

Piotr Blajer

Studium Biblicum Franciscanum (Jerusalem)

ORCID 0000-0001-8835-9357

The Usage of ἀνήρ [*anēr*] and ἄνθρωπος [*anthrōpos*] in the Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (Luke 8:26–39)

Abstract: The study takes into consideration the alternating usage of two nouns ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος in the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (Luke 8:26–39). The author briefly analyzes the use of those two nouns in the Gospel of Luke in order to find a logic behind the choices made by the evangelist. Both nouns are frequently used by Luke, and there are cases where he employs them as synonyms, although he displays a preference for the first at the expenses of the second. What at first may seem to be a haphazard usage of words and expressions, with no logic behind it, reveals itself to be a methodical and well-thought strategy to underline the impact of the encounter with Jesus on man’s live from now on. The use of rhetorical techniques such as *inclusio* in Luke 8:27 and 8:38 and repetition in Luke 8:29,33,35 awakes the audience’s alertness, serves to underscore the restored humanity of the once-demonized man and pinpoints the most important character of the narrative. The distinction between the two nouns ἀνήρ and ἄνθρωπος, as intended by the “beloved physician” Luke should, therefore, be preserved in modern translation of the Bible, which is not always the case.

Keywords: Luke’s vocabulary, Gerasene Demoniac, Gospel of Luke, narrative criticism

Introduction

All three Synoptics have the episode of the healing of demoniac in the region opposite Galilee (Matt 8:28–34; Mark 5:1–20; Luke 8:26–39).¹ The insertion of the passage in the Galilean section of the

¹ The actual place where Jesus journeyed and where he healed the demoniac is still disputed. The manuscripts are divided, whereas Γερασηνῶν has a major

Third Gospel is surprising, to say the least. It upsets an almost perfect *blueprint* on which Luke composed his two-volume work.

The plan of Luke-Acts, as we understand it today, is very precise. The story of Jesus' childhood (1:5–2:52) is followed by the period of preparation for the ministry (3:1–4:13) and leads to the itinerant ministry in Galilee (4:14–9:50). Jesus' long and meaningful journey to Jerusalem (9:51–19:46) culminates with his activity in the temple and in the holy city (19:47–21:38) and ends with the story of the passion, death, and resurrection (22:1–24:53). Luke concludes his Gospel with the ascension of Jesus and the return of the disciples to Jerusalem. In other words, the Gospel that begins in the temple of Jerusalem (1:8–9) with the announcement of the birth of John the Baptist finds its fulfillment in the same temple of Jerusalem (24:53), where the disciples of Jesus come together to glorify God. Their presence in Jerusalem and in the temple does not signal the end of the mission. In Jerusalem, the disciples are waiting to be filled with the power from above. Since the Gospel itself does not describe the mission to the Gentiles, such mission will be carried out later on by the apostles and described in the second volume of Luke's work.

Luke dedicates a lot of space to describe the actions of the apostles and their mission. It begins with the account of the Church of Jerusalem (Acts 1:6–5:42), and then moves on to the presentation of the first missions that eventually lead the preachers of the gospel from Jerusalem to Antioch (6:1–12:25). Subsequently, the missions of Paul will bring the message of salvation from Antioch to the people in Cyprus, Asia Minor, Greece (13:1–21:26) and finally to Rome (21:27–28:31). The mission of the apostles presented in the book of Acts is carried out in accordance with the command given to them by the Risen Lord "you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, throughout Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth" (Acts 1:8).

support (Ⲡ⁷⁵ B D latt sy^{hmg}) some other have the region of Γεργεσηνων (according to Ⲛ L Θ Ξ f¹ 33. 579. 700*. 1241) or the region of Γαδαρηνων (according to AW Ψ f¹³ ⲙ sy). Bruce M. Metzger (*Textual Commentary*, 121) notes that the reading Γερασηνων is preferred for the following reasons: a) it has a superior external attestation; b) the reading Γαδαρηνων could be a scribal assimilation to the text of Matthew; c) Γεργεσηνων is most likely correction proposed by Origen.

In his “orderly account” of Jesus’ public life, Luke avoids references to the pagan regions and to the mission of Jesus outside Palestine.² In fact, unlike Matt 16:13–20 and Mark 8:27–30, Luke 9:18–21 does not inform that Peter’s profession of faith took place in Caesarea Philippi. Likewise, he does not inform of Jesus’ journey to the region of Tyre and Sidon and of the healing of the daughter of a Greek woman, a Syrophoenician by birth (Matt 15:21–28 // Mark 7:24–30). Hence, it is startling at least, that Luke reports of Jesus’ mission in the pagan territory in the midst of the Galilean section as he ventures into the land opposite Galilee to heal a man possessed by a legion of demons. An attentive reader of the Gospel of Luke may find it surprising that Jesus does not welcome the exorcised man’s plea to let him follow his benefactor. Instead, he dismisses the man, tells him to go home and orders: “recount what God has done to you” (8:39). Such unexpected finale stands in apparent contrast to what Jesus said to a leper once he was cleansed of his infirmity – “he ordered him not to tell anyone” (5:14).

Rationale for the inclusion of this passage in the Galilean section or the “Messianic secret” aside, it is likewise surprising that Luke made at first glance some inexplicable alternations to the vocabulary when he adopted the episode of the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac from Mark.³ Such changes seem to have no logic at all. Within the

² Despite the attempts to avoid references to Jesus’ mission in the pagan region, the Third Gospel contain a series of episodes which foretell and anticipate the mission of the apostles among the Gentiles. For example, in Luke 6:17–18 a large crowd came to hear Jesus. In this crowd, there were people “from all Judea and Jerusalem and the coastal region of Tyre and Sidon.” The healing of the centurion’s servant in Luke 7:1–10 underscores the Roman officer’s incomparable faith and probably prepares for the account of the baptism of another centurion named Cornelius, a God-fearing man in Acts 10.

³ The author of this paper accepts and follows the “two source hypothesis” (the Gospel of Mark and the hypothetical source Q) to explain the synoptic problem. Although the hypothesis may not be wholly satisfactory as it, for example, fails to address the so-called *minor agreements*, it seems to be the best possible answer for the time being. For the synoptic problem and different attempts to solve it, see Reicke, *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels*; Stein, *The Synoptic Problem*; Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem*. For the so-called *minor agreements* see Neirynck, *The Minor Agreements*.

healing of the Gerasene Demoniac, Luke uses once ἀνὴρ (Luke 8:27) where Mark has ἄνθρωπος (Mark 5:2); once preserves ἄνθρωπος he inherits from his source (Mark 5:8 // Luke 8:29); once adds the noun ἄνθρωπος (Luke 8:33) which has no counterpart (see Mark 5:12); once uses ἄνθρωπος (Luke 8:35) for τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον (Mark 5:15) and once uses ἀνὴρ (Luke 8:38) for ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς (Mark 5:18). To complete the whole picture, it is necessary to add that Luke once uses a participle ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς (Luke 8:36) where Mark has τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ (Mark 5:16). The following table illustrates the above-mentioned differences that exist between the two Gospels.⁴

Mark	Luke
ἄνθρωπος (5:1)	ἀνὴρ τις (8:27)
τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (5:8)	ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (8:29)
	ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (8:33)
τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον (5:15)	τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν (8:35)
τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ (5:16)	ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς (8:36)
ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς (5:18)	ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ' οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια (8:38)

⁴ Modern translations often make no distinction between the nouns and translate ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος in the same manner. For example: *New American Bible* and *New Revised Standard Version* – “man”; *Bibbia CEI* – “uomo”; *La Bible de Jerusalem* – “homme”; *Nueva Versión Española* – “hombre”; *Einheitsübersetzung der Heiligen Schrift* – “Mann”; *Biblia Tysiąclecia* – “człowiek”; *Chinese Translation of the blessed Gabriele Allegra, ofm* – “人” (“man”). Surprisingly, the Modern Greek makes a distinction between the two nouns but only in the introductory verse – “άντρας” in Luke 8:27 but ἀνθρωπος in Luke 8:38. In all other instances it has ἀνθρωπος. To complete this survey, it should be remembered that *Vulgata* makes a clear distinction between the two Greek nouns. It translates ἀνὴρ as “vir” in Luke 8:27 and 8:38, whereas ἄνθρωπος as “homo” in Luke 8:29.33.35. Interestingly, Syriac *Peshitta* also makes a distinction and employs two different nouns (ܐܰܢܰܘܰܪܰܐܰܝܰܐ “man” and ܐܰܢܰܘܰܪܰܘܰܝܰܐ “human”), but their usage is far from being coherent. Thus, it has ܐܰܢܰܘܰܪܰܐܰܝܰܐ in Luke 8:27.33.35.38 and ܐܰܢܰܘܰܪܰܘܰܝܰܐ in Luke 8:29. Additionally it has ܐܰܢܰܘܰܪܰܘܰܝܰܐ ܐܰܡܰܐ ܐܰܢܰܘܰܪܰܐܰܝܰܐ in Luke 8:36 where the Greek text has the participle used as a noun ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς.

