

Chapter Ten

The opening words of this chapter ('After this') act pretty much like the typical conjunctive *kai* in its role as "and." That is to say, *Meta de*¹ *tauta* is a way of both putting behind yet at the same time having an eye on what is about to transpire. By now Jesus has had some experience with healing and teaching the people along in the company of his twelve disciples. With this under his belt, he sees a need to make more permanent his teaching. Healing and casting out of devils is wonderful but over the long haul not as lasting as teaching. Thus his appointment of "seventy others" which most likely comes from those who had accompanied Jesus and the twelve for a period of time. This gave Jesus the advantage of having observed them and deemed them qualified to go on ahead of him which literally runs as "before his face." Though their mission isn't explicit, it seems they are to prepare the way for Jesus coming later. As for doing this, Jesus gives general instructions through vs. 12. Everything else will have to be improvised. Chances are when hearing these words the seventy thought of the recent rejection of Jesus by the Samaritans.

In vs. 2 Jesus uses a familiar comparison to assuage the seventy new men, that is, he equates their work to gathering a harvest which is super-abundant though lacking in laborers. The adjectives used to make the contrast are *polus* and *oligos*, many or much and few or little. Right away he adds that while this is true and they are not to be discouraged, their primary task is not to reap the harvest. Instead, they are to pray or beseech (*deomai* also to express a need) the Lord of the harvest to send laborers to bring in the harvest. Several things are worth pointing out here and are listed as such:

-First, Jesus supposedly is the Lord or *Kurios* which means he's in charge of a field or several fields.

-Second, *ergates* is used instead of *doulos*, the common noun for slave, generally as one who works the soil.

Third, a harvest takes place in the autumn which means there's a period of inactivity for these laborers.

The way this takes place is that the lord hires the seventy on the spot basically as temporary workers, not permanent. Once hired, these men were in for a surprise. They expected to go out into a field whereas they're told not to do so. Instead, they're hired in order to beseech the Lord for additional laborers. These men must have wondered why the Lord has taken this unusual approach. Will he ask the new bunch of laborers to also pray? When will this end?

In vs. 3 Jesus gets down to business. He shifts gears with regard to the seventy, that is, after having told them to pray to the lord of the harvest, he sends them out. The **RSV's** words "Go

¹ Indeed, the conjunctive *de* sneak in though not translated!

your way” sound a bit dismissive, but Jesus wishes to get them going and not waste time. *Hupago* is the verb which can be rendered as “get on your way” and thus fits in with the **RSV** version. Apparently Jesus was less concerned with places to which these men would go, that being left up to them. Of primary interest is to spread the message he had been doing all along. The details thus are somewhat fuzzy. The missionaries must have sought out the disciples for pointers on what to say and how to say it. All in all it’s a risky venture, but Jesus is focused on getting his teaching across to the broadest possible audience. Besides, he was keenly aware that the time for doing this is short.

Jesus’ words are followed immediately with *idou* or “behold” which sets in motion how they are to comport themselves. While Jesus is speaking these words, the disciples must have felt some jealousy about these newcomers assuming a role parallel to theirs. Besides, Jesus never gave them such detailed advice. And so there they stood watching all this with some resentment of not being in the limelight.

Jesus minces no words. He’s sending these men as lambs among wolves, the phrase *en meso* or in the midst of them which sounds even worse. Is this what Jesus meant by the harvest being full...full of wolves?, they must have wondered. Because Jesus comes off with the details in a rapid-fire manner, it’d be helpful to isolate them, if you will, to get a better idea of each one and how they all tie in with each other:

- Carry no purse, no bag, no sandals. Not taking sandals seems to mean not worrying what will happen when the first pair wears out. After all, people did a lot of walking and generally must have gone through plenty of sandals in a short time.

- Salute no one on the road, *aspazomai*. There’s a chance this could arouse curiosity as to where they are going.

- Offer peace to the house you enter, *Eirene* with the verb *eiserchomai* and *eis*; i.e, two examples of the same preposition *eis*.

- If a son of peace is present, your peace will be with him. The verb is *epanapauomai* the root with two prepositions, *epi-* and *ana-*, upon and upwards. The opposite will hold true as well. An interesting phrase, son suggestive that one’s father is the source of peace which means it permeates the entire household. Thus one’s peace will be with that person, the two sharing one father, as it were, along with all members of the household.

- Remain in the same house, that is, the same house in which dwells a son of peace.

- Do not move from house to house but again, remain with the one in which dwells a son of peace.

- Eat what’s set before you when you enter a town or receive the hospitality freely given.

-Heal the sick. This must have taken the seventy by surprise. Jesus gives no guidelines or the like.

-Say that the kingdom of God has come near you. The verb is *eggizo* or to draw near with the preposition *epi* or “upon you.”

-If you’re not received, wipe off the dust from your feet which is there through the strong verb *kollao*, to clean top.

-Know that the kingdom of God has come near, *eggizo*. I.e., it draws near by reason of being rejected.

Jesus concludes his detailed advice with regard to how to interact with those people the seventy are being sent. Any town which has rejected them will come off better than Sodom (and Gomorrah implied). *Anektos* is the adjective meaning enduring. Such a powerful rejection should be sufficient to encourage the seventy about to be dispatched, again, the twelve disciples looking on with some envy as well as resentment.

After having counseled the seventy missionaries, in vs. 13 Jesus lets out an unexpected curse against Chorazin and Behtsaida, both apparently near the Sea of Galilee and possible destinations to be avoided. He uses these two places which seem to have had a less than desirable reputation though we have no other sources as to what was involved. Perhaps from the mention of Sodom in vs. 12 Jesus is inferring that Chorazin and Bethsaida are not unlike that place which along with Gomorrah, the Lord had wiped off the face of the earth.

As for Capernaum, he brings in a quote from Isaiah ² which pertains to the way it lifts itself up to heaven: “You said in your heart, ‘I will ascend to heaven; above the stars of God I will set my throne on high; I will sit on the mount of assembly in the far north’ [14.13]. By reason of such an attitude, Capernaum will be brought down to Hades. This in essence is another quote from Isaiah ³ two verses after the last one: “But you are brought down to Sheol, to the depths of the Pit.”

After these harsh condemnatory words perhaps inserted for the seventy to take heed, we have them returning in vs. 17 after an indeterminate period of time during which Jesus and the twelve disciples must have been quite anxious as to the outcome. It’d come as no surprise that some of the twelve were hoping for failure so they could step in and show how this missionary work is supposed to be done. Finally the seventy return, the phrase “with joy” or *chara* which was written all over their faces and visible even before they came to Jesus. Once they came to him they couldn’t help but exclaim that even demons become subject to them, *hupotasso*, the preposition *hupo-* meaning under or beneath. However, right away Jesus detected danger. Such spontaneous joy could work against them, thinking they are the source of this power. No

²This is the twenty-first scriptural quote in Luke’s Gospel.

³This is the twenty-second scriptural quote in Luke’s Gospel.

surprise if the disciples felt the same, they having learned their lesson the hard way and took a certain pleasure in all this. Nevertheless, Jesus saw here a teaching opportunity.

In vs. 19 Jesus shared with the seventy something he is recorded as having done with the disciples. He had seen Satan fall like lightning from heaven, the verb *theoreo* meaning to watch or to look upon. He doesn't give details as to when, how and why, simply that he had been witness to it. Reference is found later in the Book of Revelation, and Jesus must have told John about it so he could include this incident in his text: "And the great dragon was thrown down to the earth, and his angels were thrown down with him" [12.9]. This casting down to the earth accounts for Satan rendered as the devil in 4.2 when he had tempted Jesus.

Though Jesus didn't flesh out his remarks, the seventy were left wondering, that is, did Jesus exist before becoming a man? How else could explain this? Obviously what Jesus had said is beyond human comprehension. The answer to that question would have to wait, like so many things, until the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. It wasn't answered in the conventional sense but resolved in a wholly other way which was far better. I.e., the question and those like it simply disappeared.

In vs. 19 Jesus tells the seventy...again, to the consternation of the disciples...that he had given them authority or *exousia* to tread not just upon serpents and scorpions but over all *dunamis* or power belonging to the enemy. That, of course, is the just mentioned Satan and his angels now upon the earth. Despite their ferocity, Jesus reassures them that they will cause no harm, *adikeo* also as to do (no) injustice. Continuing a bit further, Jesus warns them not to rejoice in this *exousia*, the verb being *chairō*. Instead, they are to rejoice in the fact that their names are written in heaven, the same place from which Jesus had seen Satan being cast down to earth. Thus we have another cause for jealousy by the disciples though we have no word as to how they felt about all this. It'd come as no surprise that Luke felt it was too embarrassing, even scandalous, to record so omitted their words.

The success of the seventy did gladden the heart of Jesus which is why vs. 21 says in "that same hour" he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit, *agalliao* meaning not just to be full of joy but to be overjoyed. Spontaneously he expressed this by addressing his Father. He thanks him for having hidden "these things" which seem to be that *exousia* or authority expressed in *dunamis* or the power to carry it out. "These things" thus are hidden from both the wise and those with understanding, *sophos* and *sunetos*. The former implies being skilled and the latter, intelligence (from *sunemi*, to bring or to set together). Instead, revelation or *apokalupto* implying an unveiling of what is already present yet hidden is for those who are infants, *nepios*. Jesus then adds that such was due to the Father's gracious will or *eudokia* inferring a mind which is kindly disposed. As for "these things" (*tauta*), they aren't spelled out but presumably are the same "all things" (*panta*) in vs. 22 which the Father hands over to his Son.

Vs. 22 has Jesus continuing to rejoice in the Holy Spirit by exclaiming the just mentioned *panta* or all things have been given to him by the Father, the *para-* or *paradidomai* as being put at his

side so the two can share them. As for *panta* or “all things,” they rest upon that divine *exousia* and *dunamis*, authority and capacity, to put them in effect with Jesus as their source. In this same verse the conjunctive *kai* as “and” leads to the fact that no one knows who the Son is except the Father; the same knowledge or *ginosko* applies to Father. I.e., such knowledge is exclusive and strongly infers a divine relationship no human could ever attain. However, it’s up to Jesus to allow a person to share in this *ginosko* which he does by a process of revelation, the verb being *apokalupto* or as noted above, no so much a knowing but a seeing of what previously had been hidden but was always present.

Throughout this, one can’t help but again think of the disciples. It seems they’ve been getting hammered by not being attended to. Jesus realizes this which is why in vs. 23 which begins with *kai* translated as “then” he turns to them and addresses them in private, *kat’ idian*, literally “according to oneself.” Jesus calls the disciples blessed or *makarios*, also as happy, for seeing which goes unspecified and could refer to the success of the seventy missionaries. This isn’t what they expected, being reduced to observers. Then throwing salt on their wounds, Jesus says that prophets and kings had desired to see and to hear these things but did not. I’d come as no surprise that at this point Judas resolved to betray Jesus, having been pushed over the edge from which he’ll never return.

Vs. 25 begins with the conjunctive *kai* as “and” which signals a long awaited relief for the twelve disciples after having to put up with praise by Jesus of the seventy missionaries... newcomers, if you will. From this point on there’s no word as to what happened to this relatively large group of men. Given their success, we can presume that Jesus sent them out again and hopefully many if not all joined the early church at or around Pentecost. Anyway, this is yet another occasion of how a person or group of persons enter the Gospel story, do their thing for a while and then disappear...hopefully not for good as in this case.

A lawyer (*nomikos*) is introduced rather suddenly in vs. 25 by the word *idou* or behold. It seems he had been hovering around both the seventy and disciples, watching with great interest all that was transpiring between them and Jesus. Soon he reveals his real intent. He wishes to put Jesus to the test, *ekpeirazo* also as to subject to the proof where the preposition *ek-* or from prefaced to the verbal root reveals this. He puts his proof in terms of a question, asking Jesus what he must do to inherit eternal life. Note the verb *keleronomeo* which means to fulfill the requirements as one would sign papers to acquire eternal life. The lawyer felt more comfortable using legalese and wished to see how Jesus would respond.

Knowing that he’s dealing with a sharp mind, Jesus comes off with two rapid fire questions as to what’s written in *Torah* (*nomos*; cf. *nomikos*, the lawyer) and what the lawyer finds there, the preposition *ana-* generally indicative of upward motion prefaced to *ginosko* or to know. Like a good lawyer knowing he Jesus might try to set him up, appealed to the safe haven of

scripture, namely Dt 6.5 ⁴. What he cites is close to the original. Nevertheless, the two are presented here, the first being from the verse at hand:

-“You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength and with all your mind; and your neighbor as yourself.”

Agapao is the verb, the root of *agape* and connotes having an affection for. It’s in the future, not present, suggesting a certain learning process necessary before implementation. In the case at hand *agapao* means an appreciation of our constituent parts, if you will, making all this very much appealing. Such affection-for applies to four parts of ourselves followed by one’s neighbor, *plesion* also as fellow man. This person, by the way, is composed of the same constituent parts, awareness of which makes it easier to transfer over regardless of his or her response. Note the adjective *holos* as whole in the sense of entire:

-*Kardia* or heart with the preposition *ex*, literally, “from your whole heart.”

-*Psuche* or soul with the preposition *en* or in.

-*Ischus* or strength with the preposition *en* or in.

-*Dianoia* or mind, *noos* with the preposition *dia-* or through connoting through-mind or the faculty to perceive-through and with the preposition *en* or in.

As for *plesion* or neighbor, there is no preposition nor the adjective *holos*. Instead it has *hos seauton*, “as oneself” which does not require a preposition by reason of its directness.

-“Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord; and you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul, and with all your might.” Not the close parallel with vs. 25 but with the major difference that no equivalent to *dianoia* or mind is mentioned. Stress is not so much upon God as one (*’echad*) Lord but upon hearing (*shamah*) that he is as such. The conjunctive *v-* or “and” follows immediately about loving or *’ahav* which conveys longing the Lord: heart, soul, might. At the same time this Deuteronomy quote has an important follow-up in vss. 6-7 worth noting: “And these words which I command you this day shall be upon your heart; and you shall teach them diligently to your children and shall talk of them when you sit in your house, and when you walk by the way, and when you lie down, and when you rise.” “When” is rendered by the conjunctive *v-* which knits all together by acting as a kind of “and.”

At the end of the short but admittedly tense exchange in vs. 28 Jesus tells the lawyer that he has responded correctly. All that’s needed is to carry out the Deuteronomy injunction with the result that he will live. Future tense implies that the lawyer is not alive in the fullest sense. However, the lawyer being a lawyer can’t be satisfied with this. He has a need to justify himself (*dikaioo*) and responds to Jesus with a question as to who is his neighbor. It’s clear he

⁴This is the twenty-third scriptural reference in Luke’s Gospel.

missed the four elements of heart, soul, strength and mind which would have put things in a wholly different perspective instead of being fraught with tension.

Jesus does not respond lawyer-like which would have delighted the man he's dealing with. Instead, he comes off with an extended example running through vs. 37 and could have come from something in real life he either had witnessed or heard about. A man was en route from Jerusalem to Jericho, not only a significant distance on foot but a descent through rough terrain. At one point he was robbed, severely beaten and left for dead on the roadside. Those responsible took care to lay in wait, for this was a heavily traveled road. If they were caught, they'd lose their heads at once. However, those responsible didn't finish him off. Why so isn't clear. Perhaps they didn't want to be discovered by a larger, well-armed group. Also they may be recognized by people for who they were. With this in mind they left him on the road and beat it out of there.

This is a lead-on to three occasions with regard to the half-dead man. First, a priest saw the man and not only passed by but did so on the opposite side of road perhaps mumbling a quick prayer for the man. The second is a Levite who did the same. As for the difference, all priests were to be Levites according to the Law, but not all Levites were priests. We can presume that the man by the road was looking at these people as well as crying out to be helped making the situation all the more poignant. Although the lawyer is neither a priest nor a Levite, he was well educated and respected. Easily he could have been inserted into this example which was Jesus' intent.

The third example is the well know one of a Samaritan whom the Jews regarded as a half-breed and therefore despised. He had compassion or *splagchnizomai*, a rich word meaning pretty much to pouring out one's inmost self or bowels. What he did is worth briefly outlining because it contrasts not so much with the two examples of Jews passing by a fellow Jew but those who are representative of the religious establishment:

- went to him
- bound up his wounds
- poured oil and wine
- set him on his own beast
- brought him to an inn
- took care of him

The last of these six gestures has the verb *epimeleomai*, the preposition *epi-* or upon intensifying the verb *melo* or to care for. Apparently the Samaritan and injured man stayed overnight which means they must have had quite a conversation. Perhaps the man who had beaten up was a Jew. That would have made things more interesting.

On the next day the Samaritan took more care to provide lodging for the man in order to recover until he returns. End of story. We don't know what happened when the Samaritan returned but can assume he made sure the injured man was fit to travel to his destination, perhaps even going out of his way to make sure he got there safe and sound. At the end of this lengthy story Jesus says to the lawyer that he should do the same. Surely the lawyer must have identified himself with the priest and Levite. And so the two men parted without knowing if the lawyer did take up Jesus' invitation. It's left like that deliberately in order for anyone listening to the story to choose what to do.

Vs. 38 begins with "Now as they went on their way" or *poreuomai* with regard to Jesus, his disciples and perhaps some if not all the seventy who had returned from their mission. The Big Question: did the lawyer come along or was he left standing there pretty much dumbfounded?

