literal year to a prophetic and eschatological vision or metaphor. It is picked up in Luke (and Acts), with ἄφεσις (from Isa 58:6 and 61:1-2) and εὐαγγελίζω (from Isa 61:1) being crucial to Jesus’ programmatic mission statement in Luke 4:18-19. Jesus comes announcing liberty and release. Luke 7 broadens the scope to include those oppressed by evil spirits. The theme will be found in the two lake stories as Simon is released from his fear to follow Jesus (Luke 5:1-11), and the man who is possessed and held captive to a legion of demons is released to return to his home in 8:26-39.

5 Conclusion

Luke shows Jesus as the one endorsed by God and endowed with the Spirit. He is also the one who comes from Israel through human lineage and who participates in the ritual of repentance (baptism) with the people of the area. As a member of this community he, like the key OT-style figures in the prologue, is heir to Israel’s story and hope of salvation and deliverance within the plan of God. Luke makes it clear that the story he tells is the outworking of this divine plan. As the narrative unfolds and Jesus matures, he moves from being a passive recipient of God’s favour, to being an active agent within this plan of God. The transition point for this is the wilderness. Before he steps on stage at Nazareth Jesus must first follow Israel in being tested in the wilderness (4:1-13). The temptations show that Jesus’ ministry, if carried out in obedience to God, will meet demonic as well as human (4:23-30) opposition.

234 Wright, “Jubilee, Year of,” 1025.
235 Ibid., 1025-30.
Luke’s account of Jesus in Nazareth has repaid examination in some detail, particularly the composite Isaiah quotation. Luke’s editing out of the vengeance theme in the material he brings forward from Isaiah is clearly evident. Surveying the key words in 4:18-19 and then tracking this vocabulary through Luke reveals the “fusing” of the language used. Particularly noticeable is the way Luke uses πτωχός as a comprehensive description for all who are captive, blind, oppressed or poor in any way. The double appearances of ἄφεσις, ἀποστέλλω, and κηρύσσω in 4:18-19 and so are particularly important, as is the link between αἰχμαλώτος and ἄφεσις in the phrase αἰχμαλώτος ἄφεσις, and βραύω and ἄφεσις in the phrase τεθραυσμένου ἐν ἄφεσις in (4:18). This link means that the captives or oppressed are present whenever ἄφεσις takes place. Furthermore, as Luke 4:16-30 is so clearly programmatic, it is reasonable to see ἄφεσις at work in episodes where the word is absent, because Jesus’ whole ministry and mission is one of ἄφεσις.

As Luke’s narrative unfolds the disciples will join Jesus in this mission of release and of announcing the Lord’s favourable year. This will play out differently in different situations. The disciples will be seen to struggle with the challenge at times. I will argue that Luke’s two lake stories are important in the formation and development of the disciples and will demonstrate the breadth of the kingdom Jesus proclaims and the comprehensive nature of the year of the Lord’s favour.
Chapter 2: LUKE’S LAKE STORIES

1 Introduction

The thesis of this study is that in Luke’s Gospel the journey upon and then across the lake is a metaphor for the journey of discipleship. In the following chapters this will be worked out in detail. This chapter gives something of an overview and preview as to what it is that signals to the reader that Luke’s two lake stories are related metaphors for discipleship. It begins with a summary of some of the key indicators that the two lake stories are related metaphorical and parallel accounts. It takes up the earlier discussion on symbol, metaphor, and allegory in claiming that these two parallel texts are metaphors for the discipleship journey.¹ This leads naturally into a discussion of the journey motif in Luke. It will also note the pervasiveness of the journey theme, and that many of these journeys involve something deeper than just the movement from one place to another. The discussion shows the link between journey and discipleship. The discussion on the journey motif provides some context for then proposing that the Galilean section of Luke contains two discipleship cycles. The place of the two lake stories within those cycles is discussed. The final section looks briefly at the idea of liminality and its relevance to the two lake stories. This assists in understanding how the lake stories work as a metaphor for discipleship and formation.

¹ Introduction, Section 4.6.
2 The Journey on the Lake as Metaphor for the Discipleship Journey

2.1 First Indicators that the Two Lake Stories are Metaphorical Accounts

Jesus’ declaration to Simon that ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν (“you will catch people alive”) in 5:10 is the “switch point” for the metaphorisation of 5:1-11. With these words the story morphs into a complex metaphor. Catching fish becomes catching people. Catching people becomes intimately connected to proclaiming the word of God (5:1). Catching people and proclaiming the word of God become synonymous with what it means to “follow,” that is, synonymous with discipleship (5:11). While the metaphor has layers of meaning the basis for these meanings is that catching fish becomes a metaphor for catching people. “This overt shift to metaphorical language invites the audience to understand the great catch of fish on a second level: as a symbolic narrative of the amazingly successful mission that Jesus is starting and that Simon and others will continue.”

Tannehill’s statement makes the point that 5:1-11 is not even just a metaphor. It is indicative or programmatic of what is to come in Luke-Acts.

Luke’s second lake story has some clear early indicators that it, too, should be read as both a realistic narrative and a metaphorical journey. The mention of the disciples and the lake (λίμνη) in 8:22 recalls 5:1-11 and suggests that something significant with regard to discipleship is once again taking place. This time, rather than heading out εἰς τὸ βάθος (“into the deep water”) (5:4), Jesus invites the disciples to accompany him εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης (“to

2 Gupta’s test for twice-true metaphors has already been discussed in the Introduction. Discipleship and the journey on the lake were named as the linking threads between the two lake stories. Introduction, Section 4.6.4.


4 In contradistinction to “fulfilment” or “proof-from-prophecy” approaches to intertextuality, Litwak argues that Luke “frames” his discourse with Scripture in order to give interpretive clues to his readers about the narrative. Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 55-56. “Framing discourse” refers to the observation that the wording used to narrate a story offers clues to the audience as to how to interpret the narrative.” Ibid., 56. The observation can be applied to intratextuality here. That is, by including crucial elements of the first lake story in the introduction here of the second, Luke “frames” this story in such a way as to cue the reader to read this second lake story as metaphorical, as was the first. Ibid. Litwak uses the example “once upon a time” as marking the beginning of a fairy tale. Ibid., 56 (n. 78). Here the effect is “once upon a lake,” signalling the beginning of a lake story that will contain metaphorical meaning.
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the other side of the lake”) (8:22). The connection and progression between the first reported speech of Jesus in each lake story indicates that the second lake story will build upon and progress the first. This journey is the catalyst for the storm, which is followed by Jesus’ rebuke and the disciples’ response of fear and amazement. However, it is not until Jesus steps onto the shore that we grasp the full import of what is happening. Luke tells us κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν (“they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes”) (8:26). The textual and geographical problems this passage presents are legion, but casting critical questions overboard, this is fundamentally a “crossing over” into another world. The country of the Gerasenes is “predominantly Gentile territory,” with the “crossing of boundaries” and the “offer of salvation to the Gentile world” being enacted here. This reading is reinforced by Luke’s honing of the description of the location with ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας (“which is opposite Galilee”) (8:26). The repetition of λίμνη (lake) (8:22, 23, 33) and τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν/τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν (“the country of the Gerasenes”) (8:26, 37) serve to unify the episode and to remind us just how far the disciples have come with Jesus on this journey.

2.2 Parallels between the Lake Stories

Luke’s use of λίμνη (lake) is unique to his two lake stories. It is not used in the synoptic parallels to these two accounts, nor is it used elsewhere in any of the canonical Gospels. Luke, however, is not alone in this. Josephus consistently uses λίμνη (lake) for Gennesaret

5 The commentaries discuss the textual and geographical questions in varying detail, with most sensibly concluding that these questions are secondary to literary function. For example Fitzmyer states, “the religious message of the episode comes through.” Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:737; and Johnson, “[t]he geographical fact, luckily, is not necessary for appreciating the story.” Johnson, Luke, 137.

6 On the “‘other side of the sea’ as Gentile socio-symbolic space” (in Mark), see Myers, Strong Man, 190. Klutz has shown that impurity is a major theme in this text. Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 125-136. The journey to the other side is a venture into the impure.

7 Green, Luke, 335-6. On the storm and lake as symbol of the Jew/Gentile divide (in Mark), see Myers, Strong Man, 197. On crossing to the “other side” as a discipleship challenge, Myers, Strong Man, 194-7.

8 This is “more than a geographical description.” Green, Luke, 335.

(Ant. 18:28, 36; BJ 2:573; 3:463, 506, 515; Vita 1:349). While this raises the question of colloquial usage, others suggest that “lake” was the “proper Greek literary designation.” The fact remain, however, that Luke has altered the vocabulary found in his Markan source. The question is “Why has he done this?” or if this is overly suggestive of intentionalism, “to what effect has he done it?”

The use of ἄλασσα by the other evangelists (and elsewhere by Luke) invokes mythical images of chaos and disorder such as the windswept deep in Gen 1:2 and its subsequent ordering, as well as recalling OT passages such as Ps 107:23-30 and Jonah 1:4-6. As λίμνη only occurs in these two stories in Luke, its presence is another indicator of the strong relationship between the two passages. His reference to the “Sea of Galilee” (as it is called elsewhere in the NT), as the λίμνη (8:22, 23, 26, 33) or λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ (Lake of Gennesaret) (5:1), suggests that the λίμνη is not so insurmountable and terrifying as it may at first appear. “Luke minimizes the body of water the other Synoptics call a ‘sea’ (thalassa), reserving the term for the Mediterranean (Acts 10:6, 32; 17:14, 27:30, 38, 40; 28:4).” The lake is difficult and it presents huge challenges, but it is only a lake. It is not as impossible or to be feared as is the sea. Luke’s three use of ἄλασσα elsewhere lends support to this explanation. In 17:2 the sea is named as a place of inescapable destruction; in 17:6 it forms part of a humanly impossible challenge; and in 21:25 the sea is part of a terrifying apocalyptic or eschatological vision.

Green notes that the two lake episodes perform “similar functions,” in that they “display Jesus’ authoritative teaching and power.” This is correct, and this study goes on to ask what

10 Michael Wolter, Das Lukasevangelium, HNT 5 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 211.
12 Gen 1:10, 22, 26, 28.
14 Matt 4:18 (twice); 15:29; Mark 1:16; 7:31; John 6:1.
this means for those who would follow Jesus in the first lake story, and for those who would travel with him in the second to the other side of the lake.

The first reported words of Jesus in each episode are critical to the metaphor Luke is developing in these stories. Discipleship is first of all the call εἰς τὸ βάθος (“into the deep water”) to catch fish/people (5:4, 10). It is then the challenge to cross over εἰς τὸ πέραν (“to the other side”) (8:22). The progression and intensification, or movement and development, from the βάθος (deep) to the πέραν (other side) is reinforced by the changing dynamic between Jesus and the disciples. In the first episode Jesus calls Simon, along with James and John. This sets the narrative up for 6:12-18, where the twelve are chosen and named as apostles. By the second lake episode οἱ μαθηταί (“the disciples”) as a group accompany him (8:22) and are assumed to be with him throughout the episode. Thereafter Luke narrates the mission of the twelve (9:1-6). The first lake story prepares the way for the choosing and naming of the twelve as apostles. The second lake story prepares the way for the commissioning of the twelve to sometimes hostile places.

In 5:10 Jesus tells Simon that they will be catching people. ζωγρέω means “capture alive,” but in the crossing of the lake in Chapter 8 the powers opposed to Jesus’ mission whip up such a storm that the disciples fear their fishing-for-people-days are over and it is they who will perish (8:24). This, along with the drowning of the pigs (8:33) and the fear-filled rejection of Jesus by the people of the region (8:37), shows that catching people alive will not be easy. Nor will it be without risk of rejection or opposition, a point Jesus later makes explicit as he sends the twelve out to confront demons, cure diseases, proclaim the kingdom, and to heal (9:2, 5). Like the movement onto and then across the lake, the progression of discipleship does not advance easily or inevitably.

17 Johnson hints at “putting out into the deep” as a metaphor for discipleship but he does not pursue the idea. Johnson, Luke, 91.
18 Simon in 5:4, 10; James and John in 5:10.
19 “ζωγρέω,” BDAG, 429.
The above serves as an outline of what is to come in subsequent chapters where, because of the (necessary) detail, the basic contours of the argument might be obscured.

3 The Journey Motif in Luke

3.1 Introduction

The journey motif within the third Gospel is widely recognised.\(^{21}\) It first appears in Luke’s prologue which, while centred about the Jerusalem Temple, includes a number of journeys. The journey theme is present throughout the Galilean section (4:14-9:50), where Jesus moves about as an itinerant preacher and healer. In the central section (chapters 9:51-19:44)\(^{22}\) Jesus moves from Galilee towards Jerusalem. Acts takes up the story in Jerusalem and moves outward from there, eventually making its way to Rome.\(^{23}\)

3.2 The Journey Motif within Luke’s Central Section

While it is commonly acknowledged that Luke employs the journey motif outside his central section, it is chapters 9-19 that have received by far the most attention from commentators discussing the journey motif in Luke.\(^{24}\) This is most easily accounted for by the clear marking Luke gives to the beginning of this section: Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ. (“When the days


\(^{22}\) Where the central section ends is debated. See below, Section 3.2.

\(^{23}\) This discussion will be confined to the journey motif within Luke’s Gospel.

drew near for him to be taken up, he set his face to go to Jerusalem”) (9:51). Luke then provides a series of journey indicators (Reisenotizen) that serve to remind us of Jesus’ progress and of his destination. Characteristic of these markers is Luke’s use of ὁδός (way), πορεύομαι (go), ἀναβαίνω (go up), ἐγγίζω (draw near) and ἔρχομαι (come). Less clear, however, is where this journey account concludes, with 19:10, 19:28, and 19:44 being the primary contenders. The lack of clarity on this question is related to the transitional nature of the material. The parable of the pounds (19:11-27) looks forward rather than back and so serves a transitional function. The triumphant entry (19:28-40) describes Jesus’ going to Jerusalem (19:28) and then to the Mount of Olives (19:29). In 19:41-44 he weeps over the city as he approaches it (19:41). Both 19:29 and 19:41 use ὡς ἤγγισεν (“as he drew near”), which is less clearly an arrival than εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα (“into Jerusalem”) (19:28). In 19:45 Jesus enters the Temple. Given the symbolic weight of the Temple within the Gospel, 19:44 would appear to mark the end of the journey to Jerusalem most clearly.

Interpreters have found Luke’s central section something of a challenge. David Moessner describes the crux of the problem as “an unmitigated dissonance of form from content.” Despite Luke’s placing of various journey markers throughout this section, the sense of journey or movement is thoroughly diluted by the amount of teaching material Luke includes within it. The result is that Jesus’ itinerary “does not move like a river; rather it spreads out like a lake.” Thus some conclude that if Luke did intend to create a credible journey or travel

25 And the double reference to Jerusalem in 9:51-56.
28 Ibid., 1:167.
29 Cohick emphasises the centrality of the Temple to Jewish life as “the only place where Jews could make offerings to God.” Diaspora Jews travelled to it to celebrate festivals, Jews marvelled at its beauty, grandeur, and magnificence of ceremony. Lynne H. Cohick, “Judaism, Common,” DJG, 2nd ed., 457.
account then he has failed. It is this “problem” with the central section that has drawn the attention of scholars and has therefore occupied the bulk of scholarly attention around the journey motif in Luke’s Gospel.

This problem of dissonance between form and content is first of all a literary problem. That is, despite the strong start Luke gives to his central section (9:51) it does not read as a travel account, if that is what it is supposed to be. However, the problems do not end there. The account has raised a plethora of questions around Luke’s competence and reliability as a historian. These cluster broadly around three related areas. First, attempts to reconstruct the Lukan Jesus’ itinerary in the central section inevitably fail. Howard Marshall is one who notes the impossibility of constructing an itinerary. He suggests that Luke is not trying to provide an itinerary. Rather, the journey motif was present in Luke’s sources and he has taken it over “because of its usefulness.” The stress is on Jerusalem as the goal of the journey. The “real importance” of the central section “lies in the teaching given by Jesus.” Second, the historical accuracy and plausibility of many of Luke’s geographical touch-points have raised questions. McCown is one of Luke’s harsher critics: “Almost without exception the [central] section shows no definite geographical knowledge and it abounds with inconsistencies and inaccuracies.” Third, it can easily be shown that Luke has redacted Mark to remove (or at least to alter, and invariably in the direction of vagueness) the geographical indicators in the Markan account, and that Luke has done this in the service of his own theological agenda. Thus, “the trip has no locale of its own but is constructed with reference to its function as a transition between the two important places of the pattern, Galilee and Jerusalem.” Certainly there are scholars who hold a higher view of Luke’s knowledge of geography, but there has been enough criticism levelled at Luke that the case for accuracy needs to be argued for.

33 Ibid. Similarly Scobie, “Canonical Approach,” 333.
36 Ibid., 28-29.
Taken together these three areas of uncertainty have left a lingering cloud of doubt over the historical accuracy of Luke’s account of the life of Jesus.\textsuperscript{37}

Such difficulties have prompted scholars to downplay the historical questions and to emphasise instead the literary function of the central section.\textsuperscript{38} Fitzmyer states that geographical concerns are subservient to theological concerns, and that the central section in fact “transcends the structure.”\textsuperscript{39} Green looks to the central section for the fulfilment of earlier established needs within the narrative. This approach, he claims, puts emphasis on the “\textit{motif} of journey and its \textit{destination}, Jerusalem,” rather than seeing the central section as a “travelogue, from Galilee to Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{40} Unfortunately, accepting that Luke’s central section is in fact a literary creation (as most do) does not resolve all of the problems. Besides the problem of lack of movement within the central section, commentators have struggled to find a coherent pattern to the arrangement of the material within that section, or to identify clearly delineated themes. Fred Craddock is typical when he states rather dryly, “the key to Luke’s arrangement of the sayings and events is not easy to find.”\textsuperscript{41}

Is the central section merely a Lukan invention, created in order to provide a convenient dumping ground for material from his various sources that Luke wished to include within his Gospel?\textsuperscript{42} Certainly the central section is a Lukan editorial creation within which Luke has included much of his non-Markan material. Attempts to find a coherent literary pattern or clearly identifiable themes have yielded inconclusive or unconvincing results. Examples of the first approach include Kenneth Bailey (chiasmus), Talbert (parallels) and John Drury

\textsuperscript{37} Some more positive appraisals of Luke’s competence as a geographer and therefore as a historian have appeared recently. See Baban, \textit{On the Road Encounters}, 60-61 (esp. n. 45).


\textsuperscript{39} Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke}, 1:164.

\textsuperscript{40} Green, \textit{Luke}, 394-398 (his emphasis).

\textsuperscript{41} Fred B. Craddock, \textit{Luke}, Interpretation (Louisville: John Knox, 1990), 140. Scobie looks to “canonical biblical theology” as a way through the older critical debates. This approach emphasises the final form of the text in its canonical context and moves towards recognizing that meaning transcends both immediate and historical contexts. Scobie, “Canonical Approach,” 328-329.

(Deuteronomy). Examples of the second include Green (Christology and discipleship), Moessner (the journeying prophet like Moses) and Charles Scobie (Christology and discipleship). Of these the more general, by the very nature of their generality, have proved harder to refute and easier to defend.

Despite attempts to find tight unifying themes and structures within the central section, studies such as those by Moessner (theme) and (structure), while impressive and offering many very useful insights, have struggled to encompass all the available material in a truly convincing manner. In their attempts to account for all the material in the central section such schemes soon become very complex. While not wanting to underestimate the literary competence of Luke or of his real or implied audience, it is difficult to accept that some of the very complex patterns alleged by scholars were intended by Luke, or could be comprehended by his auditors. The acceptance of such schemes by Lucan scholars tends to be inversely proportional to their complexity.

What is accepted is that Jerusalem is the geographic and symbolic destination of Jesus’ journey, as well as the point of narrative focus towards which the Lukan narrative inexorably moves. Luke’s geographical editing of his sources to this end is often noted. The effect of this editing is that there remains for the Lukan Jesus only one journey, the journey to


46 Jerusalem is, after all, the “symbolic centre of Israel.” Peter W. L. Walker, Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 103.

Jerusalem. The importance of this one journey, and of Jerusalem as the destination for this journey, can be seen in the increasing frequency of journey markers placed throughout the central section as Jesus approaches Jerusalem. Luke’s Gospel both begins and ends in Jerusalem, which is for Jesus the “city of destiny” (13:31-35).

3.3 The Journey and Discipleship

Green provides a helpful reframing of some of the critical problems of the central section by suggesting that the route travelled is less important than the arrival in Jerusalem. He goes on, “the ‘journey’ in which Luke is interested is not about narrative structure or travelling itinerary; rather, it concerns the fulfilment of God’s redemptive purpose together with thematisation of the formation of a people who will hear and obey the word of God.” This introduces discipleship into the discussion in a helpful way, highlighting that the central section is not just concerned with Christology.

Scobie concurs with Green when he lists “Christology” and “Discipleship” as the two broad headings under which the material in the central section can be usefully catalogued. It is this emphasis on formation or discipleship that leads to (or results from) the large amount of teaching material Luke includes within his central section, and yet it is this very same material that obscures the sense of movement. The irony here is that Luke employs the journey motif

48 Jerusalem is the goal of Jesus’ journey in the central section. However, there are also negative associations for Jerusalem (Luke 13:33-34; 21:20, see 19:11). The Temple adds to this ambivalence. Parsons, Luke: Storyteller, 89-90. Furthermore, Jerusalem is not the ultimate end-point for Luke. Luke 24:47-48 shows mission going out from Jerusalem. Ibid., 94-95. In light of the argument that the lake stories are a metaphor for discipleship the movement beyond Jerusalem could be seen as movement εἰς τὸ πέραν (“to the other side”).


51 Ibid., 398.

52 Ibid., 399.

53 Scobie, “Canonical Approach,” 334 (his emphasis).

in the service of discipleship, with Jesus teaching the disciples as they move towards Jerusalem. This teaching includes instructing them on what must happen when they reach their destination. However, the teaching material slows the journey to the point that it threatens to stall in narrative time. Meanwhile narrated time is vague to the point of being indeterminable, so the reader wonders whether Jesus and his very well instructed disciples will ever reach the destination he is anticipating.

The close link between the journey motif and discipleship raises the question of the relationship between the journey and the reader-disciple. Craddock proposes that, “the real journey Luke has in mind is that of the reader who is being drawn by Luke’s presentation of Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem into a pilgrimage with Jesus in an unfolding and deepening way not only into the passion but into the kingdom of God.” Similarly, Kevin Giles suggests that, “by means of the journey motif Luke invites the reader to see themselves as a community on a mission, always on the move, always on a journey, always in the presence of the Lord.” This is a helpful perspective and one that needs to be included in any discussion on the journey motif.

3.4 The Journey Motif at Work beyond the Central Section

Despite the attention the journey motif in the central section has received, its presence beyond the bounds of chapters 9-19 has not gone unnoticed. The recent work by Octavian Baban is an example of a full-scale study of an aspect of the journey motif that transcends the central section of the Gospel. Baban identifies three ὅδεις passages outside of the central section of Luke’s Gospel: Luke 24; Acts 8 and Acts 9. Baban, On the Road Encounters, 56, 71. Green also notes that Luke’s emphasis on “the way” extends beyond the central section, beginning as early as Luke 3 with the appearance of John the Baptist in 3:4.

56 That is, both the original Lukan readership and the present.
60 Green, Luke, 398.
Having noted that chapters 1-2 and 24 are “distinct Lucan sections,” Scobie comments, “In fact, ‘Luke depicts Jesus as an inveterate traveller.’ Moreover, journeys are a key feature of the distinctive sections at the beginning and end of the Gospel.” The following excursus demonstrates the extensive use made of the journey motif in Luke. It also aids in seeing the wider context of journeys, against which the journeys on the lake need to be read.

### 3.5 Excursus: Survey of The Journey or Travel Motif in Luke

#### The prologue. The following journeys can be identified in Luke’s prologue:

1. Mary’s visit to Elizabeth (1:39-40, 43, 56).
2. The Census journey (2:4).
3. The shepherds’ journey to Bethlehem (2:15-16).
4. The bringing of Jesus to the Temple for presentation and return home (2:22, 39).
5. The annual journeys of Joseph and Mary to the Passover in Jerusalem (2:41).
6. The journey of the boy Jesus to Jerusalem with his family and return home (2:42, 51). This includes within it the departure of Jesus’ parents from Jerusalem without him and then back to find him (2:43-44).

These are human journeys that take place within the narrative. To these could be added the angelic visits to Zechariah (1:11-19), Mary (1:26-38), and the shepherds (2:9-15).

#### Between the prologue and the Galilean section (3:1 – 4:13). There are some further journeys in 3:1 – 4:13:

1. The movement of John into the region about the Jordan (3:3) and the coming of the crowds to be baptised by him there (3:7).
2. Jesus’ return from the Jordan (4:1).
3. Jesus’ sojourn in the wilderness (4:1).

---


These journeys are better described as indicators of movement rather than as journeys proper. As such they serve to enhance the dynamism of the plot. However, they also underline the mobility of the characters.

There are also non-human and non-literal journeys that take place in this section:

1. John anticipates the “coming” of the one more powerful than himself (3:16).
2. The descent of the Spirit from heaven to Jesus and the audible voice (3:21-22).
3. The genealogy of Jesus recalls Israel’s journey (3:23-38).
4. The temptation account contains several journeys that Jesus takes with the devil: Jesus is ἀνάγω (led up) to see the kingdoms of the world (4:5); he ἄγω (leads) Jesus to Jerusalem to ἐπὶ τὸ πτερύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ (“onto the highest point of the Temple) (4:9).
5. The ἀφίστημι (departure) of the devil (4:13).

The Galilean section. The Galilean includes few journeys proper, but makes much use of the journey or travel motif as a metaphor for discipleship, along with many further indicators of movement.

1. Jesus’ return to Galilee and the (implied) movement as he teaches in the synagogues (4:14-15).
2. Jesus’ arrival at Nazareth, entry into the synagogue, eviction from the city (4:29), and διέρχομαι and πορεύομαι from the hillside beyond the town (4:30).
4. Jesus’ entry into Simon’s house (4:38).
5. Jesus’ entry into the desert, the journey of the crowds seeking after him, their attempts to prevent his movement, and his insistence that he must continue proclaiming in the synagogues, which implies travel (4:42-44).
6. The movement of Jesus with Simon (and James and John) from the edge of the lake, into the deep water, back to the shore, and the men’s subsequent leaving of everything to follow him (5:3, 4, 6, 11).
7. The healing of the leper ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων (“in one of the cities”) implies movement from city to city (5:12), while the spreading of the news of Jesus results in great multitudes coming to him (5:15).
8. Jesus withdrawal to the wilderness (5:16).
9. The Pharisees coming to hear Jesus from the villages of Galilee, Judea, and Jerusalem (5:17).

10. In an echo of 5:11, Levi “leaves everything” to follow Jesus (5:28). He thus commences the discipleship journey.

11. Jesus and the disciples are found διαπορεύομαι the grain fields (6:1).

12. Jesus ἐξέρχομαι to the mountain to pray (6:12). He then καταβαίνω (comes down) and teaches (6:17). The people come to him ἀπὸ πάσης τῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ Ἰερουσαλήμ καὶ τῆς παραλίου Τύρου καὶ Σιδῶνος (“from all Judea and Jerusalem and the sea coast of Tyre and Sidon”) (6:17).

13. Jesus enters Capernaum (7:1) and there is the movement from and to the Centurion’s house (7:3, 4, 6, 10).

14. Jesus goes to Nain (7:11, 12).

15. Jesus refers to the peoples’ journeys to the wilderness to see John (7:24, 25, 26) and then to the prophesy of Isaiah on the preparation of an ὁδός and the sending of a messenger (7:27).


17. Jesus goes to the house of the Pharisee (7:36).

18. A summary statement describes the movement of Jesus and those with him (8:1-3).

19. People come to hear Jesus from the towns (8:4).

20. Jesus’ mother and brother come and try to see him (8:19).

21. Jesus journeys to the εἰς τὸ πέραν of the lake with his disciples (8:22) εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν (8:26) where he steps onto the land (8:27). Within this story the demons leave the man and enter the pigs. The pigs make a one-way journey into the lake (8:33). The swineherds then travel to the city and the country (8:34) and the people come out to where Jesus is (8:35). The people ask Jesus to depart (8:37), the man begs to go with Jesus (8:38), while Jesus sends him home where he ἀπῆλθεν καθ’ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν proclaiming what has happened (8:38-39). Jesus then ὑποστρέφω (8:40).

22. Jesus is met by Jairus, who comes from the synagogue (8:41). A series of movements are described as Jesus moves toward the home of Jairus (8:42), stops to heal the
woman with the flow of blood, messengers come from the house (8:49), and Jesus completes his journey to the house (8:51).

23. Jesus sends the twelve εἰς τὴν ὁδόν to preach and heal (9:3). They travel through the villages (9:6) and then return (9:10).

24. Jesus withdraws with the disciples to Bethsaida (9:10). The crowds follow (9:11).


26. Jesus takes three of his disciples up a mountain with him to pray (9:28). Moses and Elijah appear to them (9:30). They come back down the mountain and the crowd come to them (9:37).

27. In the last pericope before the central section John complains to Jesus about someone who does not follow with them (9:49).

Such a survey risks obscuring what is crucial with detail. It is the two Lukan summaries (4:14-15 and 8:1-3) and their consistency with the balance of the material in the Galilean phase that give credibility to the description of Jesus “as inveterate traveller.”

The central section. The central section is cast by Luke as a Journey with the markers already noted. This means the context of the central section is that of the journey to Jerusalem (9:51 etc.). Because of this, a survey of all the journey markers and indicators of movement is not necessary here. However, there are some journeys within the central section that are particularly worth noting. Because these are set within the central section they form journeys within the journey. In this way they are similar to some of those noted above. These include:

1. The mission and return of the seventy(-two) (10:1-20).
2. The parable of the good Samaritan, in which all of the characters (except the inn-keeper) are travelling (10:25-37).
3. The visit to Martha and Mary’s house (10:38-42).
4. The parable of the lost sons (15:11-32).
5. The story of the rich man and Lazareth (16:19-31).


64 A similar comment could be make about the Galilean phase in light of 4:14-14 and 8:1-3. However, a brief survey of that material has been included to demonstrate the point that journey and movement are found outside of the central section.
6. The story of Jesus and Zacchaeus (19:1-10).
7. The parable of the ten pounds (19:11-27).

**The Jerusalem section.** Jesus’ passion is centred on Jerusalem. However, the closing chapters of the Gospel include some very important journeys:

1. The parable of the vineyard and the tenants (20:9-19).
2. The disciples on the road to Emmaus (24:13-35).

It is interesting that the last two journeys in the Gospel fully encapsulate the relationship between the journey motif, Christology (seen here as the climactic journey of Jesus to heaven in 24:50-53), and discipleship (24:13-35).

### 3.6 The Journey Motif and the Lake Stories

These observations support the thesis that despite their location within the Galilean section rather than within the central (journey) section of the Gospel, the two lake journeys (5:1-11 and 8:22-39) may be considered under the broader Lukan journey motif. The survey demonstrates that this motif includes a number of wilderness or liminal-type of journeys. Considered thus, they may go some way towards assisting our appreciation of the journey motif as it develops throughout the Gospel and particularly in the central section. This is especially so when we note the strong association between the lake journeys and discipleship, and the broad acceptance that discipleship is a key theme in Luke’s central section. If it can be established that this is indeed the case then further exploration of the links between the lake journeys, the journey motif, and discipleship throughout the Gospel might be warranted.

If indeed Luke employs the journeys onto and then across the Lake of Gennesaret as a metaphor for the journey of discipleship, it would be helpful to establish that Luke uses

---


66 Scobie’s observation, that “[s]ome of the themes that characterize the central travel narrative have already been introduced in Jesus’ Galilean ministry” suggest such a project might be fruitful. Scobie, “Canonical Approach,” 335 (n. 40).
geography or places and landscapes with metaphorical or symbolic force elsewhere in his work. This is relatively easy to do, particularly in light of the survey above of journeys and movement in Luke. The clearest example, however, is Jerusalem and its Temple. These certainly have a more-than-literal significance in Luke. As stated, the Gospel begins and ends in the Temple.67 Within the narrative Jerusalem functions as the centre of religious, political, social, and economic power. That Luke employs the Temple in a symbolic way within his work is clearly demonstrated by the wilderness temptation, an account that is highly charged with visionary, symbolic, metaphorical, and mythical language (Luke 4:1-13). As is well known, Luke’s order is different to Matthew’s (Matt 4:1-11), with the final (ultimate) test located upon the high point of the Jerusalem Temple. This serves to make Jerusalem the scene of the final, climactic test in Luke. However one interprets the temptations, and particularly the final Lukan temptation, there is no mistaking the symbolic weight the Temple has within Luke’s story. The Temple and the city of Jerusalem are closely aligned in Luke’s narrative such that, despite Luke’s efforts to distinguish city and Temple, the two will ultimately share the same fate.68

Baban describes the journey motif within the Gospel of Luke as an “integrated geographical-ideological scheme,”69 one that is shaped by both Hellenistic and Jewish literature.70 This is to acknowledge that, read against the LXX, Mark’s and Matthew’s Gospels, and the broader literary framework of Luke’s time, places within the Lukan narrative have a more-than-geographical significance.71 Luke employs the journey as the setting for divine encounters and for moral decisions.72 These journeys occur both within Luke’s central section and beyond it.73

67 In the prologue: 1:9, 21; 2:27, 37, 46. In the Jerusalem section: 19:45, 47; 20:1; 21:1, 5, 37, 38; 22:53; 23:45; 24:53.

68 It is useful “to distinguish between the journey to Jerusalem and the journey to the Temple, as both are important to the Luke-Acts narrative.” Baban, On the Road Encounters, 41-42. Ultimately, the Temple was to share the same fate as the city. See Walker, Jesus and the Holy City, 60 (esp. n. 20). Walker notes a similar dynamic at work in Acts. Ibid., 93. Also, Luke, 71.

69 Baban, On the Road Encounters, 138.

70 On Hellenistic literature see ibid., 119-123. On Jewish literature see ibid, 123-127.


72 Baban, On the Road Encounters, 275.

73 Ibid, 194.
Wilkins expresses a similar idea when he states that discipleship “begins upon entering the Way of salvation; it advances as one travels along the way.”\footnote{Wilkins, “Discipleship,” \textit{DJG}, 1\textsuperscript{st} ed., 185.} This meshes with the advancement and progression between the two lake stories as the disciples venture out upon the deep water and then to the other side of the lake.

### 3.7 Summary

Luke uses the journey motif extensively in his Gospel, with the central section being cast as a single (though not always recognisable) journey. However, the journey motif is not confined to the central section. By the end of the Galilean section Jesus is already shown to be “an inveterate traveler.”\footnote{Giles, “The Church in the Gospel of Luke,” 139.} Furthermore, journeys and discipleship are closely bound together in Luke, so that journeys are often the context for life-changing encounters. Luke often animates the journey motif with places that carry symbolic importance. Even a cursory look at the travel motif in Luke shows its relationship to discipleship: Jesus moves about preaching the kingdom of God (4:14-15); he begins to gather followers (5:1-11); he names twelve (6:12-16); he sends them out (9:1-6); they join him on the way (9:57); they in turn travel, bearing witness to him (Acts). It would seem that the journey motif and discipleship are intimately and obviously connected, and that this connection holds throughout Luke’s Gospel and on into Acts. This includes the Galilean section and the two lake journeys that take place within it. Luke uses the journey to move the disciples from incompetence through to the place where they are able to “imitate their master’s way.”\footnote{Baban, \textit{On the Road Encounters}, 62.}

The case has been made here for considering the lake journeys as part of a wider travel motif. This in turn invites exploration of the relevance of these journeys to the discipleship theme, while alerting us to the symbolic value Luke might have invested in the Lake of Gennesaret as a place of transformational encounter. Chapters 3 and 4 of this study will develop and explore these ideas.
4 Discipleship Cycles

This study recognises a number of literary patterns and structures at work in Luke and Acts.77 Here I identify two discipleship cycles in Luke’s Galilean section. These cycles are based on three pairs:

- 4:16-30 || 7:18-35 (Jesus in Nazareth || Jesus and John’s disciples)
- 5:1-11 || 8:22-39 (Into the deep water || To the other side)
- 6:12-16 || 9:1-6 (The twelve are chosen || The twelve are sent).

The identification and description of these pairs adds further weight to the argument that the two lake stories are related discipleship texts. It achieves this by showing that they are part of a larger pattern of related texts at work in the Galilean section of Luke’s Gospel, and by locating this pattern within the journey theme.

The parallels between 5:1-11 and 8:22-39 have been introduced and will be developed and explored throughout the rest of the study. The parallels between Luke 4 and 7 are covered in above.78 It was shown there that in both Luke 4 and Luke 7 the prophet Isaiah is quoted; Jesus uses proverbs to stir up (or to anticipate) and to counter opposition; Elijah and Elisha feature; and responses to Jesus’ ministry are highlighted. The final observation was the set of inverse parallels between the two accounts as described by Siker. Thus, the importance of Luke 4 is underlined by the echoes of that passage in Luke 7, especially in vv. 18-35.

The sending of the twelve (9:1-6) is recognised as having strong parallels with the sending of the seventy(-two) (10:1-12). There are good reasons for this, as Table 3 demonstrates.


78 Chapter 1, Section 3.3.
Table 3: Luke 9:1-6 and 10:1-12

| 9:2 and 10:1 | Jesus sends the twelve. || Jesus sends the seventy(-two). |
| 9:1 and 10:9 | Authority is given to cure diseases. || Instructions are given to cure diseases. |
| 9:2 and 10:9, 11 | The twelve are to proclaim the kingdom of God. || The seventy(-two) are to declare that the kingdom of God has drawn near. |
| 9:3 and 10:4 | The twelve are to take no staff, bag, bread, money, nor extra tunic. || The seventy(-two) are to take no purse, bag, sandals, and greet no one on the road. |
| 9:4 and 10:7 | Instructions are given on entering a house. || Instructions are given on entering and remaining in houses. |
| 9:5 and 10:10-11 | Instructions are given on leaving an unwelcoming town. || Instructions are given on leaving an unwelcoming town. |
| 9:5 and 10:11 | Instruction are given to the twelve to shake the dust off their feet. || Instruction are given to say καὶ τὸν κονιορτὸν τὸν κολληθέντα ἡμῖν . . . εἰς τοὺς πόδας (“Even the dust that clings . . . to your feet”). |
| 9:6 and 10:17 | A report is given on the mission (this includes θεραπεύω, curing diseases). || The seventy(-two) report on their mission, including that τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται (“the demons submitted”). |

This table shows the strong similarity between the two pericopae. However, the account of the sending of the seventy(-two) is a longer and more detailed story. It includes the second section where the disciples return and report to Jesus and his response to that report (10:17-20).  

79 The close association between diseases and demons in Luke makes this parallel stronger than it might at first appear. Luke uses ἐπιτιμάω of Jesus rebuking the fever of Simon’s mother-in-law (4:39) and of his rebuking of demons in 4:35, 41 and 9:42 (also 8:24 if the storm is read as demonic or symbolic of the demonic opposition to Jesus’ mission). Luke also tends to show a close association between healing and casting out of demons in summary passages such as 4:40-41; 6:18 and 7:21.

80 Major elements of the account in Luke 10:1-12; 17-20 that have no correspondence in Luke 9:1-6 include: the appointing of the ones to be sent out (6:12-16 fulfils this function) (10:1); the sending in pairs (10:1); Luke narrates that the disciples are sent to the places that Jesus intending to visit (cf. 10:1); the inclusion of parabolic sayings by Jesus (cf. in 10:2, the harvest and the labourers, and in 10:3, the sheep and the wolves); the saying about Sodom (10:12); the return (with joy) of those sent (10:17); their report (10:17); Jesus’ response (10:18-20).
Can a case be made then for linking the choosing of the twelve (6:12-16) with the sending of the twelve in 9:1-6? Describing them as parallel passages might be an overstatement (especially in light of the parallels between 6:12-16 and 10:1-12, 17-20) but the two episodes do contain overlapping themes. The use of δώδεκα (twelve) in each passage suggests at least a prima facie case for linking the two stories. There are other connections between the two pericopae. First, although less text separates Luke 9:1-6 and 10:1-12, 17-20 than separates Luke 6:1-6 and 9:1-6, Luke 6:1-6 and 9:1-6 are both located in the Galilean section of the Gospel. While there is no reason related texts cannot be located across sectional boundaries, the fact that these two pericopae occur in the Galilean section makes them members of a particular subset of Lukan discipleship stories.81 Second, there is a clear progression between these accounts in Luke 6:12-16, 9:1-6 and 10:1-12, 17-20.82 The choosing of the twelve (in Luke 6) leads into the sending of the twelve (in Luke 9) and this leads on to the sending of the seventy(-two) (in Luke 10). This can be shown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galilean Phase</th>
<th>Central Section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Twelve Chosen</strong></td>
<td><strong>Twelve Sent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve (δώδεκα) → Twelve (δώδεκα)</td>
<td>Sent (ἀπέστειλεν) → Sent (ἀπέστειλεν)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The diagram illustrates clearly the progression between the three stories, the overlapping of δώδεκα (twelve) and ἀπέστειλεν (sent), and that Luke 6 and 9 fall within the same section of narrative. Note however that the twelve are not included among the seventy(-two) (10:1). Third, the neat matching of the choosing of the twelve and the sending of the twelve with the first and second lake stories (discussed below) is another argument for linking Luke 6:12-16 and Luke 9:1-6.83

---

81 Other patterns span sections of the Gospel. For example, two of the three passion predictions are found in the Galilean phase (9:21-22; 9:43b-45) and the third in the central section (18:31-34). This illustrates that, though distinctive, the different phases in Luke are not watertight compartments. Luke runs themes and patterns across, as well as within, the distinct sections of his two-volume work.

82 This is a more helpful approach than playing off the pairing of 6:12-16 and 9:1-6 against Chapters 9:1-6 and 10:1-12, 17-20.

83 A fourth argument could be added based on word count. Luke 6:12-16 and 9:1-6 are passages of similar
On balance there are enough overlaps and similarities between 6:12-16 and 9:1-6 to recognise them as parallel texts, while acknowledging that there is no need to downplay the relationship between 9:1-6 and 10:1-12, 17-20, which display a set of strong parallels. Given the programmatic nature of 4:16-30 and its obvious parallels with 7:18-35 it should not be surprising to find that Luke develops various patterns from these programmatic pericopae. These patterns and structures are formed in various ways throughout and across distinct sections of his Gospel. The paired passages identified here form a set of patterned parallels or cycles that advance the discipleship theme. The two discipleship cycles are not formed of continuous material but are interspersed throughout the larger narrative. As a whole the narrative is coherent. Lifting the particular subject material from this context reveals it has a coherence of its own, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Discipleship Cycles in the Galilean Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Cycle</th>
<th>Second Cycle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 1</strong> (Jesus)</td>
<td>4:16-30 (mission) ↔ 7:18-35 (mission outworked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 2</strong> (Lake)</td>
<td>5:1-11 (deep) ↔ 8:22-29 (other side)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pair 3</strong> (Disciples)</td>
<td>6:12-16 (choosing) ↔ 9:1-6 (sending)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first pair focuses on Jesus’ mission. This is proclaimed first in Nazareth in 4:16-30 and then reiterated to John’s disciples in 7:18-35. In the second pair Jesus commissions the disciples (ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν (5:10) and then models to them what ministry εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης (8:22) looks like. They are programmatic for discipleship in Luke in a manner

length. Luke 6:12-16 contains 76 words, while Luke 9:1-16 contains 90 words. (These numbers based on the UBS 4th edition, omitting words in [ ] (= {C})): τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς in 9:2, ἀνὰ in 9:3, and δύο (occurring twice) in 10:1.) Luke 10:1-12, 17-20 is 287 words. (If the Return of the Seventy(-two) in 10:17-20 is included. The count omits the one word in [ ] (= {C})): ἡδύ.) Added to the disparity in word count between Luke 9:1-6 and Luke 10:1-12, 17-20 is the fact that the sending of the seventy(-two) is a two-part account interrupted by Jesus’ Woes to the Unrepentant Cities (10:13-16). Note also that the acknowledged parallels between Luke 9:1-6 and Luke 10:1-12, 17-20, and that the latter is in two parts is an argument for accepting 8:22-25 and 8:26-39 as comprising a single unit.

84 While Luke does this elsewhere himself, the cycle form is another echo of the Elijah and Elisha material in 1 and 2 Kings. This reinforces the overt references to Elijah and Elisha that are important in Luke elsewhere, including in 4:16-30, the first passage in the two cycles here identified.
analogous to the way Luke 4:16-30 and 7:18-35 are programmatic for Jesus and his mission in this Gospel. The third pairing describes the naming (6:12-16) and then sending out (9:1-6) of the twelve.

These three pairs of texts exhibit a logical movement both down and across the chart, so forming two discipleship cycles. The first cycle focuses on Jesus’ proclamation of his mission and the gathering of his apostles: Jesus’ first sermon (4:16-30); Jesus calls the first disciples on the lake (5:1-11); Jesus chooses the twelve (6:12-16). The second cycle shows Jesus engaged in his mission and extending the mission involvement of the disciples: Jesus reiterates his mission to John’s disciples (7:18-35); Jesus leads his disciple to the other side of the lake (8:22-39); Jesus sends the twelve out on mission (9:1-6).

The three pairs described are diverse in their content, form, and in the way the two pericopae that form each pair relate to each other. Nevertheless, a pattern has been demonstrated. The presence of this larger pattern supports the assertion that one of those pairs, Chapters 5:1-11 and 8:22-39, the two lake stories, are parallel stories. As such, they can be read in relationship to each other, as well as reading each story in relationship to its own narrative context. This argument is a cumulative one and it will be developed throughout the study. Here we have sought to establish one of the building blocks for the argument.

---

85 Especially 4:18-19 and 7:21-23.

86 As with the Elijah and Elisha cycles in 1 and 2 Kings, the two discipleship cycles are not formed of continuous material but are interspersed throughout the larger narrative. As a whole the narrative is coherent. Lifting the particular subject material from this context reveals it has a coherence of its own.

87 This, again, highlights the disciples’ failure to step up to the task in the second lake journey.


89 Hence the structure of this study, with Chapter 3 looking at the first lake story, Chapter 4 the second, and Chapter 5 looking in more detail at the two of them beside one another.
Liminality has entered the field of the Humanities through the work of the anthropologist, Victor Turner. It has also been found to be useful in biblical studies. Turner worked for many years among the Ndembu people in Northwest Zambia, beginning in the 1950s. His study of tribal life included extensive work on ritual practices and processes. His writing on liminality came out of this study. Liminality is the transition or in-between state one enters and travels through in times of ritual transition.