While in recent years biblical studies have seen a tangible proliferation of commentaries, monographs, articles and various studies on Luke-Acts, none of them seems to dedicate adequate attention to the alternating usage of ἀνὴρ⁵ and ἄνθρωπος⁶ in the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac.⁷ Hence, the following study is required inasmuch as it aims to fill that lacuna and shed some light on Luke's usage of the two nouns within the healing of the Demoniac.⁸

1. Ἀνὴρ in the Gospel of Luke

The noun ἀνὴρ appears two-hundred sixteen times in the New Testament. Twenty-seven times in Luke and one hundred in Acts.⁹ This simple analysis indicates that 58.79% of all the occurrences of that noun in the New Testament fall in Luke-Acts. In Mark there are only four occurrences (6:20.44; 10:2.12) whereas in Matthew eight (1:16.19; 7:24.26; 12:41; 14:21.35; 15:38). Such a significant usage of the noun in Luke-Acts could indicate that it may be one of the favorite words used by the Third Evangelist. However, before such a hasty conclusion is drawn, one should remember that Luke is responsible for a substantial part of the New Testament. Therefore, the significant number of the occurrences of the noun within his Gospel may be due to the vastity of the material and not necessarily to the preferences of the author. In order to understand the large quantity of the occurrences

⁵ There are several studies on ἀνὴρ in Luke-Acts, but none of them focuses on the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac. See Bauer, "Philologische Bemerkungen," 535–540; Craghan, "Redactional Study," 353–367; Dickerson, "The New Character," 291–312.

⁶ Similarly, there are several studies on ἄνθρωπος in Luke-Acts, but none of them focuses on the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac. The majority of them investigates the expression "the Son of Man." See Bauckham, "The Son of Man," 23–33; Casey, "The Son of Man," 147–154; Derrett, "ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας (Lk 2:14b)," 101–106; Kilpatrick, "The Greek Syntax," 472–475.

⁷ See for example Klutz, *The Exorcism Stories*, 82–151; Boxall, "Reading the Synoptic Gospels," 51–65; Garcia Pérez, "El endemoniado de Gerasa," 117–146; Konieczny, "Teologia działalności Jezusa," 139–154.

⁸ The study makes use of the introduction to the narrative-criticism by Res-seguie, *Narrative Criticism*.

⁹ Denaux – Corstjens – Mardaga, *The Vocabulary of Luke*, 44–47.

of this noun in the Gospel of Luke, it is imperative to analyze its usage and not simply its frequency.

According to BDAG the noun ἀνὴρ can assume different meanings.¹⁰ Among other meanings, it can be construed as 1) an adult man or husband (Acts 5:1); 2) it can be used as an equivalent to indefinite pronoun τίς (someone); 3) or it can be used in a figurative sense to denote a transcendent figure.¹¹ The first meaning can further be used to express a whole array of linguistic nuances. For example, it can be used in sense of maturity (Eph 4:13); can be used in expressions indicating someone's provenance (Acts 8:27); or can be used to emphasize one's characteristics either negative or positive (Acts 11:24).¹²

Fourteen, out of twenty-seven occurrences of the noun ἀνὴρ in the Gospel of Luke, are unique (1:27.34; 2:36; 5:8; 7:20; 11:31–32; 14:24; 17:12; 19:2.7; 22:63; 24:4.19). They have no counterpart in the Gospel of Mark and, therefore, most likely come from Luke's own source. One occurrence (Luke 11:31) is shared with Matt 12:42 and could belong to the hypothetical source Q.¹³ Two, with some stylistic changes to the text, are preserved from Mark (Mark 6:44 // Luke 9:14 and Mark 10:12 // Luke 16:18). The remaining eleven occurrences (Luke 5:12.18; 6:8; 8:27.38.41; 9.30.32.38; 23:50 [x2]), fall into a category of changes made by Luke to his original source, namely the Gospel of Mark. Since two of those changes appear in the story of the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (8:27.38) and will be

¹⁰ BDAG, “ἀνὴρ,” s.v.

¹¹ Similar meanings the noun ἀνὴρ has in the Septuagint: 1) male person/husband; 2) person (maleness not being prominent)/people belonging to a certain location; 3) pleonastically, (usually) preceding another noun denoting class of men of some profession or disposition; 4) each. See Muraoka, *Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 50–51.

¹² The present study intends to analyze Luke's alternating usage of the nouns ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος within the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac. It does not have the slightest pretense to exhaust the topic of different meanings and nuances of the nouns. Such a study of different meanings of those two nouns goes well beyond the goal of this paper. Here, the basic meanings are provided as a guide for the study as it is intended.

¹³ Robinson – Hoffmann – Kloppenborg, *The Critical Edition of Q*, 252–253.

treated separately at the end of this paper, let us briefly analyze the remaining nine occurrences of the noun ἀνήρ in the Gospel of Luke:

(1) In the story of the cleansing of a leper (5:12–16) Luke changes the adjective λεπρός used as a substantive into ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας (5:12).¹⁴ The change is most likely to be considered a stylistic improvement. Since one of the meanings of the adjective πλήρης is “being complete and with nothing lacking,”¹⁵ the change made by Luke emphasizes much better the precarious state of the man, his dire need to be cleansed (Mark 1:40 // Luke 5:12) and to be eventually restored into community.¹⁶

(2) In Luke 5:18 there are two changes to the text of Mark which most likely are also to be considered as stylistic improvements. First of all, Luke adds the noun ἄνδρες making it clear that those who were carrying the paralyzed were in fact males and not some unspecified subjects. Adding the noun ἄνδρες made the mention of the number of those who were carrying the man superfluous and unnecessary, which

¹⁴ According to Parsons, Culy and Stigall (*Luke*, 317) the expression καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ πλήρης λέπρας should be understood as “the nominative subject of an implicit equative verb or to recognize that nominative nouns can be used to construct nominal clauses that do not contain a verb.” See also Porter, *Idioms*, 85.

¹⁵ BDAG, “πλήρης,” s.v. William Hendriksen (*Luke*, 78) notes, “his leprosy must have reached a very advanced stage.”

¹⁶ Leper is a frequent character in Luke-Acts. See the following passages: the Syrian general Naaman in Luke 4:27; the cleansing of a leper in Luke 5:12–16; a general reference to Jesus’ cleansing the lepers in Luke 7:22; and the cleansing of ten lepers in Luke 17:11–19. While according to the traditional view the lepers in the time of Jesus were forced and confined to live at the margins of the society and could not have regular interactions with other members, Myrick C. Shinall (“The Social Condition,” 915–934) argues, that “the evidence for the exclusion of the leprous from first-century Jewish society is much less certain than is generally realized. Without this assumption, the gospel texts themselves do not convey the message that lepers were excluded.” The diversity of opinion may derive from the fact that in the Hebrew Bible, the term leprosy might have included various skin diseases. Not all cases of צרעת are true leprosy (known today as Hansen’s disease). The priest, who declares the individual to be sick or healed, is neither a medic nor miracle-worker. He simply follows and applies the prescription of the Torah (Lev 13), which surprisingly is far more optimistic on the matter than one may think. It contemplates (centuries before an actual cure was found) a possibility to recover from leprosy (!). See also Green, “Healing and Healthcare,” 330–341.

in fact Luke omits. Second, Luke adds the noun ἄνθρωπος followed by the subordinate relative clause with perfect middle participle παραλελυμένος which better portrays the condition of the sick man; effect in the present of the past action. Such a change is a substantial improvement over a simple and common ὁ παραλυτικός (Mark 5:4).¹⁷ Those changes make the text smoother and more elegant.

(3) In the healing of the man with a withered hand (6:6–11), Luke substitutes the noun ἄνθρωπος with ἀνήρ. There is no apparent reason for such a change. In fact, Luke faithfully follows his source and introduces the character of the story in the same way as Mark. In both Gospels the man is introduced as ἄνθρωπος who had a withered hand (Mark 3:1 // Luke 6:6). Since there is no apparent reason why Luke made such a change when he mentions the man for the second time, it is probably licit to assume that he used a synonym to avoid repeating the same noun.