This motley group went to stay with Martha and Mary, two sisters whom Jesus seems to have known beforehand or if not, were well disposed to receive him and those with them. At least the rather large contingent could camp out by the house. During a discussion inside Mary was sitting at Jesus' feet listening to literally his word or *logos*. The preposition *para-* or beside is prefaced to the verb *kathizomai* suggestive of both nearness yet maintaining a discreet distance. At the same time the other preposition *pros* which goes untranslated here means that Mary was totally focused upon the *logos* of Jesus which is rendered as teaching. This act of teaching implies that Jesus was familiar with the two sisters and wanted to tell them more about himself. It must have been a very different and more intimate *logos* than Jesus had done with the crowds and even his disciples. Thus the *logos* may have been just between Jesus, Mary and Martha.

Vs. 40 begins with the conjunctive *de* translated as "but" to contrast Mary as *para-kathizomai* the feet of Jesus and her sister Martha ostensibly engaged in serving or *diakonia* but interiorly as being distracted. The verb *perispao* consists of the preposition *peri-* or around prefaced to the verbal root *spao*, to be drawn...in essence, to be drawn this way and that. I.e., the *peri-* here contrasts with the just mentioned *para-* of *kathizomai* coupled with *pros* relative to *logos*. Indeed, Martha was conflicted. She wanted desperately to listen in on Jesus with Mary but also was tied up with preparations most likely for a meal which isn't explicitly mentioned but most likely so. If not, Martha was focused upon providing hospitality so typical of that culture. Given Martha's state of mind, chances are it turned out to be less than desirable. Both Jesus and Mary wouldn't mind in the least if Martha joined in and certainly was able, knowing full well that he would easily put up with any delay in her showing hospitality. However, she was so absorbed that she completely was unaware of the *logos* or teaching at hand.

Martha got so flustered that she rushed over to Jesus, most likely standing deliberately in front of her sister as way of saying I'm just as important as you. She blurts out that he doesn't care that Mary whom she doesn't mention by name but as "my sister" has left her to do the *diakonia*. The verb here is *melomai* also as to be concerned. She tells Jesus...rather comes close to demanding...that he tells her sister to step in and help. The verb is *sunantilambano*

which ironically for the situation at hand consists of two prepositions prefaced to *lambano* (to take, to receive), *sun-* and *anti-* or with and against.

With regard to Mary who got all worked up we get the famous response where Jesus addresses her by her proper name twice to bring her to her senses. He says that Martha is both anxious and troubled about many things, *merimnao* and *thorubazomai*. The first means to be apprehensive and second means to be agitated, both being pretty much the same. Jesus then adds that one this is necessary, *chreia* or that which is lacking and therefore needed. Then as a rebuke Jesus adds that Mary has chosen the portion or *meris* (that which is measured out) and describes it as good, *agathos*. What must have rubbed Martha the wrong way was when Jesus added that this *meris* shall not be taken from her, *aphaireo*. All this may be part of that *logos* which had attracted Mary and which Martha wished to partake but was unable. How the two sisters interacted once Jesus had departed is left to our imagination.

Chapter Eleven

Though not mentioned in the **RSV**, the first word of this chapter is the conjunctive *kai* usually rendered as “and.” By now it has become quite familiar indicating as it does a close connection between what had just happened and the present situation. That is to say, Jesus had been with Martha and Mary and now is presented as praying, *proseuchomai*. Luke adds the phrase “in a certain place” not so much to protect Jesus’ privacy but perhaps to emphasize that the place at hand is secondary to his prayer. Vs. 1 continues with the words “when he ceased” or *pauo* (also to stop) when one of the disciples made a request. The impression is that this disciple was enthralled by the physical composure of Jesus and couldn’t take his eyes off him.

Because the disciple...he remains unnamed...is so taken aback at Jesus, he couldn’t help but wait for him to finish his prayer so he could ask how to do the same. Although the other disciples aren’t mentioned, we can be sure that they were delighted that one of their own had taken the initiative. They had gotten glimpses of Jesus prayer yet were too reluctant to ask him. Actually it just may be Peter who’s known for his impetuosity.

And so this disciple specified his question by asking how to pray as John had taught his disciples. This can be taken in two ways, if you will. Either Jesus hadn’t taught the disciples yet to pray or that John had given a specific teaching different from his cousin. As for the family connection, the disciple may have thought that at one point John had initiated Jesus into a specific way to pray. Familiarity with John’s dramatic message of repentance most likely is what this anonymous disciple had in mind. The other way is that John had modified any teaching on prayer when people came to visit him in prison. He knew full well that he would never leave while at the same time took comfort in hearing about Jesus and his ministry. In this circumstance if John spoke about prayer, naturally it’d be tinged with anxiety and a feeling

of abandonment. At the same time John would have taken great care to refer visitors to associate themselves with Jesus and his disciples.

The fact that Jesus avoided getting into a discussion about his cousin says a lot albeit indirectly. It shows that he knew any talk about how John instructed his disciples to pray was incidental. Getting right down to business was Jesus' top priority. While he was fully aware of John's approach while he had been baptizing and preaching at the Jordan River, Jesus decided to build upon the disciple's request. He knew others eventually would put the same question to him.

So without hesitation, in vs. 2 Jesus begins his instruction in the simplest possible way. Most like his words went right over the disciple's head while at the same time leaving an impact on him as well as the others. They knew what they heard was profound but at the same time it would take a long time to unpack. In such a circumstance Jesus' words about the Holy Spirit making his words clearer at a later time apply though this isn't explicit in the case at hand. Obviously the teaching is very familiar to us now, and for that reason an outline may be in order to appreciate it better. While reading through the elements that comprise this prayer, keep in mind what John the Baptist had said in the earlier chapters. This shouldn't be compared with Jesus' teaching but to see how the former fulfills what we have here:

-“Father:” not “our” as in Our Father. Jesus starts off as directly as he could using this familiar name instead of something more exalted or removed from day to day life. *Pater* also conveys authority as the head of a household. Such familiarity was certainly a far cry from the current Jewish approach to God.

-“Hallowed be your name: *hagiazō* also as to set aside, to consecrate with regard to the name at hand, that is, Father or *Pater*. And so despite the familiarity Jesus wishes to convey, he acknowledges, if you will, that just mentioned Jewish preference to acknowledge divine transcendence.

-“Your kingdom come:” in addition to God being a Father he has a kingdom which implies that he's also a king. Also it can be another acknowledgment of divine transcendence with regard to Jewish tradition. Here a person addressing the Father is to express a wish for it to come (*erchomai*) implying two things: that it is not yet present yet the person so addressing him has an inkling of what this kingdom is about.

-“Give us each day our daily bread:” a request to be nourished on a daily basis, the bread at hand being *epiousios*. This adjective is comprised of *eipi* + *ousia*, literally upon substance or existence. Anyone familiar with biblical scholarship knows that *epiousios* is subject to some controversy. In general, it seems to boil down to a request for daily nourishment, a refinement of sorts of *kath' hemeran*, literally “according to the day” or each day.

-“And forgive us our sins.” This is the first of three conjunctives (*kai*) meaning that all that follows is closely connected. The verb *aphiemi* connotes a dismissing done on the orders of someone in authority who knows what is involved. *Hamartia* or sin is the object of the verb, a depart from a standard of uprightness.

-“We forgive everyone indebted to us.” This the second instance of the conjunctive *kai* which links the previous *aphiemi* with the one at hand, that is, not just those who owe us this and that (*opheilo*) but *panti*, everyone. Though it’s the most difficult part of the prayer at hand, if followed through, it has the capacity of freeing us up the most. It infers a situation where we have certain power or control over a person and can hold him or her to exacting standards. Instead, we let that go, *aphiemi* again implying the authority as well as freedom to act as such.

-“Lead us not into temptation.” The third and final conjunctive *kai* or and. Note the two similar prepositions: *eis-* or into prefaced to *phero*, to lead into followed by *eis* with regard to *peirasmos*, a period or process of testing or trial. I.e., the Father is to be asked not to effect this double *eis* or but to keep us from it. Putting it this way gives a better view of a situation when a person is on the verge of doing something not in accord with the Father. It enables him or her to pause and to consider the double *eis* laying right there before oneself. In brief, this serves to lower the tension and to back off.

Jesus seems to be aware that the prayer he just presented is so simple that it’s easy to bypass. For this reason he decides to flesh it out by giving a vivid, indeed, bold and unusual example between vs. 5 and vs. 13. This parable revolves around a friend (*philos*) who goes to extraordinary measures to provide hospitality. For example, he had a friend (also *philos*) who came to him unexpectedly. Because he has nothing to offer (the upside is that it’s just one visitor instead of several), he figures he has no other choice but to head out in the middle of the night to another friend for something...anything...to offer the unexpected guest, the verb being *partithemi*, literally to set beside. Truly this man was caught between a rock and a hard place. He’s bound by the culture to offer hospitality yet finds himself with nothing at hand. Right away his mind races like mad to think of someone who might help out at such an ungodly hour.

Once the man reaches his friend’s house, he knocks on the door with a mixture of fear and desperation, getting the expected response not to bother. The man is in bed with his children and refuses to get up. His attitude is emphasized by the fact that he answers “from within” and that the “door is now shut” [vs. 7]. Jesus continues with this example, namely, that despite the expected harsh response, the man decides to give his friend whatever he needs by reason of his importunity., nothing else Besides, by now the children must have been frightened and were crying. The noun is *anaideia* also as lack of sensitivity as to what is proper or in a nutshell, shamelessness. One wonders if that friendship continued or was terminated that very night. Surely he, his wife and children had a hard time going back to sleep. As for the visitor who showed up out of the clear blue, he must have been impressed by his friend

returning with what turned out to be more than expected. Surely this man was a special friend. At the same time he saw the man was quite flustered at whether or not he'd be on good terms with the man and his family he had so rudely roused from bed. And so ends the story.

In vs. 9 Jesus sets out to explain the parable if we could call it that. Both the disciple and the others were fascinated, for this followed right after Jesus had expounded upon how to pray, the result being what we now call the Our Father. Note that the verse at hand begins with a noun acting as a merger of sorts, the conjunctive *kai* and first person singular pronoun, *ego*, that is, *kago* or "and I." In essence he tells his disciples straight out to do the following three things:

-Ask or *aiteo* which also means to demand which is more to the point. As soon as one does this, the request will be granted.

-Seek or *zeteo* or to strive for something. As soon as one does this, the object will present itself, that is, be found or *heurisko*.

-Knock or *krouo* which also means to strike and is the most forceful of the three verbs at hand. As a result, the door will be opened. This *krouo* is what the parable was all about though it came with a price, putting in jeopardy the friendship of two men.

In vs. 10 Jesus lays down in a straight-forward manner what he had just said about the threefold requests we are to make though he says nothing explicit about God. Presumably this is what it's all about; if not, Jesus wouldn't have spoken as such. All we have to do is the following three which produce an immediate result: ask->receive, seek->find and knock->opened. Jesus applies this not just to the disciples but to everyone (*pas*, all) which makes it sound almost too good to be true. Jesus sees in this an opportunity to situate this with his teaching on prayer, that is, the Our Father, by referring to the example of a father. He speaks directly to the disciples, "what father among you" suggesting that some of them had sons and daughters.

Obviously a father wouldn't give his son a serpent in place of a fish; the same with regard to a scorpion in place of an egg. However, in vs. 13 Jesus now speaks in a rather unsettling manner by calling his disciples evil or *poneros* which connotes a sense of degeneracy and worthlessness. *Poneros* is more to the point compared with the more common *kakos* also as evil or reprehensible. Even the way it's expressed is quite humiliating, *ei oun humeis*. Literally this reads as "if thus you," *oun* being the key word which serves to set aside the disciples for special attention albeit in a negative way. These words are less unsettling when taking into consideration vs. 29 a bit later when Jesus speaks of the current generation as evil, *poneros*. In other words, such is the universal human condition in which the disciples will find themselves in their future ministry tempered by the fact that they are no better.

While Jesus calls the disciples right before him as *poneros*, it doesn't preclude they know how to give good things to their children. They are contrasted all the more with the Father by *posomallon* or "how much more," he being described literally as "from heaven" (*ex ouranou*). It seems the Father does not lay to heart this tendency toward evil, for unhesitatingly he will give the Holy Spirit to those who make a request of him, *aiteo*. This, of course, is something the disciples hadn't even dreamed of. They were too stunned at being called *poneros*...more so by the way Jesus had put it with *oun*...even to consider the possibility of asking for the Holy Spirit. In essence, they were clueless, and Jesus was well aware of the fact. Thus the disciples were left in an awkward position, being on edge as to the threefold ask, seek and knock which seemed so straight-forward and promising.

Vs. 14 begins with the conjunctive *kai* which the **RSV** translates as "now." Jesus made it a point to move on with his disciples in tow after an awkward moment which must have registered deeply with them. To be sure, they would know better when and what to ask for.

In Vs. 14 Jesus was casting out a *daimonion* described as mute or *kophos* also as deaf which began to speak once it had left the man causing the crowd to wonder, *thaumazo*. Perhaps the contrast between the *daimonion* having been mute inside the man and then speaking once cast outside made caused some people to have doubts about Jesus. Others may have thought of this as some kind of ploy to deceive them. The claim they lay against Jesus is that he's doing this literally "in Beelzebul," prince of demons who's over the one just cast. Then there are others who sought a sign not from Jesus but from heaven without really not knowing what this *semeion* could be. Actually their motive was shady; they wished to test Jesus, *peirazo* connoting the setting of a trap. Thus the crowd or *ochlos* seemed generally hostile despite some if not many having witnessed Jesus do other miracles.

Vs. 17 begins with Jesus knowing their thoughts, the *dia-* or through of *dianoia* suggestive of conniving. Actually these words don't have to be inserted, it was so obvious. Jesus speaks of a kingdom, Beelzebul as prince being a lead into this example. If this kingdom experiences internal strife, at once it's laid waste, the two verbs *diamerizo* and *eremoo* being pretty much the same. Also in this situation one can't help but make the negative implication of *dia-*prefaced to *merizo* equivalent to the *dia-* of *dianoia*. As a result, one house falls upon the other, two examples of *epi* or upon: "upon itself" and "upon house."

This same disunity applies to Satan which seems to be another name for Beelzebul. If he's divided upon (*epi*) himself, his kingdom won't be able to stand. Jesus speaks as such in reference to the criticism leveled against him in vs. 15. So without missing a breathe, he throws the same accusation not against those making it but even worse, against their sons. In this way he's pretty much aligned with the tradition where an accusation can extend throughout succeeding generations. As a result, these sons will become judges of their fathers, one no better than the other. While all this was transpiring, we have no mention of the man from whom the mute spirit had been cast out. He could sense the growing hostility of

the crowd and decided to slip away as quietly as possible. In fact, given the circumstance, it was best that he leave town.

In vs. 21 Jesus continues responding to the accusations of being an agent of Beelzebul or Lord of the Flies by the example of a strong man whose palace and the goods within (*ta huparchonta, huparcho* suggestive of what belongs to a person) are safe as long as he's fully armed. The verb is *kathoplizo* with the preposition *kata-* or in accord with prefaced to the root *hoplizo*, to prepare or equip for military action. This examples implies that such a person has plenty of enemies and must guard against them. However, he can be subdued in an instant or when someone stronger comes on the scene who can despoil him and ruin everything. The verb associated with this hostile action is *diadidomai* or to apportion where again we have the preposition *dia-* prefaced to a verb, literally as to give through.

Jesus abruptly concludes his words saying that anyone not with him is against him which is expressed by the interplay of the two prepositions *meta* and *kata*. Similarly, anyone who doesn't gather with him, scatters, *sunago* and *skorpizo* being equivalent to *meta* and *kata*.

Vs. 24 seems to be a reflection Jesus is sharing with his disciples based upon previous experience, not a particular case at hand. In fact, he could be referring to the mute demon which caused such a controversy. The difference here is that Jesus is speaking of a spirit which is unclean, *pneuma* and *akathartos*, compared with a *daimonion* being *kophos* (demon, mute) as in vs. 14. Jesus speaks of this type of spirit which he has encountered as though he were very familiar with its behavior, showing that he had a divine knowledge otherwise is hidden from humans. The outline of what this spirit does is as follows:

- Has gone out of a man, *exerchomai* plus *apo* or two examples of "from," *ex-* and *apo* or perhaps better, out and from.

- Passes through waterless places, *dierchomai* or two examples of the preposition *dia-*, prefaced to the verb and with the noun *anudros* also a desert.

- Seeking rest, *zeteo* with regard to *anapausis* or cessation from activity.

- (Not) finding or *heurisko* rest, *anapausis*.

- Will return or *hupostrepho*, literally to turn under, *hupo-*. Note that the spirit manifests a confident boldness when it calls the person in which it had dwelt a home or *oikos* prefaced with *eis*, literally "into my house."

- Finds or *heurisko* this person-as-*oikos* swept and put in order, *saroo* and *kosmeo*: the former as with a broom and the latter also as to make beautiful or attractive. This is what Jesus had done in vs. 24.

- Leaves or *poreuomai* and returns with (*paralambano*, to take alongside or *para-*) seven other spirits worse than he, *poneros* connoting moral evil as well as worthless, degenerate. After entering, they dwell there, the verbal root for *oikos* or house prefaced with *kata-* or

down, in accord with suggesting that they set up permanent residence. No small wonder that Jesus concludes by saying that the condition of the man...the *oikos*...is now worse than at first. Again referring to vs. 14, Jesus must have been aware of the spirit returning with his companions. Perhaps it happened or will happen; the same might be applicable to other persons he had cast out demons.

Vs. 27 begins with “As he said this” which is a reminder that wherever Jesus goes he’s accompanied not just with his disciples and devoted followers but with other people. They must have listened attentively because many have seen Jesus cast out such spirits and wondered what happened to them. Despite the cures wrought, they were aware that they were out there somewhere and according to vs. 26, at any time could return thereby making the situation worse than before.