It is useful to identify pre-liminal, liminal, and post-liminal states. In the pre-liminal state a neophyte leaves behind the former life. The liminal phase in rituals and rites of passage may include the performance of tasks, or tests. There is often an instructor or elder, or a shaman-type figure who is present. Liminal time usually takes place in a different physical space, where one is neither one or the other. In the post-liminal state the new way of life is entered.

Klutz defines a shaman as one who “demonstrates mastery over the spirits of fortune and misfortune” and “attracts apprentices to whom he transmits the methods and paraphernalia of his role.” This is not to say “Jesus is therefore a shaman,” but it does provide a helpful lens

---


94 Turner, Forest of Symbols, 99-100.

95 On Jesus and shamanism see Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 11-12, 194-199.


97 Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 195.
on Luke’s lake stories. Like a shaman, Jesus guides the fishers out on the lake. There they land a miraculous catch of fish. On returning to the lake the disciples are challenged to master the storm on the lake. During these formative lake journeys Jesus has apprentices (disciples) to whom he wishes to transmit his methods.

Another concept from studies of liminality that is helpful for this study is that of “structure” and “communitas.” Structure is a way of describing social location. It is made up of a person’s roles and place in a community, for example. It is illustrated by ceremonies such as marriage. Communitas occurs between and among persons sharing liminal space as structure drops away and the normal distinctions between individuals are removed. B. Oropeza summarises communitas as “a phenomenon one experiences through comradeship, lowliness, sacredness, and homogeneity with other ‘liminars’ who have broken down or reversed the hierarchical barriers of the structured society. Accordingly, the liminal stage is unstructured or prestructured.”

The above survey of the journey motif in Luke shows that many of the journeys in Luke are non-literal, visionary, or mystical journeys. “Liminal” and “liminality” are helpful terms for grouping and discussing such events or journeys. The disciples in the boat on the lake with Jesus in Luke 5 occupy a physical place that is no longer Galilee, the pre-liminal place; nor have they returned from the “other side,” signaling the post-liminal phase of the lake journey. Rather, they are in the middle of an important transition in their lives. They have moved from the shore (5:1), to a little way from the shore (5:3), to out on the deep water (5:4, 6), where they work together to overcome the barriers presented to them: the tearing nets, the near-sinking boats. These challenges or barriers to the success of the journey form something of the nature of a test or trial. The journey is formative, and Jesus’ actions are intentional. Following the catch of fish (5:6-7) and Jesus’ commission (5:10) they will return to shore and

---


99 Moore, *The Archetype of Initiation*, 41. Or in Luke 8, by the man being bound, breaking those bonds, and fleeing into the wilderness!

100 Moore, *The Archetype of Initiation*, 42.


102 Section 3.5.
leave everything to follow him (5:11). This is the post-liminal phase. The time on the lake is a
time of in-betweenness, transformation, and reorientation. It is liminal time. There is also a
communitas-type of experience that takes place during this special time of formation. It is a
unique and special time they share together, and an experience they have joined in together
(5:7, 9-10). A special bond is created between them. This is shown by the way Simon, James,
and John are named together subsequently in Luke’s story so that they are distinguished even
within the group of twelve (8:51; 9:28). 103 These three form the nucleus of the group that will
go on to become Jesus’ apostles (6:12-16).

In the second lake journey Jesus is with the twelve and invites them to cross over to the other
side. The journey through the storm with Jesus is again an example of liminality and the
experience is one of communitas for the disciples. Despite the fact that at least Simon, James,
and John are experienced fishers, in the face of that storm the disciples are all reduced to fear,
a fear they should have overcome in order to get the boat safely to the other side. 104 As he did
in the first lake story, Jesus acts like the ritual elder or shaman, guiding the disciples. But they
fail to transition to the next phase this time. Rather than working together to overcome the
storm, as they did to bring in the large catch in 5:1-11, they leave the task of mastering the
storm to Jesus, for they are overcome by fear (8:24-25). This is a fear Jesus believes they are
ready to master. Hence, ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; (“Where is your faith?”) (8:25).

Once at the other side the storm comes to them again, this time incarnate in the possessed
man. It appears this is what Jesus was aiming to prepare the disciples for during the journey.
However, as they have failed to deal with the storm, Jesus, whose role is that of the guide, or
elder, takes on the task. I suggest the landing on the other side should have marked the post-
liminal phase, with the disciples now able to step up to the new task, that of delivering the
possessed man. But they have not prevailed in the task assigned to them during the lake
journey. This means that Jesus must perform the task of delivering the demoniac and take

103 Luke 22:8 mentions Peter and John only, but may be an extension of the same idea.

104 This idea is developed in Chapter 4, below.
them back to the beginning of the journey to continue their formation.\textsuperscript{105} This he does in 8:40-56.

Luke uses ὀδός as one of his key journey indicators.\textsuperscript{106} It is aligned to the discipleship theme both within the central section and beyond it, but it is absent from the lake stories.\textsuperscript{107} However, Luke does include ἀκολουθέω in 5:11 and σὺν αὐτῷ in 8:39. This means that, while the language of the discipleship journey is present, the absence of ὀδός here underscores the liminal nature of the lake voyages. These are journeys yes, but they are \textit{liminal} journeys. They are journeys \textit{off} the way so that the way may be found. For Luke, the Lake of Genesaret represents “the boundary for Jesus’ activity,”\textsuperscript{108} so that setting out upon it suggests stepping beyond the boundary.\textsuperscript{109} The first lake journey does not advance the geographical progress of Jesus or his disciples because the story begins and ends on the same shore. The important thing is what happens on the lake. The second lake journey takes the disciples and Jesus to the “other side.”

At the end of this journey Jesus simply returns (ὑποστρέφω) (8:40). While he has made no progress on his journey to Jerusalem, he has challenged his disciples to journey \textit{εἰς} τὸ πέραν (\textit{“to the other side”}) in their formation (8:22), and he has planted the seed of Gentile mission (8:39). This story foreshadows the missionary endeavours of the apostles in Luke’s second volume (Acts). However, in keeping with Luke’s geographical vagueness and with the liminal quality of this journey, the landing on the other side of the lake is defined only as τὸ πέραν τῆς

\begin{enumerate}
\item[105] This maybe one of the reasons the Lucan Jesus will not allow the healed demoniac to return with him in the boat.
\item[107] Luke uses ὀδός (way) in 1:76, 79; 2:44; 3:4-5; 7:27; 8:5, 12; 9:3, 57; 10:4, 31; 11:6; 12:58; 14:23; 18:35; 19:36; 20:21; 24:32, 35. It translates “way,” “path,” or “road.” In most cases it at least includes the idea of a “way” of life to choose or a journey into a way of life. See for example Luke 1:76; 3:4; 7:27; 9:57; 24:35. Elsewhere the meaning is “road” but the location is within a parable, so that it is actually about a “way” of living (8:5 and 12; 10:31; 11:6; 14:23). The link with discipleship is strong in examples such as 9:3 and 57; 10:4. In a couple of cases (2:44; 11:6) the meaning is more straightforwardly a road.
\item[109] Hilgert, \textit{The Ship}, 106.
\end{enumerate}
λίμνης (8:22) and ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας (“opposite Galilee”) (8:26) and in τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν (“the region of the Gerasenes”) (8:26, 37).110

The lake journeys are journeys of transformation. They are journeys into liminal space where reorientation (μετάνοια) takes place.111 At the end of the first lake crossing Simon (and those with him) ἀφέντες πάντα (“leave everything”) to follow Jesus (5:11). At the end of the second lake crossing the Gerasene demoniac returns to his city to proclaim what Jesus has done for him (8:39). They are journeys that prepare the disciples to follow Jesus on the way (ὁδός).112

This is not to claim that these lake stories would meet the technical criteria for liminality as described by Turner and others writing in this field. It is not to say, for example, that “Jesus was a shaman.” Rather, the idea or concept of events and travel which take place outside of or beyond normal time and place, the association of such events and travel with ritual and formation, and the role of shaman or guide, approximates to how this study sees Luke employing the journeys on the lake as metaphorical, formative, “liminal” journeys into discipleship.113 There are, no doubt, large gaps between Turner’s work and context in Africa in the 1950s and 60s, and the world of the Lukan narrative. Nevertheless, liminality can usefully be employed in the reading of Luke’s lake stories.

6 Conclusion

This chapter has established the lake stories as metaphorical and parallel accounts. The Lukan journey motif was considered, as well the two lake stories within this motif as journey stories within the Galilean section. Two discipleship cycles were identified. These include the two

110 Luke omits Mark’s mention of the Δεκάπολις (Decapolis) (Mark 5:20).

111 μετάνοια occurs in both lake stories despite the absence of the term in the accounts.


113 An analogous example of such an approach might be Brawley’s identification of elements of carnivalesque in the passion narrative. Brawley uses the concept because it is useful to his reading and interpretation, not because Luke “is” carnivalesque. Brawley, Text to Text, 43.
lake stories in a patterned relationship of three pairs of passages within the Galilean phase. Finally, liminality was introduced and shown to be useful in clarifying the lake journeys as formation journeys for discipleship. Chapter 3 looks at the first lake story, Luke 5:1-11.

1 Introduction

The calling of the first disciples on the Lake of Gennesaret represents the beginnings of the discipleship journey and the beginning of the community of followers Jesus will gather around himself. It demonstrates the nature of a positive response to Jesus.¹

2 Luke and Mark

With only two exceptions Luke 3:21-6:11 follows Mark 1:9-3:6.² First, Luke inserts the account of Jesus at Nazareth (4:16-30) in place of Mark 1:16-20.³ Second, following the account of a day at Capernaum (Mark 1:21-45; Luke 4:31-41), Luke inserts the first lake story (Luke 5:1-11). Chapter 1 of this study has confirmed that Luke 4:16-30 is a programmatic and important addition to the narrative, as it outlines Jesus’ mission and ministry. This chapter will argue that Luke 5:1-11 is of similar import as it introduces the theme of discipleship and defines that as mission, as well as adding further nuance to the mission theme introduced in Luke 4:16-30.

---


2 Though Luke has of course modified it in detail to suit his purpose and style.

3 Hilgert suggests the placement of the Nazareth account at this early stage of the Gospel underlines Jesus’ rejection by the Jews and is an early indication of the importance of Gentile mission to Luke. He notes especially Luke 4:25-27. Hilgert, *The Ship*, 105. The introduction of Gentile mission at this early stage is important but it is not clear the episode means Jesus is rejected by the Jews. Kuecker, *The Spirit*, 93-94.
Luke’s version of the story of the calling of the first disciples is clearly influenced by Mark 1:16-20 but with the addition of the account of the superabundant catch of fish.\(^4\) Luke places the calling of Simon, James, and John later in his narrative than does Mark,\(^5\) which allows him to paint a more detailed picture of Jesus and his mission, and therefore of what it means to leave everything and follow him (5:11).\(^6\)

### 3 Literary Context

Luke 5:1-11 is preceded by the statement about the beginnings of Jesus’ public ministry (4:14-15),\(^7\) which includes the information that reports about Jesus had spread throughout Galilee;\(^8\) the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (4:16-30), in which Jesus alludes to his own spreading reputation (4:23); the healing of the man with the unclean spirit (4:31-36), reports of which went to \(\pi\acute{a}ν\acute{t}a \tau\acute{o}π\acute{n} \tau\acute{e}γ \piεριχ\acute{ωρ}ον\) (“every place in the region”) (4:37); the healing of Simon’s mother-in-law and of others suffering sickness and demon possession (4:38-41), events we can assume Simon was either present at or would have a full knowledge of; and Jesus’ intention to preach the good news of the kingdom of God in the cities (4:43), the fulfilment of which Luke reports as Jesus’ preaching in the synagogues in the following verse (4:44).\(^9\) In all of these episodes Luke narrates the spreading of Jesus’ message, or of the news about Jesus’ message and deeds. The fishers in 5:1-11 are among those who hear and see this message and

---


5 Andrew is named alongside Simon in Mark 1:16-20.


8 The speech-response pattern evident in the account of Jesus at Nazareth emphasises the importance of response to Jesus and his message. It also anticipates the question of how the disciples will respond to him. Green, *Luke*, 208. Beyond that, it challenges Luke’s readers to respond positively to Jesus.

9 This reads at least as an initial or partial fulfilment. The people’s attempt to limit the scope of Jesus’ ministry in 4:42 echoes that of 4:16-30, where Jesus perceives the people’s wish that he perform for them the deeds he had done elsewhere (4:23).
these deeds. The healing of Simon’s mother-in-law (4:38-41) ensures that Simon at least has had a close family member who benefited directly from Jesus’ ministry.\(^\text{10}\) The first disciples have thus been prepared to respond to Jesus and his calling to ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν (“put out into the deep water and let down your nets a the catch”) (5:4).\(^\text{11}\)

Luke’s placement of this story gives ample narrative time for Jesus’ ability to perform miracles to be demonstrated and reported prior to there being any mention of the calling of the disciples. The placing of a miracle within a commission is unusual. With the possible exception of 8:26-39, where the delivered demoniac is sent (ἀπολύω) to his home (8:38) to declare the deeds of God (8:39), miracles are not linked with commissions in Luke’s Gospel.\(^\text{12}\) The linking of miracle and commission here suggests that Luke intends his readers to see that the men followed Jesus because of his wondrous power.\(^\text{13}\)

### 4 Literary Form

The form of 5:1-11 has been variously described. Rudolf Bultmann classifies it as a “nature miracle,”\(^\text{14}\) Fitzmyer as a “pronouncement story,” of which 5:10b is the punch-line,\(^\text{15}\) and Paul Achtemeier as a miracle story embedded within a legend.\(^\text{16}\) As a single pericope a case can be made for any of these options. However, seen within its narrative context this is a commissioning story. Several factors bear this out. The first is the emphasis on mission in the passage. Tannehill describes the three-fold structure of the episode as follows:\(^\text{17}\)

---


13 Achtemeier categorises this as a “call” rather than as a “commission” story, linking the display of power with the willingness to follow. Paul J. Achtemeier, *Jesus and the Miracle Tradition* (Eugene: Cascade, 2008), 21.


He proposes that 5:1-3 and 5:8-11 are the fulfilment of 4:43. This is not entirely convincing as this incident takes place at the lake, rather than in a city or a synagogue (cf. 4:43-44). Luke 5:1-11 is a broad fulfilment of 4:43 (and 4:18-19), but only in so far as any passage in the Gospel can be said to be so. The proclamation of the good news to other cities and in the synagogues is of course an ongoing task, but it is 4:44 that narrates the fulfilment of 4:43.

Tannehill’s claim would appear to rest on the textual proximity of 4:43 to 5:1, and the fact that there are some thematic echoes between 4:43 and 5:1-11. However, these echoes lack any of the key vocabulary connectors we might expect. For example, if 5:1-3 was intended to indicate the fulfilment of 4:43, then instead of the crowd ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ καὶ ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (“I must pressing in upon him to hear the word of God,” where ἐπίκειμαι is new vocabulary and τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ is a new phrase in Luke), we might have expected Jesus to εὐαγγελίσασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (“preach the good news of the kingdom of God”) (cf. 4:43), or to employ some of the vocabulary from 4:18-19. However, he does not. This, along with the sudden and unannounced shift in location in 5:1, indicates a clean break from Chapter 4. However, the passage does contain a strong missional emphasis, so that Tannehill’s outline could be revised as follows:

5:1-3 Jesus is engaged in catching people alive.
5:4-7 Jesus instructs Peter and those with him to catch fish.
5:8-11 Jesus commissions Peter and those with him to catch people alive.

The missional thrust of the passage is clear: Jesus brings the word of God to the crowds (ὄχλος), instructs Simon to go fishing, and then commissions him (and those with him) to catch people alive.\(^\text{18}\) Jesus transforms Simon’s catching of fish on the lake into a metaphor for his

---

\(^{18}\) See “Jesus” in bold in the outline.
commission to join Jesus in catching people (ἄνθρωπος) alive. The “metaphorisation” that takes place here means Jesus’ ministry to the crowd becomes an example of catching people alive.

The second indicator that this is a commission story is the echoes of OT/LXX commission stories this episode contains. Green notes the elements common to this story and the story of the calling of the prophet Isaiah:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epiphany:</td>
<td>vv. 4-7 (9-10a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction:</td>
<td>v. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reassurance:</td>
<td>v. 10b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission:</td>
<td>v. 10b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The comparison between Luke 5 and Isa 6 is helpful because it highlights elements of the commission form common to the two accounts. Luke’s account of the reassurance and commission of Simon (and James and John) is compressed compared to that of Isaiah, but the elements of the story are recognisably present. In drawing the comparison between Luke 5 and Isa 6 it should be noted that Isa 6 is the account of the commissioning of the prophet Isaiah. There is a formal and useful similarity between the two accounts, but Simon looks nothing like a prophet in Luke’s Gospel. Rather, it is Jesus who fills this role.

19 See the italics in the outline. “Catching people alive” in 5:8-11 applies metaphorically to what has happened in 5:4-7, which in its turn becomes “a symbolic narrative.” Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:203.

20 See the Greek terms in the proposed outline.


22 Though a case could be made for Simon (Peter) as prophet in Acts.
The third indicator that this is a commission story is that it follows the commission form. Terrance Mullins finds 37 examples of the form in the NT. Ten of these are found in Luke and seventeen in Acts. Of the total of 37 there are nine that contain all the elements of the form. Four of these are found in Acts, and three in Luke. Luke 5:1-11 is one of the latter. The seven elements can be described as follows:

1. Introduction (vv. 1-2): Where and when the event took place (on the shore of the lake of Gennesaret) and who is involved (Jesus, Simon, and others).
2. Confrontation (vv. 3-4): Jesus enters the boat, asks Simon to put out, teaches, and asks the fishers to put down their nets.
3. Reaction (vv. 5-7): Simon describes their lack of success but does as he is instructed to do.
4. Commission (v. 10c): The commission to catch people alive.
5. Protest (vv. 8-10a): Simon falls down, begging Jesus to depart and admitting his sinfulness.
7. Conclusion (v. 11): Peter, James and John (and possibly others) leave everything and follow Jesus.

23 Mendes-Moratalla initially categorises this story as a “call-narrative rather than a conversion-narrative.” Mendes-Moratalla, *Paradigm of Conversion*, 22. He appears to contradict this later when he notes abandonment of possessions is an indicator of conversion and cites 5:11 as an example. Ibid., 90. At any rate “commission” as used in the present discussion is broadly equivalent to “call” as Mendes-Moratalla uses it.


Six of the nine NT commission stories containing all these elements are commissions for specific tasks. The remaining three are of a general nature. None of the commissions are specifically for prophetic ministry.

The final indicator that this is a commission story is the narrowing focus of the story with its climactic commissioning and the response of the disciples. In the first section (vv. 1-3) Jesus addresses the crowd. In the second (vv. 4-7) Jesus is on the lake with Simon. Others come when summoned, and plural verbs in vv. 4, 6, 7 and 9, imply others are present in the boat (or boats) along with Simon, James, and John. Fitzmyer suggest this feature is a remnant of the Markan parallel. Be that as it may, the presence of these plural verbs leaves open the possibility that others might be included when Simon is commissioned in 5:10. In the final section (vv. 8-11) James and John are named and others are likely present. The focus of the narrative is squarely on Jesus and Simon. The effect of this narrowing is to highlight the commission in v. 10 and the response in v. 11.

5 Realistic Narrative, Metaphorical Journey

The argument here is that Luke uses the journey on the Lake of Gennesaret as a metaphor for the discipleship journey. Although readers recognise that this story is a “realistic account,” the “parabolic nature” of the episode is also evident. Here the implication of this reading on two levels is explored. The following exegesis enters the dynamics of the narrative as a realistic (though somewhat extraordinary) account of an episode in the life of Jesus as told by Luke. It

---

29 Mullins does not specify which of the commissions he places in each category, but looking at his list, it would appear that he classes Luke 5:1-11 as an example of a general commission. Mullins, “Commission Forms,” 608.

30 Though the ministries of John and Jesus in Luke, and perhaps that of Simon in Acts, develop to include echoes and elements of the ministries of OT prophets.


32 Green, Luke, 232. This is what I have called “realistic narrative, metaphorical journey.” Introduction, Section 4.6.4.
also considers how this first lake journey might function as a metaphor for the first steps of the discipleship journey, a reading that the story itself requires, as described below.


The crowd here gathers as a result of Jesus’ growing and rapidly spreading reputation. They come to hear the word of God. Luke thus establishes that from its very inception the Christian community is founded on the words of Jesus himself. The encounter between the people and the word of God prepares for the more focused encounter between Jesus and Simon that will soon follow. By the end of the episode it will come to be seen as an example of Jesus “catching people alive.” The focus here, meanwhile, is on the wider setting and Jesus’ interaction with the crowds. These verses also set the scene for Simon to be with Jesus in the boat. He thereby begins to move from the shore to the lake, and so towards his forthcoming commission out on the deep water.

6.1 Verse 1

Green suggests that ἐγένετο δέ (“it came to pass”) here implies this is a typical scene. This is correct in the sense that it serves as an example of a commission story. Luke allows this account to stand as an exemplar of the calling of others, so that by 6:13 Jesus can choose twelve from among the growing number of his disciples (6:17, 10:1) to be his Apostles. However, there are indicators that this scene is actually far from “typical.” It has its own unique setting and elements. V. 1 marks an abrupt shift in location to the shore of the Lake of Gennesaret. Luke provides no detail as to how Jesus arrives at the lakeside, his intention to do


34 Green, Luke, 231.

35 Ibid.

so, or of his motivation for being there. However, this is not unusual for Luke. This location, uniquely described by Luke among the Gospel writers, is surprising when the preceding Lukan summary states that Jesus went about κηρύσσων εἰς τὰς συναγωγὰς τῆς Ἰουδαίας (4:44) and that Jesus himself states that he must proclaim the good news in ἐτέραις πόλεσιν (4:43). The sudden and unexpected shift to the shore of the lake, along with the content of this story, suggests rather that ἐγένετο δὲ suits Luke because it is unspecific. There is a sense in which this journey takes place outside of (or interrupts) normal space or time, or is beyond Jesus’ normal routine.37 This is a story of transformation and liminality.

Johnson claims that the crowd (ὄχλος) is Jesus’ general audience and that when they respond positively to him they become the people (λαός).38 However, this assessment is overdrawn, and it understates the fact that the crowds are usually sympathetic to Jesus. This can be seen by their willingness to hear, follow, go with, or keep company with Jesus;39 their favourable reaction to him;40 that they meet or welcome him;41 and their ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ (“pressing in upon him”),42 trying to touch him (6:19), and seeking after him (4:42). Although it is considerably later in the narrative the Jewish leaders’ avoidance of confronting Jesus in the presence of the crowd (22:6) implies support for Jesus from the crowd, while the positive response of the crowds to John (3:7, 10) also anticipates their openness to Jesus’ message. Here in 5:1 the crowd are ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ to hear the word of God, indicating that their response to this initial encounter with Jesus is positive.43 It is sadly ironic that the only other occurrence of ἐπίκειμαι in Luke is in 23:23, where the crowd and the chief priests press upon

37 This is not dissimilar from the sudden and unannounced arrival of Elijah in 1 Kgs, though of course Jesus has already featured in the narrative, whereas Elijah comes apparently from nowhere.


42 Luke 5:1; 8:42, 45.

(ἐπίκειμαι) Pilate to have Jesus crucified (23:4). In light of the crowd’s general openness 23:4 effects a tragic reversal.

Historically the crowds were made up of the “people of the land.”44 These were mostly poor and many were needy. Women, men, and children were included, and various occupations, such as peasant farmers, fishers, and craftsmen were represented. Within a narrative the crowd becomes a character. This occurs, “when groups are represented as sharing similar traits and acting in unison.”45 Crowds typically function within literature as an indication of popularity or renown; as representative of the response of a population; as the embodiment of need; as an obstacle to be overcome; or as a threatening force.46 Luke tends to use ὄχλος to describe the nameless crowd that follow Jesus,47 while following the LXX, λαός (sing.) is frequently used to designate the people of Israel.48 However, the distinction should not be overdrawn, as ὄχλος and λαός (along with πλῆθος and πολύς) are sometimes synonyms.49 See for example 7:24 and 29, where ὄχλος and λαός are synonymous (and with πολύς in 7:21) and 8:42, 45 and 47, where λαός in v. 47 is synonymous with ὄχλος in vv. 42 and 45.

The λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ makes its first appearance in Luke-Acts here.50 As the one who speaks the word of God and who will soon perform extraordinary deeds (5:4-7) Jesus is shown here as a prophet.51 This is consistent with Luke’s picture of Jesus, who begins his public ministry in

45 Ibid.
46 Ibid.
47 Found in Luke 41 times [sing. 25 times, pl. 16 times]. Ibid., 672.
48 The word study approach misses 3rd person plural verbs or substantive participles (e.g. Luke 2:47). Strauss, Ibid., 670.
51 Green notes the balance of word and deed in Jesus’ ministry, as well as “the parabolic nature of this pericope.” Green, Luke, 232.
Nazareth (4:18-19) by quoting from the book of the prophet Isaiah. By 4:24 Jesus has cast himself overtly as a προφήτης (prophet), while the references to Elijah and Elisha locate Jesus among the prophets of old. Others in Luke-Acts also perceive Jesus to be a prophet. The people consider the possibility (9:8-9, 18-19), he is designated as such by his followers (24:19), and the soldiers’ demand that he prophesy suggests a reputation that begged demonstration. However, to say Jesus is shown as a prophet is not to limit him to this role. He is also, as Gerald Hawthorne notes, “more than a prophet.” Other images, such as Davidic king, are also at play.

Given the setting of the story, Jesus ἑστὼς παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ (“standing by the Lake of Gennesaret”) is a realistic detail. However, as the story unfolds, standing (rather than sitting) anticipates the move from the shore of the lake and out onto the deep water. The use of λίμνη rather than θάλασσα makes this journey one the disciples might contemplate, as λίμνη lacks some of the chaotic and threatening overtones associated with θάλασσα. This is so because Luke works within an OT/LXX cosmology. God has separated the dry land from the earth, and the heavens are stretched out above, while in Genesis God orders, separates and fills the earth and the sea with living creatures, and the earth itself rises “out of the sea and chaos.” There is a strong link between the sea and chaos that goes back to the creation account in


53 Ibid., 640-641.

54 Ibid., 641.


57 For example Ps 134:6 (135:6 MT); Hag 2:6; Acts 4:24.

58 Gen 1:9f., 20f.

Genesis 1:2 (LXX ἄβυσσος, Heb תֹּרְהוֹ) so that “the sea became the embodiment of the sphere of disaster. In the sea the power of water hostile to God and [people] opposes the people of Israel.”

The flood (Genesis chs. 7-9), and the possibility of its re-occurrence (Exod ch. 14) was part of Israel's story cosmology.

The sea is the dwelling place of the sea monster or dragon (Gen 1:21; Job 7:12). However, even these are ultimately set there to serve or please God. In Jer 28:34 (51:34 MT) the monster becomes a metaphor for Babylon. The defeat of the dragon becomes a metaphor for eschatological deliverance in Isa 27:1. Violence occurs at sea as God breaks open the head of the dragon at the creation of the world in Ps 73:13 (74:13 MT). The sea can also be the dwelling of evil. For example, the sea is the habitat of the four demons that take the form of the four beasts in Dan 7 (cf. Rev 13:1).

The sea, like the creatures that inhabit it, is subject to God’s power. This is a prominent theme in the Psalms where, for example, God takes the psalmist out of the many waters (Ps 17:17 (18:17 MT)); God’s voice is powerful and thunders over the many waters (Ps 28:3-4 (29:3-4 MT)); God stirs the hollow of the sea and makes its waves to roar (Ps 64:8 (65:8 MT)); God rules the might of the seas and calms the surge of its waves (Ps 88:10 (89:10 MT)); God covers even the mountains with waters, and at God’s rebuke the waters take flight (Ps 103:6-7 (104:6-7 MT)); God rebukes the sea so that it becomes dry (Ps 105:9 (106:9 MT)). Ps 106:23-32 (107:23-32 MT) tells of God’s sovereignty over the waters and power to deliver those who travel upon it and who call on God. Böcher surveys the literature of


64 Böcher, “Water,” 983.


Judaism to demonstrate that the sea is still a threatening force, while demonic forces command the sea “partly on God’s behalf.”

Acts 4:24 and 14:15 demonstrate that Luke is heir to this cosmology. The sea still poses a threat to those upon it, as for example in Acts 28:4. It therefore “belongs on the side of the demonic . . . and that which opposes God.” Böcher’s claim may seem overly dramatic but he notes a revealing redactional detail in the Lukan eschatological discourse to back his claim: To the foretold chaos of 21:25 Luke has added ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ἤχους θαλάσσης καὶ σάλου (“confused by the roaring of the sea and the waves”). The phrase is absent from Matt 24 and Mark 13.

Böcher notes that the NT writers, following the OT and Judaism, make no distinction in their use of θάλασσα between the sea and inland bodies of water. This makes Luke’s choice of λίμνη here and in Luke 8:22-39 against his sources all the more remarkable. The Lake of Gennesaret still poses a threat, as can be clearly seen by 8:22-25 and by the disciples’ reaction to this situation, but it is the Lake of Gennesaret. This nomenclature dilutes the dangerous and chaotic overtones associated with this body of water, making it a less threatening journey for the disciples to undertake than one upon the open sea. Hence Johnson’s claim that “lake” minimises the journey compared to “sea.”

6.2 Verse 2

Hilgert surveys the use of the ship as a symbol in Greek, Roman, and Jewish literature and art at the time of the writing of the New Testament. He concludes that it was chiefly employed as a symbol for “human life or the soul, the state, the world, and the conveyance to the next

68 Ibid., 984.
69 Ibid.
70 Ibid.
world, and in Jewish literature (from a milieu particularly close to that of the New Testament), the Jewish nation. In Christian literature and art from the second century onward, the ship is a recurring symbol of the church.” Furthermore, he claims that the use of such symbols in the Roman world were readily adopted and adapted by Jews and early Christians. Hilgert concludes that at least in principle “the ship in the Gospel narratives may admit of figurative meaning in some instances.” These are observations that support a metaphorical reading of the two Lukan lake stories. However, as the approach adopted for this study is a narrative-based one, the meaning assigned to the symbol of the boat or boats in these stories will be left open at this stage.

The presence of two boats suggests a joint venture or a partnership of some kind. It also prepares the scene for the inordinate catch of fish about to take place and for the co-operative action of the fishers. As with Jesus (v. 1), the boats were ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην (“standing by the shore of the lake”). This identical phraseology hints that Jesus, like these boats, is ready to put out onto the lake with the fishers from the beginning of the episode. The other effect here is that the boats, representing fishing, and Jesus who embodies preaching, are joined by common vocabulary with ἑστῶσι παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ (5:1) and ἑστῶτα παρὰ τὴν λίμνην (5:2). This intimates and strengthens the connection between proclaiming τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ and fishing that Luke develops through his narrative.

When Jesus sees (ὁράω) the boats here it is simple, literal sight. However, the boats lying ready by the shore hint at the fishers’ readiness to journey on the lake and thus embark upon the discipleship journey. This is probably over-reading for a first-time sequential reader, though the rereader might make the connection. The subsequent use of ὁράω (5:8) in this lake story does denote more-than-literal sight. The change from literal sight in 5:2 to perception in 5:8 tracks the move within this episode from literal fishing to fishing (“catching people

73 Ibid., 68.
74 Ibid., 69.
75 Ibid., 71.
76 Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 208-209.
alive”) as a metaphor for mission. As for the fishers themselves, Luke notes they had gone out of the boats and were mending their nets. This is a detail consistent with the practice of night fishing and the cleaning of the nets afterwards, demonstrating that the night’s work was finished.  

6.3 Verse 3

Jesus continues his ministry to the crowds but now he takes charge of the fishers. He boards one of the boats, the one belonging to Simon, and instructs him to put out a little way from the shore. Ownership is probably implied by “ὁ ἦν Σίμωνος” (“the one belonging to Simon”). It is possible that the boats are leased or shared among members of a fishing guild. Even if this is the case, some level of economic advantage is suggested by the partnership, the presence of associates, and the several boats.

By boarding the boat Jesus is positioned to teach the crowds, who have been ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ (“pressing in upon him”) (5:1). More subtly and perhaps more importantly (as the crowds are not mentioned again in this story) Simon is now in the boat with Jesus and has taken his first step away from the shore. He thus begins his movement from catcher of fish to catching people, without him even being aware of what is happening. Robert Moore describes journeys to boundaries as quests “for a door into sacred space.” Here, the movement from the shore


78 Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 208.

79 This detail, that the boat was Simon’s, can be seen as further evidence that the call in 5:10 is “much more personally directed to Simon.” Brown, Donfried, and Reumann, Peter in the New Testament, 110. However, the call, though addressed in the first instance to Simon, is directed more broadly. Ibid., 119.


81 Jesus is “fishing” the crowd. Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 140.

82 Moore, The Archetype of Initiation, 51.
and out onto the lake functions at the metaphorical level as the beginning of such a journey. The movement from the shore into the boat is the first step toward the accomplishment of preaching as well as fishing.\textsuperscript{83} There is a “metaphorical relation of similarity” between the two activities, so that “[e]verything that is said about fishing may be may be interpreted on the isotopy of preaching.”\textsuperscript{84} This has the effect making the metaphor Luke is developing here richer and more complex than a straightforward substitution of “preaching” for “fishing.” Details of aspects of the story such as its form, inter- and intra-textuality, as well as its content can be explored to fill out the metaphor.

The verb ἐπανάγω (put out) is used only here and in the following verse in Luke, where Simon will be challenged to ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος (v. 4). That Jesus and Simon are together in this as they move a little way from the shore so that Jesus can teach will, in hindsight, show that Simon too is called to teach the word of God to the people. That is, the linkage between Simon and Jesus, and the use of ἐπανάγω hints that Simon’s “putting out” is the first step towards a discipleship that will eventually give him the opportunity to stand and teach the word of God. Just as Jesus addresses the ὄχλος in 5:1-3, so Peter will address the ὄχλος of the believers in Acts 1:15, and the πλῆθος (crowd) in Acts 2:6 (= αὐτοῖς in Acts 2:14). This crowd is made up of people ἀπὸ παντὸς ἔθνους (“from every nation”) (Acts 2:5) assembled in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2:1), so the catch is large.

Here in Luke 5:3, Simon begins moving towards being “with” Jesus, which is characteristic of the relationship between Jesus and the twelve in Luke’s Gospel.\textsuperscript{85} Simon has not been commissioned yet, and Luke (probably unknowingly) manages to get him into the boat and off-shore without using μετά, σύν, or παρά.\textsuperscript{86} By the end of the story Simon will leave

\textsuperscript{83} Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 191.

\textsuperscript{84} Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 191. (note that in the original “fishing” and “preaching” are both capitalized).

\textsuperscript{85} Introduction, Section 5.2.

\textsuperscript{86} Which elsewhere are often discipleship indicators.
everything to follow (ἀκολουθέω) Jesus. Meanwhile, the movement here into the boat with Jesus hints at Simon’s status henceforth as representative of the disciples and of the twelve, who will soon-after be named apostles (6:13-15).

Simon (or Peter) is mentioned in 4:38 with reference to his mother-in-law and in 5:3 as the owner of the boat Jesus commandeers. In 5:4-10 he is named a further four times and his encounter with Jesus becomes the focus of the narrative. He then heads the list of disciples chosen to be apostles in 6:14, as well as subsequent shorter lists of disciples selected for special tasks for or with Jesus.87 He speaks for, reports for, or asks questions on behalf of the group.88 Following the dispute among the disciples about greatness (22:24-29), he is named three times as Jesus warns him of the temptation into which he (Simon) is about to enter 22:31-34. As foretold by Jesus, Simon then follows Jesus into the courtyard and denies him three times, being named in 22:54, 55, 58 and 60 before Jesus looks at him in 22:61. Following the resurrection it is Peter who runs to the tomb in 24:12 and who is named (by the other disciples) as the one to whom the Lord has appeared in 24:34. Peter’s position among the disciples is justifiably described by commentators as one of “prominence.”89 Commentators also note that, compared to Mark, Luke portrays Simon in a more favourable light.90

These verses also confirm the importance of Jesus’ teaching ministry to the crowds and to the disciples. Simon is with Jesus in the boat while Jesus teaches. He therefore overhears (along with many others) what Jesus is teaching. He is thus becoming equipped in due course to become a teacher himself. The emphasis on teaching extends to posture. The posture for teaching is being seated.91 The previous occurrence of seated (καθίζω) (4:20) saw Jesus hand

90 Ibid., 111-13.
over the scroll of the prophet Isaiah to announce that the Scripture was being fulfilled in the midst of the people. A narrative reading here might detect an echo of 4:18, suggesting that we are about to witness ἀφέσις and the themes associated with it as introduced in 4:16-30 (or 4:18-19 at least).

At the same time, speaking from the boat makes Jesus’ actions symbolic in the opposite direction. Jesus now preaches from the “figurative position of a fisherman.” Preaching from this vantage point is another subtle melding of the two activities (fishing and preaching), further serving the metaphorical thrust of this passage. Jesus’ movement from the shore to the boat to teach the crowds is consistent with the journey motif in Luke. This is the only place in Luke’s Gospel where Jesus teaches on the lakeside (or from a boat). Conzelmann suggests that the location could be more “theological” than geographic prompting.

There is a colourful history of interpretation that reads various symbolism into the boats. However, Luke gives no indication that the boats are symbols to be interpreted beyond what meaning can be ascribed to them from within the narrative. For example, they can be said to represent livelihood, partnership, and—following this story—the teaching ministry of Jesus, with that of the disciples also hinted at. These symbols arise from within the text. Green is correct in cautioning against allegorical, symbolic, or mythical readings of the boat. He advocates instead for a “parabolic” reading based on what arises naturally from the Lukan text. What Green calls a “parabolic” reading here is equivalent to the restrained allegorical reading described in the Introduction to this study.

---

92 Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 196, 201.
96 Introduction, Section 4.6.
Luke now narrates the superabundant catch of fish by Simon and his companions. This catch results from the fishers’ obedience to Jesus’ instruction to ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ύμων εἰς ἄγραν (“put out into the deep water and let down your nets for a catch”) (5:4). The catch that follows, along with its subsequent symbolic interpretation by Jesus, anticipates the later success of the disciples’ mission in Acts. The catch also predisposes Simon to respond positively and wholeheartedly to the commission he will soon receive from Jesus (v. 10). It also creates in Luke’s readers an expectation that, like the overwhelming success of the catch of fish, the success of Simon and his companions at catching people subsequent to 5:10 will be overwhelming.

7.1 Verse 4

Luke provides no report of the crowd’s response to Jesus and his message. Jesus has simply ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν (“finished speaking”) and so Luke dismisses the crowds from the narrative. He then moves the focus of the story onto Simon. Luke reports Jesus’ instruction to Simon through direct speech: ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ύμων εἰς ἄγραν. This is the first piece of direct speech reported of Jesus in this passage. It is also Jesus’ first address to Simon, who goes on to become a key figure in Luke-Acts. As such, it carries special weight. In light of Simon’s importance to the subsequent narrative, Jesus’ opening words in such an encounter can reasonably be expected to contain several layers of meaning. This reported direct speech (by Jesus here in v. 4) will be elegantly balanced by Jesus’ commission to Simon in v. 10. With these words in v. 4 the focus of the story apparently moves from the preaching of the word of God to the catching of fish. By v. 10 the morphing of preaching the word of God into the catching of fish will again need to be reconceptualised, with ‘people’ replacing

97 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:204.
98 Ibid.
That is, the preaching of the word of God in v. 1 becomes catching fish in v. 4, which becomes the catching of people in v. 10.

Simon’s response to Jesus’ initial instructions (v. 5) shows that the idea of putting out into the deep water and letting down the nets is counter-intuitive. This, then, is the point where Jesus “breaks in” upon Simon’s normal life and routine and begins to “orientate” Simon to his new life and task. This is another indicator that a deeper level of meaning might be at work in Jesus’ instructions, so that moving εἰς τὸ βάθος transmutes into a metaphor for the journey of discipleship. Not all accept such readings. Nolland, for example, insists that the deep water is “simply where the (literal) fish are to be fished for.” He also rejects the view that the fish are being (symbolically) rescued from the “chaotic waters of darkness.” Nolland is responding to the suggestion that the text is an allegory for Jewish and Gentile mission. Nevertheless, the principle is the same. Contra Nolland, in my view there are enough indicators in the story for a metaphorical reading and this is fortified by the parallels between the two lake stories.

The imperative “put out” (ἐπανάγαγε from ἐπανάγω) is in the singular, while “let down” (χαλάσατε from χαλάω) is plural. The singular to plural shift makes perfect sense if Simon is the one in charge of the boat whilst several people are needed to manage the nets. There is an ongoing dialectic between singular and plural running throughout these verses. The focus is on Simon as representative, but others are assumed to be present. This dynamic will be played out in the subsequent narrative. Discipleship will prove to be both an individual and a

100 McKnight, “Reader-Response Criticism,” 212.
102 Johnson hints that this might be a metaphor for the discipleship journey but he does not develop the idea. Johnson, Luke, 91.
104 Ibid. He is referring to Mánek, “Fishers of Men,” 138-141 (Nolland has the phrase as a quotation but I cannot find the exact phrase in Mánek).
105 This, of course is the argument of this study.
106 On Luke 5:10 see below, Section 8.3. This is a story primarily about Jesus and Simon, but Luke is aware that crewing the boat requires more than one person. Wolter, Das Lukasevangelium, 212.
corporate calling and venture. Luke names individual disciples (e.g. 5:4, 10) as well as employing corporate references such as “his disciples” (τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ) (e.g. 5:30), “the disciples” (τοὺς μαθητάς) (e.g. 16:1), “the twelve” (οἱ δώδεκα) (e.g. 8:1), “the apostles” (οἱ ἀπόστολοι) (9:10). Here in 5:1-11 Luke balances in microcosm the relationship between the individual and corporate, with Simon, James and John named, others present and included by implication, and Simon being the focus of this particular episode. The purpose of this journey on the lake is the catching of fish which becomes the catching of people alive (5:10). Fishing and catching people alive are individual and corporate vocations in Luke.

Deep (βάθος) occurs only here in Luke. It is used elsewhere in the NT to describe theological ideas. In 1 Cor 2:10 it is found in the phrase τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ (“the deep things of God”); in Eph 3:18 in τὸ πλάτος καὶ μήκος καὶ ύψος καὶ βάθος (“how wide and long and high and deep”); in Rom 8:39 in τί νῦν ψωμα νῦν βάθος (“neither height nor depth”); in Rom 11:33 in βάθος πλοῦτου καὶ σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως θεοῦ (“the depth of the riches of wisdom and knowledge of God”); and (with κατά) in 2 Cor 8:2 in ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία αὐτῶν (“the depth of their poverty”). In light of this tendency for NT writers to employ βάθος as a theological metaphor it is reasonable to see Luke’s use of βάθος here as potentially metaphorical as well as literal. I am arguing that Luke is developing βάθος— and indeed this whole passage—as a realistic description of events on the lake and as a metaphor for the discipleship journey.

Luke uses ἐπανάγω for the second (and last) time here. Similarly, χαλάω appears only in this episode in Luke (vv. 4 and 5). ἀγρά (catch alive) appears only here and in v. 9 in the NT. This vocabulary is specific to this passage; this is not surprising as this is the only Lukan fishing story.

107 Note that the LXX uses ἄβυσσος for Gen 1:2 and ὕδωρ for Gen 1:3.

108 Similarly the adjective βαθύς (Luke 24:1; John 4:11; Acts 20:9; Rev 2:24) can have metaphorical overtones.

Simon responds to Jesus’ instructions with ἐπιστάτης, δι’ ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν (“Master, all night we have toiled and caught nothing”). This “null catch” will form a contrast with the over-abundant catch that is soon to take place.110 Strict adherence to temporal sequence would have seen this information supplied in v. 1 or 2,111 where it would function as background to this episode. Luke withholds this information until now. In Chapter 4 it will be shown that Luke reorders narrative and narrated time in Luke 8 for the second lake story. Here in Luke 5 this rearrangement of narrative time allows for the exchange now taking place between Jesus and Simon.

In this exchange Simon’s resistance to the instruction to put out onto the lake is overcome by Jesus’ word. Simon’s reluctance to set out is thus highlighted as a barrier to the successful outcome of this encounter.112 Jesus’ authoritative word is also highlighted. If the function of the response by the one called in a commission story shows “the degree of unreadiness of the person to be commissioned,”113 then the admission of fruitless toil by Simon shows he is not yet ready. ἐπιστάτης (Master) here is more than “polite address,” as Simon effectively relinquishes control of his boat to Jesus.114 The fact that he does so in spite of his own experience as a fisher and following an unsuccessful night’s fishing supports the assertion that even if it does not necessarily come from a complete appreciation of who Jesus is, ἐπιστάτης is an acknowledgement that carries some weight.115 Simon’s use of ἐπιστάτης here anticipates the new relationship that will follow from his commissioning to discipleship in v. 10. It also

110 Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 210-211. This contrast parallels the contrast in Luke 8 between the condition of the demoniac before and after his encounter with Jesus. Chapter 4, Section 7.2.

111 Ibid., 210.

112 Bishop describes meeting a fisher who had experienced a fruitless night’s fishing on the same lake in the 1900s in Bishop, “Jesus and the Lake,” 401. The lack of success using their own means and skill serves to highlight the contrast with the forthcoming catch. Wolter, Das Lukasevangelium, 212-213.


115 See on 5:8 (below) for a discussion of ἐπιστάτης (Master) and κύριος (Lord).
resonates with the initial steps he has taken as he moves from the shore and out on the lake in response to Jesus’ command.

Meanwhile, δι᾽ ὅλης νυκτὸς κοπιάσαντες οὐδὲν ἐλάβομεν is a realistic response to the situation, though the objection does not prevent Simon’s obedience to Jesus. Again, as the story develops and fishing becomes a metaphor for the mission of the disciples (5:10), the admission ἐπιστάτης takes on a metaphorical meaning. In light of v. 10 it accrues the additional nuance of “we have been unsuccessful at our mission,” or, “we have caught no fish alive,” which in turn suggests “we have made no disciples.” κοπιάω (toil) is found only here and in 12:27 in Luke’s Gospel. The later reference forms part of Jesus’ counsel not to worry about material provision. In that discourse Jesus again employs the language of metaphor. God’s care is demonstrated in providing for the ravens of the air and the lilies and the grass of the field (12:22-31). Here in Luke 5 the disciples will forsake their κοπιάω at the nets to trust in God’s provision for their material needs as they leave everything to follow Jesus.