(4) In the healing of Jairus' Daughter (8:40–42.49–56) Luke avoids a technical and probably unknown to his implied reader term ἀρχισυνάγωγος and substitutes it with a more intelligible expression for his Greek audience.¹⁸ Thus, instead of a mouthful εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγῶγων, ὀνόματι Ἰαῖρος (Mark 5:22) Luke has a more comprehensible and elegant reading¹⁹ of ἀνὴρ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰαῖρος καὶ οὗτος ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς ὑπῆρχεν (Luke 8:41). The retention of the noun ἀρχισυνάγωγος at the end of the same passage in accordance with the version of Mark (Mark 5:35 // Luke 8:49) does not invalidate the hypothesis of substitution of an unfamiliar term with a more intelligible and recognizable one. Quite the contrary, the occurrence of ἀρχισυνάγωγος in Luke 8:49 makes this conjecture even stronger.

¹⁷ Bovon, *Luke*, 179. According to Plummer (*Luke*, 152), “Luke’s use is in strict agreement with that of the medical writers.” See also the classical study on the matter (published originally in 1882) of Hobart, *The Medical Language*, 6.

¹⁸ According to BDAG (“ἀρχισυνάγωγος,” s.v.), “the term was used only with reference to the Jewish synagogue, of an official whose duty was to take care of the physical arrangements for the worship services.”

¹⁹ A similar construction may be seen in the following passages of Acts 5:1; 8:9; 10:1; 13:6; 16:9; 17:5; 25:14. Their presence in the second volume of Luke’s work confirms the hypothesis that such a change should be assigned to Luke’s editorial work and stylistic improvement of sources at his disposal.

The more difficult and unfamiliar word ἀρχισυνάγωγος is elucidated in the light of the first ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς. It proves that Luke, although faithful to his sources, wants to provide a text which is beneficial to every reader regardless of his/her previous background. Therefore, it is plausible that once the unknown term is introduced and explained, Luke goes back to the original term to avoid repetition.

(5–6) In the transfiguration scene (9:28–36), Luke accepts the tradition inherited from Mark but makes some interesting changes. As far as the use of the noun ἀνὴρ is concerned, Luke first informs the reader of the appearance of the two characters and then explains who they are. He introduces them by the way of particle καὶ ἰδοῦ,²⁰ a prompter of attention, which is then followed by the expression ἄνδρες δύο (Luke 9:30). Although at first glance the inclusion of the whole expression seems to have no actual bearing on the meaning of the passage, it has a tremendous impact for the rest of the Luke-Acts narrative. Since there are some undeniable links between the transfiguration and the resurrection narratives,²¹ the inclusion of seemingly unnecessary expression prepares the reader for what will follow and provides a key to interpret such an unheard-of event as the resurrection of Jesus. In the same way, as a preparation for the resurrection narrative, should be considered the second addition of the noun ἀνὴρ in the rest of the transfiguration narrative (Luke 9:32).

(7) In the healing of a boy possessed by a spirit (9:37–43) Luke uses ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου (Luke 9:38) instead of εἷς ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου (Mark 9:17). In this way, he not only underlines better the distance that separated the man from Jesus but also details that it was a male who begged Jesus to help his necessitous son. Such a change stands in unison with the later comment of the narrator who declares that after the exorcism, Jesus returned the boy to his father καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ (Luke 9:42).²² The way Luke manages here the material at his disposal recalls the way he introduces Jairus in one of

²⁰ For the Hebrew origin of such expression see BDR, § 442.5 with its respective footnote 15.

²¹ The exact phrase, ἰδοῦ ἄνδρες δύο, also occurs in Luke 24:4 and Acts 1:10. See Parsons – Culy – Stigall, *Luke*, 317.

²² James R. Edwards (*Luke*, 286) notes, “this is the third and final reference to an only child in Luke.” The other two are Luke 7:12 and 8:42.

the previously discussed episodes (Luke 8:41). In both instances he uses *άνήρ* instead of *εἷς*. Does it stand as a counter-piece to a woman who shouted from the crowd in Luke 11:27 (*γυνή ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν αὐτῷ*)? Answer to this question aside, it is rather noteworthy that also Matthew felt the need to make some changes in this episode. In his version (Matt 17:14) it was *άνθρωπος* who begged Jesus to help his son. The use of two different nouns *άνήρ* and *άνθρωπος* to describe the same situation hints at Luke's preference in using the first noun at the expense of the second.

(8–9) In the narrative of the burial of Jesus (23:50–56) Luke adds twice the noun *άνήρ* to the text he inherits from Mark – *καὶ ἰδοὺ άνήρ ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων [καὶ] άνήρ ἀγαθός καὶ δίκαιος* (Luke 23:50). The first time it is used as the nominative subject of a nominal clause, whereas the second *άνήρ* is used as appositive to the first one. In order to understand the rationale behind this double insertion of the noun *άνήρ*, it is important to look closer at the text of Mark and Matthew. The first simply informs of the arrival of Joseph without any need to specify who he was, other than, he was a respected member of the council – *ἐλθὼν Ἰωσήφ [ὁ] ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας εὐσχήμων βουλευτῆς* (Mark 15:42). Matthew, for his part, feels the need to supplement the story and specifies that he was man of considerable wealth; *ἦλθεν άνθρωπος πλούσιος ἀπὸ Ἀριμαθαίας, τοῦνομα Ἰωσήφ* (Matt 27:57). Now, since also Luke modifies the Markan source and adds a noun – in fact, he adds the same noun more than once in the same verse – it is probably licit to consider *άνήρ* as his preferable choice of vocabulary. Moreover, it is rather noteworthy that Luke defines here Joseph of Arimathea not as affluent man but as “a good and upright man.” In a similar way he already introduced Simeon calling him “righteous and devout man” – *ὁ άνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής* (Luke 2:25) or Zechariah and Elisabeth calling them “righteous in the eyes of the Lord” – *δίκαιοι ἀμφοτέροι ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ* (Luke 1:6). Since those expressions seem to be standardized in the Gospel of Luke and sound as a refrain to indicate person's good standing in front of God, one would intuitively expect to hear *ἰδοὺ άνθρωπος ὀνόματι Ἰωσήφ βουλευτῆς ὑπάρχων καὶ άνθρωπος ἀγαθός καὶ δίκαιος*. The usage of *άνήρ* and not *άνθρωπος* in Luke 23:50 makes the hypothesis of *άνήρ* as Luke's preferable choice of

word all the more plausible. However, it would be amiss not to mention that Luke's choice of ἀνὴρ instead of ἄνθρωπος might have also been dictated and counterbalanced by the presence of the women at the burial of Jesus αἱ γυναῖκες, αἵτινες ἦσαν συνεληλυθυῖαι ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας αὐτῷ (Luke 23:55). Thus, Luke once again preserves the male – female pair in the parallel presentation of events.²³ Either way, it is probably prudent to assume that the noun ἀνὴρ in this passage comes from Luke himself and not his own source(s).

2. "Ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Luke

The noun ἄνθρωπος is much more frequent in the New Testament than the previously analyzed noun ἀνὴρ. It appears five-hundred fifty times. Ninety-five times in Luke and forty-six in Acts. These numbers indicate that 25.63% of all the occurrences of that noun in the New Testament fall in Luke-Acts. In Mark there are forty-six occurrences, whereas in Matthew one-hundred fifteen. This simple analysis indicates that Luke's usage of ἄνθρωπος does not deviate much from that of Matthew and might be comparable to Mark, given that his Gospel is much shorter than the other two Synoptics.

According to BDAG the noun ἄνθρωπος can assume different meanings.²⁴ Among other meanings it can be construed as: 1) a person of either gender with focus on participation in the human race, i.e., a human being; 2) a member of human race with focus on limitations and weaknesses; 3) a male person, man; 4) a person who has just been mentioned in a narrative; 5) or it can be used in a figurative sense to denote a transcendent figure, a heavenly being that looks like a person.²⁵

²³ The male – female pairs in the Gospel of Luke have been the subject of many different approaches and studies. Those studies include: Talbert, *Literary Patterns*; Forbes – Harrower, *Raised from Obscurity*; Gonzalez, *The Story Luke Tells*; Witherington, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus*; Goulder, *Luke*.

²⁴ BDAG, "ἄνθρωπος," s.v.