A woman spontaneously expressed her joy and wonderment at Jesus’ words, essentially attributing blessedness (*makarios* being the adjective also as happy) to his mother. Obviously it’s a way of giving thanks to him and acknowledging Jesus for all that he had done, she perhaps knowing or knowing of his mother Mary. Right away or in vs. 28 Jesus responds with a joy countering hers. Those who hear God’s *logos* are blessed provided they keep it, *phulasso* meaning to guard it as one would as a watchman guarding a city. The exchange is short, sharp and at the same time sweet as well as joyous.

Vs. 29 sees the crowds...plural of *ochlos*...increasing or *epathroizomai*, a vivid verb meaning to really become numerous as by the preposition *epi-*, upon. After the brief but pleasant exchange Jesus saw through what was going on to a darker side of the human condition even though for the most part those present were unaware of it. His gathers, if you will, all those before him into one generation calling it evil or *poneros*. As vs. 26 puts it with respect to the condition of a person from whom a spirit is cast, he becomes more *poneros* than at first. Thus the state of affairs described there when seven other spirits take up residence is equivalent to the generation at hand. I.e., there’s no difference between the two which must have shocked and even angered those listening to Jesus. However, no response is forthcoming.

In vs. 29 Jesus pinpoints what he means by *poneros*. The current generation is seeking a sign or *semeion* which perhaps is strongly colored by political ends such as casting off the Roman yoke. Jesus says the only sign to be given will be that related to Jonah who was as such to the inhabitants of Nineveh. Actually the only words Jonah said to those in that city was “Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown” [Jon 3.4]. There’s not one word as to repentance or the like, just the impending doom of Nineveh, *haphak* suggesting being turned upside down on its own without external influence. So it seemed that Jonah was walking around this “exceedingly great city” [Jon 3.3] as a *seimon* while uttering nothing other than that sentence.

As for the forty days, they are symbolic of a fixed or sacred period of time. It isn’t specified temporally speaking but depends upon the response to the impending *haphak* or turning upside down of Nineveh. Such are two elements of the story in which the *semeion* is located.

As for its specific place, if you will, it's with Jonah having been summoned by God to go to Nineveh "to cry against it" [Jon 1.2]. After having been swallowed by a large fish and remaining inside it for three days and three nights—consider the enormity of Nineveh described in 3.3 as "three days journey in breath"—he begins his walk through the city and comes off with the simple message of "Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be overthrown" as already noted.

As for the actual *semeion*, Jesus says that it will occur in the future and will follow the sequence of *kathos-to-housos* or so-to-as. That is to say, *kathos* belongs to the past...Jonah...and *housos* belongs to the future...Jesus. Despite the difference between the two, the pattern is the same or according to vs. 31, "this generation" is foreshadowed by Nineveh. And so in a way, Jesus has a simple mission. All he has to do is repeat Jonah's words "Yet forty days and Nineveh (substitute 'this generation') shall be overthrown." Note that the king of Nineveh is responsible for mobilizing the population of the city, not Jonah: "Who knows, God may yet repent and turn from his fierce anger so that we perish not" [3.9]? Note the element of doubt, that the people may not go for it. Perhaps Jesus is thinking, albeit wishfully so, that the current religious leaders would follow the example of this king. Actually, it'd be more remarkable if the Roman governor followed suite.

In vs. 31 Jesus shifts gears, if you will, giving the example of the queen of the South, most likely Queen Sheba, in Chapter Ten of First Kings who heard of King Solomon's fame. Note that vs. 1 contrasts this fame with the name of the Lord. The noun "fame" is *shemah* and directly associated with the verb at hand, *shamah* or to hear⁵. If this association was not present, the queen wouldn't have bothered making the journey. However, after having dealt with Solomon, "there was no more spirit in her" [vs. 5]. I.e., the queen was so impressed that her *ruach* left her or in a word, she was breathless.

Thus this queen will make a return trip, if you will, hoping for a repeat performance of sorts but knowing full well that she's returning "at the judgment" or *krisis*. This goes unspecified but most likely refers to a time when God will judge the world, an integral part of Jewish religious tradition familiar to everyone. Note that she will come with men of the current generation which seems to be the same as the evil generation of vs. 29 in order to condemn them. Here the preposition *kata-* connotes that which is downward and is prefaced to the verbal root of *krisis* or *krino*.

Thus "this generation" will stand in judgment over the "evil generation," the two being the same which results in a self-judgment. Thus both she and they are kept in reserve for this purpose while at the same time they are aware of what had led up this unfortunate event. Jesus says that the queen had come not just from afar but from earth's ends (*peras* also as boundary) in order to hear Solomon's wisdom or *sophia*. So instead of a return trip for the

⁵Note five words where the letter *shin*, giving this verse a "sh" character, if you will: *Sheva'*, *shomahath*, *shemah*, *Shelomah* and *shem* (Sheba, fame, heard, Solomon and name).

same purpose, another way of looking at it is that she comes because of a lack of *sophia*, if you will. Unfortunately King Solomon will be included as a candidate for judgment...*katakrino*...by reason of having drifted away from his renowned *sophia* (cf. 11.4+).

Vs. 33 begins abruptly with Jesus speaking of lighting a lamp and placing it on a stand instead of putting it in a cellar or under a bushel, *modion* being a kind of basket for grain. As for the latter, some just might be made of flammable material, so placing a candle or the like under it is a sure way to start a fire. Just as a lamp (*luchnos*) gives light, so one's eye is the same for the body. Thus this example stands for the physical eye which is sound and thereby makes the body full of light. The two adjectives are *haploos* and *photeinos*, the two in a way quite similar where the former applies to what is single, simple as well as straight-forward and the latter connoting illumination. The inverse holds true when the eye is not sound, this time the strong adjective *poneros* with moral implications being used. If the eye is as such, the body is the exact opposite of *photeinos*, that is, *skoteinos* also as obscure. Thus what one takes in visually transfers what's outside one's body to the inside.

In vs. 35 Jesus uses this example as a warning to be careful or *skopeo* fundamentally as to look, consider or examine one's relationship between seeing and how that affects one on the inside. The reason? That *phos* does not become *skotos*, light to darkness. Then Jesus brings home the fact that if one's entire body is full of light and has no part is being dark, it will be completely light. Here he is speaking of what happens once the light has passed from the outside to the inside through the eye. But when one's body is not sound...another example of *poneros*...it's equivalent to being dark or *skoteinos*. Jesus concludes this by returning to a lamp and its rays or *astrape* which is more as a flash such as lightning.

Vs. 37 begins with "while he was speaking" which infers that a Pharisee had been listening to Jesus and finally works up the courage to invite him for dinner. It'd come as no surprise he intended to use the occasion as a means to trap Jesus. It brings to mind the incident when another Pharisee bade Jesus to eat at his house during which a woman who was a known sinner approached Jesus to wash his feet. This man stood in stark contrast to what amounted as an intruder whose hospitality exceeded his. Perhaps the Pharisee in the situation at hand heard about it directly from Simon himself (the former Pharisee's name) who advised him not to fall into the same trap. As for Jesus, as vs. 37 says, he simply went in the house and sat down.

When vs. 38 says that this Pharisee is taken aback (*thaumazo*, also as to wonder) by Jesus not having washed before sitting down to eat, it's easy to anticipate that the conflict between him and the religious authorities laying just ahead will intensify. Jesus was fully aware of Jewish custom here inferring that he wanted to make clear that his host intends to ensnare him. Serving a nice meal would reduce the tension thereby setting up Jesus fall into a trap based on his supposed contempt for the Law. Failure to wash himself in a way was a turning of tables, of getting the Pharisee all worked up. This led Jesus to pounce not just on his host but on Pharisees in general.

Note the opening words of vs. 39, *nun humeis* or “now you” which set the tone for what is to follow. You can’t help but wonder how the meal would proceed or if Jesus would simply get up and leave. However, he rebukes the Pharisees as a whole as fond of cleaning the outside of utensils in ceremonial washings while at the same time they are full of extortion and wickedness. That is to say, their inner being or *esothern* has nothing but *harpagē* and *poneria* or the act of seizure, robbery and a lack of moral and social values.

Jesus doesn’t stop here. He’s just warming up. Perhaps by this point he has had enough of the Pharisees hounding him as well as how they took advantage of the people in their care. During his ministry Jesus must have been approached by many people who complained of the oppression they suffered by those in authority. He blurts out “You fools” or you who are *aphron*, that is, lacking in *phroneo* or wisdom and prudence. Then he exclaims rhetorically that God had made both the outside as well as the inside. Reference is to the cup and dish, symbolic of the exterior and interior life of a person. I.e., *exothern* = *esothern*. At once Jesus amplifies this by telling not just the Pharisee who was present but his colleagues to give as alms that which is inside, that is to say, *eneimi* which literally means to be in or *en-*. Should that happen, at once (which is signified by *idou* or behold) everything...without exception...is clean or *katharos*. Note that Jesus adds “for you” or for the Pharisees.

You’d think this would have been enough but as noted at the beginning of the last paragraph, Jesus is just warming up and now is going full throttle. He throws out *ouai* or woe to the Pharisees three times; and shortly afterwards applies this word to lawyers. Jesus is fully away that the Pharisees are concerned with the minutiae of tithing and the like to the neglect of justice and love of God, *krisis* and *agape*⁶, two fundamentals of the Jewish religion. The verb at hand is *parerchomai*, literally to pass by or pass *para-*.

Vs. 43 contains the second instance of *ouai*, this one with regard to how the Pharisees love (*agapao*) to have the best seat in the synagogues and being greeted in public places. *Agapao* here as love clearly represents undo attachment. In other words, they have an inordinate desire for recognition.

Right after this *ouai* comes the third one in vs. 44. The Pharisees resemble graves which aren’t seen yet are walked upon by people not knowing them. A footnote in the **NIV** is worth inserting with regard to this: “The Jews whitewashed their tombs so that no one would accidentally touch them and be defiled. Just as touching a grave resulted in ceremonial uncleanness, so also being influenced by these misguided religious leaders could lead to moral uncleanness.”

Apparently Jesus wasn’t the only person invited to the Pharisee’s home for a meal. Vs. 45 speaks of “one of the lawyers” which means a contingent of them showed up. In fact, Jesus is even harsher with them compared with the Pharisees. Most likely the Pharisee-as-host

⁶While *agape* is usually considered a hallmark of Jesus’ teaching, nevertheless it’s equivalent to the Hebrew *chesed* or mercy. This, of course, is one of those words difficult to approximate.

deliberately failed to inform Jesus about these other guests which when you look back to vs. 39, may have contributed to him being so angry and expressing it in no uncertain terms. The more against Jesus, the better chance of slamming him. The lawyer who spoke up said that Jesus had reproached him and his colleagues present at the table along with the Pharisee who was the host of what turned out to be a quite a troublesome meal. The verb is *hubrizo* essentially as to treat in an insolent manner (i.e., hubris being derived from this verb). Jesus was fully aware that this lawyer is used to manipulating words. By no means did he let him off the hook, lashing out with another *ouai* or woe which really hit home after Jesus did the same three times to the Pharisee at table.

Jesus condemned the lawyer and those present with loading burdens upon men hard to bear while not so much as lifting a finger to help out. The adjective *dusbastaktos* gets right to the point, the verbal root *bastazo*, to lift or to raise prefaced with the adjectival form *dus-*, hard. It contrasts with the verb associated with lawyers, *prosspsauo* rendered here as to touch. The preposition *pros-* prefaced to the verbal root is indicative of direction towards-which or the burden at hand, this, of course, in the negative sense. Right afterwards comes *ouai* #2 in vs. 47. The lawyers are responsible for building tombs of prophets whom their fathers had slain, thereby making them just as guilty. Not only that, they are witnesses (*martus*) who had consented to their fathers' deeds after which they killed them and built their tombs. Actually this condemnation is just as applicable to the nation of Israel and its troublesome relationship with God.

In vs. 49 Jesus quotes from what appears as from a book but may simply be in reference to himself. Speaking in the first person singular, the Wisdom (*Sophia* also as skill) of God will send prophets and apostles some of whom will be put death. Note the association between two groups, prophets (of Israel) and apostles (presumably of Jesus) which says that two halves of the same body which can work together end up as slain. The ones responsible for this, of course, are inferred as the religious authorities.

Then in vs. 51 Jesus singles out the prophets whose blood which had been shed since the world's foundation will be required by the present generation, the verb *ekzeteo*, literally to seek from (*ek-*) in the sense of requiring a debt. Jesus didn't use *katabole* or foundation with respect to the world for nothing. By it he meant there's something deep-rooted not just in Israel's history but in humankind that revolts at any meaningful relationship with God. This all got started with the blood of Abel going to that of Zechariah. As for Abel, cf. Gn 4.8: "And when they were in the field, Cain rose up against his brother Abel and killed him." This first murder is because the Lord has regard for both Abel and his offering but not for Cain and his offering. The verb applicable to both is *shahah*, essentially to look around in the sense of sizing up. As for what brought about the stoning of Zechariah, see 2 Chron 24.21: "Because you have forsaken the Lord, he has forsaken you." And so this murderous intent regarding both examples is at work in the present generation inferring that those listening to Jesus give this account will rise up and do the same to him.

The second and final woe or *ouai* to the lawyers is because they have taken away the key of knowledge, *gnosis* as applicable to *Torah*. Implied is that this key had already been available to the people. However, the lawyers failed to use it in order to first enter the *Torah*, if you will, in order to prepare the way for inviting others to follow. Instead, they hindered those in the process of entering, the verb *eiserchomai* (*eis*-into) as applicable to both.

Vs. 37 began this episode which ended with really harsh condemnation of both Pharisees and lawyers. The finishing touch by Jesus describing his state of mind albeit indirectly are the words "As he went away from there." This gives the impression that Jesus didn't leave the house of the Pharisee who invited him for supper disgusted with them all. Rather, he did what he deemed necessary and simply left. Were the disciples present? It doesn't look so, but we can be assured Jesus used this to both teach and warn them what they will come up against later on.

The scribes and Pharisees obviously were present "as he went away from there." Note that they hounded him leaving the house until he got out of ear-shot. Not only that, they took a certain pleasure in knowing that they will entrap him sooner or later. It was simply a matter of time. This is expressed by the verb *enecho* rendered as to press hard and literally as have-in. Furthermore, they provoked Jesus, *apostomazo* being comprised of *stoma* or mouth prefaced with the preposition *apo*- or from...from-the-mouth. Both verbs apply to what seems innocent enough, *polus* or many (things). In other words, they verbally sprayed Jesus with anything and everything they could think of, hence the descriptive *apostomazo*. Both *enecho* and *apostomazo* are condensed, if you will, in the verb *enedreuo* or to lay in ambush. From there the scribes and Pharisees...presumably lawyers as well though not mentioned...hoped to catch Jesus in anything further he would say, *thereuo* or the springing shut of *enedreuo*. Thus Chapter Eleven ends on a somewhat uneasy note signaling that the religious authorities will attempt to have the last say with regard to Jesus.

Chapter Twelve

This chapter begins literally as "in which" (*en hois*) or as the **RSV** has it, "In the meantime." It serves to prepare us for a continuation of that contentious interaction between Jesus, the Pharisee and lawyers. In other words, *en hois* represents a kind of interval before Jesus continues his invective against the Pharisees, lawyers not being mentioned. The effective way he dealt with them in the last chapter garnered a lot of sympathy by mention of the "thousands of the multitude" (*ochlos*) in this opening verse. At long last they had someone with the courage to stand up against these authorities that for so long had kept them in submission. Then we have the two verbs *episunago* and *katapateo* (gathered together and trod upon), the sense of which is enhanced by the prepositions prefaced to them, *epi*- and *sun*- or upon and with, *kata*- or down in the sense of trampling down. What makes the noun

ochlos all the more menacing is the noun *urias* defined as a very large number which often is rendered as ten thousand. Jesus knew that his contention with the Pharisee and lawyers had attracted this huge ...well, mob...but in an instant it could turn against him.

While fully aware of this potentially explosive situation, Jesus decides to address his disciples first which continues through vs. 12. Use of *archo* or “began” suggests this awareness, that he had to put a mental distance between himself and the menacing throng. Against this background where the people were on the verge of making him their leader, Jesus surprises the twelve by not speaking of the pressing situation at hand. Instead, he warns them against the leaven of the Pharisees which equals hypocrisy or *hupokrisis* alternately as pretense or outward show (literally to answer or respond from under or *hupo-*). As for leaven, it’s a perfect image of the subtle way these religious figures insinuated themselves into the lives of the people, using their position as a means to manipulate them and thus keep them cowered.

Despite the apostles’ association with Jesus, apparently they were not much different from the people, so they had to be warned as to what precisely had gotten them so riled up. He expands upon the hiddenness symbolized by leaven, namely, that what is covered will be revealed and that which is hidden will be made known. As for the first pair we have *sugkalupto* and *apokalupto*, the same verbal root with two different prepositions, *sug-* and *apo-* or with and from. Each represents a strong application of the same root albeit in different ways. The second pair has the adjectival form of *krupto* or *kruptos* with *ginosko* or to know. I.e, the “leaven” Jesus is referring to acts parallel to that of the Pharisees but in a very different fashion.

Jesus continues with this theme based upon leaven in vs. 3 as applicable to speech: what’s said in the dark will be heard in the light, *skotia* vs. *phos*. Similarly what’s whispered in private rooms will be proclaimed upon housetops. The first part of this sentence reads literally as “toward the ear you speak in the storerooms.” This consists of the preposition *pros* which is indicative of direction towards-which with the common verb *laleo*. As for storerooms, *tameion* suggests a secret place where valuables are kept. Note the plural, indicative of a number of such confined areas where it’d be difficult to find someone compared with any other place in the building. On the other hand, the very top of the house is where the *laleo* in the *tameion* is proclaimed, *kerusso* often applicable to a town crier giving important announcements in a public place.