Kenneth Bailey reads Peter’s answer—ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ ῥήματί σου χαλάσω τὰ δίκτυα (“yet because of your word I will let down the nets”)—as sarcasm. However, given that Simon has had a family member healed by Jesus (4:38-39), that Simon has been part of the crowd listening to the word of God delivered by Jesus (5:1-3), and his willingness and obedience in allowing Jesus to teach from his boat (5:3), this explanation does not sit well. Nevertheless, in light of the circumstances a certain level of frustration is a realistic response and might in part account for Peter’s answer. Despite his objections, Simon chooses to respond positively to Jesus’ command. As with Mary (1:33, 38), his initial incredulity gives way to obedience. The obedience to Jesus’ δήμα (word), as Peter puts it, reinforces the credibility of τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (“the word of God”) that Jesus teaches to the crowds (vv. 1-3). The range of meanings

116 On night as the suitable time for fishing with the nets and equipment used see Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 141; W. M. Christie, “Sea of Galilee,” DCG, 2:592; Bivin, “The Miraculous Catch,” 7-8.

117 Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 141-142.


covered by ῥῆμα (word) and by λόγος (word) are wide. The context here suggests λόγος (word) (5:1) means Jesus’ general message about the kingdom of God,\textsuperscript{120} with ῥῆμα (word) being the instruction from Jesus to Peter.\textsuperscript{121} The forthcoming catch of fish will show that despite the nuance of meaning between ῥῆμα and λόγος, Jesus’ word is authoritative. It also assures readers that Jesus’ word, when heard (ἀκούω, 5:1) and acted upon (5:6) brings superabundant results. This word gives a new (and solid) start to those who will hear and obey it (6:46-49). Simon’s reluctance to set out on the lake is the first barrier to discipleship in this story. This barrier is overcome by Jesus’ word.

7.3 Verse 6

With καὶ τῶι ποιήσαντες (“when they had done this”) Luke confirms that Simon and his companions have acted in accordance with Jesus’ instructions.\textsuperscript{122} The results of this obedience are superlative, with a catch so large that διερρήσσετο δὲ τὰ δίκτυα αὐτῶν (“their nets were beginning to break”). As professional fishers their nets would be adequately sized for any catch that they could reasonably expect to have taken. This catch obviously exceeded that. The contrast between the null catch during the night and this one further emphasises the size of the catch and its unprecedented and exceptional nature.\textsuperscript{123} There is irony here as “the very success of the catch invites catastrophe.”\textsuperscript{124}

\begin{footnotes}

\footnotetext[120]{“The Christian message, the Gospel.” “λόγος, οὗ, ὃ,” \textit{BDAG}, 598, Section 1aβ.}

\footnotetext[121]{A “command(ment), order, direction.” “ῥῆμα, ατος, τῶ,” \textit{BDAG}, 905. There is a sense in which one is general, or addressed to a larger group, and one is personal, addressed to an individual, but the “Logos-Rhema” distinction in popular theology is a redherring. The argument there is that logos and rhema represent God’s general word and then personal word (to contemporary readers) respectively. Logos is the “familiar Scriptures,” which may in turn become “a living word quickened to the heart.” Ian Traill, \textit{Fundamentalism at War—Contemporary Theology and Evangelical Belief} (Unknown), 17-19. Similarly Ray Puen, \textit{Is that in the Bible?: Fascinating Insights and Discoveries from the Book of Books} (Not stated: Xulon Press, 2010), 19-20. This ignores the fact that different biblical authors use these words in different ways in different contexts.}

\footnotetext[122]{The verbs, participles, and pronoun here (“ποιήσαντες,” “συνέκλεισαν,” “διερρήσσετο,” and “αὐτῶν”) are all plural, though “διερρήσσετο” here is a singular verb with a plural subject, “τὰ δίκτυα.”}

\footnotetext[123]{Wolter, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, 213.}

\footnotetext[124]{McKnight, “Reader-Response Criticism,” 211.}

\end{footnotes}
The inadequacy of the nets indicates the superabundance of the catch. What might it mean if the symbolic or metaphorical reading is pursued here? The story has been read, for example, as demonstrating the inadequacy of Judaism to contain the kingdom. Such allegorising of the story requires confident assertions about audience, purpose, and authorship. None of these factors can be argued with the requisite level of certainty.  

A more modest interpretation might suggest that the “almost breaking” nets show that the catching of people alive (v. 10) that the disciples will eventually undertake will be very successful, or that the disciples will struggle to contain what is entrusted to them. Or, closer to this story, that for Simon and his companions life as they have known and understood it is inadequate to contain all that this encounter with Jesus will mean for them. Catch (συγκλείω) appears only here in the Gospels. Elsewhere it means “to close up together, hem in, enclose.” It can be used in the literal sense (as in fishing) or figuratively, meaning to confine. Luke uses tear (διαρρήγνυμι) only here and in 8:29 where it describes the breaking of the demoniac’s bonds.

### 7.4 Verse 7

The plural verbs employed throughout v. 7 emphasise the corporate nature of the fishing venture and the cooperation required for success. The men must work together to bring in the extraordinary catch of fish. They will also need to work together when they move from catching fish to catching people (5:10). Johnson suggests this pooling of resources anticipates the pooling of possessions in Acts, however there is no reason this working together should

125 On the blurred line between allegory and metaphor and how they are used in this study see Introduction, Section 4.6.
127 Cf. 5:36-39.
128 “συγκλείω,” *BDAG*, 952.
129 Ibid.
130 “κατένευσαν,” “ἐλθόντας,” “ἦλθον,” and “ἔπλησαν.”
not extend beyond possessions to include all aspects of working to fulfil the commission. The need for co-operation also emphasises the size of the catch, and therefore the power of Jesus’ word, which results in a large “catch,” of fish and of people.  

Signalled (κατανεύω) is used only here in the NT. Bailey claims that in order to hide the location of the fish they had discovered the men signalled to one another rather than calling out. But κατανεύω does not necessarily exclude calling out. Though signalling is “usually by a nod,” it is hard to imagine the men merely nodding. It may suggest that besides the normal calling out they were leaping around waving in excitement, or that the wind had come up or was coming from the wrong direction and they would not have been heard by calling. Besides, if others could hear them calling, could they not equally have seen them signalling? Equally as plausible or realistic is the suggestion that the men signalled so as not to scare the fish. The double use of ἔρχομαι shows that the partners came to assist as requested, with the second (“ἦλθον”) serving as a summary for ἐλθόντας συλλαβέσθαι αὐτοῖς (“come and assist them”). συλλαμβάνω here refers to the bringing in of the huge catch of fish (v. 6).

The filling of both boats ὡστε βυθίζεσθαι αὐτά (“so that they almost sank”) demonstrates again the “almost disastrous” abundance of fish. Sink (βυθίζω) is used only here in the Gospels. Of ships it means “to sink,” but its only other use in the NT is figurative. This suggests a subtle metaphorical nuance to the near-sinking of the boat. That is, as with fishing for fish, fishing for people requires team work and the willingness to call for assistance and respond to calls for assistance. If these things are not forthcoming the venture may be swamped by the circumstances.

133 Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 142.
134 “κατανεύω,” BDAG, 522.
135 Wolter, Das Lukasevangelium, 213.
137 For example in 1 Tim 6:9, “αἵτινες βυθίζουσιν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους εἰς ἔλθρον καὶ ἀπώλειαν” (“that plunge people into ruin and destruction”).
There is a sound-play here between “βυθίζεσθαι” and “βάθος” in v. 4. As Jesus instructs the fishers to let down their nets into the “βάθος,” the catch now threatens to “βυθίζεσθαι” the boats, sending them down into the deep water. The almost-tearing of the nets and the filling of the boats are graphic evidence of the immensity of the catch. The picture painted here by Luke recalls the pressing of the crowds upon Jesus to hear the word of God in 5:1. Both describe the pressing of limits. This again tends to blend the fishing and preaching activities described, strengthening the metaphorical nuance of the story. In the first instance the result is Jesus’ movement into the boat and away from the shore. In the second, the men move back to the shore and out of the boats. Ironically, near disaster here is a result of obedience to Jesus’ word; it is only averted as the men work together. In this the partnership (μέτοχος) aspect of their relationship is enacted.

The emphasis on partnership here is relevant to the concept of communitas as it appears in the literature on liminality. The event can be read as an example of communitas. As the men work together the distinctions between them are broken down. This common experience becomes a shared experience, and communitas is the result. Luke works hard to maintain Simon as distinct in the account and to emphasise his leading role among the disciples by singling him out regularly. Yet in 5:10 it is almost as though the shared experience of the men being described here obliges Luke to name James and John. It is as though Luke himself senses communitas at play and must therefore name the other men.

Another important aspect of liminality is containment: “Deep structural change requires a reliable psychological ‘framing,’ the facilitation of a holding environment that can help individuals and groups tolerate the terrors of change, with its attendant painful truths and emotion.” The boat in this story can be seen to function as a physical container. The near swamping of the boat shows how this containment is pushed to the limit, implying a radical transformation is taking place in the disciples. Here in 5:7 the possibility is raised that the nets

138 Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 201.
139 Chapter 2, Section 5.
140 Moore, The Archetype of Initiation, 146-147.
themselves could be viewed as containers. Those caught alive are initially Simon and his companions, with Jesus preaching the word of God and then his attention to them being the “net.” As these men go on to take up the forthcoming commission they too will “catch” people. Those so caught must also endure the “terrors of change, with its attendant painful truths and emotion.” The “net” which contains them will be the word of God brought by the ministry of the disciples. The catch will be abundant, and so much so that the disciples will struggle to contain it, and will need to work together in partnership to do so. Thus the communitas created by the sharing of the catch on the lake will be perpetuated in the lives of those whom Jesus is about to commission.

8 Fishing for People: Luke 5:8-11

Luke now narrates the response to what has taken place out on the deep water. He begins with Simon’s reaction (v. 8) then casts the net wider to include the others present, who respond similarly. V. 9 describes the amazement of all present at the events that have taken place. Jesus commissions Simon, assuring him that he ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν (“will catch people alive”) (v. 10). James and John are mentioned by name and are thereby included in the commission in v. 10. Finally, the passage returns the men to the shore of the lake where, having completed their liminal journey out onto the deep water they leave everything to follow Jesus (v. 11).

8.1 Verse 8

Luke narrates Simon’s reaction to what has taken place in vv. 4-7: ἰδὼν δὲ Σίμων Πέτρος προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν Ἰησοῦ λέγων· ἔξελθε ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ, ὅτι ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι, κύριε (‘And seeing [what had happened], Simon Peter fell before the knees of Jesus saying, ‘Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, Lord.’’’) On the level of realistic narrative, Simon’s seeing (δράω) refers

141 Above quotation. Ibid.

142 The themes of capture and release are strong in the second lake story (8:26-39), which reinforces what is being proposed here.
here to the catch of fish. At the metaphorical level the text envisions a deeper and corresponding level of sight. Of Luke 4:18 τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν (where Luke quotes Isa 61:1), Hartsock points out that sight and blindness are part literal and part metaphoric. However, by Acts 28:23-31 (where Luke quotes Isa 6:9-10) sight and blindness have become entirely metaphorical. In support of this Hartsock observes that in 7:21 Luke reports that Jesus τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἐχαρίσατο βλέπειν (“had given sight to many who were blind”), while in 7:22 Jesus instructs John’s disciples to report that τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν (“the blind receive sight”). However, there have been no healings of blind people prior to 7:21. This has prompted some (Hartsock cites Nolland and Fitzmyer) to suggest Luke has added the phrase in 7:21 so that 7:22 makes sense. He comments, “By not specifically narrating the healing of a blind person to this point, this Gospel pushes us towards the metaphorical level of meaning that blindness carries.” That is, no healings of people who are literally blind have been narrated thus far. However, “eyes have indeed been opened metaphorically at every turn, and this is worth reporting to the Baptizer.” In line with Hartsock’s thesis, ὁράω is important to the two lake stories. It occurs (always in the aorist tense, here ἰδών) in 5:2, 8; 8:28, 34, 35, 36. Both a literal and metaphoric aspect to sight and seeing can be detected in all of these verses. The balance of this passage sees Simon come to a new level of (in)sight about himself, about Jesus, and about his future vocation. This is very important support for the metaphorical level of reading being proposed in this study.

Simon Peter’s dramatic reaction demonstrates the effect of his encounter with Jesus and his new-found sight. That reaction contrasts strongly with the response of the people of Nazareth (4:28-29), though both Peter and those with him want to separate themselves from him. Simon’s response raises a number of questions. What is it that Simon is reacting to and why

---

143 Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness*, esp. 167-205.
144 Ibid., 204.
147 Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness*, 181.
148 Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness*, 181.
What is the meaning of the self-designation ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός ("sinful man")? What is the content of κύριος, and what does the shift from ἐπιστάτης in v. 5 to κύριος here in 5:8 show?

8.1.1 What is Simon reacting to, and why “depart from me”?

Bailey frames his reading of this text with a discussion on wealth and Christian views on the relationship between the spiritual life and the material world. As mentioned above, he claims that the men signal to one another so as not to alert onlookers to the large catch Jesus has led them to in 5:7. Bailey contends that Simon is amazed (v. 9) because Jesus is willing to forgo the opportunity for wealth generation that his ability to locate such a vast supply of fish affords. Peter is thus confronted here with “a real choice between God and mammon,” and he falls at Jesus’ feet as one who puts service of God ahead of wealth. However, the argument from silence—that because the text does not say the men called out means that they did not—is always problematic. It is true that in v. 11 the disciples leave everything at the lake shore, but the thrust of the text suggests that this is a consequence of the encounter on the lake and what happens there. The emphasis is on Simon and his response to what Jesus has done, with his response being to fall before Jesus and acknowledge his sinfulness. To be sure, a catch this large was a career highlight for the men on the lake. To leave this, along with the boats in 5:11 is a huge step. This is made clear in Luke 18:28-29, where Simon refers to all the disciples have left behind and Jesus commends them for it. However, the text of 5:1-11 makes little of the God–Mammon theme that Bailey claims is present. Neither the echoes of prophetic commissioning narratives present here, the emphasis on the supra-normal size of the catch, titles of address, nor the metaphorical casting of this story suggest that this is a text primarily about wealth. Also, μὴ φοβοῦ ("do not be afraid") (v. 10) does not sit naturally with Bailey’s reading. Simon Peter’s desire for distance and implied fear are tied to his self-designation as an ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός ("sinful man") (5:10), which comes closer to the heart of the question.

---

149 Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 142-145.

150 Chapter 3, Section 7.4.

151 This dimension of the story parallels the loss of the pigs in Luke 8. In both lake stories the economic dimension is present but in the background.
8.1.2 Excursus: the “sinner” in Luke

In a recent full-length treatment of this topic Dwayne Adams summarises the history of the interpretation of “sinner” in Luke.152 Early interpreters (2nd–16th century) understood sinners to be the notoriously wicked.153 With the extensive investigation of Jewish sources in the 17th–19th century sinners came to be understood as the common people who failed to keep Rabbinic ceremonial laws.154 Modern interpretations can be catalogued as follows:

(1) “Sinner” is used by the Pharisees to describe those who do not conform to Pharisaic ritual requirements. This is the view associated with Jeremias. The Pharisees saw the common people, the “people of the land,” as sinners. On this interpretation, from Jesus’ point of view these are “the poor/little ones,” etc. who are open and receptive to Jesus’ message.155

(2) “Sinner” is used by the general population to describe immoral persons or those engaged in doubtful professions such as toll collecting. This is the view associated with Ed P. Sanders. The “sinner” is “a person who sins wilfully and heinously and who did not repent.”156 Sanders claimed Jesus welcomed such people with no requirement


154 Adams, The Sinner in Luke, 5. Note also Derrett’s view, that Simon was guilty of “fishers’ superstition” in Derrett, “Jesus’s Fishermen,” 123. Also Wilkins’ view, that sinners are those opposed to God’s will. Michael J. Wilkins, “Sinner,” DJG, 1st ed., 759.

155 Adams, The Sinner in Luke, 11. Adams notes E. Earle Ellis, Craig A. Evans, and (with slight modification) James D.G. Dunn as others who hold this view. See Adams, The Sinner in Luke, x-xi. This position has been critiqued on the basis that it characterises Judaism as a theology of merit and that the idea of the people of the land as sinners comes from the later (post NT) rabbinic writings. Michael F. Bird, “Sin, Sinner,” DJG, 2nd ed., 864. Bird argues that “sin” and “sinner” were used within Judaism by various groups as part of the process of self-definition, while in the Greek and Roman periods the terms were used of persons who violated social norms, so that it was used not just of the especially wicked or corrupt. However, those who lay outside the group (for example, Gentiles) were seen as “intrinsically wicked.”

156 Ed P. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 177.
that they repent, as required by Hebrew Scriptures and rabbinic instruction. That is, they did not “make restitution, sacrifice, and turn to obedience to the law.”\textsuperscript{157} Sanders claimed that when these “sinners” are placed alongside “toll collectors” (seen as Roman collaborators) the meaning is basically “traitors.”\textsuperscript{158} Adams counts Jeremias here, though he is usually read as under the first view. Adams states that Jeremias argues both for sinners as the truly wicked or as those engaged in despised trades, as well arguing for “sinners” as a Pharisaic designation for the common people.\textsuperscript{159} Walter Liefeld fits here too, noting that “sinner” in Luke is not used “pejoratively but compassionately” of those “isolated from Jewish religious circles because of their open sin, their unacceptable occupation or lifestyle, or their paganism.”\textsuperscript{160} They are shown by Luke as recipients of God’s grace through Jesus.

(3) “Sinner” is a generally used term describing Jews with Gentile associations and so designates those despised on political or ethnic (rather than on moral) grounds. This is the view associated with Nicholas Perrin.\textsuperscript{161}

(4) “Sinner” is a construct with no historical referent, created by Luke, to designate the “good guys” over against the Pharisees, the “bad guys.” For David Neale, both the Pharisees and the sinners in Luke are literary constructs that drive Luke’s plot: “The ‘Pharisees’ are caricatured as the official Judaism that opposed the ministry of Jesus and the ‘sinners’ are the archetypal evildoers that become the beneficiaries of his call. Such religious ‘categories’ are the essential building blocks of the Gospel story.”\textsuperscript{162}

\textsuperscript{157} Ibid., 207-08.


\textsuperscript{160} Adams, \textit{The Sinner in Luke}, xi-xiii.


\textsuperscript{162} Neale, \textit{None but the Sinners}, 97.
“Sinners” are “the poor,” being those outcast from society but receptive to Jesus’ preaching. This is Walter Pilgrim’s view.\textsuperscript{163}

The phrase ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός in 5:8 is the first Lukan use of “sin,” here employing the adjectival form (ἁμαρτωλός). Whilst taking cognisance of the various views above, our reading of “sinner” needs be guided first of all by the Lukan context. Green draws attention to the interpretive challenges. Commenting on the various readings of “sinner” available, he notes there are “too many possibilities and too few bases, in this co-text, for determining which is a probable reading.”\textsuperscript{164} Adams concedes the point, admitting that “Luke leaves room for the development of the ‘sinner’ concept later in his narrative.”\textsuperscript{165} For Adams, Luke’s focus is on Simon Peter as representative of “the kind of person Jesus is targeting for ministry.” That is, the episode shows Simon’s humility and that he is a person of “low social position.”\textsuperscript{166} Furthermore, the idea of Simon as representative could also be misleading. One must decide which aspects of Simon’s person it is that are “typical.” Is it his social position, gender, marital status, race, or something else? Typicality, however it is defined, is diluted by the fact that Luke shows Jesus as engaging with people from all walks of life and that Simon’s subsequent career in Luke-Acts is anything but typical.

The “sinner” in Luke is an unfolding theme. Nevertheless, there is a rich immediate and surrounding context for ἁμαρτωλός here, as Adams observes. The Lukan motifs of salvation and forgiveness are already at work prior to 5:1-11, particularly in the prologue.\textsuperscript{167} John the Baptist has already called the people to forgiveness (3:1-18) and ἄφεσις is a major theme in the Nazareth sermon. Adams emphasises ἄφεσις as forgiveness of sins. Though he does acknowledge the jubilee theme in 4:18-19 he does not emphasise ἄφεσις as release from debt.\textsuperscript{168}

\textsuperscript{163} Pilgrim, Good News to the Poor; Green, Luke, 247, 233-234, 570.

\textsuperscript{164} Ibid., 234.


\textsuperscript{166} Ibid., 114.

\textsuperscript{167} Luke 1:31-33; 46-55; 67-79; 2:11-14; 29-32; 38.

Had he done so his conclusions on “sinners” might have been different. Furthermore, Luke has redacted the material in 5:1-32 so that the release of sinful people is prominent.


Although καθαρίζω does not always imply sinfulness, 5:1-11 and 5:12-16 introduce the concept similarly. Like Simon, the leper falls before Jesus with a request. Simon’s issue is presented as his sinfulness (5:8) while the leper’s is uncleanness (5:12). Jesus addresses these respective issues, so that Simon is commissioned to follow Jesus (5:10), and the leper to go and verify his cleansing to the priest (5:14). The account of the cleansing of the leper is sandwiched between 5:1-11, the first lake story, and 5:17-26, the healing of the paralytic. The emphasis on sins and forgiveness in the story of the paralytic, and Simon’s sinfulness expressed in 5:1-11, suggest the sinfulness Simon expresses (5:8) is also implied in the leper’s request for cleansing. Then in 5:27-28 Levi is called. Levi is a tax collector (5:27). At Levi’s banquet in 5:29-32 tax collectors and others gather (5:29), and Jesus’ mission to call such people to repentance is articulated (5:32). This means that, though ἁμαρτωλός at this early stage of the narrative defies precise definition its appearance here should not take the reader completely by surprise either. Moving to the immediate context (5:1-11), Simon’s admission of sinfulness is accompanied by his falling before Jesus, asking Jesus to depart from him, and Jesus’ reassurance μὴ φοβοῦ (5:10).

What might be usefully inferred from this list of relevant contextual cues? That salvation and forgiveness are linked to political and national hopes, as Luke’s prologue (Luke 1-2) can be read to suggest? That to escape the coming wrath the necessities of life must be redistributed, as in John’s exhortations to the crowds about sharing food and clothing suggests (3:1-18)? That the vision of Isaiah, the jubilee, whether a “literal” or “spiritual” interpretation be adopted, is to bring release (ἀφέσις) from poverty, captivity, blindness, and oppression (as in the Nazareth sermon) (4:18-19)? That to be sinful is to be sick, as the cleansing of the leper in 5:12-16 and the healing of the paralytic in 5:17-26 might demonstrate, or a collaborator with the Romans (like Levi, the toll collector) (5:27-28)? Or that sinfulness is fear (5:9)? As these

options illustrate, if we are looking for guidance on what it means for Simon to admit to being an ἄνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός, even the narrative context thus far in Luke can be read as pointing in a number of different directions.

To turn to the last (and the most immediate) of these leads, what does Simon’s response express? The commentators are vague on this. Many (e.g. Johnson, Green, and Fitzmyer) invoke the calling of the prophet Isaiah as OT background to the incident, particularly Isa 6:5. It is common to state that Simon reacts to finding himself in the presence of the divine. Fitzmyer, for example, says that Simon perceives Jesus as being from a realm or sphere to which he himself does not belong. Tannehill sees Simon reacting in humility to the presence of one who “wields divine power.” Implied in this is that Simon perceives his own inadequacy or an ontological distance between himself and Jesus—or between himself and the power of God that the Lukan Jesus represents. Even if it is too early in the narrative for Simon to fully grasp the nature of the one before whom he finds himself, it is highly likely Luke’s readers would perceive the ontological distance between the two men.

Does Simon’s response actually go beyond the acknowledgement of distance and constitute a confession? Is Simon admitting he is guilty of participating in a despised trade? Is it “fisherman’s superstition” that prompts his confession? Is he admitting to having failed in his duty to observe Pharisaic or some other law or set of expectations? If any of these were the case then it would appear to be prompted by a realisation of this “ontological distance.” If this is a confession of moral failure of some sort then we would expect Jesus to respond with a declaration of forgiveness. Is μὴ φοβοῦ such a declaration? Adams and Tannehill believe so. Neale addresses 5:7 only briefly, acknowledging that “no direct mention of forgiveness” is made but describing this as an “initial allusion” to forgiveness of the “sinner.” However,

171 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:204.
172 Derrett, “Jesus’s Fishermen,” 123.
174 Neale, None but the Sinners, 146. Neale treats 5:7 very briefly here (ibid., 109) as he is working with the noun “sinners.” He stresses the inclusio formed by 5:32 and 19:10 (ibid., 100-101). His particular interest is in the literary dynamics at work between the Pharisees and their associates, and the toll collectors and
it strains credibility to say that μὴ φοβοῦ is equivalent to ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου (“your sins are forgiven”) especially given Luke’s willingness to state the matter directly elsewhere (5:20; 7:48). Again, the wider focus here is on Jesus’ commissioning of Simon and on Simon’s response to this commissioning. If a confession and absolution dynamic is present here, then it is secondary. Neale’s “initial allusion” to forgiveness is probably as far as one can go without outrunning the text at this place in the narrative. 175 Simon’s reaction expresses humility or a submissiveness that is consistent with liminality and the deep personal transformation that can occur in liminal places or phases. 176 As Moore puts it, “If you cannot submit, you cannot die, and if you cannot die, you cannot be reborn.” 177

The point of this episode is that, following the events on the lake, Simon responds positively to Jesus’ commission. This response accords with the general pattern in Luke where those who respond positively to Jesus’ message include “sinners.” 178 Luke’s casting of Jesus as a prophet means that Jesus is the one who brings the word and mediates the presence of God. 179 He is one who “crosses boundaries to bring good news to the unworthy.” 180

Reflecting on the range of understandings of ἁμαρτωλός that have been proposed, Green states that as the Gospel of Luke unfolds, “sinners” are shown to be “people who recognise themselves as persons in need of divine redemption or who are ostracised by others and so in need of God’s gracious intervention.” 181 Wilkins claims that sinners are “those opposed to God’s will.” 182 These are often Israel’s leaders (as in 24:7). He notes that narrower definitions

---

175 The tension between an initial sequential reading, and rereading, needs to be kept in mind here. Introduction, Section 4.1.

176 Moore, The Archetype of Initiation, 46-47.

177 Ibid., 47.


180 Green, Luke, 234. Green’s comment is accurate but begs the question of what it is that makes Simon consider himself unworthy.

181 Ibid.


190
of “sinner” are taken from the occurrence of the sinner vocabulary in factional contexts, whereas 5:8 and 13:1-2 are examples of “sinner” in non-factional contexts. They thus invite a broader definition. At this stage in the narrative (5:1-11) neither Green’s nor Wilkins’ definitions could be ruled out as descriptions of Simon, but such is the nature of broader definitions. Simon’s reaction here is compatible with OT theophany or angelophany traditions, where persons respond to the presence of the divine or to one who represents the divine presence. Some read that Simon’s agreement to obey Jesus is grudging and reluctant. His response comes from his realisation that he has behaved as such in the face of the “abounding grace of God.” On the contrary, the narrative to this point predisposes Simon to obey Jesus. It is Simon’s experience as a professional fisher that hinders his obedience.


183 Ibid., 759-60.

184 There are ample LXX references to falling before, or falling before the knees of, or before the feet of another or of God in homage or worship: Gen 17:3; Num 16:22; 17:10; 20:6; 22:31; 25:2; Josh 5:14; 7:6; 1 Sam 25:23-24; 2 Sam 1:2; 14:4, 22; 1 Kgs 18:39; 2 Kgs 1:13; 4:37; 1 Chr 21:16; 29:20; 2 Chr 20:18; 29:29; Ezra 9:5; Job 1:20; Ezek 1:28; 3:23; 9:8; 43:3; 44:4; Dan 2:46; 3:7; 8:17. See also Luke 22:41; Acts 7:60; 9:40; 20:36; 21:5.

185 Albert J. Matthews, “‘Depart from Me; for I am a Sinful Man, O Lord’ (Luke v. 8),” ExpTim 30 (1918-1919), 425.


187 Neale, None but the Sinners, 190.
8.1.3 ἐπιστάτης and κύριος in Luke 5:1-11

In his discussion of Simon Peter in Luke-Acts, Cadbury highlights how Luke uses different names and different forms of names to great effect. The titles Luke uses of Jesus in this episode are similarly important. The titles ἐπιστάτης (v. 5) and κύριος (v. 8) frame the story of the catch of fish on the lake, whilst the shift from ἐπιστάτης to κύριος reflects something of Simon’s perception of Jesus’ person through the events of the story.

Rainer Riesner describes ἐπιστάτης as a “more general term for a supervisory or official person.” But this general definition does not do justice to the specific Lukan usage. With the exception of 17:13, ἐπιστάτης always appears on the lips of the disciples. It is used in the context of confusion, uncertainty, fear, misunderstanding, or befuddlement. It appears twice in 8:24 the disciples are in the boat and are terrified; in 8:45 Peter explains to Jesus that the crowd is pressing on him, misunderstanding Jesus’ question and its significance; in 9:33 (on the Mount of Transfiguration) Luke tells us directly that Peter did not know what he was saying; in 9:49-50 Luke has John reporting trying to stop someone else casting out demons in the Lord’s name, prompting Jesus to correct him. These all suggest that when Luke places ἐπιστάτης on the lips of Simon in 5:5 it is doing more than acknowledging Jesus as someone of superior office. It reflects, rather, Simon’s lack of clarity or confusion about Jesus’ identity.

Commentators find the use of κύριος here in 5:8 ambiguous. Witherington notes that, in contrast to Mark and Matthew, Luke “shows no reticence in using ὁ κύριος of Jesus and thereby implying the transcendent religious sense of the term.” On the basis of Acts 2:36, 192


189 Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 143.

190 Rainer Riesner, “Teacher,” DJG, 1st ed., 807. BDAG notes it simply as “a title addressed to Jesus, nearly always by the disciples,” “ἐπιστάτης, ὁ, ὁ,” BDAG, 381.

191 Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 84-85.


Fitzmyer identifies “Lord” as “the New Testament title par excellence for the risen Christ.”

He notes that Luke retrojects the title into the earthly ministry of Jesus and in so doing “surrounds the character of Jesus with an aura more characteristic of the third [resurrected] phase of his existence.” He refers here to the absolute use of the title. He is less clear on how it should be translated when Jesus is addressed with the vocative. That is, should this be translated “‘sir’ (in a secular sense) or ‘Lord’ (in a religious sense)”?

The context here includes elements of commission, miracle story, and theophany/epiphany, and so suggests the religious sense of κύριος. Luke’s more frequent use of ὁ κύριος and of “κύριε” (“Lord,” voc.) has the effect of elevating Jesus to a “more than human level.”

Fitzmyer takes the location of “Lord,” being in the “unemphatic final position,” to indicate that here it is a term of “polite address.”

Bock is also hesitant about attributing too much christological weight to “Lord” early in Luke. But given the theophanic context (that is, the superabundant catch on the lake, Simon’s response, and Jesus’ reassurance and commission in 5:6-10) Green’s conclusion, that Simon does not recognise Jesus “is God,” but that “Lord” is more than “polite address,” seems prudent.

---

195 Ibid., 1:203.
196 Ibid. Witherington and Yamazaki-Ransom think that as Luke is a Gentile writing to a Gentile audience he feels free to employ the absolute form of the noun (e.g. Luke 7:13; 10:1). The term implies the “transcendent religious sense of the term,” but it is not anachronistic as Luke does not place it on the lips of Jesus’ interlocutors in a way uncharacteristic of Jesus’ ministry. (They note that 1:43; 2:11 and perhaps 1:38 as possible exceptions.) Luke’s free use of κύριος (Lord) suggests that “in being, if not yet fully in action or recognition, Jesus is already the kyrios.” Ben Witherington III and Kazuhiko Yamazaki-Ransom, “Lord,” *DJG*, 2nd ed., 531. This argument still stands even if a general mix audience for Luke’s Gospel is proposed.
197 “κύριος, ία, ὅν,” *BDAG*, 576.
198 Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:567. Fitzmyer believes “Lord” is more appropriate to a post-resurrection scene, arguing that the Lukan account and John 21:1-11 are both derived from the same post-resurrection material, material that came to Luke as “L” which Luke has then fashioned, along with Mark 1:16-20, into the received text. Ibid., 1:560-561.
Gregory Dawsey notes that “Lord” is used frequently in Luke with reference to Jesus. It is also the title Luke prefers for the narrator’s voice when referring to Jesus, appearing thus fifteen times in Luke. The title is used a further thirteen times in direct speech by the disciples, with 5:8 being the first instance. “Lord” is also used by other characters in the narrative who do not accompany Jesus. For example, Elizabeth (1:43) and Zechariah (1:76) both call Jesus “Lord.” Both are said to be full of the Holy Spirit when speaking. The angel in 2:11 and the Isaiah quotation in 3:4 link “Lord” with divine speech. Luke 20:42-44 also links “Lord” with divine speech. In summing up, Dawsey states that those within the narrative who address Jesus as “Lord” are invariably humble in their attitudes and show a willingness to be dependent on him. That humility is particularly expressed here by Simon. Dawsey concludes that “Lord” is the title used by the “believing community.” These observations require the reader to imbue Simon’s address in 5:8 with more insight and a greater acknowledgement of Jesus’ authority and power than Green’s comment (above) might suggest is appropriate, though given this is the first such use of the vocative (“κύριε”) Green’s reluctance to over-interpret the address understandable. It seems, therefore, that Green has understated the case but Dawsey has overstated it.

Though a self-identified sinner, Simon will go on to follow Jesus in catching people alive (5:10). This is a ministry to sinners (7:34). Jesus’ word (5:1, 4), along with the effect of his deeds on the lake (5:6), release Simon to obey Jesus. Despite his own fruitless night’s fishing, Simon puts out from the shore and moves out onto the deep water. This action will lead to his leaving everything to follow Jesus in catching people (5:10-11). Without employing the


203 He lists Luke 5:8; 9:54, 59, 61; 10:17; 11:1; 12:41; 17:37; 19:34; 22:33, 38, 49; 24:34. Dawsey, “What’s in a Name,” 145-146. Luke 9:59 could be dropped from this list because of its doubtful textual status, along with 9:61 as it is a would-be follower. Luke 17:5 could be added, as the apostles are also called disciples (6:13).

204 Ibid., 145.

205 Ibid., 146.

206 Ibid. For a much more detailed survey see Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, passim.
vocabulary of ἀφέσις, Luke has demonstrated ἀφέσις at work and thus validates Jesus’ jubilee ministry (4:18-19) among his own disciples.207 George Rice proposes that Simon’s “moral crisis” is the centre of interest in this passage, with 4:31-6:11 consisting of thematically arranged material that interprets the Isaiah quotations in 4:18-19. This material develops the motif of freedom from Satan’s power (4:31-44), the power of sin (5:1-32), and cultic traditions (5:33-6:11).208 This is a helpful perspective, but the importance of Peter’s response should not be underestimated. The climax of the passage is the leaving and following in v. 11. The move from ἐπιστάτης to κύριος throughout this passage is consistent with the general movement within the passage from the shore to the deep water, and from fishing for fish to leaving everything to follow Jesus. In fact, κύριος here, “is indisputably far more than ‘sir.’”209

Taken together these observations mesh with the echoes of OT/LXX commissioning stories found here. The passage vibrates in sympathy with the sense of unworthiness or sinfulness experienced by the one commissioned in Isa 6:5 and other commissioning texts.210 Simon expresses just such a reaction, with the type-scenes invoked implying he recognises in Jesus the “agency of God,”211 and his falling to the ground in humility adequately expressing this recognition.212 The reaction of the men is one of θάμβος (amazement) (v. 9) and φοβέω (v. 10). This is coherent with the general shape of the narrative. Simon, along with his companions, is first amazed at the catch of fish and then fearful in the presence of Jesus to whom he attributes the catch. His request that Jesus depart from him expresses his sense of inadequacy in the presence of one through whom he has experienced the presence of God. As Rowe observes, Simon’s fearful reaction is not adequately explained by the use of “κύριε” as “polite address.”213 “The meaning ‘sir’ simply does not add up to Simon’s fear or to Jesus’

209 Row, Early Narrative Christology, 204.
210 Above, Section 4.
213 Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 88.
reassurance.” Simon then becomes the prototype of all who find faith because they recognise Jesus as Lord and acknowledge their own inadequacy or sinfulness.

8.1.4 Barriers

Fishing in this story becomes a metaphor for discipleship. Simon’s request that Jesus depart from him in v. 8 echoes his reluctance to go fishing in v. 5. His reluctance to go back out on the lake is a barrier to the task of fishing. His request that Jesus depart from him is a barrier to discipleship. The first barrier, reluctance to fish, is overcome when Simon responds to Jesus’ instruction to ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος (“put out into the deep water”). The second barrier is Simon’s desire to be separated from Jesus. This second barrier, his reluctance to set out upon the metaphorical λίμνη of discipleship, is overcome when Simon responds positively to Jesus’ reassurance μὴ φοβοῦ (“do not be afraid”) and the commission that follows. This two-fold reluctance is overcome by Simon’s respect for Jesus’ word in the first case, and by his positive response to Jesus’ reassurance and his commission in the second. The two instructions given by Jesus are the only reported direct speech by Jesus in this episode. Through these instructions the two barriers are overcome so that the task of fishing can be achieved.

8.2 Verse 9

Luke narrates here exactly why Simon has reacted as he has. Simon and those with him are θάμβος . . . ἐπὶ τῇ ἄγρᾳ τῶν ἰχθύων ὧν συνέλαβον (“amazed . . . at the catch of fish they have taken”). At Jesus’ direction the men have gone fishing at the wrong time of day but they have landed a catch that exceeds the capacity of the nets (v. 6), boats, and crew (v. 7). This catch is obviously much bigger than anything they realistically could have expected, despite the fact that this is a professional and organised group of fishers. The catch transforms Simon. As a result he will abandon his nets and boats, and indeed everything, to follow Jesus (5:11). This catch is attributed to Jesus and to Simon’s obedience to Jesus’ instructions. θάμβος here is to be

214 Ibid.
215 Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 209.
216 Ibid., 209.
read as “religious awe.” The situation is analogous to 4:36 where amazement (θάμβος) comes ἐπὶ πάντας (“upon all”) those who witness Jesus deliver the man with the unclean spirit, and Acts 3:10 where the people are ἐπλήσθησαν θάμβους (“full of amazement”) at the sight of the man who used to beg at the gate of the Temple but has now been healed by Peter. The general tenor of Simon’s reaction is consistent with these examples of religious awe, as well as the fact that in v. 10 Simon is exhorted not to be afraid. The strong echoes throughout 5:1-11 of OT/LXX commissioning accounts add further weight to this reading. περιέχω (seize) occurs only here in Luke. When used of emotions it means “to come upon, befall, or seize.” It is a strong word depicting powerful emotions. It serves to further emphasise the tremendous effect of this episode on the life of Simon and of his companions.

Luke is unclear as to who exactly τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ (“those with him”) are. Are these unnamed companions those in the boat with Simon, or James and John, or all of these? The thrust of the verse is on the strength of the reaction to what has occurred. Verse 10 states clearly that James and John were likewise (ὁμοίως) affected. This slightly awkward construction appears to be the result of Luke’s desire to name James and John at this stage of the narrative, rather than any particular subtlety of distinction or difference of experience between the various parties named. Luke thus legitimates or balances for his readers the place, status, and roles of James and John in relation to Simon by naming the others with reference to him.

---


218 “περιέχω,” *BDAG*, 800.

219 Fuller’s view, that the “‘nature miracles’” in the NT did not form part of Jesus’ public ministry, may not be strictly correct as the presence of others is implied in the boats. Reginald H. Fuller, *Interpreting the Miracles* (London: SCM, 1963), 37.

220 They, like Simon are περιέχω (seized) with amazement” (5:9).


222 Wolter, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 214. This does not negate the earlier noted communitas between Simon, James, and John.
Marshall observes that Luke does not state that James and John are in the other boat. It is therefore possible they are to be imagined as being on the shore.\(^\text{223}\) This does not sit well with the instruction to ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος (“put out into the deep water”), which suggests that they are off-shore.\(^\text{224}\) Furthermore, v. 7, where those in Simon’s boat signal to the partners in the other boat, implies they have all been working together at the task of landing the fish.

### 8.3 Verse 10

James and John have already been described as partners (μέτοχοι) with Simon (5:7). Since Simon (next to Jesus) has been the main focus of the story, James and John are described with reference to him. Co-workers (κοινωνός) is used only here in Luke. K. Hanson translates κοινωνός as “cooperative members,” based on the fishing “κοινωνοί” (small-scale collectives or co-operatives) that formed in order to bid for fishing contracts or leases.\(^\text{225}\) The partners in these ventures were called “μέτοχοι”\(^\text{226}\) though both μέτοχοι and κοινωνός were used of the members of trade associations.\(^\text{227}\) The economic status of those involved in such ventures is debated. Wuellner labels boat owners as “middle class.”\(^\text{228}\) Hanson claims that the fishers, whether day labourers or boat owners, should all broadly be called “peasants.” He notes the influence of Jeremias, who (like Wuellner) was apt to label anyone above a beggar as middle class.\(^\text{229}\) Hanson’s critique is consistent with Steven Friesen’s analysis of wealth distribution during the era of the early Christian movement and is helpfully tabulated by Downs.\(^\text{230}\)

---

224 Though as Wuellner notes, the lake drops down sharply from the shore in most places on the Galilean side of the lake. Wuellner, Fishers of Men, 39.
228 Wuellner, Fishers of Men, 24, 45, 63.
229 Hanson, “Galilean Fishing Economy,” 105.
Despite any economic advantage that went with the ownership of boats, the fishers are still to be counted among the peasantry.

This working partnership the men had in the fishing business anticipates the closely associated roles they will have in Luke-Acts. It also hints at the deeper κοινωνία Luke will describe as characteristic of the early Church community.\(^\text{231}\) In v. 7 Luke used μέτοχος to describe the relationship between Simon and his companions. The shift from μέτοχος to κοινωνός, signals a shift in the relationship.\(^\text{232}\) It reflects the new task to which the men have been commissioned and the newly forming community Jesus is in the process of gathering. Where μέτοχος may have reflected accurately the relationship of persons working together, κοινωνός and its related word group has nuances that Luke will develop in his second volume.\(^\text{233}\) This shift parallels the shift from ἐπιστάτης to κύριος in this passage. It marks an intensification of relationship between Simon and his companions, just as the relationship between Simon and Jesus intensifies as a result of the encounter with Jesus and the catch of fish on the lake.\(^\text{234}\)

Having drawn James and John and the others with them into the frame of action, Luke describes the commissioning. This is apparently directed at Simon but others are in the background and are included by implication.\(^\text{235}\) The verbs here are singular. (A similar thing can be observed with the audience for the Sermon on the Plain, where a great crowd of disciples along with multitudes of people are gathered in 6:17, but Jesus turns and addresses


\(^{233}\) Acts 2:42 (κοινωνία); 4:32 (κοινός).

\(^{234}\) See the discussion on 5:8 above.

\(^{235}\) “Ἰάκωβον καὶ Ἰωάννην” (“James and John”) are named here with Simon.
his disciples in 6:20.)\textsuperscript{236} The framing of v. 10b implies that it is not just Simon who is being addressed here.\textsuperscript{237} The view that this story is a conflation of two traditions, one focusing on Simon and the other on Simon, Andrew, James, and John (Mark 1:16-20 and John 21:1-14) has been invoked as an explanation for the mix of singular and plural verbs throughout the passage.\textsuperscript{238} Whether this is correct or not, Luke is to be credited with the final form of the text and the focus on Simon that results from the text as we have it. The movement between singular and plural verbs expresses and shapes the dynamic between Simon and the group.\textsuperscript{239}

The commissioning begins with the reassurance μὴ φοβοῦ. While some form of reassurance is typical of OT/LXX commission narratives,\textsuperscript{240} it is also a reaction we have already met in Luke. It recalls the reaction of Zechariah to the message from the angel of the Lord (1:13, μὴ φοβοῦ), the message of the angel Gabriel to Mary (1:30, μὴ φοβοῦ), and the reassurance of the angel of the Lord to the shepherds (2:10, μὴ φοβεῖσθε). In all three instances the fear is in response to an angelic visitation. That visitation is to announce to the recipient a new thing that God is doing and is calling them to participate in, while the fear associated with this forms a barrier to the co-operation of the human agent with the divine plan. Here in 5:10 it is the same. Simon’s fear is a potential barrier to his enacting the commission to catch people alive. He is reassured, not by an angel, but by Jesus (5:10).\textsuperscript{241} Fitzmyer perceives fear to be out of place here, being more appropriate to an epiphany scene. However, this story contains elements of epiphany. The catch of fish and Simon’s response to the catch make it clear that something of Jesus as bearer of God’s message or presence has been revealed to Simon.\textsuperscript{242}

\textsuperscript{236} See also 20:45.

\textsuperscript{237} Green, \textit{Luke}, 234. Against Fitzmyer, who believes that this commission is not addressed to all Christians but is rather “a Petrine function.” Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke}, 1:568-569.


This revelation invokes a mix of reactions described succinctly by Luke as amazement and then fear. In his seeing (“ἰδὼν”) (v. 8), Simon exercises more-than-literal sight. Through the catch of fish he has glimpsed something about Jesus’ identity or person.

Following the reassurance is the commission: ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπου ζωγρῶν (“from now on you will catch people alive”). With this apparently simple sentence Luke transforms the whole episode on the lake into a metaphor for discipleship. At the same time he deftly defines the core of discipleship. As Simon and his companions have fished for fish, so now they will “catch” people alive. The verse thus looks backwards, giving additional significance to the episode and transforming it into one about catching people. It also looks toward the task that lies ahead of the disciples. Assuming a (general) Christian audience for the Gospel, Luke’s readers themselves are proof of Simon’s success in preaching the word.

The metaphorical use of fishing is well attested in the OT/LXX, but ζωγρέω has caused discomfort to some interpreters, as the fate of fish caught in nets is not a happy one. Smith, for example, objects to the unfortunate connotations of this metaphor for missionary activity. But the sense is positive, so that ζωγρέω should be read in the positive sense of catching or bringing in alive. In this the disciples become Jesus’ agents, those who will

243 An injunctive assertion, to be taken as an imperative. Geninasca, “To Fish/to Preach,” 215. Gonzalez calls this a “declaration.” Justo L. Gonzalez, Luke, BTCB (Louisville: John Knox, 2010), 75. On whether this commission amounts to a declaration of forgiveness see the discussion in Chapter 3, Section 8.1.3.

244 Based on OT and Qumran references in which the fishing metaphor represents judgement, Smith reads Mark 1:17 (“fishing for people”) as a commission to gather people for judgement. Charles W. F. Smith, “Fishers of Men: Footnotes on a Gospel Figure,” HTR 52, no. 3 (1959), 187-203. He believes this represents an earlier stratum in Mark to which was added a later stratum that saw the men as Apostles. The reworking of the passage by Luke (“catch people alive” etc.) represents the conversion of the original eschatological call to one that better fits the post-Pentecost Church. Whether or not the tradition history as he outlines it is accurate, Smith perceives correctly that the judgement theme is absent from the Lukan version of the account.