²⁵ Similar meanings the noun ἄνθρωπος has in the Septuagint: 1) man (with no particular reference to maleness)/human being/mankind, humanity; 2) man (with special reference to males in generic statements); 3) with weakened force:

Twenty-five, out of ninety-five occurrences of the noun ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Luke, appear in ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου sayings (5:24; 6:5.22; 7:34; 9:22.26.44.58; 11:30; 12:8.10.40; 17:22.24.26.30; 18:8.31; 19:10; 21:27.36; 22:22.48.69; 24:7). Some of them come from the triple tradition and are present in all three Synoptics, some come from Q, still others are present only in the Gospel of Luke. Five times the noun ἄνθρωπος appears in the infancy narrative (1:25; 2:14.25[x2].52). Ten times ἄνθρωπος (τις)²⁶ appears in Luke's special parables or proverbs which are preserved in the journey narrative: the Parable of the Samaritan (10:30); the parable of the Rich Fool (12:16); the proverb of the man building a tower (14:30); the parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11); the parable of the Dishonest Steward (16:1); the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (16:19); the parable of the Persistent Widow (18:2.4); and the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (18:10.11). Five times ἄνθρωπος (τις)²⁷ appears in

like English *one* and qualified by adjective or participle. See Muraoka, *Lexicon of the Septuagint*, 52,

²⁶ It is noteworthy that many of so-called “L-parables” in the journey narrative open in the same way. Joachim Jeremias (*Die Sprache*, 191) argues that ἄνθρωπος τις comes from one of the Lukan sources, whereas ἀνὴρ τις comes from Luke himself. According to Fitzmyer (*Luke*, 886), “this, however is far from certain [...] ἀνθρώπος/ἀνὴρ with indef. τις is exclusive to Luke among the evangelists; both should be reckoned as part of his own style.” It is possible that the anonymity of characters in the parables was intended. It enables a wider audience to be identified with the main character of the story. Since many of the Lukan parables are open-ended it is possible to envisage that such a technique was intended by the author. Simon J. Kistmaker (“Jesus as Story Teller,” 52) notes, “some of Jesus’ parables seem to have a conclusion that is open-ended [...] but these omissions reveal the express purpose of the parables, namely, to confront the reader with hidden sins that must be uncovered to bring him or her to repentance.”

²⁷ Albeit the noun ἄνθρωπος does indeed occur in the parables common to Matthew and Luke, none of these occurrences in the Gospel of Matthew can be comparable to the introductory formula as we know it from the parables of Luke: ἀνθρώπῳ βασιλεῖ in Matt 22:2; τινὶ ἀνθρώπῳ in Matt 18:12; ἄνθρωπος ἀποδημῶν in Matt 25:14 or σκληρὸς ἄνθρωπος in Matt 25:24. Almost all the parallel passages in the Gospel of Luke (except Luke 19:21 – ἄνθρωπος αἰστηρὸς, which is in the middle of the parable) functions as an introductory formula introducing a new character. Once the introductory formula ἄνθρωπος τις introduces not a character of a parable but a man who needs to be healed (Luke 14:2).

the parables common to Matthew and Luke: the parable of the Great Feast (Luke 14:16 // Matt 22:2); the parable of the Lost Sheep (Luke 15:4 // Matt 18:12) and the parable of the Minas or Talents (Luke 19:12.21–22 // Matt 25:14.24). Twice ἄνθρωπος (τις) appears in the triple tradition; in the parable of the Mustard Seed (Matt 13:31–ὄν λαβῶν ἄνθρωπος // Mark 4:31 – ὃς ὅταν // Luke 13:19 – ὄν λαβῶν ἄνθρωπος)²⁸ and in the parable of the Tenant Farmers (Matt 21:33 – ἄνθρωπος ἦν οἰκοδεσπότης // Mark 12:1 – ἄνθρωπος // Luke 20:9 – ἄνθρωπός [τις]).

Twelve times the noun ἄνθρωπος appears in the material Luke inherited from Mark; some of it made its way into the triple tradition inasmuch as it is present in all three Synoptics (4:33; 5:10; 6:6; 9:25.44; 18:27; 19:30; 20:4.6; 22:10.22; 23:47); also twelve times the noun is found in the material attributed to the hypothetical source Q (4:4; 6:31.45; 7:8.25.34; 11:24.26.44.46; 12:8–9) and thirteen times the noun is found in *lukanisches Sondergut* (6:26; 12:14.36; 13:4; 14:2; 16:15 [x2]; 21:26; 23:4.6.14 [x2]; 24:7²⁹). Besides those occurrences, eight times the noun ἄνθρωπος appears in the passages that seem to be modified by Luke (5:18.20; 6:22.48–49; 7:31; 22:58.60). Finally, the noun ἄνθρωπος appears thrice in the passage under present scrutiny, i.e., the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (8:29.33.35) and these occurrences will be examined separately below.

²⁸ Noteworthy is the *minor agreement* between Matthew and Luke, but it is most likely an independent correction or improvement of style. The rest of the story in Matthew and Luke is very much different. According to Matthew, the man ἔσπειρεν ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ (Matt 13:31), whereas in Luke the man ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ (Luke 13:19). Had there been a dependence of Luke on Matthew or vice versa, one would have expected a much better word agreement. The addition of ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Luke could be construed as assimilation with other L-parables which frequently open with a typical formula ἄνθρωπος (τις).

²⁹ This last occurrence, although present only in Luke, does reiterate verbatim the second prediction of the passion. Thus, δεῖ παραδοθῆναι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων in 24:7 recalls Jesus' words spoken to his disciples in Galilee ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων in 9:44. Note that this second prediction of the passion was preceded by the command to pay attention, or literally, “you put in your ears” (θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὦτα). No wonder that, once Jesus' words were carried to the letter and fulfilled, Luke feels the need to repeat it verbatim at the end of his Gospel.

Since the vast majority of the above-listed occurrences of the noun ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Luke come either from Mark, the hypothetical Q or are the result of Luke's own diligent research for information (*lukanisches Sondergut*), it is rather challenging to study Luke's particular way of using the noun ἄνθρωπος. Out of ninety-five occurrences of the noun ἄνθρωπος in the Gospel of Luke, the only passages that may shed some light on the matter seem to be the passages that fall into category of alteration made by Luke (5:18.20; 6:22.48–49; 7:31; 22:58.60). It may be promising to study these alternations by comparing them with their parallel passages in the Gospel of Mark and Matthew to see whether a rationale or logic behind those changes may be discovered.

The first occurrence of the noun ἄνθρωπος that require a further investigation comes from the healing of the paralytic (5:17–26). The passage has already been studied above, for Luke uses ἀνὴρ (5:18) instead of φέροντες (Mark 2:3), and resorts to a more complex form ἄνθρωπον ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος (5:18) in lieu of παραλυτικόν (Mark 2:3). Both instances, the use of ἀνὴρ at the very beginning of the pericope as well as the use of ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος are most likely a stylistic improvement. The above study proved that Luke has preference for ἀνὴρ over ἄνθρωπος and often introduces new characters with the former, except when it comes to a standardized parabolic formula. The preference for ἀνὴρ does not preclude the possibility to use a different noun or synonym should such a need arise. Although ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἦν παραλελυμένος may seem too complex, it is far more suitable and accurate than a simple and somehow common παραλυτικόν used by Mark.³⁰ First of all, the perfect middle participle παραλελυμένος “having been paralyzed” conveys the idea of the effect in the present of the past action. Second, it is also a form preferred by Luke as its use in his second volume indicate (see Acts 8:7; 9:33).

³⁰ According to Wolter (*Das Lukasevangelium*, 221), “dass Lukas den Begriff παραλυτικός durch παραλελυμένος ersetzt, hat nichts damit zu tun, dass er den Eindruck vermeiden will, es handle sich um einem von Geburt an gelähmten Menschen. Letzteres ist in der medizinischen Fachliteratur einfach der gebräuchlichere Ausdruck.”

The same passage, the healing of the paralytic, contains the second occurrence of the noun ἀνθρώπος that needs to be examined. It may come as a surprise that Luke drops a kind and warm address τέκνον found in Mark 2:5 and opts for a much formal vocative ἀνθρώπε (5:20).³¹ Such a change is astonishing, for Luke does indeed have cases where he uses τέκνον in the vocative (2:48; 15:31; 16:25). In order to understand this change, one should remember that besides this case, Luke has three other passages where he employs the vocative ἀνθρώπε (12:14; 22:58.60). In the first case, Jesus replies to unknown individual, “someone in the crowd” (12:14). In the second and third cases, Peter replies to “someone else” who was asking whether he was one of Jesus’ disciples (22:58), or to “still another” who was asking the same question (22:60). All those examples of how Luke uses the vocative ἀνθρώπε and τέκνον indicate that as a rule of thumb, he limits the use of τέκνον to mother – child or father – child relationship, either real or metaphoric,³² and reserves the use of ἀνθρώπε to unknown individuals.³³

In Luke 6:22 there is a remarkable addition of the noun οἱ ἄνθρωποι which is absent in the parallel text of Matthew. In this way an impersonal form μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν ὀνειδίσωσιν ὑμᾶς (Matt 5:11)³⁴ with an implied agent of hatred, becomes more intelligible in μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι (Luke 6:22). The agent of such hatred is clearly identified as οἱ ἄνθρωποι. Further on, this broad and somehow general οἱ ἄνθρωποι is understood as hatred from the Jews. In fact, in Luke 6:23 a persecution of the prophets by “their fathers” is brought to mind.