In vs. 4 Jesus continues speaking to the disciples whom he calls friends, this against the backdrop of “many thousands of the multitude” of vs. 1. Judging by the opening words rendered as “I tell you” he’s about to get really serious with his disciples. That’s why he prepares them by using the familiar *philos* or friends. This is the only use of the term relative to the disciples which must have taken them by surprise. However, it’s something we’re familiar with through John’s Gospel: “No longer do I call you servants...but I have called you friends” [15.15]. No doubt, the disciples were like the crowd before them, fearful of the

Pharisees and other religious authorities. Thus they were sympathetic with the people but by reason of their close association with Jesus, held their peace.

Judging by “I tell you,” the disciples were not set at ease. Just the opposite. They knew Jesus was about to present them with words hard to take, and this he does right through vs. 12. He starts off by saying they shouldn’t fear (*phobeo*) those who kill the body, the preposition *apo-* or from prefaced to the root *kteino* suggesting real intent at doing so. Even if they do—surely the religious authorities at once come to mind—that’s all they are capable of. The almost casual way Jesus frames this suggests that life somehow will continue uninterruptedly. On the other hand, they should fear him—again not specified but Satan implied—who can kill. Not only that, he has the power or *exousia* (also as authority) to cast into Gehenna or hell. To bring home the point of his words, Jesus enjoins the disciples once again to indeed fear him.

Vs. 6 Jesus attempts to assuage his somewhat somber words with a rhetorical question. Despite the fact that sparrows are sold for next-to-nothing, they do have value. He puts it almost in terms of these birds being a kind of witness, that they are not forgotten “before God,” *enopion* with the verb *lanthano*, (not) to forget. I.e., the brief and insignificant life of such an insignificant bird is constantly being watched by God. The same applies to an even far smaller measurement, one’s hair. After this Jesus again encourages the disciples by telling them not to fear because they are worth more than many sparrows. The verb is *diaphero*, literally as to carry through suggestive of divine attention to the minutest of details which humanly speaking is beyond comprehension.

Compare the *enopion* of vs. 6 with *enprosthēn* of vs. 8, the latter as “before men” which suggests facing toward, to the front, this with respect to Jesus compared with the former as in front of in the sense of being opposite with respect to God. In the verse at hand the verb is *homologeō* or to acknowledge, also as to agree (*homos* or one and the same + *legō* or to say). This verb is along with “in me” and *emprosthēn* with regard to men. Not only that, Jesus will take this *homologeō* and place it before the angels (*aggelos*, also as messenger) of God. Thus *homologeō* is twofold. On the other hand, the reverse to *homologeō* regarding Jesus is denial, *arneomai*, also to refuse consent. This will carry over to the angels of God, *aparneomai* which comes off a bit stronger than *arneomai* insofar as it contains refusal of recognition. Mention of angels is important because as messengers they shuttle back and forth between the human and divine spheres. Thus they will know those worth acknowledging and those to be ignored.

In vs. 10 Jesus phrases this acknowledgment/denial differently but with a certain parallel between him now as Son of man and the Holy Spirit. Anyone who speaks a word or *logos* literally into the Son of man will be forgiven; not so again literally into the Holy Spirit which is a case of committing blasphemy. Perhaps this is so because Jesus, while divine, is also human, so he’s an easy target for one’s anger. On the other hand, the Spirit or *Pneuma* is invisible therefore not readily perceptible. At the same time the *Pneuma* by reason of being breath, is more pervasive and in a way, more accessible than Jesus.

Jesus brings these difficult words to a conclusion in the next two verses. He foretells a time when “they” will bring the disciples before both religious and secular authorities, third person plural most likely referring to the scribes and Pharisees as well as their Roman overlords. The verb is *eisphero*, literally to bring into followed by the preposition *epi* or upon with regard to synagogues. Thus the disciples will be dragged in with force if not violence. When this happens—and Jesus is certain it will—they are not to be anxious or *merimnao*, the very sound of which conveys anxiety. This, of course, cannot be done humanly speaking but is possible with the intervention of the Holy Spirit after Pentecost. That’s why in vs. 12 Jesus mentions the Spirit as the one who will teach them, *didasko*. Note that he specifies this even further, “in that very hour,” where *hora* is not unlike a *kairos* event. Note the future tense of *didasko* which can imply after Pentecost, something the disciples were unable to comprehend at this time. Nevertheless, it should be said and said to their credit that they remained with Jesus through all this.

Vs. 13 shifts from Jesus and the disciples back to the crowd or *ochlos* as in vs. 1 which presumably had been present all along but not noted. Someone blurted out that he wanted Jesus to go to his brother and inform him that he has to share the inheritance both had received, presumably from their father who had died. He uses the title Teacher or *Didaskalos*, a formal way of addressing Jesus and hopefully making him amenable to his request. Jesus shot back at once in no uncertain terms addressing him as *anthropos* or man in order to snap him out of his importunity for asking such a favor. No response, of course.

Jesus then proceeds in vs. 15 to address not just this man but the crowd who is fully aware of having embarrassed himself in front of everybody. *Horao* and *phulasso* or to look and to guard, both to be done simultaneously with regard to being covetous, *pleonexia* also as greed and insatiability. The foundation for these two verbs rests on the fact that one’s life doesn’t consist in an abundance of possessions, those which are *huparcho* (participle), the preposition *hupo-* or under is suggestive of support from beneath. Just as quickly as this incident began, it comes to an end. Presumably the man who importunately asked Jesus not only dissolved into the crowd but left the scene completely.

Vs. 16 begins with the conjunctive *de* rendered as “and” to show the connection between this incident and a parable Jesus presents concerning a man whose land brought forth a bountiful harvest. The verb is *euphoreo* or to bear prefaced with the adverbial form of *agathos*, *eu-* suggestive on ongoing bounty. When harvest came, he discovered that he didn’t have sufficient room to store his crops, so he decides to pull down his existing structures and build larger ones. Once done and fully content with his project, this man says to himself that it’s now time to relax and enjoy life. Presumably his family and other members of his household joined in which adds to his contentment.

However, God has been keeping an eye-out on all this, the turning point being when in vs. 19 the man says to himself, “take your ease, eat, drink, be merry.” If he had decided to share some of the harvest’s abundance with others or those who are less fortunate—implied is that

he did not—things would have worked out differently. However, he's totally self-absorbed and thus merits being called a fool or *aphron* by God which fundamentally means to lack prudence. That very night his soul will be required, *psuche* and *apaiteo*, the preposition *apo-* or from prefaced to the verbal root to seek which makes the situation even worse.

This parable is reflected in Sir 11.18: "There is a man who is rich through his diligence and self-denial, and this is the reward allotted to him: when he says 'I have found rest, and now I shall enjoy my goods!' he does not know how much time will pass until he leaves them to others and dies." Jesus ends the parable with the warning that such is the fate of the person who lays up treasure only for himself. In a way, this is reminiscent of the rich man and Lazarus, the former "who feasted sumptuously every day" [Lk 16.19].

Furthermore, the man in the parable at hand is not rich literally into God, *ploutos*. This adjective which can apply to the harvest now shifts to him who is responsible for it. He finds himself not just deprived of such *ploutos* but deprived of a relationship with God inferred by the verb *apaiteo* in reference to his *psuche* or inmost being. Such is the parable Jesus told in reference to the man who had approached him to ask his brother to divide the inheritance among the two of them.

Vs. 22 begins with the conjunctive *de* translated as "and" where Jesus is addressing his disciples. Chances are it's still within the larger context of the crowds of vs. 1 and again noted in vs. 54 towards the conclusion of this chapter. If so, then some of what he said must have filtered out to a larger audience or to those mingling around him as well as the twelve. He counsels the disciples not to be anxious or *merimnao* as he did in vs. 11 when they are brought before religious authorities. Here *merimnao* pertains to life, eating, body and clothing...in a word, the basics. As for the word life in vss. 22 and 23, it's *psuche* often rendered as soul which is more valuable (*pleion*) than these four entities.

In light of this, Jesus tells his disciples to consider the ravens, the preposition *kata-* or according to prefaced to the verbal root *noeo* or to perceive, to notice. Thus the idea is to consider with the greatest care, here *korax* or raven (also crow) which are among the most intelligent of all birds. Jesus says they are exempt from heavy-duty work associated with farming while at the same time they enjoy being fed by God, *trepho* also as to nourish. This is followed by an exclamation...a heart-felt desire for the disciples...to realize how much more worth they are than these birds, *diaphero* literally as to carry through.

In vss. 25 and 26 Jesus utters two rhetorical questions about the futility of being anxious, using the verb *merimnao* twice. This turns out to be a key word in this section, about avoiding being apprehensive or overly concerned about what one cannot alter such as the span of one's life. At this point Jesus again uses the verb *katanoeo* as in vs. 24 with regard to ravens only here he speaks of lilies or *krinon* which are generally white in color and therefore attract attention. Like the ravens, they don't engage in heavy duty work but just are out there in the open. Compared with them the glory of Solomon is insignificant which Jesus puts in terms of

clothing. As for this king's splendor, the queen of Sheba was taken aback by it all. As 1Kg 10.5 puts it, "there was no more spirit (*ruach*) in her."

Vs. 28 is an exclamation where Jesus brings this comparison to King Solomon a step further by again using the image of clothing, *amphiazō* being the verb also as to put on. Compare it with *periballo* or to cast around in the previous verse. The former as associated with grass will be burned in an oven the next day, this being compared with the way God will clothe you...the disciples...even though their faith is little. The adjective is *oligopistos*, little + faithful, which makes the comparison even more compelling.

Jesus continues the theme based on the human tendency to be anxious, the two alternate words to *merimnaō* already noted being *zeteō* (with the negative *me*) and *meteorizomai*, the latter literally to be raised from the ground and suspended in midair. If ever there was a more powerful image, this certainly is it. Jesus emphasizes the situation even more by saying that all the world's nations are engaged in vain pursuits, the verb *zeteō* but with the preposition *epi-* or upon prefaced to it for emphasis. To compensate, he sets forth the fact that God identified here as Father knows that you...the disciples...need such things. This identity shift, if you will, puts the verb *eido* in whole different light of divine concern insofar as it means to see as well as to perceive. So instead of *merimnaō*, *me zeteō* and *meteorizomai*, the *zeteō* so dominant in the worthless pursuit of things is to be exchanged for a *zeteō* of God's kingdom. Furthermore, the disciples automatically will have all other things.

In vs. 31 Jesus speaks of the divine kingdom or *basileia* and again mentions it in vs. 32. Here he prefaces further words about it by calling his disciples a little flock or *poimnion*, this noun indicating a certain dear-ness as well as vulnerability. Thus for no small reason he tells them not to fear, *phobeo*. This is followed by presenting them with the good news that the Father...God...is pleased to give them the *basileia*, the verbal root being *dokeō* (to think, to suppose) prefaced with the adverbial form of *agathos* (good), *eu-*. However, there's a price to pay for this divine kingdom. Jesus proceeds to enumerate a series of rapid-fire preconditions for its possession, all of which tie in with self-denial. If followed through, this kingdom will become a treasure or *thesauros* also as storehouse, this also mentioned in vs. 34 as being in the heavens. Jesus concludes by saying that where the treasure is, so will be one's heart or *kardia*. Thus *basileia*->*thesauros*->*kardia*.

In vs. 35 ties in the necessity of watchfulness with *basileia*->*thesauros*->*kardia*. Jesus states the way a disciple has to comport himself is with loins girded and lamps burning. This has a certain parallel with the first Passover: "In this manner you shall eat it: your loins girded, your sandals on your feet and your staff in your hand; and you shall eat it in haste. It is the Lord's Passover" [Ex 12.11]. In the verse at hand the preparation recommended by Jesus starts off like those about to go on a journey. Then it switches to his real intent. By acting thus the disciples will resemble those waiting for their master to return from a marriage feast. *Prosdechomai* suggests a looking forward, the preposition *pros-* as direction towards-which lending urgency to this expectation. It ties in with the master or *kurios* who literally has to

loosen or untie himself (*analuo*) from the celebration which intimates he wasn't enjoying himself.

And so these men, actually designated as *doulos* or slaves in vs. 37, are basically hanging around. They knew that their master would be returning home late by reason of the celebration which means at first they didn't have to be so much on guard. However, the master didn't tell them the exact time of his return; even he was uncertain, it was left open-ended, almost certainly late at night. In the meanwhile the servants took care not to fall asleep as well as planning the best way how to deal with their master who most likely will be drunk. Thus the hours dragged by as they waited by the door waiting for him to knock...first the afternoon (no problem), then evening (again no problem) and finally night.

Despite the latent fear by those servants in attendance, Jesus calls them blessed or *makarios* but on one condition only, that their master finds them awake, *gregoreo* also as to be fully alert. The servants knew this would be the case given past experience. So when the master does knock on the door, he's so pleased with their attentiveness that at once he makes plans to serve them. The verb is *parerchomai* or to come beside with *diakoneo* or to function as an intermediary, hence the significance of the preposition *dia-* prefaced to the verbal root. In light of this, these servants have the most unusual master in the world, for the way he treated them was unheard of.

Vs. 38 emphasizes the blessedness of the servants by reason of their attentiveness...their *gregoreo*...during the second and third watch. Right after this Jesus speaks of a householder, *oikodespotes* or one in charge of the master's whole operation yet most likely still a slave. Say, for example, he got wind of the time a thief would break in. That would put him on high alert to prevent the break-in. Such care infers certain knowledge obtained from people familiar with such shady characters. And so Jesus concludes this example by telling his disciples that they are to imitate this *oikodespotes*, for one day they will be in a similar position with regard to the church. Here *hetoimos* or prepared equals *gregoreo*; the Son of man will come at an hour no one expects, *dokeo* being more along the lines as supposed. At least this gives a hint to whittle down the times one normally would expect the Son of man to show up. However, if one does that, he just might use it as an opportunity to arrive. Throughout this time of tension, however, is a silver lining. If the servant is watchful upon the master's arrival, as vs. 37 puts it, he will reverse the roles and become a servant to the servant.

Vs. 41 has Peter asking Jesus a question with regard to the parable just presented. It shows both his impulsiveness and overall inability to have grasped it. This is manifest by whether or not the parable is to apply to him and the disciples or for everyone. Again, this can be seen in light of vs. 1 where the crowd isn't mentioned but supposed as being in the background throughout all that had occurred right up to the present. Jesus is fully aware of this and though he won't admit it, he must have been somewhat disappointed not just in Peter but with the other disciples at their inability to grasp his words. Though it isn't explicit, this is a constant factor throughout most of the Gospel narrative.

Jesus comes off with a rhetorical question, sometimes as here as a good way to gracefully exit an awkward situation. Jesus brings up an *oikonomos* or steward, this similar to *oikodespotes*, the former most likely a slave in charge of administering the household and the latter who may or may not be a slave, someone who is higher in authority over a household. In the verse at hand, the former is described as both *pistos* and *phronimos*, faithful and sensible or prudent. The master (*kurios*) will set him over his household, *katistemi* also as to establish and carry out with regard to *therapeia* or those servants who are at service. This word also applies to treatment or healing of the sick. Furthermore, the *oikonomos* will dispense food at the proper time or *kairos*, this possibly in reference to those belonging to the *therapeia* compared with members of the household itself.

Vs. 43 refers to the *oikonomos* or steward of vs. 42 as *doulos*, servant. He is *makarios* or blessed by reason of carrying out...doing (*poieo*) or performing his duties...when his master comes. In other words, this *oikonomos/doulos* is going about his business as he should with or without his master being present. This diligence and loyalty is cause for the master to set him over (*epi*, upon) not just his possessions but them all. The verb is *katistemi* as in vs. 42 and the noun or rather participle is *huparcho*.

Now for the dark side, if you will. Jesus speaks of the same servant should he do otherwise. Should he say literally in his heart or *kardia* that his master's arrival is delayed, *chronizo* suggestive of a long time it's an opportunity he's been waiting for a long time. He decides to take out his frustrations on the male and female servants, *pais* and *paidiske*, the two also referring to children. In this case, perhaps the *doulos* or servant, by reason of his superiority, is treating those under him as disobedient children. Not only that, the servant gets drunk and eats to his good pleasure. After the passage of some time (*chronos*, if you will, by reason of *chronizo* just mentioned) his master comes. The time is one which is least expected, *prosdokao*, *dechomai* intensified by the preposition *pros-* prefaced to it indicative of direction towards-which as noted several times earlier.

So when the master does arrive and finds his household in disarray plus horror stories from the male and female servants, he will cut that servant in two, *dichotomeo*. Once he had divided this servant, if you will, he will put (*tithemi*, to place) him literally with the part or *meros* of those who are unfaithful, *apistos*, *meros* indicating that he is among those who've been so divided and where *apistos* is the adjective to describe this condition.

Vs. 47 begins with the conjunctive *de* translated as "and" continuing this theme of severe punishment in reference to "that servant." He seems to be someone else because the former one had been cut into two pieces, as it were. In the case at hand it's a matter of the servant knowing his master's will or *thlema* while at the same time not acting in accord with it, the verb being *etoimazo* also as to prepare, to provide. His fate will be just as harsh if not worse than *dichotomeo*, the verb *dero* meaning to be skinned. On the other hand, if there's an accomplice...another servant associated with this fellow...he will receive a beating which is

less severe. *Dero* is again used here which in the context could mean a whipping where the skin is sometimes flayed off.

Jesus concludes this example which must have thoroughly gripped his disciples. It may be outlined as follows:

much is given → much to be required or *didomai* → *zeteo*

commit much → demand much or *paratithemi* → *aiteo*

In vs. 49 Jesus surprises his disciples and again, presumably some of the crowd listening in with regard to his mission. He presents himself in three forms of division, the first as fire. While already present, this fire has yet to be kindled, *anapto* also as to set. Thus Jesus-as-fire is present but has in a way remained hidden awaiting to flame up.