245 McKnight, “Reader-Response Criticism,” 212.

246 Fitzmyer refers to Jer 16:16; Am 4:2; Hab 1:14-15. Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:568. But note that Am 4:2 (LXX) has λήμψονται ύμᾶς ἐν ὕπαλοις καὶ τῶς μεθ’ ύμων εἰς λάβησις ὑποκαιομένους ἐμβαλοῦσιν ἔμπυροι λοιμοί (“they shall take you with weapons, and fiery pests shall cast those with you into caldrons heated from underneath”) (NETS). To these Green adds Mark 1:17 and 1QH 5:7-8 (Green, Luke, 234).


carry out his will. The call to be those who ἀνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν (“will catch people alive”) reassures the men that the skills they have learned in life and at their trade are still of use and will be built upon. As the same time, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (“from now on”) marks this as a defining moment as they embark on what will be a life-long calling or task.

8.4 Verse 11

The commission in v. 10 has been addressed to Simon. Here in v. 11 the participles and verbs used are all plural: καὶ καταγαγόντες τὰ πλοῖα ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ (“they pulled the boats up to the shore and left everything to follow him”). Who “they” are is unspecified but it can be assumed that James and John at least are included (6:14). This further demonstrates that the commission, though addressed to Simon, is also intended for others. Simon has already begun to take on the role of representative for the inner group of disciples Jesus has begun to gather around himself.

The pulling up of the boats onto the shore marks the completion of the lake journey. When Luke states that the men ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ he is introducing themes he will develop as hallmarks of discipleship in his Gospel. Most obviously, the disciples leave behind their boats and their catch. Having featured in this story the boats have accumulated substantial symbolic weight. This makes the leaving of the boats particularly poignant.

---

250 Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 144.
251 Acts 2:41 has been called Peter’s first “fishing expedition.” Clark, Parallel Lives, 126.
252 κατάγω (bring down) occurs only here in Luke. Of its seven occurrences in Acts only the last two (27:3; 28:12) refer to boats. ἀφίημι here is to leave or abandon (a thing). “ἀφίημι,” BDAG, 156.
254 On discipleship and wealth see Introduction, Section 5.2.
255 Boats are mentioned in vv. 2, 3 (twice), 7 (twice), and 11.
Despite overstating his case somewhat, Bailey is correct in noting the economic dimension to this incident. Nevertheless, his insistence that the men would first have taken the catch home before leaving and following Jesus is difficult to reconcile with the force of the narrative, which implies an immediate and radical response to what has taken place on the lake. It must be admitted, however, that the tension in the story of the calling of Levi—where Levi also leaves everything to follow Jesus but then hosts a large party in his home (5:28-29)—allows for the possibility of a reading such as Bailey proposes.  

Leaving (ἀφίημι) and following (ἀκολουθέω) therefore have immediate economic consequences for the disciples. Besides the large haul of fish they have abandoned their boats (and presumably the nets), which are the means to their ongoing livelihood. This is indeed “a call to renunciation,” as well as a transmutation in vocation from fishers for fish to catching people alive. But despite the continuity between fishing for fish and catching people, there is also major discontinuity. The men are now joining an itinerant preacher. They will travel with him rather than working between home and the lake. This in turn has social ramifications. There is a new sense of alignment, belonging, and loyalty to Jesus and the group of disciples he is gathering about himself. Alongside this is a corresponding break from existing patterns, habits, and social relationships. In fact this turnaround is a Lukan reversal.

---

256 Though Bivin implies the fishers took advantage of the catch when he talks about the fishers being “rewarded” for their night’s work and their service to Jesus by the miraculous catch. Bivin, “The Miraculous Catch,” 10.

257 The economic impact on the fishers’ families would also have been large. Rick F. Talbott, “Nazareth’s Rebellious Son: Deviance and Downward Mobility in the Galilean Jesus Movement,” BBT 38 (2008), 104, 106-112. Talbert discuss the honour and shame dynamic of this episode on the fishers’ families.

258 This economic cost is consistent with Luke’s stance on wealth and possessions.


Gerd Theissen proposes social reasons for the disciples’ predisposition to adopt an itinerant lifestyle. He argues that fishers in the first century had experienced “social anomy” due to a decline in their economic wellbeing as a result of political, economic, and ecological factors. With this as the general backdrop he argues that frustration with his occupation following a fruitless night’s work (though the text makes no mention of this frustration) and the desire to break with his familiar home-setting are factors behind Simon’s willingness to leave and follow. This backdrop of “social anomy” provides an incentive for Simon and for those with him to leave their current situation. However, as with Bailey’s suggestion about wealth and its relationship to this passage, Theissen’s proposed backdrop is overshadowed by the strong echoes of commission stories here, the emphasis on the large catch, and the way Jesus himself interprets the story as a metaphor for the discipleship journey and as a commission to join him in his mission of catching people alive (5:10).

Simon’s response to Jesus’ commission (v. 10) is immediate and the break so radical that, without using the vocabulary of repentance (μετανοέω) Simon demonstrates the reordering of his life, leaving everything (πᾶς), including his boat. This symbolises his willingness to embrace Jesus and the commission offered to him. The verb ἀφίημι generally means “forgive,” of sins and sometimes debts, but it is used elsewhere of possessions. In 18:28 it appears along with ἀκολουθέω when Peter exclaims ἵδια ημεῖς ἀφέντες τὰ ἴδια ἠκολουθήσαμέν σοι (“look, we have left everything we had and followed you”). This would seem to be an overt echo of 5:11. Within the context of their respective verses “τὰ ἴδια” in 18:28 is synonymous with “πάντα” here in 5:11.


263 Ibid., 89-91.

264 Theissen, Social Reality, 65.

265 Johnson, Luke, 90. Luke says nothing to indicate that Simon and his companions returned home or sold the catch between 5:10 and 5:11, so that Kenneth Bailey packs a lot into a comma when he says “of course Simon didn’t leave the fish to rot. It is a highly condensed story with typical ME [Middle Eastern] exaggeration.” Bailey, Jesus Through Middle Eastern Eyes, 144-145. Consistency would require similar proposals for other texts such as 8:19-21 (the true kindred of Jesus); 9:59-60 (a would-be follower of Jesus); 18:28 (the rich ruler). Luke is rather advocating precisely such an extreme version of renunciation, even if this extreme version of renunciation is in itself is an example of “ME exaggeration.”

266 BDAG list “τὰ ἴδια” in Luke 18:28 under “home, possessions.” “ἴδιαι, ἴδιος, Ίδιος,” BDAG, 467, Section 4b. Matt
Hays contends that πάντα in Luke is a catchword for the abandonment of possessions. He claims further that it does not necessarily mean “exhaustive divestiture” as it “frequently functions hyperbolically,”267 and that it means “abandoning their livelihoods.”268 This is confirmed in 18:29-30, where houses and families are specifically mentioned. The wholehearted response from Simon and those with him, and their willingness to leave everything demonstrates a positive disposition to the visitation of God. While πάντα may not necessarily mean “exhaustive divestiture,” Luke gives no hint that the fishers retained anything at all in their leaving and following. Johnson argues that disposition towards possessions functions as a symbolic indicator of response to the visitation of God in Luke.269 The disciples’ willingness to leave and follow thus takes on deeper layers of meaning as Jesus begins his journey to Jerusalem, and as the fate awaiting him there unfolds.

Sometimes ἀκολουθέω is used of crowds or people, and often of disciples following Jesus.270 Josephus uses it of Elisha following Elijah (Ant. 8.13,8 # 354).271 Of discipleship it denotes a “sense of self commitment . . . which breaks all other ties.”272 Implied is internal commitment and attachment to Jesus and to the cause that he proclaims. This is the first appearance of ἀκολουθέω in Luke. It takes on further significance as a result of the Lukan geographical perspective.273 To follow Jesus is to set one’s face towards Jerusalem (9:51).

19:27 uses πᾶς.


268 Ibid., 82-83.


9 The Challenge to Readers

Within the world of the Lukan text, Simon and the others commissioned with him form the nucleus of the Jesus community. This episode sets the scene for the choosing of the twelve in 6:12-16. Luke challenges his readers to join these fishers. They have ἀφέντες πάντα to follow Jesus out εἰς τὸ βάθος in order that they might ἄνθρωπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν (5:10-11). Luke 4:14-44 shows Jesus as the one anointed by God’s Spirit, presents the nature and origin of Jesus’ authority, and stresses the need for, and variety of, responses to his ministry. Thus, while the emphasis in 4:14-44 is not on discipleship as such, it does give a context and depth of meaning here when Simon, James, and John respond to Jesus. As Green says of 5:1-11, “the initial purpose of this episode is to secure for Luke’s audience the nature of appropriate response to the ministry of Jesus.” The vocation of the first disciples is “to be with Jesus, to learn from him, to exemplify appropriate response to Jesus and his message (cf. Luke 5:11, 28) and thus to model the gathering of God’s people in Jesus’ ministry.” Similarly, Teide suggests that the Scriptures from the prophet Isaiah quoted in Luke 4 establish how Jesus confronted those of Jesus’ era, those of Luke’s era, “as well as the ‘now’ of the modern reader.” What these commentators identify is the message of the text to those beyond the text. Consistent with his reading of Jesus as prophet, Johnson states that Luke’s Gospel offers “less a neutral report on how things were than . . . a normative prescription for how things ought to be.” A two-level, or metaphorical reading, has a realistic dimension or level, but also another level, one that transcends the original context and invites readers in any age to put out into the deep water and let down the nets for a catch.

275 Green, Luke, 203-204; 221.
276 Ibid., 230.
I have argued that Luke uses the journey on the lake to narrate the calling of Simon, James, and John. In so doing, he ties discipleship and the journey motif together. The liminal nature of the lake journey means that it is a journey of transformation more than it is a geographical one. In fact, the disciples return to the shore from whence they started, though as very different people. The journey on the lake is transformational; it changes everything. The metaphorical nature of the journey is clearly signaled within the narrative by Jesus himself, the authoritative proclaimer of the word of God (5:10). Reading Jesus as “guide” and the hauling in of fish in the face of difficulty as a “quest” or test is also helpful in highlighting the formation dynamic that is present here.  

The corporate nature of the episode is held in tension with the attention on Simon and also on James and John. The successful completion of the task of bringing in the overlarge catch requires the co-operative venture between the fishers be brought to a new level, hence μέτοχος in 5:7 and κοινωνός in 5:10. Simon acts as representative. His self-identification as a ἀνὴρ ἁμαρτωλός (5:8), and then Jesus’ reassurance and commission (5:10), indicate the discipleship dynamic.

Jesus has brought Simon and his companions safely through the uncertainty of the liminal journey and back to the shore as transformed individuals and as the nucleus of a new community. Jesus thus proves to be a skillful guide. Jesus draws disciples into a new and transformational relationship. As they enter this new relationship they travel or transition from being hearers of the word of God on the shore of the lake (5:1-2), to those prepared to leave everything and follow (5:11). Jesus frames the discipleship invitation with the skills, places, and vocabulary that are familiar to Simon and his partners. But he is then able to draw them beyond the familiar methods and rhythms as he challenges them to put out into the deep water following an unsuccessful night on the lake (5:4-5). This challenge is directed at Simon but others are drawn into it. Jesus leads Simon in small steps, or stages. He begins on the shore, 

280 Perhaps Jesus is a “spiritual director” instead of “guide.”

281 Having to keep adding “and also James and John” when referring to Simon throughout this chapter provides an insight into how Luke may have struggled to include them in a “seamless” way.
he then puts off a little way from shore, finally he puts out into the deep water to let down the nets for a catch. Then (to borrow from John 2:9) Jesus then turns water into wine, as fishing for fish becomes fishing for people and business partners become partners in proclaiming of the kingdom of God and thereby sharers in Jesus’ ministry (4:18-19). Jesus shows himself competent as guide and compelling as Lord. He is able to take and transform place, time, and events, so that those who travel with him become those who leave everything to follow him. The inseparability of discipleship and mission has also shown itself with the disciples’ commission to catch people alive, their unequivocal leaving (“everything”!), and following Jesus.
1 Introduction

In 5:1-11 the disciples venture out into the deep water. Here in 8:22-36, the second lake journey, they travel with Jesus to the other side of the lake. This chapter takes a detailed look at the second lake journey and how the narrative works. It notes some of the parallels, antitheses, and connections with the first lake journey, the details and significance of which are explored in the following chapter. The focus here is reading the text first of all as a realistic narrative at the same time as reading it as a liminal, formative, discipleship journey.¹

Luke’s second lake journey is preceded by the summary statement in 8:1-3, the parable of the sower and its explanation in 8:4-15, the sayings about a light in a jar 8:16-18, and the arrival of Jesus’ family and the question of true kindred in 8:19-21.² These events and sayings prepare the disciples for their next formative step, crossing over εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης in several ways. First, they are σὺν αὐτῷ (Jesus) as he travels and preaches (8:1), and they experience the Sabbath economy signalled by the wealth redistribution being practised by the women with Jesus in (8:3).³ Up until now the disciples are portrayed as being mostly passive in their being with Jesus.⁴ Commentators typically argue that throughout this section of the

¹ Introduction, Section 4.6.4.

² Green notes that the theme of 8:4-21 is “response to the word of God.” Green, Luke, 330-331. That is, the same as for 4:31-44, the material preceding 5:1-11. Ibid., 221.


⁴ Between 5:1-11 and 8:22 the specific mention of the disciples (or the twelve) are limited to the disciples eating and drinking in 5:33; plucking grain in 6:1; twelve of them being names as Jesus’ apostles in 6:12-16; being looked at in 6:20a (and then being taught in 6:20b-49); accompanying Jesus to the village of Nain in 7:11; the twelve being with Jesus in 8:1; asking the meaning of the parable of the sower in 8:9. It is hard not to conclude that the disciples thus far are portrayed by Luke as passive. They are active only in eating and drinking (5:33), plucking grain (6:1), and asking the meaning of a parable (8:9). Being with Jesus (σὺν αὐτῷ) in 8:1 and accompanying him (συνεπορεύοντο αὐτῷ) in 7:11 fall somewhere between active and passive as it
Gospel Luke shows Jesus to be preparing the disciples for their own active part in his mission (9:1-6).⁵ Here it will be argued that in this second liminal and formative journey the disciples are being invited to take a more active role, but that they fail to rise to the task. Jesus is in fact challenging them to be τὴν γῆν τὴν ἀγαθὴν ἢ τῇ καλῇ γῇ (“the good soil”) (8:8, 15) by responding positively to the word of God (8:11), to place their λύχνος (lamp) in the open (8:16), and to show that they “have” and thus ought to be “given” (8:18). Jesus offers the disciples the opportunity to demonstrate that they are his true kindred by hearing the word of God and obeying it (8:21),⁶ as Peter, James, and John have already done in 5:1-11.

The relationship between the two parts of this second lake story has been variously described. Fitzmyer considers the lake crossing and the encounter with the demoniac as two separate stories, with each functioning as a “counterpart” to the other. The first shows evil overcome in the natural elements, while the second shows evil overcome as a problem for the human psyche.⁷ Johnson heads his commentary on 8:22-39 with “Two Wonders,” while his translation is formatted as a single paragraph.⁸ This suggests it is a single story in two parts. Picking up on the sense of otherness in this episode François Bovon comments, “[i]t is a single story, so that Jesus’ journey has the form of a concise advance into a strange land.”⁹ Similarly Robinson states that crossing “to the other side” allows the inclusion of both the calming of the storm and the deliverance of the Gerasene demoniac.¹⁰ The narrative reading employed for this study finds the approaches that treat 8:22-39 as a single episode in two parts most helpful in light of the parallels between the two parts of the second lake story, and the parallels between the two lake stories.

---

⁶ Luke 8:21 is read here as Jesus redefining kinship so that οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες are the ones Jesus counts as his mother and brothers. Fitzmyer reads it that Jesus is commending his mother and brothers as model disciples. Fitzmyer, Luke the Theologian, 723.
⁷ Ibid., 1:733.
¹⁰ Robins, “By Land and By Sea,” 239.
Green lists five parallels between 8:22-25 and 8:26-39, suggesting they stand in “interpretive juxtaposition” to one another: (1) reference to the “other side,” (2) in each, Jesus faces a “calamity” he must overcome, (3) Jesus commands chaotic forces, (4) “serenity” follows, (5) there is a response of fear. Furthermore, the journey motif and geographical markers require the two parts be read as one episode. In 5:1-11 the journey is from the shore, out εἰς τὸ βάθος, and back to shore. In 8:22-39 the journey is from the Galilee side of the lake εἰς τὸ πέραν (8:22), and back (8:37, 40). This makes the second lake episode somewhat longer than the first. However, the journey is further this time. The lake is the place of formative journeys, and Jesus is taking the disciples (along with his readers) a significant extra step. Here they are moving beyond leaving and following (5:11). They are now being challenged to exercise faith (8:25) as they face the elemental and demonic forces (8:23, 27) that would prevent their crossing over (8:22, 27) to the other side. Third, as will be shown in the next chapter, there is a strong and patterned set of parallels between the two lake stories when 8:26-39 is considered as part of the second.

2 The Demoniac as Gentile

Before moving to the text of 8:26-39 it will be helpful to address directly the evidence that the Gerasene demoniac is a Gentile. This will necessarily involve touching on the content of the forthcoming material, but establishing that the man is a Gentile is necessary for what follows.

As was demonstrated in Chapter 2 of this study, Luke’s geographical schema is strong and it limits Jesus’ opportunities to have contact with Gentiles or to move into Gentile territory. However, one can see the advantage to Luke’s overall narrative in showing that the movement of the apostles and of the Good News to the Gentile world in Acts is a natural and anticipated extension of Jesus’ mission. This also enables him to make something of the early indications that Jesus’ mission may take him beyond Israel, as is implied most strongly in 4:25-27. The genius of using one of the lake journeys to enable Jesus to visit Gentile territory is in their

liminal quality. I am arguing that the lake stories function in a highly metaphorical and symbolic way within the Lukan narrative, but at the same time they are real journeys.\textsuperscript{12} Jesus goes to Gentile territory, but he does so in a lake story, so that it is contained therein, and the return is clearly and unequivocally marked. The effect is similar to a bracketed phrase in a sentence. What is contained within the brackets is related to the rest of the sentence, but is also self contained within the brackets. The encounter with the demoniac on the other side of the lake involves proclaiming Jesus/God and the acceptable year of God’s favour (Luke 8:38; 4:18-19). The story takes Jesus and his disciples εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν (8:26). Luke seems careful not to overstate this. He does not specifically refer to the man or to the people of the region as Gentiles, despite all the indicators he includes that point to a Gentile setting.\textsuperscript{13}

Luke stresses the geographical “otherness” of the encounter with the Gerasene demoniac in more or less subtle ways throughout the passage. These will be considered in more detail below but it is worth gathering them together here in one place. The journey itself is εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης (v. 22). The battle with the elements to attain the far side underscores the destination as one to the far boundary. It is difficult to attain (vv. 23-24). The region is τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν (“the region of the Gerasenes”) (v. 26) and it is ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας (“opposite Galilee”) (v. 26). Then ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ("he stepped out onto the shore") (v. 27) narrates the group’s arrival at the other side (v. 22). Again in v. 37 Luke names the people asking Jesus to depart as being from περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν and it is from here that he returns (ὑποστρέφω). The man’s request to be σὺν αὐτῷ, and Jesus’ response to the request follow (vv. 38-39). The absence of scribes and Pharisees in the second lake story is another indicator of a Gentile location.\textsuperscript{14} Finally, the following pericope begins with Ἐν δὲ τῷ ύποστρέφειν τὸν Ἰησοῦν (“Now when Jesus returned”) and his being welcomed by the crowd on the Galilean side of the lake after the encounter (v. 40). Luke 8:40 is usually treated as

\textsuperscript{12} This is in contra-distinction to Luke 4:5 and 4:9 where the journey is apparently visionary or dream-like.

\textsuperscript{13} By the healing of the Centurion’s servant (7:1-10) Luke has already indicated to his readers that “Gentiles can participate in salvation on the basis of their faith in Jesus.” Jonathan Knight, \textit{Luke’s Gospel}, NTR (London: Routledge, 1998), 93.

\textsuperscript{14} Green, \textit{Luke}, 337.
belonging with the following account, but there is a good case here for reading 8:40 as a transition between the account of the Gerasene demoniac and the following material. Verse 41 begins καὶ ἰδού (“and see!”), with the shift in narrative point of view serving as an adequate starting point for the following section (8:41-56). When 8:40 is considered part of the preceding episode then reference to the crowds in 5:1 and again in 8:40 forms an inclusio around the two lake stories, further linking them together.

Luke also stresses that the man himself is a Gentile and that he is unclean. He is firstly ἀνήρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως (a man from the city) (v. 27). He lives ἐν τοῖς μνήμασι (in the tombs) (v. 27), which are the dwelling place of the dead, making him ritually impure. Mark Chancey notes that the man is not identified as a Gentile but that the presence of the pigs into which the demons flee (8:32-34) suggests a non-Jewish identity. Finally, the designation υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (“son of God Most High”) (v. 28) is at home in a Gentile as well as a Jewish setting.

Several of the links noted above between the Elijah and Elisha cycles and Luke 4 and 7 pick up the Gentile theme. The fearful and hostile reaction of the people of the region of the Gerasenes (8:35, 37) echoes the reaction of the people of Nazareth when Jesus talks of the ministry of Elijah and Elisha to outsiders, including Gentiles (4:25-29). Luke 4:25-29 suggests that ἄφεσις (4:18-19) will be extended to Gentiles. Here in Luke 8 is a Gentile captive experiencing ἄφεσις. Finally, when the man (or demon) asks Jesus τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί …; (“what have you to do with me . . .?”) (8:28), the phrase comes from 1 Kings 17:18, the story of Elijah and the Widow of Zarephath. The widow is a Gentile. Luke’s references to Elijah

15 That is, 8:40-59 is usually treated as a unit, with the account of the healing of the young girl arranged around the story of the healing of the hemorrhaging woman.
16 Even if 8:40 is read as part of the following pericope the inclusio effect is still present.
19 Note also 4:34.
throughout the Gospel highlight the ministry of Elijah and Elisha to Gentiles. The allusions to Elijah and Elisha in this particular story further suggest that this journey to the other side of the lake is a foray into Gentile territory.

Klutz cautions against the assumption that the man is necessarily a Gentile, though he concedes that “opposite Galilee” implies that the people there are “thoroughly Hellenized and predominantly Gentile.” Nevertheless, he notes that contemporary scholarship’s knowledge of the Decapolis in the 1st Century may differ significantly from what Luke’s original audience knew or believed about the region. He urges this caution in light of the Luke’s apparent confusion about the location of Gerasa, Josephus’ note that Gerasa includes Jews as well as Gentiles (J. W. 2:480), and the demoniac’s knowledge of Jewish Scriptures and hostility towards the Romans—traits more befitting a Jew than a Gentile. The caution is well sounded but the preceding discussion shows that, from within the narrative, evidence that the man is seen as a Gentile is strong. As with the case of the location of the drowning of the pigs and its proximity to cliffs and cities, the story “works” in spite of any factual shortcomings. Likewise, Josephus’ point may be correct, but Luke paints the Gerasene demoniac as a Gentile. And if, as a Gentile, his knowledge of the Scriptures and hostility towards the Romans seems out of place, it is consistent with how Luke’s (LXX familiar) audience would have seen the situation and it is for them that Luke shapes his story.

21 The following points are from Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 88-89.
22 Klutz does not spell out what he means by the demoniac’s “apparent knowledge of the Jewish Scripture and possible hostility to the Romans” at this point. Earlier, however, he does consider the argument put forward by Derrett (see Derrett, “Study of the Gerasene Demoniac,” 2-17) and others that the story is a repudiation of the Roman military garrison so it seems likely that this is what he refers to. On this he concludes, however, that the Roman military garrison reading “overlooks the ultimately intertextual function of the story’s military lexis and underestimates the importance of Jewish systems of impurity in the assumed context of culture.” Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 82.
3 The Crossing of the Lake and the Demon-Storm: Luke 8:22-25

3.1 Verse 22

This lake story, like the first (5:1), begins with ἐγένετο δὲ. The expression is temporally vague, but what follows is not necessarily “typical.” Along with the imprecision about time, Luke provides no stated motivation for this lake journey. This contrasts with the first lake journey, where Jesus instructs Simon to put out onto the deep water and let down his nets for a catch (5:4), which then becomes the commission to catch people alive (5:10). In the absence of a stated journey motive here, the catching people alive (5:10) suggests itself.25 In 5:1-11 the disciples worked together as partners to bring in the nets. In commissioning them Jesus had said that they would catch people alive ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν (5:10). However, in the intervening narrative the disciples have played a noticeably inactive role. The return to the lake creates an expectation that the disciples will again be required to play an active role in order to secure the success of the journey. The introductory comments on liminality alert the reader to a deeper motivation for both lake stories: that of discipleship formation.26 Luke 5:1-11 has shown that this is not supposed to be a passive process.

Referring back to 5:3 where Jesus gets into Simon’s boat and asks him to put out a little way from the shore, Luke uses ἐμβάινω to begin the movement out onto the deep water and then across to the other side of the lake. When Jesus returns to the boat in 8:37, completing the journey, ἐμβάινω is used again. The term therefore forms an inclusio, firstly about the second lake story (8:22, 37), and then about both lake stories (5:3; 8:37). The fact that these are the only three occurrences of ἐμβάινω in Luke highlights this effect.

---


25 Nolland suggests that the motivation is provided by 8:26-39. That is, that Jesus and the disciples go to the other side of the lake because Jesus “has an appointment to meet a demoniac at his point of pressing need.” Nolland, Luke, 1:406. He cites Luke 8:22 and 4:23 (showing Jesus’ “uncanny” or “psychic” perception). Ibid., 1:407, 413. The evidence in the Lukan text of an “appointment” is not strong.

26 Chapter 2, Section 5.
This time Jesus gets into the boat with οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ (8:22). It is unclear here who these disciples are.  

Fitzmyer believes the women in 8:2-3 are included. In light of the fact that Luke uses μαθητής loosely, sometimes of the twelve, and sometimes of a larger (or smaller) group, Green believes Luke refers here only to the twelve. But lending some weight of possibility to Fitzmyer’s view that the women were present, is Maria Co’s work on summary statements. Co notes that summary statements may be more than just abridged reports of what has preceded or is to follow. They may also describe a prolonged situation or “an event as happening repeatedly within an indefinite period of time.” This raises the intriguing possibility that, following the summary statement in 8:1-3, the women were present for the second lake journey, even where they are not mentioned. Robert Karris argues that the role the women play in their ministering (διακονέω) to Jesus (8:3) may include the idea of a “go-between,” and that their use of their resources for Jesus may have involved going on mission for him. If the boat used was of a size similar to the one described by Shelly Wachsman, then there may have been room for several others besides Jesus and the twelve. Nevertheless, the women’s presence is not mentioned in 8:22-39. The lack of precision as to who was in the boat here derives from the fact that the focus of the story lies elsewhere.

27 The lack of clarity on this parallels the uncertainty over who it is exactly who ἀφέντες πάντα ἠκολούθησαν αὐτῷ in 5:11.


29 Introduction, Section 5.1.


33 A boat believed to be of a similar type to that used by Jesus and the disciples is described in Shelly Wachsman, “The Galiliean Boat—2000 Year Old Hull Recovered Intact,” BAR 14, no. 5 (1988), 19-33. The vessel measures 26 ½ x 7 ½ x 4 ½ ft. Ibid., 30. It had provision for a sail, and so could be sailed or rowed. It was suited to fishing or transport (p. 31). It was crewed by four oarsmen and a helmsman, and could hold up to 15 people. Ibid., 31-32.
Luke uses διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης, direct speech of Jesus, to begin the movement within the narrative from the shore towards the other side of the lake. διέρχομαι (“go over,” or “pass through”) turns out to be an apt description of the passage through the hostile storm. It picks up on the use of διέρχομαι in 4:30, where Jesus had earlier passed through a hostile crowd, so that the opposing storm on the lake anticipates the opposition Jesus will meet on the other side of the lake.

Jesus’ instructions are duly followed so that the men put out (ἀνάγω) onto the lake. ἀνάγω is a Lukan favourite. He has already used it in 2:22 and again in 4:5. Luke employs here a cluster of words that mark departure and journey, with the effect that the distance and otherness of the destination is emphasised. ἐμβαίνω is used only of getting into boats in Luke. διέρχομαι further implies distance and otherness, while the adverb πέραν occurs only here in Luke. The disciples’ willingness to put out onto the lake here contrasts with Simon’s initial reluctance to do so, expressed in 5:5, so that at this point in the story things look positive.

3.2 Verse 23

πλέω (set sail) is used only here in Luke. It appears four times in Acts, all within the “we” passages, all of which are sea voyage accounts. This highlights again Luke’s choice to use λίμνη here instead of θάλασσα, as πλέω and θάλασσα normally belong together. No sooner have

34 This hints that the difficulty or opposition the group are about to experience in crossing the lake includes an element of active or mindful resistance.
36 Also 5:3; 8:37. Similarly, πλοῖον is used only in the two lake stories in the Gospel: 5:2, 3 (twice), 7 (twice), 11; 8:22, 37. In Acts: 20:13, 38; 21:2f, 6; 27:2, 6, 10, 15, 17, 19, 22, 30, 31, 37, 38, 39, 44; 28:11.
37 BDAG list διέρχομαι here as “movement toward a destination.” “διέρχομαι,” BDAG, 244, Section 1bβ. Both πέραν here, and ἄντιπέρα in 8:26 are hap. leg. The translation “other side” is suitable for πέραν but the term expresses the distance between or the position across from something else. “πέραν,” BDAG, 796.
38 The related term, πέρας, appears in 11:31 with a similar sense of foreignness or otherness.
39 Acts 21:3; 27:2, 6, 24. The final of these references is within Acts 27:21-26 and is third person narrative, but bracketed by “we” sections.
the men set out onto the water than Jesus falls asleep and a violent storm sweeps down on the lake.\textsuperscript{40} Jesus’ sleeping may show that he was tired, but the use of the \textit{hap. leg.} ἀφυπνόω (sleep) here, along with the observation that the story would work without this narrative detail, suggests something more is going on. Jesus’ sleeping demonstrates his trust in God such as in Ps 3:6 or 4:9.\textsuperscript{41} It also shows he has a level of trust in the ability of his disciples. Simon, James and John are fishers by trade. More importantly, they worked together to overcome difficulties the last time they were in a boat on the lake with Jesus (5:7). To describe the storm as a “test” is consistent with reading the lake journeys as liminal journeys, as these often included tests or ordeals.\textsuperscript{42}

The test of the disciples’ ability and faith (8:25) duly arrives in the form of a fierce storm that sweeps down on the lake. The storm’s coming down (“κατέβη”) (v. 23) plays nicely against Jesus’ getting into (“ἐνέβη”) (v. 22) the boat. Luke sets the storm and Jesus against each other, hinting of the cosmic conflict motif that I suggest he is developing throughout 8:22-39. Luke pours on the description of the storm, with λαῖλαψ (“whirlwind” or “hurricane,” only here in Luke) and ἄνεμος (wind), together meaning “a storm wind.” This is the first of three uses of ἄνεμος in this episode.\textsuperscript{43} As with the arrival of the storm, the plight of the men in the boat is narrated succinctly: συνεπληροῦντο καὶ ἐκινδύνεον (“they were filling up and they were in danger”).\textsuperscript{44} Luke gives a stark but vivid description of the result of the storm, which threatens to sink the boat and end the lake journey. This recalls the near filling of the boats in 5:7.

\textsuperscript{40} Such squalls are still common, tending to strike around the middle of the day. Bishop, “Jesus and the Lake,” 408. The low elevation of the lake makes for “sudden violent downdrafts and storm.” Riesner, “Archaeology and Geography,” DJG, 2\textsuperscript{nd} ed., 49.


\textsuperscript{42} Turner, \textit{Forest of Symbols}, 100.

\textsuperscript{43} Also 8:24, 25. Elsewhere in Luke it appears only in 7:24, where John the Baptist is a reed shaken by the wind. Compare that with here, where the men are shaken by the wind storm on the lake.

\textsuperscript{44} συμπληρῶ can be used literally of a ship or figuratively of time. Luke 9:51 and Acts 2:1 are the only other NT uses. κινδυνεύω is used only here in Luke but also in Acts 19:27 and 40.
3.3 Verse 24

Here, they respond in panic, even though in 5:7 the fishers work together to bring in the nets and manage the nearly sinking boats back to shore (5:11). Luke conveys the urgency and sense of desperation in the disciples’ response to the situation as they approach Jesus and wake him. The double use of “ἐπιστάτα” and the cry “ἀπολλύμεθα” (“we are perishing”) intensify the sense of urgency. There is an irony to the use of διεγείρω (awake) here as Jesus is awakened to calm the sea and by so doing the (cosmic) battle between Jesus and the storm is ended. διεγείρω appears only here (twice) in Luke.

The earlier discussion on ἐπιστάτης and κύριος in 5:1-11 concluded that, although ἐπιστάτης implies Jesus is recognised as something more than an authoritative leader, it lacks the nuance of a fuller understanding implicit in κύριος. In light of this, the disciples’ use of ἐπιστάτης here indicates a regression in their relationship with him. The shift from κύριος (5:8) to ἐπιστάτης (8:24) is something of a failure or weakening under pressure. This does not bode well for the disciples for the rest of the lake journey. They wake Jesus and it is he who must deal with the storm. Green comments, “They have had their first test (v. 13) and have not performed well.” Green refers here to the disciples’ failure of recognition following the theophany (the calming of the storm) on the lake, but the comment fits perfectly the disciples’ failure to deal with the storm in the first place. This failure is unfortunately consistent with the regression from κύριος (5:8) to ἐπιστάτης (8:24).

When the disciples appeal to Jesus it is on the basis of their own imminent death: ἀπόλλυμι is unambiguous. In response, Jesus wakes and rebukes the wind and τῷ κλύδωνι τοῦ ὕδατος (“the raging of the waters”). Luke has already described the severity of the storm in v. 23. By adding κλύδων here he has effectively described the storm a second time, further emphasising

45 Zerwick notes the sense of “inevitable doom” in ἀπολλύμεθα. Zerwick, Analyses, 207.
46 Chapter 3, Section 8.1.4.
its severity. The effect is to set Jesus in direct and unmediated confrontation with the storm. Similarly, there is nothing periphrastic about ἐπιτιμάω, which, prior to Jesus’ rebuke of the wind and waters here, describes Jesus’ rebuke of demons in 4:35 and 41, and of a fever in 4:39. Subsequent to 8:24 it occurs in 9:42 where Jesus again rebukes an unclean spirit. The connection with demons, then, is strong.49 Others can also be the agents of rebuke.50 Thus ἐπιτιμάω is not unique to Jesus’ rebuking of evil powers or illness, but its use prior to 8:24 is.

Klutz notes ἐπιτιμάω in the LXX is often used of the word of the Lord bringing chaos into submission.51 It thus speaks of the “cosmic rule of Israel’s God.”52 Jesus’ authoritative presence is certainly being emphasised here. Note that where Luke uses ὕδωρ here his Markan source uses θάλασσα (Mark 4:39). This change enables Luke to remain consistent in his choice of λίμνη over θάλασσα for his lake stories.

Jesus’ rebuke of the storm then echoes OT/LXX ideas of YHWH’s power over the waters.53 Jesus speaks to the storm and it ceases from preventing him and his disciples reaching whomever they will encounter on the other side of the lake. παύω here echoes 5:4, where Jesus ceases speaking to the people. Within this episode the γαλήνη (calm) that results from Jesus’ rebuke will soon be echoed in the life of the man Jesus will encounter upon reaching the other shore.54

The description of the ending of the storm is decisive: καὶ ἐπάυσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη (“and they ceased, and it became calm”). It is little diminished by Luke’s dropping of μέγας from

49 ἐπιτιμάω is also used of Jesus warning (9:21) or rebuking the disciples (9:55). If the disciples are supposed to have tackled the storm here then there may be a hint of Jesus’ forthcoming rebuking the disciples here also, though this would only be obvious retrospectively.


51 Pss 9:6; 67:31 (68:31 MT); 105:9 (106:9 MT); 118:21 (119:21 MT); Zech 3:2.

52 Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 46.

53 On God as sovereign over the sea and elements see the discussion on Luke 5:1 in Chapter 3, Section 6.1.

54 Chapter 4, Section 7.1.
γαλήνη μεγάλη in Mark 4:39. As the disciples’ response will highlight (v. 25), the rebuke is authoritative, so that the elements obey Jesus immediately. His authority and control of the situation is the antithesis of the chaotic state of the elements and of his disciples, who react to the storm in panic and confusion, betraying their lack of faith. The economy and clarity of Luke’s description emphasises the contrast between Jesus’ decisive intervention and the disciples’ disorientation.

The quasi-personal or demonic nature of the storm the disciples face is debated. Conzelmann agrees that the storm descends like a demon on the lake. Fitzmyer is not convinced. However, as Green notes, the storm can be viewed as an opposing force without it being understood as a personal agent. Green’s is a helpful approach, though Luke and his readers may have found the idea of a demonic storm less troubling than contemporary readers. If the storm is seen as demonic in nature, however that is nuanced, then we can concur with Bell, who states that “Nature miracles such as the stilling of the storm are attacks on the demonic.” In this 8:22-25 anticipates and parallels 8:26-39.

3.4 Verse 25

This is not the first reference to faith (πίστις) in Luke. It is somewhat ironic that throughout his Gospel Luke has Jesus expresses doubt about the faith of his disciples. In 17:5-6 they ask Jesus to increase their faith. He responds with the saying about faith the size of a mustard seed; in 18:8 doubt is raised over whether the Son of Man will find faith on earth when he comes; in 22:32 Jesus tells Peter that he has prayed that his faith will not fail, but his subsequent comment foresees the failure of Peter’s faith. This theme is consistent with the

55 Conzelmann, Theology of St. Luke, 49. Sorenson notes the use of exorcism language in the stilling of the storm, but nevertheless describes it as a “non-exorcistic” account. Sorenson, Possession and Exorcism, 134. He then notes examples of the personification of the winds in antiquity and how the storm on the lake and the subsequent deliverance of the man were often depicted similarly in art and literature. Sorenson, Possession and Exorcism, 134 (n. 113).


57 Green, Luke, 333 (esp. n. 53).

suggestion that this lake crossing is something of a test of the disciples’ faith, and one they fail.

In contrast, Jesus’ comments on the faith of others who are not disciples are invariably positive. That faith is linked with healing, salvation, and wholeness. Luke links πίστις and ἀφίημι in 5:20, the healing of the paralytic, where Jesus commends the faith of those who lower the man through the roof. πίστις and ὑγιαίνω (health) are linked in 7:9-10, the healing of the Centurion’s servant. The Centurion expresses confidence that Jesus can perform the healing by a word and from a distance. He thereby demonstrates that he understands Jesus’ authority (7:7-9). In 7:50, the sinful woman at the home of the Pharisee, πίστις and σῴζω (salvation or healing) are linked. The woman’s actions are enumerated and contrasted with the inaction and inhospitable welcome accorded Jesus by Simon (7:44-46). In 8:48, the healing of the hemorrhaging woman, the woman’s coming forward and touching Jesus, despite her unclean condition and the fact that she is a woman, is recognised by him as an act of faith (8:44, 48). In 17:19, the cleansing of the ten lepers, the one (a Samaritan!) Jesus commends returns on his own to give thanks (17:15-16). Then in 18:42, the healing of the blind man near Jericho, the blind man calls out to Jesus despite the stern orders from the crowd not to do so (18:38-39).⁵⁹

Luke’s use of the verb πιστεύω (believe) shows a similar pattern, though it is slightly less clear-cut. He links πιστεύω and σῴζω in 8:12 and 8:50. In 8:13, believing is linked to testing. The storm here in 8:25 is just such a test. In 24:25 the believing of the disciples is in doubt or inadequate.⁶⁰ Jairus, who is not numbered among the disciples, is exhorted to believe in 8:50. His daughter’s subsequent recovery implies that he does. There are also those Israelites who should believe, as does Mary in 1:45.⁶¹

⁵⁹ On the physical and spiritual aspects of σῴζω see Craig L. Blomberg, “‘Your Faith Has Made You Whole’: The Evangelical Liberation Theology of Jesus,” in Green and Turner, eds., Jesus of Nazareth, 75-93.

⁶⁰ In 16:11 πιστεύω is “entrust” with wealth.

⁶¹ The list of those who don’t (or whose resistance to doing so is implied) is longer: Zechariah (1:20); the chief priests, scribes, and elders (20:5); the council (22:67). In 12:46 the ἄπιστος (unbelievers) is used in the abstract.
In each of these cases where faith is commended, the faith expressed is in Jesus or God, and, crucial to the argument being developed here, it is on the basis of the actions and initiative of these characters, often expressed in their working together with others, that Jesus commends their faith or comments on their lack of it. Recall that in the first lake story Jesus is present in one of the boats. Nevertheless, it is the fishers themselves who overcome their problems on the lake (breaking nets, swamped boats) by working together as κοινωνός (5:10). In light of the first lake journey and the commendation Jesus gives to the faith-expressing actions of others noted above, Jesus’ question to the disciples, ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; (“where is your faith?”) suggests some kind of failure of initiative, action, or cooperation. The narrative thus implies that Jesus did not expect the disciples to come to him for assistance with the storm. Rather, he was hoping to see them to work together to overcome it. Fitzmyer suggests that Jesus’ question can be read as “a word of consolation or of calming of fear,” rather like the μὴ φοβοῦ of 5:10. This is possible, but the references to πίστις thus far in Luke are all to the faith of non-disciples, while in 7:9 Jesus addresses a Gentile. In light of this, the disciples’ misplacement of their faith suggests some kind of systemic failure.

It can be argued that, although the disciples’ action here leads to Jesus questioning their faith in v. 25, they have at least demonstrated some degree of faith by going to Jesus and waking him. By this reading they did the correct thing by going to Jesus, but their level of fear or panic shows an imperfect or inadequate faith. Marshall, for example implies this when he states that “for Luke disciples are characterised by faith, even if it can become weak or evanescent on occasion.” This explanation is unsatisfactory, as Fitzmyer’s comment on this passage shows when he says, “In a sense the question is strange, because the disciples at least know to whom they should turn in the face of the disaster that threatened them.”

question to the disciples is ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; He does not ask why they were so anxious when he was with them. It was by waking him in a situation that they were equipped to deal with (5:6-7) that they showed their lack of faith.

Jesus’ question to the disciples is rhetorical, but the disciples respond to one another with τίς ἀρα οὗτός ἐστιν ὅτι καὶ τοῖς ἀνέμοις ἐπιτάσσει καὶ τῷ ὕδατι, καὶ ὑπακούουσιν αὐτῷ; (“who is this then, who commands the wind and the waters and they obey him?”) The question shows how little progress they have made in understanding Jesus’ identity. They have also failed to comprehend their own identity as disciples. They are partners in the task of accompanying Jesus across the lake, and they have done so successfully before (5:1-11). They have been commissioned by Jesus (5:10). In light of the lesson of that successful first lake experience they could have worked together to overcome the storm. Using liminality as a lens on this episode, the crossing can be seen as having the nature of a test, and one the disciples have failed to meet. As guide or shaman Jesus has had to step in and rescue them, as liminal experiences gone awry can be traumatic and damaging to participants.

Luke emphasises the disciples’ lack of faith with φοβήθεντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν (“for they were afraid and amazed”). He has already introduced his readers to the disciples’ fear and wonder on the first lake journey. The appearance of these terms here forms another parallel between the two stories. φοβέω appears twenty-three times in Luke. Prior to the lake stories it is fear of the angel of the Lord (1:13, 30); of angels and glory of the Lord (2:9, 10): or of the Lord (implied) (1:50). In the lake stories it is fear in response to the catch of fish at Jesus’ word (5:10); of the calming of the wind and waters (8:25); and of the sight of the man delivered (8:35), so that fear of the divine (or divine representative or action) is a consistent theme. The pattern breaks down subsequently.

67 If this reading is valid then it is not entirely true to claim, as does Johnson, that Luke moves the emphasis away from the disciples’ failure to Jesus’ authority. Both are emphasised. Johnson, Luke, 138.
68 The disciples are seized with θάμβος in 5:9, so that Jesus orders them “μὴ φοβοῦ” in 5:10.
69 Gabriel (1:19).
70 See 8:50; 9:34, 45 12:4, 5 (twice), 7, 32; 18:2, 4; 19:21; 20:19; 22:2; 23:40.
Similarly θαυμάζω is used thirteen times in Luke. Prior to the lake stories it is wonder at Zechariah’s absence (1:21); at Zechariah’s transformation (1:63); at the shepherds’ news (2:18); at what is being said about Jesus (2:33); and at Jesus’ gracious words (4:22). These uses suggest wonder at the mysterious and divine working of God among God’s people. Again, this pattern breaks down subsequent to the second lake story,71 though 8:25 does echo the earlier theme (along with 9:43; 11:14; 24:12; 24:41) and therefore the first lake story in its use of θαυμάζω. The point here is that φοβέω and θαυμάζω prior to the two lake stories are invoked by the working of God or God’s messengers and prophets. They therefore imbue the lake stories with a sense of the divine and mysterious working of God consistent with their nature as liminal or formative journeys in the presence of Jesus as guide.

As the Lukian Jesus has just made clear in the Parable of the Sower (8:4-15), responses to the word of God will vary. The mention of the disciples’ faith here in 8:25 links this response with believing in the parable (πιστεύω is used in 8:12 and 13). This means that Jesus’ questioning of the disciples’ faith here suggests either that the devil has come and has taken their faith from them (8:12), or more likely, that the word of God has not taken deep root in their lives and now, in this time of testing, their faith may fail and they might fall away (8:13). This is something of an indictment as they have been given to know τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ (“the secrets of the kingdom of God”) (8:10). The saying on hearing and doing the word of God (8:19-21) further emphasises their under-performance.72 Jesus, however, is a faithful and committed guide and will ensure the success of the venture and the safety of the disciples.

Jesus’ rebuke (ἐπιτάσσω) of the storm here will be echoed again in 8:31 when the demon begs not to be ordered (ἐπιτάσσω) into the abyss. Obey (ὑπακούω) appears again in Luke only in 17:6 where Jesus declares that even a small amount of faith can command a mountain to be cast into the sea (θάλασσα). Here the disciples have not been able to find faith to command the

71 See 7:9; 11:38; 20:26.

wind and waters on the λίμνη to be calm. If casting a mountain into the sea takes faith as a mustard seed, calming the lake should take a similarly small amount of faith.