Another passage that may be helpful in understanding Luke’s use of ἀνθρώπος is the proverb on building well and poorly (6:47–49),

³¹ Franciszek Mickiewicz (*Ewangelia Łukasza*, 298) argues that the change ἀνθρώπε instead of τέκνον underlines the dignity of the man. Although, it may be true, it is possible that such a change has a more profound meaning.

³² In the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, the former sees Abraham from the netherworld and cries out πάτερ Αβραάμ (Luke 16:24) and Abraham replies τέκνον (Luke 16:25).

³³ Nolland, *Luke*, 235–236.

³⁴ Jacques Dupont (*Les Béatitudes*, 228–243) argues that the impersonal form of Matthew is more original.

a passage that is also present in Matt 7:21–27. It is an almost impossible task to establish beyond a reasonable doubt who of the two evangelists holds the laurel of priority and transmits the original form and who might have changed (either improved or impoverished) it.³⁵ However, given that many so-called L-parables begin with ἄνθρωπος (τις) it is quite plausible and convincing that Luke might have changed the original form and opted for a more general term ἄνθρωπος in conformity with the rest of his parables and proverbs. In this way, the proverb on building well and poorly does not apply to a single and concrete situation but assumes a more general meaning as a golden rule to be followed.

Finally, the last occurrence of the noun ἄνθρωπος that may shed some light on how Luke employs that noun is found in Jesus' testimony to John the Baptist (7:24–35). The passage has its parallel in Matt 11:7–19. All the differences that exist between the two passages aside, it is noteworthy that Luke feels the need to add the noun ἄνθρωπος.³⁶ Thus, the comparison deals not with the generation as it is in Matthew (τίνι δὲ ὁμοιώσω τὴν γενεὰν ταύτην Matt 7:16), but with the men of that generation (τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης Luke 7:31). In this way the statement resembles other forms of proverbs or parables which are present in the Gospel of Luke. It also assumes a more personal dimension. The men of that generation are compared to John whom they call ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης (Luke 7:34).

3. The alternating usage of ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος in Luke 8:26–39

After this tedious yet necessary survey of how Luke uses ἀνὴρ and ἄνθρωπος in the rest of the Gospel, it is time to look into the usage

³⁵ In the critical edition of the hypothetical Q, Robinson – Hoffmann – Kloppenborg (*The Critical Edition of Q*, 96–101) do not indicate clearly which form could be original. In their reconstruction the proverb in Q had ἄν[θρώπῳ] which means “Luke’s ἄνθρώπῳ or Matthew’s ἀνδρί.”

³⁶ According to Nolland (*Luke*, 343) “the addition (τοὺς ἀνθρώπους) may be a Lukan since elsewhere he adds the term (eg, 6:22; 5:18, 20; and see 11:31 cf. Matt 12:42).”

of these two nouns in the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac. To facilitate this endeavor, each occurrence of those two nouns as well as one additional form (ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς in Luke 8:36) of presenting the possessed man in the passage will be studied separately.

The first time Luke introduces the possessed man into the narrative, he presents him as ἀνὴρ τις³⁷ (8:27). Mark, the most likely source for this episode, has ἄνθρωπος (5:1), whereas Matthew has δύο δαιμονιζόμενοι (8:28). The latter can scarcely be the source of that mysterious alternation. The above study on the use of ἀνὴρ in the Gospel of Luke has shown that the “beloved physician” often changes ἄνθρωπος and prefers to use ἀνὴρ instead. Therefore, it is plausible that in that particular case, Luke also could have made the same change for some unknown reasons. One can only speculate what those reasons might have been. No clear indication is provided.³⁸ Given the immediate context of the passage, the calming of the storm (8:22–25), the raising of Jairus’ daughter (8:40–42.49–56) and the healing of the woman with hemorrhage (8:43–48), it may not be out of place to see in this inexplicable change, Luke’s tendency to present a male – female pair as beneficiaries of Jesus’ ministry. To support this impression, one should remember that Luke 8:22–56 presents a series of passages that portray Jesus and his sovereignty over the forces of nature (8:22–25); over the demons (8:26–39); over illness (8:40–48) and finally over death (8:40–42.49–56). The presence of two ἀνὴρ (possessed man in 8:27 and Jairus in 8:41) is balanced by

³⁷ Besides the Third Gospel the expression ἀνὴρ τις can be also found in Acts 5:1; 8:9; 10:1; 13:6; 16:9; 17:5; 25:14. For example, in Acts 5:1 – ἀνὴρ δὲ τις Ἀνανίας ὀνόματι σὺν Σαπφίρῃ τῇ γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ (here in contrast to his wife); in Acts 17:5 – ἄνδρας τινὰς πονηροὺς καὶ ὀχλοποιήσαντες (with focus on personal characteristics); Acts 10:1 – ἀνὴρ δὲ τις ἐν Καισαρείᾳ ὀνόματι Κορνήλιος, ἑκατοντάρχης ἐκ σπείρης τῆς καλουμένης Ἰταλικῆς or Acts 16:9 – ἀνὴρ Μακεδῶν τις ἦν ἐστῶς (with words indicating national origin).

³⁸ Patrick L. Dickerson (“The New Character,” 293–300) proposes that such a change is due to a *new character* entering the scene whom Luke often introduces with τις (ιδού) ἀνὴρ or γυνή or six possible variants thereof.

the presence of two γυνή (the first at the age of twelve³⁹ in 8:42 and the second suffering from hemorrhage in 8:43).

The second case that needs a further investigation is Luke 8:29. Having presented the man, his precarious condition, and his dire need to be saved, for no one could hold him fast, Luke reports of Jesus' command directed to the demons. Both Mark and Luke agree that Jesus ordered the demons to come out of the man (ἄνθρωπος Mark 5:8 // Luke 8:29). Mark speaks of the command to come out ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. While Luke speaks also of the command to come out, he uses a different preposition ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. The preposition ἀπὸ denotes a "separation from a place or person,"⁴⁰ whereas the preposition ἐκ implies a separation "from out of," or "away from."⁴¹ In other words, the first preposition conveys the idea of "removal from," whereas the second preposition has the meaning of "exit from" or "out of."⁴² Luke's decision to choose a different preposition might have been dictated by the way he presents the man at the mercy of the demons that exercise their power over man in cycles; possession comes and goes.⁴³ Thus, Luke is more interested in presenting the power of the demons over the man than the power of the man

³⁹ Although the Greek text has here a different noun θυγάτηρ and not γυνή as one would naturally expect, the reader is told that Jairus' daughter is twelve years old. The age of the young girl serves to emphasize the duration of the other woman's illness (the woman who suffered from the excessive flow of the blood has been sick the entire lifespan of the young girl). The information of the young girl's age also serves to inform that Jairus' daughter was at the point of puberty. According to Green (*Luke*, 345), who bases his observation on Roman law of that time, "the minimum age of marriage for girls was 12 (for boys, 14). Jewish practices were comparable, so that marriage for a female usually took place before she reached 12 ½ years of age." For the betrothal and wedding customs at the time of Jesus see *m. Ketubbot* 4.4–5; Bock, *Studying the Historical Jesus*, 117–119.

⁴⁰ BDAG, "ἀπό," s.v. According to Thayer (*Greek-English Lexicon*, "ἀπό," s.v.), the preposition ἀπό signifies "local separation, after verbs of motion from a place departing, fleeing, removing, expelling."

⁴¹ BDAG, "ἐκ," s.v. According to Thayer (*Greek-English Lexicon*, "ἐκ," s.v.), the preposition ἐκ signifies "universally, of the place from which; from a surrounding or enclosing place, from the interior of."

⁴² Jay, *Grammatica greca*, 40–45.

⁴³ The reference to his being seized many times suggests such a conclusion. See Bock, *Luke*, 773.

possessed by the demon.⁴⁴ According to Mark, “no one could restrain the man [...] no one was strong enough to subdue him” (Mark 5:4), while in Luke “it (demon) had taken hold of him many times [...] he would break his bonds and be driven by the demons into deserted places” (Luke 8:29). The difference in presenting the state of the man is an important factor for the correct understanding of the text and the vocabulary choices made by Luke.

