ABSTRACT

Figuring Jesus:
The Power of Rhetorical Figures of Speech in the Gospel of Luke

Keith A. Reich, Ph.D.

Mentor: Mikeal C. Parsons, Ph.D.

This dissertation examines Luke's use of rhetorical figures of speech on the lips

of Jesus as a means of persuading his audience to accept a role-reversing message that

challenged the social, religious, economic and political systems in the Roman Empire. A

figure of speech is the use of either words or thoughts in a way that is uncommon or out

of the ordinary. Because figures of speech are the "uncommon" use of language, they

stand out to an audience and grab their attention. They are an artful ordering of words

designed to be powerful, memorable, and to seize attention. This dissertation takes

seriously the adage that says, "It's not what you say, it's how you say it." The form of

the Lukan Jesus' speech is just as important as the content of that speech. To ignore the

form of Jesus' speech is to ignore the power and persuasiveness of his message.

Luke uses figures of speech in various ways to persuade his audience of the

gospel message. He uses figures of speech to fulfill the stylistic virtues of clarity and

ornamentation. Fulfilling these stylistic virtues makes the Lukan Jesus' argument easy to

follow and impressive, serving as an *ethos* argument to portray Jesus as one who speaks

like the social elites. Further, Luke uses figures as a means of argument and persuasion

to draw the audience to side with Jesus and to participate in his message. These figures

serve as arguments of *ethos, logos,* and *pathos* and create audience members who are invested in the character of Jesus and the gospel message. Finally, Luke uses powerful and memorable figures of speech to proclaim a message of role reversals in the major social, religious, economic, and political systems of the Roman Empire. Using figures of speech that are highly refined and artful allows the proclamation of this role-reversing message to resonate with the audience and ultimately to form its members

Figuring Jesus:
The Power of Rhetorical Figures of Speech in the Gospel of Luke

by

Keith A. Reich, B.A., M.Div.

A Dissertation

Approved by the Department of Religion

_____

W. H. Bellinger, Jr., Ph.D., Chairperson

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Baylor University in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree
of
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved by the Dissertation Committee

_____

Mikeal C. Parsons, Ph.D., Chairperson

_____

Charles H. Talbert, Ph.D.

_____

R. Alden Smith, Ph.D.

Accepted by the Graduate School
May 2010

_____

J. Larry Lyon, Ph.D., Dean

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Last and certainly not least I would like to express my enormous gratitude and love to my wife Brooke, without whom this dissertation literally would never have been completed. Thank you for painstakingly reading through the many drafts of this dissertation and your ability to take the jumbled thoughts in my mind and help me put them into words that are understandable to anyone other than me.

To Brooke

I could not have done it without you

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The Problem

This dissertation attempts to answer two questions. (1) How does the Lukan Jesus communicate, and (2) what does such mode of communication accomplish? First, the Lukan Jesus communicates through a variety of rhetorical figures of speech. In the Gospel of Luke I have found approximately seven hundred figures of speech. Of those, nearly five hundred are spoken by Jesus.[1] Nearly every sentence spoken by the Lukan Jesus contains a figure of speech. Second, by using highly refined rhetorical figures of speech, the Lukan Jesus speaks in the manner of an educated man of high social status, thereby gaining a hearing for his role-reversing message.

How Does the Lukan Jesus Communicate?

Figures of speech. In modern America, most people recognize the use of rhetorical figures of speech whether they are aware of it or not. For example, most Americans will recognize the phrase, "Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country,"[2] though few will recognize this as an example of the

---

[1] Of the total number of figures of speech spoken by the Lukan Jesus, I treat a relatively small number in detail in the body of this work. A complete list of the 471 figures I have discovered can be found in the Appendix.

[2] John F. Kennedy, "Inaugural Address 20, January, 1961," in *Presidential Documents: The Speeches, Proclamations, and Policies that have Shaped the Nation*

figures of speech *antithesis* and *chiasmus*.[3] Likewise, most Americans will recognize the

following quotation:

> And so let freedom ring from the prodigious hilltops of New Hampshire.
> Let freedom ring from the mighty mountains of New York.
> Let freedom ring from the heightening Alleghenies of Pennsylvania.
> Let freedom ring from the snow-capped Rockies of Colorado.
> Let freedom ring from the curvaceous slopes of California.
> But not only that:
> Let freedom ring from Stone Mountain of Georgia.
> Let freedom ring from Lookout Mountain of Tennessee.
> Let freedom ring from every hill and molehill of Mississippi.
> From every mountainside, let freedom ring.[4]

Few, however, will recognize the use of *anaphora*.[5] Franklin Roosevelt used the figure

of speech *paronomasia*[6] when he said, "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself."[7]

While one may not know the names or definitions of these figures of speech, the

fact that these words are highly recognizable demonstrates the power of rhetorical figures

---

from Washington to Clinton, (eds. J. F. Watts, and Fred L. Israel, New York: Routledge), 314.

[3] *Antithesis*, Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.81-86; Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.21; *Chiasmus*, Galen O. Rowe, "Style," In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, (ed. Stanley Porter, Leiden: Brill, 2001), 137; Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.18.39.

[4] Martin Luther King, Jr., "I Have a Dream," in *I Have a Dream: Writings and Speeches the Changed the World*, (ed. James Melvin Washington; San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996), 105.

[5] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.30; Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19.

[6] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32.

[7] Franklin D. Roosevelt, "First Inaugural Address 4, March, 1933," in *Presidential Documents: The Speeches, Proclamations, and Policies that have Shaped the Nation from Washington to Clinton*, (eds. J. F. Watts, and Fred L. Israel, New York: Routledge, 2000), 260.

of speech. These thoughts would not have been as powerful without the craft of rhetorical figures of speech.

As a testament to the power of figures of speech, a recent study in modern advertising—the modern industry perhaps most concerned with persuasion—has found that figures of speech are used in 74% of all ads that have a headline.[8] Advertising agencies have found that the use of figures of speech help to persuade their audience and grab prospective customers' attention.

Rhetoric and ancient figures of speech. What therefore are rhetorical figures of speech? In order to discuss classical rhetorical figures of speech, it is first necessary to give a brief introduction to ancient rhetoric in general. In the Aristotelian sense, rhetoric is the art which consists of discovering the possible means of persuasion.[9] Aristotle's definition, however, communicates little of what is involved in the development and codification of rhetoric as it stood in the first century C.E. What must be made clear is that classical rhetoric did not create persuasive speech; rather, it was an investigation into that which makes speech persuasive. Therefore, persuasive speech does not follow the discipline of rhetoric but vice versa. As George Kennedy notes, "Classical rhetoric is a specific cultural development of a universal phenomenon of communication that probably has its ultimate natural origin in the instinct of self-preservation common to all

---

[8] James H. Leigh, "The Use of Figures of Speech in Print Ad Headlines," *Journal of Advertising* 23 (1994): 17-33. Leigh notes that the single most used figure is that of *assonance* and *alliteration,* followed by the *rhetorical question.*

[9] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.2.

creatures."[10] Thus, as all cultures desire to communicate, and to communicate well, classical rhetoric is the result of the specific way in which the Greeks, and later the Romans, codified the art of speaking persuasively.

Classical rhetoric is divided into three genres, deliberative (συμβουλευτικόν), judicial or forensic (δικανικόν), and epideictic (ἐπιδεικτικόν).[11] These three genres are defined by the hearer of an argument. According to Aristotle, there are three kinds of hearers, one who judges things of the future (deliberative), one who judges things of the past (judicial), and one who is a spectator of the orator's skill (epideictic).[12]

Aristotle also discusses three general means of persuasion or argument: *ethos, pathos,* and *logos.* An argument from *ethos* is based upon the character of the speaker. *Pathos* arguments deal with the ability of the orator to sway the emotions of the hearer. Finally, *logos* arguments deal with logical proofs.[13]

There are five tasks enumerated in the handbooks to be completed by the rhetorician. They are: (1) *inventio* (invention), (2) *dispositio* (arrangement), (3) *elocutio* (style), (4) *memoria* (memory), and (5) *pronuntiatio* (delivery). Ps-Cicero lays out these tasks as follows:

> The speaker should possess the faculties of Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory, and Delivery. Invention is the devising of the matter, true or plausible,

---

[10] George Alexander Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, (ed. Stanley Porter, Leiden: Brill, 2001), 7.

[11] These genres were first set down by Aristotle in *Rhet.* 1.3. These genres were still the norm in the first century as Ps-Cicero refers to them in *Rhet. Her.* 1.2.2.

[12] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.3.

[13] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.3-6.

that would make the case convincing. Arrangement is the ordering and distribution of the matter, making clear the place to which each thing is to be assigned. Style is the adaptation of suitable words and sentences to the matter devised. Memory is the firm retention in the mind of the matter, words, and arrangement. Delivery is the graceful regulation of voice, countenance, and gesture.[14]

Thus, a rhetorical handbook teaches the orator to brainstorm, compose, adorn, memorize, and deliver a speech. For the purposes of this dissertation I am concerned primarily with the third task of style.

Style, under which rhetoricians discuss figures of speech, is a massive topic, including all of the guidelines an orator should follow in order to make his or her speech/composition rhetorically powerful. There are four virtues of style according to Quintilian and Ps-Cicero: (1) correctness, (2) clarity, (3) ornamentation, and (4) propriety.[15] Figures of speech fall under the rhetorical virtue of ornamentation.

There are three subtypes of "figures." Tropes, which deal with single words, figures of speech, which deal with the artful ordering of multiple words, and figures of thought which deal with the artful ordering of thoughts.

For Quintilian, a trope (which means a turn) is "the artistic alteration of a word or phrase from its proper meaning to another."[16] Thus, a trope is what we might call a "turn of phrase." A trope consists of using single words in a different way from their proper meaning in order to adorn one's style.

---

[14] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 1.2.3 (Caplan, LCL). I have deliberately tried to rely upon the ancient sources as much as possible for the controlling system of rhetoric in this study.

[15] For a good introduction of style in classical rhetoric see Rowe, "Style," 121-157.

[16] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.6.1 (Butler, LCL).

According to Ps-Cicero, figures confer "distinction (*dignitas*)" on a composition. If a trope is the change of meaning for a single word, figures of speech are the uncommon ordering of words for rhetorical ornament. Figures of speech give "fine polish" to the language.[17] A figure of thought on the other hand conveys distinction based upon the uncommon ordering or juxtaposition of thoughts, not the words themselves.

For the purposes of this dissertation I will most often refer to all three categories as "figures of speech," or sometimes merely "figures."[18] While the distinctions are good from a conceptual or teaching basis, the function of tropes, figures of speech, and figures of thought are dependent on context, not on whether the given example is a trope, figure of speech, or figure of thought.

The topic of figures of speech is enormous in its own right. One thing that makes a study of rhetorical figures of speech difficult is that there is no authoritative and comprehensive list of figures. Every book on the topic orders the lists differently and uses different names for the figures. Nevertheless, there are many and various helpful sources for study of rhetorical figures of speech.

First, there is a phenomenal website for the study of rhetoric in general, and specifically for figures of speech. Gideon Burton at Brigham Young University runs the site called *Silva Rhetoricae* (the forest of rhetoric),[19] which contains an alphabetical list

---

[17] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.18 (Caplan, LCL).

[18] Chaim Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca actually think that the distinctions make it difficult to recognize the argumentative function of figures of speech. Chaïm Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation,* (trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969), 171-172.

[19] Gideon Burton, *Silva Rhetoricae,* (Online: www.humanities.byu/rhetoric).

of links to figures of speech. The list is linked to pages with definitions, examples, other names of the figures, and often references to ancient sources. Overall, this is a great site for quick reference on figures of speech and their ancient references. As with all websites, the information is subject to mistakes and thus should not be used as an authority, but rather as a starting point and window into the works listed below.

The easiest book to use for quick reference on figures of speech is Richard A. Lanham's *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms.*[20] The book's subtitle states that it is intended for study of English literature. Therefore, the work is focused on modern figures of speech. The book provides an alphabetical list of rhetorical terms, including, but not limited to, figures of speech. There is little consistency in the definitions provided for various figures. Some figures list definitions, examples, and ancient and modern sources. Some figures list only a brief definition. There is also a section of the book devoted to "terms classified as ornaments" which includes a list of figures of speech with brief definitions. The list is organized according to tropes, figures of speech, and figures of thought. Lanham's book is good for quick reference, but is less helpful for a full understanding of the figures.

Galen O. Rowe's chapter on style in Brill's *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period* [21] is probably the most accessible modern work dealing with the classical rhetorical task of style. He deals with the four virtues of style: correctness, clarity, ornament, and propriety. In the ornament section he organizes figures by tropes,

---

[20] Richard A. Lanham, *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature,* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968).

[21] Rowe, "Style."

word figures (figures of speech), and thought figures (figures of thought). Rowe gives

concise definitions with Greek and Latin examples and their English translations. For a

succinct and accessible treatment of ancient figures of speech Rowe's article is the best

source available.

Moving to more comprehensive material, Josef Martin's *Antike Rhetorik* is one of

the two most useful authoritative sources for classical rhetoric.[22] It is organized

according to the five tasks of rhetoric: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and

delivery. Martin organizes the figures according to tropes (*die Tropen*), figures of

thought (*die Sinnfiguren*), and figures of speech (*die Wortfiguren*). Martin lists the

figures by both their Greek and Latin name—preferring the Greek—with definitions and

footnotes to ancient sources. Martin's treatment is very comprehensive and provides

useful definitions and ancient source references.

The most comprehensive work on ancient Rhetoric is Heinrich Lausberg's

Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik,[23] and its recent English translation.[24] Lausberg's

treatment of the rhetorical task of style alone spans two hundred and sixty-three pages.

Lausberg organizes the figures by tropes, figures of speech, and figures of thought.

Lausberg's treatment of ancient figures is the most complete of all current sources. He

gives the names of figures in Latin and Greek—preferring the Latin. Definitions are

---

[22] Josef Martin, *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode,* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft ; 2. Abt., 3. T; München: Beck, 1974).

[23] Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, (2nd ed. München: Max Heuber, 1973).

[24] Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study,* (ed. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson; trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen and David E. Orton; Leiden: Brill, 1998).

rarely in English, and are usually given directly from the ancient sources in Latin, Greek, or both. Lausberg's citation of source material is exhaustive and examples from ancient sources are numerous. The most useful parts of Lausberg's volume are the three indices in Greek, Latin, and French. Lausberg's massive work is the definitive modern volume treating classical figures of speech.

Finally, the two most useful ancient sources, and the sources from which I draw my list of classical figures of speech, are Ps-Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium* book 4 and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* books 8-9. Both authors list the figures in one section of their treatises and give definitions and examples from ancient literature. Ps-Cicero only has two subdivisions: figures of speech and figures of thought. He treats tropes under figures of speech. Quintilian organizes his figures according to tropes, figures of speech, and figures of thought. The examples and definitions of all of the figures in this dissertation, with the exception of one,[25] come from Ps-Cicero and Quintilian.

In the following, I give an alphabetical list of tropes, figures of speech, and figures of thought derived from Ps-Cicero's *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria.* This list serves as a glossary for the current study.

The naming of figures of speech is notoriously difficult because there are many names for a given figure and each rhetorician seems to differ as to the names, but not the definitions. For the names of the figures I have used the following rules: (1) I have used

---

[25] Neither Ps-Cicero nor Quintilian include *alliteration/assonance* in their treatment of figures. Since, however, I have found this figure of speech in Luke and the figure did exist in ancient rhetoric, I have used Lausberg for the definition and example. Ps-Cicero cites the same example, though does not refer to this as a figure of speech and does not give the practice a name. Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.18.

the most common or well-known name which is usually based on the Latin, e.g.,

alliteration/assonance rather than *homoeophrophoron*. (2) If no well-known name is

used, I have used the Greek name. (3) If no well-known or Greek name is used, I have

used the Latin name. Examples are from the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* unless figure only

occurs in Quintilian or elsewhere.

Adiunctio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.27.38): The figure in which the verb holding the sentence together is placed not in the middle, but at the beginning or end; e.g., (Beginning): Fades physical beauty with disease or age." (End): "Either with disease or age physical beauty fades."

Allegory (*Permutatio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.34.46; *Inst.* 8.6.44-53): The trope denoting one thing by the letter of the words, but another by their meaning; e.g., (Comparison): "For when dogs act the part of wolves, to what guardian, pray, are we going to entrust our cattle." (Argument) referring to Drusus as a "faded reflection of the Gracchi." (Contrast): "If, for example, one should mockingly call a spendthrift and voluptuary frugal and thrifty."

Alliteration/Assonance (*Homoeophrophoron*) (*figure of speech,* Lausberg, *Handbook,* 432): the frequent repetition of the same consonant, chiefly the initial consonant, in a sequence of several words; e.g., "O Titus Tatius, Tyrant, what great things you have brought upon yourself (*o Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti*)."

Anadiplosis (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.44-45): The figure in which there is a repetition of a word which ends a clause at the beginning of the next clause, e.g., "yet this man lives. Lives?" and again, "And ye, Pierian Muses, shall enhance their worth for Gallus, Gallus, he for whom each hour my love burns stronger."

Anaphora (*Epanaphora, Repetitio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19; *Inst.* 9.3.30): The figure in which the same words begin successive phrases; e.g., "Scipio razed Numantia, Scipio destroyed Carthage, Scipio brought peace, Scipio saved the state."

Antanaclasis (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.68-69): The figure in which the same word is used with two different meanings.

Antistrophe (*Conversio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19; *Inst.* 9.3.30-31): The figure in which there is a repetition of the same word as the last word in successive phrases: similar to *anaphora*; e.g., "Since that time when from our

10

state concord disappeared, liberty disappeared, good faith disappeared, friendship disappeared, the common weal disappeared."

Antithesis (*Contentio*) (*figure of speech, figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.15.21; 4.45.58; *Inst.* 9.3.81-86): The figure in which style is built upon contraries, using contrary thoughts in successive clauses; *figure of speech:* e.g., "When all is calm, you are confused; when all is in confusion, you are calm." "While you deplore the troubles besetting him, this knave rejoices in the ruin of the state."

Aporia (*Dubitatio*) (*figure of speech, figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.29.40; *Inst.* 9.2.19-25): The figure in which the speaker seems to ask which of two or more words he had better use; feigned hesitation, to be at a loss, to ask advice from the audience; e.g., "At that time the republic suffered exceedingly from—ought I to say—the folly of the consuls, or their wickedness, or both."

Aposiopesis (*Preacisio, Antiphrasis*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.30.41; *Inst.* 9.2.47-48, 9.2.54-55): The figure in which something is said and then the rest of what the speaker had begun to say is left unfinished. The suspicion expressed is more telling than the narration of the information itself; e.g., "You dare to say that, who recently at another's home—I shouldn't dare tell, lest in saying things becoming to you, I should seem to say something unbecoming to me."

Apostrophe (*Exclamatio*) (*figure of speech, figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22; *Inst.* 9.3.23-24, 9.2.26-27, 9.2.38-39): A figure claiming indignation or grief by means of an address to an individual; e.g., "Perfidious Fregellae, how quickly, because of your crime, you have wasted away."

Asyndeton (*Dissolutio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.30.41; *Inst.* 9.3.50): The figure in which there is a presentation in separate parts, conjunctions being suppressed; e.g., "Indulge your father, obey your relatives, gratify your friends, submit to the laws."

Autonomasia (*Pronominatio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.31.42; *Inst.* 8.6.29-30): The trope in which one designates by an accidental epithet a thing that cannot be called by its proper name; e.g., "If some one speaking of the Gracchi should say, 'Surely the grandsons of Africanus did not behave like this.'"

Brevitas (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.54.68): The figure in which one expresses an idea in the very minimum of essential words; e.g., "On his way he took Lemnus, then left a garrison at Thasus, after that he destroyed the Bithynian city, Cius; next, returning to the Hellespont, he forthwith occupies Abydus."

Catachresis (*Abusio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.33.45): The trope in which there is the inexact use of a like and kindred word in place of the precise and proper one; e.g.,

"the power of the man is short," "small height," "the long wisdom in the man," "a mighty speech."

Chiasmus (*Commutatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.18.39): The figure in which two discrepant thoughts are so expressed by transposition that the latter follows from the former although contradictory to it; e.g., "You must eat to live, not live to eat." And "I do not write poems, because I cannot write the sort I wish, and I do not wish to write the sort I can."

Climax (*Gradatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.25.34; *Inst.* 9.3.55-57): The figure in which a speaker passes to the next word only after advancing by steps to the preceding one; e.g., "Now what remnant of liberty survives if those men *may* do what they *please*, if they *can* do what they *may*, if they *dare* do what they *can*, if they *do* what they *dare*, and if you *approve* of what they *do*." And again, "The industry of Africanus brought him excellence, his excellence glory, his glory rivals."

Colon or Clause (*Membrum*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.19.26): The name given to the sentence member, brief and complete, which does not express an entire thought, but is in turn supplemented by another colon as follows: e.g., "On the one hand you were helping the enemy," which should be supplemented by another colon: "And on the other you were hurting your friend."

Comma (*Articulus*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.19.26): The figure in which single words are set apart by pauses in staccato speech; e.g., "By your vigor, voice, looks, you have terrified your adversaries." And again, "you have destroyed your enemies by jealousy, injuries, influence, perfidy."

Commoratio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.45.58): The figure in which one remains rather long upon, and often returns to, the strongest topic in which the whole cause rests.

Comparison (*Similitudo*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.45.59-4.48.61; *Inst.* 9.2.100-101): The figure in which there is a manner of speech that caries over an element of likeness from one thing to a different thing. This is used to embellish or prove or clarify or vivify. It also has four forms: contrast, negation, detailed parallel, and abridged comparison. The author lists several examples from each of the four forms, and for each of the four purposes; e.g., (Negation): "Neither can an untrained horse, however well built by nature, be fit for the services desired of a horse, nor can an uncultivated man, however well endowed by nature, attain to virtue."

Concessio (*figure of thought, Inst.* 9.2.51): The figure in which one pretends to admit something actually unfavorable by way of showing confidence in one's

cause, e.g., in Cicero, speaking of the prejudice against his client, "Let it prevail in the public assembly, but be silent in the courts of law."

Conclusio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.30.41): The figure in which, by means of a brief argument, one deduces the necessary consequences of what has been said or done before; e.g., "But if the oracle had predicted to the Danaans that Troy could not be taken without the arrows of Philoctetes, and these arrows moreover served only to smite Alexander, then certainly killing Alexander was the same as taking Troy."

Conduplicatio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.18.38): The figure in which there is a repetition of one or more words for the purpose of amplification or appeal to pity; e.g., "You are promoting riots, Gaius Gracchus, yes, civil and internal riots."

Confessio (*figure of thought, Inst.* 9.2.51): The figure in which there is a confession of a fact that in no way harms one's case.

Coniunctio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.27.38): The figure in which both the previous and succeeding phrases are held together by placing the verb between them; e.g., "Either with disease physical beauty fades, or with age. (*Formae dignitas aut morbo deflorescit aut vetustate*)."

Contrarium (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.18.25): The figure in which there are two opposing statements, one if which is used to directly prove the other; e.g., "Now how should you expect one who has ever been hostile to his own interests to be friendly to another's." And, "Now why should you think that one who is, as you have learned, a faithless friend, can be an honorable enemy."

Correctio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.26.36): The figure in which one retracts what has been said and replaces it with what seems more suitable; e.g., "After the men in question had conquered, or rather had been conquered—for how shall I call that a conquest which has brought more disaster than benefit to the conquerors."

Definitio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.25.35): The figure in which there is a brief, clear cut designation of the characteristic qualities of a thing; e.g., "The sovereign majesty of the republic is that which comprises the dignity and grandeur of the state."

Demonstratio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.40.68; *Inst.* 9.2.40-44): The figure in which an event is so described in words that the business seems to be enacted and the subject to pass vividly before our eyes; e.g., "In a sweat, with his eyes blazing, hair bristling, toga awry, he begins to quicken his pace…but this fellow,

frothing crime from his mouth, breathing forth cruelty from the depth of his lungs."

Descriptio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.39.51): The figure which contains a clear, lucid, and impressive exposition of the consequences of an act; e.g., "But, men of the jury, if by your votes you free this defendant, immediately, like a lion released from his cage, or some foul beast loosed from his chains, he will slink and prowl about in the forum, sharpening his teeth to attack everyone's property … &c."

Digressio (*figure of thought, Inst.* 9.2.55-57): The figure in which one leaves off from the original topic for a different tangential topic.

Disiunctum (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.27.37): The figure in which each of two or more clauses ends with a special verb; e.g., "With disease physical beauty fades (*deflorescit*), with age it dies (*extinguitur*)."

Distributio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.35.47): The figure in which certain specified roles are assigned among a number of things or persons; e.g., "The Senate's function is to assist the state with counsel; the magistracy's is to execute, by diligent activity, the Senate's will; the people's to chose and support by its votes the best measures and the most suitable men."

Divisio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.40.52): The figure in which one separates the alternatives of a question and resolves each by means of a reason adjoined; e.g., "Why should I now reproach you in any way? If you are an upright man, you have not deserved reproach; if a wicked man, you will be unmoved."

Effictio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.49.63): The figure in which one represents and depicts in words clearly enough for recognition the bodily form of some person; e.g., "I mean him, men of the jury, the ruddy, short, bent man, with white and rather curly hair, blue-grey eyes, and a huge scar on his chin, if perhaps you can recall him to memory"

Ellipsis (*Detractio*) (*figure of thought*, *Inst.* 9.2.37): The figure in which there is a deliberate omission of any indication of who is speaking.

Emphasis (*Significatio*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.53.67-4.54.67; *Inst.* 9.2.64-65): The figure in which one leaves more to be suspected than has actually been asserted. It is produced through hyperbole, ambiguity, logical consequence, aposiopesis, and analogy. This figure sometimes possesses liveliness and distinction in the highest degree; indeed it permits the hearer himself to guess what the speaker has not mentioned; e.g., (Hyperbole): "Out of so great a patrimony, in so short a time, this man has not laid by even an earthen pitcher

wherewith to seek a fire for himself;" e.g., (Aposiopesis): "He who so handsome and so young, recently at a stranger's house—I am unwilling to say more."

Epanalepsis (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.28-29): The figure in which one repeats the same word twice in a row, (or on both ends of a parenthesis).

Epanodos, (*Regressio*) (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.35-36): The figure in which one reiterates the same words while further distinguishing meaning; the repetition may also serve to mark a contrast, e.g., "Iphitus too with me and Pelius came, Iphitus bowed with age and Pelias Slow-Limping with the wound Ulysses gave."

Epithet (*Epitheton*) (*trope, Inst.* 8.6.40-43): The figure, which is rare in oratory, and is solely for ornament. An epithet cannot stand by itself, but only stands with the proper name as an augment to that name.

Exemplum (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.49.62): The figure in which there is a citation of something done or said in the past, along with the definite naming of the doer or author.

Expeditio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.29.40-41): The figure in which we have enumerated the several ways by which something could have been brought about, and all are discarded except the one on which we are insisting; e.g., "Since it is established that the estate you claim as yours was mine, you must show that you took possession of it as vacant land, or made it your property by right of prescription, or bought it, or that it came to you by inheritance. Since I was on the premises, you could not have taken possession of it as vacant land. Even by now you cannot have made it your property by right of prescription. No sale is disclosed. Since I am alive, my property could not have come to you by inheritance. It remains then, that you have expelled me by force from my estate."

Frequentatio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.40.52): The figure in which points scattered throughout the whole case are collected in one place so as to make the speech more impressive or sharp, or accusatory; e.g., "He is the betrayer of his own self respect, and they waylayer of the self respect of others; covetous, intemperate, irascible, arrogant; disloyal to his parents, ungrateful to his friends, troublesome to his kin; insulting to his betters, disdainful of his equals and mates, cruel to his inferiors; in short he is intolerable to everyone."

Homoeoptoton (*Similiter Cadens*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28; *Inst.* 9.3.78-79): The figure in which, in the same period, two or more words appear in the same case with like terminations; e.g., "Am I to praise a man lacking in virtue, but abounding in good luck (*Hominem laudem egentem virtutis, abundantem felicitates*)?" And again, "This man places all his hope in money; from wisdom is his soul withdrawn. Through diligence he acquires riches, but through negligence

he corrupts his soul (*huic omnis in pecunia speas est, a sapientia est animus remotus; diligentia conparat divitas, neglegentia corrumpit animum. Et tamen, cum ita vivit, neminem prae se ducit hominem*)."

Homoteleuton (*Similiter Desinens*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28; *Inst.* 9.3.77): The figure in which the endings of the words are similar, although the words are indeclinable; e.g., "You dare to act dishonorably, you strive to talk despicably, you live hatefully, you sin zealously, you speak offensively (*Turpiter audes facere, nequiter studes dicere, vivis invidiose, delinquis studiose, loqueris odiose*)."

Hypophora (*Subiectio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.24.33-34): The figure in which one asks questions of adversaries, or of oneself, and answers with what ought or ought not to be said, making oneself look good, and the adversary look bad.

Hyperbaton (*Transgressio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.32.44; *Inst.* 8.6.62-67): The trope which upsets the normal word order by means of anastrophe or transposition; e.g., (Anastrophe): "I think the immortal gods have given this to you on account of your virtue (*hoc vobis deos immortales arbitror dedisse virtute pro vestra*)." (Transposition): "Unstable fortune has exercised her greatest power on this creature. All the means of living well chance has jealously taken from him (*Instabilis in istum plurimum fortuna valuit. Omnes invidiose eripuit bene vivendi casus facultates*)."

Hyperbole (*Superlatio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.33.44; *Inst.* 8.6.67-76): The figure in which one exaggerates the truth, whether for the sake of magnifying or minimizing something. This figure is used independently or with comparison; e.g., (Independently): "But if we maintain concord in the state, we shall measure the empire's vastness by the rising and the setting of the sun." (With comparison from equivalence): "His body was as white as snow, his face burned like fire." (With comparison from superiority): "From his mouth flowed speech sweeter than honey."

Irony (*Illusio*) (*trope, figure of thought, Inst.* 8.6.54-59; 9.2.44-51): The figure in which the meaning is contrary to the words uttered, understood from context or delivery. Quintilian gives the following Greek words which represent the same concept: σαρκασμός· ἀστεϊσμός· ἀντίφρασις· παροιμία (sarcasm, urbane wit, contradiction, proverbs). In the *figurative* form the speaker disguises his entire meaning, more than just words, the entire situation may be contrary to the intended meaning; e.g., "rejected by him, you migrated to your boon companion, that excellent gentleman (*virum optimum*), Metellus," in which the irony lies in two words (*virum optimum*).

Isocolon (*Conpar*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.20.27; *Inst.* 9.3.80): The figure comprised of cola (see colon above) which consist of virtually equal number of syllables; e.g., "the father was meeting death in battle; the son was planning a marriage at home. These omens wrought grievous disasters (*In proelio mortem parens oppetebat, domi filius nuptias conparabat; haec omina gravis casus administrabant*)."

Litotes (*Deminutio*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.38.50): The figure in which we say that by nature, fortune, or diligence, we or our clients possess some exceptional advantage, and, in order to avoid the impression of arrogant display, we moderate and soften the statement of it; e.g., "This, men of the jury, I have the right to say—that by our labor and diligence I have contrived to be no laggard in the mastery of military science." (Use of "no laggard" instead of saying that he was "the best.").

Maxim (*Sententia*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.17.24): This figure is a saying drawn from life which shows concisely either what happens or ought to happen in life; e.g., "Every beginning is difficult." And "A free man is that man to be judged who is a slave to no base habit."

*Metalipsi*s (*trope, Inst.* 8.6.38-39): The trope in which one provides a transition from one trope to another; e.g., calling Χείρων the centaur Ἥσσων (both of which mean inferior).

Metaphor (*Translatio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.24.45; *Inst.* 8.6.4-18): The trope in which a word applying to one thing is transferred to another, because the similarity seems to justify the transference; e.g., "The recent arrival of an army suddenly blotted out the state."

Metonymy (*Denominatio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.32.43; *Inst.* 8.6.23-28): The trope which draws from an object closely akin or associated, an expression suggesting the object meant, but not called by its own name. This is accomplished in several ways; e.g., (Greater for the Lesser): "speaking of the Tarpeian Rock and calling it 'the Capitoline'." (Using the name of the thing invented for that of the inventor): "wine" for "Liber" or "wheat" for "Ceres." (Using the name of the instrument for the possessor): e.g., "as if one should refer to the Macedonians as follows: 'Not so quickly did the Lances (Macedonians) get possession of Greece." 4) (Using the cause for the effect): As in referring to someone doing something in war might say, "Mars forced you to do that." And several other examples: effect for cause, container for content, content for container.

Notatio (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.50.63-4.51.65): The figure in which one describes a person's character by the definite signs which, like distinctive marks, are attributes of that character; e.g., The author gives a rather lengthy story of a man who parades around as if he were rich, but is actually poor. Throughout, by

telling a story of this mans words and deeds, he describes his character with remarkable clarity. Further, the author writes, "Character delineations of this kind which describe the qualities proper to each man's nature carry very great charm, for they set before our eyes a person's whole character, of the boastful man, as I undertook to illustrate, for the envious or pompous man, or the miser, the climber, the lover, the voluptuary, the thief, the public informer—in short, by such delineation any one's ruling passion can be brought into the open."

Onomatopoeia (*Nominatio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.31.42; *Inst.* 8.31-37): The trope which suggests to us that we should ourselves designate with a suitable word, whether for the sake of imitation or of expressiveness, a thing which either lacks a name or has an inappropriate name; e.g., (Imitation): "Our ancestors, for example, said 'roar (*rudere*),' 'bellow (*mugire*),' 'murmur (*murmurari*),' 'hiss (*sibilare*).'" "After this creature attacked the republic, there was a hullabaloo (*fragor*) among the first men of the state."

Paralipsis (*Occultatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.27.37): The figure in which we say that we are passing by, or do not know, or refuse to say that which precisely now we are saying; e.g., "I do not mention that you have taken monies from our allies; I do not concern myself with your having despoiled the cities, kingdoms, and homes of them all. I pass by your thieveries and robberies, all of them."

Parenthesis (*Interpositio, Interclusio, Paremptosis*) (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.23-24): The figure in which there is an interruption of the continuous flow of our language by the insertion of some remark.

Parhessia (*Licentia*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.36.48; *Inst.* 9.2.27-29): The figure in which, when talking before those to whom we owe reverence or fear, we yet exercise our right to speak out because we seem justified in reprehending them, or persons dear to them, for some fault. One may follow *parhessia* up with praise to mollify the hearers, or use feigned *parhessia*, using pretence of frank speech to gain the support of the audience; e.g., "You wonder, fellow citizens, that every one abandons your interests? That no one undertakes your cause? Blame this on yourselves; cease to wonder…&c."

Paronomasia (*Adnominatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32; *Inst.* 9.3.66-67): The figure in which by modification of sound or a change in letters, there is a close resemblance between verb or noun, so that similar words mean dissimilar things; e.g., "This one who boasts and displays himself so magnificently was sold (as a slave) before he came to Rome (*Hic qui se magnifice iactat atque ostentat, venĭt* (*veneo*: to be sold [as a slave]) *antequem Romam venĭt* (*venio*: to come))." The author calls these word plays. It can also occur when the words are not quite so close: e.g., "Who am I, whom am I accusing, whom am I benefitting (*qui sim, quem insimulem, cui prosim*)?"

18

Period (*Continuatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.19.27): The figure in which there is a close packed and uninterrupted group of words expressing a complete thought. Best used in three places: (Maxim): e.g., "Fortune cannot much harm him who has built his support more firmly upon virtue than upon chance." (Contrast): e.g., "For if a person has not placed much hope in chance, what great harm can chance do him." (Conclusion): e.g., "But if fortune has her greatest power over those who have committed all their plans to chance, we should not entrust our all with her, lest she gain too great a domination over us."

Periphrasis (*Circumitio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.32.43; *Inst.* 8.6.59-61): The trope in which one expresses a simple idea by means of circumlocution; e.g., "The foresight of Scipio crushed the power of Carthage," instead of just saying, "Scipio crushed Carthage."

Permissio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.29.39): The figure in which we indicate in speaking that we yield and submit the whole matter to another's will. This figure helps in producing pity; e.g., "Since only soul and body remain to me, now that I am deprived of everything else, even these, which alone of many goods are left to me, I deliver up to your power. You may use and even abuse me in your own way as you think best; with impunity make your decision upon me, whatever it may be."

Personification (*Conformatio*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.53.66): The figure which consists in representing an absent person as present, or in making a mute thing, or one lacking form articulate, and attributing to it a definite form and a language or certain behavior appropriate to its character; e.g., "But if that great Lucius Brutus should now come to life again and appear here before you, would he not use this language? 'I banished kings; you bring in tyrants. I created liberty, which did not exist; which I created you do not wish to preserve…"

Pleonasm (*Expolitio*) (*figure of speech, figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.42.54*, Inst.* 9.3.45-46): The figure which consists in dwelling on the same topic and yet seeming to say something ever new; e.g., "No peril is so great that a wise man would think it ought to be avoided when the safety of the fatherland is at stake. When the lasting security of the state is in question, the man endowed with good principles will undoubtedly believe that in defense of the fortunes of the republic he ought to shun no crisis of life, and he will ever persist in the determination eagerly to enter, for the fatherland, any combat, however great the peril to life." And, "You have decided, you have passed sentence, you have given judgment," and again, "he departed, he went, he burst forth, he was gone."

Polyptoton (*klisis*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32; *Inst.* 9.3.36-37. Cf. Theon, 101 for *klisis*): The figure in which the cases of the words are changed, e.g., "Alexander of Macedon, with consummate toil from boyhood trained his mind to virtue. Alexander's virtues have been broadcast with fame and glory

throughout the world. All men greatly feared Alexander, yet deeply loved him. Had longer life been granted to Alexander, the Macedonian lances would have flown across the ocean (***Alexander** [nominative] Macedo summo labore animum ad virtutem a pueritia confirmavit. **Alexand**ri [genitive] virtutes per orbem terrae cum laude et Gloria vulgate sunt. **Alexandrum** [accusative] omnes maxime metuerunt, idem plurumum dilexerunt. **Alexandro** [dative] si vita data longior esset, trans Oceanum macedonum transvolassent sarisae*)." And again, "Is this your father? Do you still call him father? Are you your father's son (*Pater hic tuus? Patrem nunc appellas? Patris tui filius*)?"

Polysyndeton (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.50-54): The figure in which there is the use of many connecting particles. One may repeat the same conjunctions, or use different ones.

Prolepsis (*Praesumptio*) (*figure of thought, Inst.* 9.2.16-18) The figure in which we forestall objections as to what we are about to say.

Prosopopoiia (*Sermocinatio, Ethopoia, Mimesis*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.42.55; *Inst.* 9.2.29-37; 9.2.58-63): The figure in which one puts in the mouth of some person language in keeping with his character. Imitation of other person's characteristics, serves to excite the gentler emotions. Usually consists in banter, but may be concerned with words or deeds; e.g., "The wise man will think that for the common weal he ought to undergo every peril. Often he will say to himself 'Not for self alone was I born, but also, and much more, for the fatherland. Above all, let me spend my life, which I owe to fate, for the salvation of my country.'"

Ratiocinatio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.16.23): The figure in which one asks the reason for every statement made and then gives the answer; e.g., "It is a good principle which our ancestors established, of not putting to death any king captured by force of arms. Why is this so? Because it were unfair to use the advantage vouchsafed to us by fortune to punish those whom the same fortune had but recently placed in the highest station."

Rhetorical Question (*Interrogatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22): The figure in which one asks questions to reinforce the argument; e.g., "So when you were doing and saying and managing all this, were you, or were you not, alienating and estranging from the republic the sentiments of our allies."

Simile (*Imago*) (*figure of thought, Rhet. Her.* 4.49.62): The figure in which there is a comparison of one figure with another, implying a certain resemblance between them. This is used either for praise or censure; e.g., (Praise): "He entered the combat in body like the strongest bull, in impetuosity like the fiercest lion."

Symploce (*Complexio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.14.20; *Inst.* 9.3.31): The figure in which there is the combined use of *antistrophe* and *anaphora*: repeating both the first and the last words in a clause or phrase; e.g., "One whom the Senate has condemned, one whom the Roman people has condemned, one whom universal public opinion has condemned."

Synechdoche (*Intellectio*) (*trope, Rhet. Her.* 4.33.44; *Inst.* 8.6.19-22): The trope in which the whole is known from the part, or the part from the whole. Look also for the singular from the plural and vice versa; e.g., "Were not those nuptial flutes reminding you of his wedding (i.e., the flutes for the whole marriage)."

Synoikeiosis (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.64): The figure in which there is a connection of two different things: e.g., "The miser lacks that which he has no less than that which he has not."

Synonymy (*Interpretatio*) (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.18.38-39): The figure in which one does not duplicate the same word, but substitutes another with the same meaning; e.g., "You have overturned (*evertisti*) the republic from its roots (*radicitus*); you have demolished (*deiecisti*) the state from its foundations (*funditus*)."

Traductio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.14.20-21): The figure in which there is a repetition of certain words without offense to style. Also, the same type of figure is used when using a word with the same spelling in different ways; e.g., "One who has nothing in life more desirable than life cannot cultivate a virtuous life," or "I would leave this place, should the senate grant me leave."

Transitio (*figure of speech, Rhet. Her.* 4.26.35; *Inst.* 9.3.70-74): The figure which briefly recalls what has been said, and likewise sets forth what is to follow; e.g., "My benefactions to the defendant you know; now learn how he has requited me."

Zeugma (*figure of speech, Inst.* 9.3.62-64): The figure in which a number of clauses are all completed by the same verb.

The question arises, what role do figures of speech play in the argument of a narrative? That is, what is their function/effect? Are they "mere rhetoric," easily dismissed as a distraction? Or, do figures play a further role in persuasion? I will argue

that figures certainly play a role in furthering Luke's argument.[26] That said, it can be

difficult to determine what the specific function of a given figure is. As the previous

definitions and examples of figures demonstrate, very few are given a specific function.

One figure which is defined with a specific function is that of *apostrophe,* which the

Rhetorica ad Herennium defines as a figure claiming indignation or grief by means of an

address to an individual. For example, "Perfidious Fregellae, how quickly, because of

your crime, you have wasted away."[27] The stated function is to convey indignation and

grief on the part of the speaker; and the example that Ps-Cicero gives illustrates this

function. Yet, Quintilian gives the following example of the same figure: "The Marii and

Camilii, names of might, the Scipios, stubborn warriors, aye, and thee, Great Caesar."[28]

As Quintilian's example demonstrates, the emotions elicited by this figure are diverse. It

can portray indignation and grief, as with Ps-Cicero's example, yet may also convey

praise and admiration, as with Quintilian's example. Therefore, the function of a figure

must be based on context.[29]

---

[26] For a treatment of figures used as a means of argumentation see Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric,* 167-179. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca note the contextual nature of the function of figures, as well as noting that some figures may be merely ornament while others play a great role in argumentation. They argue for three primary functions of figures: (1) choice, that is the speaker is highlighting a specific choice; (2) presence, that is figures which cause the hearer to be present in the argument; and (3) communion, that is where the speaker finds common ground with the audience. I will argue throughout the dissertation that there are far more functions that figures can play.

[27] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.25.22 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.23-24 (Butler, LCL).

[28] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.23-24 (Butler, LCL).

[29] George Alexander Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism,* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 29.

The broadest function of a figure is that of emphasis. When a figure of speech is

employed, it acts as a verbal marker or warning sign, as if to say: "pay attention here."

C. B. Bradley argues that the term "emphasis" covers the widest range of such figurative

effects. He, however, rejects this term and prefers the term "accentuation."[30] Beyond the

general function of emphasis, figures of speech can be used to make the spoken word

pleasing to the ear as in the following use of *alliteration/assonance*: "ἡ πίστις σου

σέσωκέν σε" ("your faith has saved you" Luke 7:50). Figures of speech can also be

highly memorable and powerful, such as the following example of *antithesis* in the form

of *chiasmus*: Luke 13:30 καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἳ

ἔσονται ἔσχατοι" ("There are those who are last who will be first, and first who will be

last" Luke 13:30). Figures can also invite audience participation, as with the following

example of *rhetorical question*: "Τί δέ με καλεῖτε· κύριε κύριε[31], καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;"

("Why do you call me Lord Lord, and do not do what I say?" Luke 6:46). The different

chapters in this dissertation deal with a variety of different functions of figures of speech

based upon their specific context.

What Does this Mode of Communication Accomplish?

By using highly refined rhetorical figures of speech, Luke portrays Jesus as an

educated man of high status, thereby gaining a hearing for his role-reversing message.

---

[30] C. B. Bradley. "The Classification of Rhetorical Figures." *Modern Language Notes* 1 (1886): 141.

[31] Morgenthaler notes a figure he calls *Geminatio*, which according to Quintilian is called *anadiplosis*. In this verse, this figure is created by the repetition of κύριε κύριε. Robert Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian,* (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag Zürich, 1993), 267.

Luke uses this strategy of portraying his characters as those of high social status elsewhere in his two volumes. For example, John Lentz has argued that Luke portrayed Paul as a man of high status. Lentz writes, "Paul is portrayed as a man of good birth and heritage. He is upright in character, well educated, pious and wealthy. In addition to all of this, he is a citizen of Tarsus, a citizen of Rome, and the strictest of Pharisees…Paul's social credentials and virtuous character place him in elite company."[32] Lentz argues that the purpose of this characterization of Paul is to argue for a Christianity that moves beyond the bounds of the social outcasts into every corner and social niche of the Roman Empire. In another example, Shelly Matthews argues that the rhetorical strategy of Luke in Acts is to portray Gentile converts, especially women converts, as belonging to the high social classes.[33] The purpose, once again, is to portray Christianity as a religion, not only of social outcasts, but also of the higher social classes.