3.5 Conclusion

Key themes to emerge from the above discussion are the otherness of the journey destination and the “demonic” opposition to that journey. The faith of the disciples is called into question and, in light of the first lake story, it has been argued that the disciples’ lack of competence and co-operation, along with their going to Jesus and waking him on this occasion, represents a failure on their part to execute the task of piloting the boat to the other side of the lake. Tannehill does not go so far as to state specifically that the disciples should have worked together to overcome the storm themselves, but he comes close when he notes that “the storm on the lake reveals that the disciples have not yet reached maturity as hearers and doers of the word.” It is not, he states, that the disciples have no faith, but that “they have failed to respond with faith on this particular occasion.” The disciples have not been forthcoming with their faith (8:25) in this time of testing (8:13). As guide on this second liminal lake journey Jesus has had to step in and perform the task for them.

The “demonic” nature of the storm has been discussed above. What is the correlation between the power of evil and opposition in the storm, and that of Legion who occupies the man? The symmetry between the former and latter state of the lake is not as neat as we shall see that it is between the former and latter state of the demoniac, but it is equally stark. Luke describes the chaos of the lake and the peril faced by those in the boat with three clauses linked with καί in v. 23. These give the cause, implication, and effect of the situation: καὶ κατέβη λαῖλαψ ἀνέμου εἰς τὴν λίμνην (“and a wind storm came and swept down on the lake”); καὶ συνεπληροῦντο (“and they were filling up”); καὶ ἐκινδύνευον (“and they were in danger”). The more-than-natural ferocity of the storm is signalled by this weighty description of its severity.

73 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:213.
74 Ibid.
75 Chapter 4, Section 3.2.
76 ἄνεμος (wind) appears three times in this passage (8:23, 24, 25).
It is further emphasised by the intervention required to overcome it. Jesus must be woken by his desperate and fearful disciples. He must personally intervene and rebuke the storm. As shown, the language used here is elsewhere associated with deliverance from demons. Luke also uses ἐπιτιμάω of Jesus’ rebuke of demons in 4:35, 41 and of a fever in 4:39. Note also that the story is one of a pair, the second part of which (8:26-39) is a demonic encounter.

As Jesus is roused by his disciples he rebukes the wind and the raging of the waves (v. 24). This again emphasises the severity of the storm. Then ἐπαύσαντο καὶ ἐγένετο γαλήνη (v. 24). The fear and amazement of the disciples and Jesus’ rhetorical question (ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;) (v. 25) reflect Jesus’ expectation that the disciples themselves should have dealt with the storm, but it also serves to highlight the chaos released by the storm and the contrasting calm following Jesus’ intervention. Some at least of the disciples are experienced sailors. Their reaction—both their panic in the face of the storm and their fear and amazement following Jesus’ intervention—indicates the unexpected ferocity of the storm and their shock at their sudden deliverance from its power. This is no ordinary storm.

These connections between 8:22-25 and 8:26-39 are sufficiently clear to be treated as parallels between the two parts of the story. The storm therefore anticipates Legion. Conversely, the man possessed by Legion personifies the ferocious and opposing power of the storm. The parallel nature of the two parts of the story means that if the disciples had successfully addressed the storm themselves, they would have accredited themselves to have met and delivered the Gerasene demoniac also. However, as they failed in the first task, Jesus, as their guide and spiritual director, deems them ill-prepared to meet the second. He therefore steps off the boat himself to be met by the demoniac in 8:26. The disciples’ fishing for people “from now on” (5:10) is temporarily on hold.

---

77 This storm, like the one in Jonah 1:4, appears intent on preventing the journey.
4.1 The Encounter: Luke 8:26-28

4.1.1 Verse 26

Having narrated the group’s departure and journey (8:22-25), Luke now notes their arrival at the other side of the lake. He defines the relationship between the two locations as ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας which, as Conzelmann observes, emphasises that this crossing over is “an exception.” It also emphasises the distance between the two locations, whilst acting as another indicator of the “otherness” of the destination, and therefore the liminal nature of the journey.

Jesus and the disciples have “sailed down.” καταπλέω is a nautical term and one more suited to sea than lake travel. That this is Gentile territory is signalled again by τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν. The naming of the region and the location and events narrated is fraught with problems due to textual variations, transmission history, and geographical reality. The difficulties are legion, with commentators usually concluding that the current reading is both the most difficult and preferred. As to the significance of the naming to the location of the


79 A hap. leg. Elsewhere it is usually “sailed down from the high sea.” “καταπλέω,” BDAG, 524. This use of what is elsewhere commonly a nautical term points again to Luke’s deliberate or, given his sources, unexpected use of λίμνη (lake) here and in 5:1-11.

80 Prior to 8:26 (2:8; 3:1) Luke uses χώρα of literal or physical places or regions. Following 8:26 it occurs within parables or within apocalyptic discourse (12:16; 15:13, 14, 15; 19:12; 21:21). The hinge-point between the literal and metaphoric is here in 8:26, which is compatible with the idea of the lake as liminal space and the journey on the lake as metaphorical or symbolic.

81 If the Sinaiticus reading is original (χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν) then “this perhaps reflects the Semitic name for Hippos (Gergesa). Or it may refer to the Girgasites, who according to Deut 3:14 and Josh 12:5; 13:11, 13 settled in this area. This was still remembered by Origen (Comm. Joh. 6.24) and the Jerusalem Talmud (y. Šeb. 36c). A local tradition that has received some archaeological support locates the miracle at El-Kursi.” Riesner, “Archaeology and Geography,” DJG, 2nd ed., 51. See also for example Johnson, Luke, 137; Green, Luke, 337 (n. 67); Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:736-37; Evans, Saint Luke, 384-385; Rodger D. Aus, My Name is “Legion”: Palestinian Judaic Traditions in Mark 5:1-20 and other Gospel Texts, Studies in Judaism (Lanham: University Press of America, 2003), 69-80.
narrative, Wink suggests there may be a play on the Hebrew שָׁבָ֑ע,\(^{82}\) drive out or banish.\(^{83}\) ἀντιπέρα is an intensification of πέραν used in v. 22. It is used only here in the NT, where it serves to clarify the location for the Gentiles among Luke’s readers, but its effect is also to emphasise the point that the shore Jesus and his disciples have stepped onto is the opposite, or antithesis of the one they have left. Γαλιλαία is referenced five times as the locale of Jesus’ ministry in this phase of the Gospel so the location is important.\(^{84}\) The geographical departure from Galilee here foreshadows the Gentile mission in Acts.\(^{85}\)

The use of the plural form of καταπλέω (“κατέπλευσαν”) is the last acknowledgement Luke gives to the presence of the disciples in this episode. From here on, the only member of the boating party Luke mentions is Jesus. This means that the disciples, although present, are effectively dropped from the narrative.\(^{86}\) This is similar to the way the crowds on the lake shore are effectively dropped out of the first lake story following 5:3.\(^{87}\) However, Simon and the others with him in that first lake journey were active participants. This implies the disciples here are functioning only at the level of the crowds in 5:1, 3. As those already commissioned to catch people alive, and who have been subsequently appointed as Jesus apostles, this is a surprising underachievement.

---

82 Of the Markan version see Wink, *Unmasking the Powers*, 43.


86 Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 317.

87 When discussing Luke’s travel narrative Green notes that it is especially concerned with the formation of the disciples but that they fail to identify with Jesus so completely that “by journey’s end, they have all but disappeared from view.” Green, “Luke, Gospel of,” *DJG*, 2nd ed., 544. The same could be said of this pericope.
4.1.2 Verse 27

Jesus now gets out of the boat. ἐξέρχομαι here carries forward the theme of going out to sow from 8:5, where ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπείραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ (a sower went out to sow his seed). The “seed” the sower sows is ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ (8:11). This picks up on the commission to catch people alive in 5:1-11 as this episode commences with Jesus teaching τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ to the people in 5:1. The arrival at the other side in this second lake journey creates the expectation that the word of God will be sown or taught, which is to say that people will be caught alive (5:10). The first lake journey commenced with Jesus teaching the word of God (5:1), and concluded with his commission to the disciples to catch people alive. It is the catching alive of people by the disciples that is therefore being proposed as the motivation for this second lake journey.

With Jesus now having arrived (ἐξέρχομαι) the demons will soon come out (ἐξέρχομαι) from the man (v. 29, 33, 35) and the people will come out (ἐξέρχομαι) from the city and countryside (v. 35) to see what has happened. They will then come (ἔρχομαι) to Jesus (v. 35). Finally, the man will depart (ἀπέρχομαι) through the city (v. 39). In 5:8 Simon bids Jesus depart from (ἔξελθε ἀπ᾽) him. These verbs of movement are consistent with the journey theme in Luke. The emphasis on movement is also consistent with the lake being a liminal space where movement, departure, and arrival have literal as well as metaphorical importance.

Having arrived, Jesus steps out ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν. In Luke’s Gospel γῆ means “shore” only here and in 5:3 and 11. However, it does connect with the idea of “land” or “ground” where it occurs in the parable of the sower (8:8, 15). The response of the man and then of the people of the region will indicate what type of “ground” (γῆ) they are, as Jesus comes to them to speak the word of God (5:1). Jesus is then met (ὑπαντάω) by the man himself. Luke uses ὑπαντάω again in 14:31 where the imagery is again metaphorical and militaristic. The encounter here in Luke 8 is sudden and abrupt, with strong hints of aggression. It will soon be shown that, like the meeting in 14:31, this one involves confrontation and large numbers, as Legion yields his

88 And in Acts: 27:39, 43, 44.
name (8:30). The fierce and sudden storm on the lake preceding this meeting emphasises the theme of confrontation and aggression.

The writing of this chapter included the need to decide how to refer to the “δαιμόνια”; the Writing of this chapter included the need to decide how to refer to the “δαιμόνια”;89 ύπο τοῦ δαμανίου (8:29); τῷ πνεύματί τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ (v. 29); λεγιών (v. 30). Some of the finite verbs refer to δαιμόνια (λεγιών) in the singular. This is appropriate for a neuter plural subject. But others such as “παρεκάλεσαν” (v. 31), “παρεκάλεσαν” (v. 32), and “εἰσῆλθον” (v. 33) are plural, as are the pronouns and participles “αὐτοῖς” (v. 32, twice) and “ἐξελθόντα” (v. 33). Luke recounts its speech as though it is a single entity in v. 28: τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί . . . δέομαι σου, μή με βασανίσῃς. Its response to Jesus’ command is similarly narrated in v. 30: ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, even though Luke must immediately admit that δαιμόνια πολλὰ had entered the man. Throughout this study, the use of “demon,” “demons,” “unclean spirit,” “the man,” “the delivered demoniac,” and “Legion,” will reflect as far as possible the text of the verse under discussion. More important than the difficulty this episode presents to anyone wishing to comment on it is the fusing of entities within the story that the text represents. The demon (or demons!) and the man are often impossible to distinguish. This reflects the reality being narrated. The man is so thoroughly possessed that prior to his encounter with Jesus, individuation would have been inconceivable.

This ἀνήρ τις joins a list of unnamed men (ἀνήρ) in Luke.90 This lends a generic or symbolic quality to the story, despite its high level of narrative detail. Luke uses ἀνήρ and ἀνθρώπος throughout the second lake story as follows:91

90 Luke 5:12, 18; 6:8; 9:38; 17:12.
91 Likewise ἀνθρώπος, when of individuals, is often a reference to unnamed men, see (excluding in parables):
v. 27 ἂνὴρ τις from the city having demons.

v. 29 Jesus had commanded the unclean spirit to come out τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

v. 33 the demons came out τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.

v. 35 τὸν ἄνθρωπον from whom the demons had come out.

v. 38 ὁ ἂνὴρ from whom the demons had come out.

The story is framed (8:27, 38) with the man as ἂνὴρ. To start with, he is the man from the city having demons. By v. 38 he has been redefined as ὁ ἂνὴρ ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια (“the man from whom the demons had come out”). The fact that in v. 38 he is still labeled with reference to his demon possession shows how completely subsumed his person was to the demon Legion. It appears he will be forever known as the man from whom the demons had come out.

“Having demons” (v. 27) describes every aspect of his person. ἐκ τῆς πόλεως (“from the city”) is the first qualifying clause in the list of such clauses that follows ἂνὴρ τις here. This describes his physical location but this physical location is described by what he has lost. He is now not of the city. In v. 38 he will return to the city. Between these two references he is ὁ ἄνθρωπος from whom the unclean spirit (v. 29) or demons (vv. 33, 35) had been commanded, or from whom these had come out (ἐξέρχομαι). As shown above, the arrangement is chiastic. Verse 33 is the centre point and captures the emphasis of the story: ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἄνθρωπον (“the demons came out of the man”).

As the chiasm just described shows, ἔχων δαιμόνια is the primary descriptor and defining characteristic of the man, both now and after he is delivered.92 Next we learn that the man had χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον (“worn no clothes for a long time”).93 This note, added to

92 Reference to the δαιμόνιον is also made in vv. 29, 30, 33, 35, 38, and in v. 36 (δαιμονίζομαι), seven times in this passage, while in 8:2 Luke says seven demons had been cast out of Mary called Magdalene. The connection is another discipleship indicator. However, τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ in 8:29 is a synonym, so the numerical correspondence is perhaps not quite so neat.

93 The variant text reads ἐκ χρόνων ἰκανῶν καὶ ἱμάτιον “possessed by demons for a long time and wore no clothes.” (For details see Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:737.) The difference is not significant to the argument that Luke is showing the man’s condition in as stark and dire terms as he can. ἐνδύω (clothe) appears also in 15:22. It is one of the many links between 8:22-39 and 15:11-32 (pigs, uncleanness, Gentile or foreign territory, etc.)
Mark by Luke, prepares for the man’s re-clothing in v. 35. Just as importantly, his nakedness is shameful in itself. In the OT/LXX such a state is associated with shame, poverty, imprisonment or refugee status, or mourning. He is a Man Alone. He stands outside the familial and communal structures of dyadic first century society. To the already comprehensive description of displacement and isolation, Luke adds that the man ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν (“did not live in a house but in the tombs”). To Luke’s readers, who are familiar with the LXX, this fact alone makes him ritually unclean. As a Gentile, he is doubly so. Living among tombs he dwells among the dead and for all intents and purposes he is one of them. He “resembles a member of the wild races, eschewing clothes and houses.”

As one surrounded by death and the underworld, and who lives at night in graves, he is considered insane.

94 Mark 5:3 lacks an equivalent phrase.

95 For example, drunkenness/shame (Gen 9:22-23); as a metaphor for idolatry (Exod 20:26 [NB ἀσχημοσύνη is translated here as “shame” in NETS, but BDAG lists it under “nakedness”]); wretchedness (Lam 1:8 [Again, ἀσχημοσύνη is translated here as “shame” in NETS, but BDAG lists it under “nakedness”]); judgement (Deut 28:48). ἀσχημοσύνη, ἤς, ἡ, BDAG, 147. Weiglt, “Clothe, Naked, Dress, Cloth,” NIDNTT, 1:312-317. The man’s nakedness implies “vulnerability, defencelessness against alien oppression, and unfitness for any kind of divine service.” Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 101.


99 On ritually unclean see Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:737. On corpse impurity see Num 19:10b-22. On attitudes to corpse impurity in the first century see Ed P. Sanders, Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies (London: SCM, 1990). Sanders notes that care for the dead was an established religious duty, and that corpse impurity prevented entry to the Temple only until time had elapsed and washing had been performed. Sanders, Jesus and Judaism, 182-183; 387 (n. 40). However, purity was so highly valued that corpse impurity was nevertheless avoided if possible. Green, Luke, 292 (n. 33). Green notes that Jesus has crossed such clear and high social boundaries (Gentile territory, tombs, etc.) to meet this man that there are no scribes or Pharisees present to monitor him here. Green, Luke, 333 (n. 66).


101 Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 318. Aus lists the indicators that the man would have been considered insane as: he is alone, even at night; he lives among tombs (and so among unclean corpses); he is naked; he destroys his bonds; he is described after his deliverance as being of sound mind, the opposite of being mad. Aus, My Name is “Legion,” 3-6.
4.1.3 Verse 28

The man reacts strongly to Jesus’ arrival. His seeing (ὁράω) includes an immediate recognition of Jesus as ὦτο τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου and of the threat to his being that Jesus represents. His crying out denotes hostility and defensiveness. ἀνακράζω is also used in 4:33 as the demon being cast out of the man with the unclean spirit cries out, and 23:18 where the mob call for Jesus to be put away and for Barabbas to be set free. Aggressive intent against Jesus is clear in both instances. προσπίπτω is located between “ἀνακράξας” (“he cried out”) and φωνῇ μεγάλῃ here. This suggests προσπίπτω is nuanced further towards hostility than it is in 5:8. Even so, it is hard to tell if the man comes for mercy, the demon comes to challenge, or whether the man and demon (or demons) are so intertwined that it is both. This complex dynamic unfolds throughout vv. 26-33, so that as I have already noted, it is hard to speak of one without the other (or others). The man’s crying out echoes the cry of the demoniac in 4:33. μέγας (loudly) enlarges the volume of the man’s response. τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; expresses the man’s/demon’s fear and aggression. The sense here is “what business do you have with

102 See the discussion on Hartsock, Sight and Blindness in Chapter 3, Section 8.1. Here, and again in 8:34, sight has more-than-literal connotations.

103 There are numerous parallels in form, vocabulary and themes between 4:31-37 and this passage. For example: δαιμόνια (4:41 || 8:27); ἀνακράζω and φωνῇ μεγάλη (4:33 || 8:28); τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί; (4:34) || τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί; (8:28); ὥσπερ τοῦ θεοῦ (4:34) || ὦτο τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (8:28); ἥλιος ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; (4:34) || δέομαι σου, μὴ με βασανίσῃς (8:28).

104 Both senses are listed in BDAG, though Luke 8:28 is listed there under “1 to prostrate oneself before someone, fall down before/at the feet of,” rather than “2 to move with force against someth., fall upon, strike against.” “προσπίπτω,” BDAG, 884 (emphasis original).

105 Bruce J. Malina, and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels, 2nd ed. (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 208; Wainwright, “Clothed and in his Right Mind,” 173. “He felt himself at once attracted and repelled by this man; this led to a violent crisis in him, which revealed itself first of all in a cry.” Godet, “St. Luke,” 384. Note however that, in contrast to other kinds of healings where a display of faith often features, possession renders victims powerless. Sorensen, Possession and Exorcism, 127. This would tend to suggest that the man’s approach to Jesus here is driven by the demon, rather than by the man. Some commentators however see this as the man reaching out to Jesus for help. E.g. Bovon, Luke, 1:327.

106 Section 4.1.2.

107 It occurs again but of the people’s fear in 8:37.

108 See 4:34.
me?” or perhaps, “you have no business with me” (cf. 1 Kings 17:18). As with the widow in 1 Kings 17 the man here is a Gentile.

A. Burrow claims (of the Markan version) that by addressing Jesus as Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου the demon attempts to act as an exorcist against Jesus. The aggression with which the man approaches Jesus and his hostile and fearful demeanor make this plausible. The form of address does provide further evidence that the man is a Gentile. Paul Trebilco demonstrates that Luke distinguishes and adjusts his use of ὑψίστος for Jewish and Gentile settings. Summarizing his findings he states, “ὑψίστος is used of Yahweh in the LXX, the NT, in Jewish Pseudepigrapha and by other Jewish authors. However, it is also used in classical literature and inscriptions of pagan deities, most frequently of Zeus.” The form found here, with the double use of the article, is that employed in Gentile settings and on the lips of Gentiles.

Another Lukan favourite is δέομαι (beg). It expresses urgency, distress or great need, and is used where something more intense than αἰτέω (ask) or ἐπερωτάω (ask) is required. It appears again in this passage in 8:38. The man (or demon) begs that Jesus not torment him. βασανίζω is found only here in Luke. Elsewhere it can be associated with conflict between Jews and Gentiles. The subsequent fate of the demons in the pigs, as well as prior exorcisms (4:35,
41; 6:18; 8:2; and echoed or hinted at again in 8:24) show that the demon’s fear of banishment is well founded.

4.2 The Confrontation: Luke 8:29-31

4.2.1 Verse 29

Only now does Luke reveal Jesus’ command to the demon: παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (“for he had ordered the unclean spirit to come out of the man”). This reordering of narrative and narrated time allows the description of the man in v. 27 to be juxtaposed directly against his aggressive and fearful reaction towards Jesus. Green notes how Luke arranges this story to highlight the immediacy and challenge of Jesus’ confrontation with the demoniac. Luke does this especially through the rearrangement of narrative time, the use of asides, graphic detail, and cultural-specific indicators of social deviance. He now steps back to explain why the man has reacted so strongly. It is because Jesus had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of him.

Reference to τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ (“the unclean spirit”) here shows the expression to be synonymous with δαιμόνιον, but to what effect does Luke make this variation? The inclusion of ἀκάθαρτος ties together and encapsulates the various descriptors of the man that, when combined, comprehensively emphasise his uncleanness. It also anticipates the pigs in v. 32-

115 Green, Luke, 337. Appendix 1, Narrative Time Reshuffle (Luke 8:26-39), shows the editing required to achieve a strict chronological ordering of this episode. On narrative order see Genette, Narrative Discourse, 1-85. Genette uses “reach” and “extent” in describing the reordering of narrative time. Genette, Narrative Discourse, 48. The reordering of narrative time here exhibits varying reach and extent. The departure and request to leave involves a short reach and a short extent. The (impf. tense) description of the man’s life and breaking of bonds before his encounter with Jesus displays a short reach (it describes the time up until Jesus arrives) but a long extent.


117 ἀκάθαρτος appears six times in Luke (4:33, 36; 6:18; 8:29; 9:42; 11:24). In each case it is related to unclean spirits or deliverance by Jesus.

118 He wore no clothes, he lived not in a house but among the tombs, and (implied) he is a Gentile. Aus points out (re the Markan version) the connections between “‘tombs’ and an ‘unclean spirit’’” in the rabbinic literature in Aus, My Name is “Legion,” 4-5. This uncleanness means impurity, and is transferred from the demon to the victim. Sorensen, Possession and Exorcism, 128.
33. The effect is that each time the man’s description is linked to the fact that he has or has had demons he is fundamentally characterised as being (or having been) ἀκάθαρτος. Tomb (μνήμα) (v.27), pigs (χοῖρος) (32, 33), and the command here τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ are a cluster associated with impurity in the LXX. In addition to the vocabulary, the structure of the story sets Jesus against these ἀκάθαρτος things. The man is freed from the tombs to return home (8:39), he is delivered from the demon (8:33), and the swine are destroyed (8:33). This makes Jesus the one “who is diametrically opposed to things unclean and who upholds traditional Jewish distinctions between pure and impure.”

The verb παραγγέλλω (to order), appears four times in Luke but only here of Jesus ordering demons. The other three uses are related to the concealment of identity or actions. In 5:14 Jesus orders the leper not to tell of his healing, but διήρχετο δὲ μᾶλλον ὁ λόγος περὶ αὐτοῦ (“now more than ever the word about Jesus spread abroad”) (5:15). Here in 8:29 Jesus orders the demon to come out of the man, and the news of what has happened spreads quickly εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγροὺς (“in the city and in the country”) (8:34). In 8:56 the parents of the healed girl are ordered to tell no one what has happened—after the spirit of the girl returns. In 9:20, prompted by Jesus’ question about his (Jesus’) identity, Peter confesses that Jesus is τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (“the Messiah of God”) before Jesus orders him to be silent (9:21). Here, prompted by Jesus’ question, the demon has identified Jesus as Ἰησοῦ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου before Jesus orders it to come out of the man.

Although ἄνθρωπος is common in Luke its context here in the second lake story echoes ἄνθρώπους ἔσῃ ζωγρῶν in 5:10. The man is, at any rate, the closest example there is of one being “fished” alive in this Gospel, as this is the only other episode in Luke where Jesus or his disciples are by the lake (or sea). This suggests that, as it was the disciples who were

119 Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 96.
120 Ibid., 79.
121 On ἐξέρχομαι and ἄνθρωπος see on 8:27 above.
commissioned to catch people alive in 5:10, it is they who should have stepped up here and performed this task.

With γάρ (for), the leap back in time and logic noted above is repeated as Luke provides an explanation using the pluperfect as to why Jesus had ordered the demon out of the man: πολλοὶς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάξαει αὐτὸν (“for many times it would seize him violently”). The γάρ . . . γάρ construction leaves unmitigated the effect of the immediacy and the raw fear involved in the meeting between Jesus and the man. This effect would have been diluted if Luke had inserted all of this detail earlier into the account. 122

The man’s affliction has been long-term and repetitive. This is shown here by χρόνων ἱκανῷ in v. 27 and πολλοῖς . . . χρόνοις. The δαιμόνια πολλά (“many demons”) in v. 30 further amplify the magnitude of the affliction. συναρπάζω means “to seize by violence,” “to drag away,” or “to hold completely in one’s grip.” 123 In Acts 27:15 it is used of a ship caught and torn away by the wind. 124 Here it expresses the violent and possessive nature of the man’s affliction. 125 He is tossed about like a ship on the sea, held in the demon’s grip. He is seized by a violent force, just as the boat was tossed about and held by a violent storm in 8:22-25. The people respond by attempting to restrain him. Hence he is bound (δεσμεύω) with chains (ἁλύσις) and with fetters (πέδη) and kept under guard (φυλάσσω). The combination ἁλύσεσιν καὶ πέδαις can be rendered “double chains.” 126 The bonds are imposed by the man’s fellow humans in an

122 See Appendix 1, Narrative Time Reshuffle (Luke 8:26-39).


124 The use of a verb associated elsewhere with ships and the sea (θάλασσα) shows again the deliberate choice Luke has made in calling this the Lake (λίμνη) of Gennesaret (5:1), or simply the lake (λίμνη) (5:2; 8:22, 23, 33).

125 Zerwick follows Moulton in rendering the pluperfect of συναρπάζω in πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάξαει αὐτὸν as “‘as it had long ago obtained and now kept complete mastery of him.’” Zerwick, Analysis, 207-08 (his emphasis).

attempt to control the demon’s devastating effect on his life, but such is the power of the force within him that he would break asunder (διαρρήγνυμι) his bonds. The present active participle (“διαρρήγνυσω”) implies this was a regular or repeated occurrence. The demon would then drive (ἐλαύνω) the man εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους (“into the wilderness”). In this the man is painted as a passive victim. The wilderness further denotes his isolation. The man here is one of the fish (ἰχθύς) (5:6) being “caught” (συγκλείω) (5:6), or “caught alive” (ζωγρέω) (5:10).

4.2.2 Verse 30

With the parenthetical detour completed in v. 29 the narrative returns to narrative time. What this means is that Jesus’ question here, τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; (“what is your name?”) is his immediate response to the man’s cry in v. 28, τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαι σου, μή με βασανίσῃς. This exchange can be read as the demon and Jesus attempting to master each other through naming. However, the man responds to Jesus’ question by yielding his name, showing that Jesus has won the contest.

127 The note of unrealism here has not escaped commentators who point out that it is possible to craft bonds that no human being can break. Wink, Unmasking the Powers, 45 (following Girard). In Luke διαρρήγνυμι appears only here and in 5:6, where the nets retaining the fish are breaking apart. The only use of διαρρήγνυμι in Acts (14:14) has Paul and Barnabas tear their clothes of and rush into the crowd, shouting. That is, behaving like possessed men!

128 ἐλαύνω is “to drive people along” or of the wind driving clouds or ships. “ἐλαύνω,” BDAG, 314. Used only here in Luke.

129 There are parallels between this story and Judges 13-16 (Sampson). These are explored in detail (re the Markan version of the story) in Aus, My Name is “Legion,” 19-63. Some of the comparisons Aus makes seem overdrawn, and some do not work with Luke. Nevertheless, there certainly are some broad parallels between the stories of Sampson and of Luke 8:26-39. Aus looks at Palestinian Judaic interpretations of the Sampson story and how those have shaped Mark 5:1-20. The use of this material as an interpretive key for Luke is problematic. Sampson is an Israelite, the man a Gentile. Furthermore, as intratext for this story Luke 5:1-11 is closer to Luke 8:26-30 than the material Aus references.


Legion (λεγιών) is a Latinism meaning “a division of Roman soldiers.” In the NT it represents “something powerful, unparalleled and extraordinary which can force man.” Fitzmyer suggests that the designation is the demon’s attempt to foil Jesus’ question by rendering its number rather than its name. This is difficult on four counts. First, λεγιών works very well as a proper name. Second, the man immediately throws himself before Jesus and cries out. It is true that the man (or demon) displays aggression, but there is nowhere in the story that does not read as though Jesus has uncontested ascendancy in this contest. Third, in 8:2 and 11:24-26 Luke notes a particular number of demons, seven in both cases. This suggests the number is more likely symbolic than literal. Furthermore, Luke himself does not treat the number as literal. Right here he reinterprets it as πολὺς in the phrase ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν (“for many demons had entered into him”). The large number of demons indicates the severity of the possession. It emphasises the man’s plight, suggesting the number is non-literal and therefore symbolic and so a name. Various other suggestions have been made about the name Legion. Burrow suggests that λεγιών is a boast, but all other indicators are that the demon is in terror of Jesus, so this is unlikely.

The relationship between 8:22-25 and 8:26-39 means that the naming of the demon here forms a parallel with the personification of the wind and the waves during the crossing of the

132 At the time of Augustus around 6000 soldiers. “λεγιών, ὄνος, ἰ,” BDAG, 587. Also Aus, My Name is Legion,” 16-17 (esp. n.77).
133 H. Preisker, “λεγιών,” TDNT, 4:68. The reading of this story as a metaphor for Roman occupation was discussed briefly in Introduction, Section 6.
135 Garroway, “Invasion of a Mustard Seed,” 66. (Though Garroway is refering to the Markan version.)
136 The use of ἑπτά in 20:27-40 points in the same (non-literal) direction.
137 When used in a general sense the meaning is “a host.” Zerwick, Analysis, 208.
lake in the storm.\textsuperscript{140} This supports the earlier argument that the storm is an active agent of opposition to Jesus and the disciples in their attempt to cross the lake.

4.2.3 Verse 31

There is a nice assonance here between “παρήγγειλεν” in v. 29, and “παρεκάλουν” (“he begged”) here in 8:31.\textsuperscript{141} The connection between Jesus’ ordering and the demon’s begging emphasises that the contest between the demon and Jesus has been won. In fact the demons find themselves experiencing a Lukan reversal as “dieses Bedrohliche sieht sich selbst bedroht.”\textsuperscript{142} The possessing demons have been evicted and are now at the mercy of Jesus. The demons beg not to be ordered (ἐπιτάσσω) into the abyss. The last use of ἐπιτάσσω was in 8:25 where the disciples wonder at Jesus ordering the wind and the waves, which led to the calming of the storm. Here Jesus orders the demon, which will lead to the “calming” of the man and his life. This parallel also supports the reading of the storm as “demonic” in nature.\textsuperscript{143}

Luke 8:31 is the only use of ἄβυσσος in the Gospels. It is the “home of lost souls and demons.”\textsuperscript{144} In the LXX it often translates סה baja (the watery deep), as “a symbol of chaos and disorder conquered by the creator.”\textsuperscript{145} As it is used here ἄβυσσος resonates with both these aspects. The demon is averse to being sent, or rather returned (ἀπέρχομαι) to the abyss.\textsuperscript{146} The

\textsuperscript{140} Tiede, \textit{Luke}, 172.

\textsuperscript{141} Or “was begging” (“παρεκάλουν” = impf. active).

\textsuperscript{142} Klein, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, 319.

\textsuperscript{143} In Luke 4:36 ἐπιτάσσω has already been used in the context of a deliverance.

\textsuperscript{144} Zerwick, \textit{Analysis}, 208. It is the “place associated with the dead and hostile powers.” “ἄβυσσος, θ, ἡ,” \textit{BDAG}, 2, Section 2. “It also could hold hostile spirits according to Jewish belief (Ib. 5:6–7; I En. 10:4–6; 18:11–16).” Here, they beg “not to be sent to their appointed place of punishment before their destined time.” T. Lewis, “Abyss,” \textit{ISBE}, 1:22. Also H. Bietenhard, “Hell, Abyss, Hades, Gehenna, Lower Regions,” \textit{NIDNTT}, 2:205-10. In 8:32 the demon will παρακαλέω (beg) to be sent into the pigs.

\textsuperscript{145} Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke}, 1:739. See Gen 1:2; 7:11; 8:2; Deut 8:7; 33:13; Ps 32:7; 35:7; 41:8; 70:20; 76:17; 77:15; 103:6; 105:9; 106:26; 134:6; 148:7; Prov 3:20; 8:28; Job 28:14; 38:16, 30; 41:23-24; Amos 7:4; Jonah 2:6; Hab 3:10; Isa 51:10; 63:13; Ezek 26:19; 31:4, 15. It is often, though certainly always associated with the great oceans.

\textsuperscript{146} Note that ἄβυσσος parallels βάθος in 5:4.
story also links back to the chaos of the watery deep via ἄβυσσος here, as well as the stormy lake crossing, which certainly displayed chaos and disorder prior to Jesus’ intervention.  

4.3 The Exorcism: Luke 8:32-34

Verses 32-34 of this passage have proved something of a puzzle to commentators. Why does Luke (following Mark) have Jesus send the demons into the pigs? Why does Jesus comply with the demon’s request? It has also been noted that with only very slight modification to v. 35 these verses could have been omitted from the story without disrupting the basic coherence of the episode as a deliverance story. Klutz, for example, suggests that “in light of the relatively simple plot” of 4:33-37 we might have expected the story to conclude with v. 33. Without vv. 32-34 the reversal wrought in the man’s life could still have been amply demonstrated. This reversal would very adequately have served as “proof” of the effectiveness of the deliverance, if that is why the pigs are included in the episode.

Of the pigs, Joshua Garroway notes:

The number of interpretations for the significance of the pigs is itself legion. . . . Some of the most frequent include: (1) The wild boar from the shield of the tenth legion; (2) pigs are associated with Romans in later rabbinic materials; (3) pigs are a staple of Roman religious practice, particularly at funeral rites; (4) pig in Latin can refer to the pudendum muliebre, and Roman legions were known for rape; (5) pigs were an unclean animal to the Jews. This last option is probably the most popular, and it is often suggested that by destroying the pigs Jesus somehow destroys a barrier between Jews and Gentiles.  


148 Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 86.

149 On reversal in Luke see York, The Last Shall Be First, passim. York discusses the Gerasene demoniac only very briefly. However, he acknowledges this passage as an example of reversal. York, The Last Shall Be First, 168-69.


151 Garroway, “Invasion of a Mustard Seed,” 66 (n. 19). The Latin phrase, pudendum muliebre, translates as “a woman’s shame.”
As a result of Roman conquest the people of the region of the Gerasenes have reason to be offended by aspects of Roman culture and practice such those listed by Garroway. It is notable that options 1-4, being concerned with Rome, would be negative associations for Luke’s (LXX conscious) readers also. As to the fifth suggestion, the emphasis on uncleanness is certainly present. Between the association with Rome and the Jewish sensibilities about pigs as unclean, it is safe to assume that the pigs in this story are objectionable and abhorrent to Luke’s readers.

4.3.1 Verse 32
The ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν (“large herd of pigs”) is now introduced. There is an obvious parallel here between the two lake stories with fish featured in the first, and pigs in the second. Their fate, however, is reversed as a result of Jesus’ intervention. The fish are hauled out of the lake in the nets and into the boats. The pigs on the hillside are driven by the demons into the lake. Herd (ἀγέλη) is used of the pigs here and in v. 33. The term was often used of a band of military recruits. The presence of the unclean pigs in “large numbers” (“ἱκανῶν”) is a further indicator that this is Gentile or pagan territory. The man’s proximity to the pigs is another source and indicator of his uncleanness. As noted above, pigs are loaded with Roman symbolism. The location or existence of the hillside (ὄρος) in the region of Gennesaret is the cause of much scholarly anxiety but works within the world of the text as a setting for the episode described.

In v. 31 the demons beg (παρακαλέω) not to be sent into the abyss. They now beg (παρακαλέω) to be sent into the pigs grazing on the hillside. Burrow (of the Markan version) notes the irony of the demons’ cry for mercy when they have shown none to the man. As a confrontation

152 Lev 11:7; Deut 14:8.
154 Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:737. Similarly βόσκειν χοίρους (“to feed the pigs”) in 15:15 where, once again, the uncleanness of the pigs works with the pathos of the setting to paint a picture of isolation and ruin soon to be followed by homecoming.
between Jesus and the demons this double use of παρακαλέω denotes a rout. This is matched and reinforced by the double use of ἐπιτρέπω, with Jesus as the subject in both instances. ἐπιτρέπω is used as a military command.\(^{156}\) The begging of the demons to be sent into the pigs and their immediate sending by Jesus emphasises the hierarchy at work here. The demons’ request is in effect an acknowledgement of Jesus’ superior status and of their defeat. The associated use of παρακαλέω heightens this effect.\(^{157}\) The δαιμόνια πολλά who had gone into the man (v. 30) are sent by Jesus into them (ἐκεῖνος), being the ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν (“large herd of pigs”). With many demons and a large heard of pigs Luke takes every opportunity to emphasise the magnitude of the man’s plight.

### 4.3.2 Verse 33

In v. 32 the demons beg Jesus to send them into the pigs. Here, they comply with Jesus’ instruction that they do so:\(^{158}\) ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους (“The demons came out of the man and entered into the pigs”). Thereafter, “something unexpected happens”\(^{159}\) as ὁρμάω ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίγη (“the heard rushed down the cliff and into the lake and drowned”). The pigs ὁρμάω into the lake as troops into battle (v. 33). Enemy troops being swallowed by water recalls the exodus and the Egyptians at the Sea of Reeds.\(^{160}\) Like the Egyptian troops the swine (ὁρμάω) into the water, and like Pharaoh’s army they then drown.\(^{161}\) Joel Marcus notes (of the Markan version)
also the crossing of the sea (though here it is, of course, a lake).\textsuperscript{162} Aus makes much of the connection between Exod 14:29 and 15:4-5 with Mark 5:13 (|| Luke 8:33).\textsuperscript{163} Jonathan Knight argues that the people’s desire to push Jesus over the cliff in Luke 4:39 resembles 8:26-39. In Luke 4 nobody goes over the cliff and Jesus walks away of his own accord, with the reader left to wonder how this can be. Here in Luke 8 the pigs rush over the cliff because they are demonised. The answer to the mystery of 4:29 is thereby supplied: “Those who go over cliffs are the demonised in Luke. Jesus by contrast, is possessed by the Spirit of God.”\textsuperscript{164}

4.4 The Reaction: Luke 8:34-37

4.4.1 Verse 34

The swineherds (οἱ βόσκοντες) “see” (δράω) what Jesus has done for the man, being “that which had taken place.” This use of τὸ γεγονός allows the reader to see the event from two different perspectives. Here, it is from the point of view of the swineherds, who rush away to report the drowning of the pigs. In v. 35 the event is seen from the point of view of the people, who see the reversal of the man’s condition.\textsuperscript{165} This ἰδόντες δὲ . . . γεγονός (“seeing what had taken place”) echoes Simon’s “ἰδὼν” in 5:8, as well as 8:28 where the man “sees” Jesus. While δράω in each case denotes more than literal sight it is also limited or inadequate insight. Upon seeing (δράω), Simon asks Jesus to depart from him. He “sees” in Jesus someone he must be separated from, rather than one whom he must follow. Fearing the harm that may be done to

\textsuperscript{162} Marcus, \textit{Mark 1-8}, 348-49. See also Aus, \textit{My Name is “Legion,”} 47-51. For references to scholars who have explored the theme see Ibid., 47-48 (n. 146).

\textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 53, 95. On the pigs rushing down the slope and drowning see also Ibid., 48-54. Mark 5:13 uses of ἁλασσα. This echoes ב (in Exod 15:4 (twice) which the LXX translates with ἁλασσα. This contrast in vocabulary also highlights Luke’s deliberate choice of λίμνη.


\textsuperscript{165} Klutz, \textit{Exorcism Stories}, 90. The effect here is similar to בָּנָה (behold) in Hebrew (and ἴδε υ Greek) which often denote a shift in narrative point of view.
him (or to the demon within him), the man, on seeing (ὁράω) Jesus in v. 28 offers a challenge. Here, as the swineherds see (ὁράω) events unfold before them, they rush off in alarm.

The swineherds “flee,” or “run away” (φεύγω). Luke catches both nuances. They flee away in haste to spread their message, whilst their “fleeing” anticipates the people’s fearful response of the people in the cities and the country to the message they receive and the evidence they will witness (8:35). The news is spread εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς (“into the city and into the countryside”). With πόλις, Luke links the story back to the πόλις from where the man has come (8:27). It is also the place to which he will eventually go, proclaiming what Jesus has done for him (8:39). The plural of ἀγρός can mean “farms” or “estates,” hence “country” as the translation.166 This pairing emphasises the fact that the swineherds told everybody everywhere what had happened. The public nature of the event is emphasised, so that “the work of the kingdom of God in people is always manifest visibly, that is socially. . . . Whenever Jesus or the apostles heals the sick, crowds can see the healing.”167 These things are not being done in a corner (Acts 26:26).

4.4.2 Verse 35

The people come out (ἐξέρχομαι) to see what has happened. This recalls v. 27, where Jesus’ “steps out” (ἐξέρχομαι) onto the shore. This echo creates an expectation that this approach by the people is hostile.168 What the people find (εὑρίσκω) is the man καθήμενον . . . παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (“seated . . . at Jesus’ feet”). He is, lest we forget, τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν.169 Not only is he seated, but he is ιµατισµένον καὶ σωφρονούντα (“clothed and of sound mind”).170 This is a clearly and deliberately painted portrait of the reversal of the man’s

166 “ἀγρός, σῦ, ὅ,” BDAG, 15, Section 2. ἀγρός appears again in 15:25.
167 Arlandson, Women, Class, and Society, 128.
168 There is a hint of invasion in Jesus’ arrival. This is noted above at Section 4.1.2.
169 Above, Section 4.2.1.
170 σωφρονέω appears only here in Luke.
condition. He is healed. The chaos and disorder in his life has been calmed, as was the storm following Jesus’ intervention in v. 24. The calming motif echoes the reassurance (μὴ φοβοῦ) Jesus gives to Simon in 5:10. The posture of Simon (5:8) and then of the delivered man after their respective encounters with Jesus is another parallel between the two episodes. The man is found sitting at Jesus’ feet, suggesting discipleship. Simon falls before Jesus, displaying his recognition of the divine or the divine representative. In noting the emphasis on the reversal of the man’s condition and (above) the severity of his affliction, it needs to be born in mind that the exorcism demonstrates the power and authority of the exorcist. This episode is unusual in the attention that it gives to the man, but this is in the service of highlighting what Jesus has done.

Luke stages or arranges the scene so that Jesus and the man are set in place as the people arrive to see τὸ γεγονός. Luke reports simply that “they were afraid” (“ἐφοβήθησαν”). This both echoes and contrasts with the disciples’ response following the calming of the storm (v. 25). Of them we read φοβηθέντες δὲ ἐθαύμασαν. The disciples’ response suggests a sense of awe or wonder. The people’s reaction to the delivered demoniac is unqualified fear.

4.4.3 Verse 36

Just as the swineherds announce (ἀπαγγέλλω) what had happened in the towns and countryside (8:34), so here those who had seen what had taken place report (ἀπαγγέλλω) what had taken place to those who came out to see. There is a pattern to the seeing and reporting:

171 The repetition of the references to the man’s before and after condition sets up a link with Isa 58:5-7 where the δεκτήν (acceptable) day is one where the hungry are fed and the naked clothed. Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 93.
173 Sorenson, Possession and Exorcism, 136-44.
174 In Luke τὸ γεγονός is always the astonishing and gracious intervention of God or God’s agent in Jesus (Luke 2:15; 8:34, 35, 56; 24:12). This reporting by the swineherds (and then by the witnesses in v. 36) stands in contrast to v. 39 where the man is ordered by Jesus to “give an account” (διηγέομαι) and responds not in fear, but by going throughout the city κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.
Thus ἰδόντες and ἀπήγγειλαν are tightly linked. The tragedy here is that despite the double seeing and announcing of “πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς” (“how the one possessed by demons had been healed/saved”) the people will ask Jesus to depart on account of their fear. The fact that they report what they have seen (ὁράω) suggests their report is factually accurate but that their seeing is again limited. They “see” what has happened, but they are blind to the opportunity and fail to recognise who it is that has come to them. In this there is an echo of the disciples’ questioning about Jesus’ identity following the calming of the storm in 8:25 and of Simon and his companions in 5:10.

The people report how the man had been healed, or saved (σῴζω). This is more specific than τὸ γεγονός in vv. 34 and 35. This is an instance where σῴζω has the fuller nuance of healed/saved. As Nolland states, “such a healing is, for Luke, an expression of the salvation that Jesus brings.” NT healings often involve reintegration with family and larger society, along with restoration to a community of faith. This means that it is often difficult to determine which nuance of σῴζω predominates in any particular instance, its salvific aspect or the physical healing. Clinton Wahlen notes that Luke achieves this broad reading of σῴζω as

175 In the first lake journey ὁράω also occurs twice. In 5:2 Jesus sees the two boats lying on the shore. This is the first hint of a journey on the lake. Then in 5:8 Simon sees the catch of fish. His response is to ask Jesus to depart. As it is here with the people of the region of the Gerasenes, this request is also (partly) fear-driven, hence μὴ φοβοῦ in 5:10.

176 Chapter 3, Section 8.1.


179 Clinton Wahlen, “Healing,” DJG, 2nd ed., 365. See for example the raising of the widow’s son at Nain (7:11-17); the healing of Jairus’ daughter (8:41-42; 49-56); the healing of the boy with the demon (9:37-43); the healing of the hemorrhaging woman (8:43-48); the healing of the crippled woman (13:10-17); the story of the ten lepers (17:11-19).

180 Ibid, 368.
healed and/or saved by showing an interest in those healed as people. Luke often gives details of the events and circumstances, and the effect of the events on the person and their family. This particular healing account is narrated in considerable detail, even for Luke, so the effect is pronounced.

This points to a broad reading of σῴζω as healing, salvation, and restoration. Wahlen also states that given the comprehensive nature of Jesus’ healings they represent also “a return to wholeness within Israel and a sign of the redemption that [Jesus’] kingdom proclamation offered.”181 As the man is a Gentile he is not being restored to Israel, but this story could be read as suggestive of a joining or melding of Israelite and Gentile restorative hopes. Along with “possessed by demons” (δαιμονίζομαι) (used only here in Luke), σῴζω reminds the reader again of the man’s former condition and therefore of what he has been healed of or saved from. It emphasises again the contrast between his former and latter condition. This verse summarises and emphasises the reversal Jesus has effected in his life.182 It therefore also emphasises the tragedy of the people’s fearful response, as well as their forthcoming rejection of him.