In Luke 8:33 there is another case of complement of separation ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.⁴⁵ This complement has no counterpart neither in Mark nor in Matthew. All three Synoptics concur that the demons obeyed Jesus’ command and came out οἱ δὲ ἐξεληθόντες (Matt 8:32); καὶ ἐξεληθόντα τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα (Mark 5:13) and ξεληθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Luke 8:33). However, only Luke specifies that the demons came out of the *man*.

Such an addition may seem out of place, unnecessary or even gratuitous. One may even object that it contributes nothing to the story and may be seen as nothing more than a simple desire to improve the style of the narrative. Quite the contrary, the complement of separation ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου has an important role for the whole narrative. In fact, from the very beginning as Luke introduced the character of the demoniac, he painted a rather gruesome picture of him. For a considerable period of time,⁴⁶ the demoniac was not living in a house but stayed in the tombs. This behavior made him an outsider, impure or even uncivilized being.⁴⁷ He wore no clothing but was bound with chains and shackles as restraint. Such an intense image of the terrifying state of the man must have given Luke’s implied reader more an idea of an animal than that of a man. To correct this impression and restore the man to his lost humanity, the

⁴⁴ In this way Rossé (*Luca*, 300): “Luca porta la sua attenzione sull’uomo in preda al male, sottolinea la condizione penosa di quest’uomo disumanizzato, vittima delle forze del male.”

⁴⁵ Chrupcała, *Luca*, 246–258.

⁴⁶ Note that Luke has the dative of time (πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις Luke 8:29), where the accusative was to be expected. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, § 54.

⁴⁷ According to Parsons (*Luke*, 139), “he is physically violent and destructive, socially alienated, and ritually unclean.” See also Menéndez Antuña, “Of Social Death,” 643–664.

author resorts to all kinds of rhetorical techniques and means at his disposal. Repetition of words, phrases or actions for emphasis is one of them.⁴⁸ Repeating the complement of separation ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου confirms that Jesus' command had been carried out to the letter. It also reminds the implied reader of the humanity of the possessed man. With this in mind, it is no wonder that, having portrayed the man in such “beastly” colors, Luke makes it a point of honor to underline that the demons came out of the *man* ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (8:33). Had Luke wanted to show that Jesus' command was obeyed, he could have used a simple complement of separation ἀπ' αὐτοῦ or even could have used a different noun, for example his favorite word ἀνὴρ for the sake of variation. Since he chose to repeat the same noun ἄνθρωπος, there must have been a particular reason behind it. A desire and need to present the humanity of the healed demoniac comes naturally to mind. In other words, it seems that Luke has a “hidden agenda.” He wants to correct the “wildly” or even “beastly” image he depicted in the eyes of his audience when he introduced the demoniac at the very beginning of his narrative.

Probably in the same way, as restoration of the human condition stripped by the power of the demon, the next occurrence of the noun ἄνθρωπος in Luke 8:35 should be understood. Also, in this case Luke most likely changes the form he inherited from Mark and opts for a more elaborated form which expresses better the idea of the exorcism that took place. According to Luke, the people who came from the city to see what had happened to the demoniac saw him καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν (Luke 8:35). Such a long and complex expression contrasts with the much shorter and sober information provided by Mark καὶ θεωροῦσιν τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον καθήμενον ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα (Mark 5:15). Both accounts agree that the man was seating (Mark and Luke καθήμενον), was dressed (Mark and Luke ἱματισμένον) and was of sound mind (Mark and Luke σωφρονοῦντα).⁴⁹ Luke's

⁴⁸ Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 42–45.

⁴⁹ The Greek verb σωφρονέω (used here as present active participle) means “to be able to think in a sound or sane manner” or “to be prudent, with focus on

account, however, differs in two places. First of all, Luke states that the man was seating at the feet of Jesus; a hint to a customary posture of a disciple or pupil who follows his master's teaching? (See other examples in Luke-Acts; Luke 10:39; Acts 22:3).⁵⁰ Second, Luke forfeits the present middle participle τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον for the sake of a more complex construction. He continues to call the demoniac ἄνθρωπος even though it is the third time in a row he uses the same expression – τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν⁵¹ (Luke 8:35). Such a persistent repetition of the same noun ἄνθρωπος most likely

self-control." Given the way the narrator presented the man under the dominion of demons (Luke 8:29), it is licit to assume that the second meaning is meant here. Thus, after the exorcism, the man regained self-control and he is not driven by the demons into the desert any more. BDAG, "σωφρονέω," s.v. Luke T. Johnson (*Luke*, 137) notes – "the term denotes sobriety and clear-sightedness." As a virtue, σωφροσύνη was very highly esteemed in the antiquity, see for example Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 3, 10–12.

⁵⁰ Since only Luke has this particular information of the man seating at the feet of Jesus it is possible that this detail functions as a *preparation* or anticipation of man's request to follow Jesus and be with him (see Luke 8:38). The author of Luke-Acts often anticipates or introduces characters not mentioned in the narrative so far. It prepares the reader to what will follow in the course of the narrative. See Bartnicki – Klósek, *Metody Interpretacji*, 241. Luke-Acts, thrive of such preparations. For example, the inaugural speech of Jesus in Nazareth prepares for the whole series of healings and miracles such as the cure of a Demoniac (4:31–37), healing of Simon's mother-in-law (4:38–39), or a series of other healings (4:40–41) which will take place later on once Jesus settles in Capernaum. The cure of Simon's mother-in-law (4:38–39) prepares for the calling of the first disciples (5:1–11) inasmuch as it introduces a new character into the narrative (so far never mentioned and unknown), namely, Simon. Such allusions to a so far unknown episodes or characters are a frequent feature in Luke's presentation of his double work. It is seen not only in the Gospel but in the book of Acts as well. For example, according to Acts 7:58 "the witnesses laid down their cloaks at the feet of a young man named Saul." This unknown Saul "was consenting to his execution" (Acts 8:1). Such simple yet unexpected, out of the blue, entrance into the scene of a new character finds its completion and fulfillment in the following episodes (Acts 9). For other examples of seating at the feet of a teacher see 2 Kgs 4:38 or *m. Avot* 4,1.

⁵¹ Some codices A C L W Θ Ξ Ψ ^f1.13 33 read the pluperfect ἐξῆλυθει instead of the aorist ἐξῆλθεν. The former may be an attempt to harmonize the text either with Luke 8:38 or Luke 8:2. The aorist ἐξῆλθεν has a good support of the witnesses \mathfrak{P}^{75} $\aleph^{(2)}$ B pc aur f vg^{mss}, therefore, it should be considered as a preferred *lectio*.

is intentional and sooner or later should raise a question or at least increase the implied reader's awareness.⁵²

Surprisingly in 8:36 Luke preserves the participle used as a substantive though changes its case and voice.⁵³ Instead of the dative present middle participle τῷ δαιμονιζομένῳ (Mark 5:16) Luke uses the nominative aorist passive participle ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς (Luke 8:36).⁵⁴ Different cases aside (the dative is required by the verb ἐγένετο which in constriction with the dative expresses the person affected),⁵⁵ it is noteworthy that Luke decides to preserve the participle found in Mark and call the man “demonized.” Such a decision is remarkable, for Luke has already called twice the man ἄνθρωπος (8:29.33). As already pointed out, he most likely did so to underline the man's restored humanity. Moreover, Luke made it perfectly clear to his implied reader that he was the man from whom the demons departed – ἄνθρωπον ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν (8:35). In this last case, he even forfeited the very same present middle participle (τὸν δαιμονιζόμενον) he chooses now, and opted for ἄνθρωπος. Such an unexpected return to a participle form catches the attention of the audience, but more importantly it has to be understood in the light of the main verb used by the author.

Luke is not shy in using the verb γίνομαι which is precisely the verb used here by Mark.⁵⁶ In Mark's account “those who saw explained to

⁵² According to Resseguie (*Narrative Criticism*, 42), “repetition is a stylistic device that reiterates words, phrases, themes, pattern, situations, and actions for emphasis.”

⁵³ For use of the participle as substantive see BDR, § 413.

⁵⁴ Note that at the end of the passage, Mark has the same aorist passive participle ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς (Mark 5:18). It is possible that Luke was influenced by its presence in Mark and included the participle δαιμονισθεὶς in his account (although in a different position). In fact, Luke ends the passage in a different manner. He ends it with ἀνὴρ (8:38) which reminds of ἀνὴρ in 8:27 and creates a rhetorical technique known as *inclusio*.

⁵⁵ BDR, § 188; BDAG, “γίνομαι,” s.v.