The second form of division is a baptism yet to be accomplished, Jesus considering himself to be restrained until that time. The verb at hand is *teleo* as to come to an end or completion. Before that, however, he is subject to *sunecho*, the root *echo* or to have prefaced with the preposition *sun-*, literally to have-with but the preposition indicative of being constrained from all sides. This baptism, of course, differs from the one Jesus had received at the hands of John in the Jordan River (cf. 3.21-22). While we know it pertains to his future suffering, the disciples must have been totally confused, they associating these words with the Baptist. This again is another unwritten testimony as to them remaining with Jesus through all these impossible to comprehend word about himself.

The third form of division is the one where Jesus has the most to say. It's especially painful one because of the domestic break-up involved: one house will be divided into a number of factions, each at odds with each other. So when Jesus says that he hasn't come to bring peace but division, he really means it. The noun for the latter is *diamerismon* where the preposition *dia-* or through signifies a certain intensity. It pertains to the following example: family members in conflict with each other: father/son, son/father, mother/daughter, daughter/mother, daughter-in-law/mother-in-law. Jesus stops then and there without expounding further on this. He figures the disciples are fully aware it pertains to family members being either for against him.

As for this third division, Mic 7.5-6⁷ is inferred: "Put no trust in a neighbor, have no confidence in a friend; guard the doors of your mouth from her who lies in your bosom; for the son treats the father with contempt, the daughter rises up against her mother, the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law; a man's enemies are the men of his own house."

Against this prophecy vs. 54 Jesus now turns from the disciples to the *ochlos* or multitude which has been with him since the beginning of this chapter. Though not explicit, he fleshes out his ominous words by appealing to a common sense way of telling the weather. Though

⁷This is the twenty-fourth scriptural reference in St. Luke's Gospel.

everyone is familiar with this, Jesus stuns them all by calling them hypocrites. They know how to interpret various signs when it comes to weather, *dokimazo* inferring to make a critical examination. However, *dokimazo* fails miserably when it comes to literally “this time,” *kairos* referring to the just mentioned three divisions summed up in terms of fire, baptism and domestic division.

Jesus brings Chapter Twelve to a conclusion with a practical manner the crowd which he’s addressing can identify with. It has to do with judging which he puts in terms of a rhetorical question. It seems that most people fail to judge what’s right (*dikaios*) for themselves. So when it’s a question of going to trial, it’s important to make the effort to settle any dispute beforehand. The key word is *apallasso*, to set free from a controlling situation. If this doesn’t happen, the result will be prison. Jesus emphasizes the severity of this situation while at the same time giving hope. Despite the confinement, release is possible when the very last small copper coin is paid. The adjective *eschatos* modifying *lepton* or just about the smallest monetary denomination brings this home to the max.

Chapter Thirteen

This new chapter opens with the first mention of the Roman governor Pilate whose life in the near future is destined to intersect with that of Jesus Christ. Some of those present with Jesus recounted an incident...neither the details nor the time are given...with regard to the offering of sacrifices made by Galileans most likely at the temple in Jerusalem. This comes as no surprise given the tension with Rome as occupier and Pilate as its official representative. What made such an impression on those who witnessed this tragedy seems to be some kind of revolt resulting in the mingling of blood of those making a sacrifice and the sacrificial victims. After the dust of this incident had settled down, there must have been a lengthy process of ritual purification so sacrifices could continue. Those with Jesus wanted his opinion on this because like the victims, he is a Galilean. Naturally they would expect him to use this incident very much alive in the memory of the local inhabitants as a rallying point to start a rebellion.

Jesus came off with a response that must have surprised those recounting the incident which for them was very much alive and a topic of conversation in every household. He could see it being played out in their eyes as they addressed Jesus which prompted him to put before them a rhetorical question that took them off guard. Were those Galileans who had perished at the hand of Pilate worse sinners than their fellow countrymen because of what happened to them? Jesus set about diffusing the situation by responding to his own rhetorical question because some of the Galileans in front of him must have lost relatives in the event. Jesus wishes to elevate their grievance to a higher level by speaking of the necessity to repent. If not, they too will perish which will result in a failed revolt against Rome. The verb here is *metanoeo*, the verbal form of *metanoia* described earlier as a putting of the mind or *noos*

after, *meta*-. That is to say, a person should no longer be focused upon the past but needs almost in a physical manner to place his or her mind after the customary way of thing which had been operative for so long.

In addition to this, Jesus brings up the incident where a tower in Siloam collapsed and killed eighteen people. It's an incident not mentioned by those present with him, but Jesus figured it would help illustrate the tragedy at hand. Again, we have a rhetorical question which Jesus answered. Were those victims worse offenders than the inhabitants of Jerusalem, that being the largest and most renowned city of Israel? *Opheilo* is the verb to describe such offenders and means to be under an obligation as well as to be at wrong. Just as in the case of the Galileans whom Pilate had slain, the key to the quandary at hand is *metanoeo*. In other words, Jesus takes two examples where a number of people had been killed and brings both to one's personal life, of how a person is to comport oneself.

Right after this incident where people expected Jesus to take some kind of immediate action (political?) he eases out of this tense situation by offering a parable. Though we have no response from those who put the still bothersome issue of Pilate killing fellow Galileans, Jesus could tell that his words along with the tower of Siloam had assuaged them somewhat. Because of this he now has some momentum and wants to capitalize on it. The exit strategy? Jesus offers a parable about a fig tree...just one...planted in a vineyard, a place customarily for growing grapes. The man who had planted it seemed to have almost prized it above his grapevines, coming down on a regular basis for some three years looking for fruit but found nothing. Having been disappointed, he told the man in charge to cut it down who protested and asked for some time to tend to the tree. If after a year no fruit, then he'll cut it down. The parable ends abruptly then and there.

We have no final verdict on what was a highly valued fig tree, deliberately so. However, the element of time plays an important role here. The vine-dresser asked for one more year which represents time relative to the *metanoeo* or change of heart just above. The man in charge relented, but the time was now ticking down. Whether or not those listening to Jesus got the point isn't recorded. This is fairly common in his dealings with people where he speaks of important matters in a way that's free to accept or to reject...or more likely, not showing the slightest interest. In other words, Jesus would love a positive response, no doubt about it. At the same time he doesn't get all worked up should it turn out otherwise.

The way vs. 10 begins— "Now Jesus was teaching in one of the synagogues ¹⁸¹ on the Sabbath"—seems to be in Galilee or thereabouts though no definite place is given. Since it was the Day of Rest, we can assume that more people were present than at other occasions; in other words, a full house. One of the congregants was a woman who stood out by reason of being bent over, this for eighteen long years. She got Jesus' attention by reason of her

81

This is the fifth occasion where Jesus enters a synagogue.

deformity and perhaps was pointed out by someone nearby as a faithful member of the synagogue present at every service. Right away Jesus goes over and first tells the woman that she's free of her infirmity, *astheneia* also as weakness. Then he lays both hands on her with the immediate result that she started praising God, *doxazo* also to glorify. By reason of being bent over, the woman could not recognize Jesus at first but certainly could tell it was him by reason of the commotion.

Vs. 14 is quick to point out that the ruler of the synagogue—*archon* prefaced to this noun—witnessed this cure and was indignant, *aganakteo* also as to show displeasure. By reason of his position and judgmental attitude, right away we get the impression that this man who goes unidentified is cut from the same cloth as the Pharisees. Anything outside the bounds of the religious establishment is a threat, a kind of occupational hazard, which we see frequently throughout the Gospels. The ruler's position, while technically accurate, is out of line given that a woman who had been afflicted for so long is healed in the very synagogue for which he's responsible. The *archon* rightly infers that there are six days for work, one set aside as the Sabbath which happens to be the day at hand. Thus for him *ergazomai* or to work is the same as *therapeuo* or to heal.

So without knowing it, the *archon* has just set himself up for a hit. In vs. 15 Jesus responds not just to him but to others like him not just in the synagogue but most likely the Pharisees by calling them hypocrites. They think nothing of leading one of their domestic animals to water on the Sabbath which pales in comparison to the woman just healed after being bent over for eighteen years. Jesus attributes this directly to Satan whose bonds he had just loosened. In other words, this cure in no way violates the Sabbath but may in fact enhance it.

This incident concludes with vs. 17 which says that all Jesus' adversaries were put to shame, *kataischuno* also as to dishonor or to disgrace made stronger by addition of the preposition *kata-* or down prefaced to the verbal root. As for those involved, the noun is the present participle of *antikeimai*, literally to lay or to stretch against. This can be taken two ways...those hostile to (*anti-*, against) Jesus in the synagogue or others in a more general way. Nevertheless, not just the people but "all the people" or *ochlos* (crowd) rejoiced at the glorious things done by Jesus. The verb at hand is *chairo* followed by the preposition *epi* or upon with regard to *endoxos*, the preposition *en-* or in with regard to what is outstanding or distinguished. I.e., the two prepositions highlight the crowd's joy in comparison with the hypocrites against Jesus.

Vs. 18 starts off with the adverb *oun* or "therefore" which is a kind of transition from the synagogue incident to something else which could take place in the same synagogue or a bit later. *Oun* serves to introduce two rhetorical questions with regard to two parables concerning the kingdom or *basileia* of God. Although not explicit, Jesus is inviting input. Essential to any such attempt to describe the indescribable is limited, the verb in both instances being *homoioo* or to liken. Along with it is the adjective *homoios* or like. Jesus reaches out for the smallest seed known by everyone to heighten the contrast he's about to make. That is a

mustard seed, *kokkos* also meaning grain and therefore something very tiny. Once planted, this *kokkos* grew into a tree or *dendron*, usually one bearing fruit. And so this fruit tree became an ideal place for birds to make their home or *kataskenoo* which infers making their tent, *skene* and therefore suggests something homey.

The second parable involving the verb *homoioo* and adjective *homoios* is in vs. 20 and consists of one verse with a rhetorical question and one other verse. This one is more domestic, pertaining to leaven which a woman hid in meal until the whole batch had risen. The key word here is *egkrupto*, *eg-* being equivalent to *en-* or *in*, to hide in. Thus the kingdom of God works its way into what will turn out to be a totally different form, a loaf of bread. One can't help but wonder how these examples registered on people. Chances are pretty good by reason of their homey-ness, easy to remember as well as to pass on.

Vs. 22 is significant insofar as Jesus is walking toward Jerusalem. Two verbs indicate this, *diaporeuomai* and *poieo* with *poreia* or literally to walk through here with respect to towns and villages and to make a journey, *poreia* derived from *(dia)poreuomai* with respect to Jerusalem itself. Although there are a few instances of interactions with various people between here and the conclusion of Chapter Thirteen there are no instances of healing or miracles which are recorded.

Somewhere along the way a man asked whether or not those who'll be saved are few, *sozo* also as to rescue. This is such a common theme...one known to just about everyone at the time as indicated by the question...that barely thought is given to how it might be fleshed out. In general, *sozo* implies two extremes: that we have lost something of great value and need to recover it. This involves more than concerns about one's physical existence but one's eternal destiny. Apparently from the way this person put it to Jesus the number of those destined for *sozo* is up in the air. Jesus never gives a hard and fast response to such questions knowing that they can't be answered but just inferred.

Keeping in line with the deliberate vagueness, Jesus doesn't give the most encouraging answer, starting off by encouraging the questioner to enter by the narrow door, *agonizomai* fundamentally as to engage in an athletic contest which implies being in competition. With this in mind, the image that comes to mind consists of a whole bunch of contestants, each in good shape, rushing toward a door which is extremely small, *stenos* also meaning confined. On top of this is the problem of many seeking to enter but won't be able to do so. Such persons are not necessarily among the athletes competing but are spectators. They became so caught up in the excitement at hand that they forgot the necessary training to participate. Thus there's a sharp difference between *zeteo* and the negative of *ischuo*, of seeking and being able.

In vs. 25 Jesus modifies what he had just said when he introduces a householder, *oikodespotes*. This can be a free man or slave often as in charge of a large piece of property along with buildings and those who work there. In the case at hand he is responsible for

shutting the door of the house at night to keep away undesirables. Not only that, as the story develops he turns out to exercise considerable power in the name of the master of the household. On one occasion he recognizes a voice outside which represents several people and responds by saying that he does not know where they come from. Some back and forth continues with one individual outside who desperately is trying to get in. He appeals to the fact that not just he but he along with those outside had eaten and drank with the *oikodespotes* and even taught in the streets. The response is an abrupt, even harsh voice from inside the house. Actually for the second time in a row the *oikodespotes* firmly says that doesn't know him nor those with him, *eido* being the verb fundamentally as to see as well as to perceive. Then he calls them workers of iniquity, *adikia* also as injustice.

This must have taken those trying to get inside by surprise. Despite desperate appeals of trying to enter the house, the *oikodespotes* is adamant. He went on to say that they will make all sorts of lamentable sounds there or *ekei* as the first word of vs. 28 puts it which infers the night which this incident is taking place. From this place of darkness and lamentation they will behold the three patriarchs of Israel along with prophets in the kingdom of God. This, of course, is not unlike what Jesus will say later concerning the rich man seeing Lazarus in Abraham's bosom (cf. 16.3). The *oikodespotes* adds a further indignity but one apparently deserving. Those outside...already they are on the outside of the house...will be thrust out of the company of those notables just mentioned, the verb *ekballo* being an active one, if you will, to be thrown outside (*ek-*).

At first glance this incident is hard to grasp because the man and those outside were not unknowns in the middle of the night but at once recognizable by the *oikodespotes* inside. It seems that despite the familiarity, something more important is at stake. Why were these people outside in the first place? Why did they try to get in at such an inappropriate hour? Perhaps this presumption is at the heart of the parable and leads to its further development as in vs. 29 when the *oikodespotes* addresses those outside saying that people will come from the four corners of the earth and sit at table in God's kingdom. The verb is *anaklino* where the preposition *ana-* generally applicable to upward motion or up to emphasizes the relaxed position of being at table. Among those who come, there will be a reverse of the usual custom of this *anaklino*: the first as last and the last as first.

As for the *oikodespotes*, despite his important position, in the end he is not ultimately in charge. He is subject to the master of the household and his family who call the shots. Surely when day broke and the *oikodespotes* and the master got together to discuss this commotion that happened just outside the house, the master must have been very well pleased. If it hadn't been diffused and allowed to escalate, things could have gotten ugly, throwing quite a fright into the master's family. No wonder that he had been entrusted with so much, even telling those who came at night basically to get lost.

Vs. 31 begins significantly with "at (*en, in*) that very hour" or the exact time Jesus had expounded at some length about striving to enter the narrow door. And to think this started

with a simple, direct question by someone who had asked about the number of those being saved (cf. vs. 23). This time it seems the Pharisees wished to spare Jesus from being taken into custody by King Herod who had done the same with John the Baptist. In actuality they wished him to have him leave what most likely was Perea and go to Judea, the former east of the latter, this according to a footnote in the **NIV**. While saying this Jesus knew full well that the Pharisees wanted him dead which they knew would happen sooner or latter.

Jesus was well aware that he was dealing with a king known for his craftiness and rightly called a fox, especially in light of how he treated his cousin as just noted. Therefore he tells these Pharisees...equally crafty as Herod...that he is going about his designated business of casting out demons and performing cures. Then he throws in something that must have caused considerable confusion. Jesus says that on the third day he will finish the work assigned to him, the verb being *apotelo*, the preposition *apo-* basically as from and prefaced to a verb suggestive of completion, more here as completion once and for all.

As for this *apotelo*, in vs. 33 Jesus says that it will take place in Jerusalem, the place where it's fitting for a prophets to perish, the verb being *apokteino* where the preposition *apo-* prefaced to the verbal root suggests utter destruction, i.e., to kill-from. By speaking both directly as well as indirectly Jesus is intentionally confusing the Pharisees, but in actuality these words must have gone right over their heads.

While they are still in Jesus' presence he utters a lament over Jerusalem because she has slain all the prophets sent to her, the Pharisees certainly familiar with that. Chances are he did this as some distance, enough to take in the city as a whole as from the Mount of Olives. This puts a necessary distance between him and the city, otherwise he would not be able to handle the situation at hand. Jesus uses the image of a hen gathering her brood under her wings yet Jerusalem has refused. Then he calls the city forsaken, the verb *aphiemi* meaning to leave behind while at the same time it was within the reach of the inhabitants not to have this come about. Next follows a prophecy of sorts, one which will take place shortly associated of what's now called Palm Sunday. Jerusalem's inhabitants won't see Jesus until they exclaim the verse associated with that day, one week before his death, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!" And so ends Chapter Thirteen. As for this concluding verse, it contains one scriptural verse from Ps 118.26 which is quoted in full: ²⁹²

"Blessed be he who enters in the name of the Lord! We bless you from the house of the Lord." The verb *barak* which fundamentally means to kneel down out of respect occurs twice, as blessed and bless. The one who enters which Jesus applies to himself is *barak* which automatically sets off the second *barak* or acknowledgment from the people. The people aren't doing this *barak* at the city gates but from the temple, *bryth* or house being applicable

92

This is the twenty-fifth scriptural references in Luke's Gospel.

to it. Presumably the one entering is making his way through Jerusalem's streets to this temple.