Klutz argues that πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς does not refer to the transformation of the man, being something the audience could already see, but the loss of swine,183 and that the “shameful and very negative” fear described in v. 37 is different from the “innocent fear” of v. 35. The people’s response, he claims, echoes that of the townsfolk who reject Jesus in 4:25-30.184 However, πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς” directs attention onto the man, not the swine. The mention of ἁγρός (along with πόλις) makes it clear that although the people’s reaction might include reaction to the loss of the pigs, it is certainly not limited to that. Those from the cities only have an indirect interest in the pigs.185 As Klein notes, a commission is sent to see the now

182 He was “restored to his proper identity . . . restored to his community.” Johnson, Prophetic Jesus, 134.
183 Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 90-91.
184 Ibid., 91.
185 Gonzalez links this passage with Acts 16:16. He argues for both economic impact and fear of the unknown as the reasons for the people requesting that Jesus leave. Gonzalez, Luke, 109. Klutz also stresses the
delivered demoniac and the one who has performed this miracle, but no such commission is sent to investigate the fate of the pigs. The swine form part of the story of the man’s transformation and no doubt the people would have felt their loss. It is an overstatement to say the account “is unconcerned with the economic loss that the herdsmen have incurred.”

However, it is accurate to say that the narrator’s focus remains on the transformation of the man. Furthermore, Klutz’s comparison with 4:25-30 points rather to the people’s reaction to Jesus and his mission of transformation (4:18-19) as what the people react to. Jesus’ mission (4:18-19) does have an economic dimension as it is heavily laden with jubilee themes. But that economic dimension is not the focus of 4:25-30, nor of 8:26-39.

4.4.4 Verse 37

The request that Jesus depart comes from ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν (“all the people of the region of the Gerasenes”). It is a comprehensive rejection. The rationale for this rejection, or at least the raw emotion behind it, is now spelled out: ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο (“because a great fear had seized them”). The people’s fear (φοβέω) in v. 35 has become “great fear” (“φόβῳ μεγάλῳ”), and it has seized them. συνέχω indicated that the people are “possessed” by this “great fear.” With ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος (here), as well as the swineherd’s rushing off to the city and the country in v. 34, Luke emphasises that it is all the people. The economic aspect of the loss of the pigs. Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 91-2.

186 Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 319.


188 The consistent emphasis on the man’s transformation throughout the passage has been noted in the above discussion. Klutz himself acknowledges the man and the demons are “almost constantly in view” from 8:27-39. Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 85.

189 Though the parallel between this passage and Acts 16:16-18 count in favour of Klutz’s view. Ibid., 89-92.

190 περίχωρος is here “the Gerasenes and the people living around them.” “περίχωρος, ov,” BDAG, 808.

191 Other occurrences of συνέχω in Luke are: 4:38 (with μεγάλῳ) πενθερὰ δὲ τοῦ Σίμωνος ἦν συνεχομένη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ (“Simon’s mother-in-law was seized with a great fever”); 8:45 οἱ ἤχοι συνέχουσιν σε (“the crowd presses about you”); 12:50 πῶς συνέχομαι ἐως ὅτι τελεσθή (“what stress I am under until it is completed”); 19:43 συνέξουσί σε (“you will be besieged”); 22:63 οἱ συνέχοντες αὐτόν (the men guarding him). All of these suggest pressure, stress, or difficulty.
seizing fear thus becomes a kind of corporate personality that “possesses” the people. The man’s possession by a legion of demons (λεγιών/δαιμόνια πολλὰ in 8:30) mirrors this.

The previous use of συνέχω was in 4:38 where Simon’s mother-in-law is seized (συνέχω) by a great fever which Jesus rebuked (ἐπιτιμάω), just as he had rebuked (ἐπιτιμάω) the demon-storm in 8:24. The fear is μέγας because it is awe-full, and the power behind it is ruinous, as the man’s former condition attests.

The people ask Jesus to depart. Despite ἐρωτάω being a reasonably common verb in Luke, the reader recalls 5:3 from the first lake journey where Jesus asks (ἐρωτάω) Simon to put the boat out a little way from the shore, sits in the boat, and teaches the crowd. The parallel uses of ἐρωτάω are the only occurrence in each of the two lake stories. Both precipitate journeys out onto the lake. The request here comes from the people’s fear. It means Jesus’ departure. Had the people let Jesus be the one who asks (as he did in 5:3) he might have had Simon put the boat out from the shore so that he could teach them the word of God. If the disciples had succeeded in piloting the boat across the lake through the storm and then delivered the demoniac themselves, it might have been one of them (probably Simon as the one prominent in 5:1-11 and as representative of the others) who did the proclaiming.

Luke’s use of πλῆθος here echoes the large large number (πλῆθος) of fish caught in the net in 5:6. Again, had they allowed themselves to be “caught alive” (ζωγρέω) (5:10), rather than allowing themselves to be “seized by a great fear,” the story could have ended differently. The people’s request that Jesus depart echoes Simon’s request that Jesus depart from him in 5:8, though the outcome of the request is very different.


193 Compare ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον (5:3) with ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν...ἀπολύσθην ἀπ’ αὐτῶν (8:37). What is being asked for, and by whom, is quite different, but in the context of the two lake stories they are connected. Jesus’ asking Simon to cooperate is the antithesis of the people asking Jesus to leave. However, the movement (a little from the shore and then to remove completely—to the other side) captures the movement within the two lake stories from the shore to the far side of the lake.

In v. 32, Jesus complies with the demons’ request that he send them into the pigs. Here he complies with the request from the people that he depart. The parallel ideas and vocabulary between these two verses, along with φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο emphasise the fearful compliance of the demons and the fear of the people. ἐμβαίνω is unique to the lake stories in Luke.195 Here Jesus enters the boat. This compliance with the people’s request is further emphasised by the use of ἀπέρχομαι, which Luke has also used in v. 31 as the pigs beg not to be sent back (ἀπέρχομαι) into the abyss. The opposition and fear Jesus experiences from the people proves a more difficult obstacle than the demons.196


4.5.1 Verse 38

In 8:28 the man begs (δέομαι) not to be tormented by Jesus. Now he begs (δέομαι) to go with him. His life has turned around. The parallel with Simon, who requests that Jesus depart from him (5:8) but then leaves everything to follow Jesus (5:11), is strong. The use of δέομαι brackets the double use of παρακαλέω (implored) in vv. 31 and 32:

v. 28 δέομαι σου, μὴ με βασανίσῃς.
v. 31 παρεκάλουν αὐτόν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν.
v. 32 παρεκάλεσαν αὐτόν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν.
v. 38 ἐδείτο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ’ οὗ ἔξεληλύθη τὰ δαιμόνια ἔνας σὺν αὐτῷ.

Luke uses δέομαι to express urgency, distress, or great need.197 It is another Lukan favourite, meaning “to ask, beg, or pray.” The double use in this passage and the urgency associated with it suggests that the people want to be delivered of Jesus as if of a demon. The μὴ … ἵνα

μὴ...ίνα...εἶναι pattern shows Jesus’ control of the situation. In the first three cases Jesus complies with the request. In v. 38 he does not. Jesus agrees to the requests from Legion and from the people of the region, neither of whom welcome him. In stark contrast to this is Jesus’ refusal to allow the delivered demoniac to be with him. This seems strange until Luke reports the commissioning of the man in v. 39.

The man here is described, once again, as ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια. He begs to be σὺν αὐτῷ (with Jesus), which is a key discipleship indicator, as the dramatic context here demonstrates. However, ἀπέλυσεν...αὐτ (“Jesus sent him away”).

4.5.2 Verse 39

The strong parallelism between the two halves of this verse are loaded with import and form a fitting end to this second lake story:

ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἴκον σου καὶ διηγοῦ ὡς σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός.
καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καθ᾽ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

(“Return to your home, and declare how much God has done for you. So he went away, proclaiming throughout the city how much Jesus had done for him.”)

Note particularly:

198 On the man as ἀνὴρ see Section 3.1.2.

199 This is the only sending away in the two lake stories. ἀπολύω is common in Luke, appearing twelve times (2:29; 6:37 (twice); 8:38; 9:12; 13:12; 14:4; 16:18 (twice); 23:16, 18, 20, 22, 25) and Acts fifteen times (3:13; 4:21, 23; 5:40; 13:3; 15:30, 33; 16:35f; 17:9; 19:40; 23:22; 26:32; 28:18, 25). It usually means release or pardon from sin, disease or infirmity, or to be granted acquittal. The same form (“ἀπέλυσεν”) is used in 14:4 where the person ἰάομαι (healed) by Jesus is sent away. This is another highly symbolic story, the man with dropsy being symbolic for the avarice of the Pharisees. See Braun, Feasting and Social Rhetoric.

200 NRSV.
The first of these parallels (ὑπόστρεφε || ἀπῆλθεν) indicates that the man was in fact obedient to Jesus’ request.201 The second (εἰς τὸν οἶκόν || καθ’ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν) that he has more than obeyed Jesus, as the reach of his going far exceeds the area Jesus had directed him to. The man is as fervent in his enthusiasm for Jesus after his deliverance as he was fearful of and opposed to him beforehand. The third (διηγοῦ || κηρύσσων) shows that the man is commissioned both with a similar task to Luke’s in the narrating of his Gospel (Luke 1:1), and as an active participant in Jesus’ mission (4:18-19), but he goes among Gentiles. The fourth parallel (δια σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός || διὰ ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς) shows that the man equates what Jesus has done with him with what God has done for him. In Luke this is in turn to the purpose and plan of God. These four parallels form the basis for the following discussion.

ὑπόστρεφε || ἀπῆλθεν. In 8:37 the people ask Jesus to depart (ἀπέρχομαι) from their region. In response, Jesus returns (ὑποστρέφω). In 8:39 Jesus instructs the man to return (ὑποστρέφω). In response he departs (ἀπέρχομαι). The pattern is chiastic:

v. 37 ἀπέρχομαι (Jesus)
ὑποστρέφω (Jesus)
v. 39 ὑποστρέφω (Man)
ἀπέρχομαι (Man)

This arrangement has the man and Jesus acting and responding to the same verbs. The effect is to align the man with Jesus, and reinforces the point made above, that the delivered man is actively taking up Jesus’ mission. Jesus sends the man to his home, a reminder of v. 27 where

---

201 This is against the view that the demoniac’s preaching tour is a violation of Jesus’ instruction to the man to return to his home. Gundry notes (of Mark 5:20) that were this to be the case the reader would expect an adversative δέ, rather than the copulative καί. Robert H. Gundry, *Mark: A Commentary on His Apology for the Cross* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 265. Luke retains καί from Mark.
Luke notes that the man had no home. (The difference in meaning between ἀσια in v. 27 and ὠικῶς in v. 39 is indistinguishable in this context.) These references to home bracket the event, with the man who had no home now being sent to his home. Although in both cases “home” is literally “a dwelling,” much more is implied: a household, a community, and a social fabric. Jesus, the demons (via the pigs), and the man all ultimately return (ἀπέρχομαι) to their places of origin, being Galilee, the abyss, and the city, respectively. The man returns having been healed/saved (σῴζω). This adds to the sense of completeness or fulness of the episode.

εἰς τὸν ὠικῶν || καθ’ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν. The man then ἀπῆλθεν καθ’ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν. As with ὠικία (v. 27) and ὠικῶς (v. 39), the repetition of πόλις (8:27, 39) gives a sense of inclusion and completion to the episode. The man came from the city with all his demons (8:27) to live among the tombs (8:27), but even there he had no peace, being regularly driven into the wilderness (8:29). Now he returns to the city, κηρύσσων δὲ ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

The return to home and city has a strong jubilee ring to it. Recall that jubilee in Luke essentially comes to mean liberty and return. The man has been released, and he is now able to return home. This recalls Isaiah 58:7 where the homeless poor and the naked are mentioned. Isaiah names these as being among the oppressed for whom God desires release (Isa 58:6). Luke places the phrase on Jesus’ lips at Luke 4:18 as he proclaims the arrival of the acceptable year (4:19), God’s jubilee. The mention of the πόλις in 8:34 emphasises the distance between the man and the city he has come from as the people travel there and then return while he remains outside of the city with Jesus.

διηγοῦ || κηρύσσων. Luke uses the noun διήγησις (account) only in Luke 1:1. This man’s story, with its detailed and careful exposition of his release from captivity, demonstrates Luke’s desire to produce an ordered narrative (1:1). The verb διηγέομαι (give an account) here reminds

202 BDAG include “social unit within a dwelling, household, family” (emphasis original) among the semantic range for ὠικία, though they list ὠικία in 8:27 under “as a building.” “ὁἰκία, πς, ἡ,” BDAG, 695, Section 2. Similarly for ὠικῶς BDAG include “household, family” (emphasis original), but list the meaning of ὠικῶς in 8:39 as “a dwelling” (emphasis original). “ὁἰκῶς, υς, δ,” BDAG, 698, Section 1αα. 255
the reader of Luke’s stated intention to compose a deliberate and careful narrative. It also reveals that the man and Luke himself share in the common task of recounting Jesus’ deeds as the outworking of the plan of God. Furthermore, by placing διηγέομαι in parallel with κηρύσσω, Luke links the whole of his Gospel with the arrival of ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν as διηγέομαι echoes διήγησις in 1:1, where Luke refers to his whole Gospel story, and κηρύσσω echoes 4:18-19, which is programmatic to Jesus’ ministry in Luke. 203

δια σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός || δια ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The shift between the two phrases is from the general to the particular. As such, it takes on the nature of witness, or testimony (Luke 24:48). It speaks of the man’s clarity of mind (8:35) that he would translate Jesus’ instructions in v. 39a in the manner he has in v. 39b. Rowe writes, “The grammatical similarity and structure of the sentences point to the continuity of God and Jesus, here at the point of the unity of salvific action.” 204 Luke is making a powerful Christological statement here.

What God/Jesus has done for the man relates to the whole of 8:26-39. However, the recurring refrain ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια (v. 38) and its variations point to the man’s deliverance from the demons as the crux of God’s action on his behalf. The previous (and proximate) use of ποιέω is μήτηρ μου καὶ ἀδελφοί μου οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες (“my mother and brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it”) (8:21). The man is one who hears the word of God and (immediately) does it. His obedience to Jesus’ command shows therefore that he is Jesus’ brother (8:21). In this he is contrasted favourably with the disciples, who, in this second lake story, fail to face up to the storm or to deliver the man possessed by demons who meets them on the shore.

The interchanging of θεός with Ἰησοῦς here is reminiscent of the way the identity of the man and the demon (or demons) were fused earlier in the episode. In this final verse, having been freed from his captivity to the demon Legion and commissioned by Jesus, the man finally

203 The following develops the earlier survey of κηρύσσω in Luke at Chapter 1, Section 3.4.4.
204 Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 120-121 (n. 129).
emerges from under the demon’s power as an active agent.\textsuperscript{205} It is also ironic, as the demons had earlier acknowledged Jesus as υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ υψίστου (“Son of God Most High”) (8:28), an expression associating Jesus with God.\textsuperscript{206} In that context, the association of Jesus with God was a fearful acknowledgment. Here in 8:39 the association of Jesus with God is a joyful one that speaks of freedom and release: in 8:28 he was challenging Jesus; now he is proclaiming him.

Taken together, the dramatic encounter between the Gerasene demoniac and Jesus, his desire to be with Jesus, his enthusiastic response to the task Jesus sets him, his active proclamation of Jesus/God ahead of the twelve show him in the best possible light.

5 Conclusion

5.1 The Disciples

Several strands running through the above material need to be traced. The first is the role of the disciples. What has emerged here is that Luke’s lake stories are formative liminal journeys involving barriers or tasks that Jesus hopes the disciples will master. In 5:1-11 it was Simon’s initial reluctance to put out on the lake. This was followed by the bringing in of the fish. Here it is the storm on the lake and then the deliverance of the Gerasene demoniac. In the first lake story the fishers overcame their reluctance to put out on the lake and were then successful in bringing in the large catch. Here, however, the disciples fail to pilot the boat through the storm, prompting Jesus to wonder at their lack of faith. Jesus therefore steps out of the boat himself to meet the Gerasene demoniac and casts out the legion of demons. This has been

\textsuperscript{205} Klutz, Exorcism Stories, 103-104.

\textsuperscript{206} Rowe, introducing his work on κύριος in Luke, remarks that θεός and κύριος can be distinguished, yet both share the identity of κύριος. Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 21-22, 199-202 (and passim). A closely related effect is at work here, where Jesus and God are distinguishable, but the parallelism of this verse tends to fuse the two.
argued at various points so it will be helpful to gather together the evidence from the discussion above that supports this aspect of the study.

First, there are the various parallels between the storm crossing and the deliverance of the Gerasene demoniac. By questioning the disciples about their faith Jesus makes it clear they have failed in some way. Jesus’ “where is your faith?” makes this clear. Jesus’ indictment of the disciples’ faith does not imply they should have trusted him to see them through the storm (he was, after all, sleeping), but that Jesus anticipated that (in light of 5:1-11) the disciples themselves would prevail at the task.

The reading of the lake journeys as liminal, formative journeys fits with the proposal that Jesus is setting this “task” before the disciples. While surveying πίστις and πιστεύω in Luke I stated that where Jesus commends the faith of others it is “on the basis of the actions and initiative of these characters, often expressed in their working together with others.” Where he expresses doubt about the faith of others (invariably his disciples) it is on the basis of the failure of such actions, initiatives, and working together with each other. This supports the suggestion that “where is your faith?” in 8:25 indicates that the disciples themselves should have managed the boat through the storm by working together.

The arrival on the far shore (8:26) creates an expectation that the word of God will be taught to the people, as it was in 5:1. The commission to “catch people alive” in 5:10 is of course a metaphor for mission. Nevertheless, 8:26-39 is the next and, in fact, the only other occasion in Luke where the disciples find themselves by the lake. Recall that in 5:10 the disciples have been commissioned to catch people alive “from now on.” This is obviously a good time to “go fishing.” Again, as a liminal, formative journey, such a task as the one that presents itself here would be expected to fall to the disciples. In 5:7 the disciples bring the fish into the boat. Here they might have been expected to send the demons into the pigs.


---

207 Above, Section 3.4.
5.2 The Man

The second major thread to this story that needs to be traced is that of the deliverance, transformation, and then the sending of the Gerasene demoniac. Throughout 8:26-39 Luke

Table 5: The Gerasene Demoniac before and after His Encounter with Jesus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE</th>
<th>AFTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Had demons had demons</td>
<td>Demons gone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχων δαιμόνια (v. 27);</td>
<td>τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐισῆλθον (v. 33);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου (v. 29);</td>
<td>τὸν ἀνθρώπων ἀφ’ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν (v. 35);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν (v. 30).</td>
<td>ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς (v. 36);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demons gone</td>
<td>ὁ ἀνήρ ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια (v. 38).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naked</td>
<td>Clothed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>οὐκ ἔνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον (27).</td>
<td>ἴματισμένον (35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not live at home</td>
<td>Sent home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν (27).</td>
<td>ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου (39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell before Jesus</td>
<td>Sitting at Jesus’ feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσέπεσεν (28).</td>
<td>καθήμενον . . . παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shouted</td>
<td>In his right mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνακράξας (28).</td>
<td>σωφρονοῦντα (35).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seized many times</td>
<td>Unclean spirit ordered out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτόν (29).</td>
<td>παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kept under guard and bound</td>
<td>ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (29).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἁλύσεις καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος (29).</td>
<td>Proclaiming throughout the city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>καθ᾽ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων (39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven into the wilderness</td>
<td>Sent home to declare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἥλαυνετο . . . εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους (29).</td>
<td>ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ διηγοῦ (39).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many demons had entered him</td>
<td>Healed/Saved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν (30).</td>
<td>ἐσώθη (36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begs not to be sent to the abyss</td>
<td>Begged to be with Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν (31).</td>
<td>ἐδεῖτο δὲ αὐτοῖς . . . εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ (38).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
has, in my view, very deliberately used a number of techniques to emphasise the dire plight of the man prior to his deliverance. His careful matching of this description with the state of the man following his deliverance shows him to be one of the captives (αἰχμαλώτος) of Luke 4:18 who has experienced release (ἀφεσις) and who has been saved (σῴζω). The magnitude of the reversal wrought by Jesus in his life is summarised in Table 5.

To achieve this effect Luke shapes the story he has taken from Mark to emphasise the seriousness of the man’s plight. As noted above, he does this by sharpening the description of the man’s former condition by filling in some of the gaps in Mark’s narrative. Luke emphasises the hostility the man displays towards Jesus as he arrives at the shore (8:28). The narrative highlights the contrast between his state and condition before he is delivered with his calm demeanour afterward. Notable here also is the amount of detail Luke provides in this account. This goes far beyond that given about any of the subjects of healings or deliverance he has narrated thus far, including even the account of raising of the son of the widow at Nain in 7:11-17. Luke is clearly at pains to emphasise the transformation of the man, and he obviously considers this story of key importance to his narrative.

Luke has shaped the story of the Gerasene demoniac around Jesus’ mission κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν (4:18). The man who was captive and under the power of a legion of demons has experienced ἀφεσις as a result of his encounter with Jesus. His latter condition is a complete reversal of his former one. Luke also stresses the former and latter condition of the lake, first


209 The healings and deliverances narrated thus far in Luke are: the man with the unclean spirit (4:31-37). The actual deliverance in this story occupies only 3 verses (vv. 33-35); Simon’s mother-in-law is healed (4:38-39); many are delivered and healed in 4:40-41; the cleansing of the leper (5:12-16). The actual encounter is narrated over vv. 12-14. It includes a brief dialogue; the healing of the paralytic (5:17-26) is a longer account but being a controversy story much of it is devoted to the interaction between Jesus and the Pharisees; the man with the withered hand (6:6-11) is a controversy story so that of the six verses approximately half the material involves Jesus in dialogue with the scribes and Pharisees; many healings and deliverances are reported in the summary statement in 6:18; the healing of the Centurion’s servant (7:1-10) includes an extended dialogue between Jesus and the Centurion but very little detail on the actual healing; the raising of the widow’s son at Nain (7:11-17) is brief on the actual healing. All of these healings or exorcisms, are rich in context and background, but it is still true to say that 8:26-39 is the longest and most detailed exorcism or healing reported by Luke thus far.
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under the influence of the storm and then following Jesus’ intervention. The two parts of this one lake story form a commentary on one another. Neither αἰχμάλωτος nor ἀφεσις are used in this passage, but they are more than amply described here by the detailed contrasting of the former and latter condition of the man and its echoing the calming of the storm in 8:22-25. As 4:16-30 is programmatic we would expect subsequent passages in Luke to fit with the programme presented in 4:18-19 without necessarily including all of the specific vocabulary at each point. Such is the case here.

Jesus announces his ministry as one of ἀφεσις and of the arrival of ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν (4:18-19). The story of the healing of the Gerasene demoniac demonstrates this ministry in action (8:26-39). His story embodies what it means to be αἰχμάλωτος (4:18) and under the power of demonic forces. Luke’s vocabulary in 8:28-29 makes this very clear. In v. 28, the language is that of fear and oppression: ἀνακράζω; προσπίπτω; δέομαι; βασανίζω. Following this v. 29 is full of the language of captivity and violence: συναρπάζω; δεσμεύω; φυλάσσω; διαρρήγνυμι; ἀλυσις and πέθη; δεσμός; ἔλαυνω. But he is granted ἀφεσις by Jesus. This can be said even if the specific vocabulary (αἰχμάλωτος, ἀφεσις) is absent from this episode. Following his healing the man goes on to join Jesus in the proclamation of the arrival of God’s jubilee to his own people. Luke has crafted this story to emphasise the reversal in his situation.

5.3 Jesus

Jesus acts to further the formation of his disciples by inviting them to cross the lake with him. He also demonstrates his confidence in them by sleeping in the boat, leaving them to deal with whatever may “test” their progress. When the disciples come to him (in panic) during the storm, however, he demonstrates his authority by calming the wind and waves. His question

210 Compare this with 5:8-10 and 8:24-25.

211 Green and Perrin, “Jubilee,” DJG, 2nd ed., 452. Green and Perrin note that Luke associates “release” with “liberation from the demonic, from economic enslavement, and from the power and consequences of sin (i.e., aphasis hamartion ['forgiveness of sins']).” Ibid, 451-452. This is to say that as one captive to demons the man is also one of “the poor” and his deliverance a manifestation of Jesus’ jubilee ministry of release.

212 “His foremost characteristic is his bondage to and release from demonic power (cf. 4:18-19).” Green, Luke, 335.
to the disciples—ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν;—is penetrating. He perceives the disciples’ faith as absent. Having calmed the demon-storm Jesus goes on to meet, deliver, and commission the Gerasene demoniac. In doing this he shows not only his authority and power, but also his ability and perception as a guide or spiritual director to his disciples. Following the return from the other side of the lake, he continues the work of their formation (8:40-56) before commissioning them to go out on their own (9:1-2).
Chapter 5: DISCIPLESHIP AND THE LAKE STORIES

1 Introduction

This study proposes that Jesus had prepared the disciples to master the demon-storm and then the demon Legion in 8:22-29. The argument has been made on the basis of the parallels between the two lake stories (5:1-11 || 8:22-39) and within the second lake story (8:22-25 || 8:26-39). The parallels between the two lake stories suggest that the disciples should have been able to perform the tasks in the second lake story in the same manner that they did on the first lake journey. In Luke 5:1-11 the task is fishing. Simon and his companions must contend with the tearing nets and near-sinking of the boats. In 8:22-39 the tasks are navigating the storm on the lake, and then exorcising the demon that possesses the man. In the first story the co-operative action of the fishers accomplishes the task. On the basis of the parallels between 5:1-11 and 8:22-39, Luke shows that Jesus expected the disciples to pilot the boat through the storm and to deliver the demoniac in 8:26-39 through their co-operative action.

However, the evidence that this is the case goes beyond the parallels between the two lake stories. The material leading up to, and following, the second lake story also needs to be considered.

This larger section of Luke (8:1-9:50) is headed by 8:1-3. By being σὺν αὐτῷ in 8:1 the disciples have the opportunity to see Jesus κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (“proclaiming and preaching the good news of the kingdom of God”). Jesus’ ministry up to this point includes the deliverance and confrontation of those possessed by demons.1 It is reasonable to infer then, that this summary of Jesus’ ministry in 8:1 includes deliverance from evil or unclean spirits. The summary nature of 8:1-3 looks forward and backwards in the narrative. This means that the period between the first and second lake journeys is formative.

---

for the disciples as they accompany Jesus, as he proclaims and preaches the kingdom of God (8:1).

If we frame Jesus’ role in regard to the disciples here as teacher, guide, spiritual director, or shaman, then his suggestion that they join him in crossing the lake (8:22) comes at a point when he deems them adequately prepared to make the journey successfully, and to succeed in overcoming whatever tasks or barriers are involved in the journey. That is to say, the Lukan Jesus considers the disciples adequately prepared to meet the demon-storm, and then to proclaim the word of God to the Gerasene demoniac at the lakeside in 8:26-39. After all, they have seen others delivered, they have seen Jesus proclaim the word of God to the crowds in 5:1, and they have been commissioned to take up that same task in 5:10.

Did the disciples simply misunderstand the role that Jesus expected them to play during the second lake journey? Examples of the disciples’ failure to understand Jesus, or the situations in which they find themselves with him, are plentiful in Luke. There is ample precedent, then, to say that the disciples misunderstood their role on the lake. Examples of actions not performed—as I am proposing is the case in 8:22-39—are rarer, but they do exist. There are two others in the Galilean section of the gospel. The first is 9:10-17, the feeding of the five thousand. Here, the twelve demonstrate their misunderstanding of the situation by suggesting that Jesus should send the people away to find food (9:12). Jesus, however, wants the disciples to feed the people, hence δότε αὐτοῖς ψωμί φάγειν (“you give them something to eat”) in 9:13a. They respond by claiming their resources are inadequate to feed so many (9:13b). The disciples display their lack of understanding here, but their failure is in their lack of action. Jesus expected them to feed the people. Green comments, “Luke thus appears to narrate this episode as a setback in the formation of Jesus’ followers. The presence of the

---

2 Simon (at least) may be assumed to have been present at 4:33-37, 41. Also 4:41; 6:18; 7:21; 8:2.

3 Examples from the Galilean section of the Gospel include 8:9, where the twelve fail to understand the parable of the sower (8:4-8) and 9:33, where Peter speaks, but doesn’t know what he is saying during the Transfiguration.

4 This misunderstanding is highlighted by the placement of the feeding of the five thousand immediately following the return of the twelve from their mission (9:1-6; 10-11). Luke emphasises the success of this mission, as well as the status of the twelve by referring to them again as apostles (ἀπόστολος) in 9:10.
crowds and their needs are unveiled as a test to their faith, a test in the face of which they flounder.”

In identifying this as a “formation” opportunity, a “test to their faith,” and one in which the disciples “flounder,” Green names three aspects of this episode that are also present in 8:22-39. In fact, the comment could have been written of 8:22-29. As he did with the calming of the storm and the deliverance of the demoniac, Jesus himself performs the deed he hoped his disciples would perform (9:16). At the end of the episode there are twelve baskets full of leftovers (9:17). These are symbolic of the disciples’ role as those who should have arranged the distribution of food among the people (9:13). The symbolic lesson of the twelve baskets demonstrates Jesus’ concern that the disciples learn from this episode. A similar dynamic is at work following 8:22-39, as the disciples accompany Jesus while he heals the twelve-year-old girl and the hemorrhaging woman (8:40-56). That is, following the (twelve) disciples’ failure at the test Jesus places before them, Jesus ensures appropriate corrective formation. Following the second lake story, this appropriate corrective formation is the healing of the twelve-year-old girl and the woman who has bled for twelve years (8:40-56). Following the feeding of the five thousand, it is collectively the twelve baskets of food (9:17).

The second example of the disciples’ failure in action is 9:37-43. Here, the disciples are unable to deliver a boy possessed by a demon (9:40). This elicits a scathing response from Jesus: ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; (“O faithless and perverse generation, how much longer must I bear with you?”) (9:41). This recalls the ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; in 8:25. Luke 9:42 makes explicit the connection between the disciples’ lack of faith and their inability to cast out demons. Part of Jesus’ frustration here may be that the

6 Ibid., 366.
7 Green notes the connection between the “faithlessness” here in 9:41 and 8:25 in Green, Luke, 386. From 9:40 it can be seen that the disciples had already attempted to exorcise the boy without Jesus, and without success. Jesus’ remark (ὁ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη) in 9:41 is addressed at least in part to them. Some read this as directed primarily at the disciples. For example, Green, Luke, 388-389; Bovon, Luke, 1:387 (though on the basis of Luke’s sources he believes the saying to be slightly incongruous here). Other see the comment as being directed more broadly but including the disciples. For example Marshall, Luke, 391-392; Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:809.
situation is so similar to that on the lake in 8:22-25. The same dynamic is at work in both, as the disciples struggle with their faith as they are confronted with demonic opposition.

Luke 8:1-3 has several other features that suggest Jesus has been preparing the disciples for what they will encounter on the second lake journey. First, they were with Jesus in the company of women delivered from demon possession. Mary had been delivered from multiple demons (8:2). Second, the mention of Joanna as the wife of Herod’s steward means that Rome forms part of the backdrop of the disciples’ formation. The juxtaposition of steward (ἐπίτροπος) and the women providing resources (ὑπάρχω) for Jesus and his disciples (8:3), highlights the conflict of loyalty in the charged political environment. There is a certain incongruity to the idea that Chuza’s wife is providing for the itinerant Jesus and his disciples (8:3), while Chuza stewards Herod’s household. Rome is always part of the backdrop in Luke.

Despite the context, which should have prepared the disciples for the second lake crossing, they fail to overcome the (“demonic”) storm on the lake (8:22-25) or to step out of the boat on arrival at the other side (8:27). Nor do they deliver the demon-possessed man that the demon-storm surely prefigures, or preach the word of God to the people on the other side (8:26-39). Instead, following this episode Jesus takes them through another preparatory stage (8:40-56) before explicitly giving them δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν (“power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases”) (9:1) and sending them out κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι (“to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal”) (9:2). The result of the disciples’ failure and extended preparation therefore yields the rather surprising result that the (Gentile) man from the region of the Gerasenes is proclaiming (κηρύσσων) what God/Jesus has done for him in 8:39 before the twelve are commissioned in 9:2.

This preparatory stage provides other formative opportunities for the twelve disciples. Like the Gerasene demoniac, the plight of the twelve-year-old girl (8:42) and of the woman who

8 This suggests the same conflict that Luke mentions in 16:33: οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ (“you cannot serve both God and wealth”) (Luke 16:13) and ὅλος ἐπὶ ὅλον πίπτει (“a house (divided) against itself will fall”) (Luke 11:17).
had bled for twelve years (8:43) involve ritual uncleanness.⁹ They are all healed/saved by Jesus.¹⁰

Following 8:40-56, Jesus is apparently satisfied that the disciples have (this time) received adequate formation, so he sends them forth (9:1-6). Their commissioning for this journey begins with ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν (“he gave to them power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases.”) (9:1). The power and authority over all demons echoes the power Jesus displayed in calming the storm (8:24) and in the delivering of the demoniac (8:29), so that the implicit authority the disciples failed to exercise in 8:22-39 is now explicitly conferred upon them. The mention of diseases picks up on the two healings (8:40-56) that Jesus has just performed. The disciples are now granted the power and authority to do this. The commission finishes with καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι (9:2), an echo of 8:1, the Lukan summary statement that precedes it.


Elements of the above discussion raise an important question about narrative order. How would the Lukan Jesus expect the disciples to deal with the opposing powers (the storm) on the lake, and then the demon on the other side, before Jesus confers upon them the power and authority to do so in 9:1-2? The issue of narrative order is sharpened by the parallels between Luke 6:12-16 and Mark 3:13-19. Mark 3:14b-15 describes Jesus appointing the twelve and sending them out to κηρύσσειν καὶ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐκβάλλειν τὰ δαιμόνια. However, Luke withholds this material in writing 6:12-16, using it instead in 9:1-2. Luke also includes material from Mark 6:7, where Jesus calls the twelve and sends them out in pairs, giving them ἐξουσίαν τῶν πνευμάτων τῶν ἀκαθάρτων (“authority over unclean spirits”), so that Luke 9:1-2 reads,

---

⁹ Dowling, Taking Away the Pound, 159.
συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἰᾶσθαι [τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς] (“Then Jesus called the twelve together and gave them power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases, and he sent them out to proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal [the sick].”)

What is the narrative logic behind this re-ordering of Luke’s source material? Can it still be argued that the Lukan Jesus expected his disciples to deal with the storm on the lake and the demon Legion prior to their commissioning in 9:1-2?

The lake crossing in 8:22-39 falls between the appointment of the twelve as Jesus’ apostles in 6:12-16, and their commissioning in 9:1-2. The designation “apostle” includes the idea of being sent. However, the twelve are not sent anywhere until 9:1-6. Rather, the period between their appointment and commissioning is a time of formation to prepare them for this mission. It contains important blocks of teaching, and the disciples are with Jesus as he ministers and interacts with others. Jesus is guiding the disciples towards the point when he can send them out on their own in 9:1-6. Fitzmyer recognises this when he says of 9:1-6, “the witnesses from Galilee that Jesus has been in the act of training are now being sent to participate in his own mission.”

The training or formational process leading up to this point has been a mostly passive one for the disciples. However, the lake journeys contain tests or barriers that they are expected to overcome, as 5:1-11 has shown. The failure of the disciples in 8:22-39 reveals two areas of weakness: faith, and overcoming demonic opposition. Luke 8:25 is Jesus’ first reference to the faith of his disciples. It is indicative of what will be for them an ongoing struggle with faith.

11 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:216.
12 Between Luke 6:16 and 9:1, and apart from the lake story in 8:22-39, Luke narrates Jesus’ teaching in the sermon on the plain (6:20-49), the parable of the sower and its explanation (8:4-15), and the sayings that follow it (8:16-21). In addition to the blocks of teaching material he describes Jesus’ ministry as Jesus teaches and heals (6:17-19), heals the Centurion’s servant (7:1-10), raises the son of the widow at Nain (7:11-17), responds to John’s disciples (7:18-35), and dines with Simon the Pharisee and ministers to the sinful woman (7:36-50). Luke 8:1 summarises this portion of Jesus’ ministry and notes that the twelve are with Jesus.
14 Green, Luke, 357.
Their failure to confront the storm and then the demon Legion makes clear that they will also struggle to deal with demons.

Following the lake journey the disciples are with Jesus as he heals (8:40-55). Healing is an important aspect of Jesus’ mission, so it is important that the disciples are familiar with his healing ministry. However, Peter’s comment in 8:45 shows that they struggle to comprehend what Jesus is doing here: ἐπιστάτης, οἱ ὄχλοι συνέχουσί σε καὶ ἀποθλίβουσιν (“Master, the crowds surround you and press in on you”). Peter addresses Jesus here with the same title (ἐπιστάτης) as the disciples used in their panic during the storm on the lake (8:24). The use of this title, along with the out of place comment, show Peter’s competence and understanding of healing to be no further advanced than it is concerning demons.

Jesus’ commission to the disciples in 9:1-2 includes a general mandate to proclaim the kingdom of God, but it also specifically addresses both authority and power over demons, and the curing of illness and healing. This shows that the commission is—at least partly—aimed specifically at the areas the disciples have recently struggled with (8:22-39, 45).15 Furthermore, the commission is specific or limited to 9:1-6.16 This is shown to be the case by the ongoing struggle the disciples have with demons. Their failure to deliver the boy in 9:37-43 (discussed above), shows this vividly. This incident follows after they are granted power and authority over demons in 9:1. It stands in stark contrast to 9:6 and 9:10, where, having been commissioned by Jesus, the disciples are able to minister successfully without him.17


16 Evans admits the possibility, describing it as “a temporary extension through the Twelve of Jesus’ activity, and a rehearsal for their mission to the world (24:46ff.; Acts 1:8; Matt 10:23).” Evans, Saint Luke, 394. Leifeld argues for a limited commission in 9:1-2 when he states that it is “not appointment to a permanent office but commissioning for an immediate task. The practice of sending a man on a mission empowered to act on full authority on behalf of the sender is known from the Talmud (j Hagigah 1.8).” Liefeld, “Luke,” 918. Bovon names Marshall as one who holds this view, but in fact Marshall holds only that Jesus’ instructions in 9:3-5 are specific, rather than the commission. Compare Bovon, Luke, 1:344 n. 11 with Marshall, Luke, 351.

17 Luke 9:6 does not mention specifically that the disciples successfully cast out demons on their mission. However, I would argue that they did, as healing and deliverance are not sharply distinguished in Luke. (See Green, Luke, 358.) In light of the inclusion of both in 9:1-2, the mention of one here in 9:6 can be taken to include the other. Furthermore, εὐαγγελίζω in 9:6 functions as an umbrella term that includes deliverance from evil powers. Finally, there is nothing in 9:6 and 9:10 that suggests that the mission of the twelve was anything but successful.
Whatever power or authority was conferred upon the disciples in 9:1-2 it seems to have evaporated soon after. The efficacy of the commission seems to have been very short-lived.

Not only do the disciples continue to struggle with demons following 9:1-2, their record with the other aspects of the commission in 9:1-2 (healing, and the general proclamation of the kingdom of God) also proves to be mixed. In fact, throughout the whole period between 9:1-6 and Acts 2, their contribution to Jesus’ mission is minimal. There are several positive reports of them, a flash of inspiration from Simon (9:20), and a couple of helpful questions (11:1; 21:7). However, they struggle to comprehend Jesus and his mission, and their own role as disciples (9:46; 22:24). When they do act they are often clumsy or weak, or they work unwittingly against Jesus’ purpose (9:49; 18:15). Judas betrays him, and Peter denies him.

Following 9:1-6, the disciples remain with Jesus right through until he is seized and taken away in 22:54. There is nowhere else in between these two events (in fact between 9:1-6 and Acts 2) where the disciples look at all as though they are fulfilling the commission given to them in 9:1-2. Nowhere are the disciples sent out again to “proclaim the kingdom of God and to heal” (Luke 9:2). This includes Luke 10:1-12, the sending of the seventy (-two), which Luke introduces with, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἀνέδειξεν ὁ κύριος ἑτέρους ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] (“After these things the Lord appointed seventy(-two) others”), thereby making it clear that the twelve are

23 The sending of the two disciples to untie the colt in 19:29-35 and the sending of James and John to prepare for the passover in 22:8-13 are more in the nature of errands. They do not resemble the commissioning described in 9:1-2. At any rate, in these two cases Jesus sends the disciples, so it could be argued that they contain their own limited commissions.
not among the seventy(-two). Furthermore, their three attempts to act independently of Jesus are failures.

The disciples are commissioned again in 24:47-48. This re-commissioning is not identical to the one in 9:1-2, but it is consistent with it. The need for a re-commissioning implies the earlier one had either already lapsed, or that it was in need of renewal due to the new (post-resurrection) setting. Either way, it confirms the provisional or short-term nature of the first commission. While re-commissioning the disciples, Jesus instructs them to wait until they have been “clothed with power from on high” (24:49). Acts then narrates the coming of the Spirit (Acts 2:1-13) and following that, the unfolding mission of the apostles in accordance with the commission in Luke 24:46-48.

Jesus, of course, is not physically present with them in Acts 2. Luke’s double narration of the ascension (24:50-51; Acts 1:9) makes it very clear that the commissioning in Luke 24:46-48 is linked to Jesus’ absence. The case is similar in 9:1-6. The commission is required because Jesus is sending the disciples out without him. Bovon picks up on this when he notes that Jesus’ sending “away” of the disciples in 9:1-6 “anticipates the final separation at the ascension.” Bovon is not arguing for a temporary commission, but his comment accurately reflects the situation. A commission is required in both instances because in both cases the disciples are to be separated from Jesus.


25 The first is the above-mentioned exorcism. In 9:40 the disciples are reported as unable to cast a demon out of a boy. Jesus’ response in 9:41 expresses a high level of frustration. The second is 9:49, where John reports to Jesus that “we” (presumably the disciples) tried to stop another person exorcising in Jesus name. Jesus immediately corrects him in 9:50. The third is in 18:15, where the disciples attempt to stop the people bringing children to Jesus. Again, Jesus immediately corrects them (18:16). These three exceptions prove the rule: the commission in 9:1-2 is limited to 9:1-6. Any attempt by the disciples to act outside of it—unless Jesus is present—is doomed to failure.

26 The crucial difference between the two commissions is that the disciples are now witnesses (μάρτυς) (24:48) to the resurrection (24:46).

The commission in 9:1-2 is necessary because the power and authority Jesus confers upon the disciples resides in his person.\(^{28}\) It is the power and authority of Jesus.\(^{29}\) He confers this upon them temporarily in 9:1-6, and permanently with the second commission, in conjunction with the coming of the Spirit in Acts 2. The commission is temporary in 9:1-6 because the separation is temporary. The commission in 24:46-48 is permanent because the separation is permanent. Jesus is the one with the power and authority. When he is not present physically he confers his power and authority upon his disciples. After his ascension this comes in the form of the Spirit.

Here is Luke’s narrative logic for having Jesus’ disciples face the demon-storm and then the demon Legion (8:22-39) prior to their commissioning in 9:1-2. During the second lake journey, the disciples struggle to understand that the calming of the storm (8:25), as well as power and authority over the demonic, resides with Jesus’ person. But although Jesus is the one with the power and authority, it is the disciples who are expected to act together, as they did in 5:1-11. Luke believes that the disciples could have acted together in 8:22-39, even prior to the commission in 9:1-2, because Jesus is with them.

If this argument is found to be persuasive, then the questions raised by Luke’s use of Mark 3:13-19; 6:7, and his delaying of Jesus’ conferral of authority to cast out demons and to proclaim until Luke 9:1-2, has also been answered. That is, Jesus commission in 9:1-2 picks up on and addresses the areas the disciples have struggled with during their formation up to that point. The commission is a limited one, specific to the missionary journey in 9:1-6. For Luke, the commissioning of the disciples is required when Jesus is absent because his power and authority reside in his person. This means that, because Jesus is with the discipies in 8:22-39, they could have overcome the storm and delivered the man from the demon Legion, despite the fact that this encounter occurs prior to their commission in 9:1-2.

---


2.1 Conclusion

Jesus begins calling disciples in 5:1-11. From here until they are commissioned and go out in 9:1-6, Jesus is concerned with their formation, of which the lake stories are an important part. In the first lake story (5:1-11) Jesus begins gathering disciples. Out in the deep water, they successfully bring in the catch of fish. In the second (8:22-39) Jesus tests them with the storm on the lake and then the demon Legion on the other side. Although they fail these tests, Jesus continues with their formation, so that in 9:1-6 they are ready to be successfully commissioned for a mission journey without him. The temporary nature of that commission is apparent soon-after. In fact, despite some successes, the disciples struggle until they are again commissioned in Luke 24:47-48, and the Spirit comes upon them in Acts 2:1-13.

Meanwhile, the man that Jesus delivers on the far side of the lake, the Gerasene demoniac, goes to the people of his city and proclaims to them what Jesus has done for him. Jesus’ sending, and the man’s going, are now considered in more detail.

3 The Delivered Demoniac as Disciple

Some commentators deny the delivered man discipleship status. For example, Fitzmyer attributes a missionary errand to the man but not discipleship status.\(^30\) Jeremias reads Jesus’ refusal of the man’s request to follow him as a refusal to grant him discipleship status.\(^31\) Likewise Leon Morris believes that when Jesus sends the man away he is rejecting his bid for discipleship.\(^32\) The parallels with the first lake story, where Jesus commissions Simon and those with him (5:10), support the assertion that the man is a disciple. Luke 8:26-39 gives several clear indications that the delivered man is now a disciple even if he is not explicitly called one.


\(^{31}\) Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise*, 30.

The first post-deliverance observation Luke narrates about the man is that he is καθήμενον . . . παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ (8:35). Being seated at the feet of a teacher is the position of the disciple. His subsequent request to be σὺν αὐτῷ (8:38) is a classic Lukan discipleship indicator. The man’s desire to be with Jesus expresses his desire to be a disciple. Jesus’ sending of the man to his home so that he might διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς amounts to a commission (8:39) comparable to the one given to Simon in 5:10. His obedience and positive response to Jesus’ instructions in 8:39 show him to be a more responsive disciple than the twelve (8:24-25). His enthusiastic obedience contrasts with the disciples’ fear and misplaced faith in 8:22-25.