Like the high-status characters in Acts, I will argue that through figures of speech, Luke portrays Jesus as a man of education and high-status. Luke uses rhetorical figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to accomplish this goal in three main ways. First, Luke portrays Jesus as an educated man who speaks with the high rhetorical style of the social elites. Through rhetorical figures of speech the Lukan Jesus fulfills the stylistic virtues of

---

[32] John Clayton Lentz, Jr., *Luke's Portrait of Paul,* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 103-104.

[33] Shelly Matthews, *First Converts: Rich Pagan Women and the Rhetoric of Mission in Early Judaism and Christianity,* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 85-87. Matthews notes such converts as "the Ethiopian Chamberlain (8:26-40) Cornelius, a centurion and prototypical 'God-fearer' (10:1-48), the proconsul Sergius Paulus (13:7-12), the women of high standing in Thessalonica (17:4), the leading men and women of Beroea (17:12), and Dionysius the Areopagite (17:33)." All of these examples come in a discussion of Lydia of Thyatira, a women whom Matthews argues is of high social status.

clarity and ornament to make his speech and message easy to follow and pleasing to the ear. Second, Luke uses these figures of speech as a means of persuasion to draw the gospel audience to his side and cause them to become participants in the gospel message. In order to persuade his audience, Luke portrays Jesus as one using figures of speech as a means of defeating his narrative interlocutors. By defeating his narrative interlocutors, the Lukan Jesus pulls the gospel audience over to his side as they see the truth of his message. Further, as a means of persuasion, the Lukan Jesus uses figures of speech to inculcate audience participation in his message. The audience is drawn into the Lukan Jesus' message as they are beckoned to become participants in conversation with the text. Third, Luke uses figures of speech to highlight and adorn the socially subversive and role-reversing message of a new way of living in the kingdom of God. By highlighting and ornamenting the socially subversive aspects of his message with figures of speech, the Lukan Jesus makes that message powerful and memorable.

Review of Literature

While research into the Lukan corpus has long shown Luke's authorial skill in communicating according to Greco-Roman forms of communication, no one has yet looked at the Lukan Jesus' use of rhetorical figures of speech. This dissertation attempts to fill that void.

This dissertation aims at finding the mode of composition and reception of the third gospel and Acts among the Greco-Roman literary milieu. Many scholars have demonstrated Luke's literary skill in conforming the gospel and Acts to Greco-Roman literary patterns and modes of communication. For example, Eckhart Plümacher argued that Luke, in his composition of Acts, modeled his composition on Hellenistic historians.

25

Luke used such methods as mimesis (of the LXX), using appropriate language to given situations, using archaisms, portraying Paul as an educated Greek, and freely inventing speeches for historical situations. All of these methods were in imitation of Hellenistic historians in an attempt to communicate his gospel to a Hellenistic audience.[34]

Charles Talbert and Richard Burridge proposed a Greco-Roman genre for the gospels and Acts, placing these works in the genre of ancient Mediterranean biography (*bios*).[35] Talbert highlighted the similarities between the gospels and Greco-Roman biographies noting such similarities as the cultic function and controlling myths of both. Burridge, though originally attempting to overturn Talbert's thesis, came to the same conclusion after a more in depth comparison of the gospels with ten ancient *bioi.*

Following on the work of Talbert and Burridge, Michael Martin, in his 2008 article, argues that the *topoi* lists in the *progymnasmata* served as templates for ancient Mediterranean biographies (*bioi*) as well as for the gospel of Luke.[36] Lists of *topoi* included such things as "origin, nature, training, disposition, age, fortune, morality, deeds, words, death, and what follows death."[37]

---

[34] Eckhart Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte,* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972).

[35] Charles H. Talbert, *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels,* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977). See also Charles H. Talbert, "Once again: Gospel Genre," *Semeia* 43 (1988): 55; Charles H. Talbert, "Reading Aune's Reading of Talbert," in *Reading Luke-Acts in its Mediterranean Milieu*, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 57-63; Richard A. Burridge, *What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography,* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 2004).

[36] Michael Martin, "Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi," *NTS* 54 (2008): 18-41.

[37] Theon, 78. Michel Patillon, *Aelius Theon Progymnasmata,* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997).

While the previous studies discussed the overall genre and structure of the gospel of Luke and found Greco-Roman parallels to the gospels, the investigation into specific parts of the gospel have proved no less fruitful. Much work has been done on the speeches in Luke and Acts and has found that they correspond, more or less, to the rhetorical practice of *prosopopoiia*. *Prosopopoiia* is found both as a figure of thought in the rhetorical handbooks and as a preliminary exercise in the extant *progymnasmata*. Theon defines *prosopopoiia* as "the introduction to a person to whom words are attributed that are suitable to him or her and which are indisputably related to the matter at hand."[38] Another way to say this is that in *prosopopoiia*, the author is creating speech in character, that is, speech in keeping with the character of the speaker and in accordance with the needs of the situation. The Greek historian Thucydides offers a useful perspective with regard to this technique of crafting speeches. He writes, "Therefore the speeches are given in the language in which, as it seemed to me, the several speakers would express, on the subjects under consideration, the sentiments most befitting the occasion, though at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said."[39] Conrad Gempf notes the seemingly paradoxical nature of this practice of attempting to convey "truthfulness," while at the same time taking "liberties" with ancient speeches.[40] Scholars such as George

---

[38] Theon, 115 (Patillon).

[39] Thucydides, *Hist.* 1.22.1-2 (Smith, LCL).

[40] Conrad Gempf, "Public Speaking and Published Accounts," in *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*, (eds. Bruce W. Winter, and Andrew D. Clarke, Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1993), 299.

Kennedy,[41] Conrad Gempf,[42] and Bruce Winter[43] have all argued that to some degree or another the speeches in Luke and Acts were composed by Luke according to the ancient practice of *prosopopoiia.*

Continuing the work on the speeches in Acts, Derek Hogan has recently demonstrated the similarity between the forensic speeches in Acts with both the rhetorical handbooks and with similar forensic speeches in the ancient novels *Callirhoe,* and *Leucippe and Clitophon.*[44] By finding positive comparisons with these speeches, Hogan contends with those who have argued that such techniques were too sophisticated for the gospel of Luke. Bruce Winter compares the forensic speeches in Acts to both rhetorical theory laid out in the handbooks and to other extant examples of official forensic proceedings in the ancient world. He concludes that one cannot rule out the possibility that Luke was using official records of Paul's forensic proceedings, nor can one rule out the possibility of the free invention of these speeches according to the rules and examples laid out in the rhetorical handbooks.[45]

---

[41] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation.* Kennedy looks at speeches in Luke, like Mary and Elizabeth's speeches in the Lukan infancy narrative, and at many of the apostles speeches in Acts, including Paul's forensic speeches, and notes the probable use of the practice of *prosopopoiia.*

[42] Gempf, "Public Speaking," 259-304.

[43] Bruce W. Winter, "Official Proceedings and Forensic Speeches," in *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Volume 1 Ancient Literary Setting,* (eds. Bruce W. Winter, and Andrew D. Clarke, Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1993), 305-336.

[44] Derek K. Hogan, "Paul's Defense: A Comparison of the Forensic Speeches in Acts, Callirhoe, and Leucippe and Clitophon," *PRS* 29 (2002): 73-87.

[45] Winter, "Official Proceedings." Cf. Derek K. Hogan, *Forensic Speeches in Acts 22-26 in their Literary Environment: A Rhetorical Study,* (Electronic Resource ed. Waco, Tx: Baylor University, 2006).

Ample work has also been done on Lukan vocabulary. Henry Cadbury's work on Luke's style is a statistical work comparing the style of Luke to the other gospels as well as to other Greek works. Cadbury notes that the vocabulary of Luke is superior to the other gospels as well as to Paul.[46] Cadbury also demonstrates that Luke's vocabulary is comparable to other Greek writers such as Xenophon, Aeschines, and Antiphon.[47] Luke's style, while being somewhat dependent on the Septuagint and koine Greek, was not beyond comparison with some Attic writers.[48]

Mikeal Parsons and Chad Hartsock have recently investigated Luke's use of the ancient Greco-Roman practice of physiognomy. As Chad Hartsock notes, "Physiognomy is a pseudo-science that claims that the inner, moral character of a person can be known by studying the outward, physical characteristics."[49] Parsons breaks down three types of physiognomy: anatomical, zoological, and ethnographic. Anatomical physiognomy takes its moral cues from physical features, especially facial features. Zoological physiognomy works with the comparison of a character to an animal. Finally, ethnographic

---

[46] Henry Joel Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke,* (Harvard theological studies, 6. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1920), 1-4. For example, he notes that if one removes the Pastoral Epistles, which are of questionable authorship, Luke (including Acts) has a vocabulary of 2697 words to Paul's 2170 words. Moreover, Luke uses 750 words not used elsewhere in the NT while Paul has 593 such words. Compare with Robert Morgenthaler, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes,* (Zürich: Gotthelf, 1958), 166, who gives 2055 words for the gospel of Luke. Compare to 1691 for Matthew, 1345 for Mark, 1011 for John, and 2648 for Paul.

[47] Cadbury, *Style,* 4.

[48] Cadbury, *Style,* 38.

[49] Chad Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts,* (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1.

physiognomy uses ethnic origins and stereotypes to determine inner character.[50]

Hartsock has argued that the gospel writers, from the practice of physiognomy, make

clear the correlation between physical sight/blindness and spiritual sight/blindness.[51] The

only real exception to this physiognomic stereotype in the gospels is blind Bartimaeus in

Mark 10, who, though blind, shows keen spiritual vision.[52] Parsons, also looking at

Luke's use of physiognomy, uses the stories of the bent woman, Zachaeus, the man lame

from birth, and the Ethiopian eunuch, to show how Luke used the ancient methods of

physiognomy while at the same time subverting the values typically conveyed by those

methods.[53]

Much work has also been done on the prefaces of Luke and Acts. Luke is alone

among the gospel writers in including a grammatically and rhetorically complex

prologue. As Kennedy notes, "Luke opens his Gospel with a fine periodic sentence,

immediately reassuring to an educated speaker of Greek."[54] L. C. A. Alexander,[55] Clare

---

[50] Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity,* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2006), 22-23.

[51] Chad Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts,* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).

[52] Hartsock, *Sight and Blindness,* 155-160.

[53] Parsons, *Body and Character.*

[54] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation,* 107.

[55] L.C.A. Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); L.C.A. Alexander, "Acts and Intellectual Biography," In *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. I: Ancient Literary Setting*, (eds. Bruce W. Winter, and Andrew D. Clarke, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1993), 31-63. Alexander notes the similarity of the prefaces to both Greek technical treatises and what she calls intellectual biography.

K. Rothschild,[56] and David P. Moessner[57] have all produced fruitful studies about the

Lukan prologues finding affinities with Greco-Roman technical treatises, historiography

and intellectual biographies. Moessner highlights Luke's use of the verb παρακολουθέω

from Luke's prologue as a convention in Greco-Roman prologues. The convention

served to bolster the authority of the writer, demonstrating his or her "superior

credentials" in taking up a topic that had already been discussed by others.[58]

In his 1985 article, William S. Kurz argues that Luke 22:14-38 corresponds to

Greco-Roman and biblical farewell addresses.[59] He compares Luke's farewell address to

those in the Hellenistic world (including the Greek bible and Jewish intertestamental

literature) and finds that the comparison makes sense of many previously troubling parts

of the passage. Kurz writes, "Luke had enough rhetorical training to recognize and

imitate a literary form and genre such as the farewell address finding this literary form

---

[56] Clare K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography,* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 67-68. Rothschild notes six common claims in Greco-Roman historical prologues: (1) the claim to truth (ἀλήθεια, σαφές), (2) the claim to accuracy (ἀκρίβεια), (3) the claim to research (ἱστορία) or narrative (διήγησις), (4) the claim to avoid style (τὸ κάλλος τῶν λόγων), (5) the claim to order the sources (καθεξής), and (6) the claim to rely on autopsy (eyewitnesses αὐτοψία). She notes that the terminology changes, and all authors do not include all claims.[56] Instructively, Luke includes five of these six claims, leaving out only the claim to avoid style or beauty in words.

[57] David P. Moessner, "The Lukan Prologues in the Light of Ancient Narrative Hermeneutics. Παρακολουθηκότι and the Credentialed Author," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, (ed. J. Verheyden, Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 399-418.

[58] Moessner, "The Lukan Prologues."

[59] William S. Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses," *JBL* 104 (1985): 251-268.

both in his Greco-Roman milieu and in the Greek Bible which he was consciously imitating."[60]

Rothschild attempts to look at the whole of Luke-Acts against the backdrop of Hellenistic historiography and classical rhetoric. She presents a study on Luke-Acts in which she argues that the author of Luke-Acts uses rhetorical devices in his narrative in order to garner support for his version of events. Specifically, Luke uses patterns of recurrence, syncrisis, prediction and fulfillment, the use of the simple verb δεῖ (it is necessary), and exaggeration (*hyperbole*). According to Rothschild, the use of these rhetorical devices demonstrates that Luke was truly a historian in line with Hellenistic and early Roman historiography. These rhetorical devices also demonstrate that Luke's concern was not primarily theological as opposed to historical; but rather he used rhetoric to support his version of the historical events.[61]

To conclude this section on research devoted to comparing Luke with Greco-Roman modes of composition and communication, one monograph has attempted to compare the rhetoric of Quintilian to the composition of the Gospel of Luke. While promising at first glance, Morgenthaler's study[62] uses Quintilian in a far different way than my use of the rhetorical handbooks. Morgenthaler's study can be divided into two major parts. In the first part he deals with Quintilian and rhetoric in the Hellenistic world. The second part of the study treats Luke-Acts. The second part can be broken down into seven subsections, four of which deal specifically with the gospel of Luke.

---

[60] Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38," 252.

[61] Clare K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts*.

[62] Robert Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian*.

The first considers Luke's use of the Old Testament through the LXX. The second deals

with Luke's use of Mark. The third treats Luke's use of Q. The fourth examines Luke's

special material. In each subsection, Morgenthaler's goal is to demonstrate that Luke

used classical rhetoric to improve his sources or to compose his special material. While

this work provides background information for my study, Morgenthaler rarely touches on

figures of speech.[63]

The comprehensive result of these studies is to demonstrate that Luke was a

competent author at home in the Hellenistic literary world. All of these studies have

greatly contributed to my understanding of Luke's gospel as a whole and in its various

parts. Specifically they shed light on how the gospel was composed and received in the

Greco-Roman milieu. As of yet, however, there has been no investigation of the Lukan

Jesus' use of rhetorical figures of speech and how that might effect Lukan interpretation.

This dissertation seeks to fill that gap in scholarship.

Method

The controlling method of this dissertation is that of authorial audience-oriented

rhetorical criticism. Unlike reader-response criticism, audience-oriented criticism

attempts to hear a text, as far as can be determined, as the original audience would have

heard it. A good metaphor for this type of criticism is that of a telescope.[64] With ancient

---

[63] With regard to the sermon on the plain, Morgenthaler actually spends a fair amount of time on figures of speech as ornamentation. See Morgenthaler, *Lukas,* 267-268.

[64] Wayne Booth also uses the metaphor of lenses for looking at ancient texts. He refers to different types of lenses, microscope, telescope, or camera, each providing a different view of the text. Wayne C. Booth, *The Rhetoric of Fiction,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 405. Darr, picking up on Booth's metaphor claims that he will

texts, the modern interpreter views the text from a distance (of time and culture).

Historical and cultural studies allow the modern critic view an ancient text with different

levels of magnification. For the gospel of Luke, the greatest level of magnification that

can be achieved is to reconstruct the literary, cultural, and rhetorical expectations of a

Greek speaker in the first century Mediterranean world. The primary reconstruction for

reading as the ancient audience in this dissertation comes from an understanding of the

primary mode of literary communication in the ancient world: classical rhetoric.[65]

Authorial audience criticism was a logical advancement from literary criticism. It

is an attempt to steer a middle way between the pitfalls of authorial intent on the one

hand and of reader-oriented theories on the other hand. W. K. Wimsatt and M. C.

Beardsley demonstrate the problems with criticism based on the intent of the author and

---

use four lenses: the wide angle, editorial, objective, and reading lenses. By wide angle, he refers to the "scope of the critic's literary and historical knowledge related to the work in question." By editorial lens, he is referring to redaction criticism. By objective lens he means literary criticism of the work as a whole; and by a reader lens he is referring to the various forms of reader construction in literary and reader-response criticism. John A Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization,* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series Sheffield; UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 47-50.

[65] For the classical treatments of education in the Greco-Roman world, see H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity,* (trans. George Lamb; London: Sheed & Ward, 1956); Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome,* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977); Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds,* (Cambridge Classical Studies; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998). All argue for three levels of education, the third level being rhetoric and philosophy. As H. I. Marrou points out, students chose rhetoric over philosophy in overwhelming numbers. Marrou, *Education,* 194-196. For the oral nature of the classical world and the likelihood that one would hear a presentation of the gospel aloud rather than reading silently see Whitney Shiner, *Proclaiming the Gospel: First Century Performance of Mark,* (New York: Trinity, 2003); Tony M. Lentz, *Orality and Literacy in Hellenic Greece,* (Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989); Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 10.

with criticism based on the reactions of the reader in two articles in the middle of last century.[66] In the beginning of the second article, Wimsatt and Beardsley summarize the conclusions of both articles. They write:

> The Intentional Fallacy is a confusion between the poem and its origins, a special case of what is known to philosophers as the Genetic Fallacy. It begins by trying to derive the standard of criticism from the psychological *causes* of the poem and ends in biography and relativism. The Affective Fallacy is a confusion between the poem and its *results* (what it *is* and what it *does*), a special case of epistemological skepticism, though usually advanced as if it had far stronger claims than the overall forms of skepticism. It begins by trying to derive the standard of criticism form the psychological effects of the poem and ends in impressionism and relativism.[67]

The roots of this audience-oriented criticism came from Peter J. Rabinowitz in his book *Before Reading,* and his article, "Truth and Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences."[68] Rabinowitz believes that with reader-response criticism, modern critics had made a good start at getting away from the sticky problems that come from an attempt at authorial intent; but he is concerned with the resulting multiplicity of audiences. He posits that any author writes his or her text for a "hypothetical audience." This hypothetical audience has shared conventions and expectations by which the author

---

[66] W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," *STRev* 54 (1946): 468-488; W. K. Wimsatt and M. C. Beardsley, "The Affective Fallacy," *STRev* 57 (1949): 31-55.

[67] Wimsatt and Beardsley, "Affective Fallacy," 31.

[68] Peter J. Rabinowitz, *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation*, (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987); Peter J. Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences," *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121-141.

can rhetorically shape his or her text. Rabinowitz calls this hypothetical audience the

"authorial audience."[69]

Charles Talbert takes up Rabinowitz's method and applies it to biblical criticism.

He writes:

> To read as authorial audience is to attempt to answer the question: if the literary work fell into the hands of an audience that closely matched the author's target audience in terms of knowledge brought to the text, how would they have understood the work? This type of reading involves trying to adopt the perspectives of the authorial audience so that one may become a member of the author's original audience's conceptual community. To do this, modern readers must gain an understanding of the values of the authorial audience and the presuppositions upon which the original text was built. We must reconstruct the conceptual world that was used in the creation and original reception of the text.[70]

Authorial audience criticism has become fundamental for the recent works of both

Charles H. Talbert and Mikeal C. Parsons.[71]

Argument

This dissertation will proceed in three chapters in which I will demonstrate how

Luke uses figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to portray Jesus as an educated man who

speaks like the social elites. The goal of portraying Jesus this way is to gain a hearing for

and persuade the audience to accept the role-reversing message of the gospel.

---

[69] Rabinowitz, *Before Reading*, 22-23; Rabinowitz, "Truth in Fiction," 126. Cf. Darr, *Herod the Fox,* 63.

[70] Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke-Acts in Its Mediterranean Milieu*, (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 15-16.

[71] Parsons, *Body and Character*; and Talbert, *Reading Luke-Acts.* For example, Parson's book uses audience criticism, specifically an ancient audience's familiarity with physiognomy—the practice of using physical attributes to convey character—to demonstrate that Luke was subverting such practices.

Chapter two deals with the rhetorical style of the Lukan Jesus. I will demonstrate that through the use of figures of speech, Luke portrays Jesus as a teacher who fulfills the stylistic virtues of clarity and ornamentation. The effect of portraying Jesus in this manner is to elevate the style of his speech to make it pleasing to the ear and easy to follow. For any speech (or in our case, an oral presentation of the gospel) to be successful, the audience must be able to follow the argument and find pleasure in paying attention. For, as Quintilian notes concerning the stylistic virtue of clarity:

> For we must never forget that the attention of the judge is not always so keen that he will dispel obscurities without assistance, and bring the light of his intelligence to bear on the dark places of our speech. On the contrary, he will have many other thoughts to distract him unless what we say is so clear that our words will thrust themselves into his mind even when he is not giving us his attention, just as the sunlight forces itself upon the eyes. Therefore our aim must be not to put him in a position to understand our argument, but to force him to understand it.[72]

Thus, by using figures of speech for emphasis and clarity, Luke is able to make the message of the gospel easy to follow. In addition, Luke uses figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to fulfill the stylistic virtue of ornamentation. Ornamentation, however, is not to be thought of as mere rhetoric or superfluous and flowery language. Rather, as Quintilian writes, "But rhetorical ornament contributes not a little to the furtherance of our case as well. For when our audience find it a pleasure to listen, their attention and their readiness to believe what they hear are both alike increased."[73] Luke thus gives Jesus a grand rhetorical style for the purpose of gaining a hearing for his gospel message.

---

[72] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.2.23-24 (Butler, LCL).

[73] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.3.5 (Butler, LCL).

Chapter three explains how Luke moves beyond making the gospel message easy to follow and ornamental, by using figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a means of argumentation and persuasion. If the figures in chapter two make the gospel message easy to listen to, the figures in chapter three demonstrate how Luke pulls his audience into the message of the gospel. He does this primarily in two ways. The first is by using figures of speech as a means of portraying Jesus as one who is victorious in argument against his narrative interlocutors. Luke portrays Jesus as a Socrates like character who is able to overcome hostile adversaries through clever use of figures of speech. The Lukan Jesus does this by, like Socrates, inducing *aporia* in his opponents. *Aporia* has various definitions, but its most basic to be "at a loss" or "perplexed."[74] In the Socratic sense, it refers to the way in which, through dialogue, Socrates would lead his interlocutors to a place of confusion. Rebecca Benson Cain defines this concept as follows:

> In general, elenctic [pertaining to refutation] arguments are constructed by the questioner to refute the answerer by getting him to contradict himself. In Socratic dialectic, the immediate purpose of the refutation is to induce the experience of *aporia* in the interlocutor and cause him to wonder why he is confounded and perplexed about those things which he took himself to know so well.[75]

Socrates' method of causing *aporia* in his interlocutor was through an extended dialogue of question and answer in which Socrates finally gets his opponent to contradict himself.

---

[74] The *LSJ* defines *aporia* as "difficulty passing," "not providing a thing," "difficulty dealing with or getting at," "being at a loss, embarrassment, perplexity," and other related definitions. See Liddell, "ἀπορία," *LSJ,* 215. See also, Rebecca Benson Cain, *The Socratic Method: Plato's Use of Philosophical Drama,* (New York: Continuum, 2007), 16. Cain writes, "The Greek term '*aporia*' translates into English as 'difficulty', 'perplexity', 'without resources', or 'being at a loss'."

[75] Cain, *Socratic*, 16.

Once the contradiction has occurred, the interlocutor finds himself in a place of *aporia.*
At that point, Socrates fills the empty mind with a better construction of the matter at
hand. The Lukan Jesus, on the other hand, induces *aporia* much more quickly. Very
rarely is there any form of complete dialogue. The Lukan Jesus is usually able to induce
aporia with one sharply worded question or statement. In this way, the Lukan Jesus traps
his opponents, induces *aporia*, and his argument is upheld.

The second way in which Luke seeks to persuade his audience involves the use of
figures of speech to invite audience participation. Kathy Maxwell has argued extensively
in her 2007 dissertation that the ancients invited audience participation in their writings
as a means of persuading their audiences. She writes, "A passive audience may remain
untouched, but active hearers who help the proclaimer create the stories in their own
minds come away from that encounter formed and changed, continuing to create the story
in their own lives."[76] In chapter three I will demonstrate how Luke used figures of
speech to inculcate this type of audience participation, attempting to form their opinions
and actions.

Finally, in chapter four I will demonstrate how Luke uses figures of speech on the
lips of Jesus to communicate, in a powerful and memorable way, the role-reversing
message of a new way of living in the kingdom of God. The Lukan Jesus' preaching
about the kingdom of God utterly undermined the conventions and values of the Roman
Empire. The kingdom of God subverts the various aspects of the religious boundary

---

[76] Kathy Reiko Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu,* (Electronic Resource; Waco, Tx: Baylor University, 2007), 320.

systems, the agrarian social stratification system, the honor-shame system, the system of patron-client relations, and the values of kinship groups.

The Lukan Jesus' attacks and indictments often were directed toward religious boundary systems that kept the grace of God from flowing to those in need.[77] Various groups within Judaism[78] in the first-century sought to separate themselves from Gentiles and from other Jewish groups by means of erecting boundaries based upon holiness and purity regulations. For example, food purity regulations, tithes, Sabbath observance,

---

[77] What I refer to as religious boundary systems did not exist as a unified system or even collection of systems in the first century. Instead, the regulations that various Jewish groups imposed had the effect of creating boundaries that separated the insiders and the outsiders. For example, Sabbath regulations separated those who followed them properly from those who did not, and in Luke's Gospel one sees the Lukan Jesus flouting Sabbath regulations in order to bring the mercy of God to the needy. Moreover, purity laws pertaining to things clean and unclean often erected boundaries between insiders and outsiders and thus also hindered the grace of God according to the Lukan Jesus. J. P. Meier lists four basic types of purity regulations as follows: 1) ritual impurity (a temporary condition incurred through the normal activities, such as burial of the dead, disease, and sexual activity), 2) moral impurity (incurred through certain "heinous sins"), 3) genealogical impurity (based upon pure Jewish bloodlines), and 4) food purity laws. Meier notes that these regulations were not fixed and that there was considerable debate among Jewish groups ranging from very strict to relatively permissive. John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus,* (Vol. 4; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 344-351.

[78] I am working within the historical framework of what Gabriele Boccaccini has called "Middle Judaism." By this he denies that there was a definable group known as Judaism in the first-century, but rather claims that Judaism was made up of a number of Jewish groups such as the Pharisees, Sadducees, Essenes, and Christian Jews. Gabriele Boccaccini, *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001). See also Jacob Neusner, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds. *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). This is a collection of essays discussing the diversity within Judaism in the late second temple period, specifically with regard to their expectations of a messiah. Cf. Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah,* (Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987); James H. Charlesworth, *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha & the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins,* (Harrisburg, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1985); George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah,* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981).

table fellowship, and even the geography of Palestine served as boundary markers that reinforced one's specific Jewish identity.[79] As Hannah Harrington notes, "Circumcision, food laws, and purification took on great importance in the rabbinic period… Their primary ingredient is separation. These rituals erect boundaries which separate and reinforce the difference between Israel and non-Israel creating a formidable group identity."[80] The Lukan Jesus found these religious boundary systems to be in opposition to the new way of living in the kingdom of God. Therefore, in his interactions with the Pharisees and other religious leaders, he proclaimed role reversals in these systems and broke down boundaries that kept the needy separated from the grace of God.

Gerhard Lenski's sociological theory of social stratification in an agrarian society[81] has become the primary model on which biblical scholars have drawn for insight into the sociological implications of the gospel.[82] Lenski's theory is based on the

---

[79] For anthropological work on rituals as identity markers, see Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo,* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966); Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology,* (2nd ed. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1973). For identity based on table fellowship see Gerard Rouwhorst, "Table Community in Early Christianity," in *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity*, (eds. Marcel Poorthuis, and Joshua Schwartz, Leiden: Brill, 2006), 69-84.

[80] Hannah K. Harrington, *Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman World,* (New York: Routledge, 2001), 165. See also Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society,* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2001), 212-220.

[81] Gerhard E. Lenski, *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification,* (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966).

[82] For example, see John Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*, (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1991); William R. Herzog, *Prophet and Teacher: An Introduction to the Historical Jesus*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005); William R. Herzog, *Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God*, (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox press, 2000); Philip F. Esler, ed. *The*

agrarian society in which wealth was tied to the land, and he essentially divides society into the "haves" and the "have nots."[83] The peasants who worked the land were the vast majority of the population, but taxation policies[84] and land grabbing by the elite classes made the system inherently unjust. William Herzog writes, "the goal of the aristocracy was to push exploitation to the limit in order to maximize their yield… urban elites learned how to extract everything but the 'barest minimum needed for subsistence.'"[85]

It was common in this society for peasants to be unjustly dispossessed of their land. Douglass Oakman describes the process by which a peasant might be deprived of his land as follows:

Early Christian World. (New York: Routledge, 2000), 11-22; Marcus J. Borg, *Jesus: Uncovering the Life, Teachings, and Relevance of a Religious Revolutionary*, (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 2006), 77-108; Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, *The Jesus Movement*, (Translated by O. C. Dean Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998). Bruce J. Malina's model, though not citing Lenski comes to similar conclusions about the first century Mediterranean world. Bruce J. Malina, *The Social Gospel of Jesus: The Kingdom of God in Mediterranean Perspective*, (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 15-35.

[83] Lenski lists nine classes of society, the first five being the "haves," and the last four being the "have nots." (1) The ruling class, (2) the governing class (approximately 1% of the population), (3) the retainer class (bureaucrats and military, about 5% of the population), (4) the merchant class, (5) the priestly class, (6) the peasant class (the vast majority of the population), (7) the artisan class, (8) the unclean and degraded class, and (9) the expendable class. Lenski, *Power and Privilege,* 210-283.

[84] Taxes passed through all of the five upper classes, each class taking its share before passing their required amount up the ladder, eventually culminating with the Roman Emperor. Bruce Malina compares the agrarian society to the Mafia in that all resources are controlled by the ruler and this exploitation is brought about by force or the threat of force. Bruce J. Malina, *The Social Gospel of Jesus,* 28-30.

[85] William R. Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed,* (Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994).

A bad harvest or excessive taxation, coupled with the need of the Jewish peasant to feed his family and set aside grain for animals or the next crop, led to arrears. When this was compounded with low productivity or successive bad years, default ensued. The tax collector, or a wealthy man advancing credit, might insist on securing a fiscal debt through property. The peasant, obviously, would try to secure it with the labor power of his offspring, or something less valuable…the overall result of escalating debt, whether its nature was private or fiscal, was the growth of tenancy and the landless class.[86]

It is against this unjust system that the Lukan Jesus uses powerful and memorable figures of speech to advance his argument for a new way of living in the kingdom of God.

In addition to arguing against the religious boundary and agrarian stratification systems, Luke also employs various figures of speech to attack three other Greco-Roman values. First, he undermines the honor-shame system which conditioned individuals to seek honor and status in society as a means of social advancement. As Neyrey writes, "All ancient people were socialized to depend on what others thought of them as their source of worth and identity."[87] Second, Luke uses powerful and memorable figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to attack the patron-client system. This system depended upon a form of reciprocity between two unequal members of society. The Patron, of higher class, would provide protection or goods in exchange for the loyalty, honor, or service of the client from the lower classes.[88] In this system, one's patron-client relationships were one's social connection to the rest of the empire. The patron-client system was an

[86] Douglas E. Oakman, "Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt," *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 67. Cf. Esler, *The Early Christian World*, 13.

[87] Jerome H. Neyrey, ed. *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*. (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2008), 86. Cf. Bruce Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights From Cultural Anthropology,* (Rev. ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 28-62.

[88] Malina, *Social Gospel,* 31.

unofficial organizational web which kept the social stratification system intact. Third, the Lukan Jesus attacked kinship groups and thus the values at the heart of the Greco-Roman culture. Jerome Neyrey writes, "Because no welfare or social-security system was in place, individuals looked to their families to comfort, feed, nurture, and finally, bury them. It was a tragedy to be taken from one's family or to be forced to leave. Ties of affection, identity, and support would be broken by this rupture."[89]

This dissertation will move from the use of figures of speech as a means of portraying the Lukan Jesus' style and ornamentation, to specific rhetorical techniques of argumentation by use of figures, and finally, to the use of figures as a rhetorically powerful way to convey a role-reversing message. While this movement works for the organization of this dissertation, the movement in the Gospel of Luke is not sequential in this manner. Rather, these uses of figures of speech in the gospel of Luke are simultaneous and cumulative rather than sequential. That is, Luke does not first seek to mollify the audience through rhetorical style, then move to figures as a means of persuasion, and then finally create a rhetorically powerful message of his culturally undermining message. Instead, these three functions of figures of speech are constantly at work, often times within the same passage or even verse.

---

[89] Neyrey, ed. *The Social World,* 25. Cf., Malina, *New Testament World,* 117-148; Hanson and Oakman, *Palestine,* 19-62.

CHAPTER TWO

Figures of Speech and the Stylistic Virtues of Clarity and Ornamentation

In this chapter I will demonstrate how Luke uses figures of speech on the lips of Jesus in order to portray Jesus as an educated and eloquent speaker who fulfills the stylistic virtues of clarity and ornamentation. By portraying the Jesus as one who fulfills these stylistic virtues and speaks like the social elites, Luke presents an argument of *ethos* that inspires confidence and admiration among the educated classes in the audience. For, as Aristotle writes, "the speaker should show himself to be possessed of certain qualities and that his hearers should think that he is disposed in a certain way towards them."[90] Luke's *ethos* argument disposes Jesus favorably to the social elites, and in so doing, gains a hearing for the gospel message, perhaps even among skeptical audience members.[91]

In speaking of rhetorical style[92] and how an orator should seek to impress his audience, Cicero gives the following instructions about using figures of speech.

---

[90] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 2.1 (Freese, LCL).

[91] I hope to demonstrate that F. Blass and A. Debrunner are mistaken in their claim that Luke "has not so elaborated his speeches nor made them so long as did Mt [Matthew], nor does he seem particularly to have stylized them." Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, *A Greek grammar of the New Testament and other early Christian literature,* (Translated by Robert W Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 260.

[92] Style can be difficult to judge as even Cicero notes, "I thought you wished to know what I considered the best oratorical style. A hard task, I swear; indeed the hardest of all. For not only is language soft, pliant and so flexible that it follows wherever you turn it, but also the varieties in ability and taste have produced styles widely different. Fluency and volubility please those who make eloquence depend on swiftness of speech; others like clearly marked pauses and breathing spells. Could two things be more

There we touched on the ornaments of style both in the use of single words [tropes] and in their combinations [figures]. These will be so plentiful that no word will fall from the orator's lips that is not well chosen or impressive; there will be metaphors of all sorts and in great abundance… The other ornaments derived from combinations of words [figures] lend great brilliance to oration…Words are redoubled and repeated [*anadiplosis, traductio*], or repeated with a slight change [*paronomasia*], or several successive phrases begin with the same words [*anaphora*] or end with the same [*antistrophe*] or have both figures [*symploce*], or the same word is repeated at the beginning of a clause [*anadiplosis*] or at the end [*epanalepsis*], or a word is used immediately in a different sense [*antanaclasis, epanodos*], or words are used with similar case endings [*homoeoptoton*] or other similar terminations [*homoteleuton*]; or contrasting ideas are put in juxtaposition [*antithesis*], or the sentence rises and falls in steps [*climax*], or many clauses are strung together loosely without conjunctions [*asyndeton*]; or sometimes we omit something and give our reason for doing so [*paralipsis*], or we correct ourselves with a quasi-reproof [*correctio*]; or make some exclamation of surprise or complaint [*apostrophe*], or use the same word repeatedly in different cases [*polyptoton*].[93]

Beyond these examples of figures of speech, Cicero lists many figures of thought as well

that are pertinent to the Lukan Jesus. Cicero writes:

He [the orator] will repeat what he has said [*pleonasm, epanodos*]…he will urge his point by asking questions [*rhetorical question*] and will reply to himself as if to questions [*hypophora*]… he will portray the talk and ways of men [*prosopopoiia*]…he will use similes…he will often exaggerate a statement above what could actually occur [*hyperbole*].[94]

---

different? Yet there is something good in each. Some spend their labour on smoothness and uniformity, and on what we may call a pure and clear style; others affect a harshness and severity of language and an almost gloomy style." Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 17.52-53 (Hubbell, LCL).

[93] Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 39.134-135 (Hubbell, LCL).

[94] Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 39.136-40.139 (Hubbell, LCL). Following this, Cicero gives a discussion of *hiatus,* or the running together of vowels which come consider to make a disagreeable sound. Cicero is ambivalent on this issue, allowing for *hiatus,* therefore the inclusion or avoidance of hiatus seems to be a moot point for the orator. *Or. Brut.* 44.149-45.152.

These statements could have been spoken about the Lukan Jesus. He uses all of these figures to embellish his speech (with the single exception of *paralipsis*). Much of the Lukan Jesus' speech can be seen to be, as Cicero writes, "well chosen and impressive." So much so that the narrative audience is often amazed at Jesus' speech.[95]

The Stylistic Virtue of Clarity

The stylistic virtue of clarity dictates that a speaker present his or her message in such a way as is clearly understood and that proper attention is given to the words spoken. For, as Quintilian writes, the orator's message should be "so clear that our words will thrust themselves into his [the judge/audience member] mind even when he is not giving us his attention, just as the sunlight forces itself upon the eyes."[96] How does Luke make his argument clear to the audience? In the following I give examples of figures of speech that enhance the clarity of the gospel message. These figures serve to highlight and emphasize,[97] to seize the attention of the audience and force them to listen carefully.

---

[95] For example, "and all those hearing him were amazed (ἐξίσταντο) at his understanding and his answers (2:47);" "And all were witnessing him and they were amazed (ἐθαύμαζον) at his words of grace (4:22);" "and they were not able to overcome his words before the people, and having been amazed (θαυμάσαντες) at his answers they were silent (20:26)."

[96] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.2.23-24 (Butler, LCL).

[97] In a sense all figures are used for emphasis. Given that a figure is defined as the use of language in a way that runs contrary to common usage, all figures cause the ears of the audience to perk up. See C. B. Bradley. "The Classification of Rhetorical Figures." *Modern Language Notes* 1 (1886): 141; George Alexander Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism,* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 29. Kennedy writes, "Many [figures] are primarily devises of emphasis which call attention to a phrase within a sentence."

Examples of Figures of Clarity

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *paronomasia* as the figure in which by modification of sound or a change in letters, there is a close resemblance between verb or noun, so that similar words mean dissimilar things. For example, "This one who boasts and displays himself so magnificently was sold (as a slave) before he came to Rome (*Hic qui se magnifice iactat atque ostentat, venīt* (*veneo*: to be sold (as a slave)) *antequem Romam venĭt* (*venio*: to come))." The author calls these word plays. The figure can also occur when the words are not quite so similar. For example, "who am I, whom am I accusing, whom am I benefitting (*qui sim, quem insimulem, cui prosim*)?"[98]

Another figure which grabs the attention of the audience is *alliteration/assonance,* the only figure of speech used by Luke, that while known in the ancient world, is not found in the handbooks of Ps-Cicero or Quintilian.[99] Lausberg defines *alliteration* as the figure in which there "is the frequent repetition of the same consonant, chiefly the initial consonant, in a sequence of several words." For example, "O Titus Tatius, Tyrant, what great things you have brought upon yourself (*o Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti*)?"[100] Though Lausberg only mentions initial consonants, the figure also applies to repeated vowel sounds in a sequence of several words. The repeated consonant or vowel

---

[98] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32 (Caplan, LCL).

[99] The *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* while not listing *alliteration/assonance* as a figure of speech, notes its use and states that it should not be used excessively. He cites the same example as Lausberg below ("*o Tite tute Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti*" (Ennius, *Ann.* 104.)). Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.12.18.

[100] Heinrich Lausberg et al., *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study,* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 432. Lausberg refers to this figure by the ancient name *homoeophrophoron.* The quote is from Ennius, *Ann.* 104. Ennius, writing in the 3rd to 2nd century shows the ancient nature of this figure.

sound draws attention to the specific phrase or clause, placing emphasis on the words. This figure can also carry force on behalf of the speaker.

> Luke 8:5 ἐξῆλθεν ὁ σπείρων τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἐν τῷ σπείρειν αὐτὸν ὃ μὲν ἔπεσεν παρὰ τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ κατεπατήθη, καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέφαγεν αὐτό.

At the beginning of this verse, the Lukan Jesus uses four words that begin with the σπ sound. The effect when read aloud is pronounced.[101] The use of *alliteration/assonance* creates a powerful rhythm[102] which draws the attention of the auditor to the main theme of this parable which is the sowing of seed. These same words also form the figure *paronomasia.* The four words σπείρων, σπεῖραι, σπόρον, and σπείρειν all come in rapid succession but mean different things in each case. The first is a participle, which with the article means "the sower." The second is an infinitive meaning "to sow." The third is a noun meaning "seed." Finally, the fourth is also an infinitive with ἐν τῷ that gives this infinitive a temporal meaning of "while sowing." The Lukan Jesus has used these similar words in four different ways in this compact section. This play on words enlivens the Lukan Jesus' language and draws the attention of the hearer. Vinson notes Luke's redactional activity in the opening of the parable. He writes, "Luke takes Mark's opening

---

[101] Blass, Debrunner, and Funk point out this figure and call it *etymologica,* Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek grammar,* 259.

[102] Rhythm is also an important part of the Lukan Jesus' speech. Many of the figures Luke uses create a pleasant rhythm to make certain points stand out and to make the Lukan Jesus' speech pleasant to the ear. For rhythm created by figures, Cicero notes, "Sentences are rounded off either by the arrangement of words—spontaneously, as it were—or by using a certain class of words in which there is inherent symmetry. If they have similar case-endings [*homoeoptoton*], or if clauses are equally balanced [*isocolon*], or if contrary ideas are opposed [*antithesis*], the sentence becomes rhythmical by its very nature." Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 49.164 (Hubbell, LCL).

line (Mark 4:3) and enhances the alliteration to give a little more punch to the opening, and, as we will see, to focus our minds on this one action in particular."[103] Thus, Luke, through the figures *paronomasia* and *alliteration/assonance,* has effectively emphasized the main subject of the parable, namely the sowing of seed. This emphasis in turn helps the audience to pay attention and to focus specifically on the action the Lukan Jesus is addressing.

Polyptoton is an interesting figure of speech in that there is no way to translate it into English. *Polyptoton* depends on the case system in Greek or Latin, and thus has no counterpart in the English language. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *polyptoton* as the figure which consists of inflecting the same word in different cases. For example:

> **Alexander** [nominative] *Macedo summo labore animum ad virtutem a pueritia confirmavit.* **Alexandri** [genitive] *virtutes per orbem terrae cum laude et Gloria vulgate sunt.* **Alexandrum** [accusative] *omnes maxime metuerunt, idem plurumum dilexerunt.* **Alexandro** [dative] *si vita data longior esset, trans Oceanum macedonum transvolassent sarisae* (Emphasis added in bold)."[104]

In this example, Alexander is inflected in four of the six Latin cases. Quintilian defines this figure as the construction in which the cases of repeated words are varied. For example, "**Pater** [nominative] *hic tuus? **Patrem** [accusative] nunc appellas? **Patris***

---

[103] Richard B. Vinson, *Luke,* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2008), 247. On the redactional activity of Luke, see Pierre Courthial, "La Parabole du Semeur en Luc 8:5-15," *ETR* 47 (1972): 406. Courthial notes the addition of the words τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ, as an important change of the Lukan text.

[104] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32 (Caplan, LCL). "Alexander of Macedon, with consummate toil from boyhood trained his mind to virtue. Alexander's virtues have been broadcast with fame and glory throughout the world. All men greatly feared Alexander, yet deeply loved him. Had longer life been granted to Alexander, the Macedonian lances would have flown across the ocean." Ps-Cicero does not refer to this figure as *polyptoton,* but rather, treats it as a different form of *paronomasia.*

[dative] *tui filius* (Emphasis added in bold)?"[105] This form of *polyptoton* simply repeats the same words in different cases.

Another form of inflection, however, is taught in the handbooks.[106] This second form is more difficult and consists of inflecting different words, including nouns, pronouns, and adjectives, all of which refer to the same subject. To illustrate this form of inflection I give the following example from Theon:

> Ὁποῖός ἐστι καὶ παρά τῷ Σωκρατικῷ Φαίδωνι μῦθος ἐν τῷ Ζωπύρῳ. Τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ αἰτιατικῆς ἔχει· <<Φασὶ τοίνυν· ὦ Σώκρατες· τῷ νεωτάτῳ βασιλέως υἱῷ χαρίσασθαί τινα λέοντος [genitive sing] σκύμνον>>· μικρὸν δὲ ὑποβὰς μετέβαλεν εἰς τὴν εὐθεῖαν οὕτω· <<καί μοι δοκεῖ ὁ λέων σύντροφος ὢν [nominative singular] τῷ παιδὶ νεανίσκῳ ἤδη ὄντι ἀκολουθεῖν ὅπου βαδίζοι· ὥστε οἵ γε Πέρσαι ἐρᾶν [subject accusative { αὐτόν } lion + infinitive] ἔφασαν τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτόν>>· καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς.[107]

This is the example given by Theon for the practice of inflection within a fable. The noun, lion, is inflected in two cases, genitive and nominative, as well as once as a subject accusative pronoun referring to the lion. This form of inflection seems to depend especially on the change of constructions, i.e., from direct discourse to indirect.

---

[105] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.36-37 (Butler, LCL). "Is this your father? Do you still call him father? Are you your father's son?"

[106] This more complicated form of inflection was first brought to mind based on Josh Stigall's unpublished graduate seminar paper "The Progymnasmata and the Characterization of God in Luke's Parables: The Parable of the Rich Fool as a Test Case," p. 12, 16, and the subsequent discussion in the seminar. Stigall notes the use of the more complicated form of inflection in the parable of the rich fool, p. 16.