Chapter Fourteen

This new chapter opens with the conjunctive *kai* usually rendered as “and” but is not translated as such in the Greek text. Nevertheless, true to form it shows a close connection with what went before it and the situation now at hand. You can be aware of this simply by dwelling upon *kai* for a moment or two, allowing it to sink in. As for the text, it runs somewhat literally as “and it became in the coming” with regard to Jesus going to dine with a ruler who belonged to the Pharisees. *Archon* suggests an important member of that religious group who either personally or through agents must have been keeping a close eye on Jesus' activity for some time now. By having him come into his home, he as well as the other Pharisees who were invited had him on their home turf, the verb *paratereo* as to watch. The preposition *para-* or beside is prefaced the verbal root suggests something that has been quite evident for a while. That is to say, the Pharisees were constantly beside or *para-* Jesus as they kept their eyes peeled on him. The dinner occurred on a Sabbath, the very mention of which foretells trouble: Sabbath→Jesus→Pharisees, by now a familiar and often troublesome combination.

Once the *archon* and his fellow Pharisees got Jesus in a relaxed setting as was the case of 11.37 +, they could attack him more effectively. No doubt Jesus was aware of this and accepted, going well-armed and for the purpose of hopefully disarming not all present but hopefully a few which would work to his advantage. Either on the way or near the ruler's house Jesus happened upon a man afflicted with dropsy, *hudropikos* where fluid builds up usually in the arms and legs causing swelling. We can assume that this man could barely walk or had to be carried about. Having gotten word that Jesus would be passing soon, he took up a convenient position so as to meet him. This comes as no surprise. In a rather small, compact society as is the case at hand word about events and people traveled with the speed of light. Thus the Pharisees who similarly had been invited came across this man much to their annoyance as well as the ruler who eagerly was awaiting their arrival.

Before taking any action with regard to the man afflicted with dropsy, Jesus spoke to (*pros*, suggesting words right to the point) the Pharisees and lawyers, the latter also being invited to the ruler's house, about whether or not it was lawful to heal on the Sabbath. The verb is *existin* more along the lines of “it is permitted.” You'd think the response would be negative, especially from the lawyers who were well versed in the Law. However, they and the Pharisees kept silent, this rendered as one simple sentence in vs. 4, the verb being *hesuchazo* or more as they became silent. Without further ado, Jesus took the man, healed him and let him go. That was it. No response from the cured man nor from those present with Jesus. This, of course, is yet another case where a healed person disappears from the scene not to be heard of again.

Obviously it makes you wonder what he did afterwards or whether at a later stage he became a member of the church.

In vs. 5 Jesus asks an obvious though deliberate question with regard to the Sabbath day, that is, no one would show hesitation of rescuing a son or animal if it had fallen into a well. To this nobody could give a response. You could cut the silence in the room with a knife. Jesus senses this awkwardness, he being the center of attention and immediately offers a parable to break the ice. After all, he's at the home of the ruler of the Pharisees and simply can't just walk out the door. That would be the equivalent of having admitted defeat. Such an occasion demanded a hierarchy of seating, rather reclining, Jesus most likely at the head or near the head of the table beside the ruler. The verb with regard to Jesus being aware of this protocol is *epecho*, literally to have upon, *epi-* inferring close attention. It is directed literally "into (*eis*) place of honor;" *protoklisia* or "first laying down" which intimates the customary position for such meals.

While everyone was jostling for the best place to recline as *protoklisia* infers, Jesus must have been amused at the hubbub taking place around him. He sees the situation ripe for a parable about a marriage feast and encourages anyone invited to let someone of greater honor take first place. To the Pharisees and lawyers this must have been an affront because they were highly respected and used to getting their way as well as automatically having first choice in just about everything. If by chance someone walks in and take a designated place at the marriage feast, that person will be put to shame (*aischune*) for having done so when the rightful person arrives. That means he'll be bumped down to the very end. No real problem in and by itself but a big deal because it's done in front of everyone. For someone in a relatively high social position as those whom Jesus is addressing, this is as bad as it gets. However, that place does have an advantage. Once the feast begins, it's easier to sneak away without being noticed.

The conclusion of this parable? The well known exalting oneself leads to being humbled and visa versa. Jesus called blessed or *makarios* (also as happy) the person who humbles himself which automatically leads to being exalted: *hupsoo*->*tapeinoo* and *tapeinoo*->*hupsoo* (to exalt->to humble and to humble->to exalt). Note the mechanism at work. Each of the two verbs has two parts, if you will. The first part consists in taking action with regard to oneself and the second part, of the action happening to the person beyond one's power but wholly dependent upon the first part. This second action goes unspecified, but it seems to be part and parcel of human nature. Though Jesus puts it in straight-forward manner, to the Pharisees and lawyers it was as though he was speaking a foreign language. To them he was completely unintelligible.

In vs. 12 Jesus turns his attention to the man who had invited him saying before all present that he's to favor those who are poor, maimed, lame and blind over others who can repay him. The latter, of course, are those present. The result? He will be blessed or *makarios*...again, happy...because these unfortunates are unable to give him anything in return. As for any

repayment, it will be at the resurrection of the just or *dikaïos*, also as upright, the Hebrew equivalent being *tsadyq* which among other things, connotes that which is normal. As for the resurrection, the Pharisees were familiar with a verse from Dan 12.2 and must have thought Jesus was referring to it: "Multitudes who sleep in the dust of the earth will awake; some to everlasting life, others to shame and everlasting contempt." We have no response from this man who as already noted is an *archon* in good standing with the Pharisees. Thus the decision is left up in the air, deliberately so, though another person at table couldn't help but chime in. He was so impressed and exclaimed that the person who eats bread in God's kingdom is blessed, *makarios*.

The *archon*, Pharisees and lawyers felt as though they just got off the hook by this man's sudden intervention. However, vs. 16 begins with *ho de* rendered as "but" which signifies that Jesus will quickly make sure this expectation will quickly run into reality by launching into an extended parable. Even before Jesus begins to speak those present could infer he means business by the somber expression on his face. He speaks of a man who had given not just a banquet but a great (*meGas*, also as large) one with invitations extended to many people. He dispatches his servant or *doulos* (also as slave) to sum those invited which consists of three invitations.

It turned out that all excused themselves because they were engaged in pressing matters. When you think of it, to drop this on the spot was no small matter and perfectly understandable. However, the invitation inferred by Jesus excels all human necessity which is the point of the parable. One recently purchased a field, another had obtained five yoke of oxen and another just got married. In fact, the servant could tell just by looking at the face of each man which was essentially elsewhere, he would get no response. Nevertheless, he was bound to carry out his duty. Those whom he invited didn't treat the servant harshly as we might have expected but showed a certain graciousness for the invitations. Besides, they were fairly well off and weren't lacking anything to eat. Also no reason for the banquet is given which may have been another reason why all three declined to attend.

In vs. 21 the servant returns to his master also known as a householder, the two words being *kurios* (also as Lord) and *oikodespotes*. In a way, his anger (the verb *orgizo*) is misplaced given the circumstances outlined above. Although the servant never would say it aloud, he must have thought his boss was too impatient in his desire to have his "great banquet" suitably attended. As soon as he heard that none of those invited are coming he dispatched his servant yet again to go out to the streets and lanes and invite the poor, maimed, blind and lame. They would be easy to find, hanging out in these public ways most likely on the side begging for money or food or both. On the way to these places the servant must have wondered about his master, why on earth he chose these unfortunates and so forth. Nevertheless, he was faithful in having fulfilled his duty though we have no confirmation of any reward by his master.

The servant simply didn't go around the streets, etc., inviting them to come. Rather, vs. 23 says that he was enjoined by his master to compel them to attend the "great banquet," *anagkazo*

which is a pretty strong verb. The intent behind such force...almost compulsion...is to fill the master's house, *gemizo* in the literal sense of having every inch of the house occupied. Again, no reason for this is given. The parable closes with the lord/householder saying in a huff that those who had originally been invited won't taste any part of the "great banquet," *geuomai*. Given that all three groups were occupied with matters requiring immediate attention, chances are that they could care less. Thus the parable ends with a kind of uneasy draw.

These three who declined the invitation stands in sharp contrast to those whom the servant compelled. Despite being dragged to the banquet, they figured something like why not? At least we're guaranteed a free meal, rather a feast. If this is a parable about the kingdom of God, those to whom it's addressed they must have second thoughts about Jesus and his message. Being comprised of the religious establishment, it simply solidified their preconceptions about him. The same might apply to the disciples who aren't mentioned but presumed to be present. Some if not most perhaps felt embarrassed at being associated with Jesus, for what he says reflects upon them as well.

Vs. 25 has not just a crowd or *ochlos* accompanying Jesus but many, *polloi*. Obviously they weren't invited to the banquet but milled around outside the ruler's house waiting for Jesus to come out. You could almost say that they represent the rejects the servant had gone out to collect for the banquet, coming to Jesus on their own volition. The *archon* and his associates must have felt intimidated at this spontaneous assembly just outside and didn't know what to make of it. After all, it was pretty much equivalent to a mob which could get out of and at any moment.

So when Jesus did leave he apparently resumed moving towards Jerusalem. Somewhere along the way he turned to those following him, *strepho* inferring that he was in the lead. The assorted mass of people in tow must have followed Jesus gladly not unlike one big celebration that easily attracted attention. When the "great multitudes" as the **RSV** puts it saw Jesus turning to him—let's assume he was on an uphill slant as to Jerusalem—they expected some encouraging words. Instead, they were startled when he says that should anyone come to him *erchomai* plus *pros* inferring direction towards-which) and doesn't hate his close relatives including his own life (*psuche* also as soul), this person cannot be his disciple, *mathetes*. This word often refers to a student and perhaps not unlike one under the tutelage of a rabbi.

If such words cause the "great multitudes" dwindle, it gets worse. In vs. 27 Jesus speaks of the necessity of bearing one's cross, *bastazo* also as to sustain a burden. This too is a requisite of becoming a *mathetes*. What makes this so offensive is that the cross represents a painful form of public execution. Not only that, it is meted out by the dreadful Romans. Since Jesus and this vast multitude were headed toward Jerusalem, they must have passed or had seen nearby some unfortunates who had been crucified and were left hanging until their bodies were rotted away. Also some empty crosses may have been left in place, a cruel warning, if you will. This makes you wonder how many of the "great multitudes" were now left with Jesus. Although only those close to him could hear his words, nevertheless his message spread like

wildfire throughout them all. From his vantage point in front Jesus could see them melting away.

In vs. 28 Jesus switches gears and offers an example of building a tower, *oikodomeo*. To do so properly first of all involves having sufficient funds in order to see the task through to completion. To the verb *teleo* the preposition *ek-* or from is prefaced to it suggesting that this sound way is carried out. Jesus gives the example of the tower's foundation having been laid and nothing more. Passers by will take notice and mock the builder, *empaizo* also as to ridicule. Quickly news will get around that he's an unreliable builder unable to finish what he had undertaken. Such a builder would be out of work at once.

Jesus continues in vs. 31 with the same theme of the need for preparation, that is, a king about to go into battle against a force twice the size of his. Most likely he'll be unable to pull off a victory under these circumstances and therefore will be forced to send a delegation to sue for peace. And so Jesus concludes with the message of this parable saying that the chief qualification of being his disciple is to renounce all that he has, *apotasso* also as to set aside where the preposition *apo-* or from clearly suggests such renunciation. As for the possessions at hand, the preposition *hupo-* or under (*huparcho*) is suggestive of support from beneath. It seems that when a person realizes he's pressed up against a wall and has no escape, the only way out is to surrender. And so these words have a very practical application: life over what one has.

Jesus' final remarks in Chapter Fourteen have to do with the benefit of salt, important for a preservative. If salt loses its taste, it can't be restored, the verb *artuo* meaning to season or to add condiments. Thus it will be tossed out, *ekballo* which is reminiscent of Jesus' earlier words about those knocking at the door at night where the householder says that he does not know where those persons have come. A theme as to the possibility of being rejected is one theme that is starting to emerge in parables Jesus is using and will continue as such the closer Jesus comes to Jerusalem.

Chapter Fifteen

This new chapter grabs one's attention right away with mention of tax collectors and sinners, the two pretty much considered as one. The present participle of *eggizo* or to draw near gives the impression of a continuous coming to Jesus for the purpose of hearing him, not for healing. Use of the noun *hamartolos* or sinner suggests such persons were known by the local community and therefore shunned just as much as those collecting taxes for Rome. Of the twelve disciples, Matthew must have had the greatest sympathy for this group, having been one himself. "Why do you eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?" That verse in 5.30 is just as applicable here as it was then. Typically as then the Pharisees and scribes murmured in

what seems a general sort of way. However, it's subdued while at the same time nasty by reason of the preposition *dia-* or through prefaced to the verbal root *gogguzo*. That verb minus *dia-* is in reference to the one in 5.30 as directed not to Jesus but to his disciples.

In the verse at hand, the essence of this murmuring-through, if you will, is that Jesus first receives sinners and then eats with them. Note that they Pharisees and scribes don't refer to Jesus by his proper name but by the belittling phrase "this man." As for the two verbs *prosdechomai* and *sunesthio*, the respective prepositions prefaced to them are *pros-* and *sun-*. The former involves direction towards which infers immediacy and *sun-* or with which follows this *pros-*. Inferred is an interlude, of Jesus first receiving sinners (tax collectors aren't explicitly mentioned) followed by eating with them. Compare this meal with Jesus on two earlier occasions having been invited to dine with the Pharisees. Which, if you will, are the sinners?

When in such a situation Jesus decides upon using a parable, *pros autous* or "to (the directness of *pros* inferred) them" as found in vs. 3. Though not specified, we can assume Jesus means the Pharisees and scribes, he saying this in the company of tax collectors and sinners. As for the parable, Jesus speaks of a shepherd who leaves his flock of ninety-nine sheep in search of just one. He puts it not unlike a challenge, "What man of you?" Surely not one who heard these words would identify with the shepherd, thinking him crazy for having abandoned his entire flock for one measly sheep. Jesus interjects some drama by saying that the shepherd leaves the flock in the wilderness or *eremos* or in utter desolation.

Upon finding the lost sheep...and this most likely is due to sheer luck...the shepherd returns with it on his shoulders rejoicing, *chairo* suggestive of prolonged gladness. Jesus says nothing of the ninety-nine sheep who hadn't strayed. Chances are as soon as their heard their master approaching, they could detect his gladness and see their lost cousin draped around his shoulder. It'd come as no surprise that some of the them were jealous, even angry. After all, the shepherd did leave them the in the wilderness meaning they could have been eaten by a pack of wolves or the like. Enter a similarity with the parable of the prodigal son which comes shortly. The elder son is full of resentment upon the return of his brother and the attention showered upon him. Now multiply that by perhaps not ninety-nine but a good number of them.

Jesus doesn't stop here but rubs it in by saying in vs. 6 that the shepherd summons all his friends and neighbors to rejoice with him, the verb *chairo* again but here prefaced with the preposition *sug-* or with. If this were real life, those summoned by the man would think him a bit off his rocker due to just one sheep as noted two paragraphs above. Such was what the Pharisees and scribes must have thought of Jesus. Anyway, he continues with the somewhat ominous words "I tell you" followed by what this parable means. There will be more joy or *chara* (from the root *chairo*) in heaven over one sinner who repents than ninety-nine who are righteous and have no need for repentance. In other words, at issue is *metanoia*, the noun and the verb being used here. Thus the ninety-nine are already in heaven, not angels, for they are identified as being righteous, *dikaios*. Unlike the elder son of the parable and some of the

ninety-nine sheep, they manifest neither jealousy nor resentment. Such is what it is like to be *dikaios*.

Vs. 8 begins with *he tis*, “or what,” which shows that Jesus isn’t finished and wishes to make a connection with the parable he just spelled out and another one which is much shorter. In this instance a woman has ten drachma, each one equivalent to a day’s wage for a laborer. That means in her possession are ten days worth of work, well over one full week. Upon losing one drachma this woman lights a lamp, sweeps the house and seeks with all diligence until she finds it. The adverb *epimelos* can also be rendered as carefully. Having lost one day’s worth of work is a big deal, this indicated by the preposition *epi-* or upon used for emphasis with regard to what can be taken as the verbal root *melo*, to be the object of care. Like the shepherd, she summon her friends and neighbors to celebrate with her, *sugchairo*. Again, those who did come must have thought she went a bit overboard but nevertheless were glad for her. And so there is joy or *chara* before God’s angels over one sinner who repents, *metanoeo* again being the theme of this parable. Note that the *chara* at hand is before God which could infer the presence of those who are righteous as in vs. 7. If so, the assembly is doubled...righteous persons plus angels.

Vs. 11 begins an extended parable about the prodigal son and continues to the end of this chapter. Already as noted we got a preview of what’s involved in the two parables about the lost sheep and lost coin. Now this subject of lost-ness is magnified which means that for Jesus it is ultra-important. Because of this, the parable is outlined as follows instead of the usual way of going through a text and making notations. Such notations, of course, are included:

The parable starts out poetically enough to grab one’s attention with the conjunction *de* rendered as “and” followed by “he said.” Again, the Pharisees and scribes along with tax collectors and sinners are presumed to be the primary listeners, they hearkening back to vs. 1 of this chapter. Thus we have two major groups very different from each other. At a glance and anticipating the outcome of this parable, the Pharisees and scribes could be identified with the elder brother whereas the tax collectors and sinners can be represented by the prodigal son. And so the two are seated opposite each other, if you will, awaiting the parable’s outcome but from what they know about Jesus, they could intimate what it will be.

Vs. 12 sets the stage by introducing a father with two sons. Then in the next verse, the younger son addresses his father in a demanding sort of way. He asks (*dos moi*, ‘give to me’) for the share of the property coming to him, the present participle *epiballo* literally as this share falling upon him. As for the share or *meros* (also as part), he being the younger will receive less than his elder brother. He realizes this yet persists in his demand. For him it’s better than being in what he perceives as an intolerable situation. There might be some truth to this because later the elder son rips into his father for having shown such generosity toward his younger brother, proneness to such resentment unfortunately being part of his character.