⁵⁶ There are 669 occurrences of the verb γίνομαι in the New Testament, 131 of them in the Gospel of Luke and 125 in Acts; only 55 in the Gospel of Mark and 76 in the Gospel of Matthew. Moreover, Luke, frequently begins a new episode with ἐγένετο δέ or different variations thereof, which is most likely to be ascribed as his intention to imitate the language and style of LXX. See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 118–119.

them what happened to the possessed man and to the swine.” Luke, although frequently uses the verb γίνομαι throughout Luke-Acts, employs here a different verb. He uses one of his favorite words σῶζω.⁵⁷ Such a choice informs the reader that what happened to the man was not accidental but an intended action. The use of a passive voice indicates that God is a hidden actor of the whole scene and true benefactor of the man. The use of the aorist participle ὁ δαιμονισθεὶς reminds the reader of the previous precarious state of the man. It indicates that God saved the man who was possessed by the demons. One of the common uses of the aorist participle is to indicate an action that occurs before the action of the main verb. The use of the participle δαιμονισθεὶς in this particular case indicates that the man was possessed in the past but because of God’s intervention he is now saved. The ending of the story underlines who restored the man into his “human” condition. At the man’s beseeching to let him follow Jesus, the Lord replies “return home and recount what God has done for you.” In this way the man, who at the very beginning of the story was presented as someone who did not live in a house (καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν 8:27) but stayed in the graves, therefore, had no contact with the living, now is dismissed and told to go home (εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου 8:39) and to recount what God has done to him ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. Note the emphatic position of ὁ θεός at the end of the words of Jesus directed to the healed man. It would be amiss not to mention that according to Luke, those who saw “told how the demonized was saved.” In Luke’s account there is no mention that those who witnessed the healing (οἱ ἰδόντες in Luke 8:36) told the people who came from the city what had happened to the herd of the swine. It is rather a remarkable shift of attention. Healing the demonized man becomes the center of the narrative.⁵⁸

⁵⁷ For the use of this noun and its derivatives in Luke-Acts, see Marrow, “Principles for Interpreting,” 268–280; Wells, *The Greek Language*, 180–191; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 222–223.

⁵⁸ Michael Wolter (*Das Lukasevangelium*, 321) notes, “mit dieser Themaangabe identifiziert er die Erzählung als Geschichte von der Befreiung eines Menschen von dämonischer Besessenheit und macht damit auch das Geschick der Schweine zu einem Bestandteil dieser Geschichte.”

Finally, in Luke 8:38 there is long and complex construction ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια, whereas in Mark there is participle used as substantive ὁ δαιμονισθείς (5:18). The first noteworthy difference between the two Gospels is the presence of noun ἀνὴρ in Luke. At first it seems to be out of place, and it may be difficult to explain such a change made by the evangelist. However, it is possible that Luke replaces the participle he inherited from his source with a noun to create an *inclusio*.⁵⁹ This rhetorical technique, used frequently by the Third Evangelist, helps to identify the beginning and the ending of a narrative. Furthermore, it serves to underline and pinpoint the most important concept of the story. In this way ἀνὴρ in 8:38 reminds the reader of ἀνὴρ in 8:27 creating a well-organized unit. Not without significance is the rest of the expression.

The statement that demons had left that man (ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια Luke 8:38) stays in evident contrast with the way Luke introduced the demoniac at the very beginning of the story.⁶⁰ In fact, in introducing the possessed man into narrative, Luke provided a series of information about him. He was a “certain man,” “from the city,” “who had demons,” “from a long time had not worn clothes,” “did not live in a house” and “lived among the tombs” (8:27). After the healing, Luke presents him also as an ἀνὴρ but whose condition is strikingly different from his previous state. He does not have demons anymore. Note the use of the present active participle ἔχων in 8:27 and the use of the pluperfect active indicative ἐξεληλύθει in 8:38.

Although it is true that Mark also insisted on the metamorphosis between then and now, there is a slight yet significant difference in the way Mark and Luke express the idea of the change. Mark uses a participle as a substantive ὁ δαιμονισθείς (Mark 5:18), whereas Luke resorts to a more complex expression ἀφ’ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια (Luke 8:38). In this way Luke not only encapsulates the whole unit in an *inclusio*, but also puts more emphases on the final state of the man. The legion of demons left the man who is now safe and sound. The use of pluperfect ἐξεληλύθει, a tense that describes an action that was completed and whose effects are felt at a time after

⁵⁹ Resseguie, *Narrative Criticism*, 57–58.

⁶⁰ Grasso, *Luca*, 255.

the completion,⁶¹ expresses that idea in the best possible way. Thus, Luke underlines more the effect of the healing than the process of the healing itself or the state of the man before that healing.

Summary

This study proves that it is rather a challenging task to understand why such a careful and meticulous writer as Luke decides to use different terms to describe the man possessed by the legion of demons in the region opposite Galilee. For the most part, Luke builds upon the story found in the Gospel of Mark. Though Luke respects the *blueprint* provided by Mark, he does not follow it submissively. Occasionally, he makes some changes and adapts the text as the circumstances require. It confirms Luke's double tendency. On the one hand he accepts and respects the sources at his disposal and on the other hand he improves the style and grammar to make the narrative more acceptable and pleasing to the ears of his predominantly Greek audience. With his implied audience in mind, Luke resorts from time-to-time to rhetorical techniques and narrative strategies which make the reader appreciate the narrative as it unfolds and want to dig deeper and follow the rest of the story.

Such a procedure by no means should be considered a misrepresentation of the tradition received but rather its adaptation to the needs of the implied reader. Since the noun ἀνὴρ is most likely Luke's favorite word, it should not come as a surprise that he uses it to introduce a new character in the narrative (8:27). In like manner, Luke concludes his healing of the Gerasene Demoniac with the same noun (8:38). In this way, ἀνὴρ in 8:27 and ἀνὴρ in 8:38 create a rhetorical technique known as *inclusio*. Since the passage concerns the healing of the man possessed by the legion of demons, no wonder Luke wanted to put emphasis on the man making a reference to him at the beginning and the end of the story.

As a rhetorical strategy used by the author of the Third Gospel a triple repetition of the noun ἄνθρωπος (8:29.33.35) should be also considered in the center of the narrative. In all probability, it is

⁶¹ Mounce, *Biblical Greek*, 234; Corsani, *Greco Biblico*, 163–167.

intended to awake the audience's alertness, and direct their attention to the extraordinary result of the encounter between Jesus and the demoniac. In fact, in order to emphasize the effect of that encounter, Luke repeats the noun *ἄνθρωπος* (8:35), used here as the direct object. Literarily, "(they) came to Jesus and discovered the man." This time, the noun *ἄνθρωπος* is followed by the relative clause which puts emphasis on the effect of the exorcism *ἀφ' οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξήλθεν*.

As a result of Luke's editorial work and rhetorical strategies used in the composition of the narrative, the reader obtains a well-organized and logically written account that keeps him interested in the story of the man living among the tombs, who at the end becomes an "apostle," first in his household, then, throughout the whole town (8:39).

To summarize, the alternating usage of two nouns *ἀνήρ* and *ἄνθρωπος* in the healing of the Gerasene Demoniac reveals Luke's intention. Both nouns are frequently used by Luke and there are cases where he uses them as synonym, although he displays preference for the first at the expenses of the second. Luke introduces a new character into the narrative by way of his favorite word *ἀνήρ*. Faithful to his source—the Gospel of Mark—he pictures a rather gruesome portrayal of that male who did not live in a house but stayed among the tombs. He wore no clothing but used to be bound with chains and shackles as a restraint. The encounter with Jesus and the exorcism restored to the once-demonized man to his human condition. In other words, what at first may seem like a haphazard usage of words and expressions, with no logic behind it, reveals to be a methodical and well-thought strategy to underline the impact of the encounter with Jesus on man's live from now on. As a matter of fact, the story ends with the narrator's comment on the vicissitudes of the man and not on the actions of Jesus and his followers as one would expect; "the man went off and proclaimed throughout the whole town what Jesus had done for him" (Luke 8:39).