[107] Michel Patillon, *Aelius Theon Progymnasmata,* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997), 4.75. Translation: It is like the myth by Phaedo the Socratic in his *Zopyro*. On the one hand he begins with the accusative: "Therefore, O Socrates, they say that a certain man gave a cub of a lion to the youngest son of the king." On the other hand, a short time later he changed into direct discourse thus, "and I suppose, the lion, being raised with the boy, who was now already a young man, followed him wherever he would go. So that the Persians say that he (the lion) loved the boy," and the rest."

Within parables *polyptoton* is one way to determine the main character or subject, thus clarifying the point of the parable. In Theon's preliminary exercises he teaches his students to expand upon chreia[108] and fables[109] by using grammatical inflection. He writes, "Chreias are practiced by recitation, grammatical inflection [*polyptoton*], comment, and disputation."[110] And again, "One should inflect the fables, as with the chreia, in different numbers and oblique cases."[111]

> Luke 15:12 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ νεώτερος αὐτῶν τῷ <u>πατρί</u>· <u>πάτερ</u>, δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας. ὁ δὲ διεῖλεν αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον.
> Luke 15:17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἐλθὼν ἔφη· πόσοι μίσθιοι τοῦ <u>πατρός</u> μου περισσεύονται ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ λιμῷ ὧδε ἀπόλλυμαι.
> Luke 15:18 ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν <u>πατέρα</u> μου καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτῷ· <u>πάτερ</u>, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου,
> Luke 15:20 καὶ ἀναστὰς ἦλθεν πρὸς τὸν <u>πατέρα</u> ἑαυτοῦ. Ἔτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος εἶδεν αὐτὸν ὁ <u>πατὴρ</u> αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη καὶ δραμὼν ἐπέπεσεν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ καὶ κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν.
> Luke 15:21 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτῷ· <u>πάτερ</u>, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου.
> Luke 15:22 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ <u>πατὴρ</u> πρὸς τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ· ταχὺ ἐξενέγκατε στολὴν τὴν πρώτην καὶ ἐνδύσατε αὐτόν, καὶ δότε δακτύλιον εἰς τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ καὶ ὑποδήματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας,

---

[108] In Theon's progymnasmata, *chreia* is the first exercise in a series of ten which increase in difficulty. He defines *chreia* as "a concise saying or deed skillfully making a point, attributed to a specific person or something analogous to a person." Theon, 96 (Patillon).

[109] Theon defines fable as "a fictional story which images the truth (Μῦθός ἐστι λόγος ψευδὴς εἰκονίζων ἀλήθειαν)." The definition is fairly simple, but like the *chreia*, the fable can be expanded or contracted, inflected, confirmed, refuted, and woven into a narrative. Theon 72 (Patillon). Mary Ann Beavis argues that on the Hellenistic side, the parables of Jesus have several affinities with Greek fables. Mary Ann Beavis, "Parable and Fable," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 473-498.

[110] Theon, 101 (Patillon). Theon uses the term κλίσις which means the same thing as the figure *polyptoton*.

[111] Theon, 74 (Patillon).

Luke 15:27 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἥκει, καὶ ἔθυσεν ὁ <u>πατήρ</u> σου τὸν μόσχον τὸν σιτευτόν, ὅτι ὑγιαίνοντα αὐτὸν ἀπέλαβεν.

Luke 15:28 ὠργίσθη δὲ καὶ οὐκ ἤθελεν εἰσελθεῖν, ὁ δὲ <u>πατὴρ</u> αὐτοῦ ἐξελθὼν παρεκάλει αὐτόν.

Luke 15:29 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν τῷ <u>πατρὶ</u> αὐτοῦ· ἰδοὺ τοσαῦτα ἔτη δουλεύω σοι καὶ οὐδέποτε ἐντολήν σου παρῆλθον, καὶ ἐμοὶ οὐδέποτε ἔδωκας ἔριφον ἵνα μετὰ τῶν φίλων μου εὐφρανθῶ·

For the purposes of this figure, I have only included the verses in the parable that contain the word father. As Mikeal Parsons has shown, *polyptoton* can inform the reader as to the main character of a parable. He examines the so-called Parable of the Prodigal Son and demonstrates that through grammatical inflection, the authorial audience would have understood the father to be the main character of the parable. The term father (πατήρ) occurs twelve times and in all five cases; while the term son occurs eight times and only in two cases. He argues that the parable should more rightly be understood as pertaining to the father and his love, rather than the wayward son.[112] Along these lines, the so-called Parable of the Prodigal Son should more properly be called the Parable of the Loving Father. Luke uses *polyptoton* to emphasize the loving father in this parable, and thus to enhance the clarity of his message of God's love.

---

[112] Mikeal C. Parsons, "The Quest of the 'Rhetorical' Jesus," in *Literary Encounters with the Reign of God*, (eds. Sharon H. Ringe, and H. C. Paul Kim; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 34-35. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV,* (AB 28a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 1086; Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke,* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1954), 406; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* (SP 3; ed. Daniel J. Harrington; Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1991), 240. For traditional readings with the son(s) as the focus of the parable, see Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel,* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 149; John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* (WBC 35b; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 789; F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke,* (vol. 2; trans. M. D. Cusin; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1870), 150.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *antistrophe* as the figure in which one repeats the same word as the last word in successive phrases. For example, "Since that time when from our state concord disappeared, liberty disappeared, good faith disappeared, friendship disappeared, the common weal disappeared."[113] By coming back to the same word at the end of successive clauses, the figure *antistrophe* creates rhythm and puts emphasis in the repeated word.

> Luke 15:18 ἀναστὰς πορεύσομαι πρὸς τὸν πατέρα μου καὶ ἐρῶ αὐτῷ· πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου,
> Luke 15:19 οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου· ποίησόν με ὡς ἕνα τῶν μισθίων σου.
> Luke 15:21 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ υἱὸς αὐτῷ· πάτερ, ἥμαρτον εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἐνώπιόν σου, οὐκέτι εἰμὶ ἄξιος κληθῆναι υἱός σου.

Furthering the case that this parable is primarily about the father and not the son is the figure of *antistrophe.* In the first two verses (18-19), the last three clauses end with σου, thus forming the figure of *antistrophe.* Ending these three clauses with the second person genitive singular *you* adds emphasis to the father. Though the son is speaking, it is the father who receives the attention of the audience because of this figure. A translation which would capture this figure in English would read as follows: "I have sinned against heaven and against *you,* I am not longer worthy to be called a son of *you,* make me as one of the hired workers of *you.*" This makes for an awkward translation, and thus the English translations use the possessive pronoun *your* instead of *you.* This however removes the figure of *antistrophe* and thus takes the original emphasis off of the father. This figure is then repeated in v. 21.

---

[113] Ps-Cicero*, Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian*, Inst.* 9.3.30-31.

Quintilian defines *anadiplosis* as the figure in which a word which ends a clause is repeated at the beginning of the next clause. For example, "yet this man lives. Lives?" and again, "And ye, Pierian Muses, shall enhance their worth for Gallus, Gallus, he for whom each hour my love burns stronger."[114] The repetition of words at the end of one clause and the beginning of the next draws the attention of the hearer to the repeated word.

> Luke 15:12 καὶ εἶπεν ὁ νεώτερος αὐτῶν τῷ πατρί· πάτερ, δός μοι τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος τῆς οὐσίας. ὁ δὲ διεῖλεν αὐτοῖς τὸν βίον.

Here the Lukan Jesus uses the figure of *anadiplosis* to again emphasize the father in this parable. As seen earlier, the father stands out as the main character in this parable according to the figures *polyptoton* and *antistrophe*. The addition of the figure *anadiplosis* further highlights the prominence of the father in this parable. Therefore, in this parable which is peculiar to Luke, he goes to great rhetorical lengths to make clear to the audience that the focus and main character in the parable is indeed the loving father, not the wayward son. As two of the three figures used in this parable do not come across in translation, it is not surprising that the focus of this parable is often on the prodigal son.

> Luke 19:12 εἶπεν οὖν· ἄνθρωπός τις εὐγενὴς ἐπορεύθη εἰς χώραν μακρὰν λαβεῖν ἑαυτῷ βασιλείαν καὶ ὑποστρέψαι.
> Luke 19:13 καλέσας δὲ δέκα δούλους ἑαυτοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δέκα μνᾶς καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· πραγματεύσασθε ἐν ᾧ ἔρχομαι.
> Luke 19:14 οἱ δὲ πολῖται αὐτοῦ ἐμίσουν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέστειλαν πρεσβείαν ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ λέγοντες· οὐ θέλομεν τοῦτον βασιλεῦσαι ἐφ' ἡμᾶς.
> Luke 19:15 καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐπανελθεῖν αὐτὸν λαβόντα τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ εἶπεν φωνηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοὺς δούλους τούτους οἷς δεδώκει τὸ ἀργύριον, ἵνα γνοῖ τί διεπραγματεύσαντο.

---

[114] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.44-45 (Butler, LCL).

Luke 19:16 παρεγένετο δὲ ὁ πρῶτος λέγων· κύριε, ἡ μνᾶ σου δέκα προσηργάσατο μνᾶς.

Luke 19:18 καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ δεύτερος λέγων· ἡ μνᾶ σου, κύριε, ἐποίησεν πέντε μνᾶς.

Luke 19:20 καὶ ὁ ἕτερος ἦλθεν λέγων· κύριε, ἰδοὺ ἡ μνᾶ σου ἣν εἶχον ἀποκειμένην ἐν σουδαρίῳ·

Luke 19:21 ἐφοβούμην γάρ σε, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς εἶ, αἴρεις ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκας καὶ θερίζεις ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρας.

Luke 19:22 λέγει αὐτῷ· ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου κρινῶ σε, πονηρὲ δοῦλε. ᾔδεις ὅτι ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρός εἰμι, αἴρων ὃ οὐκ ἔθηκα καὶ θερίζων ὃ οὐκ ἔσπειρα;

Luke 19:23 καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ ἔδωκάς μου τὸ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τράπεζαν; κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν σὺν τόκῳ ἂν αὐτὸ ἔπραξα.

Luke 19:25 καὶ εἶπαν αὐτῷ· κύριε, ἔχει δέκα μνᾶς

Luke 19:27 πλὴν τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου τούτους τοὺς μὴ θελήσαντάς με βασιλεῦσαι ἐπ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἀγάγετε ὧδε καὶ κατασφάξατε αὐτοὺς ἔμπροσθέν μου.

For the purposes of this figure, I have only included the verses in this parable that have a reference to the nobleman. Interestingly, in the few verses that do not refer to the nobleman directly, the nobleman himself is speaking. The nobleman dominates this parable as the figure *polyptoton* indicates. In this parable, the Lukan Jesus uses the more complex form of *polyptoton*. When one takes into account all of the references to the nobleman, he is inflected twenty-six times in all five cases.[115] I will deal with the content and message of this parable in chapter four. Here I am only concerned with Luke's emphasis of the nobleman in this parable.

---

[115] v. 12 ἄνθρωπός τις εὐγενὴς (nominative), v. 12 ἑαυτῷ (dative), v. 13 ἑαυτοῦ (genitive), v. 14 αὐτοῦ (genitive), v. 14 αὐτὸν (accusative), v. 14 αὐτοῦ (genitive), v. 14 τοῦτον (subject accusative), v. 15 ἐπανελθεῖν αὐτὸν (subject accusative), v. 15 αὐτῷ (dative), v. 16 κύριε (vocative), v. 16 σου (genitive), v. 18 κύριε (vocative), v. 18 σου (genitive), v. 20 κύριε (vocative), v. 20 σου (genitive), v. 21 σε (accusative), v. 21 ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς (nominative), v. 22 ἐγὼ (nominative), v. 22 ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρός (nominative), v. 23 μου (genitive), v. 23 κἀγὼ (nominative), v. 25 αὐτῷ (dative), v. 25 κύριε (vocative), v. 27 μου (genitive), v. 27 με (accusative), and v. 27 μου (genitive), for a total of: Nominative: 5, Genitive: 9, Dative: 3, Accusative: 5, Vocative: 4 = 26.

This parable is often called the Parable of the Pounds, and thus is connected with

Matthew's Parable of the Talents. Unfortunately Matthew's parable dominates the

interpretation of Luke's version; but Luke's use of *polyptoton* informs the hearer that the

main subject of this parable is actually the nobleman. Luke re-forms the parable making

the nobleman, and not the talents or the slaves the main subject, as is the case in

Matthew's parable. As commentators have noted, the inclusion of a second political

narrative (vv. 12b, 14, and 27)[116] in Luke's version of this parable focuses the story on

the nobleman rather than on the slaves and their work.[117] Further, Luke does not include

the actions of the slaves in his narrative, but only describes them in retrospect as the

slaves answer the nobleman. He therefore reduces the role of the slaves, as opposed to

Matthew who includes three verses about the slaves' productivity (Matt 25:16-18). Once

again, Luke uses *polyptoton* to bring emphasis and clarity to this parable enabling the

audience to easily follow the argument.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *personification* as the figure which consists

in representing an absent person as present, or in making a mute thing, or one lacking

---

[116] See Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 178-179. Talbert notes the similarity between this narrative and the story of Archilaus, the son of Herod, who went to Rome to receive the kingdom his father had left him. He was opposed by an embassy from the Jews who followed him to Rome to protest his kingship.

[117] Recently, with increased literary interpretation, two commentators have given more attention to the royal and political nature of the parable. John Nolland does not refer to this pericope as the Parable of the Pounds, but renames the section, "Going to a Distant Land to Receive Kingly Power." John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* (WBC 35c; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 908-919. Likewise, Luke T. Johnson refers to this section as "The Kingship Parable." Johnson, *Luke,* 288-292. Cf. R. Alan Culpepper, *Luke,* (NIB 9; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 360. Culpepper labels this section "The parable of the greedy and vengeful king."

form articulate, and attributing to it a definite form and a language or certain behavior appropriate to its character.[118]

> Luke 19:42 λέγων ὅτι εἰ ἔγνως ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ <u>σὺ</u> τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην· νῦν δὲ ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν <u>σου</u>.
> Luke 19:43 ὅτι ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ <u>σὲ</u> καὶ παρεμβαλοῦσιν οἱ ἐχθροί <u>σου</u> χάρακά <u>σοι</u> καὶ περικυκλώσουσίν <u>σε</u> καὶ συνέξουσίν <u>σε</u> πάντοθεν,
> Luke 19:44 καὶ ἐδαφιοῦσίν <u>σε</u> καὶ τὰ τέκνα <u>σου</u> ἐν <u>σοί</u>, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσουσιν λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν <u>σοί</u>, ἀνθ᾽ ὧν οὐκ ἔγνως τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς <u>σου</u>.

This section uses the figures *polyptoton* and *personification*. In these three verses the Lukan Jesus uses the second person personal pronoun σὺ twelve times and in four different cases (σὺ, σου, σὲ, σου, σοι, σε, σε, σε, σου, σοί, σοί, σου). The "you" is referring to Jerusalem in the Lukan Jesus' lament over the city. The recurrence of the personal pronoun in different cases draws attention to the city as the central theme of this lament. The verses also depict Jerusalem as a living and breathing entity. Jerusalem is said to have eyes (v. 42) and children (v. 44). The repeated pronouns along with the *personification* of the city also increase the emotional appeal of this material, showing the intense emotion of the Lukan Jesus as well as rousing the emotions of the audience. He uses the figures *personification* and *polyptoton* to highlight the city of Jerusalem.

Apostrophe is used when the speaker turns from one audience to another, usually in direct address. *Apostrophe* is an interesting figure of speech because in itself it displays the emotion of the speaker or the desired effect upon the audience. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *apostrophe* as a figure claiming indignation or grief by means of an address to an individual. For example, "Perfidious Fregellae, how quickly,

---

[118] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.27.38 (Caplan, LCL).

because of your crime, you have wasted away."[119] The figure can also display a wider

variety of emotions ranging from judgment to praise.

> Luke 11:42 ἀλλὰ <u>οὐαὶ ὑμῖν</u> τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀποδεκατοῦτε τὸ ἡδύοσμον καὶ τὸ πήγανον καὶ πᾶν λάχανον καὶ παρέρχεσθε τὴν κρίσιν καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην τοῦ θεοῦ· ταῦτα δὲ ἔδει ποιῆσαι κἀκεῖνα μὴ παρεῖναι.
> Luke 11:43 <u>Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν</u> τοῖς Φαρισαίοις, ὅτι ἀγαπᾶτε τὴν πρωτοκαθεδρίαν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀσπασμοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἀγοραῖς.
> Luke 11:44 <u>Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν</u>, ὅτι ἐστὲ ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα, καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι [οἱ] περιπατοῦντες ἐπάνω οὐκ οἴδασιν.
> Luke 11:47 <u>Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν</u>, ὅτι οἰκοδομεῖτε τὰ μνημεῖα τῶν προφητῶν, οἱ δὲ πατέρες ὑμῶν ἀπέκτειναν αὐτούς.
> Luke 11:52 <u>Οὐαὶ ὑμῖν</u> τοῖς νομικοῖς, ὅτι ἤρατε τὴν κλεῖδα τῆς γνώσεως· αὐτοὶ οὐκ εἰσήλθατε καὶ τοὺς εἰσερχομένους ἐκωλύσατε.

Of the eleven verses from 11:42-11:52, the Lukan Jesus begins five verses with the same

phrase οὐαὶ ὑμῖν (woe to you). This repeated phrase creates the figures *anaphora* and

apostrophe. The Lukan Jesus' speech forms a rhythm and expectation for the audience.

The audience gets used to the rhythm and pays attention. The frequent repetition of "woe

to you" imprints this message of judgment on the mind of the hearer. This verse also

uses the figure *apostrophe,* by which the Lukan Jesus turns from the general audience to

a specific address to the Pharisees. The effect is powerful, displaying the anger and

wrath of the Lukan Jesus against the Pharisees. These figures, along with the rhythm

created by them, demonstrate the force of the Lukan Jesus' speech. The repetition of the

---

[119] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.25.22 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.23-24 (Butler, LCL). Quintilian gives the following example: "The Marii and Camilii, names of might, the Scipios, stubborn warriors, aye, and thee, Great Caesar." Ps-Cicero claims that this figure shows indignation or grief on behalf of the speaker. Since this handbook is primarily written for the purpose of training individuals in forensic rhetoric, this figure would usually show indignation or grief in a courtroom setting. I contend, however, that the emotions portrayed by this figure are not nearly as restricted as Ps-Cicero claims. Quintilian's example shows that indignation and grief are not the only emotions displayed by this figure.

woes causes the audience to pay attention and clearly comprehend the message of the passage.

The two figures *polysyndeton* and *asyndeton* are related in that they both deal with how the author uses or omits conjunctions. Quintilian defines *polysyndeton* as the use of many connecting particles. One may repeat the same conjunctions, or use different ones.[120] He defines *asyndeton* as the lack of connecting particles, which is useful when speaking with special vigor.[121] This figure affects the way an auditor hears a phrase. *Polysyndeton* slows down the recitation of a list, adding emphasis to the individual parts. *Asyndeton* on the other hand speeds up the recitation of a list, drawing more attention to the speaker and the urgency of what is being read. These two figures also create a rhythm in the speaking, either by regularly returning to the same conjunction, or by omitting the conjunction altogether. Blass, Debrunner, and Funk note that *asyndeton* can "give the impression of ease rather than vividness or haste on the part of the narrator." Further, they note that the use of these figures lend "solemnity and weight" to language.[122]

> Luke 9:3 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μηδὲν αἴρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδόν, μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πήραν μήτε ἄρτον μήτε ἀργύριον μήτε [ἀνὰ] δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν.

In this verse, there are five negative conjunctions μήτε. The sentence also begins with the negative pronoun μηδὲν. Thus, the sentence reads like a list with every item

---

[120] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.50-54 (Butler, LCL).

[121] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.50 (Butler, LCL). Cf. Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.30.41, who only lists the figure *asyndeton*.

[122] Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar*, 241 § 460.

introduced by a conjunction. This creates a rhythm: neither… nor… nor… nor… nor…

nor. The use of *polysyndeton* slows the pace of the sentence drawing attention to the

specific items in the list. The length of the list together with the use of *polysyndeton*

gives the sense of an infinite length as if the list could go on forever. The rhythm is also

increased by the use of *anaphora* and *homoeoptoton*. The commentators on this passage

are concerned mostly with the differences between Luke and his sources. Namely, the

differences between what is on the list of what the disciples should and should not take

on their journey.[123] While these differences are interesting, the language that the Lukan

Jesus uses affects the audience, causing them to focus on the sacrifice necessary to follow

Jesus.

> Luke 13:29 καὶ ἥξουσιν ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν καὶ δυσμῶν καὶ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ καὶ νότου καὶ
> ἀνακλιθήσονται ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.

In this short verse, the conjunction καὶ is used five times. The Lukan Jesus lists four

places from which people will come to recline in the Kingdom of God. He draws

attention to all members of the list, East, West, North, and South.[124] Luke has added to

Matthew's list which only refers to East and West. By using the figure *polysyndeton,*

Luke makes clear his message about the universality and grandeur of the kingdom of

---

[123] For example, Luke's prohibition of a staff that is permitted in Mark (6:8). See
Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX,* (AB 28; Garden City, NY:
Doubleday, 1981), 754; John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20,* (WBC 35a; Dallas: Word Books,
1989), 426-427; Johnson, *Luke,* 145; Barnabus M. Ahern, "Staff or No Staff?," *CBQ* 5
(1943): 332-337.

[124] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1023; notes the inclusive list in this passage as being
an illusion to Psalm 107:3 "and gathered in from the lands, from the east and from the
west, from the north and from the south" (NRSV). Fitzmyer claims that for Luke, this list
encompassed Gentiles, but did not exclude Jews. Cf. Johnson, *Luke,* 217, who draws on
other OT passages for parallels (Isaiah 11:11-16, 60:1-22), and notes the fulfillment of
these passages in Acts 2:5-13.

God. The Lukan Jesus uses *polysyndeton* in this pericope, masterfully concluding his

discussion of the eschatological banquet with these forceful and nearly poetic words.

> Luke 14:12 Ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ τῷ κεκληκότι αὐτόν· ὅταν ποιῇς ἄριστον ἢ δεῖπνον, μὴ
> φώνει τοὺς φίλους σου μηδὲ τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου μηδὲ τοὺς συγγενεῖς σου μηδὲ
> γείτονας πλουσίους, μήποτε καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀντικαλέσωσίν σε καὶ γένηται ἀνταπόδομά
> σοι.
> Luke 14:13 ἀλλ᾽ ὅταν δοχὴν ποιῇς, κάλει πτωχούς, ἀναπείρους, χωλούς, τυφλούς·

Here the Lukan Jesus uses both figures, *polysyndeton* and *asyndeton,* in successive

verses. In v. 12, the Lukan Jesus uses *polysyndeton* listing the types of people one should

not invite to a banquet. He draws this list out with the conjunctions *μὴ* and *μηδὲ*

(neither/nor). The NRSV actually keeps this figure in translation as follows: "do not

invite your friends or your brothers or your relatives or rich neighbors." The repetition of

the conjunction draws attention and emphasis to each member of the list. In this case,

each member of the list builds upon the last, adding emphasis and clarity to the point:

don't invite people who can repay you! In v. 13, the Lukan Jesus uses *asyndeton* in a list

of four types of people to be invited: the poor, crippled, lame, blind.[125] By removing the

conjunctions, the Lukan Jesus' words provide the opposite effect of the previous verse.

Asyndeton speeds up the delivery and draws more attention to the list itself rather than the

individual members. All of the people in the second list are the outcasts of agrarian

society. Therefore the individual members of the list do not need attention, only the

impression of the list, which is comprised of social outcasts. By giving contrasting lists,

---

[125] See Culpepper, *Luke,* 286. Culpepper notes the differences in the two lists. The
first list is made up of those who can confer honor, while the second list is made up of
those that were barred from the priesthood and the Qumran community. Cf. Johnson,
Luke, 224-225.

using contrasting figures, the Lukan Jesus emphasizes these contrasting members of society and secures the message in the minds of the audience.

> Luke 14:21 ἔξελθε ταχέως εἰς τὰς πλατείας καὶ ῥύμας τῆς πόλεως καὶ τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ ἀναπείρους καὶ τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς εἰσάγαγε ὧδε.

Here is another list in which the Lukan Jesus uses *polysyndeton*. Jesus lists two places to which and four types of people to whom the slave is supposed to go and bring to the banquet. The Lukan Jesus introduces each successive member of the list with the conjunction καὶ. Once again, by using this figure, the Lukan Jesus slows the delivery of this list and draws special attention to the members of the list:[126] "Go to the squares and to the streets of the towns, and to the poor, and to the crippled, and to the blind, and to the lame." Because this would not be considered proper English, most English translations give the list without the conjunctions. In doing so, however, they remove the rhetorical effect of *polysyndeton*. The Lukan Jesus has used *polysyndeton* in the parable of the banquet to highlight his message of compassion to the social outcasts.

> Luke 17:27 ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἐγάμουν, ἐγαμίζοντο, ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας εἰσῆλθεν Νῶε εἰς τὴν κιβωτὸν καὶ ἦλθεν ὁ κατακλυσμὸς καὶ ἀπώλεσεν πάντας.
> Luke 17:28 ὁμοίως καθὼς ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Λώτ· ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον, ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ᾠκοδόμουν·

Here are two examples of *asyndeton* from the Lukan Jesus' material on the day of the Son of Man. From the use of this figure the urgency of the day of the Son of Man becomes clear. Each individual member of these lists from the days of Noah and the

---

[126] See Culpepper, *Luke,* 290. Culpepper notes the "social ostracism" of those on the list of invitees.

days of Lot[127] do not carry individual significance. Rather, the figure highlights the

number of everyday things that were taking place in those days, and the regularity and

speed with which they were accomplished. The Lukan Jesus uses the figure here to

create a pattern of regularity and normal life. This pattern is shattered in the minds of the

hearers because of the context. The pattern of normal life was shattered in the days of

Noah and the days of Lot. Tannehill notes the forceful language in this passage as these

verbs stand with no words added to them, "not even conjunctions."[128] The effect of this

figure, as Tannehill notes, is to demonstrate the rhythm of ordinary life, which gives

"structure to our lives and, therefore, a kind of security," which is then shattered by the

coming of disaster.[129] Here the Lukan Jesus engages his audience with *asyndeton* by

listing in rapid succession the every day activities of those before an impending disaster.

The rapid delivery of the list without conjunctions seizes the audience and causes them to

pay special attention.

> Luke 18:32 παραδοθήσεται γὰρ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἐμπαιχθήσεται καὶ ὑβρισθήσεται καὶ ἐμπτυσθήσεται

---

[127] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1165. Fitzmyer notes the Lukan addition of v. 28 (the reference to Lot) to the Q passage. The addition balances out the list of everyday things happing in the times of both Noah and Lot.

[128] Robert C. Tannehill, *The Sword of his Mouth: Forceful and Imaginative Language in Synoptic Sayings*, (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 119. Tannehill does note the use of asyndeton in the footnote to this text where he has drawn on Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar*.

[129] Tannehill, *Sword,* 119-121. Tannehill notes that the forceful language of Luke stands out more when compared with the text of Matthew which does not contain the parallel reference to Lot, nor does it contain the patterns of repetition. Cf. Sharon H. Ringe, *Luke,* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 222. Ringe notes the sense of everyday life and business as usual that preceded times of complete and unforeseen disaster.

Luke 18:33 καὶ μαστιγώσαντες ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ ἀναστήσεται.

This list deals with what the Son of Man will face in Jerusalem. The Lukan Jesus has used the figure of *polysyndeton*. The third singular aorist passive ending θήσεται also creates the figure *homoteleuton*.[130] The repeated use of καὶ rings in the ear of the hearer, causing him or her to take notice of every separate member in the list. The use of *polysyndeton* and *homoteleuton* creates a rhythm which slows the delivery. This list prolongs the agony of the hearer who listens to the litany of horrible things that will be done to Jesus. The figure also highlights Jesus' resurrection. The repeated use of καὶ creates a rhythm and sets up an expectation for a never-ending list of atrocities committed upon the Lukan Jesus. This expectation is then abruptly thwarted as the list ends with the promise of the resurrection.[131] The Lukan Jesus uses these figures to intensify the emotions of his audience with regard to his death, first with fear and anxiety, then with joy and anticipation. The figure arrests the attention of the audience as they hang on the Lukan Jesus' every word.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *climax* as the figure in which a speaker passes to the next word only after advancing by steps to the preceding one. For example, "Now what remnant of liberty survives if those men *may* do what they *please*, if they *can*

---

[130] Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 895. Nolland notes the addition of a third passive verb to Mark's list. Where the Lukan Jesus uses a figure in Mark, he expands upon it, increasing its efficacy.

[131] Many commentators note the differences between Luke's passion prediction and those in Mark and Matthew. They, however, fail to mention the effect that the Lukan version has upon the audience. See Culpepper, *Luke,* 351; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1209; Johnson, *Luke,* 279; Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 895-896.

do what they *may*, if they *dare* do what they *can*, if they *do* what they *dare*, and if you

approve of what they *do*." And again, "The industry of Africanus brought him

excellence, his excellence glory, his glory rivals."[132]

> Luke 10:16 Ὁ ἀκούων ὑμῶν ἐμοῦ ἀκούει, καὶ ὁ ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ· ὁ δὲ ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με.

Here the *climax* begins with those who reject the disciples. It then moves to a rejection of

the Lukan Jesus, and finally to a rejection of God. Burney notes this figure, but calls it

by the name of "step-parallelism" which, by his definition, is indistinguishable from the

rhetorical figure of *climax*.[133] This figure, by its very nature builds tension toward a

climactic moment. The tension builds as each rejection moves to a higher level,

presumably with greater consequences. This figure seizes the attention of the hearer as

he or she contemplates the rise toward the climax. The figure also carries a certain

rhythm with the rising tension.[134] The use of the figure *climax* aids in grabbing and

keeping the attention of the hearer as they wait for the climactic moment in the chain.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *traductio* as the figure in which the author

repeats certain words without offense to style. The same type of figure is created when

using a word with the same spelling in different ways. For example, "One who has

---

[132] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.35.34 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.55-57.

[133] C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ,* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925), 90-91. In step parallelism "a second line takes up a thought contained in the first line, and, repeating it, makes as it were a step upwards for the development of a further thought, which is commonly the climax of the whole."

[134] See Burney, *Poetry,* 124. Burney notes the Hebrew four-beat rhythm in this verse. Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 221, who sees in this passage a "chain of three members: the ones whom Jesus sends, Jesus, and the one who sent Jesus." Culpepper fails to note the *climax* in this chain, and thus the effect it would have on an auditor.

nothing in life more desirable than life cannot cultivate a virtuous life." And again, "I

would leave this place, should the senate grant me leave."[135]

> Luke 10:23 Καὶ στραφεὶς πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς κατ' ἰδίαν εἶπεν· μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ
> οἱ βλέποντες ἃ βλέπετε.
> Luke 10:24 λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι πολλοὶ προφῆται καὶ βασιλεῖς ἠθέλησαν ἰδεῖν ἃ ὑμεῖς
> βλέπετε καὶ οὐκ εἶδαν, καὶ ἀκοῦσαι ἃ ἀκούετε καὶ οὐκ ἤκουσαν.

Here there is a threefold repetition of the verb βλέπω, a twofold repetition of the

synonym εἴδω, and a threefold repetition of the verb ἀκούω. The constant repetition of

the metaphors of hearing and sight, especially with the repeated verbal patterns, affect the

hearer, causing him or her to take notice of what is being said. The repetition is left

ringing in the ear of the auditor even after the speech has continued. With the repeated

words, the Lukan Jesus uses *traductio* to create rhythm[136] and resonance that pleases the

ear. Luke employs *traductio* to clarify and highlight his message of hearing and seeing.

> Luke 11:34 Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου. ὅταν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου
> ἁπλοῦς ᾖ, καὶ ὅλον τὸ σῶμα σου φωτεινόν ἐστιν· ἐπὰν δὲ πονηρὸς ᾖ, καὶ τὸ σῶμα
> σου σκοτεινόν.
> Luke 11:35 σκόπει οὖν μὴ τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοὶ σκότος ἐστίν.
> Luke 11:36 εἰ οὖν τὸ σῶμά σου ὅλον φωτεινόν, μὴ ἔχον μέρος τι σκοτεινόν, ἔσται
> φωτεινὸν ὅλον ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζῃ σε.[137]

---

[135] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.14.20-21 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.70-74.

[136] See Burney, *Poetry,* 145. Burney notes that this repetition creates the Hebrew *Ḳīnā-rhythm.*

[137] Burney notes that the Matthean text displays a Hebrew three-beat rhythm. He calls Matthew's text "rhythmically superior" based upon a reverse translation into Aramaic." As Luke's text was composed from a Greek linguistic point of view this might speak to Luke's Greek prowess over against Matthew's Aramaic prowess. Burney, *Poetry,* 131 fn. 1.

In these three verses, the Lukan Jesus deals with the antithesis between light and darkness. He uses the root for light, φῶς five times, while using the root for darkness, σκότος, three times. Luke also repeats the word λύχνος, which represents light, twice. Using the figure of *traductio,* the Lukan Jesus draws attention to light and darkness in an interesting way.[138]

> Luke 11:46 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς νομικοῖς οὐαί, ὅτι φορτίζετε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους φορτία δυσβάστακτα, καὶ αὐτοὶ ἑνὶ τῶν δακτύλων ὑμῶν οὐ προσψαύετε τοῖς φορτίοις.

In this verse there is a threefold repetition of the Greek root φορτ. It is used once as a verb, and twice as a noun. There are two figures used here. *Traductio* is the mere repetition of the same word, while *paronomasia* is the slight change of the word in successive repetitions. The NRSV does not carry this figure across in translation. A paraphrase would be, "you burden with burdens but do not help with the burdens."[139] The repetition draws attention to the actions of the law experts and the fact that they are not compassionate to the people. With this clever play on words the Lukan Jesus uses these figures to direct condemnation against those who would burden the people without lifting a finger to help.

> Luke 13:33 πλὴν δεῖ με σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ ἐχομένῃ πορεύεσθαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐνδέχεται προφήτην ἀπολέσθαι ἔξω Ἰερουσαλήμ.

---

[138] Culpepper, *Luke,* 244. Culpepper rightly notes that this passage is controlled by the dual metaphors of lamp and light. While Culpepper is concerned with what those metaphors mean in this context, my study is concerned with how the Lukan Jesus highlighted these images through his speech. Cf. Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 656. Nolland claims that this passage is held together by a series of "catchwords."

[139] Neither Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 666; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 949; nor Culpepper, *Luke,* 248, note the play on words here with the threefold repetition of the root φορτ.

Luke 13:34 Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλήμ, ἡ ἀποκτείνουσα τοὺς προφήτας καὶ λιθοβολοῦσα τοὺς ἀπεσταλμένους πρὸς αὐτήν, ποσάκις ἠθέλησα ἐπισυνάξαι τὰ τέκνα σου ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας, καὶ οὐκ ἠθελήσατε.

In these verses, Luke uses two figures of repetition, *anadiplosis* (repetition of the same word at the end of a clause and the beginning of the next clause), and *epanalepsis* (repetition of the same word twice in a row), by repeating Jerusalem as the last word in v. 33 and as the first two words in v. 34.   Some translations begin a new paragraph with verse 34, thus separating the connection between the two verses.[140] The effect on the audience of the thrice-repeated Jerusalem causes the words to ring in their ears and emphasizes the Lukan Jesus' care for and lament over this city.[141] Such emphasis heightens the emotional appeal of the passage.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *pleonasm* as a figure of thought which consists in dwelling on the same topic and yet seeming to say something ever new. For example:

> No peril is so great that a wise man would think it ought to be avoided when the safety of the fatherland is at stake. When the lasting security of the state is in question, the man endowed with good principles will undoubtedly believe that in defense of the fortunes of the republic he ought to shun no crisis of life, and he will ever persist in the determination eagerly to enter, for the fatherland, any combat, however great the peril to life.[142]

---

[140] See Culpepper, *Luke,* 280. Culpepper not only separates these verses in his translation, but also in his section of comments. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke, X-XXIV,* 1027-1038, who separates these verses into two completely separate pericopes. While, from a narrative standpoint there is a division here, from a linguistic standpoint, such division negates the power of the figure of speech.

[141] Matthew has parallel material but does not use this figure.

[142] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.42.54 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.45-46.

The figure, as Luke uses it, consists in repetition of the same thought in different words, thus adding emphasis and variety to an important position of the Lukan Jesus.

> Luke 8:17 οὐ γάρ ἐστιν κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ φανερὸν γενήσεται οὐδὲ ἀπόκρυφον ὃ οὐ μὴ γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθῃ.

The two clauses of this verse repeat the same thought using different words. κρυπτὸν is replaced with ἀπόκρυφον and φανερὸν γενήσεται is replaced with φανερὸν ἔλθῃ, and finally φανερὸν γενήσεται is expanded to include μὴ γνωσθῇ. This passage, by using the figure *pleonasm,* as well as by using *antithesis,*[143] *creates* a rhythm which drives this message deeply into the mind of the hearer.

> Luke 12:2 Οὐδὲν δὲ συγκεκαλυμμένον ἐστὶν ὃ οὐκ ἀποκαλυφθήσεται καὶ κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται.
> Luke 12:3 ἀνθ' ὧν ὅσα ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε ἐν τῷ φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται, καὶ ὃ πρὸς τὸ οὖς ἐλαλήσατε ἐν τοῖς ταμείοις κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῶν δωμάτων.

As a way to amplify the use of *pleonasm* in 8:17, the same thought is now repeated again with the figure *pleonasm* in 12:2-3, once again varying the vocabulary and imagery. While 8:17 is parallel to Mark 4:22, 12:3 is parallel to Matthew 10:27. In this thrice-repeated sentiment in Luke's gospel, he makes clear his message of reversal. The language of repetition is powerful as it imprints these words on the mind of the hearer. The use of *pleonasm,* in the varied repetition of the same thought calls out to the reader to pay attention to what is said.

> Luke 11:9 αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν, ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε, κρούετε καὶ ἀνοιγήσεται ὑμῖν·
> Luke 11:10 πᾶς γὰρ ὁ αἰτῶν λαμβάνει καὶ ὁ ζητῶν εὑρίσκει καὶ τῷ κρούοντι ἀνοιγ[ήσ]εται.

---

[143] See Burney, *Poetry,* 65. Burney notes the Hebrew synonymous parallelism in this verse as the same thoughts are rendered in both clauses.

Here the Lukan Jesus uses the figure *pleonasm* in six clauses that all say nearly the same thing. Any one of the clauses could stand alone, but the six-fold repetition of the thought using different imagery strengthens the effect of the argument. V. 9 is also an example of *isocolon* which contains three clauses with 10, 8, and 11 syllables, which creates a rhythm that is pleasing to the ear. Though not following the *isocolon* as closely, v. 10 rounds out the thought and carries on the rhythm. Tannehill notes the rhythm in these verses, writing:

> Each of the small units above designate [sic] a "foot" in this type of rhythm. We have here, then, a rhythmic pattern of two feet per line. In spite of the fact that the number of syllables and accents in each foot varies, the division of each sentence into two elements is so clearly marked and the parallelism is so strong that it is difficult not to read this rhythmically.[144]

The Lukan Jesus uses these verses with three similar ideas, each repeated twice, to emphasize the rewards of persistence.[145] This repetition with the variation of words allows the message to reverberate in the minds of the audience.

Finally, the Lukan Jesus uses the figure *prosopopoiia* to emphasize certain portions of the parables by making them lively and energetic. The figure *prosopopoiia* lends itself very well to Jesus' parables as the figure involves creating speech for a character. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines the figure as putting in the mouth of some person language in keeping with his character.[146] Theon includes this figure *prosopopoiia* as one of his preliminary exercises in the *Progymnasmata*. He defines

---

[144] Tannehill, *Sword,* 46-47.

[145] See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 914. Fitzmyer also notes the repetition used for emphasis. Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 238. Culpepper notes the repetition here, and of the same catchwords later in the gospel (11:29, 13:24-25).

[146] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.42.55 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.2.29-37.

prosopopoiia as "the introduction to a person to whom words are attributed that are suitable to him or her and which are indisputably related to the matter at hand."[147] Theon then demonstrates how a student would pose questions as to what a certain speaker might say on a given occasion as follows:

> What words would a certain man say to his wife when he was about to go on a journey? Or what would a military commander say to his troops to urge them on to danger? And likewise when the people are identified, such as, what would Cyrus say when pursuing the Massagetae? Or what words would Datis use upon meeting the king after the battle of Marathon?[148]

Another way to define *prosopopoiia* would be to say that it is a figure in which the author creates speech in character. That is, he or she writes speech for someone that is in keeping with his or her character.

> Luke 12:17 καὶ διελογίζετο ἐν ἑαυτῷ λέγων· τί ποιήσω, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχω ποῦ συνάξω τοὺς καρπούς μου;
> Luke 12:18 καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτο ποιήσω, καθελῶ μου τὰς ἀποθήκας καὶ μείζονας οἰκοδομήσω καὶ συνάξω ἐκεῖ πάντα τὸν σῖτον καὶ τὰ ἀγαθά μου
> Luke 12:19 καὶ ἐρῶ τῇ ψυχῇ μου· ψυχή, ἔχεις πολλὰ ἀγαθὰ κείμενα εἰς ἔτη πολλά· ἀναπαύου, φάγε, πίε, εὐφραίνου.

This is a very interesting example of *prosopopoiia*. The implied question in this passage is, "What would a rich man say if he had a surplus crop?" The answer is this somewhat humorous story of a rich man's conversation with himself. His conversation is lively, including his self address in the vocative case ψυχή as he says, "and I will say to myself, Self…" Johnson notes the use of what he calls "*dialogismos*" in this passage, a parallel figure to *prosopopoiia*. He argues that in Luke, *dialogismos* reflects negatively on the

---

[147] Theon, 115 (Patillon).

[148] Theon, 115 (Patillon).

speaker.[149] By using the figure *prosopopoiia,* Luke enlivens this passage as opposed to just narrating the event.

> Luke 14:18 καὶ ἤρξαντο ἀπὸ μιᾶς πάντες παραιτεῖσθαι. ὁ πρῶτος εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀγρὸν ἠγόρασα καὶ ἔχω ἀνάγκην ἐξελθὼν ἰδεῖν αὐτόν· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον.
> Luke 14:19 καὶ ἕτερος εἶπεν· ζεύγη βοῶν ἠγόρασα πέντε καὶ πορεύομαι δοκιμάσαι αὐτά· ἐρωτῶ σε, ἔχε με παρῃτημένον.
> Luke 14:20 καὶ ἕτερος εἶπεν· γυναῖκα ἔγημα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ δύναμαι ἐλθεῖν.

The Lukan Jesus presents the dialogue between invited banquet guests and the slave of the banquet master. The implied question behind the dialogue is, "What would an invited banquet guest say if he or she wanted to slip the invitation to attend?" The answer comes in this figure *prosopopoiia.* The use of *prosopopoiia* is an active and lively way for the Lukan Jesus to make his point. He presents three possible responses of those who would wish to weasel out of a banquet invitation. The Lukan Jesus has enlivened this parable with the use of *prosopopoiia,* whereas Matthew simply states that the invited guests refused the invitation. As Johnson notes, "In Luke's version, the reader's attention is caught by the threefold excuses and the threefold invitations."[150] Luke once again uses *prosopopoiia* to make the speech lively and interesting, inviting the audience to fix it firmly in their minds.

In this section I have demonstrated how Luke used figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to fulfill the stylistic virtue of clarity by arresting and holding the attention of the hearer. Luke uses many figures of speech as verbal markers or signposts that attract

---

[149] Johnson, *Luke,* 199. Cf. Nolland, *Luke, 9:21-18:34,* 686. Johnson refers to the dialogue here as a "soliloquy." Both Johnson and Nolland fail to note any way in which this dialogue livens the conversation and causes the hearer to take notice.

[150] Johnson, *Luke,* 231.

attention and cause the hearer to listen carefully, thus rooting his message firmly in their minds.

<center>*The Stylistic Virtue of Ornamentation*</center>

While the previous section demonstrated how Luke used figures of speech to enhance the clarity of his message, this section deals with the stylistic virtue of ornamentation. Many of the Lukan Jesus' figures are impressive examples of ornament. They are rhetorical flourishes that make the sentence pleasant to hear. As Quintilian notes, "For as speaker wins but trifling praise if he does no more than speak with correctness and lucidity…by the employment of skilful ornament the orator commends himself."[151] Also, as Cicero writes concerning ornamental style, "I mean the kind of eloquence which rushes along with the roar of a mighty stream, which all look up to and admire, and which they despair of attaining."[152] Therefore, to ornament one's sentences is primarily for the purpose of gaining admiration and assent. Nevertheless, one ought not disparage these figures as mere ornament. It must not be thought that ornament is merely superfluous.[153] Quintilian writes, "But rhetorical ornament contributes not a little to the furtherance of our case as well. For when our audience find it a pleasure to listen, their attention and their readiness to believe what they hear are both alike increased."[154]

---

[151] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.3.1-2 (Butler, LCL).

[152] Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 28.97 (Hubbell, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.3.11, where he notes that in epideictic rhetoric, one ought to use all means of ornament to impress the audience.

[153] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.3.1 (Butler, LCL).

[154] Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.3.5 (Butler, LCL).

In the following, I will demonstrate that the Lukan Jesus, while not flooding his audience with constant and overpowering ornament, was, however, capable at times of forming grand rhetorical adornments to his language in order to gain admiration and a hearing for his message. For the following figures, reading the verses aloud helps to comprehend the ornamental value they hold.

Examples of Figures of Ornamentation

I begin with perhaps the most rhetorically packed and ornamented sections of Luke's gospel: the blessings and the woes of the Sermon on the Plain. This passage will be discussed in chapter four with regard to the message conveyed. Here, however, I only point out the ornamental embellishments employed by the Lukan Jesus.