Without hesitation or with asking for an explanation, the father gives in to this demand or *dos moi* as in the last paragraph. This is not a sign of weakness but done with the hope some good eventually will come of it. The verb *diaireo* or to divide is used (*dia-* or through prefaced to *haireo*, to take as for oneself) with *bios*, literally as life but here is more as what constitutes a mode of life or the inheritance that's due. Nothing is said with regard to the elder brother's *bios* which as noted and according to law, was more substantial. He must have been surprised at this sudden division, figuring that it would take place only upon the death of their father. And so the seeds of resentment towards the younger brother were planted early on.

Vs. 13 continues the story-like quality of this parable by the words "not many days later." Apparently the young son took some time preparing where he was going and what he intended to do with his *meros* or share. All the while he was under the menacing gaze of his elder brother as well as other members of the household, especially the mother who isn't mentioned throughout the parable. They knew something was up and it wasn't good. As for the elder brother, he must have breathed a sigh of relief when his younger brother departed.

This son finally takes his leave after gathering all he had and stealthily makes his way to a far off country. His desire to be done with it and not been given to date yet becomes clearer through the verb *apodomeo*, literally to be from one's home. This is followed by the preposition *eis* or into a land described as *makros* distant as well as long. Obviously this infers a long journey. *Apodomeo* is important insofar as it hints at a some kind of dissatisfaction at home, obviously with the father and brother, and the need to get away from it. On top of it, the not mentioned mother must have been suffering in the background more than the others.

Once in that distant place at once he squanders what's described as his property, *diaskorpizo* literally as to scatter through his *ousia* or very substance, this noun standing in for his *bios* as in vs. 12. As for the scattering-through, it's on living in a manner which is *asotos* or in a wasteful manner, this adverb being left up to one's imagination.

In vs. 14 the younger brother squanders all that he has or that *meros* or part with regard to his *ousia* or very essence which was part of the Father's living or *bios* noted in vs. 12. All three terms are mentioned in order to show the extreme condition he got into represented by the verb *dapanao* or to use up all the resources at one's disposal. On top of it, the country in which he was in...keeping in mind that it's far off or *makros* as in vs. 13...really hit him hard, *hustereo* meaning to give out completely. Thus we can line up the following which conspire against this brother: *apodomeo*->*makros*->*diaskorpizo*->*asotos*->*dapanao*->*hustereo* or to be far from home->far->to scatter->in a wasteful manner->to squander->to give out.

Vs. 15 begins with the conjunctive *kai* translated as "so" which reveals the son's desperation and need to do something about it at once. As a further sign of his desperation, the person to whom he went for help assigned him to care for his herd of swine, anathema for a Jew. Chances are this man knew the younger son was a Jew and wanted to humiliate him.

The son did accept the job despite the disgrace involved and wasn't even allowed to eat the food given to the swine. In other words, the third step down in his humiliation.

This third humiliation was the turning point. In vs. 17 the son came to his senses which reads literally as "coming into himself." Then and there he recalled how well his father treats his hired servants with more to spare while he's perishing from hunger in a far off land. Not only that, those around him couldn't care less.

In vs. 18 the younger son gets up sufficient strength to make the journey home, this coming straight from memories of how well he had had it back home and left at once. Obviously the trip back was long, again he being in a far off country. Nevertheless, the determination to return provided the necessary strength for the perils of the journey. The source for this strength? Admission of having sinned both against heaven and his father. Instead of being treated as a son, he'll ask to be numbered among his father's servants. *Misthios* is the word here, one who is hired compared with *doulos*, servant or slave, and the same word in vs. 17 when the son recalled how well his father had treated them. In other words, the son is thinking that to be reduced to that status would be a huge benefit compared to where he had been.

Vs. 20 has the son first arising which means he has made the decision to return followed by his father seeing him from a distance. Though the son was en route from a far off land, the father had the uncanny ability to see (*eido*, also to perceive) far off. In fact, he was able to keep track of him the moment he rose up to leave, *anisthemi*. What is the source of the father's unusual insight? Actually it is his love or as the verb *splagchnizomai* has it, to be moved right from one's bowels. Such deep perception can extend anywhere, so the element of distance is of no issue. That infers that the father ran, *trecho* implying that he make a rush, this emphasized that there's no preposition involved such as *pros*. This rush is followed immediately by the father embracing and kissing his son. Note the two prepositions prefaced to the two verbs at hand, *epi-* and *kata-*, upon and down: *pipto* and *phileo* or to fall and to show affection. Apparently the elder son was unaware of all this; he doesn't come on the scene until vs. 25, having been out in the field.

Vs. 21 sounds like the son may have rehearsed his words well before returning. However, the father's ability to see, have compassion, run, embrace and to kiss at a distance precluded this. In other words, it came straight from the heart or as *splagchnizomai* infers, straight from the bowels. Instead of listening to his son blab on about being not worthy (*axios*)...after all, he had expected that...the father ordered his servants to prepare fine garments and food with the same swiftness that he had just shown from at a distance.

Vs. 23 sums up the situation with the verb *euphraino* or to make merry or to be glad, the prefixed *eu-* being the adverbial form of *agathos* or good. The father makes quite a show of his son to all at the celebration, telling that he had once been dead but now is both alive

once more and is found, *anazao* and *heurisko*. Actually everyone, especially the son, knew it was the father who was responsible for both, so the celebration in reality is more about him.

Vs. 25 signals a shift in this parable by the small conjunctive *de* translated here as “now.” The character who had been missing all along but lurking in the background by reason of having mentioned him briefly in vs. 11 is the elder son. Here he’s presented as being out in the field unaware of all that had just happened. Actually he was doing his very best as elder son but must have held a deep anger toward his wayward brother since he had bolted. The same applied to his father who unquestioningly gave him his part of the inheritance. From a distance in the field the elder son heard the celebration and asked one of the servants what was going on. And so he told the elder son which enraged him, refusing to go inside.

Perhaps the same servant told the father about his elder son pouting and refusing to join the celebration, vs. 28 having the verb *orgizo* or to be angry. Despite the entreaties or literally summoning beside (*para +kaleo*) him, the son came off with an extended rant. He went on about having served his father yet never received recognition.

After having listened patiently to his elder son go about “this son of yours” which was a slap in the face, the father retains his composure and says that he’s always with him and that both of them share all things.

The conclusion of the parable? The father uses indirect words so as not to make the situation worse by starting off with “it is fitting” or *edei* also as it is necessary. Then he adds that such a situation demanded a celebration, *euphraino* as in vs. 23. The father adds the words “your brother” to counter “this son of yours” which must have angered the son even more before saying that he had been dead and is not alive, this equivalent to being lost but now found. Thus the parable ends in an unresolved manner, leaving Jesus’ listeners hanging as to whom they could identify: the father? The prodigal son? The elder son?

Chapter Sixteen

This chapter begins with two conjunctives, *de* and *kai*, which together are rendered as “also” after Jesus had presented the extended parable of the prodigal son. According to the first two verses of the previous chapter, that had been addressed to tax collectors, sinners and Pharisees whereas here Jesus presents another parable but for his disciples. The two groups are quite dissimilar which implies that there was an unspecified time interval between the two events. However, both are connected by *de* and *kai*.

Because the parable of the dishonest steward is fairly long, running through vs. 9, it will be outlined in accord with that of the prodigal son above:

A rich man had a steward or *oikonomos* which as in 12.42 consists of *oikos* + *nemo* or house + to distribute. In other words, this person held an important position especially since his master was so wealthy. However, some under his authority brought charges against him, *diaballo* literally as to cast through. This consists in the supposed waste of goods at his disposal, another verb prefaced with the preposition *dia-*, *diaskorpizo* or to scatter, disperse. It pertains to *ta huparchonta*, the present participle of *huparcho* or to be at one's disposal. In light of the verb's fundamental meaning such an accusation suggests that the steward secretly distributed his master's goods to those whom he knew, that is, family members and friends.

In vs. 2 the rich man summoned his steward, obviously upset about the allegations and demanding to turn in an account of his stewardship. The verb is *apodidomi* along with *logos* or to give back a word with regard to his office from which he's being dismissed. Because the steward gives no response the assumption is that clearly he was guilty while at the same time had the courage not to contest the accusation. Perhaps he figured this dismal, difficult as it was to accept, could have been worse. His master could have either executed him or sent him off to prison. Indeed, he got off lightly despite admitting to himself that he's at a complete loss as how to earn a living.

In vs. 4 the steward comes to a conclusion, *ginosko* or to know here as a kind of eureka moment. Note that he experiences this while still employed ('when I am put out of the stewardship'). Obviously he's thinking of himself so that other people will receive him into their homes. Such wording infers that the steward is not married and apart from being associated with his master, is quite desperate with no family members on whom to rely for support.

Wisely the steward seeks to make amends keeping in mind that he had squandered his master's goods. On two occasions he summoned those in debt to the same master and reduced their respective debts. Because these two were former employees and perhaps even were among those who had accused the steward, word as to the drastic reduction of debts certainly got back to the rich man. Such was the shrewdness of the steward.

In vs. 8 the master or *kurios* got word of all this and commended his steward, calling him unjust or *adikia* which is a noun rendered vividly as "steward of injustice." Again, keep in mind that according to vs. 4 he still seems to be in office. As for the praise offered, the verb is *epaino* and done in an intense fashion by reason of the preposition *epi-* or upon. He did this in recognition of the servant's prudence which is rendered by the verb *poieo* (to do, to make) and the adverb *phronimos* or that which is done with insight. In other words, the master saw in the steward a lot of what he sees in himself which is why the two got along so well before the scandal arose. It also bodes well for reconciliation.

And so the master concludes with the observation that the steward is typical of the current age or *aion* being a period of time. In other words, he's wiser than those who are sons of light or *phos* and do not belong to this *aion*. Technically speaking the parable ends here,

again with the steward apparently not having yet been fired. Perhaps the master decides to retain him of which nothing is said, this leaving us hanging as to his fate.

In vs. 9 Jesus uses the familiar expression “And I tell you” which translates as pay attention. He urges his disciples to whom this parable is addressed to make friends for their own advantage (‘make friends for yourselves’), giving the example of unrighteous mammon. *Philos* and *mamonas* are usually opposite each other but as in the case at hand, both can have a utilitarian value, the latter more along the lines of wealth as well as property. However, *mamonas* here is rendered as associated with injustice, *adikia*. That means invariably it’s bound to fail for one reason or another and thus lacks stability. Because of this, supposedly the friends made through such mammon will receive you in your destitution or into literally the tent (*skene*) described as *aionios* or everlasting. Implied is that those with whom the steward is dealing have access to a place infinitely better than the household over which he is still apparently in charge. In other words, such persons are indeed extraordinary and even may be angels. And so the cunning-ness of the steward is associated with these special people (or angels). The two know it and act accordingly.

The parable comes to a conclusion in vs. 9, and from vs. 10 through vs. 13 Jesus proceeds to spell out a lesson from what he had just presented to his disciples. Two pairs of two opposites: first one who is faithful or *pistos* in very little things then advances to being as *pistos* in many things, *elachistos* and *polus*. The same pattern follow with regard to being dishonest, *adikos* also as crooked. Keeping in mind this issue of *pistos* and *adikos* (faithful and dishonest) in little as well as in many things, in vs. 9 Jesus shifts to not being faithful when it comes to unrighteous mammon or *adikos*. Failure here will become known to other persons who as a result will be reluctant to entrust true riches, the verb *pisteuo* or to have faith in that which is *alethinos* or true. The same applies with regard to what belongs to another person.

Jesus draws a conclusion when it’s a question of reliability whether in good things or in bad. Vs. 13 says that no servant or *oiketes*, often a household domestic or slave, is able to serve two masters, the verb being *douleo* which connotes functioning as a slave. He either hates one or loves the other, that is, *miseo* or *agapao* (also to despise and to have *agape*). Another way of putting it in this same verse is that he’ll either be devoted to one or despise the other, that is, *antecho* and *kataphroneo*: the former as to have a strong attachment and that latter to look with contempt (*kata-* or down). The conclusion? A person cannot serve God and mammon together, the verb *douleo* being used once again. Although Jesus doesn’t say it, the choice is stark and needs to be made.

Vs. 14 brings in the Pharisees last mentioned at the beginning of Chapter Fifteen. For a chapter and a half they are silent but ever hovering in the background waiting to pounce. The verse at hand says that they had heard what Jesus was speaking to the disciples which at first seems to be in private. However, Jesus may have out in the open with people milling all around while the Pharisees kept their ears focused as much as possible on the conversation. The disciples could see this which obviously made them quite uncomfortable. In other words,

they were taking notes to use against him at an opportune time. Luke is careful to equate the Pharisees with lovers of money, *philarguros*, the first part of this word being *philos* or to be a friend which intimates a more intimate relationship with money, one that's almost personal but in a negative way. Their response to Jesus' words about mammon? Scoffing or *ekmukterizo* also as to sneer where the preposition *ek-* or from serves to intensify this word's meaning.

Vs. 15 has Jesus simply turning toward these Pharisees whose very faces revealed intense disdain and counters their scoffing with "you are those who justify yourselves before men," *dikaioo*. It's as though he's fitting them in with a larger category of the same type and, in a word, is a way of putting them in their rightful place. God, however, knows the hearts of such people, *ginosko* and *kardia*. Jesus proceeds to shut them down by saying that what's exalted among men is an abomination before God. That is, *hpselos* = *bdelugma* or that which is loathsome. Chances are he is referring to mammon as in the recent parable. To such harsh words the Pharisees give no response. Perhaps by now they've figured it's best to remain silent, knowing that time is on their side for taking down Jesus.

Note that vs. 16 has the Law (*Nomos* = *Torah*) and prophets being its existence until John, *mechri* also as a given point but lacks a verb which suggests that despite the difference at hand, both are as two halves forming a whole. When these two halves meet John, they move into different territory, if you will, signaled by the phrase *apo tote* or "since then." That new territory is the preaching of the kingdom of God, *euaggelizo* prefaced with *eu-*, the adverbial form of *agathos* or good. However, Jesus tacks on a caveat of sorts, that those who enter this *basileia* do so violently, the verb *biazo* which is suggestive of force. Perhaps this strong word is in reference to all the people who've followed Jesus and are eager to partake of what he is preaching. With this in mind, the idea is of jostling one's way into this *basileia*. However, as things turn out in reality, this number is drastically reduced.

Jesus contrasts this *biazo* with a view concerning the Law or *Torah* which makes perfect sense when keeping in mind the reverence with which it has been maintained and passed on from one generation to the next. Reference is to one dot of *Torah*, *keraiá* fundamentally something shaped like a hook and referring to the letter *yod*, smallest of the Hebrew alphabet. In other words, it's easier (*eukopos*: *eu-* + *kopos*, toil, trouble) for both the massive heaven and earth to pass away in comparison with this tiniest of letters, *parerchomai* suggestive of leaving by the side, *para-*. While on the face of it, an exaggeration but in reality quite true when it comes to a reverential reading of *Torah* as *lectio divina* as it has been held throughout the centuries.

Vs. 18 contains a statement by Jesus which seems to come out of the clear blue in light of what had just been said. He brings up the subject of divorce which is equivalent to adultery, *moicheuo* being the verb. It's divided into two parts, if you will: divorce with regard to one's wife and marrying a woman divorced from her husband. Perhaps the sharp, un-compromising

nature of instances tie in with the similar un-compromising nature of Jesus' words with regard to entering the kingdom violently and the superiority of one dot or *keraiá* over heaven and earth. Also it's a question of showing the superiority of the kingdom of God over the Law and the prophets which remains in effect up to John. Nevertheless, from the point of view of *lectio divina* the pair as noted in vs. 16, *mechri* and *apo tote...* "until" and "since then"...do not necessarily mean a break but represent a shift where the former is carried over into and with the latter. In this way perhaps the adverb rendered by the verb *biazo* as violently can apply here.

In vs. 19 Jesus at once launches into a parable, the rich man and Lazarus, and continues to the conclusion of Chapter Sixteen. Though the audience to which it's directed isn't mentioned, by reason of the rich man we can assume it's for the Pharisees "who were lovers of money" [vs. 14]. As with the two other lengthy parables, the one at hand will be outlined as follows:

-Rich man or *plousios* made all the more conspicuous and deliberate by his rich clothing and delight in rich food not just occasionally but daily, *euphraino* meaning to gladden or to cheer. This very word with regard to his clothing and eating habits show how small-minded he is despite his wealth.

-In contrast to the rich man, vs. 20 presents a poor man (*ptochos*) by the name of Lazarus who has taken up residence at the gate of the former's house. The preposition *pros* is used, indicative of leaning if not pressing against this gate which adds to a description of his plight. He has a proper name whereas the rich man does not. This in itself is worth mentioning. Not only is Lazarus poor but is covered with sores, *helkoo*. If it were leprosy most likely Jesus would have mentioned it, that being just about the most fearful disease of the time. If it were leprosy, Lazarus certainly would not be there.

-From his position *pros* the gate, Lazarus yearned to have any scraps of food that fell from the rich man's table. The verbs *epithumeo* fits in well here, to have *thumos* or intense desire made even more so by the preposition *epi-* or upon prefaced to it. It reflects the other verb, *chortazo* or to fill with food. This yearning has nothing to do with him asking for anything to eat. Perhaps Lazarus caught a glimpse of the rich man here and there or heard talk about it from his friends who were coming and going. Of course, they completely ignored Lazarus. At the same time, dogs were licking Lazarus' sores, *helkos* also as ulcer and from the verbal root *helkoo* of vs. 20. Practically speaking you can't help but wonder why the rich man put up with such a fellow just outside his home.