Further evidence that Luke considers the man to be a disciple is found in the links between 8:1-3 and 8:25-39. Luke 8:1-3 is a summary statement linking what precedes and what follows it. Jesus’ ministry is summarised as κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ. In 8:39 the man goes κηρύσσων what Jesus has done for him. This is but one of a number of links that show that the man is engaged in the same mission as Jesus and those who follow him as he proclaims the kingdom of God. The following summarises these links and echoes:

34 Luke 8:1 has the twelve and various women σὺν αὐτῷ. In 8:51 a select few of Jesus’ disciples (along with the parents) go σὺν αὐτῷ to raise the girl who is sleeping (dead). Luke 22:14 sees the apostles σὺν αὐτῷ for his final meal. In 22:56 a servant girl accuses Peter of being σὺν αὐτῷ, while in 24:29 Jesus goes inside with travellers on the road to Emmaus and remains σὺν αὐτοῖς.
35 On διηγοῦ see Section 4.5.2.
37 The chart uses Greek where vocabulary corresponds, and English where the idea is similar but the vocabulary is different.
Table 6: Parallel Vocabulary and Themes in 8:1-3 and 8:26-39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8:1-3</th>
<th>8:26-39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πόλιν and villages (8:1)</td>
<td>πόλιν and country (8:34), πόλιν (8:39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κηρύσσων and bringing (8:1)</td>
<td>κηρύσσων (8:39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The good news of the kingdom (8:1)</td>
<td>What God/Jesus had done for him (8:39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The twelve (8:1)</td>
<td>The disciples (See 8:22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σὺν αὐτῷ (8:1)</td>
<td>σὺν αὐτῷ (8:38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cured (8:2)</td>
<td>Healed/saved (8:36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πνευμάτων πονηρῶν (8:2)</td>
<td>τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ (8:29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven (8:2)</td>
<td>Legion (8:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δαιμόνια (8:2)</td>
<td>Δαιμόνια (8:27, 30, 33, 35, 38), δαιμονισθείς (8:36).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 8:1-3 Jesus, the twelve, some women, and “many others” are grouped together. In 8:25-39 Jesus, the disciples, the man, and the “people of the region” are grouped together. The man here is like the women in 8:2. Like Mary, he has multiple demons. Like the women, he has been delivered, or healed. He is also like Jesus in going to the city (8:1 and 8:39), and proclaiming (κηρύσσω) to people there (8:1 and 8:39). His going and declaring what God/Jesus has done for him echoes Jesus’ proclamation of the kingdom of God. The man is also shown to be like the twelve in 8:1-3 in his wanting to be σὺν αὐτῷ (Jesus). In 8:1-3 the disciples accompany Jesus. In 8:22-39 their fear overcomes them, so that they fail to be active in that mission. However, the man is active in proclamation, even sharing the same verb (κηρύσσω) with Jesus. Luke does indeed use this story as a “paradigm of what conversion involves: the responsibility to evangelise.”38 But the man’s willingness to proclaim shows him to be a paradigm of discipleship. His active involvement in proclaiming and bringing the kingdom of God (Jesus in 8:1, the man in 8:39) fulfils the mandate the twelve have failed to take up in this episode.

In light of 8:1-3 the delivered demoniac surprises by actively joining in Jesus’ mission. Like the disciples, he desires to be with Jesus, and he actively participates in Jesus’ mission where they have failed to do so. He is not one of the twelve, but then neither are the women with Jesus in 8:1-3. Like the women, he had demons, many of them, but he too has been healed. Jesus’ refusal to allow the man into the boat seems strange on first reading, but as a consequence of Jesus’ commission and of the man’s over-compliance, he goes throughout the city proclaiming what Jesus has done for him (8:39). In this he anticipates the mission of the apostles in Acts and becomes the first Gentile missionary. In view of the commission to catch people alive and the abundance of the catch in 5:1-11, the man appears to have taken up the task Jesus intended for the disciples when he suggested crossing the lake in 8:22.

4 The Delivered Demoniac as Associate of the Apostles

The case for recognising the man as a disciple is strong. Here I take the argument a step further by suggesting that Luke associates the delivered man with the apostles. I will argue that he achieves this by choosing vocabulary in 8:39 that is associated with the apostles (διηγέομαι and κηρύσσω); by the parallels between the man’s commissioning and going, and the commissions given to the twelve; and by parallels between the man’s deliverance and Paul, particularly his Damascus road encounter.

4.1 κηρύσσω and διηγέομαι

The use of these verbs in Luke-Acts provides a rich context against which the sending and going of the man in 8:39 needs to be read. The discussion on κηρύσσω below builds on the earlier one in Chapter 1 Section 3.3.4.

39 The historical origins of the apostolate has long been debated. The question is whether it goes back to the historical Jesus or arose from the later (post-Easter) Christian mission so that it was “used anachronistically by the Evangelists in their Gospel accounts of Jesus’ ministry.” Colin G. Kruse, “Apostle,” DJG, 1st ed., 29. This particular issue is not relevant for this study, which deals with the Lukan narrative.

40 This identification would not be made by first time sequential readers. However, the resonances would be clear to the general Christian audience familiar with Luke and Acts.
Luke-Acts uses κηρύσσω to denote the entire content of Jesus’ proclamation, or of the apostolic proclamation of the deeds and word of God. It is often incorporated into programmatic or summary statements. There is a nice balance built into Luke’s Gospel: κηρύσσω is used of Jesus four times, and of others four times. These others are preparing for or extending Jesus’ ministry. What is proclaimed is first and finally μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (“repentance and the forgiveness of sins”). This is done first by John through baptism (3:3), and finally becomes the commission given to the disciples (24:47). The similar object of proclamation in these two verses thus brackets the other κηρύσσω passages. John’s announcement is programmatic for his ministry, which is to Israel. Jesus’ commission to the disciples in 24:47 is programmatic for their mission in Acts with its developing focus on Gentile mission.

Jesus is the subject of the four κηρύσσω references following Luke 3:3. The content of this proclamation is αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν . . . (4:18), ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν (4:19), and εὐαγγελίσασθαί . . . τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ (4:44 and similarly 8:1).

There is a strong case for 4:18-19 as the content of the message of the kingdom of God in 4:44. The argument can probably be extended to subsequent references to the kingdom of God.

For a clear summary of this pattern see Spencer, Luke, 110-112.
Also important for the use of κηρύσσω in Luke is the succession or progression throughout the course of the narrative as new characters take up the task of proclamation. Luke begins with John’s proclamation (3:3-6), moves to Jesus’ mission statement (4:18-19), goes on to the delivered Gentile demoniac (8:39), passes on to the twelve (9:2), and finally to the eleven and their companions (24:47).

In Acts, Philip proclaims (κηρύσσω) the Messiah first in the city of Samaria (8:5) to the crowds, who hear and see the signs he does (8:6). This includes unclean spirits coming out of many, with loud shrieks (8:7). Paul proclaims Jesus in 9:20, following his experience on the road to Damascus. The case in 19:13 is not so straight-forward, but itinerant Jewish exorcists attempted to cast out demons in the name of Jesus δν Παῦλος κηρύσσει (“whom Paul proclaims”), so the reference is actually to Paul’s proclamation of Jesus. In 20:25 Paul farewells the Ephesian elders and refers to his own proclamation of the kingdom among them. In the final verse of the book, 28:31, Paul is in Rome, κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ και διδάσκων τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μετὰ πάσης παρρησίας ἀκωλύτως (“proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ with all boldness and unhindered”). As with Jesus in Luke, there are four references to Paul proclaiming in Acts. Peter refers to the baptism John proclaimed (10:37), before describing the imperative from God that the apostles proclaim Jesus and testify to him in 10:42. When Luke has James use κηρύσσω in 15:21 the reference is to the proclamation of Moses, but the context of that reference is the Jerusalem council, where James is summing up the argument for the terms of Gentile inclusion into the Church.

---

48 Although the disciples are with Jesus in 8:1, κηρύσσων there is a singular participle. It is Jesus who proclaims while the disciples accompany.


50 Luke does not approve of the action described but the manner of the report implies that it is accurate.

The succession of who proclaims in Acts, is Philip (8:5), Paul (9:20), John (10:37), Peter (10:42) and Moses (15:21). This differs slightly from who uses the term, as in two of these examples the speaker reports the proclamation of someone else (10:37 and 15:21). The roles or offices of those who proclaim in Acts form a mixed collection. The Philip in Acts 8:5 is probably not Philip the apostle, who remained in Jerusalem (8:1). Paul’s status as an apostle is discussed below (Luke distinguishes him from the twelve), Peter is a leader among the apostles, John the Baptist (reported by Peter) is Jesus’ forerunner, and those who proclaim Moses (reported by James) are presumably the Jewish teachers and leaders, as well as all faithful Jews, hence “the Jewish communities.”

What is proclaimed, however, is much less varied. Philip proclaims Christ (8:5); Paul proclaims Jesus (9:20 and 19:13), the kingdom (20:25), and the kingdom of God (28:31). John proclaims baptism (10:37); the apostles preach “the one appointed to judge the living and the dead,” that is, Jesus (10:42); and the Jews proclaim Moses (15:21). It is very clear then that Paul, the apostles, and Philip preach Jesus and his kingdom.

Alongside who and what is proclaimed in Acts is Luke’s careful placement of κηρύσσω. With the outbreak of persecution against the Jerusalem church there is a scattering of all except the apostles (8:1). Philip (not the apostle) goes immediately to Samaria and proclaims there. This means κηρύσσω is associated with the message about Jesus as it begins to move outwards from Jerusalem (cf. 1:8). Paul’s proclaiming in 9:20 follows “immediately” (εὐθέως) after his experience on the Damascus road. Peter speaks to the Gentile Cornelius about the baptism John proclaimed (10:37), before going on to describe the apostolic imperative to proclaim


53 See Section 5.


55 “Us,” here refers to the apostles: those who witnessed all he (Jesus) did in Judea and Jerusalem (10:39); who were chosen by God as witnesses, and who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead (10:41); and were commanded by God to preach and to testify that he is the one ordained by God as judge of the living and the dead (10:42).
Jesus (10:42). Moses’ proclamation is mentioned by James at the Jerusalem council (15:21), the center of the book of Acts, and narrated by Luke as a key moment for the advance of the gospel. The itinerant exorcists’ use of the name of Jesus “whom Paul proclaims” (19:13) is not a key point in the narrative, but illustrates Paul’s effectiveness as he spends time in Ephesus (19:1-20). Paul’s speech to the Ephesian elders (20:18-35) portends his departure to Rome and all that he will face on the way.

Acts narrates the movement of the gospel from Jerusalem to Rome and its acceptance among the Gentiles. Luke uses κηρύσσω at key points of this process. He also uses it to connect back to his gospel by mentioning Johns’ proclamation in 10:37, and to the entire Jewish people through James’ reference to the proclamation of Moses in 15:21. The four uses of κηρύσσω linked to Paul encapsulate his work and mission. Having met Jesus he immediately begins to proclaim him (9:20), so that the proclamation of Jesus is what he becomes known for (19:13). In 20:25 he uses κηρύσσω to summarise his work with the church in Ephesus. In due course Paul arrives in Rome (28:16). Acts 28:31 marks the end of the book, but sounds a strong note of hope as Paul is free to go about the task of proclaiming the kingdom of God and teaches about Jesus boldly and unhindered in Rome.

Paul’s arrival in Rome marks the successful completion of the book’s geographical schema and the fulfillment of its purpose, as given by the risen Jesus before he ascends into heaven (1:8). Luke-Acts is also bracketed by the use of “κηρύσσων” (proclaiming). In Luke 3:3 John was proclaiming a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, while in Acts 28:31 Paul was proclaiming the kingdom of God. Both John the Baptist and Paul enjoy high status in the Lukan narrative, so this framing is not incidental.

This brief survey shows that throughout Luke and Acts the use and placement of κηρύσσω is strongly associated with the introduction of key characters or of major advances in the plot of his story. By being located where he is among these κηρύσσω passages, the delivered demoniac is shown in the best possible light. Like Jesus, John, Paul, the apostles, and the larger group of disciples, he too proclaims. His placement among, and his association with, other such key characters and events in the Lukan narrative needs to be recognised.
It was seen in Chapter 4 that through his use of διηγέομαι in 8:39 Luke links the man’s task, which is to give an account (δήγησις) of what God has done for him, with Luke’s own task in presenting an orderly account of the events “accomplished among us” (1:1-3). The other four occurrences of διηγέομαι in Luke-Acts will now be considered. Three of these are associated with the apostles, and the other (Acts 8:33) with preaching the good news to Gentiles. (The matter of Paul’s apostleship is discussed below.)

Luke 9:10 relates the apostles returning to report (διηγέομαι) on their mission (9:1-6), which was broadly described as proclaiming (κηρύσσω) the kingdom of God (9:2). The delivered man in 8:39 is also sent by Jesus and goes back to his home/city without him. Luke uses διηγέομαι and κηρύσσω to describe both events. Furthermore, the man is sent to report what Jesus has done (ποιέω) for him, anticipating the disciples reporting of what they have done (ποιέω) in 9:2.

In Acts 8:33, Philip is quoting from the prophet Isaiah to the Ethiopian eunuch. The eunuch is a Gentile, and the prophet Isaiah is being used to preach the good news (εὐαγγέλιζω) (Acts 8:35) about Jesus (Acts 8:26-40). Luke’s choice of διηγέομαι for the delivered man in Luke 8:39 thus links him here with mission to the Gentiles, and the good news about Jesus.

Luke describes Paul’s immediate response to his conversion by detailing his proclamation (κηρύσσω) of Jesus as the son of God (9:20). In Acts 9:27 Barnabas brings Paul before “the apostles” (τοὺς ἀποστόλους) and gives an account (διηγέομαι) of Paul’s transformation and bold speech about Jesus. Despite Luke’s apparent reluctance to do so, Luke will acknowledge that Paul (along with Barnabas) is an apostle in Acts 14:4 and 14:14. Barnabas reports that Paul has spoken boldly (παρρησιάζομαι) about Jesus. διηγέομαι here associates Paul and Barnabas with the apostles. This in turn links the man with Paul, Barnabas, and the apostles. Where Paul has spoken boldly (παρρησιάζομαι) about Jesus, the man has proclaimed (κηρύσσω) him.

56 Chapter 4, Section 4.5.2.
Luke’s final use of διηγέομαι is in Acts 12:17, where Peter gives an account of his release from prison to those gathered in prayer (Acts 12:6-19). Luke has shown the delivered demoniac as a captive (αἰχμάλωτος) who has experienced release (ἀφεσις) (4:18). Once again, διηγέομαι places the man in apostolic company. Both the man and Peter share the experience of being imprisoned (Acts 12:1-17) or captive (Luke 8:27-29), both are released from their chains (ἀλωσις),\(^{58}\) and the two men share the distinction of being commissioned by Jesus in the context of a lake journey (Luke 5:1-11; 8:22-39).


In light of the strong association of both κηρύσσω and διηγέομαι with the apostles, Luke’s use of both these terms here in 8:39 could only be described as very generous indeed if he was not wanting to associate the man with the apostles in some way, or to show that there is something apostle-like about his instructions from Jesus and his proclaiming in response to that sending. Furthermore, Paul and the delivered man are linked by διηγέομαι (Luke 8:39; Acts 9:27) and κηρύσσω (Luke 8:39; Acts 9:20). This places the man in the company of Paul, who will come to be the leading figure in proclaiming Jesus and advancing the mission to the Gentiles in Acts. Luke 8:39 uses κηρύσσω and διηγέομαι to narrate the man’s response to his encounter with Jesus. Acts 9:20 and 9:27 use these verbs again, but this time of Paul, following the account of his meeting with the risen Jesus upon the road to Damascus.

In addition to κηρύσσω and διηγέομαι, there are other connections between the man and the apostles. First, there is the timing of the man’s encounter with Jesus. The twelve were appointed as Jesus’ apostles in Luke 6:12-15, prior to Jesus’ encounter with the man in Luke 8:26-39. This means that Jesus’ sending of the man and his going and reporting what Jesus has done for him are not without precedent in Luke. Related to this is the nature of the man’s

---

commission. The task of the twelve apostles is to join Jesus in his ministry in Galilee and to be with him as he journeys to Jerusalem. Their specific commission and ministry in Luke 9:1-6 mirrors Jesus’ ministry to that point. Luke 24:44-49 describes the re-commissioning of the disciples for mission. This second commissioning (or re-commissioning) takes place after Jesus’ resurrection. It is a commission to go to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλήμ (“all the nations, beginning in Jerusalem”) (24:47). The commissioning of the delivered demoniac combines elements of both of these commissions. The first has already been discussed. As the apostles will do in 9:1-6, the man proclaims (κηρύσσω). He, like them, is acting out a commission from Jesus (8:39).

Second, when the twelve are sent in Luke 9:1, power and authority over demons is bestowed upon them. The man has already experienced this power and authority directly from Jesus. In proclaiming what God/Jesus has done for him, he proclaims his own deliverance. The apostles have been given authority over demons; the man is delivered from demons.

Third, in being sent to the Gentile people of his region the man shares also in the later re-commissioning of the apostles to go to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. Fourth, Luke 8:39 stresses heavily that the man goes as a witness to what Jesus/God has done for him. Although Luke does not use μάρτυς or μαρτυρέω with regards to the man, the parallelism between the two parts of 8:39 make it clear that he is a witness to what Jesus has done for him. This links the man’s commissioning forward to Luke 24:44-49, where μάρτυς is used as the apostles are commissioned as witnesses to the resurrection (24:49).59

However, Luke does not ever label the man as an apostle. This is not surprising, given his reluctance to extend the title to others beyond the twelve. Furthermore, where he has the opportunity to use ἀποστέλλω of the man in 8:38 he uses ἀπολύω instead. The choice better fits his portrayal of the man as one of the αἰχμάλωτος (4:18) who has found ἅφεσις through Jesus. What can be said is that the delivered demoniac is clearly commissioned to go to his own

---

59 Beginning with the account of Matthias’ appointment in Acts1:21-22, Luke continues to stress the function of the apostles as witnesses to the resurrection.
Gentile people and he goes proclaiming. In this he follows Jesus and he anticipates the mission to the Gentiles in Acts.

5 The Delivered Demonic and Paul

If the delivered man is to be associated with the apostles and goes to the Gentile people of his city, then what is the relationship between himself and Paul? It has been argued that Luke-Acts associates the man with the apostles. The word “associates” has been carefully chosen in light of Luke’s apparent reluctance to recognise apostles other than the twelve. Luke does admit Matthias as Judas’ replacement in Acts 1:26. It is important that the symbolic link between Israel and the twelve apostles is maintained. Luke narrates the commissioning of Saul and Barnabas in Acts 13:1-3. He uses ἀπόστολος for their sending (Acts 13:3), just as he did for the man in Luke 8:38. He also recognises Paul and Barnabas as apostles in Acts 14:4 and 14:14. However, these are the only times he does so, and the sense of the term is debated, so that it is often claimed that Luke uses τοῖς ἀποστόλοις in Acts 14:4 and 14:14 of Barnabas (and some argue, of Paul) in a more general sense than references elsewhere to the twelve.


62 “Apostle to the Gentiles” in Rom 11:13 is Paul’s self-designation.

63 Longenecker suggests that as with other titles such as “disciples,” “prophet,” “teacher,” or “elder,” Luke used the term “apostle” not just in the “restricted sense of a small group of highly honored believers who had special functions within the church but also in the broader sense of messengers of the gospel.” Longenecker, “Acts,” 433. Bruce also wants to read τοῖς ἀποστόλοις in 14:4 and 14:14 as “a more general use of the term than found elsewhere in Acts.” F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes, NLCNT (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1954), 287 n. 6. Similarly Bock, Acts, 470-471. Pervo believes the sense of “apostles” here is “representatives of communities” (cf 2 Cor 8:3) Pervo, Acts, 350. Barrett surveys various ways 14:4 can be read in Barrett, Acts, 1:671-672. He favours reading it here that “Paul and Barnabas were apostles but in a sense different from that in which Peter and John were apostles.” Barrett, Acts, 1:671. He discusses this further in Barrett, Acts, 1:94-95, 666-667.
Furthermore, there are several references to Paul and Barnabas subsequent to Acts 14 in which Luke seems to want to distinguish between them and the twelve based in Jerusalem. This is evident in Acts 15, where Paul and Barnabas are selected to travel εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ ("to Jerusalem") to discuss the matter of Gentile inclusion πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους ("with the apostles and elders") (15:2). On arrival they are welcomed ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ("by the church and the apostles and the elders") (15:4).

Following that discussion, τοῖς ἀποστόλοι καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ἡ ἐκκλησία ("the apostles and the elders, with the whole church") choose others to go with Paul and Barnabas (15:22). In 15:6 οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι are listed as those who ἰδεῖν περὶ τοῦ λόγου τούτου ("consider the matter"). Peter then stands and speaks (15:7-11). Barnabas and Paul then speak (15:12). Then James speaks (15:13-21).

Because Paul and Barnabas speak between Peter and James, this might be taken to imply equal status. However, Luke reports what Peter and James say as direct speech. Both address the gathering with ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί ("Men [and] brothers") (Peter in 15:7, and James in 15:13). James acknowledges what Peter ("Simeon") has said (15:14) and endorses it with a (lengthy) quotation from the prophets (15:16-18), before outlining a course of action (15:19-21). What Paul and Barnabas have said is not acknowledged by James, and their report occupies but a single verse (15:12). Charles Barrett notes also that Barnabas and Paul “are not separated as speakers,” and that “no details are given” of the signs and wonders that they report. Furthermore, by reporting what Paul and Barnabas have said in the form of a summary statement, Luke denies them the opportunity to address the assembly as ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, and

64 James’ status as an apostle is another question. Charles K. Barrett, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles, Vol. 2: Introduction and Commentary on Acts XV-XXVIII, ICC (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998), 722-723. As he was not one of the twelve, but gained his status in Acts by other means, Luke’s downplaying of Paul and Barnabas here, which shows them as subordinate to James, is another indicator that Luke does not regard, or does not wish to portray, their status as being the same as that of the twelve.

65 Ibid, 2:709.


therefore to claim their status as apostles along with the twelve who are based in Jerusalem. Nor does he report that they stand (ἀνίστημι), as does Peter in 15:7.

With the discussion concluded in 15:21, the decision about who is to go to Antioch with Paul and Barnabas is made by τοῖς ἀποστόλοι καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις σὺν ἡκλησίᾳ in 15:22. The letter conveying the council’s decision (15:23-29) makes it clear that Barnabas and Paul are held in high regard and with great affection (15:25-26). However, the controversy over Paul and the Gentile mission that lead up to the council in the first place suggests that the glowing reference to Paul and Barnabas here has been formulated (in part, at least) to suppress those opposed to them and to the Gentile mission. The proceedings of the council and the decision that came from it might well have been expected to assuage the concerns of some, but it could also be expected to aggravate the concerns of others.

The wording of the letter itself maintains a clear distinction or distance between them and the Jerusalem apostles. Hence it is “we” (ἡμῖν) who decide unanimously to send representatives “along with” (σύν) Paul and Barnabas (15:25). σύν might imply that Paul and Barnabas occupy a separate category to Judas and Silas, and are therefore to be counted alongside the apostles. However, the letter is sent from οἱ ἀπόστολοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβυτέροι ἀδελφοί (“the apostles and elders [your] brothers”) (15:23), and it speaks of certain persons who have gone out ἐξ ἡμῶν (“from us”) (15:24). This suggests strongly that in Luke’s view the apostolate resides in Jerusalem, and that Paul and Barnabas are distinct from it. Acts 16:4 continues in a similar manner, with Paul and his companions delivering the decision reached ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις (“by the apostles and elders who were in Jerusalem”).

It is clear from the above that even despite the acknowledgment of Paul and Barnabas as apostles in Acts 14, Luke continues to maintain a distinction between them and “the apostles” in Jerusalem. The above discussion also portrays Paul and Barnabas as being subordinate to

68 Barrett reads it that although the elders are mentioned at points in Acts 15, it is the apostles who are the “real decision makers.” Barrett, Acts, 2:712-713.

them. It looks very much as though Luke’s acknowledgment that Paul and Barnabas are apostles is a reluctant one. Without Luke’s grudging admission in Acts 14 the narrative could be read as portraying Paul and Barnabas as close associates of the apostles. This downplaying of Paul’s and Barnabas’ apostleship probably reflects the historical situation in which Paul’s apostleship was contested and Jerusalem claimed pre-eminence. Luke may have wanted to avoid controversy over Paul’s and Barnabas’ role as apostles, but not out of disrespect. Rather, he deftly emphasises all that Paul and Barnabas have achieved, but without re-igniting the controversy that had arisen around Paul’s claim to the apostolic office. Richard Longenecker suggests “political reasons” for the lack of acknowledgment and the desire to avoid “needless offense.”

The above discussion shows that, although Luke acknowledges Paul as an apostle in Acts 14, “Acts differentiates between Paul and the Twelve, and avoids calling him an apostle.” But this is to put the matter negatively. Positively, it can be said that Luke portrays Paul as one associated closely with “the apostles” in Jerusalem, while Paul himself is “the great evangelist.”

5.1 Common Themes

The three accounts of Paul’s experience on the Damascus road reveal several strong themes (or parallels) that are common to all three versions of that story and are also found in Luke

72 Barrett, Acts, 1:444.
First, at the beginning of his encounter with Jesus, Paul falls to the ground. The demoniac does likewise in Luke 8:28. Second, Paul is sent to the city (Damascus). Although Jesus sends the man to his home, Luke tells us he went \( \chi αβ ' \ \delta ην \ \tau \eta \ \nu \ \pi ιλιν \) (Luke 8:39). Third, Paul is commissioned to go to the Gentiles. The man is a Gentile from the region of the Gerasenes, so that his going and proclaiming in Luke 8:39 is, by implication, to Gentiles.

Fourth, Luke narrates Paul’s experience on the road to Damascus in Acts 9. In Acts 22 and 26 it is Paul who, within the narrative, narrates the same event. He is thus, like the man in Luke Chapter 8, “giving an account” of what Jesus/God has done for him. Finally, the overall purpose of Luke’s triple recounting of Paul’s Damascus road experience is “to show the progress of the church from the Jewish to the Gentile community,” which the study of 8:22-39 anticipates.

5.2 Other Parallels

There are other parallels and echoes linking one or more of the Damascus Road accounts with Luke 8:26-33. First, in Acts 9:20 Saul enters the synagogue in Damascus in order to proclaim (\( \kappa \eta ρ \acute {υ} \sigma \omega \)) Jesus as \( \delta \ \upsilon \varepsilon \ \tau \acute {o} \upsilon \ \theta \acute {e} \sigma \upsilon \). In Luke 8:28 the man (or demon) declares Jesus to be \( \upsilon \iota \varepsilon \ \tau \acute {o} \upsilon \ \theta \acute {e} \sigma \upsilon \ \psi \lambda \sigma \tau o \). By Luke 8:39 the man goes proclaiming (using \( \kappa \eta ρ \acute {υ} \sigma \omega \)) what Jesus/God


79 Chapter 4, Section 2.

80 It is also notable that Luke adjusts Paul’s account to fit the different contexts in which he speaks.


82 The context is very different but the title is nevertheless fitting as a Gentile designation for Jesus coming from a Gentile. Luke uses \( \delta \upsilon \sigma \tau o \) positively elsewhere, though it is not embedded in the same phrase (Luke 1:32, 35, 76; 2:14; 6:35; 19:38; 7:48). In Acts 16:17 the slave girl calls after Paul that they are \( \delta \upsilon \lambda \omicron \upsilon \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omicron \upsilon \omicron \upsilon \omicron \omicron \upsilon \upsilon \upsilon \)
has done for him. Second, by Acts 9:21 the people are amazed (ἐξίστημι) and puzzled over Saul’s former identity as the one who has been so fiercely opposed to the believers. In Luke 8:35 the people are afraid (φοβέω), while in Luke 8:37 they are “seized by a great fear” (φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο). Then, like the believers in Damascus, the people of the region of the Gerasenes wonder about the man in light of his former condition. This is shown in τὸ γεγονός (Luke 8:35); τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα (Luke 8:35); and πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς (Luke 8:36). Third, in Acts 22:15 Ananias reports God’s will that Paul will witness to all the world what he has seen and heard. This echoes Luke 8:39, where the man is sent to give an account of what God has done for him. Both are very much in the nature of personal witness, or testimony. Fourth, speaking to Agrippa in Acts 26:18, Paul relates that his commission to the Gentiles includes turning them from τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν (“the power of Satan to God”). The man has been delivered from a legion of demons (= the power of Satan) by the power of God/Jesus (Luke 8:26-39). Fifth, Paul reports his obedience to the vision he received in Acts 26:19. Luke reports the man’s super-abundant obedience to his commission by the parallelism at work in Luke 8:39. Sixth, in Acts 26:24 Agrippa accuses Paul of being mad (μαίνομαι). Paul denies this in Acts 26:25, claiming rather that he speaks the “sober” (σωφροσύνη) truth. In Luke 8:27-29 the demoniac is portrayed as insane. Following his deliverance he is found seated at Jesus’ feet and of sound mind (σωφρονέω) (Luke 8:35).

Taking one step back from the detail of these episodes, another important parallel becomes clear. Luke has narrated the transformation of the man in Luke 8:26-39 in great detail, while emphasising the reversal in his status and situation. The story is dramatic and powerful. In fact, the man’s deliverance could be called something of a “Damascus road experience.” When comparing his story with Paul’s, his encounter is (arguably) an event of a similar order

---

83 The meaning here is “soundness of mind, reasonableness, rationality.” “σωφροσύνη, ης, ὑς,” BDAG, 987 (emphasis original).
84 Chapter 4, Section 4.1.2.
of magnitude to Paul’s in detail, length, and drama, as the Pharisee who persecuted the early believers so zealously was dramatically transformed—in status and situation, in faith and practice, in his major and ongoing role in the narrative of the early church. The importance of the demoniac’s story against Paul’s should not be overstated, but this does not detract from the similarities, while being consistent with the suggestion that the man in Luke anticipates Paul who emerges as chief missionary and proclaimer to the Gentiles in Acts.

5.3 Differences between the Accounts of the Gerasene Demoniac and Paul

Details could be multiplied but the above is enough to show that common themes and vocabulary link between Luke 8:26-39 and the three accounts of Saul/Paul on the road to Damascus. However, this should not obscure the fact that there are major differences in the context and detail of the respective narratives. First and foremost the Gerasene in Luke 8:26-39 is a Gentile. The uncleanness associated with his healing is emphasised throughout the account of his deliverance. Paul, by contrast, is a Jew. There is nothing to suggest he is unclean or that he considers himself a sinner (cf. Luke 5:8), certainly not in Acts 26:4-8. 85

In fact there are numerous elements in the Damascus road accounts that are absent in Luke 8:26-39. Some of these are due to the fact that Luke has Paul meet Jesus in a vision (ὀπτασία) (26:19) or theophany, whereas the Gerasene demoniac is met by Jesus in person. 86 Other elements in the Acts passages, but missing from Luke 8:26-39, are related to the commission (or the commission elements of the conversion, if that is what the event is understood to be) given to Paul. The absence of these in the Gerasene demoniac’s story count more heavily against his commission being considered apostle-like than the ones just listed because these relate to the core of Paul’s commission, rather than the form of the story and its post-

85 In the Epistles Paul emphasises his zeal for God, his Jewish pedigree, and his purity with respect to the law (Gal 1:13-14; Phil 3:4-6). The interpretation of Romans 7:7-25 is contested. Some read it as describing Paul’s frustration at his inability to keep the law as a Jew. Others believe that “I” in this passage is used in a general sense but shows his close identity with the law. Another suggestion is that Paul uses “I” to describe Jewish-Christian experience with the law post-conversion. Everts, “Conversion,” DPL, 158. 1 Tim 1:15 expresses Paul’s failure with regard to the law. It stands in contrast to the Galatians and Philippians material (and possibly with that in Romans, depending on how it is read). However, the Pauline authorship of 1 Tim is disputed.

86 These elements include the bright light and voice (Acts 9:5; 22:8; 26:13); Paul’s struggle to identify the speaker (Acts 9:5; 22:8; 26:15); getting up (Acts 9:8; 22:16; 26:16); losing and receiving sight (at least in its literal dimensions) (Acts 9:8-18; 22:11, 13); and being led by the hand (Acts 9:8; 22:11).
resurrection setting. That is, the visionary aspect of Paul’s encounter comes from the fact that
the Jesus he meets is the risen Christ, and so comes to him in the form of light and a voice.
The demoniac, by contrast, meets Jesus in person.

Some of the elements listed below as part of what I have just called the “core of Paul’s
commission,” are also related to the post-resurrection context. For example, Paul says he
testifies to what the prophets and Moses said would take place: that Christ had to suffer, be
raised from death, and proclaim light to Jews and Gentiles (Acts 26:22-23). As a Gentile, the
Gerasene demoniac would not have been familiar with Moses and the prophets, nor in Luke 8
could he have witnessed Jesus as risen from the dead in order to be able to testify to it.
Likewise, where Paul is exhorted to be filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 9:17), Luke 8:26-39
sits prior to the use of the expression in connection with disciples or apostles in Luke-Acts.87
Thus, although the elements given below distinguish Paul’s commission from the man’s, some
of them could hardly have been otherwise.

These core elements from Paul’s commission that are lacking in the discussion of
the demoniac in Luke 8:26-39 include: being filled with the Holy Spirit (Acts 9:17); being
26:16); calling on God’s name (Acts 22:16); service (Acts 26:16); being rescued from his own
people and from the Gentiles (Acts 26:17); opening the eyes of the Gentiles so they can turn
from darkness to light and receive forgiveness of sins and sanctification through faith (Acts
26:18); the turning of the Gentiles to God to do deeds worthy of repentance (Acts 26:20);
being helped by God to testify (Acts 26:22) that Christ had to suffer, being raised from death,

5.4 Conclusions

The delivered demoniac is associated with the apostles first of all by the use of διηγέομαι and
κηρύσσω in Luke 8:39. His commission and proclaiming look back to the mission of the twelve
in Luke 6:12-16 and forward to 24:47-48. His going and proclaiming to the Gentiles

---

87 Despite Luke’s many references to people filled with or led by the Holy Spirit, or upon whom the Holy Spirit
comes (Luke 1:15, 35, 41, 67; 2:25-27; 3:16, 22; 4:1, 14, 18; 10:21; 11:13) it is notable that this is not said of
the disciples or the apostles prior to Pentecost (Acts 2:4).
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anticipates that commission for Paul in Acts. His encounter with Jesus parallels Paul’s
touch with the risen Christ in Acts, so that there are parallels (and yet differences)
between their respective experiences. Luke, in response to the controversy surrounding Paul’s
apostleship, (reluctantly it seems) identifies Paul as an apostle while making it clear that he is
not one of the twelve. Luke appears to want to emphasise Paul’s role as preacher and
missionary to the Gentiles, rather than the fact that he is an apostle. The Gerasene and Paul
are similar in this regard; Paul is acknowledged as an apostle but is held at a distance from
them; the man is not an apostle but is associated strongly with them. However, the man, like
Paul, proclaims to the Gentiles. He is associated with the apostles, but it is by his going and
proclaiming among them that Luke shows this most clearly. The association with the apostles,
including Paul, is at the service of this emphasis.

It might be ventured that the Gerasene demoniac’s story in Luke anticipates Paul’s story in
Acts. Of the common elements listed above, being sent by Jesus to the Gentiles is a very
important parallel. Despite some significant differences, Luke’s portrayal of the delivered
demoniac resembles his portrayal of Paul in a number of ways.

6 The List of Parallels

This discussion examines the most significant of the various parallels and connections
between the lake stories and draws them together to underline how well structured and
connected they are. From this synthesis, the disciples’ failure of action in the second lake
story stands out. This failure brings into bold relief the exemplary response of the delivered
man.

88 It is worth reiterating that what is being claimed here is not that these are the only passages in Luke that
contain parallels. The parallels that are present between the various panels in the discipleship cycles
underline the significance of what Luke is presenting to his readers or hearers about the formation of the
twelve.
6.1 Discipleship Cycles

In Table 4 in Chapter 2 Section 4, the two discipleship cycles in the Galilean section of Luke’s Gospel are diagrammed in six panels arranged as three pairs. Many of the parallels between each of these three pairs, especially those between the two lake stories, have been discussed so far. Here I wish to make clear how the six passages in this pattern also develop the discipleship theme in their narrative sequence. In the first cycle Jesus announces his mission (4:16-30). He begins gathering a community of disciples around him, commissioning Simon and his companions to join with him in the work (5:1-11). He then chooses twelve of these to be his apostles (6:12-16). In the second cycle Jesus reiterates his mission for his own disciples by answering the question from John the Baptist (7:18-35). He then invites his own disciples to make the journey to the other side of the lake (8:22-39). Finally, he commissions the twelve to go out on their own (9:1-6).

The (limited) commission Jesus gives the twelve in 9:1-2 reflects his own mission statement in 4:18-19, and again in 7:22-23. It is a people-catching mission (cf. 5:1-11). It picks up on the disciples’ struggle with the demonic powers on the lake (8:22-25) and on the other side of the lake (8:26-39). Having been chosen as apostles in 6:12-16, the twelve are now being sent out (9:1-6). These six panels are the points at which Luke highlights the disciples’ formation in the Galilean section. However, their formation is not limited only to these sections. Luke signals the disciples’ presence throughout Jesus’ Galilean ministry, in more or less subtle ways. Simon is mentioned because of his mother-in-law’s healing as early as 4:38, even before the first lake journey. Following 5:1-11 the disciples (or the twelve) are mentioned in various places outside these two discipleship cycles. In many cases they appear to be little more than recipients of Jesus’ teaching or his disputes with the authorities. Luke could have narrated much of this material without reference to the disciples, but by including them as he has, they remain present with Jesus as he travels, and are being formed and prepared. Hence the last panel in the discipleship cycles (9:1-6), where the twelve are sent on their mission journey without Jesus, is the culmination of their formation thus far.

89 Luke 5:30, 33; 6:1, 17, 20; 7:11; 8:1, 9; 9:12, 14, 16, 18, 40, 43. Luke 9:10 also mentions the apostles but because it reports on the mission journey (9:1-6) it is not included in the list.
The disciples succeed in bringing in the catch in 5:1-11. They fail to navigate the storm or deliver the demonic in 8:22-39. Their mixed success on the lake is followed by another period of formation, and then a commission (in 9:1-2). This anticipates the mixed success of the disciples and further formation experiences throughout the rest of the Gospel, which also culminates in a commissioning in Luke 24:46-48, and with the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2:1-13.

The pattern also anticipates the apostolic proclamation of Jesus to the Gentiles in Acts. The Elijah and Elisha material in Luke 4:24-28 hints at this proclamation. The lake as symbolic of the far boundary means that both lake journeys also hint at this movement to the Gentiles. The naming of the twelve as apostles anticipates their being sent. This is fulfilled soon after in 9:1-6, which can be seen a precursor for the larger mission in Acts. Because the reiteration of Jesus’ mission in 7:21-23 precedes the journey to the other side in 8:22-39, Luke is demonstrating that the mission as described in 7:21-23 (and therefore 4:18-19) is the one being taken to the far side of the lake. The Gerasene is a captive who is released (cf. 4:18), as he is cured of his demons (cf. 7:21). The sending of the twelve is local and temporary, but it anticipates the fact that the later, permanent commission is to “all nations” (24:47).

The two lake stories form the central pair in the discipleship cycles. As formative, liminal journeys on the lake, they bring into focus the theme of formation or transformation. This theme is a constant for the disciples as they journey with Jesus throughout Luke. The lake journeys also anticipate the movement to the “other side,” to the Gentiles, in Acts.

The formation theme is well recognised by commentators, but the discipleship cycles, and particularly the focusing effect of the lake journeys within this pattern, have not been adequately acknowledged. The journey into Gentile territory and the man’s going and proclaiming as anticipatory of Acts has also been recognised elsewhere. The discipleship cycles, and the lake stories as they have been described in this study, demonstrate that the theme and anticipatory function of the second lake story particularly have been understated.

6.2 Parallel Vocabulary in Luke’s Lake Stories

The vocabulary common to the lake stories has been discussed in detail in Chapters 3 and 4 above. The purpose of this section is to lay out as simply and clearly as possible this shared...
vocabulary in order to emphasise the parallel nature of the two lake stories. Brief comments are included.

6.2.1 λίμνη (5:1, 2; 8:22, 23, 33)

Luke uses λίμνη only in his lake stories, which are the setting for the two discipleship journeys on the lake. Luke makes a conscious decision to use this word. He alters the vocabulary he finds in his source (Mark calls the Lake of Gennesaret θάλασσα), even though other nautical terms—πλοῖον (5:3; 8:22, 37), ἐμβαίνω (5:3; 8:22, 37), κατάγω (5:11), πλέω (8:23), καταπλέω (8:26)—are used in the accounts. Luke normally associates πλοῖον with sea voyages. ἐμβαίνω is usually “embark,” and used of boarding water transport. πλέω (also in Acts 27:25) normally describes sea travel. κατάγω is elsewhere (sometimes) used of boats on the high seas. καταπλέω, is a hap leg. in Luke. In Acts 27:15 συναρπάζω is used of a ship caught or torn away by the wind. This use of language associated elsewhere with sea voyages underscores the fact that Luke has deliberately used λίμνη in Luke 5:1-11 and 8:22-39.

6.2.2 πλοῖον (5:2, 3, 7, 11; 8:22, 37)

The boats in the lake stories are the means to a livelihood (5:2). The boat enables Simon to take his first step from the shore with Jesus (5:3). It provides a platform from which Jesus teaches (5:3). The boats are the means by which Simon (and the others present) are able to obey Jesus’ command to put out into the deep water (5:4, 6). They represent fruitless toil in the darkness when Jesus is not present (5:5). The boats enable and contain the abundant catch of fish (5:7). They are the place where all present wonder at the catch of fish (5:9), as well as

91 “ἐμβαίνω,” BDAG, 321.
92 “κατάγω,” BDAG, 516.
the place where Simon falls before Jesus as a “sinful man” (5:8) and Jesus commissions Simon (and the others) to catch people (5:10). The boats become a symbol of the old life that is to be left behind (as part of “everything”) (5:11), but they have also accrued many positive associations. The first disciples were willing to leave behind their dependence on the boats for a new way of life, but they would later prove themselves willing to revisit and extend the experience of their commission on the lake by entering a boat again at Jesus’ invitation in 8:22.

6.2.3 ἐμβαίνω (5:3; 8:22, 37)

In each use of ἐμβαίνω it is Jesus who is the subject. In each case it is clear he is not the only one boarding the boat. The initiative for these journeys lies with him and he is the enabling presence on the lake journeys.

6.2.4 θεός (5:1; 8:28, 39) and Ἰησοῦς (5:8, 10; 8:28 (twice), 30, 35 (twice), 39)

Reference to God forms an inclusio around the lake stories. Jesus is teaching the word of God in 5:1, and the man is sent to give an account of the deeds of God in 8:39. Jesus is identified as Son of the Most High God in 8:28. The first two references to Jesus (5:8, 10) describe his interaction with Simon, the next three his interaction with the man (8:28 (twice), 30), and the last three with the man in his healed condition (8:35 (twice), 39). Luke shows Jesus here as the chief protagonist in the lake stories, but the reference to God in the first and last verse speaks of the plan and purpose of God at work through Jesus. It is notable that 8:39 refers to God and then to Jesus, with Ἰησοῦς forming the last word of the verse, as the man goes proclaiming what Jesus has done for him.

6.2.5 ὀχλος (5:1, 3; 8:40)

The first lake story opens with Jesus standing by the lake and the crowd pressing in on him (5:4). In 8:40, immediately after Jesus’ return to the Galilean side of the lake, the crowd are waiting for him (8:40). These verses form another inclusio around the lake stories.
6.2.6 ἀνήρ (5:8; 8:27, 38)

Simon declares himself a sinful man (5:8). The demoniac is a man of the city (8:27) and then a man from whom the demons had gone (8:38). Is the man’s transformation more complete? His actions suggest so.

6.2.7 ἐπιστάτης (5:5; 8:24 (twice))

In both of the lake stories ἐπιστάτης denotes inadequate faith. On both occasions it is the disciples who are addressing Jesus. In 5:5 the inadequate faith is overcome by Jesus’ word to Simon. In 8:24 the double use of ἐπιστάτης emphasises the disciples’ failure to comprehend the power and authority that reside in Jesus’ person, and that because he is with them, they can work together to manage the boat through the storm.

6.2.8 ἐρωτάω (5:3; 8:37)

The two occurrences of ἐρωτάω in the lake stories both involve requests to go out onto the lake. Jesus asks Simon to put the boat out a little way from the shore (5:3). In 8:37 the people ask Jesus to depart from them. This second request is actually a rejection. Nevertheless, these two verses form another inclusio around the two lake stories, as 5:3 is the beginning of the movement from the shore out into the deep water, and 8:37 refers to the return from the other side.

6.2.9 καθίζω (5:3) and κάθημαι (8:35)

Jesus is seated in the boat teaching the people in 5:3. In 8:35 the delivered man, now of sound mind, is seated at Jesus’ feet. That is, he is seated as a disciples at the feet of Jesus, who is the teacher.

6.2.10 ὁράω (5:2, 8; 8:28, 34, 35, 36)

The references to seeing in both lake stories bear out the symbolic nature of the stories as sight is clearly both literal and a metaphor for insight, perception, or understanding. Jesus sees
two boats and sees the opportunity to teach from the lake and to engage Simon (5:2). Simon sees the catch and sees Jesus as one from whom he needs to be distant (5:8). The man sees Jesus and goes on to confront him (8:28). The swineherds see what had happened and rush off to tell of it (8:34). The people come out to see what has happened and become afraid (8:35). Those who had seen how the man was delivered report it (8:36). The seeing of the people is limited or inadequate as they are filled with fear and ask Jesus to depart from them (8:37).

6.2.11 παύω (5:4; 8:24)

Jesus ceases speaking τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ in 5:4. In 8:24 it is Jesus’ own word that makes the wind and waves cease.

6.2.12 ὅλος (5:5; 8:39)

In Luke 5:5 the disciples have fished all night and caught nothing. Following Jesus’ instructions (5:5b) they catch a large number of fish (5:6). The large haul of fish speaks of the disciples’ success at mission. However, on the second lake journey they fail the tests put before them. The man’s superabundant response to Jesus’ instructions—as he goes throughout all of the city—stands in marked contrast to the lack-lustre performance of the disciples.

6.2.13 ποιέω (5:6; 8:39)

What the disciples have done in 5:6 is to let down their nets for a catch. What God or Jesus has done in 8:39 is deliver the man from his demons. The parallel would have been stronger if the disciples had delivered the man.