One set of figures which demonstrates ornamentation is made up of *anaphora, antistrophe,* and *symploce.* All three of these figures employ the repetition[155] of certain words, either at the beginning of clauses, ending of clauses, or both. Ps-Cicero gives the following definitions of the three figures: *anaphora* is the figure in which the same words begin successive phrases. For example, "Scipio razed Numantia, Scipio destroyed Carthage, Scipio brought peace, Scipio saved the state."[156] As for *antistrophe,* Ps-Cicero

---

[155] Robert Tannehill notes the importance of repetition in prose writing as a means of enhancing the "forceful and imaginative" nature of the language. He claims that repetition creates resonance, by which language is "amplified" and "enriched." That resonance activates the imagination of the reader/hearer and challenges his or her preconceived notions. Tannehill, *Sword*, 45.

[156] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian*, Inst.* 9.3.30. Quintilian does not name this figure, he only refers to the definition, but he is clearly referring to *anaphora.* Likewise, Quintilian does not name the following two figures of *antistrophe* or *symploce.*

says, it is the figure in which one repeats the same word as the last word in successive phrases. For example, "Since that time when from our state concord disappeared, liberty disappeared, good faith disappeared, friendship disappeared, the common weal disappeared."[157] Finally, *symploce* is the combined use of *anaphora* and *antistrophe*: repeating both the first and the last words in successive clauses. For example, "One whom the Senate has condemned, one whom the Roman people has condemned, one whom universal public opinion has condemned."[158]

Luke 6:20   Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί,
              ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
Luke 6:21   μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν,
              ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε.
           μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν,
              ὅτι γελάσετε.
Luke 6:22   μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·
Luke 6:23 χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.
Luke 6:24   Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις,
                  ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.
Luke 6:25   οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν,
              ὅτι πεινάσετε.
           οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν,
              ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.
Luke 6:26   οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι·
           κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

In both the blessings and the woes the Lukan Jesus has used these three figures masterfully. He begins every blessing with the word μακάριοι (*anaphora*), every second

---

[157] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.30-31.

[158] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.14.20 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.31.

line with the word ὅτι (*anaphora*), and ends two clauses (v. 21) with the word νῦν (*antistrophe*). Likewise, the woes mirror the blessings, beginning every woe with the word οὐαὶ, every other line with ὅτι, and ending two woes with the word νῦν (v. 25). The use of *anaphora* and *antistrophe* thus create the figure *symploce.* The use of these figures in this passage creates a pleasant and memorable rhythm. The balancing of the blessings and woes further augments this rhythm, highlighting the antithetical nature of the Lukan Jesus' message and making this section pleasant to the ear.[159]

Another figure used in the blessings and woes is that of *apostrophe. Apostrophe* represents the turning from the general audience to the specific direct address. Here the Lukan Jesus turns from the general audience, "blessed are the poor," to the specific direct address, "for *yours* is the kingdom of God." This direct address personalizes Jesus' message and conveys his compassion to the audience. Luke alone adopts this figure as Matthew's Beatitudes retain the third person address until the last beatitude.

Another two figures that can serve to ornament a sentence are *homoeoptoton* and *homoteleuton*. The figures are taken together because they both deal with words having similar endings. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *homoeoptoton* as the figure in which in the same period two or more words appear in the same case with like terminations. For example, "Am I to praise a man lacking in courage but overflowing

---

[159] Robert Morgenthaler notes the use of *anaphora, antistrophe*, and *symploce* in this passage with Μακάριοιοί, ὅτι, Μακάριοι νῦν, ὅτι Μακάριοι νῦν, ὅτι Μακάριοί, in the blessings, and likewise with οὐαὶ, ὅτι, οὐαὶ νῦν, ὅτι, οὐαί νῦν, ὅτι, οὐαὶ in the woes. Morgenthaler notes the geometric pattern in this passage and writes that it leaves an "unmistakable impression." Robert Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian,* (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag Zürich, 1993), 268. Cf. Vinson, *Luke,* 177-183. Vinson notes the "poetic" and "parallel" structure of the blessings and woes but does not use the ancient rhetorical terms.

with good fortune (*Hominem laudem egentem virtutis, abundantem felicitatis*)?"[160] This

figure occurs when the case endings are the same. The second figure, *homoteleuton*

occurs when the endings of the words are similar, although the words are indeclinable.

For example, "You dare to act dishonorably, you strive to talk despicably, you live

hatefully, you sin zealously, you speak offensively (*Turpiter audes facere, nequiter*

studes dicere, vivis invidiose, delinquis studiose, loqueris odiose)."[161]

> Luke 6:22 μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσιν ὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·

In addition to the ornament of the blessings and woes with *anaphora, antistrophe,*

symploce, and *apostrophe,* the Lukan Jesus concludes the blessings by using the figure

homoteleuton, as there is a fourfold repetition of the third person plural aorist active

subjunctive ending ωσιν. The repetition of the verb ending creates an audible effect on

the reader. This passage already has a rhythm due to the use of *anaphora, antistrophe,*

and *symploce*, and the use of *homoteleuton* adds variety and punch to this rhythm. In the

blessings and woes, the Lukan Jesus uses a highly ornamented style, masterfully

combining numerous carefully crafted figures of speech, in order to please the ear of his

audience and to rouse their emotions.

In addition to the previous figures, many of the Lukan Jesus' words also use the

figure *isocolon. Isocolon* is a figure which takes great care to produce and thus shows

tremendous forethought on Luke's part. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *isocolon*

---

[160] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.78-79.

[161] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.20.28 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.77.

as a figure comprised of clauses which consist of virtually equal number of syllables. For

example, "the father was meeting death in battle; the son was planning a marriage at

home. These omens wrought grievous disasters (*In proelio mortem parens oppetebat,*

domi filius nuptias conparabat; haec omina gravis casus administrabant)."[162] In this

example every clause is made up of twelve syllables.

> Luke 6:43 Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρόν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.[163]

Here is a striking example of *homoeoptoton*, *homoteleuton* and *isocolon*. On the one

hand there are eight nouns or adjectives with the nominative neuter singular *ον* ending.

Further there are four more words which end with the *ν*. Out of fifteen words in this

sentence, twelve end with the Greek *ν*. The verse is also a perfect *isocolon* with fourteen

syllables in each clause.[164] The meter of the verse is also interesting. Out of twenty-eight

syllables, twenty-six are long. In terms of meter, the first foot of each clause is a trochee

followed by seven spondees. (- �‍/- -/- -/- -/- -/- -/- -// - �‍/- -/- -/- -/- -/- -/- -). The

proliferation of long syllables, combined with rhyme (*homoeoptoton* and *homoteleuton*)

and *isocolon* creates a beating or chanting rhythm. Read aloud the rhythm of this verse is

quite striking. If one reads Luke's version aloud and then Matthew's parallel material

(7:16ff and 12:33ff), Luke's version is much more stylized and rhythmic. Vinson, while

---

[162] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.20.27 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.80.

[163] Morgenthaler notes the repetition of the word δένδρον in this passage, though he does not notice the use of *homoeoptoton* or *homoteleuton*. Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian,* 267.

[164] Matthew contains parallel material and makes limited use of *homoeoptoton* in 12:43, yet the rhythm of Luke's sentence is not represented in Matthew.

not employing the rhetorical terms, notes the rhythm, same number of syllables (*isocolon*) and rhyme (*homoeoptoton* and *homoteleuton*) in this phrase. He writes, "it is a bit of a tongue twister…which you might try saying five times fast."[165] The rhythm here would be too much to carry on for a significant amount of time, but for a short sentence, the phrase arrests the attention of the auditors. Unfortunately, there is no decent way to translate this figure into English while keeping the meaning. Here the Lukan Jesus has, in a very compact sentence, combined three figures in a grand style to ornament his speech, make it pleasing to the ear, and seize the attention and admiration of the audience.

> Luke 7:22　　τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν,
> λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν,
> νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται·

In this verse the Lukan Jesus is listing his accomplishments in response to John's messengers. In this list, he uses six nouns that end with the nominative plural masculine οὶ. Three verbs also end with the third plural active ending ουσιν, and three with the third plural passive ending ονται. The figures used here are *homoeoptoton* and *homoteleuton*. The repeated sound creates a rhythm and draws the audience's ear to pay attention. These clauses also partake of *isocolon.* The first four clauses have seven syllables each, the fifth has six syllables, and the sixth has eight. The arrangement of feet in the first

---

[165] Vinson, *Luke,* 195. Cf. C. F. Burney, *The Poetry of Our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ,* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1925), 76. Burney finds at work in this verse Hebrew parallelism. Burney's book has some interesting insights, but as his method relies on a translation of the Greek into Aramaic, he is ultimately working with a different text than the Greek used in this study.

three clauses of this verse is exactly the same. Each clause begins and ends with a

spondee (--) with a tribrach[166] (˘˘˘) in the middle for the following rhythm: --˘˘˘--.[167] This

rhythm is perfectly repeated in the first three clauses in this verse.[168] The Lukan Jesus, in

his response to the disciples of John, has used an eloquent style by combining the figures

homoeoptoton, homoteleuton, and *isocolon* to create a rousing rhythm pleasing and

compelling to the ear.

Another highly artistic figure of speech that Luke employs is that of *chiasmus*.

Ps-Cicero defines *chiasmus* as the figure in which two discrepant thoughts are so

expressed by transposition that the latter follows from the former although contradictory

to it. For example, "you must eat to live, not live to eat." And "I do not write poems,

because I cannot write the sort I wish, and I do not wish to write the sort I can."[169]

> Luke 12:52 ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν ἑνὶ οἴκῳ διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ
> δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισίν,
> Luke 12:53 διαμερισθήσονται πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ *υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί,* μήτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν
> θυγατέρα καὶ *θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα,* πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς καὶ *νύμφη
> ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.*

These verses employ a number of *antitheses* in the artful form of *chiasmus*. V. 53

presents a family of five, three against two, and two against three. Father against son,

and son against father, mother against daughter, and daugher against mother, mother in

---

[166] For tribrach see Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 57.191.

[167] For a discussion of prose rhythm as a means of augmenting rhetorical style, see Cicero, *Or. Brut.* 57.191- 58.197 (Hubbell, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.4.91 (Butler, LCL).

[168] See Burney, *Poetry,* 117. He finds the use of the Hebrew four-beat rhythm in this passage.

[169] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.18.39 (Caplan, LCL).

law against bride, and bride against mother in law. In chapter four I deal with the content

of these verses. Here I only point out the ornamental construction that Luke has used.

Compared with Matthew who has parallel material (10:35), Luke's is much more

rhetorically complex. For every pair of family members pitted against one another in

Matthew, Luke has added a second clause reversing the order of the first and thus

creating the figure *chiasmus*. Robert Tannehill, while not using the rhetorical terms,

notes the linguistic power of this passage. He notes the reversal of terms in each of the

pairings He writes, "Luke's text comes to a powerful climax through effective use of

short clauses in strong and rapid rhythm."[170]

> Luke 12:38 κἂν ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ κἂν ἐν τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ καὶ εὕρῃ οὕτως,
> μακάριοί εἰσιν ἐκεῖνοι.

Here again is a mixture of both *homoeoptoton* and *homoteleuton*. First, including

articles, there are four words ending with the feminine singular dative η. Further there

are two verbs which end with the third person singular aorist active subjunctive η. The

similar endings in this verse create a pleasant rhythm for the ear of the hearer.[171]

Commentators on this passage note the various historical references to the watches of the

night, while missing the clever construction which the Lukan Jesus employs.[172]

> Luke 21:23 οὐαὶ ταῖς ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσαις καὶ ταῖς θηλαζούσαις ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς
> ἡμέραις·

---

[170] Tannehill, *Sword,* 146-147. Tannehill notes the forceful impact in Luke's
version as superior to that of Matthew. See also Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 709. Nolland
also notes the reversal of the terms in the second clause of the three divisions.

[171] Though there is nearly parallel material in Matthew and Mark, neither makes
use of this figure.

[172] See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 988; Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 701-702.

Here is another example of *homoeoptoton* in which, including articles, seven of twelve words end with the feminine plural dative αις. Once again the similar endings create a pleasant rhythm which echoes in the ear of the auditor. Much is made in the commentaries about Luke's reworking of the Markan material in this verse, but nothing is made of the figure of speech noted here which Luke actually takes from Mark verbatim.[173] The Lukan Jesus, like in the previous verse, has again used rhetorical ornament to embellish this statement and make it pleasing to the ear.

Luke 21:16 παραδοθήσεσθε δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν καὶ φίλων, καὶ θανατώσουσιν ἐξ ὑμῶν.

This is an example of *homoeoptoton* in which five nouns end with the masculine plural genitive ων. Four of these words ending in ων come in rapid succession and elaborate four groups of people who will betray the followers of Jesus. The use of *homoeoptoton* along with *polysyndeton* creates a rhythm to this verse which draws the attention of the hearer. Luke diverges from Matthew and Mark in their parallel material, thus creating this figure, while Matthew and Mark lack the figure but follow each other closely.

Luke 7:50 εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τὴν γυναῖκα· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.
Luke 8:48 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῇ· θυγάτηρ, ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε· πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην.
Luke 17:19 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀναστὰς πορεύου· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.
Luke 18:42 καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἀνάβλεψον· ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε.

These four verses all use the same structure of *alliteration/assonance*. The phrase ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε uses the repetition of the sigma to form this figure. This is one figure which requires a verbalization of the Greek in order to recognize the figure, and once the phrase is spoken aloud the figure becomes evident. A faithful translation of this

---

[173] See Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 1002; Culpepper, *Luke,* 404.

phrase is "your faith has saved you." That translation however cannot carry the weight

and meaning of the original because of the figure *alliteration/assonance.* The *alliteration*

creates a powerful rhythm and embeds this phrase in the mind of the hearer.[174]

Luke 12:49 Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη.

There are three ornamental figures in this verse. First, the figure of *alliteration/assonance*

is formed by the repetition of the long e sound produced either by ει or η. In a sentence

of nineteen syllables, nine carry the long e sound. Second, this verse also forms an

isocolon. The first clause contains nine syllables, and the second, ten. Third, in the first

clause there is *homoteleuton* with βαλεῖν, τὴν γῆν; and the same figure is used in the

second clause with εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη. The three figures highlight the ornamental nature of

this verse. The verse, because of *isocolon* and the internal rhyme created by *homoteleuton*

creates a strong and forceful rhythm.[175]

> Luke 14:7 Ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς κεκλημένους παραβολήν, ἐπέχων πῶς τὰς
> πρωτοκλισίας ἐξελέγοντο, λέγων πρὸς αὐτούς·
> Luke 14:8 ὅταν κληθῇς ὑπό τινος εἰς γάμους, μὴ κατακλιθῇς εἰς τὴν πρωτοκλισίαν,
> μήποτε ἐντιμότερός σου ᾖ κεκλημένος ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

Luke uses the ornament of *paronomasia* in this passage as a play on words. The play on

words here comes with the repetition of the sound κλ. The following words contain this

sound: κεκλημένους, πρωτοκλισίας, κληθῇς, κατακλιθῇς, πρωτοκλισίαν, κεκλημένος. The

---

[174] Matthew uses the figure once in the story of the woman with the flow of blood
(9:22). Mark uses the figure in the same story (5:34) and in the story of blind Bartimaeus
(10:52). Only Luke latches on to the full power of this phrase and uses the figure four
times throughout his gospel.

[175] For the "forceful and imaginative" nature of the language in this passage, see
Tannehill, *Sword,* 144-145.

most striking example of the similar sounding words which mean different things is the occurrence of κληθῇς and κατακλιθῇς in v. 8. The first word is a verb meaning "you have been invited." The second word means "you choose your seat" Thus, the verse reads, "When you have been invited to a wedding by someone, do not choose the best seat." Jesus has used words which mean radically different things, but which sound remarkably similar. This play on words once again serves to ornament the language of the Lukan Jesus and thus to draw the attention of the audience.

In this previous section I have demonstrated that at times the Lukan Jesus employed highly ornamental rhetorical figures of speech to communicate his message. The use of such refined ornament served to make his message pleasing to the ear while also gaining admiration from the audience.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have demonstrated how Luke uses figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to portray him as an educated and effective speaker who is able to fulfill the stylistic virtues of clarity and ornamentation. Through figures of speech, the Lukan Jesus grabs the attention of his audience and emphasizes certain words and phrases, enhancing the clarity of his message. Moreover, through rhetorical ornamentation the Lukan Jesus is able to impress his audience with his eloquent and educated speech. These two factors serve as an argument of *ethos*, portraying the Lukan Jesus as educated and refined. This in turn serves to gain a hearing for Luke's gospel message among an audience that might dismiss the speech of a mere peasant, by establishing his character as one worthy of

attention and confidence.[176] For, as Aristotle writes, "The orator persuades by moral

character [*ethos*] when his speech is delivered in such a manner as to render him worthy

of confidence."[177]

Portraying the Lukan Jesus as educated in the Lukan corpus is not limited to his

speech. Luke portrays Jesus as educated through his narrative, showing him to be wise

beyond his years as he confounds the temple leaders at the age of twelve (Luke 2:46-

47),[178] to be literate as he is said to unroll an ancient scroll, find the passage he wants,

and to read it aloud (Luke 4:17-19),[179] and to be able to inspire wisdom and learning in

others as the members of the Sanhedrin note the learned nature of the unlearned disciple's

speech and remark that they were "with Jesus" (Acts 4:13).[180] Luke rounds out this

characterization of Jesus in his ability to create well crafted and ornamented speech.

---

[176] One can see evidence of early attacks on the Christian religion for its perceived attraction to only the uneducated, poor, and peasants in Origen's *Contra Celsum*. See Origen, "Contra Celsum," in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, (eds. Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson, trans. Frederick Crombie; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1979), I.13 p. 401; III.44, p. 482.

[177] Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.2.4 (Freese, LCL).

[178] See also Vernon K. Robbins, "A Socio-Rhetorical Look at the Works of John Knox on Luke-Acts," in *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts,* (eds. Mikeal C Parsons, and Joseph B. Tyson, Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 103. Robbins compares the Luke 2 story to the stories of Jesus' education in the Infancy Gospel of Thomas. He writes, "The special interest of Infancy Thomas is to claim that Jesus has attained the abilities of a lettered person without submitting to the social environment of *paideia* training through which people regularly become lettered."

[179] For background on the ancient roll (scroll), see Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 43-48.

[180] For comment on this passage see Thomas J. Kraus, "'Uneducated', 'Ignorant', or even 'Illiterate'? Aspects and Background for an Understanding of Agrammatoi (and Idiotai) in Acts 4.13," *NTS* 45 (1999): 434-449. Kraus argues that the translation of these

Luke, through the narrative and through Jesus' speech, demonstrates the learned nature of Jesus and more importantly, the early Christian message. Even without formal education, the Lukan Jesus was able to confound the wise on their own terms. It was important for Luke to portray Jesus as one who was educated in order to make his gospel palatable to the elite classes of the Roman Empire. Luke accomplishes this task in large part through the refined rhetorical style he attributes to the speech of Jesus in the gospel.

---

two terms should be "illiterate" and "laymen." These were not necessarily derogatory terms, but only meant to demonstrate that Peter and John were not trained in reading or expositing the Law.

CHAPTER THREE

Figures of Speech and the Art of Argumentation and Persuasion

In chapter two I demonstrated Luke's portrayal of Jesus as an educated and

rhetorically powerful speaker who was able to fulfill the stylistic virtues of clarity and

ornamentation to make his message attention grabbing, as well as stylistically eloquent

and impressive. Rhetorically, portraying Jesus in this manner helped gain a hearing for

the gospel message. In this chapter, I will move deeper into Luke's rhetorical strategy to

explore his use of figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a means of persuasion and

argumentation.

As I noted in the introduction, the function of a given figure of speech is

determined by the context of the figure. In this chapter, the function of the figures cited

is that of argumentation and persuasion. Luke, through the use of figures, is able to draw

the audience into the argument of the gospel. He does this in two ways.

First, Luke portrays Jesus as victorious in debate against hostile interlocutors.

The Lukan Jesus uses cleverly worded and well-placed figures in order to induce a state

of *aporia*[181] in his opponents, thus gaining the victory in debate. This serves as an *ethos*

argument as the audience wants to side with the victor. At the same time, the arguments

that Jesus uses to defeat his opponents are often logically persuasive, thus winning over

---

[181] The *LSJ* defines *aporia* as "difficulty passing," "not providing a thing," "difficulty dealing with or getting at," "being at a loss, embarrassment, perplexity," and other related definitions. Liddell, "ἀπορία," *LSJ,* 215.

the audience through an argument of *logos*. Sometimes the figures also create an emotional response in the audience and thus display the use of an argument of *pathos.*

Second, Luke uses figures of speech to invite audience participation. Such figures require the audience to enter into the argument and make it their own. As the audience is drawn into the gospel narrative and message, they become responsible for creating and participating in its meaning and thus have a stake in the gospel message. As the audience is drawn into the argument, they also become emotionally connected to the message and are thus affected by Luke's argument of *pathos.*

The Art of Inducing Aporia

In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus demonstrates an uncanny knack for seizing control of any conversation. He rarely responds directly to a question and often transforms his interlocutors from predators to prey. Luke employs many figures of speech to portray Jesus as a cunning teacher and conversationalist who can harness any argument in his favor. Like Socrates,[182] the Lukan Jesus engages in conversations with his opponents,

---

[182] In his discussion of Burton Mack's work, Marcus Borg refers to Jesus as "a Jewish Socrates, if you will, but a Socrates who has become homeless." Borg bases this view on Jesus acting like a "gadfly" who "mocked or subverted conventional beliefs." See Marcus J. Borg, "Portraits of Jesus," in *The Search for Jesus: Modern Scholarship Looks at the Gospels: Symposium at the Smithsonian Institution, September 11, 1993*, (ed. Hershel Shanks; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1994), 92. Upon further investigation, the association of Jesus with Socrates is Borg's take on Mack's work. Mack views Jesus as a cynic sage. That is, Jesus acted like a cynic by renouncing comforts, speaking in aphoristic sayings, and by engaging in public debate and usually getting the best of his interlocutors. See Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins,* (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993), 115-116.

using figures of speech as a means of inducing *aporia* in his adversaries.[183] The Lukan

Jesus often reduces his opponents to a state of *aporia* by changing the rules of the debate.

For example, when the temple authorities ask by what authority the Lukan Jesus speaks

and acts as he does, he asks them a question he knows they cannot answer. If asked

about the legality of healing on the Sabbath, the Lukan Jesus asks about the morality of

healing on the Sabbath. By changing the rules of the debate, the Lukan Jesus is able to

induce *aporia* in his adversaries. Inducing *aporia* in the Lukan Jesus' opponents yields

two simultaneous results. Through an argument of *ethos,* the audience is drawn to the

side of the Lukan Jesus who is victorious in debate. At the same time, the audience

follows the *logos* argument used to defeat his opponents and, if persuaded, becomes a

proponent of the message. With these figures the Lukan Jesus wrests control of the

conversation from his interlocutors, putting his narrative opponents on the defensive,

while at the same time gaining the support of the gospel audience.

---

[183] The Lukan Jesus induces *aporia* in his opponents quickly, not through a lengthy dialogue with his interlocutors as with Socrates. David Daube has noted a Socratic form of argument in rabbinic writings from the first-century which he calls forensic interrogation. Rabbinic forensic interrogation has four parts: 1) the rabbi is asked a hostile question; 2) the rabbi responds with a question of his own; 3) in answering the question the interlocutor shows his ignorance; and 4) the rabbi uses this opportunity to refute his opponent. Daube notes that this type of rabbinic forensic interrogation has its roots in Socratic dialectic, coming through Hellenistic rhetoric to the rabbis, and he names his chapter "Socratic Interrogation." Daube further notes that the Lukan Jesus uses Socratic interrogation more than in the other gospels due to Luke's "stronger Greek contacts." David Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism,* (New York: Arno Press, 1973), 154-157.

Examples of Aporia Figures

The most common figure that the Lukan Jesus uses to gain the upper hand in a conversation is that of the *rhetorical question*. The answers to *rhetorical question*s are obvious to the hearer. Thus, the question does not require a given answer. Rather, the implied answer itself makes the Lukan Jesus' point more powerful. In the case of *aporia* figures, the obvious answer denigrates the Lukan Jesus' opponents while gaining admiration for him as the victor.

According to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium, rhetorical question* is the figure in which the speaker asks questions to reinforce his argument. For example, "So when you were doing and saying and managing all this, were you, or were you not, alienating and estranging from the republic the sentiments of our allies?" Or "And was it, or was it not, needful to employ some one to thwart these designs of yours and prevent their fulfillment?"[184] The Lukan Jesus uses several *rhetorical questions* in order to bring his opponents to a state of *aporia.*

> Luke 5:23 τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον, εἰπεῖν· ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου, ἢ εἰπεῖν· ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει;

This saying comes in the midst of one of the Lukan Jesus' many controversy stories. In these short narratives there are two rhetorical contexts. First, there is the narrative context, with the immediate audience made up of observers and opponents. On a second level, there is the gospel audience listening to the narrative unfold. The figures of speech affect both levels, and in different ways. In what follows, I refer to the narrative context

---

[184] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Galen O. Rowe, "Style," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*, (ed. Stanley Porter, Leiden: Brill, 2001), 139.

only with regard to the Lukan Jesus' opponents or adversaries. I use the term "audience" to refer to the gospel audience and the ways in which they are affected by Luke's use of figures of speech.

In this verse the Lukan Jesus uses the figure of *rhetorical question* in response to a question from the Pharisees. The Lukan Jesus perceives the hostile motives behind his opponents' question. Because they are hostile and boastful, the Lukan Jesus asks them a question to curb their hostility. The answer to the question is obvious. Surely it is more difficult to heal a cripple than to say, "your sins are forgiven."[185] Sharon Ringe refers to Jesus' question as a "trick question."[186] John Nolland notes that this question of the Lukan Jesus is not as simple as it sounds. On one level, it is harder to proclaim healing because the effects can be verified. On the other hand, to proclaim God's eschatological forgiveness is of much greater benefit.[187] The *rhetorical question* allows the audience to participate in the narrative as they affirm the Lukan Jesus' point that it is easier to proclaim forgiveness than to heal. This assertion, which the audience has just formulated on their own, increases the power of Jesus' actions as the lame man is actually healed.

---

[185] As to the question as to which word or action would be easier in the mind of the Pharisees, see Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX,* (AB 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 584.

[186] Sharon H. Ringe, *Luke,* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 81.

[187] John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20,* (WBC 35a; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 236. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 584; Richard B. Vinson, *Luke,* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2008), 146. Vinson calls this question a "double-bind" remark, in that the question has two meanings. On the one hand, a healing is practically more difficult, but the forgiveness of sins is theologically more difficult.

The *rhetorical question* followed by the miracle induces *aporia* in his opponents and gains the favor of the audience.

> Luke 6:9 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς· ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς εἰ ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;

Here is another situation where the Lukan Jesus uses the *rhetorical question* to control the conversation and change the rules of the debate. The *rhetorical question* is also ornamented by the use of *homoteleuton* with the repetition of the aorist infinitive ending σαι. This repetition creates a rhythm in the question and reinforces the point. The Lukan Jesus knows that the Pharisees are trying to trap him into breaking their Sabbath rules. He therefore uses this figure of speech to two ends.

The Lukan Jesus goes on the attack. As Luke T. Johnson notes, "Luke adds this opening rubric and thereby shifts the initiative to Jesus; the testers are being tested."[188] The Lukan Jesus seizes the initiative through this question and puts his opponents on the defensive. At the same time, the Lukan Jesus moves the debate from a legal to a moral matter. As Johnson notes, "Jesus establishes a priority for moral activity above ritual. The doing of good or evil, the saving or taking of life, these are matters which are trivialized by being subordinated to the demands of ritual observance."[189] This *rhetorical question* plays on the common sense of the audience and they immediately side with Jesus against the Pharisees. The moral answer is obvious and thus the Lukan Jesus has

---

[188] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* (SP; ed. Daniel J. Harrington; Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1991), 102. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 611. Fitzmyer refers to this question as "deliberate provocation of the Scribes and Pharisees."

[189] Johnson, *Luke,* 104. Cf. Vinson, *Luke,* 168; Ringe, *Luke,* 87-88. Ringe notes that Jesus has taken the question of what is lawful to do on the Sabbath and raises it to "another level" by trying to interpret the original Sabbath command to "observe the Sabbath day and keep it holy" (Deut. 5:12).

won over his audience and trumped the trap of the Pharisees. His opponents are left in a state of *aporia*.

> Luke 13:15 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος καὶ εἶπεν· ὑποκριταί, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει; Luke 13:16 ταύτην δὲ θυγατέρα Ἀβραὰμ οὖσαν, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη, οὐκ ἔδει λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

Through composition criticism on this passage, Robert O'Toole demonstrates that the focus of this passage falls on the Lukan Jesus' words in verses 15-16.[190] In this passage, which demonstrates very Lukan language and themes,[191] the Lukan Jesus uses the *rhetorical question* in order to persuade the audience to the rightness of his cause and actions. Like the previous example, the Lukan Jesus uses this figure in two ways: as an attack on his opponents, and as a means to move the debate from a legal to a moral matter. The Lukan Jesus goes on the offensive, calling the synagogue leader a hypocrite.[192] As Bruce Malina and Richard Rohrbaugh note, the Lukan Jesus turns the

---

[190] Robert F. O'Toole, "Some Exegetical Reflections on Luke 13:10-17," *Bib* 73 (1992): 84-107. O'Toole argues that this passage be split into two sections, the first an introduction (vv. 11-13), and the second the focus of the passage (vv. 14-17). The focus on the second part is seen in several ways: the more elaborate style, expansion of contrasts, the number of words used. Further, O'Toole has also found a chiasm from 12:49-13:35, in which the healing of the bent woman falls at the center, thus making it the focus, p. 101-102.

[191] See M. Dennis Hamm, "The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13:10-17 as Narrative Theology," *JSNT* 31 (1987): 23, 38-39. Hamm argues that this passage is notably Lukan in its diction, themes, and use of the LXX. In this passage one sees the development of Lukan eschatology, Christology, ecclesiology, and soteriology.

[192] See Heidi Torgerson, "The Healing of the Bent Woman: A Narrative Interpretation of Luke 13:10-17," *CurTM* 32 (2005): 185. Torgerson demonstrates the conflict inherent in this debate between Jesus and the synagogue leader, in which Jesus emerges victorious and leaves the religious leaders shamed and silenced.

challenge of the synagogue leader back on him with an "insult." The Lukan Jesus is thus seen by the crowd to have won the exchange.[193]

The Lukan Jesus then uses a *rhetorical question* to induce *aporia* in his opponents. He notes that all people will water their animals on the Sabbath. In the second verse he makes the explicit comparison, asking whether it was not good to do good to this woman on the Sabbath. The argument here is from the lesser to the greater (*a fortiori*).[194] The implication is that if the people, and presumably even the Lukan Jesus' opponents, will do good for an animal, why not for a human? As the synagogue leader is reduced to a state of *aporia*, and thus has no way forward, the audience sides with Jesus as the victor in the debate.

At the same time, the Lukan Jesus moves the debate from a legal to a moral matter. As Hisako Kinukawa writes:

> He [Jesus] refers to a traditional convention which has been commonly practiced on the Sabbath. This is not a special rule set aside as an exception. Everybody knows and actually practices what Jesus is talking about. This is a very good educational strategy often used by Jesus in his response; it cannot raise protest."[195]

Thus, the Lukan Jesus appeals to the common moral judgment of the audience instead of pursuing a legal debate (which he would have lost). As Heidi Torgerson

---

[193] Bruce Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 363.

[194] See Ringe, *Luke*, 187; Culpepper, *Luke,* 274; Johnson, *Luke,* 212. Johnson refers to the Hebrew term *qal wehomer* instead of the Latin term *a fortiori*.

[195] Hisako Kinukawa, "The Miracle Story of the Bent-Over Woman (Luke 13:10-17): An Interaction-Centered Interpretation," in *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed,* (ed. Ingrid Rosa Kitzenberger; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 305.

writes, "The law is appropriately interpreted only through the lens of mercy."[196] The

Lukan Jesus' questions engage in an argument of *logos* and gain him favor with his

audience while reducing their regard for his opponent.

> Luke 14:3 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους λέγων· ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὔ;
> Luke 14:4 οἱ δὲ ἡσύχασαν. καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν.
> Luke 14:5 καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

In this third Sabbath healing story, The Lukan Jesus' tactics to reduce his opponents to a

state of *aporia* are the same. In his first question the Lukan Jesus asks the Pharisees

whether it is legal to heal on the Sabbath or not. He does not receive an answer, but

rather answers his own question by healing the man with dropsy. The legal experts and

Pharisees are then silent, which in the ancient world would signify ceding their

agreement.[197]

Once again the Lukan Jesus has moved the discussion from the legal realm to the

moral realm. With his questions he has seized the moral high ground and trapped his

interlocutors. According to Vinson, the Lukan Jesus might not have been arguing from

the letter of the law, but rather from "what most people actually did."[198] He is playing on

---

[196] Torgerson, "Bent Woman," 185.

[197] See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV,* (AB 28a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 1041; Johnson, *Luke,* 223; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke,* (trans. David E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984), 233. Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 284. Contra these interpreters, Vinson argues that the silence of Jesus' opponents is not an admission of agreement. Vinson, *Luke,* 481.

[198] Vinson, *Luke,* 481. Cf. Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel,* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 197. Talbert demonstrates that the Lukan Jesus' comment in v. 5 is found nowhere in Jewish tradition. He mentions, however, that Jewish Sabbath tradition was extremely diverse at

the common sentiments of his audience. The figure once again changes the rules for the debate, winning the audience over to his side while silencing his opponents. Like Socrates, through the asking of questions, the Lukan Jesus leaves his opponents no way of moving forward.

> Luke 5:34 ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· μὴ δύνασθε τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐν ᾧ ὁ νυμφίος μετ' αὐτῶν ἐστιν ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι;

As in the previous examples, the Lukan Jesus perceives hostility in the question posed to him. He has been asked why his disciples do not fast like the disciples of John and the Pharisees. He poses a *rhetorical question*, "You cannot make the sons of the bridegroom fast while he is yet with them, can you?" The Lukan Jesus even uses an emphatic marker at the beginning of this question, the Greek μὴ. Μὴ is used in Greek to introduce a question to which the expected answer is "no." This can be translated in English by adding the emphatic, "can you?" at the end of the verse. The Lukan Jesus has thus used the figure of *rhetorical question* to neutralize the question of the Pharisees as to why his disciples do not fast. Talbert notes that the Lukan Jesus uses a clever simile. Fasting during the proclamation of the good news would be like fasting at a wedding.[199] By setting up the debate with such an absurd comparison, the Lukan Jesus has seized control of the conversation. Through this masterful *rhetorical question* the Lukan Jesus has reduced his opponents to a state of *aporia,* while at the same time gaining the assent and admiration of the audience.

---

the time of Jesus. Talbert concludes that the Pharisees must have had a provision about pulling animals out of a pit on the Sabbath.

[199] Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 65. Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 130-131.

Luke 11:18 εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς ἐφ᾽ ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη, πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια.
Luke 11:19 εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται.

Here the Lukan Jesus responds to his overconfident opponents who are accusing him of casting out demons by the power of Beelzebul and goading him for a sign. He recognizes their boastful assertiveness and responds with two *rhetorical question*s that logically deny his interlocutors' accusations. First, how can Satan survive if he is fighting against himself? Second, if the Lukan Jesus is using the power of Beelzebul, what power are his opponents' exorcists using? Nolland notes that "Luke's own contribution will be the rounding off of this phase of the argument and the driving home of the inner contradiction of the view that Jesus is here criticizing."[200] The questions neutralize the accusation and silence the accusers. Moreover, the Lukan Jesus, through these *rhetorical questions*, gains the support and admiration of the audience as he is able to cleverly refute his adversaries.

The Lukan Jesus also uses *hypophora*, which is similar to the *rhetorical question*, in order to induce *aporia* in his opponents. According to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* the figure *hypophora* consists of asking questions of adversaries, or of oneself, and answering with what ought or ought not to be said, making oneself look good, and one's adversary look bad.[201]

Luke 20:41 Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· πῶς λέγουσιν τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι Δαυὶδ υἱόν;
Luke 20:42 αὐτὸς γὰρ Δαυὶδ λέγει ἐν βίβλῳ ψαλμῶν·
εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,

---

[200] John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* (WBC 35b; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 638.

[201] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.24.33-34.

Luke 20:43 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
Luke 20:44 Δαυὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ, καὶ πῶς αὐτοῦ υἱός ἐστιν;

These verses come at the end of a long series of controversies in the temple. In this

section, the Lukan Jesus is not directly answering a question posed by his interlocutors.

Instead, he uses these questions to bring a final silence to his hostile interlocutors. He

uses *hypophora* and *rhetorical question* without ever giving a direct answer. His purpose

in this question and answer is to pose an unsolvable riddle to his opponents. Vinson

notes that this is a riddle par excellence. He writes, "it's an imponderable, the sort of

thing one might bring up at a dinner party to get some appreciative 'hmms,' or in a riddle

contest as the coup de grace."[202] Nolland notes that one possible interpretation of this

section is that "Jesus makes no Christological point here; his goal is, rather, in

controversy with his opponents to ask a difficult question in order to break off the

conversation."[203] The question serves two purposes. First, it serves to silence his

opponents. Second, it serves to pique the interest of the audience, invite their

participation, and ultimately gain their admiration. The audience must stop and ponder

the answers to these questions. This is another location at which the Lukan Jesus takes

control of the debate with his interlocutors and causes them to be silent. The Lukan Jesus

has reduced his opponents to the state of *aporia* and they are forced to cease from their

arguments.

Luke 10:25 Καὶ ἰδοὺ νομικός τις ἀνέστη ἐκπειράζων αὐτὸν λέγων· διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω;

---

[202] Vinson, *Luke,* 631-633. For other interpreters who see this question as a "riddle" or "puzzle," a question not meant to be answered, see Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 195; Schweizer, *Luke,* 309; Culpepper, *Luke,* 390-391.

[203] John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* (WBC 35c; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 971.

Luke 10:26 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν· ἐν τῷ νόμῳ τί γέγραπται; πῶς ἀναγινώσκεις;
Luke 10:27 ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· ἀγαπήσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου ἐξ ὅλης [τῆς] καρδίας σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχύϊ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου, καὶ τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτόν.
Luke 10:28 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ὀρθῶς ἀπεκρίθης· τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ.
Luke 10:29 ὁ δὲ θέλων δικαιῶσαι ἑαυτὸν εἶπεν πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν· καὶ τίς ἐστίν μου πλησίον;
[Parable of the Good Samaritan]
Luke 10:36 τίς τούτων τῶν τριῶν πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι γεγονέναι τοῦ ἐμπεσόντος εἰς τοὺς λῃστάς;
Luke 10:37 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν· ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετ' αὐτοῦ. εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως.

This passage, from which I have removed the parable of the Good Samaritan for space, is the closest that Luke comes to constructing a Socratic dialogue by using the rhetorical figure *hypophora*. The purpose is to induce *aporia* in the Lukan Jesus' interlocutor while at the same time gaining support from the gospel audience. The lawyer overconfidently walks into the trap of the Lukan Jesus. The dialogue is as follows: (1) a hostile lawyer asks Jesus a question in order to trap him. (2) Jesus answers with a counter question about the law. (3) The lawyer responds well. (4) Jesus tells him to "do this and you will live." (5) The Lawyer is not content to just go his way, and seeking to justify himself, asks another hostile question, setting himself up for Jesus' trap. (6) Jesus responds with the parable of the Good Samaritan. (7) Jesus asks another question. (8) The lawyer is reduced to the state of *aporia* and must answer the question as Jesus intended with the unpalatable admission that the Samaritan is the neighbor.[204] Talbert, while not noting the

---

[204] For an alternate rhetorical construction of this passage, see J. Ian H. McDonald, "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy in Luke 10:25-37 and Acts 10:1-11, 18," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*, (eds. Stanley E. Porter, and Thomas H. Olbricht; Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 66-67. McDonald divides the section into the parts of a rhetorical speech. The *peroratio* covers the initial question and answer session by Jesus and the lawyer. The *definitio*, or redefinition of the matter comes in the parable proper. Finally, the *peroratio*,

Socratic nature of this exchange, calls this a "controversy dialogue" and breaks the passage down into two sections each with four components of question and answer.[205]

Jairo Alfredo Roa Barreto notes the pedagogical method used in this parable and calls for modern ministers to emulate it. For Barreto, the Lukan Jesus is using this question and answer method, along with the parable, to educate the lawyer.[206] While, Barreto is sympathetic to the lawyer, Luke remains silent on this issue. Andre Lacocque, like Barreto, is sympathetic to the lawyer in this parable. He notes that in his confusion (*désorientation,* read *aporia*), he wants to do the right thing. He further notes that we do not know whether or not the lawyer will have a conversion like "*Saul de Tarse*," but seems to think the trajectory of the passage leads in that direction.[207] The ultimate response of the lawyer is inconsequential, as has been the case with the responses of the Lukan Jesus' other opponents in previous controversy stories. The real education that happens in this passage is that of the audience. They have their conceptions of

---

or conclusion comes in Jesus question, the lawyer's answer, and Jesus call to "go and do likewise." McDonald's rhetorical reconstruction is perhaps valid, but as this is certainly not a full speech, I think the Socratic question and answer session with the desire to induce *aporia* provides a much closer ancient parallel and gives more insight into the rhetoric of the passage.

[205] Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 120. For "controversy dialogue" see John Dominic Crossan, "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus," *NTS* 18 (1972): 285-307. Cf. Vinson, *Luke,* 338.

[206] Jairo Alfredo Roa Barreto, "The Pedagogy of Jesus as a Transforming Practice," *Ministerial Formation* 111 (2008): 13-17. Contra Barreto, Brett Younger also sees a form of pedagogy in this pericope, but finds it controversial. He uses this section of Luke as a call for controversial preaching to effect change. Brett Younger, "Luke 10:25-37—Preaching Like the Good Samaritan," *RevExp* 90 (1993): 395.

[207] André Lacocque, "L'herméneutique de Jésus au sujet de la loi dans la parabole du Bon Samaritain," *ETR* 78 (2003): 46.

"neighbor" challenged, while also learning about the skillful rhetoric of the Lukan Jesus with which he silences his interlocutor.

The climactic moment of this passage comes with the Lukan Jesus' final question to the lawyer. Culpepper writes, "Jesus then turns the question back to the lawyer, and the lawyer is caught on the very question with which he intended to impale Jesus."[208] The Lawyer had asked, "Who is my neighbor?" and Jesus asks, "Who, in the previous story, acted like a neighbor?" The Lawyer wanted to justify himself by limiting the category of neighbor. The Lukan Jesus expanded the category of neighbor and then trapped the lawyer with his own question. The lawyer must respond with the inevitable, but also unsavory answer of the Samaritan. The Lukan Jesus has trapped the lawyer into this answer by his story and has thus humbled this lawyer who sought to justify himself. The Lawyer is then in the state of *aporia,* causing him to accept the Lukan Jesus' redefinition of the concept of neighbor, and by his previous statements about the law, to act in accordance with the Lukan Jesus' teaching. The auditor, as he or she listens to this dialogue, is drawn into the story and ultimately is invited to take the side of Jesus. The use of *hypophora* in this passage is a great example of Luke's rhetorical strategy through the use of figures of speech to gain support for Jesus' character and message.

Luke 20:4 τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν ἢ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων;
Luke 20:5 οἱ δὲ συνελογίσαντο πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς λέγοντες ὅτι ἐὰν εἴπωμεν· ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐρεῖ· διὰ τί οὐκ ἐπιστεύσατε αὐτῷ;

---

[208] Culpepper, *Luke,* 230. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 888; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary,* 347; Ringe, *Luke*, 160. Ringe notes, Jesus has also subverted the lawyer's question. The lawyer asked, "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus redefined neighbor, not as a category of "being", but as a category of "doing". She writes, "No one can simply *have* a neighbor; one must also *be* a neighbor.

Luke 20:6 ἐὰν δὲ εἴπωμεν· ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ὁ λαὸς ἅπας καταλιθάσει ἡμᾶς, πεπεισμένος γάρ ἐστιν Ἰωάννην προφήτην εἶναι.
Luke 20:7 καὶ ἀπεκρίθησαν μὴ εἰδέναι πόθεν.

The Lukan Jesus uses *hypophora* to once again induce a state of *aporia* in the chief

priests, the scribes, and the elders. His authority has just been questioned. The Lukan

Jesus, recognizing the hostility of his adversaries, decides to change the subject and

silence his opponents. He asks a question that he knows they will be unable to answer.

The interlocutors give the consequences of various answers and then tell Jesus that they

do not know the answer. The Lukan Jesus has changed the rules of the discourse in this

section. His opponents asked a simple question, "By what authority you do these

things?" The Lukan Jesus answers with a question of his own, thus confounding his

opponents. Vinson notes that "Jesus uses the age-old teacher's trick of answering a

question with a question. He dares them to go first—you show me yours, I'll show you

mine—and then hits them with John the Baptist."[209] This question of the Lukan Jesus

causes his interlocutors to abate from their attempts to trap him. As Culpepper notes,

"the authorities" attempt to cut their losses by refusing to answer the question. Their

refusal to answer, however, is an admission that they have lost the contest of wits."[210]

The Lukan Jesus uses this question to reduce his adversaries to a state of *aporia*, causing

---

[209] Vinson, *Luke,* 614. For other interpreters who note Jesus' clever question see Johnson, *Luke,* 308. Johnson notes that answering a question with a question was common in both Rabbinic discourses and the Hellenistic diatribe "(e.g., Epictetus *Discourses* 2, 23)." He writes, "By being able to deflect a hostile question with one of his own, Jesus is recognizable as a sage of that world." Cf. Ringe, *Luke*, 243. Ringe notes, "Jesus' strategy mirrors earlier encounters with the Pharisees, when Jesus was said to trap them by responding to their questions with other questions, to which any answer would be incriminating."