In vs. 22 Lazarus died and was carried away (*apophero*) by angels to the bosom of Abraham, *kolpos* also as breast or chest. It's no surprise that Jesus mentions Abraham, he being "the father of a multitude of nations" [Gn 17.4], the one to whom Lazarus goes. At the same time the rich man dies and went straight to Hades. There he was in torment, *huparcho*

literally as to begin from under which suggests that immediately he underwent *basanos* which is in the plural and suggestive not just of continuous torment but a variety of them.

The rich man is described first as lifting his eyes which means he was so taken up with his afflictions that barely he noticed anything else. When he does manage momentarily to see something outside his current torments, his eyes catch sight of Abraham and Lazarus in his bosom finally at rest. Note that the two are not just in different states but *makrothen* or far off suggestive of this yet at the same time having the ability to communicate with each other.

In vs. 24 the rich man called out to Abraham asking that he have mercy upon him, *eleao*. He puts his request in the most pitiful way possible, that is, to have Lazarus dip a finger in water and put it on his tongue, nothing more. Contrast this drop with the anguish or *oduno* he's experiencing through flames, *phlox* also being a flash and symbolic of intensity.

-In vs. 25 Abraham responds, worsening the torment of the rich man just by calling him "son." He reminded him that while alive he enjoyed good things (*agathos*) compared with Lazarus who got the short end, *kakos* or evil. Such remembrance consists of the smallest interval of time, for as soon as the rich man died, he ended up in torment. That two is a chasm as the one about to be described in 26. While the rich man is in anguish, Lazarus is comforted. Thus we have a contrast between *parakaleo* (literally to summon beside, *para-*) and *oduno* as in vs. 24. So while this dialogue between Abraham and the rich man is going on, Lazarus is sitting pretty in the bosom of Abraham.

Lazarus isn't gloating over the fact that now he's taken care of for all eternity while the rich man is in anguish. Chances are the rich man either didn't know about Lazarus at his gate or barely noticed him. Such people tended to come and go, depending on the generosity at hand. Abraham continues by telling the rich man that a great chasm has been established preventing any movement from one side to another. As for this chasm or *chasma*, it is infinitely deep while at the same time infinitely close. That's why the rich man and Abraham could speak with each other. Just attempting to get close to the edge of this chasm is a sufficient barrier.

In vs. 27 the rich man begs Abraham to send Lazarus literally into the house of his father to warn his five brothers, *diamarturomai* being the verb, the root fundamentally as to give witness and the preposition *dia-* or through to convey urgency. Interestingly the rich man completely forgot that Lazarus had been stationed outside his house; now he wishes him to enter. In the meanwhile Lazarus is not deaf to all this but simply looking on in a way not unlike he had done so for so long at the rich man's gate. In the meantime the two men couldn't help but not take their eyes off that enormously deep yet at the same enormously narrow chasm between them. As for the rich man's plea to have his brother avoid his fate, the preposition *eis* or into with regard to the place of torment or *basanos* is the exact opposite *eis* with regard to Lazarus going to his house.

In vs. 29 Abraham responds without any air of condemnation nor pity but tells it like it is, namely, the five brothers as well as anyone else have both Moses and the prophets. It's up to them to listen to them, *akouo*. That means, of course, the totality of the Hebrew scriptures.

The rich man vigorously counters Abraham's warning by saying that should someone from the dead go to them, they will repent, *metanoeo*. On the surface, a valid argument given the situation at hand. However, as Abraham says afterwards, Moses and the prophets are more than sufficient witness. Not listening to them is equivalent to not being convinced by anything a person from the dead would say, *peitho* meaning to persuade. He or she would be just like Lazarus at the gate, completely ignored.

And so ends Chapter Sixteen. The rich man continues in his state of torment made all the worse by the nature of that chasm both separating and uniting him with regard to Abraham and Lazarus. Though it isn't mentioned, chances are the worse part about rich man's torment is by reason of this closeness he can never escape the presence not so much of Abraham but of Lazarus resting in the patriarch's bosom. It made him think of how Lazarus had spend so many years outside the gate of his house, again so close yet so far apart.

Chapter Seventeen

This new chapter begins with the conjunctive *de* translated as "and" where Jesus continues to speak with his disciples as noted in vs. 1 of the previous chapter. In this instance the connecting nature of the conjunctive is emphasized, if you will, by the preposition *pros* (i.e., 'to') which is indicative of directness concerning speech. Right away it serves to introduce *anendekton* in the neuter. It can be rendered as something like "it is impossible or inadmissible" with regard to *skandalon* or stumbling and the negative of the verb *erchomai* or to come. In other words, Jesus is saying that stumbling is inescapable and that the disciples should expect it. With that in mind, there's a need to watch one's step, of where one is going so as to avoid such occasions. In the positive sense, stumbling does necessarily mean a fall; a person can catch him or herself before it happens.

In the same breath Jesus comes off with *ouai* or woe, a strong type of warning here applicable to anyone who puts a *skandalon* in the way. The image is that of a person stealthily either making the path unstable or by placing obstacles on it to trip up a passer-by. A better fate for such a devious person would to have a millstone hung around his neck and be cast into the sea. Such is what will happen to anyone who causes a little one to fall into sin. The adjective *mikros* also means small and most likely refers to those who are humble and receptive to Jesus' teaching. Obviously the scribes and Pharisees as presented in the Gospel don't fit this category. Perhaps Jesus has them in mind while saying this. The verb *rhipto* is especially

strong, to be thrown vehemently not to mention the dead-weight of a *mulikos* or millstone. Taken literally, to cast such an object as this requires super-human strength.

The first two words of vs. 3 can be taken as a sentence, the verb *prosecho* literally as to have to oneself. This watching directed towards (that is, *pros-*) oneself, if you will, is a prerequisite for what Jesus is about to say when speaking of a brother or *adelphos* who sins, a word suggestive of the fellowship of believers seminally present but destined to come to full flower with the emergence of the church.

Jesus brings this one step further when a brother sins, making it more personal by reason of his sin being against “you,” the disciples at hand and by inference, those whom they will teach later on. He ramps it up with this sin being committed seven times “in the day.” Taking this perhaps to the extreme we have the preposition *eis* or “sins into you.” Obviously the number seven has special significance by reason of its association with sacredness. Perhaps one way of understanding this is that when someone sins against us, the impart can be reduced provided we remember the sacredness associated with the Lord’s day of rest recounted in Genesis.

Such recollection of a sacred time can go a long way to mitigating the sin when it hits us, all the more personal as from a brother. Thus it’s easier to forgive him when he expresses his desire to repent seven times a day. The verbs here are *epistrepho* or to turn upon and *metanoeo*. Jesus seems to be implying that this example of forgiveness...*aphiemi*...is not just for one given calendar day but as a state of mind transcending time. Again, this makes something against the grain of human nature that much easier to swallow and has a liberating effect. By way of summary, the sequence presented here is as follows: *hamartano*->*epitima*->*metanoeo*->*aphiemi* or sin->rebuke->repent->forgive, also as to release which culminates this fourfold sequence.

Vs. 5 mentions the word apostle for the first time since 9.10 though it’s found in 11.49 generically speaking. Just reading the verse at hand comes across as a spontaneous cry from the heart, namely, that Jesus increase their faith, *prostithemi* literally as to place towards or in the direction of, yet another example of the directness of the preposition *pros*. Apparently the apostles were so taken by surprise by Jesus’ earlier words that this was the only thing they could utter. Jesus recognized this, of course, which is why he seizes the opportunity to speak of faith in terms of a mustard seed...the smallest of them all...which could tell a sycamine (mulberry) tree to be uprooted and be planted in the sea. And so the smallest entity can command the largest which obeys at once, the verb being *hupakouo* also as to answer or literally, to listen as from under, *hupo-* suggestive of close attention.

Vs. 7 moves onto what the **RSV** calls a “saying” of Jesus again directed to the apostles where he puts forth two rhetorical questions. Here they pertain to a servant (*doulos*, again also as slave) who has been engaged in rigorous work out in the field. Upon finishing that work, he’s expected to prepare supper for his master after which he can take his own meal. Obviously he doesn’t expect to be thanked for this service, *doulos* implying ownership of a person who’s treated as a thing. In other words, Jesus presents a commonly accepted practice at the time. That’s why in vs. 10 he tells the apostles that upon completion of what they’ve been commanded (*diatasso*, to arrange thoroughly, hence the *dia-*), their only claim is that they are unworthy servants, having done their duty and nothing else. The adjective at hand here is *acheios* also as useless, alpha privative of *chreos* or that which needs to be done. Unfortunately there’s no response from the apostles, that being left up in the air. However, they continued to remain with Jesus.

Vs. 11 picks up where 13.22 left off, that is, Jesus making his way to Jerusalem and thus drawing closer to the fate awaiting him. Upon reaching one village which goes unnamed, Jesus meets ten lepers. As customary with such a dreaded disease, they stood some distance from him (*porrothen*) yet recognized him at once and cried out for mercy, *eleao*. This infers that word about Jesus had gone before him. All he did was to tell the ten lepers to show (*epideiknumi*) themselves to the priests, nothing more. In other words, no physical contact. The ten did as they were told, perhaps disappointed that Jesus hadn’t cured them on the spot. Given their desperate situation, they went off to the nearest priests. Why not? They had nothing to lose. Then suddenly along the way they found themselves healed.

As for this *epideiknumi*, refer to 5.14 where Jesus heals one leper by actually touching him. It was after this cure that he bids the leper to show himself to the priest, *deiknumi* without the preposition *epi-* prefaced to it. All this is in accord with Chapter Fourteen of Leviticus noted in that earlier incident. It seems the single leper was cured in “one of the cities” [5.12] which perhaps was in the vicinity of Lake Gennesaret (cf. 5.1) whereas in the situation at hand the ten are located between Samaria and Galilee. Nevertheless, was the priest who had received the first leper present but this time with his fellow ministers? Obviously he was astounded upon having encountered the first leper who must have informed him about Jesus. So if that priest was among the others, it’s easy to imagine his extreme astonishment when the nine cured lepers arrived at the doorstep. Will there be more coming to make an offering, he thought? If Jesus had done this as it seemed, chances are this priest and perhaps others with him may have went off at once to follow him.

This is jumping ahead a bit, for when one of the ten lepers discovered that he was healed, he stopped dead in his tracks and without notifying the others who were similarly healed, rushed back to Jesus continuously praising (*doxazo*, also to glorify) God with a loud voice. The others

must have looked at him, thinking he was out of his mind, not fulfilling what Jesus had commanded them. When he came upon Jesus he fell down with gratitude at his feet, *eucharisteo*. This verb consists of the root *charizomai*, to say or do something favorable which is prefaced with *eu-*, the adverbial form of *agathos* or good. The other nine obviously were grateful. Who wouldn't after having been cured of leprosy? Nevertheless, by showing themselves to the priests they fulfilled what Jesus had commanded them in accord with Leviticus. And so this incident leaves two choices with regard to healing from the dreaded disease of leprosy. One returned to Jesus with gratitude and the nine proceeded to fulfill the law as in Leviticus. So in a way we have a tie.

Vs. 16 contains the simple but telling sentence with regard to the one leper, "Now (*kai*) he was a Samaritan." This, of course, grabs everyone's attention and situates the incident in a context Jesus and those with him can't help but notice, almost glaringly so. Jesus said publicly what was on everyone's mind, asking the whereabouts of the other nine who had been cured. He then contrasts the Samaritan not simply as a foreigner (*allogenes*) but as "this foreigner." It must have created a somewhat embarrassing moment, singling out one Samaritan in contrast to nine Jews. Jesus doesn't allow the situation to get out of hand. All he does is tell him to rise and go his way. The Samaritan's faith had made him well, *sozo* also as to save. Although he did so, chances are later he decided to follow Jesus and after Pentecost was one of the first members of the newly formed *ekklesia* or church. Hopefully the nine Israelites decided to follow as well.

Vs. 20 shifts back to the Pharisees at perhaps a later time who ask Jesus when the kingdom of God was coming. They wanted a clear-cut answer most likely within a political context which would make it more easy to ensnare Jesus. As usual, he answered deftly, that the kingdom or *basileia* of God is not coming (the common verb *erchomai*) as the Pharisees had intimated, that is, with observable signs or *parateresis*. This word differs from the more common *semeion*. It suggests keeping an eye on something (*tereo*, to watch or to observe) while being situated close by or beside it, hence the *para-*. The same would apply should anyone try to point it out with words such as *idou* or *ekei* (behold, there). Then Jesus uses *idou* in another sense, to get the Pharisees' attention, by saying that the kingdom of God is already present or "in your midst," *entos* also as within or inside.

In vs. 22 the shift is to the disciples (i.e., not apostles as in vs. 5) but obviously the same men who had been accompanying Jesus. He brings up an issue that had been on their minds pretty much from the beginning, his ultimate fate and how they tie in with it. A time is coming which he puts in terms of days, suggestive of an extended period of time associated with *erchomai* or coming as noted in vs. 20 and the kingdom of God¹⁰. During that time the disciples (and

¹⁰ From this point on to the end of the chapter the word day or days (*hemera*) is mentioned ten times.

others) will desire to see (*horaos*) one of the just mentioned days associated with the Son of man but will not see it. The verb *epithumeo* connotes having *thumos* or intense desire made even more so by the preposition *epi-* or upon prefaced to it. Just as in vs. 21 people will say *idou* which here is coupled with *ekei* (behold and there).

Jesus warns his disciples neither to go nor to follow those making the claim to knowing when and where to see one of the days associated with the Son of man, *idou* and *ekei* being tied in with a specific place and time. The two verbs at hand are *aperchomai* and *dioko* or to go away and to pursue, both associated with physical movement. Instead, the way the Son of man will be seen is like lightning whose flashing lights up the sky from one end to the other. It runs literally as “from under heaven into under heaven.” Such phrasing suggests that the Son of man will take up all the space under heaven and thus cover the earth. This will be his day, *hemera* more as a *kairos* event. Not the absence of any word pertaining to the Son of man coming to do this. He is simply in that day, the verb *eimi* or to be.

Before this total filling which takes place under heaven, vs. 25 says that the Son of man must suffer many things and be rejected by the present generation, *pascho* and *apodokimazo*, the latter whose root means to examine, to test and is prefaced with the preposition *apo-*.

In vs. 26 Jesus elaborates on days of the Son of man, days as mentioned in vs. 22 paralleling them with the following two examples, Noah and Lot. With regard to the days of Noah, they refer to the way people were behaving at the time. Note *kathos* and *houtos*, as and so. The first pertains to the people just mentioned whereas the second refers to the future, the days of the Son of man. In between is the present time, if you will, which suggests that human activity in Noah’s day continues as it had been right into the present. In other words, there’s no real difference. Jesus doesn’t say anything negative about their activity, just that they were going about their everyday business.

Jesus omits but possibly infers the strong words of Gn 6.11 familiar to the disciples: “Now the earth was corrupt in God’s sight, and the earth will filled with violence.” Or as the next verse puts it more directly, “for all flesh has corrupted their way upon the earth.” The two Hebrew words are *shachat* (also for the two verses) and *chamas*, also to act wickedly, to ruin as well as a tearing away. What’s important for Jesus is that they were doing this until (*achri* or right up to) the day Noah entered the ark (*eiserchomai* with *eis*). In fact, they didn’t even notice that something strange was afoot. The Genesis text doesn’t speak of a specific day except in 6.22 when “Noah did this; he did all that God commanded him.” In other words, God waited until Noah finished building the ark and brought his family and all the pairs of animals into it before the waters of the flood came, *mabul* also a deluge. As for the people who had ignored Noah,

at the last minute they rushed to the ark begging to be admitted but were not. All Noah and those inside could do was listen to their pitiful screams and cries for mercy.

The second example relative to the days of the Son of man is in vs. 28 with regard to Lot, nephew of Abraham, and begins with *homoios kathos* or “likewise as it was.” These two words show the close connection between that time and the present. Here days don’t pertain to Lot proper but as with the case of Noah, persons described as going about their regular business. However, in this instance...Sodom...clearly the Lord was displeased and decided to destroy the city along with Gomorrah. However, the two angels as they are called in Gn 19.1 and vs. 15 who came to stay with Lot urged him to flee along with his family just before the Lord blotted it from the face of the earth. In sum, this example serves as a pattern summed up by *kata ta auta* literally as “according to these.” Reference is to the day when the Son of man is revealed, *apokalupto* fundamentally as to uncover, to uncover a reality that already is present yet not manifest.

Vs. 30 begins with another reference to day, again with regard to persons going about their regular business. When it comes they are not to dilly-dally or come up with excuses like Lot, “but I cannot flee to the hills lest the disaster overtake me and I die” [Gn 19.20]. Instead, Jesus bids his disciples to remember the wife of Lot who famously (or infamously) turned into a pillar of salt by looking back on the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah. She’s a lead-in to a warning with regard to gaining and losing one’s life or *psuche*, the two verbs being *zeteo* and *apollumi*, the latter fundamentally as to destroy. Should a person apply *apollumi* to his very *psuche*, he will preserve it, *zoogoneo* which is comprised of *zoe* and *gignomai*, life and to come into existence or to be born.

Jesus continues in vss. 34 and 35 where one person will be taken and the other left. Apparently the former or *paralambano*...to take to be beside (*para*-)...is preferable. Again, keep in mind the example of Lot’s wife who was left behind not alive but as a pillar of salt. With respect to these dramatic words the disciples naturally asked in the last verse of this chapter where these people are being taken. Jesus doesn’t say. Instead, he says that eagles will be gathered to where the body is, *aetos* also applicable to a vulture. As for the verb, it fits the image of a scavenging bird, *episunago* consisting of the root *ago* or to lead, to carry prefaced with the two prepositions *epi*- and *sun*-, upon and with.