6.2.14 πλῆθος (5:6; 8:37)

The fishers bring in πλῆθος ἰχθύων πολύ so that their nets are breaking (5:6). The fish become symbolic for the many people the disciples will catch alive. In 8:37 it is ἄπαν τὸ πλῆθος, all the people of the region of the Gerasenes who refuse to be caught because they are seized by fear, and because the disciples are not actively joining Jesus at “fishing.”
6.2.15 πολύς (5:6; 8:29, 30)

In 5:6 there are many fish. The man is seized many times (8:29) because many demons (8:30) had entered into him. The size of the catch and the power of Legion are being emphasised.

6.2.16 διαρρήγνυμι (5:6; 8:29)

There are so many fish in 5:6 that the nets are beginning to break. The demon that possesses the Gerasene in 8:29 is so powerful that he repeatedly broke his bonds.

6.2.17 ἔρχομαι (5:7 (twice); 8:35)

Simon and those with him signal to his partners to come and help, and they come (5:7). The people come to see what has happened to the man (8:35). In both cases it is the extraordinary event (miraculous catch of fish, deliverance from the demon) that causes the movement.

6.2.18 ἐξέρχομαι (5:8; 8:27, 29, 33, 35 (twice), 38)

Simon asks Jesus to depart from him (5:8). Jesus’ departure from the boat marks his arrival at the other side (8:27). Four of the other five occurrences of ἐξέρχομαι refer to the unclean spirit (8:29) or demons (8:33, 35b, 38) that had come out of the man. The other use describes the people coming out to see the man (8:35a).

6.2.19 θάμβος (5:9) and θαυμάζω (8:25)

In 5:9 Simon and those with him are amazed at the catch they have taken. In 8:25 the disciples are amazed (and afraid) when Jesus calms the wind and waves. In both cases they react to what Jesus has done to display his power and authority over the natural world.
Jesus begins his commissioning of the disciples with the command or reassurance not to be afraid (5:10). When Jesus calms the wind and waters the disciples are afraid (and amazed). In 8:35 it is the people who are afraid as they see the delivered man. The catch of fish, the calming of the storm, and the deliverance of the man are all performed by Jesus. They are the central events of the two lake stories. Each provokes fear. For the disciples the fear is blended with amazement (θάμβος in 5:9; θαυμάζω in 8:25). In the people of the region of the Gerasenes the response is fear alone. As they ask Jesus to leave, Luke states that they were seized φόβῳ μεγάλῳ (8:37).

**6.3 Inclusio**

Luke 5:1 and 8:39 form an inclusio around the two lake stories. In 5:1, the crowd press in upon Jesus ἀκούειν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ as Jesus is standing παρὰ τὴν λίμνην Γεννησαρέτ. In 8:39 the man goes καθ᾽ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. There is an obvious and strong parallelism between hearing Jesus proclaim τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ and the man proclaiming ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The content of “word of God” is not specific, but it implies the content of Jesus’ Nazareth sermon (4:18-19). In 8:39 the proclamation is specific. It is the man’s deliverance from the demon Legion. The shift is from the general message to the particular. God (θεός) is mentioned in 5:1 and again 8:39 when Jesus instructs the man to return home to give an account of what God has done for him. As such, it takes on the nature of witness, or testimony (Luke 24:48). The other observable shift is from the word of God to the deeds of Jesus. This aligns with the shift in 8:39 from what God had done for the man (8:39a), to what Jesus had done for him (8:39b).

The sense of return or completion is further enhanced by the use of ὄχλος in 5:1 and again in 8:40. In 5:1 the crowd press in upon Jesus to hear him. In 8:40 they are waiting for him and welcome him. The crowd remains on the shore: Jesus sets out on the lake. The movement is captured by the use of ἐμβαίνω and πλοῖον in 5:3 and 8:37. After Jesus has boarded the boat
(5:3), he asks (ἐρωτάω) Simon to put out from the shore, and he complies with this request. In 8:37 the people of the region ask (ἐρωτάω) Jesus to return, and he complies with their request.

6.4 Reported Direct Speech of Jesus

Luke reports the following direct speech of Jesus in the lake stories:

First Lake Journey (5:1-11)

ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα ὑμῶν εἰς ἄγραν (v. 4)
μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἐσθη ζωγρῶν (v. 10)

Second Lake Journey (8:22-39)

The Storm (vv. 22-25)
διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης (v. 22)
ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; (v. 25)

The Demoniac (vv. 26-39)
τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; (v. 30)
ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός (v. 39)

Jesus speaks twice in each episode to Simon, the disciples, and the man respectively. The first line of speech in each episode presents a task, or challenge. In the first lake journey Jesus instructs Simon to put out into the deep water. The second lake journey has two parts. In the first, Jesus invites his disciples to go over to the other side of the lake. In the second he asks the demon for its name. The second line of speech marks the resolution or clarification of each episode. In the first journey Jesus commissions the disciples to catch people alive. In the second he asks the disciples where their faith is, and sends the man to declare what God has done for him.

The first and last lines of direct speech by Jesus form an inclusio around the two lake stories:

ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος καὶ χαλάσατε τὰ δίκτυα υμῶν εἰς ἄγραν (5:4)
ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός (8:39)

Each begins with a second person singular imperative. The first is addressed to Simon, the second to the man. Each follows with a destination. For Simon, the deep water; for the man,
his home. Each has a task to be performed. Simon is to let down the nets for a catch. The man is to give an account of what God has done for him. Within their respective episodes these phrases have specific meanings. The letting down of the nets for a catch (5:4), becomes catching people (5:10), which is teaching the word of God (5:3). Telling what God has done (8:39a), means telling what Jesus has done (8:39b), which is releasing a captive from demonic power (8:32-36).

The achievement of this inclusio required Luke to rearrange the sequence of events within the narrative. Jesus’ return is narrated in 8:37, before the man’s request to go with him, and Jesus’ instructions to him, in 8:38-39. If Luke had followed the chronological order of events it would still have allowed for an inclusio: Simon being instructed to put out in 5:4, and Jesus returning with his disciples in 8:39. However, the suggested re-ordering allows Luke to show a number of things. First, the outward movement, passing on, and multiplication of mission and proclamation are emphasised as Simon puts out in 5:4, and the man goes forth in 8:39.

Second, as one sent to tell what God has done for him, the man is shown as one who is caught alive (5:10). Third, Luke achieves a leap forward into the later part of Acts, by making “return” here, the Gerasene’s return to Gentile territory. That is, rather than having him return with Jesus to Galilee, the man returns to his city. This city is on the “other side” of the lake, in Gentile territory. The man is a Gentile, who goes to give an account of what God has done for him. Fourth, this inclusio invites a comparison between Simon and the man.

A comparison between Jesus’ final speech in the two lake stories is also instructive:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{μὴ φοβοῦ· ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπου εἶσῃ ζωγρῶν} & \quad (5:10) \\
\text{ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός} & \quad (8:39)
\end{align*}
\]

Both are Jesus’ commissions (or instructions). Catching people alive and telling what Jesus has done are both valid expressions of the call to discipleship.

The following chiastic structure confirms the presence of parallels within Luke 8:22-39:

94 “χαλάσατε” is plural, so others are involved.

95 See Appendix 1, “Narrative time reshuffle (Luke 8:26-39).”

96 Below, Section 8.
A διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς λίμνης, (v. 22)
B ποῦ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν; (v. 25)
B¹ τί σοι ὄνομα ἐστιν; (v. 30)
A¹ ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ διηγοῦ ὡσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. (v. 9)

A is an instruction to the disciples. A¹ is an instruction to the man. B is a question to the disciples. B¹ is a question to the man. The question to the disciples (B) represents their failure to fulfill Jesus’ instructions in A. The question to the man (B¹) highlights the captivity of the man’s identity to the demon who possesses him. The instruction to the man (A¹) highlights his new identity as one set free by God, and is fulfilled in his obedience to Jesus (8:39b).

This chiasm also contains a glaring gap. In A¹ Jesus tells the man where he is to go and what he is to do. In A the disciples are given a destination, but no task. What are they to do at the other side of the lake? A¹ provides an answer. They should be declaring what God has done for them. The larger pattern of Jesus’ direct speech in the lake stories confirms this. In 5:4 Simon is given a destination and a task. The destination is the deep water. The task is to let down the nets for a catch. By the second lake story the disciples and Luke’s readers know that this means catching people alive (5:10). This is related (as shown above) to giving an account of what God has done in 8:39. The gap can thus be filled. The disciples were invited by Jesus to go over to the other side of the lake in order to catch people alive, or give an account of the deeds of God. This they fail to do.

The questions and tasks Luke lays out so clearly in these stories are addressed to his readers. To disciples he says, “Where is your faith?” To those who are captive to any evil power, he asks, “What is your name?” which is to say, “What is the power that holds you?” Luke invites his readers out on the deep water and then to the other side in order that they might catch people alive and declare what God has done for them.

6.5 Tasks

The two lake stories present Simon and his companions with a series of tasks. As formative discipleship journeys, Jesus expects them to complete these tasks. In the first journey they succeed. In the second they fail:
The task in 5:1-11 is fishing. When Jesus suggests that they do so (5:4), Simon’s response is that they have fished all night without success. But despite his own experience as a fisher and the unsuitability of the time of the day, he agrees to follow Jesus’ instructions (5:5) and they let down the nets (5:5-6). However, they take in such a huge catch (5:7), that it threatens to sink the boat and tear the nets (5:6-7). Those in the boat signal to their partners in the other boat to come and help, which they do. The completion of the task requires two barriers to be overcome: Simon’s reluctance to go fishing, and the bringing in of the fish as the nets begin to tear and the boats threaten to sink. The task is completed successfully because Simon is obedient to Jesus’ word, and because the fishers work together at the task.

The fishers are overcome with fear and amazement (5:8-9), and Simon asks Jesus to leave (5:8). Jesus then makes it clear that the catch and the fish are an object lesson (a metaphor) for the vocation to which Simon (along with James and John) is being called: to catch people (5:10). Simon (with the others), responds to these words by leaving everything to follow Jesus.

In 8:22-26 the task is piloting the boat through the storm, which comes upon them suddenly as Jesus sleeps. The disciples forget what happened in the first lake journey. Back in 5:5 their experience told them that putting out on the lake would be fruitless. Here in 8:24 they deem it to be fatal. In 5:5 Simon chose to obey Jesus’ word and the journey was a success (5:6). Here in 8:24 the disciples waiver in fulfilling Jesus’ instructions and he must intervene. Rather than work together to sail through the storm (as they did in 5:7 to bring in the catch) they wake

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7: Tasks or Barriers on the Lake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Lake Story (5:1-11)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing (v. 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus’ word (v. 5) and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples’ action (vv. 5-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazed and afraid (vv. 9-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Lake Story (8:22-39)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm (v. 23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus’ rebuke (v. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazed and afraid (v. 25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demon (v. 27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus’ command (v. 29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seized with great fear (v. 37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jesus. He rebukes the storm (8:24) and the wind and waves cease (8:24). The task on this journey has been overcome, but not by the disciples. Jesus makes it clear that they were to perform this task when he questions their faith (8:25). The disciples wonder in fear and amazement at what has happened. They question Jesus’ identity and his authority over the natural elements. But they should have been aware of this from their experience in 5:1-11, where Jesus’ authoritative presence, along with the disciples’ co-operative action, lead to the successful catch.

The demon-storm prefigures the demon Legion in the second part of this lake journey (8:26-39). Luke reports the arrival of the group at the other side of the lake in 8:26. But ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν is singular and refers only to Jesus. The disciples have not stepped up to the mark, neither are they reported as stepping onto the land. If the Lukan Jesus hoped that by being with him on the lake as he stilled the storm they would have re-found their faith (8:25) and stepped onto the shore with him and delivered the man, then he was disappointed. Luke narrates the encounter between Jesus and the man entirely without reference to the disciples. Indeed, the disciples may as well still be in the boat, as that is where Luke leaves off mention of them in this episode. As with the demon-storm, the demon Legion is overcome by Jesus’ word (8:29, 32), which demonstrates his power and authority (cf. 8:25b). Once again, there is a strong reaction from those around Jesus. The people of the region are seized with fear and ask him to return across the lake (8:35, 37).

The lake stories are clearly structured around these three tasks: fishing, piloting the boat through the storm, and delivering the Gerasene demoniac. This structuring serves to highlight the formative nature of the lake voyages and the success and failure of the disciples.

6.6 Common Themes

The above chapters have argued that the lake stories are formative discipleship journeys. The theme of the disciples’ success and failure has been highlighted. Where the fishers/disciples succeed, it is a result of their working together and their obedience to Jesus’ word. Where they fail it is through lack of faith which leads to lack of co-operative action.
The disciples’ passivity in the second lake story, and elsewhere in Luke, forms a marked contrast with the healed man’s action. As Luke describes him before his deliverance, he is a passive victim to the demon. It drives him into the wilderness and causes him to live a life more like death. Once delivered, however, the man is outstanding for his active going and proclaiming. In this he stands in relief to the often mediocre performance of the twelve, especially their failure in the second lake story.

The journey theme itself has proved to be important. There is a sense of development and progress that goes with the formation of the disciples as they travel with Jesus both literally, and metaphorically. The lake stories are an interesting case as they are journeys, but they are journeys of a liminal nature. From the perspective of discipleship, their significance is as much about transformation and growth as it is about reaching a certain destination or performing a particular task. The fact that both journeys begin and end on the shore of the lake emphasises this point. This observation is consistent with the conclusions others have reached about the central section of Luke’s Gospel.97

The lake stories are not only about the disciples’ performance. As a biography, Luke maintains a steadfast focus on Jesus’ authority and power. His actions instil fear and amazement. He is the enabling presence, and when he is not physically present with his disciples he makes provision for them. Before his resurrection, he gives them a temporary commissioning (9:1-6). After his resurrection this is by permanent commissioning (Luke 24:47-48) and the gift of the Spirit (Acts 2:1-13).

Jesus’ power and authority over demons is shown to be absolute. This should not obscure the fact that Luke also shows the hideous and destructive power of evil. The disciples’ reaction to the storm on the lake may represent a failure, but it also indicates the more-than-natural ferocity of the storm. This is no ordinary storm. Likewise, the demon Legion is no ordinary demon. He is Legion and he is ruination. It is understandable that the disciples are not even reported as stepping out of the boat in 8:27. The reader imagines that having experienced the demon-storm on the lake the disciples have no desire to have any more experiences on this journey. However, the catch of fish in 5:1-11 was no ordinary catch either. It was also a

97 Chapter 2, Section 3.
metaphor, but for the disciples it was a sign of Jesus’ authority, and of what they could achieve when they cooperate, with him “in the boat.” The lake stories show the power of evil and the power and authority of Jesus writ large.

Another important theme at work is the mission to the Gentiles. The lake as symbolic of the boundary of Israel, the journey to the other side of the lake, and what takes place upon the other side, bring the Gentile mission to the fore. The man’s going and proclaiming embody this mission. Luke emphasises this by casting his sending and going in a manner that resembles the commissions of the apostles, their proclaiming in Acts, Paul’s experience on the road to Damascus, and his ministry of proclamation among the Gentiles. Catching people in 5:1-11 becomes mission to the Gentiles in 8:22-39, which in turn becomes proclamation and evangelism in Acts. The delivered man is one of the few Gentiles mentioned in Luke. As with the others, Luke does not follow through with his story, preferring to leave detailed accounts of Gentile mission until Acts. Nevertheless, he is narrated as an exemplary disciple.

The man’s story shows him to be a captive who finds release through his encounter with Jesus. This, and his restoration to his home and city, connect strongly with the jubilee ministry and proclamation of Jesus in Luke 4:18-19 and 7:21-22.

7 The Man and the Discipleship Cycles

The Gerasene demoniac occupies an interesting place within the lake stories. He is a key part of 8:22-39. His deliverance has been identified as the “task” in 8:26-39 that the disciples fail to master. His exorcism illustrates Jesus’ power and authority. It precipitates the reaction of the people of his region. The contrast between his life as it was before and after his deliverance, shows Jesus’ ministry of release to the captives and the proclamation of the acceptable year of the Lord at work.

All this would be adequately shown if the account finished with Jesus’ return to the Galilean side of the lake in 8:37. But Luke goes on to narrate the man’s request to go with Jesus, Jesus’ sending of the healed man, and the man’s going and proclaiming in 8:38-39. Then in 8:40 Jesus’ return is mentioned again. The effect here is that the man’s sending and going sits on the end of the second lake story after Jesus has returned. If Luke had withheld all reference to Jesus’ return until the end of the account, this would not be the case.\(^9\) However, because 8:38-39 is framed by references to Jesus’ return (ὑποστρέφω), it is not completely orphaned.\(^{10}\)

Luke’s use of ὑποστρέφω of the man’s return to his home and of Jesus’ return suggests that both are doing the will of God. Jesus returns to the crowd (8:40), to whom he teaches the word of God (5:1). He is returning to fulfil his mission to proclaim (κηρύσσω) (4:18-19). The man returns to tell what God has done for him. He goes proclaiming (κηρύσσω) what Jesus has done for him (8:39). Luke 8:38-39 is thereby an important and integrated part of the narrative, but the shuffling of narrative order means it also sits just outside the second lake story.

By placing 8:38-39 as he has, Luke achieves several things. First, he leaves the reader with a picture of the man going and proclaiming Jesus at the end of the second lake story. There is something about this he wishes to emphasise. Second, prior to 8:37 the man is voiceless and passive within the narrative. In 8:38-39 he makes a request of Jesus (though Luke denies him direct speech). Jesus refuses the request but gives him his own mission, which he actively goes and pursues. The discussion above on the man’s activity as a disciple and as an apostle is all centered on 8:39. In one verse, Luke says much about the man’s active response. This stands in marked contrast to the disciples’ performance on this lake journey.

I have suggested above that Luke’s narration of Jesus’ return (8:37, 40) leaves the man’s return and proclamation sitting just outside of the second lake story. Now I argue that there are connections between Luke 8:39 and each of the other panels in the discipleship cycles. The parallel nature of these pairs has been presented earlier in Table 4, Chapter 2 Section 4.

---

99 See Appendix 1, Narrative Time Reshuffle (Luke 8:26-39). Jesus’ return is again narrated in 8:40, but this does not remove the fact that in 8:37 Luke says he left, before he narrates 8:38-39.

100 Without 8:40 the man’s sending and going in 8:38-39 would sit on the end of the lake story like a postscript, or epilogue.

In 4:16-30 Jesus announces his jubilee mission. This includes proclaiming release to the captives. The man is a captive released who, like Jesus, goes proclaiming.\(^{101}\) When Jesus cites the example of Elijah and Elisha, he shows his intention to move beyond ministry to his own “in-group.”\(^{102}\) As with the examples of Elijah and Elisha, this going beyond one’s own extends all the way to Gentiles. The man is sent to minister to his own people, Gentiles.


The task given to Simon (and those with him) is to put out the nets for a catch. He is then commissioned to catch people alive. In the second lake story the disciples are being given the chance to catch people alive. This they do not do, so Jesus does it. The demoniac in 8:26-39 parallels the fish in 5:1-11, in being caught. Then he is sent to proclaim what Jesus has done for him.

The man’s expressed desire following his deliverance is to be \(σὺν \ αὐτῷ\) (= with Jesus). This is the classic discipleship indicator in Luke.\(^{103}\) The same idea is expressed in 8:22 as the disciples accompany Jesus in the boat, and in 5:11 when Simon and his companions leave everything to follow Jesus. The connection with 5:1-11 is paradoxical as the man leaves Jesus rather than following him. However, in 9:1-6 the disciples leave Jesus, showing that this can

---

\(^{101}\) Luke 4:18, 19, 44; 8:1.

\(^{102}\) Chapter 1, Section 3.3.

\(^{103}\) Luke 8:1, 51; 22:14, 56; 24:29.
be a response of obedience and faith and one that results in deliverance, healing, and the proclamation of the kingdom of God (9:1-2).

**7.3 Luke 6:12-16 || 9:1-6**

Jesus chooses the twelve (6:15) and names them as his “apostles,” a title that suggests they will be sent. This happens in 9:1-6. Jesus’ commission to them echoes his own mission statements in 4:18-19 and 7:22, and his ministry thus far (7:21). This commission is linked in turn to the re-commissioning of the disciples in Luke 24. Despite the success of the mission in 9:1-6 the disciples do not catch any large numbers of people alive (cf. 5:10) until the book of Acts, which chronicles the unfolding Gentile mission. The healed man, however, responds immediately and proclaims Jesus among the Gentiles. His going and proclaiming in 8:39 reflects the nature of the disciples’ commissionings. His being sent by Jesus connects his story to the apostles’ story. He also anticipates Paul’s call or conversion experience and his preaching ministry among the Gentiles.

The Gerasene has experienced Jesus’ power and authority over demons. This means that as he proclaims what God/Jesus has done for him, he is in effect proclaiming the kingdom or rule of God, God’s jubilee, which he has experienced in his own life.

In light of the way the man connects with all of the elements in the discipleship cycles, I conclude that Luke portrays him as a model disciple. When this is placed alongside the disciples’ failure in the second lake story, it can be seen that Luke sets up this juxtaposition in order to highlight what makes for successful and unsuccessful discipleship.

**7.4 Success on the Lake**

Through the lake stories Luke uses Simon and the other disciples, as well as the man, to show what is at the heart of discipleship. Simon and those with him begin as fishers working by the crowds (5:1-2). They receive a direct invitation from Jesus (5:3), though the initial invitation was for something seemingly small. Even here, the theme of co-operative action is present as Jesus asks Simon to assist him with the provision of a boat and his skills in handling it. James and John find themselves being drawn into the action by virtue of their association with Simon (5:6-7, 9-11). Obedience to Jesus’ word is required, even though this word from Jesus
contradicts Simon’s experience (5:5). Once on the “lake” (of discipleship) co-operative action is required for the task of fishing (= catching people alive) (5:6-7). Simon and those with him are commissioned to catch people (5:10). This appears to be a general commission, and not one only for those who will later become apostles like Simon, James, and John do (6:12-16).

The lake stories show Simon and his companions as successful some of the time (5:1-11) and failing at other times (8:22-39). This pattern continues throughout Luke. The lake stories show that despite the mix of failure and success discipleship means being with Jesus and being transformed by the experience. The metaphor of the lake as a liminal formative journey, with Jesus present as guide, is one that Luke has gone to great trouble to present in his Gospel. The mission in 9:1-6 shows that failure is not the last word for disciples. The rest of Luke and Acts bears this out.

7.5 Success on the Other Side

The Gerasene demoniac enters the narrative as one living a death. He challenges Jesus, yet falls before him. Once he is delivered, his life is completely transformed. He is a willing learner (sitting at Jesus’ feet), which prepares him for being sent in 8:39. His desire is to be with Jesus but he is obedient even when instructed to do the opposite (cf. 5:5). He embraces Jesus’ sending wholeheartedly. By going and proclaiming he takes on Jesus’ mission. By telling what God/Jesus has done for him he witnesses to Jesus. He interprets Jesus’ instruction to give an account of what God has done for him as giving an account of what Jesus has done for him. By this he shows an awareness of who Jesus is and of how God works. This comes from his experience of having been possessed by a legion of demons and being delivered by Jesus.

7.6 Failure on the Lake

In Luke 5:1-11 Simon learns that “fishing” will not be successful when done at the wrong time in the wrong place based on one’s own knowledge and without Jesus (5:5). The second lake journey begins well. The disciples are with Jesus in the boat and he has instructed them to cross over to the other side. However, when the storm comes the disciples panic in the face of danger (8:24) and their faith deserts them (8:25). This looks reasonable in the circumstances, but the first lake journey has already demonstrated that they can succeed by
working together while Jesus is in the boat with them. Linked to this lack of faith in 8:25 is the inadequate recognition of Jesus’ power and authority implied by the double use of ἐπιστάτα in 8:24 (cf. 5:5). The disciples’ failure to cooperate further displays their lack of faith and their inadequate recognition of Jesus, as they wake him (8:24, 27).

8 Simon and The Man

Luke shows the healed man as a model disciple. Within the lake stories his response to being sent by Jesus stands in sharp contrast to the mixed response of the twelve, but there is more to comparing the disciples and the man than just this response. The situation of each, both before and after their encounters with Jesus during the lake journeys, is very different. Below I draw together the relevant material from the study in summary form to compare Simon (as the representative disciple) with the Gerasene, and to consider these in light of Jesus’ jubilee proclamation of 4:18-19. Table 8 sets out their respective situations before the lake stories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>The Demoniac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Is</strong></td>
<td>A Jew</td>
<td>A Gentile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>From</strong></td>
<td>Galilee</td>
<td>The region of Gerasenes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Life</strong></td>
<td>Settled</td>
<td>Chaotic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lives</strong></td>
<td>In a house</td>
<td>Among the tombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household</strong></td>
<td>Extended family</td>
<td>The dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Found</strong></td>
<td>With the crowd at the shore</td>
<td>At shore, in the company of demons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relationships</strong></td>
<td>Partners and family</td>
<td>Away from home, among the dead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jesus revealed</strong></td>
<td>Out on the deep water</td>
<td>On the other side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>“Depart . . . sinful man”</td>
<td>Challenges Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaction</strong></td>
<td>Fear/awe</td>
<td>Sitting at Jesus’ feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows that at every point of comparison the man is the antithesis of Simon. The contrast between the two is maintained in Luke’s description of them following their lake encounters with Jesus:
Table 9: Simon and the Healed Man after Meeting Jesus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Simon</th>
<th>The Healed Man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>An itinerant follower</td>
<td>A missionary to his own people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>Returns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td>Jesus and disciples</td>
<td>Family (implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Found</td>
<td>With Jesus</td>
<td>Home and city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission</td>
<td>Catch people</td>
<td>Give an account of what God has done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Leaves everything, follows</td>
<td>Proclaims what Jesus has done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipleship</td>
<td>Leaving everything</td>
<td>Restoration to home and city</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Released to</td>
<td>Follow and catch</td>
<td>Go and proclaim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry to</td>
<td>Jews (Gentiles in Acts)</td>
<td>Gentiles</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Luke refers to Simon’s household in 4:28. He makes no mention of land in connection with Simon, but he is a partner in a fishing business. This involves at least two boats, nets (5:2), and fishing partners (5:7). This is not land as such, but it is a livelihood and so probably the means to support himself and his family—a central jubilee concern. Leaving everything (5:11) would include all of this, as well as the social implications they imply: his place in his family, his honour in his village, and his identity. When Jesus orders the man to return to his home (8:27, 39) a family, household, and livelihood are implied. No mention is made of a livelihood, but he is restored to his home and city (8:39). The question of his occupation has moved very much into the background. After all, he has come back from among the dead (8:27). 104 His defining characteristic is his possession and then former possession by demons. (Hence he is “the Demoniac,” and then “the Healed Man,” in Tables 8 and 9 above.) His captivity and then release from the demons that held him captive show that Jesus’ jubilee proclamation of release has come to the Gentiles.

104 Compare this with Lev 25:10 which, in summarising the jubilee, speaks of return to property and family. Land and livelihood are assumed to be part of the mix in such statements.
Without 8:38-39 the lake stories—as formative discipleship journeys—could be read to imply that discipleship necessarily means the abandonment of everything (5:11). By narrating the return of the man to his home and city, Luke allows the possibility of different responses. Simon and the man show how different contexts and situations can lead to very different expressions of discipleship. In light of the whole of Luke-Acts this may seem an obvious conclusion to come to, but it shows again the programmatic nature of the lake stories. The pattern of discipleship suggested in 5:1-11 reflects discipleship in Luke prior to Jesus’ resurrection. The man anticipates discipleship in Acts. There are itinerant disciples in Acts, but the point made earlier about commissions and Jesus’ presence or absence applies here: discipleship is being with Jesus, it is focused on his person. For effective action without him prior to his resurrection, a commission is needed (9:1-6; 10:1-12). Following his resurrection disciples are empowered by the Spirit. In Acts 2, the twelve have received their re-commissioning and the Spirit has come upon the larger gathered group. Jesus is now present—and so is his Spirit—with them wherever they may be. This allows for local gatherings of disciples in the places in which they live. The man, in returning to his home and city (8:39), anticipates discipleship lived among one’s own people.

This does not mean that 5:1-11 is obsolete, as the community of goods and common life described in Acts 2:43-47 and 4:32-37, and the ongoing task of “catching people alive,” demonstrate. The discipleship of Simon and then of the man are related, while also showing movement or progression. Such movement or progression is found in many of the parallels and themes in the two lake stories, as well as in the movement and progression between Luke and Acts, especially with regard to discipleship. The lake stories anticipate this: Luke 5:1-11 broadly reflects discipleship in Luke’s Gospel: Luke 8:22-39 develops the theme, but the Gentile setting and sending, and the going of the man, mean that this lake story prepares the

---

105 This raises the whole question of Luke’s wealth ethic. Hays’ thesis is that the common thread on this topic in Luke’s work is the divestiture of possessions, but that this has different implications for different individuals or groups. He states, “Luke proposes a coherent ethical principle with a range of contingent applications.” Hays, Luke’s Wealth Ethics, 185 (his emphasis). The crucial principle is Luke 14:33. The application of this principle depends on “vocation and wealth.” Ibid. (his emphasis). Hays conceives of two axes as relevant to Luke’s wealth ethic: on the horizontal is “rich” and “poor,” and on the vertical “itinerant” and “sedentary.” “πάντα,” as used by Luke does not always mean “exhaustive divestiture,” and it “frequently functions hyperbolically.” Ibid., 82-83.

reader for Acts. The man experiences jubilee release and goes proclaiming that to his own Gentile people. His deliverance from the demon Legion shows in his person that Jesus’ jubilee announcement in 4:18-19 is for all people.

The comparison of Simon and the man moderates the tendency to read 5:1-11 either as normative for discipleship on the one hand, or the need to explain away the radical example of 5:11 on the other. It might be claimed, for example, that because Simon and his companions become apostles that they are a special case, and so the leaving of everything to follow Jesus does not have to apply generally. It is true, of course, that Simon, James, and John become apostles, but in 5:1-11 they are being commissioned as disciples to catch people. A broader reading of Luke and Acts could suggest that catching people is a special task that is entrusted to the apostles, but it is one that all disciples can share in. The difficulty with two-tier readings of discipleship is that Luke seems to apply the more stringent requirements consistently to the twelve, but it is unclear what he requires of the broader group of disciples.\(^\text{107}\) The situation is more mixed after the resurrection (Acts) where sedentary discipleship is more the norm. The man here anticipates this aspect of Acts, where many of the disciples live at home but are actively proclaiming Jesus in their own places.\(^\text{108}\)

9 Conclusion

In Chapter 4 of this study the failure of the disciples to act on the lake in Luke 8:22-39 was identified by comparing Luke 8:22-39 with 5:1-11. Here it has been shown that the wider literary context supports that reading, and that the mixed success of the disciples is an ongoing theme in Luke.

\(^{107}\) Luke 5:27; 9:57-62; 14:25-33; 18-22 are directed at potential disciples beyond the twelve. Elsewhere it is unclear what is required of the larger group of disciples. They are sometimes found in remote places listening to Jesus, or being healed and delivered by him (e.g. 6:17-18; 9:12-17), but the isolation of such places suggests they normally reside elsewhere, as 9:12 implies.

\(^{108}\) Acts has many references to disciples (or Christians, or believers) in various places sharing, worshiping, and serving together. Sedentary discipleship is stated or implied. For example, Acts 4:32; 6:1, 7; 14:21-23, 27-28; 18:23, 27; 20:1; 21:4, 16.
The Lukan Jesus’ concern with the formation of his disciples has also been shown to be highlighted in the discipleship cycles. Within these, the two lake journeys provided a unique context in which Jesus commissions Simon and his companions to catch people, and then to advance their formation by setting out for the other side of the lake. It has then been shown that the theme of formation is also present throughout the Galilean section, especially between the appointment of the twelve to be Jesus’ apostles in 6:12-17, and their sending in 9:1-6. Jesus is preparing them for this event, where he sends them out without him.

Against the mixed success of the disciples, the sending and going of the man in 8:38-39 stands out in bold relief. It has been shown that the man is shown as a model disciple, and that his ministry anticipates the ministry of the apostles and of Paul in Acts.

The various narrative strategies Luke uses to present the lake stories as parallel accounts have then been focused on the role of the man, on Simon (as representative of the twelve), and the discipleship theme. Lukan vocabulary and the structuring of the two lake stories have also been considered. The result of this has been to show that the delivered man in 8:38-39 occupies a unique place within the two discipleship cycles, and that Luke’s narration of his sending and going (8:38-39) connects with the other panels of the discipleship cycles in such a way as to highlight discipleship success and failure on the lake. The comparison between Simon and the man, and success and failure has proved to be reflective of discipleship in Luke and Acts.
CONCLUSION

1 Luke’s Lake Stories

This study has argued that Luke presents the lake stories as parallel accounts. Through the use of shared vocabulary, themes, and narrative structuring, Luke displays the journey on the lake as a unique setting in which Jesus calls Simon and his companions to “put out into the deep water,” and then the disciples to journey with him “to the other side of the lake.” Luke’s structuring of these stories is persuasive and artful. Through his choice of vocabulary and the use of devices such as inclusio and the careful placement of direct speech, he narrates Jesus gathering and forming his disciples. The Lukan Jesus employs the lake journeys to place before Simon and his companions, and then the disciples, tasks that they are expected to perform. In the first lake journey they succeed in bringing in the large catch of fish. In the second they fail to navigate the boat through the demon-storm and then to deliver the Gerasene demoniac.

These stories are about discipleship and apostleship. It is a remarkable achievement that Luke has managed to anticipate the ministry of the apostles and of Paul in Acts in his two lake stories in the Galilean section of Luke. He does this by focusing on Simon in the first lake story, and the delivered man in the second.

The lake stories occupy a special place in Luke as formative discipleship journeys in a unique setting, the Lake of Gennesaret. The lake represents the boundary of Jesus’ ministry to Israel, and the crossing over to the other side of the lake leads to a Gentile encounter and the sending of the first Gentile missionary. The concept of liminality helps to characterise the lake stories as a particular type of journey. They are less about geographical progress than they are about discipleship and transformation. In this they anticipate Luke’s central section, where geographical progress is less important than what happens and what is said on the way.
Ultimately, of course, it is important that Jesus reaches Jerusalem, as that is where the Gospel narrative must return. Place and progress are also important in the lake stories. Luke carefully narrates the movement from the shore of the lake, to a little way from the shore, out into the deep water and back to shore in the first lake story. In the second Lake journey Jesus and his disciples put out and arrive at the other side of the lake. Jesus steps onto the shore, encounters and delivers and commissions the Gerasene demoniac, and then returns to the Galilean side of the lake. The movement from the shore, across the lake, and to the “other side” is echoed in the overall shape of Luke-Acts. Luke begins and ends in Jerusalem, while Acts moves from Jerusalem and crosses into the Gentile world, ending in Rome.

At the metaphorical level, the discipleship journeys use this geographical progress to describe the formation and growth of the disciples. Simon begins on “the shore,” moves a little way from it in the boat with Jesus, sets out into the deep water, and eventually—following various setbacks and failures, as on the lake—becomes active in catching people alive, including Gentiles, in Acts.

As a reading strategy the idea of “metaphorical journey, realistic narrative” proved fruitful. Recognising that the lake stories work as metaphor (5:10) allowed room to explore what the reference of the metaphor might be. The corollary description (realistic journey) kept the exploration of the metaphorical or allegorical dimension focused on the text. An early stage of this study touches briefly on a military-political reading of the story of the Gerasene demoniac as symbolic of the occupation of the people by Roman forces. Although the power of such a reading is impressive it does not help to clarify the formative discipleship experiences unfolding in the lake stories. Similarly, the reading of the boat (or boats) as a symbol of the Church has a long and noble history. However, my own reading has sought to understand the metaphorical force of the lake stories in light of their form as a realistic narrative, and this produced what I hope is a different but complementary result.

The narrative approach taken here allowed for the exploration of inter- and intra-textuality, gaps and blanks within the text, and a focus on the finished form of that text. This approach allowed for—and in fact requires—a degree of imagination and creativity in order to create

---

1 Introduction, Section 6.
reading options that can be explored and tested. The internal connections, surprises, and mysteries of Luke’s Gospel become generative of imaginative and creative reading when the narrative is approached in this manner. The realistic nature of this narrative, and Luke’s characteristic way of telling it, mean that reading options sparked by this Gospel can be tested, and that this is a fascinating and inspiring enterprise.

As the study progresses, it becomes clear that liminality is a way “in” to seeing the lake stories as formative discipleship journeys. To frame Jesus as shaman, guide, elder, or spiritual director is in no way to deny the emphasis on his power and authority. What it does though, is allow a reading that focuses on what the lake stories say and show about the journey of discipleship. The reading of 8:25, where Jesus questions the disciples’ faith, illustrates the point. When 8:22-25 is read as Jesus displaying his power and authority over the elements, then his question to the disciples—where is your faith?—is difficult. After all, if Jesus is the one who calms storms and rescues the disciples, then the disciples did the right thing by coming to him when the storm threatened, and the rebuke seems unwarranted. Reading the lake stories as formative journeys prompts a different question: “What are the disciples expected to do or learn here?” This question offers a different way to interpret Jesus’ question about the disciples’ faith in 8:25. Jesus wonders about the absence of their faith because they fail to take the formative opportunity offered to them and navigate the boat through the storm.

The discipleship cycles identified in this study give a setting or context for the two lake journeys. These cycles have been usefully considered both as three pairs of parallel episodes, and as six related episodes in temporal sequence. By the end of Chapter 5 of this study it becomes clear that the cycles connect Jesus’ mission, the lake stories, and the choosing and sending of the twelve with the broader discipleship journey in Luke and Acts. The cycles also provide a way to track the disciples’ development and formation, which in the Galilean section of Luke culminates with the sending of the twelve in 9:1-6.

κηρύσσω direct the reader’s attention into Acts. The lake stories and the sending of the twelve both form part of the discipleship cycles. This links to the re-commissioning of the twelve in Luke 24 and the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2. This in turn anticipates the later commission in Luke 24:47-48 and subsequent mission to the Gentiles in Acts.

Several of the key findings of this study come to light as a result of the approach and understanding of the narrative outlined above.

The lack of motive for the second lake journey is a curious feature of Luke 8:22-39. When the lake stories are considered as parallel accounts, and their vocabulary, structure, and themes are analysed, it becomes clear that the journey to the other side of the lake is a “fishing” expedition. Once the demon-storm has been mastered by Jesus, the Gerasene demoniac appears at the lake shore. He is a “fish,” waiting to be caught alive. This is ironic as he lives among the dead in the tombs. If the disciples had delivered the man then perhaps, they, along with Jesus, would have preached the word of God to the people (cf. Luke 5:1; 9:1-6).

I have suggested the journey to the other side of the lake is a formative discipleship journey, and so the reader can anticipate that those on the journey with Jesus, the disciples, will be given tasks to perform. This also points to the deliverance of the man as that task, and opens the question of what could have happened if the disciples had been successful on the lake and on the other side. By 9:1-6 it becomes clear that the purpose of these tasks has been to prepare the disciples for their mission journey without Jesus. Thanks to his skill as a spiritual director, and the efficacy of his commissioning of the disciples, the mission is a success, despite the disciples’ mixed performance during the lake journeys.

Against the disciples’ failure in 8:22-39, the Gerasene emerges as a model disciple and apostle. It was made clear in the study that the man is not actually an apostle. However, the vocabulary, the sending of the man, and the setting of 8:38-39 within the lake stories and the discipleship cycles, act together to show the man as a model missionary to the Gentiles. He anticipates the apostolic proclamation to the Gentile world as it unfolds in Acts.

The Gerasene also anticipates Paul. The detailed narration of the demoniac’s story, the parallels between his story and Paul’s, the telling of what God/Jesus has done for him, and his
going and proclaiming among the Gentiles, mean that the story of the delivered man anticipates Paul’s Damascus road experience and subsequent missionary work among the Gentiles. The juxtaposition of all of this against Simon and the disciples’ mixed success on the lake journeys highlight the man’s exemplary discipleship and missionary activity.

The connections between the lake stories and Acts go beyond the healed man, the apostles, and Paul. The mixed success of the disciples in the lake stories plays out in the rest of Luke. Jesus continues to form and guide them, and is able to commission and send them successfully in Luke 9:1-6. They struggle further along the road to Jerusalem but are eventually re-commissioned and given the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2. They are then very successful at “catching people alive” throughout Acts. The experience of Simon and the other disciples on the lake shows that successful discipleship is a co-operative venture. In Luke 5:1-11 the fishers work together to bring in the catch. In Luke 8:22-25 they lose faith and rush to Jesus in confusion. The theme of co-operative ministry becomes strong in Acts, and this is where the apostles and other disciples are shown to be effective.

Seeing the lake stories within the discipleship cycles as a paradigm for Luke-Acts sheds light on the disciples’ ineffectiveness. The feeding of the five-thousand (9:12-17), and the disciples’ unsuccessful attempt to deliver the boy of a demon in 9:37-43 were looked at as examples. The contrast between Simon and those with him leaving everything, and the man’s return to his home anticipate the shift in focus from itinerant discipleship in Luke, to sedentary in Acts, though these are not tight compartments.

While others (Hilgert and Conzelmann were mentioned) have suggested there is a connection between the first lake story and mission to the Gentiles, this study strengthens the case. The logic is simple enough. The lake stories are parallel texts, the second of the lake stories is strongly connected with the Gentile mission in Acts, therefore the first lake story might be expected to have a similar connection. The idea of the lake as representing the boundary, and the first reported speech of Jesus in each of the lake stories (“put out into the deep water” and “let us go to the other side of the lake”) point in the same direction. The parallels between Simon and the Gerasene reinforce the connection between the lake stories and Gentile mission.
The proposal that the second lake story showed the disciples’ failure to fulfill the tasks set before them raised the question of Luke’s placement of narrative order, as the lake story precedes the commission in 9:1-2. The argument that the commission was a limited one proved to make good sense of the disciples’ mixed success thereafter. The exploration of the disciples’ commission and then later re-commissioning, and the proposal that the disciples were expected to face the demon-storm and the demoniac, lead to the clear conclusion that the commissioning in 9:1-9, and the subsequent re-commissioning in Luke 24 and the gift of the Spirit in Acts 2, are linked to Jesus’ presence and absence. Prior to the resurrection the disciples are inevitably unsuccessful in carrying out the commission of 9:1-2 when Jesus is not with them, except of course, during the mission journey (9:1-6) itself.

The above point about Jesus’ presence, the relationship between Luke 8:39a (θεός) and 39b (Ἰησοῦς), along with the titles used of Jesus in the lake stories (ἐπιστάτης and κύριος) confirmed a nuanced and carefully presented Christology in the lake stories. The move from ἐπιστάτης (5:5) to κύριος (5:8) and back to ἐπιστάτης (8:25) showed Simon’s developing understanding of Jesus, and then the panic, confusion, and failure of the disciples in 8:25. This showed that successful discipleship is linked to Jesus’ person and the recognition of his power and authority. The setting of the lake stories in the discipleship cycles and then within Luke-Acts also shows that Jesus continues to work in his disciples even when they fail to adequately comprehend and act in light of his power and authority.

Luke employs the contrast between Simon and the healed man both before and after their encounters with Jesus to show just how varied discipleship can be. The man as a captive released, and as one restored to his home and all that is implied with that, resonated strongly with Jesus’ jubilee proclamation (4:18-19). For Simon, discipleship is abandonment of his former life and a new attachment to Jesus. This reflects the focus in Luke on the twelve and their journey with Jesus. The healed man anticipates the pattern of discipleship that develops in Acts. Crucially, although he is sent home (Luke 8:39a) he goes proclaiming throughout the city (8:39b). He thereby demonstrates that discipleship, even for one who returns home, is active and involves the proclamation of what Jesus has done.
2 Further Research

There are various themes and specific passages in Luke that would repay revisiting and consideration in light of the lake stories and the discipleship cycles identified here. For example, the question of wealth and possessions has exercised commentators, Saints, and ordinary disciples since Luke was written. What would the contrast between the delivered demoniac’s return to his home and family, juxtaposed against Simon’s leaving everything, add to that discussion?

Liminality proved to be a useful lens through which to view the lake stories. There are other passages in Luke and Acts that could be viewed through a similar approach. The wilderness temptation and the transfiguration come to mind immediately. In using liminality to look at the lake stories, Jesus was framed as shaman, or guide, or spiritual director. This could be further considered. The Lukan Jesus as spiritual director would make a good starting point for further study of discipleship in Luke.

The identification of the motive for the second lake crossing, and the expectation in that story that the disciples were expected to have sailed the boat through the storm and then delivered the demoniac were identified by looking at the parallels between the two lake stories and their setting within the discipleship cycles. Such an approach might be applied elsewhere in order to identify and then fill in some of the gaps in Luke’s story.

Reading the disciples’ failure on the lake within the context of the discipleship cycles shows that Jesus continues to work at their formation and gives them the commissioning and empowerment they need to carry out his mission. Other episodes in which the disciples fail could be looked at in detail against the lake stories.

This study has demonstrated an approach to Luke’s lake stories that throws new light on Luke’s literary methods and the key themes of discipleship and mission, opening up new directions for further fruitful investigation.
Appendix 1

Narrative Time Reshuffle (Luke 8:26-39)

The reordering required for 8:26-39 to follow a strictly chronological narrative order is shown below. Strike-through denotes where the text has been cut, and bolding where it has been pasted.


26 Then they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee.
27 As he stepped out on land, a man of the city who had demons met him. For a long time he had worn no clothes, and he did not live in a house but in the tombs. Many times it had seized him; he was kept under guard and bound with chains and shackles, but he would break the bonds and be driven by the demon into the wilds.
28 When he saw Jesus, he fell down before him. Jesus commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. [The man] shouted at the top of his voice, “What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beg you, do not torment me.”
29 for Jesus had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. (For many times it had seized him; he was kept under guard and bound with chains and shackles, but he would break the bonds and be driven by the demon into the wilds.)
30 Jesus then asked him, “What is your name?” He said, “Legion”; for many demons had entered him.
31 They begged him not to order them to go back into the abyss.
32 Now there on the hillside a large herd of swine was feeding; and the demons begged Jesus to let them enter these. So he gave them permission.
33 Then the demons came out of the man and entered the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep bank into the lake and was drowned.
34 When the swineherds saw what had happened, they ran off and told it in the city and in the country.
35 Then people came out to see what had happened, and when they came to Jesus, they found the man from whom the demons had gone sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind. And they were afraid.
36 Those who had seen it told them how the one who had been possessed by demons had been healed.
37 Then all the people of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes asked Jesus to leave them; for they were seized with great fear. So he got into the boat and returned.
38 The man from whom the demons had gone begged that he might be with him; but Jesus sent him away, saying,
39 “Return to your home, and declare how much God has done for you.” So he went away, proclaiming throughout the city how much Jesus had done for him. Jesus got in the boat and returned.
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