[210] Culpepper, *Luke,* 378.

them to cease from their attacks. By portraying Jesus as victorious in this debate, Luke

once again draws the audience into his message by enticing them to side with the victor.

> Luke 20:22 ἔξεστιν ἡμᾶς Καίσαρι φόρον δοῦναι ἢ οὔ;
> Luke 20:23 κατανοήσας δὲ αὐτῶν τὴν πανουργίαν εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· Luke 20:24
> δείξατέ μοι δηνάριον· τίνος ἔχει εἰκόνα καὶ ἐπιγραφήν; οἱ δὲ εἶπαν· Καίσαρος.
> Luke 20:25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τοίνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ
> θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.
> Luke 20:26 καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἐπιλαβέσθαι αὐτοῦ ῥήματος ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ
> θαυμάσαντες ἐπὶ τῇ ἀποκρίσει αὐτοῦ ἐσίγησαν.

Here is another example of the Lukan Jesus, by understanding the malicious[211] intent of

his opponents, decides to trap them and bring them to a state of *aporia*. He uses the

figure *hypophora* to confound his opponents. In this context, the Lukan Jesus' opponents

are specifically trying to trap him. They ask him a question that, as Ringe notes,

whichever way he answered he would be on the wrong side. If he sided with paying

taxes he would be for the oppression of the poor. If he refused to pay taxes he would be

labeled a revolutionary and rebel against Rome.[212] Instead of answering, the Lukan Jesus

asks them a question to which the answer is obvious, and thus sets them up to be

confounded. After they answer Jesus' question about the inscription and image on the

coin, Jesus pulls the rug out from under them with his statement about rendering to

Caesar and to God. As Culpepper notes, "Jesus catches the wise in their craftiness and

deceitful scheming. His trap is even more sly…Failing to trap Jesus in his words, his

---

[211] The Greek word πανουργίαν is translated "craftiness" by the NRSV. Craftiness, however, does not render the ill intent of the word.

[212] Ringe, *Luke*, 245.

opponents are reduced to silence."[213] In this case the narrator even tells the audience that

the Lukan Jesus' opponents were amazed by his answer and were silent. This silence on

the part of the Lukan Jesus' interlocutors demonstrates their sense of *aporia*. Once again,

the audience is invited to side with the victor.

Another figure which the Lukan Jesus often uses to trap his opponents is that of

antithesis. According to *Rhetorica ad Herennium, antithesis* is the figure in which "style

is built upon contraries, using contrary thoughts in successive clauses." The author then

gives the following example: "When all is calm, you are confused; when all is in

confusion, you are calm."[214] *Antithesis* therefore is a figure which brings together either

contrasting words or contrasting thoughts. The effect is an artful combination of words

to display a contrast.

> Luke 11:39 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν· νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ
> ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἁρπαγῆς καὶ
> πονηρίας.
> Luke 11:40 ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν;

Here, in response to the implied question of why Jesus did not wash his hands before a

meal, the Lukan Jesus responds with an *antithesis* and a *rhetorical question.* The Lukan

Jesus recognizes the hostility and overconfidence of his opponents and crafts this

antithesis and *rhetorical question* to silence them. The *antithesis* is between inside and

outside. The Lukan Jesus uses this *antithesis* to demonstrate the hypocrisy of the

Pharisees. The Pharisees pay attention to the outside but ignore the inside. The language

---

[213] Culpepper, *Luke,* 386. For other interpreters who note Jesus clever counter-trap see Ringe, *Luke*, 245; Vinson, *Luke,* 623.

[214] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.25.21 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.81-86.

is striking in its antithetical nature with the words ἔξωθεν and ἔσωθεν. He then poses this

rhetorical question, "Did not God create the inside as well as the outside?" The Lukan

Jesus has used the figure of *rhetorical question* to once again change the course of the

conversation. He goes on the offensive, accusing the Pharisees and calling them fools.

He then uses the *rhetorical question* to put the Pharisees on the defensive. As Culpepper

notes, "The Pharisees should realize that God made the whole person, inside and out, and

that God is not just concerned with the observance of rituals of purity but with the purity

of one's heart."[215] Thus, the Lukan Jesus, through his attack and *rhetorical question* is

able to reduce his interlocutors to a state of *aporia* in which they can no longer argue

their point. The *antithesis* and *rhetorical question* invite the audience to enter the debate

and ultimately side with the Lukan Jesus.

> Luke 12:56 ὑποκριταί, τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς καὶ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, τὸν
> καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν;
> Luke 12:57 Τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον;

Here the Lukan Jesus again uses two *rhetorical questions* to attack his opponents as well

as to induce *aporia.* These verses are usually separated into two sections: the first on

judgment of the times, i.e., what is happening in the coming of Jesus; and the second, on

what is just in relation to the economic/debt situation in first-century Palestine.[216] The

Lukan Jesus has cleverly put these questions back to back in order to join the two

---

[215] Culpepper, *Luke,* 247. Cf. Jacob Neusner, "First Cleanse the Inside: the 'Halakhic' Background of a Controversy-Saying," *NTS* 22 (1976): 494-495. Neusner notes that the debate washing utensils was already current among Pharisees at the time of Jesus. He demonstrates that Jesus attempts to move that debate from a legal matter to a moral matter. It is not about the legalities of the inside or outside of the cup, but rather about the inner traits of a human.

[216] See Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 145.

seemingly unrelated issues. He opens the first verse with a direct address: "Hypocrites!"

He then asks two *rhetorical question*s. (1)"You know how to interpret the face of the

earth and of heaven, but why do you not know how to interpret this present time?" (2)

"Why do you not judge for yourselves what is just?" Both questions are used to attack

his opponents. The answer to the questions are obvious, namely, there are no answers.

There is no defense to these questions in the way that they are framed. The Lukan Jesus

uses the *rhetorical questions* as a jab, meant to gain favor for himself while denigrating

his opponents. Ringe notes "Those hearing Jesus' words are 'hypocrites' because of their

inability to perceive something so self evident… Their alleged inability to discern the

times is matched by their inability, even after all that has been said on the subject, to

make a judgment on the side of 'justice.'"[217] Once again, Jesus emerges victorious in

debate, and thus gains favor with the audience.

The previous examples demonstrate the Lukan Jesus' ability to induce *aporia* in

his opponents through questions. The following figures show the Lukan Jesus' ability to

achieve the same ends through direct attack.

According the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, *exemplum* is the figure in which the

speaker cites something done or said in the past, along with the definite naming of the

doer or author.[218] Ps-Cicero does not give any examples of this figure, but the meaning is

clear. When the Lukan Jesus uses this figure he is always citing scripture. Though the

Rhetorica ad Herennium states that there is a definite mention of the doer or author of the

---

[217] Ringe, *Luke*, 182. Cf. Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* 712-713; Culpepper, *Luke,* 268. Culpepper notes the *a fortiori* argument here, from the lesser things like the weather to the greater things like the signs of the present time.

[218] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.49.62.

citation, the Lukan Jesus often omits this information. Instead he uses introductory

statements such as, "it is written," or "the scriptures say." This figure places the Lukan

Jesus' opponents in a state of *aporia* because they are unable to overturn the authority of

scripture.

> Luke 4:4 καὶ ἀπεκρίθη πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· γέγραπται ὅτι *οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.*
> Luke 4:8 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῷ· γέγραπται· κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις.
> Luke 4:12 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὅτι εἴρηται· *οὐκ ἐκπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου.*

In these three verses from the temptation narrative,[219] the Lukan Jesus attacks his

opponent, Satan, with three citations of scripture, thus using the figure *exemplum*. In this

context, Satan plays the overconfident opponent who attempts to trap the Lukan Jesus.

The use of this figure by the Lukan Jesus bolster's the authority of his statements. The

first quotation is from Deuteronomy 8:3 and is in verbatim agreement with the LXX. The

second is from Deuteronomy 6:13, though he takes considerable liberty in the quotation

---

[219] Christopher Tuckett locates the temptation narrative of the triple tradition as an introduction to the Q document. Being located at the beginning of Q, Tuckett argues that the narrative introduces the reader to the main themes of Q, such as, Q's view of material possessions, miracles, and the kingdom of God. Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Temptation Narrative in Q," in *The Four Gospels: Festschrift Frans Neirynck* (Vol. 1; eds. F. Van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 506. Kim Paffenroth finds the nearest parallel to this text in the Old Testament with the testing of Solomon by the Queen of Sheba. Kim Paffenroth, "The Testing of a Sage: 1 Kings 10:1-13 and Q 4:1-13 (Lk 4:1-13)," *ExpTim* 87 (1985): 142-143. Paffenroth lists the following similarities between the narratives: 1) a sage is tested, 2) he is asked difficult questions, 3) the adversary is defeated and put to flight, 4) both take place (in part) in Jerusalem. The similarities end there however. The "adversary" in the temptation narrative is hostile, while the Queen of Sheba hopes that Solomon is as wise as she has heard. Satan is a supernatural being, the Queen is human. Overall, the Queen of Sheba story sheds little light on the Temptation narrative.

and differs greatly from the LXX.   The third is a verbatim quotation of Deuteronomy 6:16 in the LXX.

The first-century auditors of the gospel would most likely have been familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures and thus would have recognized this as an authoritative statement. Even if they were not aware of the exact reference in the Old Testament, the Lukan Jesus' introductory statement makes it clear that he is citing a scriptural authority. The Lukan Jesus uses the figure of *exemplum* three times, and finally, after the third exchange, he silences his opponent, the devil, and reduces him to a state of *aporia,* causing him to withdraw "until an opportune time."

Robert Brawley treats the temptation narrative from a rhetorical viewpoint. He claims that the primary function of this text is to persuade the audience as to the noble character of the Lukan Jesus. To this end, the Lukan Jesus uses the canon of scripture to make his points. This gains him favor with the audience.[220] While Brawley's analysis is strong, he only deals with one rhetorical aspect and misses the polemical rhetoric in this passage and the Lukan Jesus' ability to silence Satan. Not only is Jesus' noble character exemplified in his citation of scripture, but it is also enhanced by his ability to emerge victorious in debate over none other than the devil.

> Luke 20:17 ὁ δὲ ἐμβλέψας αὐτοῖς εἶπεν· τί οὖν ἐστιν τὸ γεγραμμένον τοῦτο· λίθον ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας;
> Luke 20:18 πᾶς ὁ πεσὼν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν λίθον συνθλασθήσεται· ἐφ' ὃν δ' ἂν πέσῃ, λικμήσει αὐτόν.

---

[220] Robert L. Brawly, "Canon and Community: Intertextuality, Canon, Interpretation, Christology, Theology, and Persuasive Rhetoric in Luke 4:1-13," *SBLSP* 31 (1992): 432.

Here the Lukan Jesus uses a verbatim citation of Psalm 118:22 in the LXX. He uses *exemplum* here as a conclusion to the parable of the wicked tenants in which he has passed judgment on the chief priests, the scribes, and the elders (the tenants of the parable 20:1).[221] The parable and the quotation play off of one another in a mutual comparison. The citation of scripture brings silence to his interlocutors. Johnson writes, "The citation has a particular edge. If we take seriously the allusion to the Isaiah 'song of the vineyard,' which identifies the vineyard with 'the house of Israel' (Isa 5:7), then the 'builders of the house' in this citation can refer only to the leaders of the people."[222] This indictment reduces the Lukan Jesus' opponents to a state of *aporia* and silence. In fact, it causes such anger and dishonor that they seek to seize him because of the viciousness of his attack. Once again the audience is invited to side with the Lukan Jesus because of his ability to dispatch his opponents.

> Luke 16:15 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ δικαιοῦντες ἑαυτοὺς ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὁ δὲ θεὸς γινώσκει τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν· ὅτι τὸ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑψηλὸν βδέλυγμα ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.

Here the Lukan Jesus uses *antithesis* to attack the practices of the Pharisees. He does this by accusing them of honoring what is lofty in the sight of humans, but an abomination in the sight of God. The Lukan Jesus once again highlights the difference between human things and things of God. He traps his opponents by placing them in opposition to God.

---

[221] For the issues of judgment see Charles A. Kimball III, "Jesus' Exposition of Scripture in Luke 20:9-19: An Inquiry in Light of Jewish Hermeneutics," *BBR* 3 (1993): 86-90. Kimball notes the theme of harsh judgment against the tenants of the parable in vv. 15-18. He also notes a son/stone wordplay, but as this wordplay is based upon a reverse translation into Hebrew, the wordplay is of no consequence to my paper.

[222] Johnson, *Luke,* 306. Cf. Ringe, *Luke*, 244-245. Ringe notes that in the quotation of Psalm 118 Jesus "springs the trap, for the authorities have just made their public rejection of John and Jesus."

Culpepper writes, "this saying works by tensive contrasts. 'In the sight of others' is opposed to 'in the sight of God,' and 'what is prized' by one is 'an abomination' to the other."[223] Contrary to many interpreters, Thomas Schmidt argues that with this saying, Jesus is not condemning pride, but rather, wealth.[224] This argument makes better sense of the context as this saying comes on the heels of the parable of the unjust steward and several sayings about wealth. Whether the Lukan Jesus is condemning pride or wealth is of little consequence to the rhetorical effect of this figure. The figure silences Jesus' opponents, while at the same time gaining the favor of the audience.

The Lukan Jesus also uses the figure of *metaphor* to attack his opponents and turn his audience against them while swaying the conversation to his advantage. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *metaphor* as a figure in which a word applying to one thing is transferred to another, because the similarity seems to justify the transference. For example, "The recent arrival of an army suddenly blotted out the state."[225] This figure is vivid in nature and is thus emotionally powerful for the purpose of attacking enemies.

> Luke 13:32 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ· ἰδοὺ ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι.

Here Jesus uses *metaphor* as an insult against Herod. He calls Herod a fox. The *metaphor* is supposed to make Herod look shifty, sly, and crafty. Mikeal Parsons

---

[223] Culpepper, *Luke,* 312.

[224] Thomas E. Schmidt, "Burden, Barrier, Blasphemy: Wealth in Matt 6:33, Luke 14:33, and Luke 16:15," *TJ* 9 (1988): 185. Cf. Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 156. Talbert also grounds the saying in v. 15 to money, although money leading to self-sufficiency and pride.

[225] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.24.45 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 8.6.4-18.

demonstrates that according to the ancient practice of physiognomy, the fox was seen in

ancient literature as cunning, deceitful, wily, and of bad character. In general, to compare

someone to a fox was to cast an insult upon them.[226] Vinson, to make the Lukan Jesus'

insult to Herod more poignant, suggests the following paraphrase: "Go tell that little

yappy-dog Herod…"[227] The Pharisees, interestingly, are not the Lukan Jesus' opponents

here. Their motives are unclear, but either way they are playing messengers for Herod.

They therefore receive this attack against Herod, and are thus silenced, as there is no

further message to be proclaimed.

> Luke 22:48 Ἰησοῦς δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως;

Like with the *aporia* question figures, the Lukan Jesus is able to use the *rhetorical*

question as an attack, which in turn silences his opponents. Luke's is the only gospel in

which Jesus actually speaks to Judas as he is being arrested. The Lukan Jesus asks Judas

a *rhetorical question*, "Is it with a kiss that you betray the Son of Man?" Jesus does not

expect an answer. The obvious answer is "yes." The question however emphasizes the

incredible hypocrisy of Judas and his actions. Nolland writes, "This verse has no

counterpart in Mark. The image of betrayal it creates stands as one of the most powerful

---

[226] Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity,* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2006), 69-71. For other comments on the meaning of fox see Schweizer, *Luke,* 229. Schweizer calls the fox "insignificant or cunning;" See also Culpepper, *Luke,* 281. Culpepper calls the fox "sly, cunning, and voraciously destructive."

[227] Vinson, *Luke,* 471.

ever to have gripped the human imagination."[228] The power in this verse is derived from

the Lukan Jesus' question. The question heightens the tension and imprints this scene in

the minds of the hearers. The scene becomes more poignant as the Lukan Jesus actually

speaks with his betrayer. The question thus serves two purposes. First, it shames Judas

and keeps him silent. Second, it stirs the emotions of the audience causing them to feel

sympathy and solidarity with the Lukan Jesus at this scandalous betrayal.

> Luke 22:52 Εἶπεν δὲ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς τοὺς παραγενομένους ἐπ᾽ αὐτὸν ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ
> στρατηγοὺς τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρους· ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν
> καὶ ξύλων;

Again the Lukan Jesus draws attention to the hypocrisy of his opponents by asking why it

was necessary to bring clubs and swords to arrest him. Was that necessary, as if he were

a bandit?[229] The question is an accusation. The answer is obvious, they have clubs and

swords. The answer to the second question, according to the narrative, is that surely

Jesus is no bandit. Surely he is not dangerous. This question reflects negatively on the

Lukan Jesus' opponents, painting them as conspiratorial and dishonest. Culpepper notes

this duplicity on the part of those arresting Jesus. They could not trap Jesus by his words

in public, and they feared the people, so they have come under cover of darkness with

---

[228] Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 1088. Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 435. Curiously, while others note the question of Jesus in Luke as opposed to Matthew and Mark, only Nolland and Culpepper comment on the importance of that interchange.

[229] The notion of bandit (λῃστὴς) will be further discussed in chapter four. For now, I read this to mean social bandit or revolutionary, rather than mere "robber." Fitzmyer notes that possible translation of λῃστής as "insurrectionist." Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1451. Culpepper gives three possible definitions for λῃστής: "Brigand," "Bandit," or "Violent Man," Culpepper, *Luke,* 436. Nolland gives the definition of a robber, or possibly a revolutionary, but he sides with a translation of robber; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1089.

clubs and swords.[230] Luke uses this figure to highlight his hero, Jesus, as a victim of a

conspiratorial and unjust mob. Like the previous figure, the audience is once again

drawn to the side of the Lukan Jesus in sympathy and respect.

The previous figures used by the Lukan Jesus represent *ethos*, *logos,* and *pathos*

arguments on the part of Luke. Luke, by portraying his main character as continuously

victorious in debate, draws the admiration of the audience as they are beckoned to take

his side in arguments. Moreover, Luke uses these figures in many instances to create an

argument of *logos* against the position of Jesus' opponents. The Lukan Jesus' argument

prevails in these instances precisely because they are well reasoned and logically argued.

Finally, many of the figures rouse the emotions of the audience, a use of a *pathos*

argument that bonds the audience to the Lukan Jesus.

The Art of Inviting Audience Participation

A second rhetorical tactic which Luke uses to persuade his audience of his

message is to use figures of speech on the lips of Jesus to invite the audience to

participate in the narrative and message. By creating participants, Luke allows the

audience to make the story and message their own. As they become invested in the

narrative they are more likely to hold strongly to the message conveyed therein.

Audience participation in ancient narrative has been the subject of a recent dissertation by

Kathy Maxwell.[231] Maxwell argues that ancient authors left "gaps" in their narratives as

---

[230] Culpepper, *Luke,* 436.

[231] Kathy Reiko Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu,* (Electronic Resource; Waco, Tx: Baylor University, 2007).

a means of inviting audience participation and increasing the persuasive appeal of their works. Maxwell writes, "Rhetorical elements may be omitted, allusions to other texts or events may be incomplete, and solutions to puzzles may be left unwritten."[232] Maxwell lists six main methods of inviting audience participation: (1) privileged information given to the audience, (2) deliberate omissions (such as enthymemes), (3) open-ended comparisons (such as metaphor, riddle, fable, and parable), (4) hidden meanings (such as innuendo, double meanings, and irony), (5) question and answer, and (6) allusions. The following figures that Luke uses to invite audience participation fall mainly under Maxwell's categories of question and answer and of open-ended comparisons.

Examples of Audience Participation Figures

As with *aporia* question figures, the *rhetorical question* is a common way to invite audience participation. With these questions, the Lukan Jesus reveals some pieces information, while hiding others. The *rhetorical question* requires the audience to enter into the argument and complete the meaning for themselves. That meaning is not always clear, and thus the Lukan Jesus remains hidden, allowing the audience to judge for themselves what he meant.

Two interesting studies in social psychology demonstrate that the use of *rhetorical questions* enhances thought and participation on the part of the audience. Both studies attempt to ascertain the persuasiveness of speech which used *rhetorical questions.* In the first study, conducted by Dolf Zillmann, a group of students was given an argument, some with propositional statements, and some with those same statements in

---

[232] Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines,* 2.

rhetorical question form. It was found that the arguments in rhetorical form were more

persuasive and the students were more likely to agree with the overall argument.[233]

A second study sought to modify Zillmann's method and refine the results. Petty,

Cacioppo, and Heesacker found that further variables affected the persuasiveness of the

rhetorical questions. They introduced the variables of a strong and weak argument and

of a low and high relevance to the audience. That is, if the arguments were strong,

rhetorical questions increased persuasiveness over simple propositional statements. On

the other hand, if arguments were weak, *rhetorical questions* decreased persuasiveness

because the audience was drawn further into the argument to determine how weak it

actually was. Further, if an argument was of high relevance to an audience member, and

they were already engaged in and thinking about the argument, the use of a *rhetorical

questions* actually distracted from the argument. In the same way, if the subject was of

low relevance and the audience member was unlikely to already be thinking about the

argument, the use of *rhetorical questions* increased thought and persuasiveness.[234]

While these two studies attempt to determine the persuasiveness of *rhetorical

questions,* the secondary conclusion to be drawn is that *rhetorical questions* increase the

participation of the audience. *Rhetorical questions* draw the audience in to examine what

is actually said. Zillmann gives the following rationale for this occurrence. He writes:

> It may be argued that the assumed covert agreement response elicited by a
> rhetorical agreement question, as compared to the relatively passive decoding of
> an assertion in statement form, raises the individual's level of awareness. It

[233] Dolf Zillmann. "Rhetorical Elicitation of Agreement in Persuasion." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 21 (1972): 159-165.

[234] Richard E. Petty et al. "Effects of Rhetorical Questions on Persuasion." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40 (1981): 432-440.

makes him cognizant of his position on a particular issue, and it may activate his issue-related cognitions to consolidate and bolster his evaluations, thereby facilitating his involvement with the issue, and possibly producing some self-commitment.[235]

Therefore, the Lukan Jesus' use of *rhetorical questions* serves to draw the audience into the argument to determine meaning for themselves. In this way the Lukan Jesus reveals enough information about himself and his message to get his audience involved, but he stops short of explaining everything.

Luke 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με;

These are the first words that Jesus speaks in Luke's gospel. Interestingly, the first words out of the Lukan Jesus' mouth are conveyed in a figure of speech, even more, in one of his most used figures of speech, the *rhetorical question.* Fitzmyer notes that Jesus' first question "has something of a reproach in it."[236] The very reasonable question of his parents, "Why have you treated us like this, we were searching for you?" is answered with two *rhetorical questions* to which the answers should be obvious. The first question, "Why were you searching for me?" implies that the Lukan Jesus was perfectly fine on his own. The second question, "Did you not know that it was necessary for me to be in my father's house?" implies that no searching was necessary. The Lukan Jesus' parents should have known exactly where he was. Father's house (temple) however is only one possible translation of ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου. A very literal translation would be "among the things of my father." The commentaries are full of various opinions as to

---

[235] Zillmann. "Rhetorical Elicitation," 161.

[236] Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 443.

the proper translation of this phrase. Johnson notes the ambiguity in the phrase and gives three renderings: "'My Father's things (i.e., affairs or business)'; 'my Father's house'; or 'my Father's associates' (e.g., relatives)."[237] Culpepper notes the ambiguity in Jesus' question and gives one possible translation of "about my father's business."[238] Dennis Sylva argues that this phrase refers to God's teaching in the temple. Thus, the τοῖς has a double meaning. It refers both to the house of the father (temple), and to the words or teaching of the father that Jesus proclaims in the temple.[239] This figure invites audience participation in two ways. On one level, the two questions call for an answer. The audience must fill in those answers. On a second level, the answers are not simple. What does it mean to be ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου? The context demonstrates that one possibility is "my father's house," but the question is deliberately ambiguous and preserves the mystery of the Lukan Jesus and his mission. That very mystery invites further audience participation in the narrative.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *maxim* as a saying drawn from life which shows concisely either what happens or ought to happen in life. For example, "Every beginning is difficult." And "A free man is that man to be judged who is a slave to no base habit."[240] *Maxims* are very memorable, and thus many of the Lukan Jesus' *maxims* are among the most recognizable of his sayings.

---

[237] Johnson, *Luke,* 59.

[238] Culpepper, *Luke,* 77.

[239] David D. Sylva, "The Cryptic Clause *en tois tou patros mou dei einai me* in Lk 2:49b," *ZNW* 78 (1987): 139.

[240] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.17.24 (Caplan, LCL).

Quintilian defines *anadiplosis* as the figure in which there is a repetition of a word which ends a clause at the beginning of the next clause. For example, "yet this man lives. Lives?" and again, "And ye, Pierian Muses, shall enhance their worth for Gallus, Gallus, he for whom each hour my love burns stronger."[241] The repetition of a certain word brings emphasis to that word, especially when repeated twice in a row.

Luke 6:39 Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς· μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν[242] ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;

This *maxim* comes in the form of two *rhetorical questions,* also incorporating the figure *anadiplosis* with the repeated τυφλὸς τυφλὸν.[243] Not only is this *maxim* memorable, it carries the effects of *rhetorical question* and *anadiplosis* as well. The audience hears a memorable phrase, but is also drawn into the Lukan Jesus' argument because of the question. Matthew has a parallel verse, but it is less rhetorically embellished. He has kept the *maxim,* but he lacks the *rhetorical question* and *anadiplosis* (Mt. 15:14).

The answer to the first question should be an emphatic "no," while the answer to the second question should be an emphatic "yes." The phrase is a true maxim in that it is a clever saying that is true to life. The mystery comes when trying to determine to whom this saying was addressed. Nolland notes the confusion about whom this statement is uttered. He gives several possibilities: the apostles as teachers of the church, those who hate rather than love, those who as teachers judge and show no mercy, false teachers in

---

[241] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.44-45.

[242] Morgenthaler notes the use of *polyptoton* in this passage with the repetition of τυφλὸς τυφλὸν; Robert Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian,* (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag Zürich, 1993), 267.

[243] See Vinson, *Luke,* 192. Vinson notes the use of *rhetorical question* and *maxim* in this section.

the church, or popular Jewish teachers.[244] Fitzmyer notes the ambiguity of this phrase as it could refer to the hearer (i.e., self judgment) or to the blind leaders of Israel.[245] Schweizer argues that this saying is directed to the disciples.[246] The context itself is ambiguous and the recipients are also ambiguous. The Lukan Jesus uses this *maxim* in the form of two *rhetorical questions* in a deliberately mysterious way. The imagery as well as the questions draw the audience into the argument of the Lukan Jesus to contemplate the meaning for themselves.

Luke 6:46 Τί δέ με καλεῖτε· κύριε κύριε[247], καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;

In this verse, the *rhetorical question,* which also uses the figure *anadiplosis* with the repetition of κύριε, has several layers of meaning. On one level, it displays the hypocritical nature of the Lukan Jesus' narrative audience. Why are these people calling Jesus Lord and ignoring his advice? On a second level, it raises the question of the Lukan Jesus' identity. Is he really ὁ κύριος? On yet a third level, the question of the Lukan Jesus is posed to the listening audience. The listeners are drawn into the question to contemplate their own nature and response to Jesus. Matthew uses a similar statement, but he has not used the figure of *rhetorical question.* Rather he has lengthened the statement and formed the argument as a statement rather than a question (Mt. 7:21). The Lukan Jesus' question is masterfully crafted in order to play on several levels, both for

---

[244] Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20,* 306-307.

[245] Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 641-642.

[246] Schweizer, *Luke,* 126.

[247] Morgenthaler notes a figure he calls *Geminatio*, which according to Quintilian is called *anadiplosis.* In this verse, this figure is created by the repetition of κύριε κύριε. Morgenthaler, *Lukas,* 267.

the narrative and gospel audience. The question invites the audience to participate in self

evaluation and evaluation of the character of the Lukan Jesus.

Luke 14:34 Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἅλας· ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται;

This is perhaps one of the most mysterious of the Lukan Jesus' questions in the gospel. It

falls under what Kathy Maxwell calls a "riddle" and thus invites further audience

participation. How does one regain the taste of salt when the salt has lost its saltiness?

Eugene Deatrick helpfully fills in the historical context. Modern salt (Sodium Chloride)

cannot lose its saltiness. On the other hand, salt in first-century Palestine was a mixture

of elements, and the salty part could wear away, thus losing its saltiness.[248]

Most commentators rightly relate this saying to the previous discussion on

discipleship, and thus give some form of argument as to how the disciples should remain

"salty."[249] While there is agreement on the fact that this saying is related to the issue of

discipleship, there is little agreement as to what losing one's saltiness means. One of the

more interesting interpretations is by Vinson. In the larger pericope (14:25-35), Vinson

finds three demands, and three explanatory stories/metaphors. The third demand:

renouncing "all your stuff" then is illustrated by the metaphor on salt. Thus, refusing to

renounce one's possessions would equal losing one's saltiness.[250] This would also fit

---

[248] Eugene P. Deatrick, "Salt, Soil, Savior," *BA* 25 (1962): 41-43.

[249] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1068. Fitzmyer writes, "Salt expresses the willingness of the disciple to offer himself/herself in allegiance to Jesus. Just as salt can lose its saltiness, so too can the allegiance deteriorate." Ringe, *Luke*, 203. Ringe writes, "A disciple who begins with energy and enthusiasm risks running short of both before the journey is completed." Cf. Schweizer, *Luke*, 242; Culpepper, *Luke,* 293. Culpepper claims that this saying on salt is a warning to present disciples. To give up the relationship with Jesus is to lose one's saltiness.

[250] Vinson, *Luke,* 495.

with the Lukan attitude toward wealth and possessions. While the saying indeed pertains

to discipleship, it is abrupt and not nearly as clear on a first hearing as subsequent

interpretation might make it seem. The saying invites audience participation as they

contemplate the vivid and evocative image and the possible consequences of such

meaning.

> Luke 18:7 ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ τὴν ἐκδίκησιν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ τῶν βοώντων αὐτῷ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, καὶ μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ’ αὐτοῖς;
> Luke 18:8 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι ποιήσει τὴν ἐκδίκησιν αὐτῶν ἐν τάχει. πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐλθὼν ἆρα εὑρήσει τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς;

There are three questions that end this parable: will God grant justice, will he do it

quickly, and will the Son of Man find faith on the earth when he comes? There are two

mysterious parts to this threefold question. (1) What is the meaning of μακροθυμεῖ in the

second question; and (2) what is the answer to the third question. The term μακροθυμεῖ is

literally translated as "to have patience."[251] A translation of "will he have patience" is in

contradiction to the answer of "he will act quickly" in v. 8. Johnson notes that the verb

could be translated, "shall he delay" which would then solve the problem of the answer in

v. 8.[252] David Catchpole argues that μακροθυμεῖ ought to be translated as "forbearance."

That translation then ties in with v. 8b, where the Son of Man comes to find faith on the

earth. According to Catchpole, the forbearance of God prompts faith in those awaiting

---

[251] Culpepper, *Luke,* 338.

[252] Johnson, *Luke,* 270. Cf. Herman Ljungvik, "Zur Erklärung einer Lukas-Stelle (Luk. 18:7)," *NTS* 10 (1964): 293-294. Ljungvik also argues for a translation with μακροθυμεῖ meaning "shortly" or "quickly." See also Albert Wifstrand, "Lukas 18:7," *NTS* 10 (1964): 73. Wifstrand argues for the translation of μακροθυμεῖ as "tarry" or "delay."

the coming of the Son of Man.[253] So then, the audience must decide which meaning is correct, siding with Fitzmyer (shall he delay), or with Catchpole (will he have forbearance.) The second question is answered by v. 8a, thus demonstrating the *a fortiori* argument. Surely, if the unjust judge acted justly, so too will God.[254] The third question, will the Son of Man find faith on the earth? is unanswerable. Once again, the Lukan Jesus uses this question to hide and reveal at the same time. The question prompts participation on the part of the audience.

Luke 24:26 οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; The context here is the meeting of Jesus and the two disciples on the road to Emmaus. The disciples tell Jesus, whom they do not recognize, about his own suffering and death. They are doubting whether Jesus was the Messiah. The Lukan Jesus then poses this *rhetorical question*: "Was it not necessary for the messiah to suffer these things and to come into his glory?" The answer might not be obvious to the disciples, but by beginning the question with the emphatic οὐχὶ, the Lukan Jesus makes clear both to the

disciples and to the audience that the answer to the question should be "Yes, of course." It is not surprising that the disciples knew nothing of a suffering messiah. Fitzmyer notes that "The notion of a suffering messiah is not found in the OT or in any texts of pre-

---

[253] David R. Catchpole, "The Son of Man's Search for Faith (Luke 18:8b)," *NovT* 19 (1977): 104.

[254] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1180. Cf. Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary,* 381.

Christian Judaism."[255] Nevertheless, the Lukan Jesus makes this assertion, and does so in a question that forces the audience to search for the meaning of such a statement.

Luke 7:35 καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν τέκνων αὐτῆς.

Here the Lukan Jesus uses a *maxim* as a saying which is true or ought to be true to life. This saying comes on the heels of the people's description of John as an ascetic and Jesus as a "glutton and drunkard." The people have been questioning the identity both of Jesus and John. There is one primary question in this *maxim* that has caused fits among commentators: who are the children of wisdom?

On the one hand, there are those who see Jesus and John as the children of wisdom. Fitzmyer notes that in the Q context, Jesus and John are the children of wisdom. In the Lukan context however, Fitzmyer notes the ambiguity of the phrase. By adding "all" he notes, "Luke has included Jesus' disciples as well."[256] Others exclude Jesus and John and opt for the disciples and followers of Jesus and John. Ringe notes that in this context, the children of wisdom are those who "welcome both the repentance and the joy

---

[255] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1565. Cf. Johnson, *Luke,* 397; Peter Doble, "Luke 24:26,44—Songs of God's Servant: David and his Psalms in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 28 (2006): 267-283. Doble argues that where NT scholars have tried to find a background for the suffering messiah they have looked at the suffering servant of Isaiah. In Contrast, Doble looks in the Psalms, noting Jesus' heavy quotations of the Psalms in the passion narrative.

[256] Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 679.

appropriate to God's purpose and reign, each in its season."[257] Finally, some include Jesus, John, and their followers.[258]

To further muddy the waters, Simon Gathercole argues for a completely different translation of this *maxim.* Using a linguistic argument from the term ἐδικαιώθη + ἀπὸ, he argues that the construction should be rendered "acquitted from" not "justified by."[259] He therefore renders the verse, "And wisdom has been dissociated from her children."[260] In this translation, the *maxim,* would be placed on the mouth of "this generation," as they claim that lady Wisdom has been dissociated from Jesus, John, their followers (the children) and their deeds.

The Lukan Jesus uses this *maxim* not as a direct response to who he or John is, but rather to draw the hearer into the issue itself. The hearer must then ask about the outcome of Jesus and John's lives. They must question the identity of Jesus and John and ask themselves, who are the children of Wisdom and will they justify Jesus and John?

According to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium, correctio* is the figure in which one retracts what has been said and replaces it with what seems more suitable. For example, "After the men in question had conquered, or rather had been conquered—for how shall I

---

[257] Ringe, *Luke,* 106. Cf. Schweizer, *Luke,* 136; Johnson, *Luke,* 124. Vinson, *Luke,* 226.

[258] Wendy J. Cotter, "The Parable of the Children in the Market-Place, Q (Lk) 7:31-35: An Examination of the Parable's Image and Significance," *NovT* 19 (1987): 303. Cotter argues that the children of the *maxim* are Jesus and John, and those who follow the way.

[259] Simon Gathercole, "The Justification of Wisdom," *NTS* 49 (2003): 483-484. Gathercole argues from the only two other places where the construction ἐδικαιώθη + ἀπὸ occurs (Acts 13:38-39, Romans 6:7), where the terms clearly mean acquitted from.

[260] Gathercole, "Wisdom," 476.

call that a conquest which has brought more disaster than benefit to the conquerors."[261]

This is a question figure that draws the audience into what is being said. They are baited

with false assertions before being given a more suitable answer.

> Luke 18:19 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός.

Here the Lukan Jesus responds to a certain ruler who has called him good teacher. The

Lukan Jesus answers enigmatically with the figure *correctio*. He begins by asking the

question, "Why do you call me good?" Then he gives the correction, "No one is good

except God." This *correctio* draws the attention of the audience to the main issue at

hand, namely, is Jesus God? Is Jesus good? Fitzmyer lists five historical interpretations

of this saying. 1) Jesus intends the man to see that he is divine, 2) Jesus rejects the term

good as his interlocutor understands it and seeks to redefine it, 3) Jesus is acknowledging

his sinfulness, 4) good should be understood as gracious or kind, and 5) Jesus is directing

attention away from himself and to God. Fitzmyer agrees most with the last

interpretation, saying that in posing this question, Jesus is pointing past himself to the

goodness of God.[262] Whichever interpretation one chooses, one must ponder the

relationships between Jesus, God, and the good. The Lukan Jesus' use of *correctio* was

masterfully crafted to draw the audience into the question and to determine for

themselves the identity of the Lukan Jesus.

---

[261] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.26.36.

[262] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1199. Cf. Ringe, *Luke*, 227-228; Culpepper, *Luke,* 346; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary,* 384; Johnson, *Luke,* 276. Ringe, Culpepper, Malina and Rohrbaugh, and Johnson all side with Fitzmyer in claiming that Jesus is correcting the interlocutor and deflecting attention away from himself and to God as the only good.

In this section, I have demonstrated how Luke used figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a means of inviting audience participation. By asking questions or posing riddles the Lukan Jesus is able to draw the audience into the message of the gospel, causing them to join in the narrative to complete and even create the meaning for themselves. These figures serve as arguments of *logos* and *pathos* as the audience is asked to logically fill in gaps in the narrative and is invited into an emotional bond with the narrative and message.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have demonstrated that Luke, while not abandoning the rhetorical strategies in chapter two of making Jesus' speech both easy to follow and ornamental, also operates on a deeper level of argumentation through the use of figures of speech. The figures cited in this chapter served Luke's purpose of drawing the audience into his argument, causing them to side with Jesus and participate in the narrative and gospel message.

In the first part of this chapter, I illustrated how Luke used figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a means of portraying Jesus as a teacher victorious in verbal debate. Using figures in this way served three argumentative purposes. On the one hand, these figures form an argument of *ethos* as the Lukan Jesus is portrayed as a cunning and clever conversationalist who is able to overcome his hostile opponents on the field of debate. The Lukan Jesus repeatedly uses figures of speech as a means of inducing *aporia* in his narrative interlocutors, causing them to cease from their hostile questions and traps. On the other hand, these figures serve as a *logos* argument as the reasoning of Jesus serves to prove the rightness and justice of his cause. The audience follows these logical

127

statements and is persuaded that the Lukan Jesus' message is right. Finally, these figures serve as an argument of *pathos* as they rouse the emotions of the audience and cause them to become connected to the character of the Lukan Jesus. All three of these argumentative effects serve to increase the persuasiveness and power of Jesus' message and the audience is drawn further into a position where they are ready to accept the agenda of Luke's gospel.

The second section of the chapter dealt with figures that invite audience participation in the narrative. As the audience is drawn into the narrative, being asked to fill in details, answer questions, and complete arguments for themselves, they have a greater stake in the gospel and in the process are changed by the narrative. As Maxwell notes concerning audience participation, "Audiences responded, paying attention to the rhetoricians' words, helping create the story, and in the process being morally formed."[263] Luke uses many questions and riddles to draw the audience into the narrative, making them participants and co-creators of the meaning and message. Ultimately, inviting audience participation serves as arguments of *logos* and *pathos* by which Luke seeks to implant the message of the gospel in the minds of the hearer and, ultimately, to bring about a transformation of their moral character.

In sum, this chapter has demonstrated how Luke uses figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a means of argument and persuasion to further prepare the audience for the message of the gospel. By arguing from *ethos, logos,* and *pathos,* Luke is able to increase the bond between the audience and Jesus, to begin to logically draw the audience

---

[263] Maxwell, *Hearing Between the Lines,* 314.

to the side of Jesus, and finally, to bond the audience to Jesus and to the narrative and

gospel message.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Power of Figures of Speech in Communicating a Role-Reversing Message

Chapters two and three focused on how Luke uses figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a rhetorical strategy, first to make the audience amenable to Jesus' character through his refined rhetorical style, and second through argumentative strategies meant to draw the audience to the Lukan Jesus' side and into participation in his message. This fourth chapter, while not abandoning the rhetorical strategies already discussed, will demonstrate how Luke uses forceful and memorable figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as a rhetorical strategy to implant his most challenging role-reversing message in the minds of his hearers.

When approaching the role-reversing message of the Lukan Jesus, it seems that there are two extremes to be avoided. One the one hand, one can spiritualize the teaching of the Lukan Jesus to a point where his challenging social message is lost in the background. At that extreme, Luke's "poor" in the blessings and woes, which certainly has spiritual aspects, become more like Matthew's "poor in spirit" in the Beatitudes. Thus, the Lukan Jesus is reduced to a spiritual teacher who cared little for the social or economic situation of the poor and outcast, but was only concerned with spiritual salvation or eschatological benefits.[264] On the other hand one can read the Lukan Jesus'

---

[264] For an example of this type of spiritualization of Luke's text, see Malcolm O. Tolbert, *Luke,* (The Broadman Bible Commentary 9: Luke-John; ed. Clifton J. Allen; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1970), 58-59. For Tolbert, the poverty which Luke speaks of is a spiritual poverty, not materialistic. See also R. Alan Culpepper, *Luke,* (NIB 9; Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), 25. Culpepper warns against spiritualizing Luke's

ministry as exclusively directed toward social or political ends. At this extreme, the

Lukan Jesus' teaching, which indeed sought to challenge unjust religious systems,

economic policies, political realities, and social constructs, is seen as the ultimate end of

Jesus' ministry.[265] Thus, the Lukan Jesus is reduced to a mere social reformer who

sought only to bring about social change through his radical teaching. Both types of

interpretation provide valuable insights into the text, but often swing too far to the

extremes. Fortunately, neither extreme is necessary as this is not an either/or situation,

but a both/and situation. The Lukan Jesus, in whom the spiritual and physical were

joined in the incarnation, ministered to those in both spiritual and social bondage.

The basis for holding the spiritual and the materialistic elements of the Lukan

Jesus' teachings together comes from Luke's message of the cosmic inbreaking of the

kingdom of God[266] with the advent of Jesus and the resulting defeat of the devil and the

---

comments about the rich and poor. He writes, "Modern readers must, therefore, guard
against efforts to pull the prophetic sting from Luke or spiritualize poverty in spite of
Luke's efforts to prevent us from doing so."

[265] For examples of this extreme in Lukan interpretation see William R. Herzog,
Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed, (Louisville, Ky:
Westminster John Knox Press, 1994). For Herzog, the predominant factor in the telling
of parables was the social and economic situation of the peasants in the agrarian society.
Thus, some parables with rich spiritual meanings, such as the parables of the rich man
and Lazarus, the talents/pounds, the friend at midnight, the unjust judge, and the unjust
steward, all receive heavily social and economic interpretations.

[266] I contend that the kingdom of God is the central message of the Lukan Jesus.
Thus, though the specific words "kingdom of God" may not be used, much of what the
Lukan Jesus says pertains to his message of the kingdom. See Robert O'Toole, "The
Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts," in *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*,
(ed. Wendell Willis, Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 1987), 153-154. O'Toole argues that
"The Christian message can be summarized in the phrase, 'The Kingdom of God.'" See
also N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996),
225. Wright notes that to reduce the concept of the kingdom of God to places where the
term is actually used would exclude much relevant material.

evil powers that held sway in the world. The victory of the Lukan Jesus over these

cosmic powers represents a cosmic role reversal as the dominance of the devil over this

present age is replaced with the kingdom of God. This reversal in the cosmic realm then

enables the various role reversals he proclaims in the religious, political, economic, and

social arenas as he proclaims a new way of living in the kingdom of God. Nevertheless,

the role reversals are contingent upon this cosmic victory and are enabled by it, and only

through the Lukan Jesus' victory over Satan and the evil powers of this age is he able to

proclaim that the poor are blessed and the rich are cursed, that the lofty shall be brought

low and the lowly exalted, that the first shall be last and the last shall be first.

Susan Garrett demonstrates the importance of Luke's message of a cosmic victory

of Jesus over Satan and demonic powers in her monograph *The Demise of the Devil*.[267]

She writes:

> "Jesus plundered the devil's kingdom, releasing from captivity some of its
> oppressed and delegating authority to the disciples that they might do the same.
> According to Luke, Jesus saw these acts of release as a foreshadowing of the
> imminent day when his death and resurrection would cause Satan finally to be
> cast from his position of authority, to "fall like lightning from the sky."[268]

The "release from captivity," then, is seen as a result of the Lukan Jesus' cosmic victory

over Satan. In like manner, Joel Green also sees the Lukan Jesus' release of the captives,

and the ensuing role reversals as a result of this cosmic victory. In his investigation of

the healing of the bent woman, of whom Jesus said that she had been "bound by Satan for

eighteen years" (13:16), Green finds that the healing and subsequent controversy story go

---

[267] See Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

[268] Garrett, *Demise,* 58.

hand in hand. He writes, "This healing, and with it many others in Luke, is set in the

context of eschatological battle and is vested with a significant sign value, pointing to the

realization of the kingdom of God today, in Jesus' ministry."[269] According to Green, the

victory in the cosmic realm enables the message of the controversy story which is to

reverse roles, to allow healing and compassion on the Sabbath where it was previously

prohibited.[270] Therefore, the role reversals that the Lukan Jesus proclaims and empowers

are contingent upon and derivative from the cosmic battle between God and Satan that

lies in the background of the third gospel.