Użycie ἀνήρ [*anēr*] i ἄνθρωπος [*anthrōpos*] w opowiadaniu o uzdrowieniu opętanego z Gerazy (Łk 8,26–39)

Abstrakt: Niniejsze studium uwzględnia użycie rzeczowników ἀνήρ i ἄνθρωπος w uzdrowieniu opętanego z Gerazy (Łk 8,26–39). Na wstępie autor analizuje ich występowanie w Ewangelii Łukasza. W ten sposób pragnie zrozumieć logikę wyborów

dokonanych przez ewangelistę. Oba rzeczowniki są często używane przez Łukasza i zdarzają się przypadki, gdy stosuje je jako synonimy. To, co na pierwszy rzut oka może wydawać się przypadkowym użyciem słów i wyrażen bez żadnej logiki, okazuje się metodyczną i przemyślaną strategią. Wykorzystanie dwóch różnych rzeczowników ἀνὴρ i ἄνθρωπος podkreśla bowiem jaki wpływ na życie opętanego z Gerazy miało spotkanie z Jezusem. Techniki retoryczne, takie jak *inclusio* w Łk 8,27 i 8,38 oraz *repetitio* w Łk 8,29.33.35 zwracają uwagę czytelnika i uwrażliwiają go na przywrócone człowieczeństwo niegdyś opętanego mężczyzny z Gerazy. Tym samym wskazują najważniejszą postać Łukasowego opisu uzdrowienia. Rozróżnienie pomiędzy dwoma rzeczownikami ἀνὴρ i ἄνθρωπος, zgodnie z intencją „umiłowanego lekarza” Łukasza, powinno zatem zostać zachowane we współczesnych tłumaczeniach Biblii, co nie zawsze ma miejsce.

Słowa kluczowe: słownictwo Łukasza, opętany z Gerazy, Ewangelia Łukasza, krytyka narracyjna

Bibliography

- Bartnicki, R. – Klósek, K., *Metody Interpretacji Nowego Testamentu. Wprowadzenie* (Kraków: Petrus 2014).
- Bauckham, R., “The Son of Man: A Man in My Position or Someone,” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 7/23 (1985) 23–33. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0142064X8500702302>.
- Bauer, J.B., “Philologische Bemerkungen zu Lk 1,34,” *Biblica* 45/4 (1964) 535–540, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42640842>.
- Bauer, W. – Danker, F.W. – Arndt, F. – Gingrich, F.W. (eds.), *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, IL – London: The University of Chicago Press 2000) (= BDAG).
- Blass, F. – Debrunner, A. – Rehkopf, F., *Grammatica del greco del Nuovo Testamento* (Introduzione allo Studio della Bibbia Supplementi 2; Brescia: Paideia 1997) (= BDR).
- Bock, D.L., *Luke 1:1–9:50* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 1994).
- Bock, D.L., *Studying the Historical Jesus* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2002).
- Bovon, F., *Luke 1. A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (Hermeneia. A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN: Fortress 2002).
- Boxall, I., “Reading the Synoptic Gospels: The Case of the Gerasene Demoniac,” *Scripture Bulletin* 37/2 (2007) 51–65.
- Casey, P.M., “The Son of Man Problem,” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 67/3–4 (1976) 119–122. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/zntw.1976.67.3-4.147>.
- Chrupcała, L.D., *Il Vangelo di Luca. Analisi sintattica* (Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 86; Milano: Edizioni di Terra Santa 2018).

- Corsani, B., *Guida allo studio del Greco Biblico* (Roma: Società Biblica Britannica e Forestiera 2012).
- Craghan, J.F., “Redactional Study of Lk 7,21 in the Light of Dt 19,15,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 29/3 (1967) 353–367, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43711996>.
- Denaux, A. – Corstjens, R. – Mardaga, H., *The Vocabulary of Luke. An Alphabetical Presentation and a Survey of Characteristic and Noteworthy Words and Word Groups in Luke’s Gospel* (Biblical Tools and Studies 10; Leuven: Peeters 2009).
- Derrett, J.D.M., “ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας (Lk 2:14b),” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 11 (1998) 101–106.
- Dickerson, P.L., “The New Character Narrative in Luke-Acts and the Synoptic Problem,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116/2 (1997) 291–312. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/3266225>.
- Dupont, J., *Les Béatitudes: Tome I: Le problème littéraire – Les deux versions du Sermon sur la montagne et des Béatitudes* (Louvain: Nauwelaerts 1958).
- Edwards, J.R., *The Gospel according to Luke* (The Pilar New Testament Commentary; Nottingham: Apollos 2015).
- Farmer, W.R., *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis* (Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina Press 1976).
- Fitzmyer, J.A., *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes I–IX* (Anchor Bible 28A; New York, NY: Doubleday 1985).
- Forbes, G.W. – Harrower, S.D., *Raised from Obscurity: A Narratival and Theological Study of the Characterization of Women in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications 2015).
- García Pérez, J.M., “El endemoniado de Gerasa (Lc 8,26–39),” *Estudios bíblicos* 44 (1986) 117–146.
- Gonzalez, J.L., *The Story Luke Tells: Luke’s Unique Witness to the Gospel* (Grand Rapids, MI – Cambridge: Eerdmans 2015).
- Goulder, M.D., *Luke. A New Paradigm* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1989).
- Green, J.B., “Healing and Healthcare,” *The World of the New Testament. Cultural, Social and Historical Context* (eds. J.B. Green – L.M. McDonald; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2013) 330–341.
- Green, J.B., *The Gospel of Luke* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 1997).
- Grasso, S., *Luca. Traduzione e commento* (Roma: Borla 1999).
- Hendriksen, W., *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 1988).
- Hobart, W.K., *The Medical Language of Saint Luke* (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press 2004).

- Jay, E.G., *Grammatica greca del Nuovo Testamento* (Casale Monferrato: Piemme 2001).
- Jeremias, J., *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1980).
- Johnson, L.T., *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press 1991).
- Kilpatrick, R.S., “The Greek Syntax of Luke 2.14,” *New Testament Studies* 34/3 (1988) 473–475. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500020221>.
- Kistmaker, S.J., “Jesus as Story Teller: Literary Perspectives on the Parables,” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 16 (2005) 49–55.
- Klutz, T., *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts* (Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series 129; Cambridge: University Press 2004).
- Konieczny, D., “Teologia działalności Jezusa wypędzającego demony,” *Studia Diecezji Radomskiej* 2 (1999) 139–154.
- Marrow, S.B., “Principles for Interpreting the New Testament Soteriological Terms,” *New Testament Studies* 36/2 (1990) 268–280. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0028688500015083>.
- Metzger, B.M., *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft 2005).
- Mickiewicz, F., *Ewangelia według świętego Łukasza* (Nowy Komentarz Biblijny Nowy Testament III/1; Częstochowa: Edycja Świętego Pawła 2011).
- Muraoka, T., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain – Paris – Walpole, MA: Peeters 2009).
- Mounce, W.D., *Basics of Biblical Greek. Grammar* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan 2009).
- Neiryneck, F., *The Minor Agreements. In a Horizontal-Line Synopsis* (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 15; Leuven: Peeters 1991).
- Menéndez Antuña, L., “Of Social Death and Solitary Confinement: The Political Life of a Gerasene (Luke 8:26–39),” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 138/3 (2019) 643–664. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15699/jbl.1383.2019.650443>.
- Nolland, J., *Luke 1–9:20* (World Biblical Commentary 35A; Dallas, TX: Word Books 1989).
- Parsons, M.C. – Culy, M. – Stigall, J.J., *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press 2010).
- Parsons, M.C., *Luke* (Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2015).
- Plummer, A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Saint Luke* (Edinburgh: Clark 1928).
- Porter, S.E., *Idioms of the Greek New Testament* (Biblical Languages Greek; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press 1994).
- Reicke, B., *The Roots of the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia, PA: Fortress 1986).

- Resseguie, J.L., *Narrative Criticism of the New Testament. An Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2005).
- Robinson, J.M. – Hoffman, P. – Kloppenborg, J.S. (eds.), *The Critical Edition of Q. Synopsis including the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, Mark and Thomas with English, German, and French Translations of Q and Thomas* (Hermeneia. A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible; Minneapolis, MN – Leuven: Peeters 2000).
- Rossé, G., *Il Vangelo di Luca. Commento esegetico e teologico* (Roma: Città Nuova 2001).
- Shinall, M.C., “The Social Condition of Lepers in the Gospel,” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 137 (2018) 915–934.
- Stein, R.H., *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 1987).
- Talbert, C.H., *Literary Patterns: Theological Theme and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 20; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press 1974).
- Thayer, J.H., *Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark 1961).
- Wells, L., *The Greek Language of Healing from Homer to New Testament Times* (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 83; Berlin – New York, NY: Gruyter 1998).
- Witherington, B., *Women in the Ministry of Jesus: A Study of Jesus' Attitudes to Women and their Roles as Reflected in his Earthly Life* (Cambridge: University Press 1984).
- Wolter, M., *Das Lukasevangelium* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 5; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2008).
- Zerwick, M., *Biblical Greek Illustrated by Examples* (Scripta Pontifici Instituti Biblici 114; Roma: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico 1994).