In Luke's Gospel, the defeat of Satan and the setting free of those in spiritual

bondage is most often seen through the narrative, through healings and exorcisms, and

most powerfully, through the Lukan Jesus' triumph over death and Satan in the

resurrection.[271] When examining the proclamation of the role reversals made possible by

the Lukan Jesus' cosmic victory, however, we find these reversals communicated in the

form of the Lukan Jesus' speech. More importantly, for my study, these reversals are

pronounced with rhetorically powerful figures of speech. In what follows, the figures of

speech are interpreted as a message of role reversals primarily in the material realm. This

is not to say that many of these verses do not at the same time have spiritual implications,

---

[269] Joel B. Green, "Jesus and a Daughter of Abraham (Luke 13:10-17): Test Case for a Lucan Perspective on Jesus' Miracles," *CBQ* 51 (1989): 654.

[270] See also Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke,* (NICNT; Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 1997), 23. Green, speaking about healing and table fellowship, writes, "Such practices embody the truth of the inbreaking kingdom of God. In Jesus' interactions with people at the table and in his ministry of healing, he communicates the presence of divine salvation for those whose position in society-at-large is generally on the margins."

[271] See Garrett, *Demise,* 101-103.

they often do. But, the main thrust of the rhetoric is directed not at spiritual opponents or

spiritual realities, but rather at social and religious systems and the elites who benefitted

from them. The foundation for the rhetoric of role reversal in these systems is that the

undermining of these systems is ultimately proof of the cosmic role reversal that has

already taken place with the defeat of Satan and the inbreaking of the kingdom of God.

None of the interpretations given in this chapter are new or original. The view of

social realities and the role reversals that the Lukan Jesus proclaimed in the midst of

those realities are all well established within the biblical guild. For example, Luke

Timothy Johnson highlights this role-reversing theme in the Gospel of Luke in one of the

sections of his introduction to the gospel called "The Great Reversal."[272] He writes:

> Those who are powerful, rich, and "have consolation" within society and who
> seek on that basis to "justify themselves" respond to this prophet with "testing"
> and rejection. They themselves are "cast down" or "lowered" and in the end, "cut
> off from the people." In contrast, those ordinarily deemed unworthy, lowly,
> marginal, or even outcast, are accepted by God. They are "raised up" and become
> part of the restored people of God.[273]

Robert C. Tannehill also notes the role-reversing character of Jesus in the gospels both

through his short sayings and through the parables. He argues that society perpetuates

injustice, but God intervenes with a reversal of roles. He writes, "Those with power,

---

[272] Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* (SP 3; ed. Daniel J. Harrington; Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1991), 22.

[273] Johnson, *Luke,* 22. Johnson finds this "great reversal" at the heart of the theme of the rich and the poor in Luke. The gospel of Luke reverses fortunes and cultural norms, perhaps the most visible being the disparity between rich and poor. The poor in the gospel, while to be taken literally, can also be a substitute for any of those traditionally rejected by society, such as "the lame, the blind, the deaf, the sexually mutilated."

status, and riches are put down and those without them are exalted."[274] What is new, however, is the focus on the rhetoric with which the Lukan Jesus assailed these social systems. It is precisely where aspects of his message would find the most opposition that the Lukan Jesus employed some of his most forceful, powerful, and memorable figures of speech.

It is an understatement to say that the task set before Luke was daunting. He had to persuade an audience of social and religious elites to abandon the very social, religious, political, and economic institutions that held their society together, the very institutions that benefited precisely those of high status. To proclaim this message to the social and religious elites, Luke needed to draw on all of his rhetorical ability to form this message to be as powerful, memorable, and forceful as possible. Because the message was so radical and challenging to the upper classes, it was precisely the form of this message, the rhetoric used to communicate the message, that might be able to penetrate the minds of those who only stood to lose in the short run if they accepted it.

The form and rhetoric of the Lukan Jesus' radical message is the subject of this chapter. Luke employs various figures of speech, many of which have become some of the most memorable phrases in the gospel, as a means of implanting in the minds of his audience a message of a radical new way of living in the kingdom of God. The message

---

[274] Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation,* (vol. 1; The Gospel According to Luke; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991), 109-110. Tannehill notes such reversals in the blessings and woes of Jesus (6:20-26), the sayings about last and first (13:30), exalting and humbling (14:11, 18:14), and in the parables of the great supper (14:12-13), the rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31), and the Good Samaritan (10:29-37). For reversal in the parable of the Good Samaritan see George W. Knight, "Luke 16:19-31: The Rich Man and Lazarus," *RevExp* 94 (1997): 279-280.

conveyed by means of these powerful figures is that of a cosmic victory of the Lukan

Jesus enabling a complete reversal of roles in the prominent social, economic, political,

and religious systems of the Roman Empire, thus, literally turning the world upside-

down. Through the use of powerful figures of speech, the Lukan Jesus subverts religious

boundary systems, the agrarian social stratification system, the patron-client system, the

honor-shame system, and finally, ancient Mediterranean kinship groups.

Religious Boundary Systems

In this first section I discuss how the Lukan Jesus uses figures of speech to

challenge and undermine religious boundary systems in first-century Palestine.

Boundary systems were used by the Jews, and specifically by the Pharisees, as a means

of creating a specific Jewish identity, defining the in-group and the out-group.[275] This

delineation was important for various Jewish groups to create and sustain their identity in

the Hellenistic world where there was constant pressure to conform to Greek ways of

thought and belief. Regulations regarding food purity, the Sabbath, table fellowship, and

associations with those considered to be on the outside all served to strengthen the social

boundaries of this identity group.[276] For the Lukan Jesus, these boundaries and

regulations prevented God's mercy from reaching those in need. The cosmic victory of

the Lukan Jesus over Satan enabled him to open his table fellowship to tax collectors and

---

[275] For religious regulations as identity markers see Mary Douglas, *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo,* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966); Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology,* (2nd ed.; London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1973).

[276] Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society,* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Eerdmans, 2001), 212-220.

sinners, perform healings on the Sabbath, and to proclaim that it was not the healthy that needed a doctor, but the sick, that he came for sinners, not the righteous, and that there was more joy in heaven over one repentant sinner than for ninety-nine righteous persons.

Examples of Role Reversing Figures in Religious Boundary Systems

According to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium, rhetorical question* is the figure in which the speaker asks questions to reinforce his argument. For example, "So when you were doing and saying and managing all this, were you, or were you not, alienating and estranging from the republic the sentiments of our allies?" Or "And was it, or was it not, needful to employ some one to thwart these designs of yours and prevent their fulfillment?"[277]

Luke 6:9 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτούς· ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς εἰ ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ ἀγαθοποιῆσαι ἢ κακοποιῆσαι, ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι;

With these two *rhetorical questions,* the Lukan Jesus challenges the religious boundary systems that kept those in need from receiving God's mercy. Joel Green notes that the Sabbath regulations erected boundaries which were used then for the demarcation of Jewish identity.[278] Unfortunately, these boundaries thwarted efforts to do justice and the good. Jesus challenges Sabbath regulations, which in this case prohibited the healing of the man with a withered hand. As Johnson notes, "Jesus establishes a priority for moral activity above ritual. The doing of good or evil, the saving or taking of life, these are

---

[277] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Galen O. Rowe, "Style," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400,* (ed. Stanley Porter, Leiden: Brill, 2001), 139.

[278] Green, *Luke,* 252.

matters which are trivialized by being subordinated to the demands of ritual observance."[279] The *rhetorical questions* are also ornamented by the use of *homoteleuton* with the repetition of the aorist infinitive ending σαι. This repetition creates a powerful rhythm at the end of the verse and thus implants these questions in the minds of the audience.

> Luke 13:15 ἀπεκρίθη δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος καὶ εἶπεν· ὑποκριταί, ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ οὐ λύει τὸν βοῦν αὐτοῦ ἢ τὸν ὄνον ἀπὸ τῆς φάτνης καὶ ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει; Luke 13:16 ταύτην δὲ θυγατέρα Ἀβραὰμ οὖσαν, ἣν ἔδησεν ὁ σατανᾶς ἰδοὺ δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη, οὐκ ἔδει λυθῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

In this passage, another example of a Sabbath healing narrative, the Lukan Jesus again uses two *rhetorical questions*. As demonstrated in chapter three, these questions serve to silence the Lukan Jesus' opponents. They also demonstrate the Lukan Jesus' subversion of a religious system of ritual. As Joel Green notes, "the focus of the story falls therefore on the role of Jesus' healing in God's redemptive plan as an expression of his mission—in contradistinction to the Jewish institutions that threw up a dividing wall restricting access to God's mercy for this needy woman."[280] The argument here is from

---

[279] Johnson, *Luke,* 104. Cf. Richard B. Vinson, *Luke,* (Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2008), 168; Sharon H. Ringe, *Luke,* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995), 87-88. Ringe notes that Jesus has taken the question of what is lawful to do on the Sabbath and raises it to "another level" by trying to interpret the original Sabbath command to "observe the Sabbath day and keep it holy" (Deut. 5:12).

[280] Green, "Jesus and a Daughter of Abraham," 654. See also Heidi Torgerson, "The Healing of the Bent Woman: A Narrative Interpretation of Luke 13:10-17," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 32 (2005): 185. Torgerson writes, "The law is appropriately interpreted only through the lens of mercy."

the lesser to the greater (*a fortiori*).[281] The implication is that if the people, and

presumably even the Lukan Jesus' opponents, will do good for an animal, why not for a

human? Therefore, through these *rhetorical questions* the Lukan Jesus exposes the

hypocrisy of the synagogue leader and further challenges the boundary system that

prevented the mercy of God from reaching the needy. The use of *rhetorical questions*

enables this story to resonate in the mind of the hearer.

> Luke 14:3 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς τοὺς νομικοὺς καὶ Φαρισαίους λέγων· ἔξεστιν τῷ σαββάτῳ θεραπεῦσαι ἢ οὔ;
> Luke 14:4 οἱ δὲ ἡσύχασαν. καὶ ἐπιλαβόμενος ἰάσατο αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέλυσεν.
> Luke 14:5 καὶ πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· τίνος ὑμῶν υἱὸς ἢ βοῦς εἰς φρέαρ πεσεῖται, καὶ οὐκ εὐθέως ἀνασπάσει αὐτὸν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου;

In this passage, a third Sabbath healing, the argument and challenge of the Lukan Jesus is

the same. Again he poses two *rhetorical questions* that use an *a fortiori* argument. Luke

adds a further narrative comment about the silence of the legal experts and Pharisees,

which in the ancient world would signify ceding their agreement.[282] Once again, the

Lukan Jesus challenges the religious system of the Pharisees in constructing boundaries

that prevent the free flow of God's grace to the needy. By using *rhetorical questions* the

Lukan Jesus invites audience participation as they seek to answer these questions in their

own experience.

---

[281] See Ringe, *Luke*, 187; Culpepper, *Luke,* 274; Johnson, *Luke,* 212. Johnson refers to the Hebrew term *qal wehomer* instead of the Latin term *a fortiori.*

[282] See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV,* (AB 28a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985), 1041; Johnson, *Luke,* 223; Eduard Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke,* (trans. David E. Green; Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984), 233. Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 284. Contra these interpreters, Vinson argues that the silence of Jesus' opponents is not an admission of agreement. Vinson, *Luke,* 481.

According to Ps-Cicero, *antistrophe* is the figure in which one repeats the same word as the last word in successive phrases. For example, "Since that time when from our state concord disappeared, liberty disappeared, good faith disappeared, friendship disappeared, the common weal disappeared."[283]

> Luke 10:31 κατὰ συγκυρίαν δὲ ἱερεύς τις κατέβαινεν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκείνῃ καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν·
> Luke 10:32 ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Λευίτης [γενόμενος] κατὰ τὸν τόπον ἐλθὼν καὶ ἰδὼν ἀντιπαρῆλθεν.

In this section, which comes from the Parable of the Good Samaritan, The Lukan Jesus yet again challenges current religious boundary systems. In those systems, Samaritans were unclean and to be excluded from fellowship. The parable radically subverts this view, shattering the carefully constructed boundaries of the Jews.

Both verses end with the word ἀντιπαρῆλθεν (to pass by), thus creating the figure of speech *antistrophe*. Ending these two verses with the same word draws attention to the idea of passing by. Further, the word, being a New Testament *hapax legomenon* draws the further attention of the reader.[284] The figure highlights the actions of the priest and Levite as they acted in accord with religious boundary systems.[285] The Lukan Jesus

---

[283] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.30-31.

[284] Patrice Galup, "Trois remarques sur la parabole dite du 'Bon Samaritain'" (Lc 10:25-37)," *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 83 (2008): 414-416. Galup notes the rarity of this word. It is found only here in the New Testament, and once in the LXX in Wisdom 16:10, where surprisingly the word seems to carry the opposite meaning of "pass by" meaning instead "to come" (Wis. 16:10). Nor did the teeth of the venomous dragon defeat your sons, but your mercy came (ἀντιπαρῆλθεν) and healed them (Translation mine).

[285] See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV, 883-885.* Fitzmyer summarizes the scholarship on this passage, especially with regard to the priestly regulations concerning defilement, and the background of the Samaritan/Jewish hatred of each other. Fitzmyer also notes other

uses the figure of *antistrophe* to set up the surprise moment of the parable when the Samaritan actually stops and helps the beaten man. Culpepper notes the literary pattern here but not the figure of speech. He writes, "By storytelling conventions, the audience can expect a series of three, the third character will break the pattern created by the first two. Moreover, the expected pattern would be a priest, a Levite, and then an Israelite."[286]

Ringe notes two prominent reversals in this parable. First, the Samaritan, despised and outcast, is actually the embodiment of the "neighbor" in this passage. Second, the traveler was also likely a merchant, another of the outcasts in society. Therefore, the Lukan Jesus has lifted up two of the despised classes in this parable while demoting two of the higher and more respected classes.[287] This parable is an attack on the religious boundary systems in which outcasts were prevented from receiving the mercy of God. The Lukan Jesus once again demonstrates that in the kingdom of God, roles will be reversed. The priest and the Levite (temple authorities in the current system) will be excluded, while the outcasts (the Samaritans and merchants) will be welcome. By using the figure *antistrophe* to set up the surprise moment of the parable, Luke implants this image of a shocking "good Samaritan" in the minds of the audience.

---

historical interpretations focusing on allegory, and others focusing on whether the parable is anti-Jewish. These issues do not need to be rehearsed here.

[286] Culpepper, *Luke,* 143.

[287] Ringe, *Luke,* 158. Cf. Bruce Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 347. For Malina and Rohrbaugh, like Ringe, the traveler was probably a merchant, a dispossessed member of society. Thus, Jesus' peasant audience would have identified more with the merchant and the Samarian in this story than with the priest or Levite.

According to Ps-Cicero, *antithesis* is the figure of speech consisting of "style built upon contraries, using contrary thoughts in successive clauses." The author then gives the following example: "When all is calm, you are confused; when all is in confusion, you are calm."[288]

> Luke 11:39 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ κύριος πρὸς αὐτόν· νῦν ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τὸ ἔξωθεν τοῦ ποτηρίου καὶ τοῦ πίνακος καθαρίζετε, τὸ δὲ ἔσωθεν ὑμῶν γέμει ἁρπαγῆς καὶ πονηρίας.
> Luke 11:40 ἄφρονες, οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν;

Here, in response to the implied question of why Jesus did not wash his hand before a meal, the Lukan Jesus responds with an *antithesis* and a *rhetorical question*. The language is striking in its antithetical nature with the twofold repetition of the words ἔξωθεν and ἔσωθεν. The Lukan Jesus ends this exchange by posing this *rhetorical question*, "Did not God create the inside as well as the outside?" As Culpepper notes, "The Pharisees should realize that God made the whole person, inside and out, and that God is not just concerned with the observance of rituals of purity but with the purity of one's heart."[289] Moreover, Joel Green notes, "Jesus directs attention toward a purity that overcomes socio-religious barriers, in direct contrast to one that separates people form one another and keeps them separated."[290] In these verses the Lukan Jesus proclaims the

---

[288] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.25.21 (Caplan, LCL) Cf. Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.45.58. For *antithesis* as a figure of thought. See also Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.81-86.

[289] Culpepper, *Luke,* 247. Cf. Jacob Neusner, "First Cleanse the Inside: the 'Halakhic' Background of a Controversy-Saying," *NTS* 22 (1976): 494-495. Neusner notes that the debate washing utensils was already current among Pharisees at the time of Jesus. He demonstrates that Jesus attempts to move that debate from a legal matter to a moral matter. It is not about the legalities of the inside or outside of the cup, but rather about the inner traits of a human.

[290] Green, *Luke,* 471.

overturning of purity regulations in favor of a new way of living in the kingdom of God where purity does not separate but rather brings people together. The use of the striking *antithesis* and the *rhetorical question* serve to implant these images in the minds of the audience.

> Luke 5:31 καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες ἰατροῦ ἀλλὰ οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες·
> Luke 5:32 οὐκ ἐλήλυθα καλέσαι δικαίους ἀλλὰ ἁμαρτωλοὺς εἰς μετάνοιαν.

The Lukan Jesus uses these two *antitheses,* the first of which is also in the form of a *maxim,* in answer to the Pharisees' question as to why Jesus shares the company of tax collectors and sinners. He uses the contradictory categories of sick[291] and healthy, righteous and sinners. The Lukan Jesus uses the *antithesis* to demonstrate that the kingdom of God is concerned with sinners, those on the outside in boundary systems, not the righteous, those on the inside. Talbert notes that contrary to Greco-Roman convention, the Lukan Jesus looked for his followers not among the worthy of society, but rather among the social outcasts, the "sick" and "sinners."[292] The fact that this phrase is often quoted today is a testament to its power to infiltrate and remain in the minds of those who hear it.

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *comparison* as the figure which carries over an element of likeness from one thing to a different thing. This is used to "embellish or prove or clarify or vivify." For example, "Neither can an untrained horse, however well

---

[291] Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX,* (AB 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 592. Fitzmyer notes the importance of the "sick" referring to a broader category of "outcasts and a despised element of contemporary Palestinian society."

[292] Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel,* (New York: Crossroad, 1982), 63-64.

built by nature, be fit for the services desired of a horse, nor can an uncultivated man, however well endowed by nature, attain to virtue."[293]

> Luke 15:7 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὕτως χαρὰ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἔσται ἐπὶ ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ μετανοοῦντι ἢ ἐπὶ ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις οἵτινες οὐ χρείαν ἔχουσιν μετανοίας.

The comparative particle in this verse is ἤ. This one letter declares that there is *more* joy in heaven for the one repentant sinner than for the ninety-nine "righteous" that need no repentance. The prime comparison here is between the sinner, those on the outside of the boundary systems, and the righteous, those on the inside. In the world of the Pharisees, righteousness was a sign of status. Schweizer notes that the Lukan Jesus' interpretation of the parable "runs counter to rabbinic perception, which gives higher status to those who remained righteous."[294] Culpepper notes the antithetical nature of this saying and the parable in general. He argues that it is a reversal of the position of the scribes and Pharisees on the one hand and the outcasts on the other. Only the outcasts cause God to rejoice.[295] By seeking the outcast, the Lukan Jesus demonstrates his contempt for and indictment of the religious boundary systems. He would leave those who were "already pure" to seek those in need of God's mercy. This saying, paired with the image of the shepherd in the preceding parable resonates in the minds of the audience and causes them to take heed to this powerful figure.

---

[293] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.45.59-4.48.61 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Theon on *syncrisis*, Michel Patillon, *Aelius Theon Progymnasmata,* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997), § 112-115, pp. 78-82.

[294] Schweizer, *Luke*, 244-245.

[295] Culpepper, *Luke,* 296.

The Agrarian Stratification System

As the Lukan Jesus uses figures of speech to undermine the religious boundary systems, so he uses forceful figures to subvert the agrarian social stratification system in which the various classes were well established, the gap between the rich and the poor was vast, and economic oppression by the "haves" of society against the "have nots" was common.[296] The lower classes were often dispossessed of their land and ultimately driven to serfdom as a means paying exorbitant taxes and sustenance.[297] Because the Lukan Jesus had defeated the cosmic powers of evil that had held sway and wrought oppression in the world, he confidently preaches the kingdom of God in which prisoners would be set free, the poor would be blessed and the rich would be cursed, and revelation would come to babes, not to the wise and understanding.

Examples of Role Reversing Figures in the Agrarian Social Stratification System

There are several figures of speech that the Lukan Jesus uses to advocate role reversals in the agrarian stratification system. These figures use language in an artful and powerful manner to display this message to his audience. The most common is

---

[296] For an explanation of the agrarian social stratification system, see Gerhard E. Lenski, *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification*, (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966).

[297] For an explanation of the exploitation of the peasants in this system see Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech,* 64. Herzog writes, "the goal of the aristocracy was to push exploitation to the limit on order to maximize their yield… urban elites learned how to extract everything but the 'barest minimum needed for subsistence.'" See also Douglas E. Oakman, "Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt," *SBLSP* 24 (1985): 67; Philip F. Esler, ed., *The Early Christian World* (Vol. 1; New York: Routledge, 2000), 13.

antithesis, which is a figure that brings together either contrasting words or contrasting thoughts. The effect is an artful combination of words to display a contrast.

> Luke 4:18 πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμὲ οὗ εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,

In the first statement of his public ministry the Lukan Jesus uses the figure *antithesis* to demonstrate his role-reversing message by claiming that his ministry will invert the agrarian social stratification system. The Lukan Jesus has taken this quote from Isaiah. He has actually joined passages from Isaiah 61 and 58. By using scripture, Jesus employs the figure *exemplum,*[298] the citation of an authority. This in turn bolsters the authority of his role-reversing message. The passage contains three *antitheses*. The Lukan Jesus has been sent to proclaim freedom for the prisoners, sight for the blind, and to set the oppressed free. All three *antitheses* are striking opposites. Prisoners, blind, and oppressed comprise the lowest classes in the agrarian social world. As many commentators have noted, this verse is tied to the Jewish year of Jubilee.[299] Through these words, the inaugural statement of the Lukan Jesus' ministry, he proclaims an overturning of the agrarian social stratification system of his day. Jesus was there to

---

[298] This passage is an example of *exemplum,* in which Jesus quotes a known author. Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her,* 4.49.62 (Caplan, LCL). *Exemplum* is the citing of something done or said in the past, along with the definite naming of the doer or author.

[299] Paul Hertig. "The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes." *Missiology: An International Review* 26 (1998): 173. Hertig writes, "Luke portrays a reversal between the oppressed and the oppressors. Jesus initiated the reversal motif when he announced a new jubilary age in the Nazareth synagogue." Cf. R. Alan Culpepper, *Luke,* 106. Culpepper, while not denying the Jubilee nature of the Isaiah 61 passage, claims that Jesus was here not only proclaiming a jubilee year, but the arrival of the kingdom of God. Cf. James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in *Luke and Scripture*, (eds. Craig A. Evans, and James A. Sanders, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 64; Ringe, *Luke*, 69.

bring a reversal of situation, turning the social systems upside down. By using the three

compact *antitheses,* the Lukan Jesus forcefully and memorably proclaims this radical

message.

Many of Luke's *antitheses* take the form of a second figure, *maxim.* The

Rhetorica ad Herennium defines *maxim* as a saying drawn from life which shows

concisely either what happens or ought to happen in life. For example, "Every beginning

is difficult." And "A free man is that man to be judged who is a slave to no base habit."[300]

Maxims are very memorable, and thus many of Jesus' *maxims* are among the most

recognizable and powerful of his sayings.

> Luke 8:18: ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται αὐτῷ· καὶ ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, καὶ ὃ δοκεῖ ἔχειν ἀρθήσεται ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ.
> Luke 19:26 λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι παντὶ τῷ ἔχοντι δοθήσεται, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος καὶ ὃ ἔχει ἀρθήσεται.

These two *antitheses*, also in the form of *maxims,* ornament the role-reversing nature of

the Lukan Jesus' message of the kingdom of God. Luke uses this masterful *maxim* and

antithesis twice and in two separate contexts. The first context is more difficult to

interpret as the phrase is one among a series of sayings.

The second context is more straightforward as the saying serves as a conclusion to

a lengthy parable. The parable is often called the Parable of the Pounds, often tying it

directly in the mind of interpreters to Matthew's Parable of the Talents. As I have

demonstrated in chapter two, Luke's parable is not about the servants, nor about the

pounds (cf. Matthew's Parable of the Talents), but rather, an ancient audience would

identify the main character in the parable as the nobleman. Because of the influence of

---

[300] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.27.24 (Caplan, LCL).

Matthew's parable, the predominant interpretation of 19:26, and of the parable, holds that

the noble man is God. The first two servants who made money were praised and the third

was condemned for merely sitting on the noble man's money. The moral of the story is

commonly thought to be, "work hard with what you have, gain a profit, and God will

bless you."[301] R. Alan Culpepper argues against this standard interpretation, claiming

that the figure of speech reinforces what actually happens in the agrarian society, as the

rich get richer and the poor have what little they have taken from them.[302] According to

Culpepper, Luke's parable is not about God the father, or Jesus, rather it is about a

wicked king. Therefore, this phrase should not be seen as exemplary of the kingdom of

God, but rather as an ironic statement.[303] Thus, contrary to many standard interpretations

of the so-called Parable of the Pounds, the Lukan Jesus actually uses this story as a

powerful indictment of the injustice of the current agrarian stratification system. The

figure of speech, because of its clever wording and artful construction has become one of

the Lukan Jesus' most memorable phrases.

> Luke 10:21 Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο [ἐν] τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν·
> ἐξομολογοῦμαί σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ
> σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία
> ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν σου.

The *antithesis* here contrasts two groups of people, the wise and intelligent against

infants. The carefully crafted nature of this *antithesis* can be seen in Luke's choice of

---

[301] See John Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* (WBC 35c; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 916-918. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1232-1233.

[302] Culpepper, *Luke,* 181. Cf. Vinson, *Luke,* 598-599. Vinson argues that this story is a "dystopian" "worst-case scenario" about the greed of the rich.

[303] Culpepper, *Luke,* 363-364.

Greek words. Fitzmyer notes that the use of the verb ἀποκαλύπτω for revelation from

God is not the normal Greek word used for revelation from the gods to humans. Instead,

the Greeks usually used ἐπιδείκνυμι, ὑποδείκνυμι, or σημαίνω.[304] Choosing to use

ἀποκαλύπτω instead of a more common word makes sense here if Luke was conscious of

the rhetorical figure of speech. Ἀποκαλύπτω creates a nice verbal contrast with

ἀποκρύπτω as both begin with the *apok* sound and both end with the *uptō* sound. This

wordplay heightens the intensity of the figure.[305]

Once again, the Lukan Jesus uses the figure of *antithesis* to display the role-

reversing nature of the kingdom of God. The things of the kingdom do not come to those

whom one might expect, priestly authorities, the scribes, the wise and intelligent (the

"haves" in the agrarian social stratification system). Rather, the kingdom of God is

revealed to the babes, the lowly, and the unlearned.[306] By using this striking *antithesis*,

the Lukan Jesus creates a phrase that is powerful and memorable, one that implants itself

in the minds of his hearers.

> Luke 16:13   Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν· ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἕνα μισήσει
> καὶ τὸν ἕτερον ἀγαπήσει, ἢ ἑνὸς ἀνθέξεται καὶ τοῦ ἑτέρου καταφρονήσει. οὐ
> δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ.

These sharp *antitheses* demonstrate that the pursuit of money (as of status, honor, and

upward mobility in the agrarian society) is contrary to the worship of God and the

kingdom of God. In a society in which wealth was concentrated among a small number

---

[304] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 873.

[305] Schweizer, *Luke,* 182. Schweizer notes the wordplay of hiding and revealing is more evident in Luke's version than in Matthew 11:25.

[306] See Johnson, *Luke,* 170.

of elites, and was often used for oppression, service to money is explicitly contrary to God's role-reversing kingdom. Therefore, one cannot serve God and Mammon. This statement should not be over-spiritualized. The Lukan Jesus does not condemn the service of mammon only from the standpoint that wealth can become a distraction, an idol, or a substitute for God,[307] but also, in the context of the agrarian society in which wealth was often a means of oppression, wealth was in opposition to the Lukan Jesus' message of role-reversal. Ringe notes that "Although a person may *use* wealth on behalf of God's justice, as the parable [of the unjust steward] portrays, one cannot be committed to justice and to the pursuit of wealth at the same time."[308] These three phrases, which have remained powerful for nearly two thousand years, would arrest the attention of the audience and cause them to feel the force of the Lukan Jesus' message.

Another set of figures that Luke uses to make Jesus' message of role reversal powerful and memorable is that of *anaphora, antistrophe, and symploce.* All three of these figures involve the repetition of certain words, either at the beginning of clauses, ending of clauses, or both. Ps-Cicero gives the following definitions of the three figures: *anaphora* is the figure in which the same words begin successive phrases. For example, "Scipio razed Numantia, Scipio destroyed Carthage, Scipio brought peace, Scipio saved

---

[307] For a more standard view on wealth see Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1107. He writes "If one allows oneself to get involved in the servile pursuit of wealth and reduces oneself to a slave of it, then one cannot really serve God." Cf. Johnson, *Luke,* 246-248. Johnson notes the importance of the word Mammon, which should be capitalized because it represents an idol in direct competition with God.

[308] Ringe, *Luke,* 214.

the state."[309] *Antistrophe* is the repetition of the same word as the last word in successive

phrases. Finally, *symploce* is the combined use of *anaphora* and *antistrophe*: repeating

both the first and the last words in successive clauses. For example, "One whom the

Senate has condemned, one whom the Roman people has condemned, one whom

universal public opinion has condemned."[310]

> Luke 6:20 Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί,
> ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
> Luke 6:21 Μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν,
> ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε.
> Μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν,
> ὅτι γελάσετε.
> Luke 6:22 Μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσινὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι...

All four blessings begin with the same word, μακάριοί. The results of the

blessings all begin with the word ὅτι. Both effect the figure of *anaphora,* the repetition of

the same word beginning successive clauses. The second and third blessings, ending as

they do with νῦν,[311] combine the use of *anaphora* and *antistrophe,* thus creating two

examples of *symploce.*

---

[309] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian*, Inst.* 9.3.30.
Quintilian does not name this figure, he only refers to the definition, but he is clearly
referring to *anaphora.* Likewise, Quintilian does not name the following two figures of
antistrophe or *symploce.*

[310] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.14.20 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian*, Inst.* 9.3.31.

[311] See Schweizer, *Luke,* 120. Schweizer notes the present nature of these
beatitudes. By Luke's addition of "now" to the blessings, He demonstrates that the results
of these blessings are to happen in the present. The addition of this "now" not only makes
these blessings present, but also creates the more complex figure of *symploce,* further
drawing the audience into the present nature of these blessings.

Unlike Matthew, Luke has balanced his four blessings with parallel[312] woes as follows:

Luke 6:24   Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις,
                 ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.
Luke 6:25   οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν,
                 ὅτι πεινάσετε.
                 οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν,
                 ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.
Luke 6:26   οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι...

Like Luke's blessings, all four woes begin with the word οὐαὶ, and the interspersed clauses begin with the word ὅτι (*anaphora*). The second and third woes both end with νῦν, thus combining *anaphora* and *antistrophe* to create the figure *symploce*.[313] The blessings and woes overturn the predominant societal values and replace them with their exact opposite. The entire construction of this passage, matching blessings with woes conveys the absolutely antithetical nature of the current social order against the kingdom of God. The blessings and the woes of Luke also employ the figure *hyperbole*. This proclamation hardly means that every poor person is inherently righteous and every rich person is automatically wicked. The use of *hyperbole*, by exaggerating the point, draws attention to the role reversals that the Lukan Jesus is procaiming.

---

[312] See John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20,* (WBC 35a; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 279. Nolland notes that the whole section on beatitudes and woes are parallel.

[313] Robert Morgenthaler, *Lukas und Quintilian,* (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag Zürich, 1993), 268. Morgenthaler notes the use of *anaphora*, *antistrophe*, and *symploce* in this passage with Μακάριοιοί, ὅτι, Μακάριοι νῦν, ὅτι, Μακάριοι νῦν, ὅτι, Μακάριοί, in the blessings, and likewise with οὐαὶ, ὅτι, οὐαὶ νῦν, ὅτι, οὐαί νῦν, ὅτι, οὐαὶ in the woes. Morgenthaler notes the geometric pattern in this passage and writes that it leaves an "unmistakable impression."

Many commentators note the role-reversing nature of Luke's blessings and woes.[314] As Hertig notes, "Jesus restructured the traditional value systems according to God's mercy, which for first century Jews turned their world upside down and their worldview inside out."[315] One can see the blessings and woes of the Lukan Jesus as the fulfillment of his mission proclamation in chapter four.

As demonstrated in chapter 2, the Lukan blessings and woes are more rhetorically complex than the beatitudes of Matthew. What is most striking in this passage is the rhetorical force and complexity with which the Lukan Jesus proclaims his message of reversal of fortunes as the agrarian stratification system is turned upside down. These figures demonstrate the force and beauty of the Lukan Jesus' speech and make this message powerful and memorable for the audience. Both visually on the page, and aurally as heard spoken aloud, the blessings and woes cry for attention.

Another figure which the Lukan Jesus uses to convey his role-reversing message is that of *comparison.* The Lukan Jesus also uses the figures of *antithesis* and *hyperbole* in his *comparisons.* The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *hyperbole* as exaggerating the truth for the sake of magnifying or minimizing something. For example, "But if we maintain concord in the state, we shall measure the empire's vastness by the rising and the setting of the sun." And "his body was as white as snow, his face burned like fire."[316]

---

[314] See Tannehill, *Narrative Unity,* 109; Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 632; Schweizer, *Luke,* 120; Culpepper, *Luke,* 143.

[315] Hertig, "Jubilee Mission," 174.

[316] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.33.44 (Caplan, LCL).

Hyperbole, by the very nature of the exaggeration draws the attention of the hearer,

inviting one to ponder the statement.

> Luke 18:25 εὐκοπώτερον γάρ ἐστιν κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης εἰσελθεῖν ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσελθεῖν.

This verse follows the story of the rich man, who, when asked to sell his possessions and

give the proceeds to the poor, became sad because of his great riches. This man

represents the social elites in the agrarian society who were often guilty of exploiting and

oppressing the poor. The Lukan Jesus concludes his exchange with this rich man with a

powerfully worded *comparison* and *hyperbole.* The *comparison* and *hyperbole* are meant

to shock the audience with extreme images. Richard Vinson, in a paraphrase writes,

"your stuff makes it hard for you to enter God's kingdom, and your wealth makes it

impossible."[317]

Many commentators have dealt with the attempts to soften this saying by

reference to a small city gate or by Origen's linguistic argument that the word should, by

the shift of one letter, read a ship's cable rather than camel. Though popular for a time,

these options have been largely dismissed and the original force of the hyperbole

remains.[318]

---

[317] Vinson, *Luke,* 578.

[318] Fitzmyer rejects the interpretations which would soften the literal meaning of this saying. He notes that the explanation of the eye of the needle being a small entrance to a city is unfounded, nor is the linguistic explanation in which camel means a ship's cable based on strong evidence. For Fitzmyer, this is a literal saying in which "the largest of Palestinian animals is compared with the tiniest of commonly known openings." Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1204. Culpepper agrees that the small entrance to the city has no evidence, and that the change of the letter from the Greek κάμηλος (camel) to κάμιλος (rope or cable) does little to change the hyperbole. Cf. John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34,* (WBC 35b; Dallas: Word Books, 1993), 890. Nolland notes the abandoned attempt to

This verse, like the verse on serving two masters, reverses the roles in the agrarian social world. The rich and lofty in the present Roman Empire cannot gain entrance into the present kingdom of God; not because they have wealth, but because that wealth is often used to oppress the poor. Thus, Jesus attacks the social stratification system, bringing down society's elites while exalting the poor. By using the striking figure of *hyperbole,* the Lukan Jesus proclaims his role-reversing message in a powerful way with a phrase that has continued to be quoted and discussed for nearly two thousand years.

Another figure which the Lukan Jesus uses to highlight his role-reversing message is that of *epanalepsis.* Quintilian defines *epanalepsis* as the figure in which one repeats the same word twice in a row, (or on both ends of a parenthesis).[319]

> Luke 20:25 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τοίνυν ἀπόδοτε τὰ Καίσαρος Καίσαρι καὶ τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ.

This is a clever use of *epanalepsis* as the Lukan Jesus repeats both Caesar and God but in different cases.[320] This allows the Lukan Jesus to draw attention to both Caesar and God in this verse by keeping the words together. This figure does not carry over in translation as one must include words in English conveyed by the different cases in Greek.

Fitzmyer notes three historical interpretations of this saying. (1) The two kingdoms tradition in which the kingdom of God has been initiated, but does not usurp the power of the present earthly kingdoms. Thus, each kingdom rightfully demands

---

reduce the "eye of the needle" to a term used for a small city gate. He also comments on the transposition of letters from κάμηλος (camel) to κάμιλος (rope or cable) but notes the unnecessary change based on the "weakly attested" reading;

[319] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.28-29 (Butler, LCL).

[320] By varying the cases in this verse, the Lukan Jesus has also employed the figure of *polyptoton.* See Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32.

submission. (2) The ironic interpretation in which Jesus' words about rendering to Caesar are ironic because he really has no care for the things rendered to Caesar. (3) The anti-Zealot interpretation in which Jesus attempts to avoid open rebellion against the Roman Empire by refusing to pay taxes.

A good interpretation of the saying is, "Give to Caesar things which bear his image, but give to God the things which bear his image, namely the lives of humans." The statement is radical in that the Lukan Jesus claims the whole person for God, not just taxes.[321]

Because of this radical statement, claiming the whole person for God, the two kingdoms view must be rejected. Paul Hertig rejects the two kingdoms interpretation as he interprets the saying as a limitation of Caesar's power. This limitation overturns the cultural expectations in the Roman Empire that Caesar was all-powerful, in fact, that Caesar was God.[322] Culpepper agrees that this saying does not create a realm where God does not have authority, i.e., the realm of Caesar. Rather, it reserves "for God a level of

---

[321] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1292-1293.

[322] Paul Hertig. "The Subversive Kingship of Jesus and Christian Social Witness." *Missiology: An International Review* 32 (2004): 475-490. See also Charles Homer Giblin, "'The Things of God' in the Question Concerning the Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20:25; Mk 12:17; Mt 22:21)," *CBQ* 33 (1971): 525. Giblin argues that the most important words of this saying are "the things of God." Because these "things" are not enumerated, Giblin argues that one should carry over the terms "image" and "inscription" used of the things of Caesar over to the things of God. In that case, it is the very person who is the "thing of God." Giblin writes, "For the interpretation of 'the things of God' as men who are to offer themselves to the Lord or who are to repay him with their service, inasmuch as they bear his image and are inscribed with his name." Unfortunately, Giblin refers to the service toward God as a one's "interior dispositions in relation to God." By referring to "interior dispositions" Giblin has weakened the force of Luke's argument that to do justice is not an "interior disposition" but rather role reversing action for justice here and now.

fidelity that supersedes any other obligation."[323] Contrary to the two kingdoms

interpretation, the saying of the Lukan Jesus limits the authority of Caesar and thus

reverses roles as it is now God who has supreme authority.

The ironic view is partly correct in that Jesus has little concern for the question of

giving a denarius to Caesar. But, the ironic interpretation does not go far enough in

demonstrating the Lukan Jesus' ultimate concern that everything belongs to God.

Likewise, the anti-Zealot interpretation is only partly correct. While the Lukan

Jesus clearly dodges *de jure* the question about paying taxes to Caesar, and thus escapes a

charge of treason, he is actually subverting the emperor's authority to a greater degree

than if he had merely refused to pay taxes. Because of this clever use of *epanalepsis,* this

saying has remained powerful to the present day.

The Patron-Client System

Just as the Lukan Jesus used figures of speech to highlight Jesus' role reversing

message with regard to the religious boundary systems and the agrarian social

stratification system, so he uses figures to subvert the patron-client system[324] of the

Roman Empire. The patron-client system was the primary social organization system in

---

[323] Culpepper, *Luke,* 386.

[324] For an explanation of the patron-client system, see Bruce J. Malina, *The Social Gospel of Jesus: The Kingdom of God in Mediterranean Perspective,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 31. Malina writes, "First, the patron-client tie develops between two parties unequal in status, wealth and influence. Second, the formation and maintenance of the relationship depends on reciprocity in the exchange of goods and services. Such mutual exchanges involve noncomparable goods and services, however. In a typical transaction, the low status person (client) will receive material goods and services intended to reduce or ameliorate his environmental threats, while the high status person (patron) receives less tangible rewards, such as esteem, deference, or loyalty."

the Roman Empire, codifying relationships between those of different social status. In

any relationship between non-equals, the patron of higher status would provide

protection, money, or goods to the client of a lower status. In return, the client would

serve the patron, either through loyalty, service, honor, or some other means of payment.

This system served to order the social web and keep the lower classes in their place. The

cosmic victory of the Lukan Jesus and the inbreaking of the kingdom of God enabled the

breaking down of these rigid social boundaries. It is against these boundaries that the

Lukan Jesus argued, urging his listeners not to give banquets for those who could repay,

nor to "love those who love you," but rather to "love your enemies" and give banquets

for those who cannot repay.

Examples of Role-Reversing Figures in the Patron-Client System

> Luke 16:8 καὶ ἐπήνεσεν ὁ κύριος τὸν οἰκονόμον τῆς ἀδικίας ὅτι φρονίμως ἐποίησεν· ὅτι οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου φρονιμώτεροι ὑπὲρ τοὺς υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς εἰς τὴν γενεὰν τὴν ἑαυτῶν εἰσιν.

Here the *comparison* comes from the comparative form of the adjective φρονιμώτεροι.

The children of this age are wiser than the children of light. This saying bears many

difficulties. It comes at the end of one of the most puzzling and debated parables in the

gospels (The Parable of the Unjust Steward 16:1-8). There are many questions that need

answering. First, who are the subjects of this comparison? Who are children of light,

and who are the children of this age?

One interpretation of this verse is as follows: according to Fitzmyer, children of

this age refers to those "whose outlook is totally conditioned by this world/age and have

158

no care for the godly aspects of human existence."[325] By contrast, the children of light

"is a designation of Christian disciples."[326] If Fitzmyer's interpretation is correct the

material makes little sense. Why would Luke praise the children of this age over the

children of light?

On the other hand, Ryan S. Shellenberg, C. S. Abraham Cheong, and Hady

Mahfouz all argue that the "children of light" are not to be understood as Christians, or

disciples, but rather as the Pharisees.[327] If one should read "children of light" as

Pharisees, the verse begins to make more sense. The praise of the unjust steward, a

"child of this age" compared to the Pharisees, who certainly do not receive praise from

Luke, is in line with the Lukan Jesus' teaching thus far in the gospel.

A second large question which arises is what is the identity of the master ($\kappa\acute{u}\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma$)

who praises the unjust steward in v. 8a? Is it the master in the parable or is it Jesus? If

one argues that the $\kappa\acute{u}\rho\iota\sigma\varsigma$ of v. 8a is the master in the parable, then one has to deal with

the apparent inconsistency of a master praising a steward who just defrauded him. B. B.

Scott takes this position and argues that the master is praising the steward for his

---

[325] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1108.

[326] Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1108. Cf. Schweizer, *Luke,* 255.

[327] Ryan S. Schellenberg, "Which Master? Whose Steward? Metalipsis and Lordship in the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Lk. 16.1-13)," *JSNT* 10 (2008): 280; He argues that the "children of light" represents the self-perception of the Pharisees. For other interpreters who read "children of light" as Pharisees, see C. S. Abraham Cheong, *A Dialogic Reading of The Steward Parable (Luke 16:1-9),* (New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 109; Hady Mahfouz, "Une relecture de Lc 16, 8b," *Theological Review* 25 (1004): 55.

shrewdness.[328] Dennis Landry and Ben May also argue for the κύριος as the master in the parable. They argue from the social custom of honor-shame to demonstrate that the steward's actions actually restore the honor of the master by making him look like a generous benefactor.[329] Contra this opinion, Schellenberg notes the inconsistency of a Lukan audience expecting benevolence from the rich under any circumstances.[330]

If on the other hand, one argues for Jesus as the κύριος of v. 8a, then the discontinuity disappears. Jeremias reads the κύριος of v. 8a as Jesus for two reasons. First, reading κύριος as the master in the parable is "nonsensical" in the narrative. Second, κύριος in Luke usually refers to Jesus.[331] Schellenberg argues for a slightly more nuanced view. He argues that the use of κύριος in v. 8a is a use of the literary device called "metalipsis" (not to be confused with the ancient rhetorical figure of speech by the same name). In Schellenberg's usage, metalipsis is the transgression of boundaries between narrative levels. In this case, the transgression of boundaries comes between the

---

[328] Bernard Brandon Scott, *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989), 264. Scott argues that the reading of the κύριος as the master of the steward creates an oxymoronic character to the parable in which the audience expects the master to be angry. To make sense of this reading, Scott argues that what the master is praising is not the fraud of the steward but his shrewdness.

[329] David Landry and Ben May, "Honor Restored: New Light on the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Luke 16:1-8a)," *JBL* 119 (2000): 287-309. Cf. Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary*, 375.

[330] Schellenberg, "Which Master?" 266. Schellenberg argues that in Luke, the rich (πλούσιος) "are precisely those who distance themselves from the broader community, treating the valuation of their social inferiors with utter disregard."

[331] Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus,* (Translated by S. H. Hooke; New York: Scribner, 1955), 33.

narrative of the gospel (Jesus telling the story) and the narrative of the parable itself. In

that regard, the κύριος of v. 8a refers to both the master and Jesus. The first referent

causes a disconnect, and spurs the reader on to view the κύριος as Jesus.[332]

If one reads the κύριος of v. 8a as Jesus, one regards the praise of the steward as

praise for remedying an unjust situation.[333] This interpretation ties the patron-client

system to the agrarian social stratification system in which the upper classes often used

wealth to oppress the poor. Ringe argues that the praise for the steward comes from his

action in relieving the debt of the poor and thus enacting the justice of the kingdom of

God.[334] Trudinger shrinks from calling the steward the hero because of the ultimately

ineffectual nature of his debt reduction. He does, however, claim that this parable is an

indictment of the agrarian system.[335]

If one understands this parable with the κύριος of v. 8a as Jesus, and with the

"children of the light" as the Pharisees, many of the apparent difficulties disappear.

Further, against the background of common oppression of the lower classes, the parable

becomes a powerful indictment of the patron-client system. In that context, the praise of

---

[332] Shellenberg, "Which Master?" 272.

[333] See Daniel Lys, "Les Richesses Injustes: Luc 16:1-13," *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 76 (2001): 398. Daniel Lys argues that one must manage the unjust wealth in this world by a redistribution of that wealth.

[334] Ringe, *Luke,* 213-214; "by reducing the amount owed by the (obviously poorer) debtors to the rich man, the manager is doing justice—a way of doing his job as a "manager of injustice" that no longer aims at perpetuating and even adding to old inequities, but instead reflects the new "economy" of which Jesus is the herald."

[335] Paul Trudinger, "Ire or Irony? The Enigmatical Character of the Parable of the Dishonest Steward (Luke 16:1-13)," *The Downside Review* 116 (1998): 99.

the servant for his subversive deed makes sense on the lips of Jesus.[336] He used the little

power that he did have to remedy an unjust situation. In so doing, he offended his patron,

rejected his obligation to honor his patron, and reversed the roles of that system as he was

now serving the poor.

> Luke 6:32 καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.
> Luke 6:33 καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.
> Luke 6:34 καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ᾽ ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις [ἐστίν]; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα.

In these verses the Lukan Jesus uses the figures *antistrophe* and *rhetorical question.*

Each verse ends with the question: "What good is it for you?" The threefold repetition of

this question communicates the force and power of the Lukan Jesus' message of role

reversal in the patron-client system. The patron-client system depended on some level of

reciprocity, either of goods (economics), or of services (social status). The Lukan Jesus

rejects this system, subverting the goal of fulfilling patron-client obligations. Ringe notes

that the good news of the kingdom meant that "the patronage system in general is

replaced by a social structure founded on generosity, respect, and equal treatment for

all."[337] Nolland, while not specifically referring to the patron-client system, notes the

---

[336] See Silvia Pellegrini, "Ein 'ungetreuer' οἰκονόμος (Lk 16,1-9)," *Bibische Zeitschrift* 48 (2004): 174. Seeing the "unjust steward" as a hero makes sense if one takes the designation to be not "unjust steward" but rather "steward of injustice" as argued by Pellegrini. In that case, it is not his actions in the parable that make him unjust, but rather the fact that he is a steward who is serving an unjust master, namely one that is exploiting the poor.

[337] Ringe, *Luke,* 95.

Lukan Jesus' criticism of this "self-serving ethic."[338] For the Lukan Jesus, the patron-client system perpetuated the status quo and thus kept the unjust social web in place. In this verse, the Lukan Jesus condemns the patron-client system for that very reason. Instead, he advocates a system based not on reciprocity, but on freely given generosity. The Lukan Jesus subverts this system with a threefold repetition of a *rhetorical question*. The thrice-repeated question resonates with the audience and implants this powerful message in the minds of his hearers.

> Luke 16:25 εἶπεν δὲ Ἀβραάμ· τέκνον, μνήσθητι ὅτι ἀπέλαβες τὰ ἀγαθά σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακά· νῦν δὲ ὧδε παρακαλεῖται, σὺ δὲ ὀδυνᾶσαι.

There are two *comparisons* here. Lazarus and the rich man are compared both in the earthly life and the afterlife. In the earthly life the rich man received "good things" while Lazarus received "bad things." Now, in the afterlife, Lazarus lies in the bosom of Abraham while the rich man suffers pain. By making this twofold *comparison*, the Lukan Jesus is also using the figure of *antithesis*. There is an antithetical nature to the roles in the earthly life and the afterlife. The Lukan Jesus highlights the tremendous reversal of fortunes from one life to the next.

Bultmann refers to the first theme of this parable as "the balancing of earthly destinies in the world to come."[339] The term balancing, however, makes it seem as if this reversal is merely a karmic evening things out. To counter this possible misunderstanding, Tannehill writes, "The charge against the rich man, however, is not simply that he received good things in life and so must take evil things now to balance

---

[338] Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20,* 298-299.

[339] Rudolf Karl Bultmann, *The History of the Synoptic Tradition,* (trans. John Marsh; New York: Harper & Row, 1963), 178.

things out. The way in which the story is told strongly suggests that the rich man

deserves torment because he did not share his wealth with the poor man who was in

need."[340] The reversal here is an active pursuit of justice. Other commentators prefer the

term reversal as God actively turns present circumstances upside down.[341]

William Herzog notes that while this parable narrates role reversals in the

afterlife, it also challenges roles in the present. In a world in which present status, good

or bad, was seen as a sign of divine blessing or judgment, the parable turns those views

upside down. No longer can present circumstances be seen as a reliable judge in

determining one's status before God.[342]

David Gowler notes that the parable proclaims a condemnation of the Roman

patron-client system. Lazarus would have been useless in such a system, as he had no

means of providing reciprocity. In the kingdom of God, however, reciprocity is marked

by a free giving from God toward humans.[343] Thus, through the telling of this parable,

---

[340] Tannehill, *Narrative Unity,* 131.

[341] See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1126; Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 830; Johnson, *Luke,* 255; Culpepper, *Luke,* 317-318; David B. Gowler, "'At His Gate Lay a Poor Man': A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31," *PRS* 32 (2005): 255. Johnson, Culpepper, and Gowler all note that the reversal is in line with the dramatic reversals proclaimed in the blessings and woes of chapter 6.

[342] Herzog, *Parables as Subversive Speech,* 129.

[343] Gowler, "'At His Gate,'" 261-262. Gowler refers to three kinds of reciprocity: 1) Generalized reciprocity which he refers to as "an open sharing founded on altruism." This is the reciprocity of the kingdom of God. 2) Balanced reciprocity which is an exchange based on common interests. 3) Negative reciprocity which is an exchange of "pure self interest where one party attempts to receive from another without giving anything in return." of these three, number two was the norm for Greco-Roman patron-client relations, with number three a real possibility.

the Lukan Jesus highlights the antithetical nature of values in the kingdom of God and values in the patron-client system.

The Honor-Shame System

Just as the Lukan Jesus uses figures of speech to communicate his role-reversing message in a powerful way with regard to the religious boundary, agrarian social stratification, and patron-client systems, so he uses figures to highlight the way in which the Lukan Jesus reverses roles in the Mediterranean honor-shame system.[344] The honor-shame system also preserved the social status quo by codifying the rules by which one was given honor. These rules often benefitted the social elites while keeping the social outcasts permanently shamed. The cosmic role reversal and the replacing of the rule of Satan with the inbreaking of the kingdom of God upended the honor shame-system allowing the Lukan to proclaim its exact opposite. He told his listeners not to seek the best seats at the banquet, to accept those who could confer no honor, to become like children, and that the greatest of all is the one serving.

Examples of Figures Reversing Roles in the Honor-Shame System

> Luke 7:33 ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μὴ ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε πίνων οἶνον, καὶ λέγετε· δαιμόνιον ἔχει.
> Luke 7:34 ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε· ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.

---

[344] For an explanation of the honor-shame system, see Jerome H. Neyrey, ed. *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models*. (Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson, 2008), 86. Cf. Bruce Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights From Cultural Anthropology,* (Rev. ed. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993), 28-62.

Here is an *antithesis* and *comparison* of Jesus and John the Baptist. The actions of the two are opposite, though their message is the same. The reactions of "this generation" to both Jesus and John are also the same. The Lukan Jesus uses this figure to demonstrate how the kingdom of God radically subverts the honor-shame system. Fitzmyer notes that John's asceticism is in contrast to Palestinian social mores, whereas Jesus' associations are likewise offensive to the Palestinian society.[345] Both Jesus' and John's actions would shame them in their society. Therefore, by highlighting the subversive actions of two "heroes" of the gospel, the Lukan Jesus emphasizes his role as one who undermines the Greco-Roman honor-shame system. He does this through artistic and forceful *antithesis* and *comparison.*

Ps-Cicero defines *chiasmus* as the figure in which two discrepant thoughts are so expressed by transposition that the latter follows from the former although contradictory to it. That is, in two clauses, the words are expressed in reverse order, and the thoughts display contrary ideas.[346] *Chiasmus* is an extremely artful way to express *antithesis.* Ps-Cicero's examples are instructive: "you must eat to live, not live to eat." And "I do not write poems, because I cannot write the sort I wish, and I do not wish to write the sort I can."[347]

---

[345] Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 681.

[346] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.28.39 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Rowe, "Style," 137. I have used Rowe's term *chiasmus* rather than Ps-Cicero's term *commutatio* because of the greater familiarity of modern scholars with the term chiasm.

[347] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.28.39 (Caplan, LCL).

Luke 9:24: ὃς γὰρ ἂν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν· ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ οὗτος σώσει αὐτήν.
Luke 17:33 ὃς ἐὰν ζητήσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ περιποιήσασθαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν, ὃς δ᾽ ἂν ἀπολέσῃ ζῳογονήσει αὐτήν.

In these verses, the Lukan Jesus presents a highly artistic *antithesis* in the form of a *chiasmus*. By reversing the order of the words in the second clause, the saying becomes balanced, rhythmic, forceful, and memorable. The two forms of this *antithesis* cut at the very heart of the ancient honor-shame system. In that system, one sought to improve one's lot in life by enhancing one's honor and status. In a society in which the only means of preserving one's life[348] was to seek honor to cement one's status in the social stratification system of the Roman Empire, the Lukan Jesus' statement subverts the common view. Only by losing one's life (i.e., running to the bottom of the social stratification pyramid), does one save it. This saying is not a simple trick to gaining life (so Culpepper[349] and J. B. Bauer[350]) but is a complete reversal of the honor-shame system in antiquity. The careful construction of this phrase and its repetition two times within the gospel would have cemented this idea in the minds of the audience.

---

[348] Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53* 483. Nolland points out that ψυχή here certainly means "life" and not soul. The threat to this life is of ultimate consequence.

[349] Culpepper, *Luke,* 202. Culpepper notes the context of the command to soldiers that "the first to die will be those who turn and run." Contra Culpepper, Jesus is not here simply reinforcing military wisdom. Rather, he is cutting at the very heart of first century Mediterranean values.

[350] Johannes B. Bauer, "Wer sein Leben retten will," in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, (eds. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mußner; Regensberg: Pustet, 1963), 7-10. Bauer argues from Greco-Roman sources that one should read this saying in the light of an ancient military commander giving sage advice to his troops. A soldier running away to "save his life" would be much more likely to be killed in combat. He notes that this was the reading of Chrysostom.

Luke 9:25 τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος κερδήσας τὸν κόσμον ὅλον ἑαυτὸν δὲ ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς;

The Lukan Jesus uses this *rhetorical question* to undermine the Greco-Roman honor-shame system. Ringe notes that this saying challenges the social values of the day. She writes, "In any context where honor and prestige are primary values, status depends on a person's competing to be known and recognized. To set aside such goals for the sake of Jesus is to negate the competitive and hierarchical social order of the dominant society."[351] One goal in the Greco-Roman honor-shame system was to climb as high as one could on the social pyramid in order to preserve one's life. The Lukan Jesus proclaims the opposite sentiment. To participate in the kingdom of God, one should race to the bottom of the pyramid. Through this *rhetorical question,* the Lukan Jesus invites audience participation and makes this phrase forceful and memorable as it takes root in the mind of the hearer.

Another highly artful figure that the Lukan Jesus uses to undermine the honor-shame system is that of *climax.* Ps-Cicero defines *climax* as the figure in which a speaker passes to the next word only after advancing by steps to the preceding one. For example, "Now what remnant of liberty survives if those men *may* do what they *please*, if they *can* do what they *may*, if they *dare* do what they *can*, if they *do* what they *dare*, and if you

---

[351] Ringe, *Luke,* 138. Cf. Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 107-108; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 788. Fitzmyer notes that the language in this passage is that of financial transactions. κερδήσας deals with financial gain, whereas ζημιωθείς is often used in business transactions to mean forfeit.

approve of what they *do*." And again, "The industry of Africanus brought him excellence, his excellence glory, his glory rivals."[352]

> Luke 9:48 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· ὃς ἐὰν δέξηται τοῦτο τὸ παιδίον ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, ἐμὲ δέχεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ἐμὲ δέξηται, δέχεται τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με· ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ἐν πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχων οὗτος ἐστιν μέγας.

In this verse the Lukan Jesus uses three figures: *climax, antithesis,* and *maxim.* The *climax* comes with the rising series of receiving the child, receiving Jesus, and finally receiving the one who sent Jesus. The *antithesis* in the form of a *maxim* comes at the end of the verse: "For the least among all of you is the greatest." The very words "least" and "greatest" would automatically call up the thought of the Greco-Roman honor-shame system which was ultimately concerned with greatness. Malina and Rohrbaugh argue that this verse cuts at the heart of the honor-shame system. They write, "A squabble over honor status would be typical within any ancient Mediterranean grouping… Jesus' reversal of the expected order challenges the usual assumptions about what is honorable in a very fundamental way."[353] In this context, to be the least is to be like a child.[354] Children were unable to bestow honor, monetary gain, or power to anyone with whom they associated. Thus, for the Lukan Jesus to exalt the children as the greatest

---

[352] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.35.34 (Caplan, LCL).

[353] Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary,* 344. For a similar treatment of this verse with regard to the honor-shame system, see Ringe, *Luke,* 144. Ringe notes that Jesus' response contradicts the social customs of "honor, power and merit."

[354] See Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 518. Nolland points out that Jesus had set up a child in the midst of the disciples in answer to their question as to who is the greatest. "He transgressed the sensibilities of his culture and in particular of his disciples, and left a lasting impression upon them."

undermines the honor-shame value system. The power of this carefully phrased figure

can be seen by its continued use in western civilization.

Luke 13:30 καὶ ἰδοὺ εἰσὶν ἔσχατοι οἳ ἔσονται πρῶτοι καὶ εἰσὶν πρῶτοι οἳ ἔσονται ἔσχατοι.

The Lukan Jesus ends his parable of the homeowner who had shut his doors with this

antithesis in the form of both a *chiasmus* and a *maxim* that is often quoted to this day.

The pithy comment stays with the audience because of its compact and forceful nature

and its enigmatic message. The transformation of polar opposites into their antithesis is

unthinkable. This saying of the Lukan Jesus undermines the honor-shame system by

proclaiming a complete reversal of roles.[355] As Ringe notes, "none of the criteria

according to which they might presume that they hold a place of privileged access to the

blessings of salvation will be of any avail."[356] Those who seek honor shall not find it,

and those who have gained no honor will receive it.

Luke 14:11 ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, καὶ ὁ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.
Luke 18:14 λέγω ὑμῖν, κατέβη οὗτος δεδικαιωμένος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ παρ' ἐκεῖνον· ὅτι πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται.

These two sayings are highly artful constructions in the form of *antithesis* and *chiasmus*.

The antithetical words, lofty and humble, are placed in reverse order in the second clause.

The figures of speech highlight the role-reversing nature of the Lukan Jesus' ministry.[357]

---

[355] See Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1023. Fitzmyer writes, "v. 30 shows that the kingdom brings into human relations a reversal, for it turns upside down all human calculations." Cf. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 736; Culpepper, *Luke,* 278-279.

[356] Ringe, *Luke,* 191.

[357] Mikeal C. Parsons, "Landmarks Along the Way: The Function of the 'L' Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative," *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 40 (1997):

These sayings of dramatic role reversal are found in two different contexts. The first is after a discussion of choosing seats at a banquet. The second is after the parable of the Pharisee and tax collector at prayer. As Luke likes to do (contrary to Matthew and Mark), he repeats this impressive figure of speech in two places in his gospel. In both contexts, Jesus attacks the Greco-Roman honor-shame system.

Johnson notes that the Lukan Jesus' parable could be seen as mere Hellenistic wisdom if not for the role-reversing concluding lesson. He writes:

> In the context of Luke's gospel as a whole, with its consistent theme of divine reversal, they take on a much more powerful significance: all those who exalt themselves will be humbled, and all those who humble themselves will be exalted. It is not the *appropriate way to get* exalted that Jesus addresses, but the frame of mind that seeks exaltation in any fashion. His advice therefore is "parabolic" because it parodies the "good advice" of worldly wisdom only to subvert it by the more radical demand of the kingdom.[358]

Not only does the second use of this saying speak to reversals of the humble and the prideful, it also justifies the hated tax collector, while condemning the "righteous" Pharisee. In this regard, the Lukan Jesus attacks the honor-shame system of the ancient Mediterranean world. This verse is another saying which, because of its artful construction and forceful message, has remained powerful and oft quoted for nearly two thousand years.

> Luke 21:4 πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς ἔβαλον εἰς τὰ δῶρα, αὕτη δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς πάντα τὸν βίον ὃν εἶχεν ἔβαλεν.

---

45. In this article, Parsons looks at the 'L' parables in the Lukan travel narrative and finds that at the core of these parables is parable of the "chief seats" at a banquet, the theme of which is the reversal of fortunes, namely from exaltation to humility.

[358] Johnson, *Luke,* 226-227. Cf. Ringe, *Luke,* 195.

With this well crafted *antithesis* and *comparison*[359] the Lukan Jesus demonstrates that

what is important in the kingdom is not the amount of money given, or the honor

received from others, but the amount of the self that is given. This is a radical change

from the prominent way of thinking in Jesus' time. According to Hertig, the Lukan Jesus

has redefined sacrifice and stewardship. He writes, "Jesus introduces a new way to gauge

an offering. If measured by what is left over after giving, she outgave them all!"[360] At

stake here is not just the amount of money given, but rather, the honor perceived to be

gained by the rich as a result of their large donations.

   Culpepper notes recent attempts to read this story as a lament for the widow rather

than praise, in light of the Lukan Jesus' condemnation of the temple. He nevertheless

continues to read the story as praise of the widow in contrast to the gifts of the rich.[361] If

this is a story of praise for the widow, then it strikes at the honor shame system of the

culture. The rich only wanted the honor which came from giving large sums of money to

the Temple treasury. The widow on the other hand could gain little honor from her

pittance, but gave to God her whole self. The widow therefore becomes the hero by

subverting the Greco-Roman honor-shame system. The striking images in this

---

[359] See Johnson, *Luke,* 316. Johnson notes the linguistic parallelism in this passage that heightens the effect of the *antithesis*. The parallelism is between "out of their abundance" (ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς) and "out of her lack" (ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος αὐτῆς).

[360] Hertig, "The Subversive Kingship," 479.

[361] Culpepper, *Luke,* 396. For those who would view this story as a lament for the widow see A. G. Wright. "The Widow's Mites: Praise or Lament? —A matter of Context." *CBQ* 44 (1982): 256-265; and Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV,* 1321; and Ringe, *Luke,* 250.

comparison and *antithesis* secure the force of the Lukan Jesus' message in the minds of the audience.

Another figure, related to the *rhetorical question,* which the Lukan Jesus uses to highlight his role-reversing message, is that of *hypophora.* According to Ps-Cicero, *hypophora* is the figure in which one asks questions of adversaries, or of oneself, and answers with what ought or ought not to be said, making oneself look good, and the adversary look bad.[362]

> Luke 22:27 τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.

Here the Lukan Jesus uses *hypophora* in an interesting way. In the context of the last supper where Jesus is serving the disciples, the answer to Jesus' first question is obvious (like a *rhetorical question*). Jesus nevertheless answers the question in order to set up the shock of his final statement. The one reclining and being served is (according to the Greco-Roman honor-shame system) greater than the servant. The point, however, is not this question and answer. The Lukan Jesus actually subverts this answer. The point is that he, Jesus, is the one serving. There is an understood *rhetorical question*: am I, the one serving, not greater? Ringe writes:

> By serving or distributing the food to the other guests, Jesus has taken on the work generally carried out by a servant or by a woman of the household. Far from a role marked by prestige or privileged access on the basis of one's attributes of social status (for example one's class, ethnicity, or gender) or one's formal

---

[362] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.24.33-34.

credentials for leadership (such as ordination), Jesus' role at the supper belongs to those who lack status or who relinquish it in order to serve others.[363]

In a system where the most common way to provide for one's safety and security was to increase one's status in society, the Lukan Jesus' teaching, which undermines the honor-shame system, was indeed shocking. With Jesus, the head of Christian religion, as a model servant, Vinson notes that early Christians had a hard time convincing the Romans that they were not a slave religion.[364] The teaching of the Lukan Jesus, however, advocates a subversion of the Greco-Roman honor-shame system.

> Luke 9:58 καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· αἱ ἀλώπεκες φωλεοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατασκηνώσεις, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἔχει ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνῃ.[365]

In this verse, someone has just offered to follow Jesus. The Lukan Jesus responds with this *comparison*. He uses two images of nature to contrast with his situation. Both foxes and birds have homes but Jesus has no home. The Lukan Jesus, through vivid *metaphors* demonstrates the abandoning of honor necessary to follow him in this example of *comparison*. The kingdom of God reverses the traditional roles in that the kingdom is not one of physical comfort; even the inaugurator of the kingdom has no home. On one level of interpretation, the Lukan Jesus is merely saying that to follow him is not a comfortable

---

[363] Ringe, *Luke*, 263. Cf. Vinson, *Luke,* 682-683. Vinson demonstrates in depth the various master/slave, master/servant relations in the Greco-Roman world. Jesus' teaching was indeed subversive to the Greco-Roman system.

[364] Vinson, *Luke,* 683.

[365] See Robert C. Tannehill, *The Sword of his Mouth: Forceful and Imaginative Language in Synoptic Sayings,* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 161-162. Tannehill notes the rhythm of parallelism in this verse. The first two lines are parallel, the third, though not parallel carries the same rhythm.

option.[366] The thrust of this saying then is that life in the kingdom of God is certainly no ordinary life.

On a deeper level, this saying of the Lukan Jesus demonstrates the absolute undermining of the honor-shame system. As Ringe notes, to cut social and familial ties and to even deny oneself a home would have placed one in the lower despised classes of first century Palestine.[367] Wanderers had no claim to wealth or honor. The Lukan Jesus is claiming that to follow him in the kingdom one must sacrifice the cultural value of honor-shame.

To add to this interpretation, the images in this passage are instructive. The Lukan Jesus gives a comparison of the Son of Man with both foxes and birds of heaven. The only other place in Luke's gospel where he uses the term fox is the decidedly negative *metaphor* for Herod (13:32).[368] The birds of heaven are used several times in the Lukan corpus. In Luke 8:5 the birds of heaven are unmistakably negative as they eat the seed sown on the path. In Luke 13:19, the birds of heaven are neutral as they are provided a place to nest by the mustard tree. Of the two related references to the birds of

---

[366] See Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX,* 834. Fitzmyer writes that "he [the Son of Man] lives the life of a homeless wanderer, having no shelter, no home, no family—none of the things that people usually consider requisite for ordinary life." Cf. Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 541. Nolland writes, "the Son of Man is ultimately a misfit in this world where the invasion of the kingdom of God is considered to be an intrusion."

[367] Ringe, *Luke,* 150.

[368] See Mikeal C. Parsons, *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity,* (Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2006), 69-71. Parsons demonstrates that according to the ancient practice of physiognomy, the fox was seen in ancient literature as cunning, deceitful, wily, and of bad character. In general, to compare someone to a fox was to cast an insult upon them.

heaven in Acts, they are among the unclean animals that Peter sees in his vision (Acts 10:12; 11:6).

J. Duncan M. Derrett clarifies the Jewish background of these two nature images. He writes, "*Alōpekes* means 'jackals', animals of the lowest character; corpses are their diet. The 'fowls of the heaven', a biblical cliché, are vultures."[369] Thus, both of the wildlife images in this passage carry negative connotations. This makes the Lukan Jesus' comparison even more powerful. Destructive wildlife, scavengers, and wily foxes have places in the current honor-shame system while the Son of Man has no home. In that regard, through his *comparison*, the Lukan Jesus displays the tremendous injustice and oppression of the Roman social system.[370] The imagery of this passage is striking and an ancient audience would have felt the incongruity in the Roman social system displayed by this comparison.

Mediterranean Kinship Groups

As the Lukan Jesus uses powerful figures of speech to subvert the religious boundary, agrarian social stratification, patron-client, and honor-shame systems of the Roman Empire, so he employs similar figures of speech to undermine Mediterranean

---

[369] J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Two 'Harsh' Sayings of Christ Explained," *The Downside Review* 103 (1985): 223. Cf. Mahlon H. Smith, "No Place for a Son of Man," *Foundations & Facets Forum* 4 (1988): 89. Smith notes that in the Jewish mind jackals were often confused with foxes.

[370] Smith, "No Place," 99. He writes, "Taken as phrased, as an absolute description of the way things are, the contrast of foxes and birds having a place in this world and 'the son of man'—however that idiom may be understood—having none, points to a dislocation and an inherent injustice in the present fabric of things."

kinship groups.[371] In so doing, the Lukan Jesus strikes at the very heart of ancient

Mediterranean values. Kinship groups were the primary social unit in the agrarian

society. A person's identity, and thus honor, status, economic situation, and protection

came from the family. Thus, to reject or attack the kinship system was to undermine the

political and social system of the day. As the basic social unit and network of social

relationships, kinship groups helped to preserve the status quo in which the rich often

oppressed the poor and the social elites exploited the social outcasts. The breaking of the

evil powers with the advent of the kingdom of God prompted the Lukan Jesus to

proclaim liberating role-reversals among Mediterranean kinship groups. Thus he

proclaimed that he came not to bring peace but division, that he would set father against

son and son against father; and that none could be his disciple unless they hated their

father and mother, their wife and their children.

Examples of Role Reversal Figures in Kinship Groups

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* defines *traductio* as the figure in which the author

repeats certain words without offense to style. The same type of figure is employed when

using a word with the same spelling in different ways. For example, "One who has

nothing in life more desirable than life cannot cultivate a virtuous life." And again, "I

---

[371] See Neyrey, ed. *The Social World,* 25. Neyrey writes, "Because no welfare or social-security system was in place, individuals looked to their families to comfort, feed, nurture, and finally, bury them. It was a tragedy to be taken from one's family or to be forced to leave. Ties of affection, identity, and support would be broken by this rupture." Cf., Malina, *New Testament World,* 117-148; K. C. Hanson and Douglas E. Oakman, *Palestine in the time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts,* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998), 19-62.

would leave this place, should the senate grant me leave."[372] This figure may also be

taken together with that of *epanodos*. According to Quintilian *epanodos* is the figure in

which one reiterates the same word while further distinguishing its meaning.[373] In this

figure, the repeated word is further defined by the different meanings of both instances.

> Luke 2:48 καὶ ἰδόντες αὐτὸν ἐξεπλάγησαν, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ·
> τέκνον, τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως; ἰδοὺ ὁ πατήρ σου κἀγὼ ὀδυνώμενοι ἐζητοῦμέν σε.
> Luke 2:49 καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς· τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με; οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ
> πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με

As the first words out of Jesus' mouth in the gospel of Luke, v. 49 subverts the kinship

relationships of first century Mediterranean culture. In these two verses Luke repeats and

redefines the word father through the figures *traductio* and *epanodos*. In v. 48 Mary is

speaking, saying that she and Jesus' father (Joseph) had been searching for him. The

Lukan Jesus responds with a question, "Did you not know that it was necessary for me to

be in my father's house?"[374] The Lukan Jesus is in the temple which is the house of God.

Thus, by repeating the word father, the Lukan Jesus redefines who his father really is.

Roles are reversed. The Lukan Jesus is no longer the child of Joseph, but the child of

God. Schweizer notes this play on the word father. He writes, "The unusual expression

'your father and I' paves the way for Jesus to speak of his other father who is very

---

[372] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.20-21 (Caplan, LCL). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.70-74.

[373] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.35-36 (Butler, LCL).

[374] We have already dealt with the ambiguous phrase "in my father's house" in chapter three. The enigmatic nature of that phrase is unimportant here, as the unambiguous term "father" is the focus of the argument.

different."[375] The Lukan Jesus is distancing himself from his own family in order to serve a new kinship group, the kingdom of God.

According to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium, correctio* is the figure in which one retracts what has been said and replaces it with what seems more suitable. For example, "After the men in question had conquered, or rather had been conquered—for how shall I call that a conquest which has brought more disaster than benefit to the conquerors."[376]

> Luke 12:51 δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ἢ διαμερισμόν
> Luke 12:52 ἔσονται γὰρ ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν πέντε ἐν ἑνὶ οἴκῳ διαμεμερισμένοι, τρεῖς ἐπὶ δυσὶν καὶ δύο ἐπὶ τρισίν,
> Luke 12:53 διαμερισθήσονται πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ *υἱὸς* ἐπὶ *πατρί,* μήτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν θυγατέρα καὶ *θυγάτηρ ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα,* πενθερὰ ἐπὶ τὴν νύμφην αὐτῆς καὶ *νύμφη ἐπὶ τὴν πενθεράν.*

In these verses, the Lukan Jesus seizes the attention of the audience through the use of *correctio,* and then sets up an *antithesis* between peace and division, between people's expectations of him and his actual mission. This verse is part of the double tradition in which Matthew has a similar phrase, but he does not use a question and thus avoids the use of *correctio,* and instead of division, he uses the Greek μάχαιραν (sword). It is paradoxical that the messiah, the prince of peace, should bring division upon the earth.[377]

---

[375] Schweizer, *Luke,* 63. See also Ringe, *Luke,* 48. Ringe also notes the play on the word father. She claims that calling Joseph Jesus' father makes no sense based on the birth narrative unless it was a mistake or was "in order to set up a pun in reference to 'my Father's house.'" Cf. Culpepper, *Luke,* 77. Culpepper also notes the contrast between Mary's use of father and Jesus'.

[376] Ps-Cicero, *Rhet. Her.* 4.26.36 (Caplan, LCL).

[377] See Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53,* 709. Nolland notes that even Luke portrays Jesus as bringing peace, (see 1:79, 2:14, 7:50) and thus this verse is paradoxical. Cf.

The second two verses, with an artful use of the figures *antithesis* and *chiasmus,* explain what sort of division the Lukan Jesus is going to bring. He will bring division among the kinship groups as families will be divided and set against each other.[378] The Lukan Jesus therefore undercuts the foundation for kinship groups which was the foundation for the entire agrarian society. For R. Vinson, this division is merely an unfortunate and unintended, but necessary consequence of Jesus' ministry.[379] Contra Vinson, the Lukan Jesus was attacking the kinship groups, which perpetuated the injustices of the social status quo. In addition to the role-reversing nature of these verses, the figures of speech convey the force and power of the Lukan Jesus' point. As Tannehill notes, "Luke's text comes to a powerful climax through the effective use of short clauses in strong and rapid rhythm. This rhythm is much more strongly developed in Luke than in Matthew. The number of units of the pattern is greatly increased, for each of the relationships mentioned in Matthew is also presented in reverse form."[380] The artful construction of this passage with the sharp *antithesis* and the reversal of order with the figure *chiasmus* served to implant this radical message in the minds of the audience.

Culpepper, *Luke,* 267; Johnson, *Luke,* 208-209. The paradoxical nature of this verse is also apparent to Johnson who notes the dissonance between the infancy narrative's promise of peace and the division predicted here. Nevertheless, Johnson highlights Jesus' role as a prophet that brings division. Jesus is thus a polarizing figure who reverses roles in the community and thus causes people to take sides.

[378] See Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social Science Commentary,* 362. Malina and Rohrbaugh list the devastating consequences of being cut off from one's kinship groups. For example, "Alienation from family or clan could literally be a matter of life and death, especially for the elite, who would risk everything by association with the wrong kind of people.

[379] Vinson, *Luke,* 436.

[380] Tannehill, *Sword,* 146.

Luke 9:60 εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ· ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς θάψαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νεκρούς, σὺ δὲ ἀπελθὼν διάγγελλε τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.

This repetition is an example of *epanodos*. The repeated word is νεκροὺς (the dead). The meaning of the second instance is clear as these dead are to be buried. The first instance is more nuanced. The first group of "dead" must be alive physically if they are to bury the literally dead. Thus this repetition is a clever play on words. Through the Lukan Jesus' play on words, he is assaulting ancient Mediterranean kinship groups. As Derrett notes, "A father's funeral was very much his son's business, a principle axiomatic for Jews and Greeks alike."[381] Derrett argues that the Lukan Jesus has called his disciples to distance themselves from their present kinship groups in order to fully participate in their new kinship group in the kingdom of God.[382] The Lukan Jesus has thus, once again, undermined the kinship groups in agrarian society.

Another figure which the Lukan Jesus uses to undermine the ancient Mediterranean kinship groups is that of *polysyndeton*. Quintilian defines *polysyndeton* as the use of many connecting particles. One may repeat the same conjunctions, or use different ones.[383]

---

[381] Derrett, "Two 'Harsh'," 221.

[382] Derrett, "Two 'Harsh'," 221. Derrett approaches this passage from Jewish ritual purity. For the disciples to stay pure, they must separate themselves from the present chaotic system in which even the act of burying one's own father could compromise that purity. Derrett's view of ritual purity for the disciples is not necessary to understand the remarkable attack on Greco-Roman kinship groups the Jesus here displays.

[383] Quintilian, *Inst.* 9.3.50-54 (Butler, LCL).

Luke 14:26 εἴ τις ἔρχεται πρός με καὶ οὐ μισεῖ τὸν πατέρα ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὰς ἀδελφὰς ἔτι τε καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἑαυτοῦ, οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής.

This verse, with the drawn out use of *polysyndeton,* is perhaps the most poignant and powerful instance of the Lukan Jesus' attacks on the Greco-Roman kinship group. Using the term hate (μισεῖ) with regard to one's kinship group as a requirement for discipleship powerfully subverts ancient Mediterranean values.

Polysyndeton is for the most part unacceptable in modern English. A list of this length, containing seven objects, would probably only receive one conjunction in English. Greek, however, allowed this use of the conjunction καὶ between each object. Instead of reading off a quick list of things to be hated, the Lukan Jesus slows down this process, being very inclusive and allowing each member of the list to give its full weight to his argument. The list crescendos at the end as the Lukan Jesus uses a particle ἔτι and two conjunctions τε καὶ, which serve to further set apart the last member of the list: one's own life.

Ringe makes the powerful point that to leave one's kinship group was to leave all. She writes, "The saying is powerful precisely because one's own life and family relationships *are* a baseline for one's personal security and identity."[384] Thus, the Lukan Jesus is asking his disciples to give up all claims to personal security in the Greco-Roman society.

---

[384] Ringe, *Luke,* 201.

Conclusion

In this chapter I have shown that through the great cosmic role reversal, the cosmic battle in which the power of the devil is destroyed and replaced by the kingdom of God, the Lukan Jesus proclaims and empowers role reversals in the material realm. Further, I have demonstrated how Luke communicates these role reversals through the use of forceful and memorable figures of speech on the lips of Jesus. Through various figures the Lukan Jesus attacks the religious boundary systems, the agrarian social stratification system, the patron-client system, the honor-shame system, and kinship groups, all of which were pillars and values of the Greco-Roman social, political, religious, and economic society. As a means of making these socially subversive statements as powerful and memorable as possible, Luke employed many complex and highly refined figures of speech.

Many of the examples of figures of speech in this chapter are among the most recognized, memorized, and quoted passages from the gospel of Luke. One reason why these verses have remained powerful over time is because of the tremendous craft used to form these phrases. The content of the message is only part of the reason that these verses have endured. As the modern figure of speech states, "it's not just what you say, but how you say it." It is not only the message found in these verses that has endured, but also the form of speech that Luke crafted to carry this message. For many of the examples in this chapter Luke uses multiple figures in close proximity, like the combining of *antithesis, chiasmus,* and *maxim.* By clothing his radical message in powerful rhetorical figures of speech, Luke sought to imprint these phrases on the minds of the audience, causing them to ponder them and, hopefully, be formed by them.

CHAPTER FIVE

Conclusion

This dissertation has attempted to answer two questions: (1) how does the Lukan

Jesus communicate? and (2) what does that mode of communication accomplish? I have

demonstrated that the Lukan Jesus speaks with a great variety of rhetorical figures of

speech. By portraying Jesus as speaking according to classical rhetorical methods with

rhetorical figures of speech, Luke makes the message of the gospel as persuasive as his

rhetorical ability could make it.

In chapter two I discussed how Luke used figures of speech on the lips of Jesus as

a means of fulfilling the stylistic virtues of clarity and ornamentation. The Lukan Jesus

used figures for emphasis, guiding the audience as they listened to pay attention to certain

points in his discourse. By guiding the audience and grabbing their attention at various

points through figures of speech, the Lukan Jesus enhanced the clarity of his message and

insured that the audience was gripped by his speech. Further, the Lukan Jesus used

figures of ornamentation as a means of impressing the audience with his rhetorical

ability. Luke often dressed up the language of Jesus to make his speech powerful and

pleasant to the ear. By fulfilling the stylistic virtues of clarity and ornamentation Luke

used an argument of *ethos,* portraying Jesus as an educated man who spoke like the social

elites with fluid and ornamental rhetoric. This served to gain a hearing for his message

among the educated classes.

In chapter three I discussed how Luke used figures of speech on the lips of Jesus

as a means of argument and persuasion. One tactic of persuasion that Luke used was to

portray Jesus as one victorious in debate. Through cleverly placed and worded figures of speech, the Lukan Jesus was repeatedly able to reduce his hostile adversaries to a state of *aporia* and to defeat them on the field of debate. The gospel audience, experiencing these many victories of the Lukan Jesus was drawn to side with Luke's main character and to join him in his message. Another persuasive tactic that Luke used was to invite audience participation in the gospel narrative and message. Through figures of speech the Lukan Jesus beckoned the audience to answer questions and to solve riddles. By entering into the narrative and message of Jesus, the audience at once had a stake in the gospel as they were partly responsible for shaping and completing the narrative. Luke used both of these tactics of persuasion to move beyond the *ethos* argument discussed in chapter two, to *ethos*, *logos,* and *pathos* arguments for Jesus' character and message. The audience was drawn to side with Jesus and to logically ponder and emotionally experience his arguments and message.

Finally, in chapter four I discussed how Luke used figures of speech to powerfully and memorably communicate his role-reversing message of a new way of living in the kingdom of God. The cosmic role reversal in which the rule of Satan was replaced with the inbreaking kingdom of God enabled the Lukan Jesus to proclaim role reversals in the material realm. Luke, knowing that his role-reversing message was in direct opposition to prevailing social, religious, political, and economic systems of the Roman Empire, chose to convey that message in a manner that was as artful and rhetorically powerful as his rhetorical ability allowed. Through highly ornamented figures such as *antithesis, chiasmus, maxim, climax*, and others, often times with multiple figures overlapping, the Lukan Jesus preached his message of role reversal. Through these artful figures the

Lukan Jesus undermined the religious boundary systems, the agrarian social stratification system, the patron-client system, the honor-shame system, and Mediterranean kinship groups.

While I have divided these three aspects of Luke's use of figures of speech and discussed them in separate chapters, the effect of the rhetoric in Luke's gospel is not divided and sequential in this manner. In chapters two through four, I have highlighted three different aspects of Luke's persuasive rhetoric. I have examined Luke's highly refined rhetorical style in chapter two. In chapter three I looked at certain rhetorical tactics that Luke used to persuade his audience of his message. Finally, in chapter four I demonstrated how Luke used rhetorical figures of speech to inculcate his role-reversing message in the minds of his audience. While treating these three aspects of Luke's rhetorical strategy in separate sections makes sense for the sake of clarity, they all function together in a cumulative way, not in a sequential reading. To understand how these three different uses of figurees of speech work in the gospel, it is necessary to trace these aspects of the Lukan Jesus' speech through a sustained passage. Therefore, in what follows, I look at the Sermon on the Plain to see how all of these aspects of Luke's rhetorical strategy work together.

> Luke 6:20 Καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἔλεγεν·
>> Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί,
>>> ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
> Luke 6:21   μακάριοι οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν,
>>> ὅτι χορτασθήσεσθε.
>> μακάριοι οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν,
>>> ὅτι γελάσετε.
> Luke 6:22   μακάριοί ἐστε ὅταν μισήσωσινὑμᾶς οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ ὅταν ἀφορίσωσιν ὑμᾶς καὶ ὀνειδίσωσιν καὶ ἐκβάλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν ἕνεκα τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου·

Luke 6:23 χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ σκιρτήσατε, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ· κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς προφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.
Luke 6:24   Πλὴν οὐαὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς πλουσίοις,
                    ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.
Luke 6:25   οὐαὶ ὑμῖν, οἱ ἐμπεπλησμένοι νῦν,
                    ὅτι πεινάσετε.
                οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν,
                    ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλαύσετε.
Luke 6:26   οὐαὶ ὅταν ὑμᾶς καλῶς εἴπωσιν πάντες οἱ ἄνθρωποι·κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ γὰρ ἐποίουν τοῖς ψευδοπροφήταις οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν.

As I covered in chapter two, the style of the blessings and woes of the Sermon on the Plain is highly refined and rhetorically packed. The blessings and woes are perfectly balanced, using a repeated pattern of *anaphora, antistrophe,* and *symploce.* The rhythm of the blessings and woes is notable and pleasant to the ear. The repeated words μακάριοι, ὅτι, νῦν, and οὐαί create verbal markers for the audience aiding in listening and paying attention. Luke also uses the ornamental figure *homoteleuton* in v. 22 with the four time repeated verbal ending ωσιν. Thus, the blessings and the woes of Luke demonstrate a high rhetorical style.

In addition to the ornamental styling of this passage, Luke also uses rhetorical tactics to draw the audience in. He uses the figure *apostrophe* in the blessings and woes by turning from a general third person audience, i.e., blessed are the poor (Μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί) to a personal second person address, i.e., for yours is the kingdom of God (ὅτι ὑμετέρα ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ). This figure personalizes the blessings and the woes as the Lukan Jesus addresses his audience in the specific second person and not in the general third person. The figure of *apostrophe* uses an argument of *pathos* and makes the message emotionally powerful for the audience.

187

Finally, this passage, while highly stylistic and rhetorically persuasive, also drives home the role reversing and message of the gospel. This passage, as much as any in the entire gospel, speaks of the role reversals inherent in the kingdom of God. Jesus is indicting the entire Greco-Roman agrarian stratification system. He is turning the world upside down. It is not the haves of the Greco-Roman society who have a place in the kingdom of God, but rather the poor, the hungry, the mournful.

> Luke 6:27 Ἀλλὰ ὑμῖν λέγω τοῖς ἀκούουσιν· ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς,
> Luke 6:28 εὐλογεῖτε τοὺς καταρωμένους ὑμᾶς, προσεύχεσθε περὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς.
> Luke 6:29 τῷ τύπτοντί σε ἐπὶ τὴν σιαγόνα πάρεχε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντός σου τὸ ἱμάτιον καὶ τὸν χιτῶνα μὴ κωλύσῃς.
> Luke 6:30 παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε δίδου, καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴροντος τὰ σὰ μὴ ἀπαίτει.
> Luke 6:31 Καὶ καθὼς θέλετε ἵνα ποιῶσιν ὑμῖν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ποιεῖτε αὐτοῖς ὁμοίως.
> Luke 6:32 καὶ εἰ ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀγαπῶσιν.
> Luke 6:33 καὶ [γὰρ] ἐὰν ἀγαθοποιῆτε τοὺς ἀγαθοποιοῦντας ὑμᾶς, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν; καὶ οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν.
> Luke 6:34 καὶ ἐὰν δανίσητε παρ᾽ ὧν ἐλπίζετε λαβεῖν, ποία ὑμῖν χάρις [ἐστίν]; καὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοῖς δανίζουσιν ἵνα ἀπολάβωσιν τὰ ἴσα.
> Luke 6:35 πλὴν ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν καὶ ἀγαθοποιεῖτε καὶ δανίζετε μηδὲν ἀπελπίζοντες· καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολύς, καὶ ἔσεσθε υἱοὶ ὑψίστου, ὅτι αὐτὸς χρηστός ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀχαρίστους καὶ πονηρούς.

In this passage, Luke highlights the message of Jesus to love one's enemies. Luke fulfills the stylistic virtue of clarity through the figure of speech *traductio*. He repeats the verb ἀγαπάω (to love) six times in this passage. He also bookends the passage in vv. 27 and 35 with the phrase ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς. In this passage, Luke also fulfills the stylistic virtue of ornament. He employs the figure *alliteration/assonance* in vv. 32-35. In the span of these four verses there are fourteen words which begin with αγα, αμα, απο, απε, and αχα. If one adds the α sound from ὑμᾶς, ποία and χάρις there are twenty-two α

heavy words in this short section. This repetition of the same vowel sound creates a rhythm and pleasant sound for the hearer.

In addition to having a high rhetorical style, this passage also uses figures as rhetorical tactics of persuasion. There is a threefold *rhetorical question* in vv. 32-34 (ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν, what good is it for you?). This question serves to draw the audience into Luke's argument and message. The audience must stop to ponder the question, asking themselves what advantage they get from loving those who love them back.

Finally, while being highly stylistic and rhetorically persuasive, this passage also upends Greco-Roman values. These verses attack the Greco-Roman honor-shame and patron-client systems, challenging the commonly held value of patrons honoring clients and vise versa. Luke undermines this value system by comparing those who practice the system with sinners and using a threefold *rhetorical question,* asking what benefit comes from this system.

> Luke 6:36 Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν.
> Luke 6:37 Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε· καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε, καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε. ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε·
> Luke 6:38 δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν· μέτρον καλὸν πεπιεσμένον σεσαλευμένον ὑπερεκχυννόμενον δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν· ᾧ γὰρ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.
> Luke 6:39   Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς· μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν; οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;
> Luke 6:40 οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον· κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.
> Luke 6:41 Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς;
> Luke 6:42 πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου· ἀδελφέ, ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου, αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν οὐ βλέπων; ὑποκριτά, ἔκβαλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, καὶ τότε διαβλέψεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

In this section, the Lukan Jesus highlights what life will be like in the kingdom of God. The morality of the new kingdom will be mercy rather than judgment. Once again the Lukan Jesus uses figures of speech to communicate this message. In vv. 36-38 the Lukan Jesus uses several figures for clarity and ornamentation.

First, there is the repetition of the theme of not judging. The Lukan Jesus uses the figures *pleonasm*, *traductio,* and *paronomasia* in v. 37 to highlight the theme of mercy over judgment. Using the figure *pleonasm* the Lukan Jesus highlights this message three times while varying the diction slightly. He says, "do not judge, and you will not be judged, do not condemn, and you will not be condemned, forgive and you will be forgiven." These three phrases all say the same thing, but use different words. Moreover, these three statements are also ornamented by the use of *paronomasia.* The three statements made in pairs, all use *paronomasia* or word play as the words are only slightly modified to effect their opposite (κρίνετε, κριθῆτε; καταδικάζετε, καταδικασθῆτε; ἀπολύετε, ἀπολυθήσεσθε). The ornamentation continues in v. 38 with another use of *paronomasia* with the following play on words: μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε ἀντιμετρηθήσεται. Using these three words, all with the same root but in slightly different form is a highly ornamental way to punctuate the Lukan Jesus' point of mercy triumphing over judgment.

The Lukan Jesus also invites audience participation in vv. 39-42 with a series of *rhetorical questions* meant to draw the audience into the argument and beckon them to logically think through the issues themselves. The Lukan Jesus asks the following questions: "Can a blind man lead a blind man? Will not both fall into a pit? Why do you see the speck of dust in your brother's eye and ignore the plank in your own eye? How are you able to say to your brother, 'brother let me remove the speck from your eye,'

while you yourself do not see the plank in your own eye?" These *rhetorical questions* invite audience participation. They beckon the audience to come to the same conclusion that the Lukan Jesus has just stated about mercy triumphing over judgment.

Finally, these figures highlight the role reversing nature of the kingdom of God. Through the use of *antithesis,* the Lukan Jesus highlights the opposites of judging and not being judged in v. 37. Through *hyperbole,* the Lukan Jesus highlights the hypocritical nature of the honor-shame and agrarian social stratification systems in vv. 41-42. The use of the hyperbolic imagery of a plank and a speck in these verses demonstrates the moral bankruptcy of the social, religious, political, and economic systems of the day.

> Luke 6:43 Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν δένδρον καλὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν σαπρόν, οὐδὲ πάλιν δένδρον σαπρὸν ποιοῦν καρπὸν καλόν.
> Luke 6:44 ἕκαστον γὰρ δένδρον ἐκ τοῦ ἰδίου καρποῦ γινώσκεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀκανθῶν συλλέγουσιν σῦκα οὐδὲ ἐκ βάτου σταφυλὴν τρυγῶσιν.
> Luke 6:45 ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐκ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ θησαυροῦ τῆς καρδίας προφέρει τὸ ἀγαθόν, καὶ ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ προφέρει τὸ πονηρόν· ἐκ γὰρ περισσεύματος καρδίας λαλεῖ τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.
> Luke 6:46 Τί δέ με καλεῖτε· κύριε κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω;
> Luke 6:47 Πᾶς ὁ ἐρχόμενος πρός με καὶ ἀκούων μου τῶν λόγων καὶ ποιῶν αὐτούς, ὑποδείξω ὑμῖν τίνι ἐστὶν ὅμοιος·
> Luke 6:48 ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομοῦντι οἰκίαν ὃς ἔσκαψεν καὶ ἐβάθυνεν καὶ ἔθηκεν θεμέλιον ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν· πλημμύρης δὲ γενομένης προσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμὸς τῇ οἰκίᾳ ἐκείνῃ, καὶ οὐκ ἴσχυσεν σαλεῦσαι αὐτὴν διὰ τὸ καλῶς οἰκοδομῆσθαι αὐτήν.
> Luke 6:49 ὁ δὲ ἀκούσας καὶ μὴ ποιήσας ὅμοιός ἐστιν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδομήσαντι οἰκίαν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου, ᾗ προσέρηξεν ὁ ποταμός, καὶ εὐθὺς συνέπεσεν καὶ ἐγένετο τὸ ῥῆγμα τῆς οἰκίας ἐκείνης μέγα.

In this last section of the Sermon on the Plain, there is no new teaching per se. Rather, the Lukan Jesus ends his sermon by re-emphasizing that which he has already taught. He ends by warning those who would hear his words to actually act upon their new knowledge. He states the sharp split between those who will hear and do and those who will merely hear. In short, he re-emphasizes his message of role-reversal and a new

way of living in the kingdom of God. He also re-emphasizes the audience's role as fellow participants as they are beckoned to enter into the argument and invited to act.

The Lukan Jesus uses several figures in this passage for clarity and ornamentation. For emphasis and clarity, the Lukan Jesus uses the figure *polyptoton* in v. 45. In that verse he uses the words for good and evil each in three cases (ἀγαθὸς, ἀγαθοῦ, ἀγαθόν; πονηρὸς, πονηροῦ, πονηρόν). This figure serves to highlight the message that Jesus has been preaching as a battle between good and evil. The Lukan Jesus also ornaments this passage with the use of *homoeoptoton* in v. 43. Of the fifteen words in that verse, eight end with the masculine/neuter accusative singular ending ον (δένδρον, καλὸν, καρπὸν σαπρόν, δένδρον, σαπρὸν, καρπὸν καλόν). Four more words end with the Greek ν. When read aloud the rhythm of this verse is quite striking.

The Lukan Jesus also invites audience participation in this passage through the *rhetorical question* in v. 46. He asks, "Why do you call me Lord Lord, and do not do what I say?" This question causes the audience to enter into the message. Do they call Jesus "Lord?" Is Jesus Lord? Will they do what he says? This question draws the audience into the Lukan Jesus' message to make a decision for or against that message.

Finally, while not bringing up any more arguments for the role-reversing nature of the kingdom of God, the Lukan Jesus ends his sermon by reinforcing that role-reversing message with a warning for those who will ignore his teaching. He concludes with a parable in the form of *antithesis* as he narrates the outcomes of those who put his teaching into practice and those who refuse to do so.

The previous analysis demonstrates how the three aspects of the Lukan Jesus' figures of speech work together simultaneously. Throughout the sermon the Lukan Jesus

192

uses figures of speech to emphasize main points in order to enhance the clarity of his message. Moreover, he uses figures of speech as rhetorical ornament in order to make his speech pleasing to the ear and to inculcate admiration in the audience. These tactics serve as an argument of *ethos* to gain a hearing for his radical message.

At the same time, the Lukan Jesus invites audience participation at fairly regular intervals during the sermon. The Lukan Jesus uses direct address (*apostrophe*) and *rhetorical questions* to invite the audience into his message. He beckons them to contemplate the message, to form the message, and ultimately, to participate in the message. Thus, through arguments of *logos* and *pathos,* the Lukan Jesus creates hearers of the gospel message who have a stake in what they have heard.

Finally, the Lukan Jesus uses figures of speech to create rhetorically powerful statements about the role-reversing message of a new way of living in the kingdom of God. Through such figures as *anaphora, antistrophe, symploce, paronomasia, pleonasm, hyperbole* and *antithesis,* the Lukan Jesus communicates the bankruptcy of current social, religious, political and economic systems of the Greco-Roman world. He attacks the agrarian social stratification system, the patron-client system, and the honor-shame system through rhetorically powerful figures of speech.

The three aspects of the Lukan Jesus' use of figures of speech that I have highlighted in this dissertation work together in a complex rhetorical strategy to gain a hearing for Luke's radical message among those who may have rejected such a message if it had been communicated merely in plain language. By shaping this message with rhetorical figures of speech, Luke is able to ingratiate audience members to Jesus, to

193

invite participation in his message, and ultimately to inspire change and reformation for a new way of living in the kingdom of God.

Further Study and Concluding Comments

If the method and conclusions found in this dissertation are compelling, then a whole realm of previously uninvestigated ground opens up. In what follows, I list several areas of further study that follow from this dissertation.

First, similar studies to this might be done for the other gospels. For example, how did the Matthean, Markan, and Johannine Jesus speak? How would an ancient audience have heard them? What would that mean for interpretation of the message of Jesus in these other gospels?

Second, one might engage in comparative studies as to the rhetoric of Jesus between the gospels. For example, how is the use of rhetorical figures of speech of the Lukan Jesus different than the Matthean Jesus? This could be done on the scale of the full gospel, or in specific parallel areas like healing or miracle stories. The possibilities and combinations seem endless and could produce a myriad of monographs and articles.

Third, the comparative rhetoric of the gospels could be used to further Q research. Where redaction and source critics have made conclusions about the content of Q, or even the necessity of positing Q, rhetoric might provide ancient criteria on which to base conclusions.

Fourth, one could pursue a study of the rhetoric and figures of speech used by other characters in the gospels. For example, is there a consistent rhetoric of the Pharisees in Luke, Mark, or Matthew? Do supernatural figures such as angels, demons,

and voices from heaven have a specific rhetoric that could shed light on their modes of communication?

Fifth, similar studies could take place on other books of the New Testament. For example, what function do rhetorical figures of speech serve in Acts? How does Paul use figures of speech in Galatians as opposed to Romans? What is the rhetoric of John the revelator?

I believe that reading an ancient text with regard to how an ancient audience would have heard rhetorical figures of speech therein provides important insights into ancient texts and as yet seems to be a fairly untapped field in biblical studies. I believe that this dissertation contributes to the overall biblical field by providing a method of comparing biblical texts with the rhetorical handbooks to provide the beginnings of an ancient poetics.

We have seen through this study that Luke was a very capable rhetorician. He made his main character, and thus the message of his gospel, compelling to educated and elite classes in the Roman Empire. Moreover, Luke portrayed Jesus in such a way as to turn his listeners into participants. The rhetoric of the Lukan Jesus beckoned his audience to think, ponder, and ultimately to enter into life changing action called for by Jesus' message of the kingdom of God. To ignore the form, beauty, and rhetoric of Jesus' speech is to ignore an indispensible part of his character. For, on the one hand, an ancient audience would have given great attention to the way in which the Lukan Jesus spoke. And, on the other hand, it is the very form and rhetoric of Jesus' speech that made his message powerful, memorable, and ultimately, transforming.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

Alphabetical List of Figures of Speech used by the Lukan Jesus

1. *Adiunctio: Rhet. Her.* 4.27.38.
    1. 7:28: ends with ἐστιν
    2. 7:28: ends with ἐστιν
    3. 7:44: ends with ἔδωκας
    4. 7:44-45: ends with ἔδωκας
    5. 21:3: ends with ἔβαλεν
    6. 21:4: ends with ἔβαλεν

2. *Alliteration/Assonance:* Lausberg, *Handbook,* 432.
    1. 6:32-35: repeated α sound: αγα, αμα, απο, απε, αχα
    2. 7:50: repeated σ sound: πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε
    3. 8:5: repeated σ sound: σπείρων, σπεῖραι, σπόρον
    4. 8:48: repeated σ sound: πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε
    5. 12:20: repeated η sound: ταύτῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν ψυχήν
    6. 12:49: repeated η and ει sound: ἦλθον, βαλεῖν, τὴν, γῆν, εἰ, ἤδη, ἀνήφθη
    7. 17:19: repeated σ sound: πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε
    8. 18:42: repeated σ sound: πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε
    9. 19:13: repeated δ sound: δὲ δέκα δούλους, ἔδωκεν, δέκα
    10. 23:29: repeated αι sound: μακάριαι αἱ στεῖραι καὶ αἱ κοιλίαι αἱ

3. *Anadiplosis: Inst.* 9.3.44-45.
    1. 7:31-32: repetition of ὅμοιοι
    2. 12:5: repetition of φοβηθῆτε
    3. 12:48: repetition of πολύ
    4. 13:33-34: repetition of Ἰερουσαλὴμ
    5. 15:12: repetition of πατρί· πάτερ

4. *Anaphora: Inst.* 9.3.30; *Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19.
    1. 6:20-22: repetition of μακάριοι
    2. 6:20-22: repetition of ὅτι
    3. 6:24-25: repetition of οὐαὶ
    4. 6:24-25: repetition of ὅτι
    5. 7:44-46: repetition of αὕτη δὲ
    6. 8:6-8: repetition of καὶ ἕτερον

7.   10:13: repetition of οὐαί σοι
8.   11:4: repetition of καὶ
9.   11:42-52: repetition of οὐαὶ ὑμῖν
10. 12:33-34: repetition of ὅπου
11. 17:21: repetition of ἰδοὺ
12. 17:23: repetition of ἰδοὺ

5.   *Antistrophe: Rhet. Her.* 4.13.19; *Inst.* 9.3.30-31.
     1.   6:21: repetition of νῦν
     2.   6:25: repetition of νῦν
     3.   6:32-34: repetition of ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν
     4.   7:27: repetition of σου
     5.   7:28: repetition of ἐστιν
     6.   7:44-45: repetition of οὐκ ἔδωκας
     7.   10:31-32: repetition of ἀντιπαρῆλθεν
     8.   11:2: repetition of σου
     9.   11:9: repetition of ὑμῖν
     10. 11:31-32: repetition of ὧδε
     11. 11:50-51: repetition of ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης
     12. 12:8-9: repetition of τῶν ἀγγέλων τοῦ θεοῦ
     13. 12:10: repetition of ἀφεθήσεται
     14. 12:56: repetition of οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν
     15. 14:18-19: repetition of ἔχε με παρῃτημένον
     16. 14:26-27: repetition of οὐ δύναται εἶναί μου μαθητής
     17. 15:18-19: repetition of σου
     18. 15:21: repetition of σου
     19. 16:18: repetition of μοιχεύει
     20. 17:3-4: repetition of αὐτῷ
     21. 17:34-35: repetition of ἀφεθήσεται
     22. 18:42: repetition of ἀναβλέψω, ἀνάβλεψον
     23. 20:10-11: repetition of κενόν
     24. 20:34-35: γαμίσκονται, γαμίζονται
     25. 21:33: repetition of παρελεύσονται

6.   *Antithesis: Inst.* 9.3.81-86; *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.21.
     1.   5:31: ἔχουσιν οἱ ὑγιαίνοντες, οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες
     2.   6:27: ἀγαπᾶτε, ἐχθροὺς
     3.   6:27: καλῶς ποιεῖτε, μισοῦσιν
     4.   6:28: εὐλογεῖτε, καταρωμένους
     5.   6:28: προσεύχεσθε ἐπηρεαζόντων
     6.   6:37: κρίνετε, οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε

7. 6:37: μὴ καταδικάζετε, οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε
8. 6:37: ἀπολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε
9. 6:47-49: ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν, ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν χωρὶς θεμελίου
10. 7:33-34: μὴ ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε πίνων οἶνον, ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων
11. 8:10: βλέποντες, μὴ βλέπωσιν
12. 8:10: ἀκούοντες, μὴ συνιῶσιν
13. 8:18: ὃς ἂν γὰρ ἔχῃ, δοθήσεται, ὃς ἂν μὴ ἔχῃ, ἀρθήσεται
14. 9:24: σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει, ἀπολέσῃ, σώσει
15. 9:26: ἐπαισχυνθῇ, ἐπαισχυνθήσεται
16. 10:2: πολύς, ὀλίγοι
17. 10:15: ὑψωθήσῃ, καταβήσῃ
18. 10:16: ἀκούων, ἀθετῶν
19. 10:21: ἀπέκρυψας, ἀπεκάλυψας
20. 11:23: μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ, κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ
21. 11:33: λύχνον, κρύπτην, λυχνίαν
22. 11:39: ἔξωθεν, ἔσωθεν
23. 12:2: συγκεκαλυμμένον, ἀποκαλυφθήσεται
24. 12:2: κρυπτὸν ὃ οὐ γνωσθήσεται
25. 12:3: σκοτίᾳ, φωτὶ
26. 12:3: ταμείοις, δωμάτων
27. 12:8-9: ὁμολογήσῃ, ὁμολογήσει, ἀρνησάμενός, ἀπαρνηθήσεται
28. 12:10: ἀφεθήσεται, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται
29. 12:47-48: γνοὺς, δαρήσεται πολλάς, μὴ γνούς, δαρήσεται ὀλίγας
30. 12:51: εἰρήνην, διαμερισμόν
31. 12:56: οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν, οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν
32. 14:11: ὑψῶν, ταπεινωθήσεται; ταπεινῶν, ὑψωθήσεται
33. 14:13: μὴ φώνει τοὺς φίλους... κάλει πτωχούς...
34. 15:17: μίσθιοι, περισσεύονται ἄρτων, ἐγὼ δὲ, ἀπόλλυμαι
35. 15:24: νεκρὸς, ἀνέζησεν
36. 15:24: ἀπολωλὼς, εὑρέθη
37. 15:32: νεκρὸς, ἔζησεν
38. 15:32: ἀπολωλὼς, εὑρέθη
39. 16:10: ἐλαχίστῳ πολλῷ
40. 16:10: ἐλαχίστῳ, πολλῷ
41. 16:12: ἀλλοτρίῳ, ὑμέτερον
42. 16:13: μισήσει, ἀγαπήσει
43. 16:13: ἀνθέξεται, καταφρονήσει
44. 16:15: ὑψηλὸν, βδέλυγμα
45. 16:19-20: πλούσιος... πτωχὸς
46. 17:33: ζητήσῃ περιποιήσασθαι, ἀπολέσει; ἀπολέσῃ, ζωογονήσει
47. 18:14: ὑψῶν, ταπεινωθήσεται; ταπεινῶν, ὑψωθήσεται
48. 18:27: τὰ ἀδύνατα, δυνατὰ
49. 19:26: ἔχοντι δοθήσεται, μὴ ἔχοντος ἀρθήσεται

50. 20:18: πεσὼν ἐπ’… συνθλασθήσεται; πέσῃ, λικμήσει
51. 20:34-35: γαμοῦσιν γαμίσκονται, οὔτε γαμοῦσιν οὔτε γαμίζονται
52. 20:38: νεκρῶν, ζώντων
53. 21:4: ἐκ τοῦ περισσεύοντος, ἐκ τοῦ ὑστερήματος
54. 21:33: παρελεύσονται, οὐ μὴ παρελεύσονται
55. 22:26: μείζων, νεώτερος
56. 22:26: ἡγούμενος, διακονῶν
57. 22:42: μὴ τὸ θέλημά μου ἀλλὰ τὸ σὸν γινέσθω
58. 23:28: μὴ κλαίετε, κλαίετε

7. *Apostrophe: Inst.* 9.2.38-39; *Rhet. Her.* 4.15.22.
    1. 6:20: ὅτι ὑμετέρα
    2. 6:42: ἀδελφέ
    3. 7:9: λέγω ὑμῖν
    4. 8:48: θυγάτηρ
    5. 8:54: ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε
    6. 9:41: ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη
    7. 11:39: ὑμεῖς οἱ Φαρισαῖοι
    8. 11:40: ἄφρονες
    9. 12:4: Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν τοῖς φίλοις μου
    10. 12:5: ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν
    11. 12:19: ψυχή, ἔχεις
    12. 12:20: ἄφρων
    13. 12:28: πόσῳ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς, ὀλιγόπιστοι
    14. 12:56: ὑποκριταί
    15. 13:15: ὑποκριταί
    16. 13:24: λέγω ὑμῖν
    17. 14:24: λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν
    18. 16:15: ὑμεῖς ἐστε
    19. 17:10: οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς
    20. 19:5: Ζακχαῖε
    21. 23:25: ὦ ἀνόητοι καὶ βραδεῖς τῇ καρδίᾳ

8. *Asyndeton: Inst.* 9.3.50; *Rhet. Her.* 4.30.41.
    1. 14:13: πτωχούς, ἀναπείρους, χωλούς, τυφλούς
    2. 17:27: ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἐγάμουν, ἐγαμίζοντο
    3. 17:28: ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον, ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ᾠκοδόμουν
    4. 18:11: ἅρπαγες, ἄδικοι, μοιχοί
    5. 18:20: μὴ μοιχεύσῃς, μὴ φονεύσῃς, μὴ κλέψῃς, μὴ ψευδομαρτυρήσῃς

9. *Autonomasia: Inst.* 8.6.29-30; *Rhet. Her.* 4.31.42.
    1. 5:24: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    2. 6:5: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    3. 7:34: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    4. 9:22: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    5. 9:26: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    6. 9:44: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    7. 11:30: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    8. 11:31: βασίλισσα νότου
    9. 11:49: ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ
    10. 12:8: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    11. 12:10: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    12. 12:40: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    13. 17:22: τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    14. 17:24: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    15. 17:26: τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    16. 17:30: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    17. 18:8: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    18. 18:31: τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    19. 19:9: υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ
    20. 19:10: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    21. 21:27: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    22. 21:36: τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    23. 22:11: ὁ διδάσκαλος
    24. 22:22: ὁ υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    25. 22:48: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    26. 22:69: ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    27. 24:26: τὸν χριστὸν

10. *Brevitas: Rhet. Her.* 4.54.68.
    1. 5:13: θέλω, καθαρίσθητι
    2. 7:13: μὴ κλαῖε
    3. 8:54: ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε
    4. 10:28: τοῦτο ποίει καὶ ζήσῃ
    5. 11:17: οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει
    6. 16:18: καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν μοιχεύει
    7. 18:13: ὁ θεός, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ
    8. 22:51: ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου

11. *Chiasmus: Rhet. Her.* 4.18.39.
    1. 9:24: σῶσαι, ἀπολέσει; ἀπολέσῃ, σώσει
    2. 10:22: υἱὸς, πατήρ; πατήρ, υἱὸς
    3. 12:52: τρεῖς, δυσὶν; δύο, τρισίν
    4. 12:53: πατὴρ, υἱῷ; υἱὸς, πατρί
    5. 12:53: μήτηρ, θυγατέρα; θυγάτηρ, μητέρα
    6. 12:53: πενθερὰ, νύμφην; νύμφη, πενθεράν
    7. 13:30: ἔσχατοι, πρῶτοι; πρῶτοι, ἔσχατοι
    8. 14:11: ὑψῶν, ταπεινωθήσεται; ταπεινῶν, ὑψωθήσεται
    9. 17:33: περιποιήσασθαι, ἀπολέσει; ἀπολέσῃ ζῳογονήσει
    10. 18:14: ὑψῶν, ταπεινωθήσεται; ταπεινῶν, ὑψωθήσεται

12. *Climax Rhet. Her.* 4.25.34; *Inst.* 9.3.55-57.
    1. 10:16: ἀθετῶν ὑμᾶς; ἐμὲ ἀθετεῖ; ἐμὲ ἀθετῶν; ἀθετεῖ τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με
    2. 12:58: πρὸς τὸν κριτήν; κριτής σε παραδώσει τῷ πράκτορι; πράκτωρ σε βαλεῖ εἰς φυλακήν

13. *Comparison: Rhet. Her.* 4.45.59-4.48.61; *Inst.* 9.2.100-101.
    1. 9:58: Comparison of ἀλώπεκες, πετεινὰ, υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    2. 10:13: Comparison of Χοραζίν and Βηθσαϊδά with Τύρῳ and Σιδῶνι
    3. 11:17-18: Comparison of ἐγὼ with οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν
    4. 11:30: Comparison of Ἰωνᾶς with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    5. 11:31: Comparison of Σολομῶνος with πλεῖον Σολομῶνος
    6. 11:32: Comparison of Ἰωνᾶ with πλεῖον Ἰωνᾶ
    7. 12:6-7: πολλῶν στρουθίων διαφέρετε
    8. 12:24: Comparison of ὑμεῖς with τῶν πετεινῶν
    9. 12:27: Comparison of Σολομὼν with ἓν τούτων
    10. 12:28: Comparison of τὸν χόρτον with ὑμᾶς
    11. 15:7: Comparison of ἑνὶ ἁμαρτωλῷ with ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα δικαίοις
    12. 16:8: Comparison of υἱοὶ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου with υἱοὺς τοῦ φωτὸς
    13. 16:17: Comparison of τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν with νόμου μίαν κεραίαν
    14. 16:25: Comparison of σου with Λάζαρος
    15. 17:24: Comparison of ἀστραπὴ with ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    16. 17:26: Comparison of ἡμέραις Νῶε with ἡμέραις τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    17. 17:28-30: Comparison of ἡμέραις Λώτ with ἡμέρᾳ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
    18. 18:25: Comparison of κάμηλον διὰ τρήματος βελόνης with πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ
    19. 22:25-26: Comparison of βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν with ὑμεῖς
    20. 24:39: Comparison of πνεῦμα with ἐμὲ

14. *Correctio: Rhet. Her. 4.26.36.*
    1. 7:26: προφήτην; ναὶ λέγω ὑμῖν, καὶ περισσότερον προφήτου
    2. 17:21: ἰδοὺ ὧδε ἤ· ἐκεῖ, ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐντὸς ὑμῶν ἐστιν
    3. 18:19: τί με λέγεις ἀγαθόν; οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς ὁ θεός
    4. 22:27: τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν

15. *Distributio: Rhet. Her. 4.35.47.*
    1. 21:21: ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ, ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς, ἐν ταῖς χώραις

16. *Epanalepsis: Inst. 9.3.28-29; Rhet. Her. 4.18.38.*
    1. 10:41: Μάρθα Μάρθα
    2. 13:34: Ἰερουσαλὴμ Ἰερουσαλήμ
    3. 14:35: ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω
    4. 20:25: Καίσαρος Καίσαρι
    5. 20:25: θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ
    6. 21:10: ἔθνος ἐπ' ἔθνος
    7. 21:10: βασιλεία ἐπὶ βασιλείαν
    8. 22:15: ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα
    9. 22:31: Σίμων Σίμων

17. *Epanodos: Inst. 9.3.35-36.*
    1. 2:48-49: πατήρ, πατρός

18. *Epithet: Inst. 8.6.40-43.*
    1. 7:33: Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς

19. *Exemplum: Rhet. Her. 4.49.62.*
    1. 4:4: *οὐκ... ἄνθρωπος*
    2. 4:8: *κύριον... λατρεύσεις*
    3. 4:12: *οὐκ... σου*
    4. 7:22: *τυφλοὶ...* εὐαγγελίζονται
    5. 7:27: *ἰδοὺ...σου*
    6. 8:10: βλέποντες... συνιῶσιν
    7. 19:46: *ἔσται... προσευχῆς*
    8. 20:17: *λίθον... γωνίας*
    9. 20:37: *κύριον... Ἰακώβ*
    10. 20:42-43: *εἶπεν... σου*
    11. 22:37: *καὶ ... ἐλογίσθη*

12. 23:30: *τοῖς... ἡμᾶς*
13. 23:46: *εἰς... μου*

20. *Homoeoptoton: Rhet. Her. 4.20.28; Inst. 9.3.78-7.*
    1. 5:35: ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις
    2. 6:43: δένδρον, καλὸν, καρπὸν, σαπρόν, δένδρον σαπρὸν, καρπὸν, καλόν
    3. 7:22: *τυφλοὶ,* χωλοὶ, λεπροὶ, *κωφοί, νεκροὶ* πτωχοὶ
    4. 7:47: ἀφέωνται, αἱ ἁμαρτίαι, αἱ πολλαί
    5. 8:15: τῇ καλῇ γῇ, καλῇ ἀγαθῇ, ὑπομονῇ
    6. 9:22: τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, ἀρχιερέων, γραμματέων
    7. 10:23: μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ οἱ
    8. 11:3: τὸν ἄρτον ἡμῶν τὸν ἐπιούσιον
    9. 12:37: μακάριοι οἱ δοῦλοι ἐκεῖνοι
    10. 12:38: τῇ, τῇ τρίτῃ φυλακῇ ἔλθῃ, εὕρῃ
    11. 12:43: μακάριος ὁ δοῦλος ἐκεῖνος
    12. 13:2: οἱ Γαλιλαῖοι οὗτοι ἁμαρτωλοὶ
    13. 13:16: τοῦ δεσμοῦ τούτου, τοῦ σαββάτου
    14. 14:24: τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κεκλημένων
    15. 18:30: τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ, τῷ, τῷ ἐρχομένῳ
    16. 19:27: τοὺς ἐχθρούς, τούτους τοὺς, αὐτοὺς, αὐτοὺς
    17. 21:16: γονέων, ἀδελφῶν, συγγενῶν, φίλων
    18. 21:23: ἐχούσαις, ταῖς θηλαζούσαις, ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις
    19. 21:36: ταῦτα πάντα τὰ μέλλοντα

21. *Homoteleuton: Rhet. Her. 4.20.28; Inst. 9.3.77.*
    1. 6:22: ἀφορίσωσιν, ὀνειδίσωσιν, ἐκβάλωσιν
    2. 6:47: ἀκούων, τῶν λόγων, ποιῶν
    3. 8:10: βλέποντες, ἀκούοντες; βλέπωσιν, συνιῶσιν
    4. 7:22: *ἀναβλέπουσιν,* περιπατοῦσιν, *ἀκούουσιν*
    5. 7:22: καθαρίζονται, *ἐγείρονται,* εὐαγγελίζονται
    6. 17:28: ἤσθιον, ἔπινον, ἠγόραζον, ἐπώλουν, ἐφύτευον, ᾠκοδόμουν
    7. 18:32: παραδοθήσεται, ἐμπαιχθήσεται, ὑβρισθήσεται, ἐμπτυσθήσεται,
    8. 19:43: ἥξουσιν, παρεμβαλοῦσιν, περικυκλώσουσίν, συνέξουσίν

22. *Hyperbole: Rhet. Her. 4.33.44; Inst. 8.6.67-76.*
    1. 6:41-42: κάρφος, δοκὸν
    2. 17:6: ἐκριζώθητι καὶ φυτεύθητι ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ
    3. 18:25: εὐκοπώτερον... εἰσελθεῖν

23. *Hypophora: Rhet. Her. 4.24.33-34.*
    1. 7:24-26: τί ἐξήλθατε... περισσότερον προφήτου
    2. 10:26-36: τί γέγραπται... πορεύου καὶ σὺ ποίει ὁμοίως
    3. 13:2-5: δοκεῖτε ὅτι... ὡσαύτως ἀπολεῖσθε
    4. 14:3-4: ἔξεστιν... σαββάτου
    5. 20:4-8: τὸ βάπτισμα ... ταῦτα ποιῶ
    6. 20:15-16: τί οὖν... δώσει τὸν ἀμπελῶνα ἄλλοις
    7. 20:24-27: ἔξεστιν... θεοῦ τῷ θεῷ
    8. 20:41-43: πῶς λέγουσιν... πῶς αὐτοῦ υἱός ἐστιν
    9. 22:35-36: ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς... ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν

24. *Isocolon: Rhet. Her. 4.20.27; Inst. 9.3.80.*
    1. 7:22: *τυφλοὶ... χωλοὶ... λεπροὶ... κωφοὶ... νεκροί...πτωχοὶ*
    2. 7:27: *ἰδοὺ... ὅς...*
    3. 7:32: ηὐλήσαμεν... ἐθρηνήσαμεν...
    4. 11:2: ἁγιασθήτω... ἐλθέτω...
    5. 11:9: αἰτεῖτε... ζητεῖτε... κρούετε...
    6. 11:49: ἀποστελῶ... καὶ...
    7. 12:31: πλὴν... καὶ...
    8. 12:49: Πῦρ... καὶ...
    9. 12:52: τρεῖς... δύο...
    10. 12:53: πατὴρ... *υἱός...*
    11. 12:53: μήτηρ... *θυγάτηρ...*
    12. 12:53: πενθερὰ... καὶ...
    13. 22:68: ἐὰν... οὐ...
    14. 23:30: *τοῖς... καὶ...*

25. *Maxim: Rhet. Her. 4.17.24.*
    1. 5:31: οὐ χρείαν... οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες
    2. 5:36: οὐδεὶς ἐπίβλημα... ἀπὸ τοῦ καινοῦ
    3. 5:37: καὶ οὐδεὶς βάλλει... ἀπολοῦνται
    4. 6:39: μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν
    5. 6:40: οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς... ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ
    6. 6:43: Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν... καρπὸν καλόν
    7. 6:44: ἕκαστον... τρυγῶσιν
    8. 7:35: καὶ ἐδικαιώθη ἡ σοφία...τέκνων αὐτῆς
    9. 8:16: Οὐδεὶς δὲ λύχνον ἅψας... βλέπωσιν τὸ φῶς
    10. 9:48: ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος... ἐστιν μέγας
    11. 9:50: ὃς γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν καθ' ὑμῶν, ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐστιν
    12. 10:7: ἄξιος γὰρ ὁ ἐργάτης τοῦ μισθοῦ αὐτοῦ
    13. 11:34: Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου

14. 12:15: ὅτι οὐκ... ὑπαρχόντων αὐτῷ
15. 12:21: οὕτως ὁ θησαυρίζων ἑαυτῷ καὶ μὴ εἰς θεὸν πλουτῶν
16. 12:23: ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ... ἐνδύματος
17. 12:34: γάρ ἐστιν ὁ θησαυρὸς... καρδία ὑμῶν ἔσται
18. 14:34: Καλὸν οὖν τὸ ἅλας... ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται
19. 16:13: Οὐδεὶς οἰκέτης δύναται δυσὶ κυρίοις δουλεύειν
20. 16:13: οὐ δύνασθε θεῷ δουλεύειν καὶ μαμωνᾷ
21. 17:37: ὅπου τὸ σῶμα, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ ἀετοὶ ἐπισυναχθήσονται
22. 19:26: λέγω ὑμῖν... ἔχει ἀρθήσεται

26. *Metaphor: Rhet. Her.* 4.24.45; *Inst.* 8.6.4-18.
   1. 8:11: ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ
   2. 11:34: Ὁ λύχνος τοῦ σώματός ἐστιν ὁ ὀφθαλμός σου
   3. 12:32: μικρὸν ποίμνιον
   4. 13:32: ἀλώπεκι
   5. 22:19: τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά

27. *Metonymy: Inst.* 8.6.23-28. *Rhet. Her.* 4.32.43.
   1. 16:22: κόλπον Ἀβραάμ
   2. 16:29: ἔχουσι Μωϋσέα
   3. 16:31: εἰ Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν

28. *Paronomasia: Inst.* 9.3.66-67; *Rhet. Her.* 4.21.29-4.23.32.
   1. 2:48-49: πατήρ, πατρός
   2. 7:31: ὁμοιώσω, ὅμοιοι
   3. 8:5: σπείρων, σπεῖραι, σπόρον, σπείρειν
   4. 14:7-10: κεκλημένους, κληθῇς, κατακλιθῇς, κεκλημένος, κληθῇς, κεκληκώς
   5. 14:35: ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω
   6. 21:11: λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ
   7. 23:31: ξύλῳ, ξηρῷ

29. *Pleonasm: Rhet. Her.* 4.18.38; *Inst.* 9.3.45-46; *Rhet. Her.* 4.42.54.
   1. 4:24-25: ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν; ἐπ᾽ ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν
   2. 7:31: Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω; τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι
   3. 8:17: κρυπτόν, φανερὸν γενήσεται; ἀπόκρυφον, γνωσθῇ καὶ εἰς φανερὸν ἔλθη
   4. 11:9: αἰτεῖτε, δοθήσεται; ζητεῖτε, εὑρήσετε; κρούετε, ἀνοιγήσεται
   5. 11:10: αἰτῶν λαμβάνει; ζητῶν εὑρίσκει; κρούοντι ἀνοιγ[ήσ]εται
   6. 11:47-48: Οὐαὶ... ὑμεῖς δὲ οἰκοδομεῖτε
   7. 12:2: συγκεκαλυμμένον, ἀποκαλυφθήσεται; κρυπτόν, γνωσθήσεται
   8. 12:3: σκοτίᾳ εἴπατε, φωτὶ ἀκουσθήσεται; ἐλαλήσατε, κηρυχθήσεται

9. 12:11: ἀπολογήσησθε, εἴπητε
10. 13:18: ὁμοία; ὁμοιώσω
11. 16:13: Οὐδεὶς... μαμωνᾷ
12. 22:16, 18: οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως; οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ
13. 23:29: αἳ στεῖραι; αἱ κοιλίαι οὐκ ἐγέννησαν; μαστοὶ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν
14. 23:30: *ὄρεσι, πέσετε; βουνοῖς, καλύψατε ἡμᾶς*

30. *Polyptoton: Inst. 9.3.36-37. Rhet. Her. 4.21.29-4.23.32.*
    1. 5:36-39: καινοῦ, καινὸν, καινοῦ, καινοὺς
    2. 5:36-39: παλαιόν, παλαιῷ, παλαιούς, παλαιὸν, παλαιὸς
    3. 5:36-39: νέον, νέος, νέον, νέον
    4. 6:29-30: σε, σου, σε, σὰ
    5. 11:3-4: ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν, ἡμῖν, ἡμῶν, ἡμῖν, ἡμᾶς
    6. 12:16-20: Thirteen references to the rich man in four cases
    7. 15:11-32: Inflection of πατήρ twelve times in all five cases
    8. 17:22-31: Inflection of ἡμέρα ten times in three cases
    9. 19:11-27: twenty-six references to the nobleman in all five cases
    10. 19:43-44: σου, σοι, σε, σε, σε, σου, σοί, σοί, σου

31. *Polysyndeton: Inst. 9.3.50-54.*
    1. 9:3: μήτε, μήτε, μήτε, μήτε, μήτε
    2. 10:4: μὴ, μὴ, μηδένα
    3. 13:29: καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, καὶ
    4. 14:12: μηδὲ, μηδὲ, μηδὲ
    5. 14:21: καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, καὶ
    6. 14:26: καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, καὶ, ἔτι τε καὶ
    7. 18:29: ἢ, ἢ, ἢ, ἢ
    8. 20:46: καὶ, καὶ, καὶ
    9. 21:16: καὶ, καὶ, καὶ
    10. 21:34: καὶ, καὶ, καὶ

32. *Prosopopoiia: Rhet. Her. 4.42.55; Inst. 9.2.29-37.*
    1. 12:16-19: Speech for the rich man and for God
    2. 14:18-19: Speech of the invited banquet guests
    3. 15:11-32: Speech of the father and the two sons
    4. 16:3-4: Speech of the unjust steward
    5. 16:19-31: Speech of the rich man and Abraham
    6. 19:11-27: Speech of the Nobleman and of the third slave
    7. 20:14: Speech of the wicked tenants

33. *Rhetorical Question: Rhet. Her. 4.15.22.*
    1. 2:49: τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με
    2. 2:49: οὐκ ᾔδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναί με
    3. 5:23: τί ἐστιν εὐκοπώτερον... ἔγειρε καὶ περιπάτει
    4. 5:34: μὴ δύνασθε... ποιῆσαι νηστεῦσαι
    5. 6:9: ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς... ψυχὴν σῶσαι ἢ ἀπολέσαι
    6. 6:32-34: ποία ὑμῖν χάρις ἐστίν (3Χ)
    7. 6:39: μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν
    8. 6:39: οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται
    9. 6:41: Τί δὲ βλέπεις... οὐ κατανοεῖς
    10. 6:42: πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν... οὐ βλέπων
    11. 6:46: Τί δέ με καλεῖτε· κύριε κύριε, καὶ οὐ ποιεῖτε ἃ λέγω
    12. 7:24: τί ἐξήλθατε... σαλευόμενον
    13. 7:25: τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν... ἠμφιεσμένον
    14. 7:26: τί ἐξήλθατε ἰδεῖν; προφήτην
    15. 9:25: τί γὰρ ὠφελεῖται ἄνθρωπος... ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς
    16. 11:11: τίνα δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν... ὄφιν αὐτῷ ἐπιδώσει
    17. 11:12: αἰτήσει ᾠόν, ἐπιδώσει αὐτῷ σκορπίον
    18. 11:18: εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ σατανᾶς... ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ
    19. 11:19: εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ... τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν
    20. 11:40: οὐχ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔξωθεν καὶ τὸ ἔσωθεν ἐποίησεν
    21. 12:25: τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν... προσθεῖναι πῆχυν
    22. 12:26: εἰ οὖν... τί περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν μεριμνᾶτε
    23. 12:56: τὸν καιρὸν δὲ τοῦτον πῶς οὐκ οἴδατε δοκιμάζειν
    24. 12:57: Τί δὲ καὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν οὐ κρίνετε τὸ δίκαιον
    25. 13:15: ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τῷ σαββάτῳ... ἀπαγαγὼν ποτίζει
    26. 13:16: οὐκ ἔδει λυθῆναι... τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου
    27. 14:5: τίνος ὑμῶν... ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ σαββάτου
    28. 14:28: Τίς γὰρ ἐξ ὑμῶν... εἰ ἔχει εἰς ἀπαρτισμόν
    29. 14:31: Ἢ τίς βασιλεὺς... χιλιάδων ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ' αὐτόν
    30. 14:34: ἐὰν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἅλας μωρανθῇ, ἐν τίνι ἀρτυθήσεται
    31. 15:4: τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν... ἕως εὕρῃ αὐτό
    32. 15:8: οὐχὶ ἅπτει λύχνον... ζητεῖ ἐπιμελῶς ἕως οὗ εὕρῃ
    33. 16:11: εἰ οὖν ἐν τῷ ἀδίκῳ μαμωνᾷ... τίς ὑμῖν πιστεύσει
    34. 16:12: καὶ εἰ ἐν τῷ ἀλλοτρίῳ... τίς ὑμῖν δώσει
    35. 17:7: Τίς δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν δοῦλον ἔχων... παρελθὼν ἀνάπεσε
    36. 17:8: οὐχὶ ἐρεῖ αὐτῷ· ἑτοίμασον... πίεσαι σύ
    37. 17:17: οὐχὶ οἱ δέκα ἐκαθαρίσθησαν
    38. 17:17: οἱ δὲ ἐννέα ποῦ
    39. 17:18: οὐχ εὑρέθησαν ὑποστρέψαντες... ἀλλογενὴς οὗτος
    40. 18:7: ὁ δὲ θεὸς οὐ μὴ ποιήσῃ... ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός
    41. 18:7: μακροθυμεῖ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς
    42. 18:8: πλὴν ὁ υἱὸς... τὴν πίστιν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

43. 19:23: καὶ διὰ τί οὐκ ἔδωκάς μου τὸ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ τράπεζαν
44. 20:44: Δαυὶδ οὖν κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ... υἱός ἐστιν
45. 22:27: τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν
46. 22:27: οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος
47. 22:48: Ἰούδα, φιλήματι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδως
48. 22:52: ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν ἐξήλθατε μετὰ μαχαιρῶν καὶ ξύλων
49. 23:31: ὅτι εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ... τί γένηται
50. 24:26: οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν... δόξαν αὐτοῦ

34. *Simile: Rhet. Her. 4.49.62.*
    1. 10:3: ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων
    2. 10:18: ὡς ἀστραπὴν
    3. 11:36: ὡς ὅταν ὁ λύχνος τῇ ἀστραπῇ φωτίζῃ σε
    4. 11:44: ὡς τὰ μνημεῖα τὰ ἄδηλα
    5. 13:19: ὁμοία ἐστὶν κόκκῳ σινάπεως
    6. 13:21: ὁμοία ἐστὶν ζύμῃ
    7. 13:34: ὃν τρόπον ὄρνις τὴν ἑαυτῆς νοσσιὰν ὑπὸ τὰς πτέρυγας
    8. 17:6: ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως
    9. 17:24: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ ἀστραπὴ ἀστράπτουσα
    10. 18:17: ὡς παιδίον
    11. 20:36: ἰσάγγελοι
    12. 21:35: ὡς παγίς
    13. 22:31: ὡς τὸν σῖτον
    14. 22:44: ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος
    15. 22:52: ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστὴν

35. *Symploce: Rhet. Her. 4.14.20; Inst. 9.3.31.*
    1. 6:21: μακάριοι... νῦν; μακάριοι... νῦν
    2. 6:25: οὐαὶ... νῦν; οὐαὶ... νῦν
    3. 12:5: φοβηθῆτε, φοβηθῆτε, φοβηθῆτε

36. *Synechdoche: Inst. 8.6.19-22; Rhet. Her. 4.33.44.*
    1. 9:44: θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὦτα
    2. 9:44: εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων
    3. 22:53: ἐξετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας

37. *Traductio: Inst. 9.3.70-74.*
    1. 2:48-49: πατήρ, πατρός
    2. 4:26-27: εἰ μὴ, εἰ μὴ
    3. 6:38: δίδοτε, δοθήσεται, δώσουσιν

4. 6:45: ἀγαθὸς, ἀγαθοῦ, ἀγαθόν
5. 6:45: πονηρὸς, πονηροῦ, πονηρόν
6. 8:13: καιρὸν, καιρῷ
7. 8:17: κρυπτὸν, ἀπόκρυφον
8. 9:48: δέχεται, δέξηται, δέχεται
9. 9:60: νεκροὺς, νεκρούς
10. 10:5-6: εἰρήνη, εἰρήνης, εἰρήνη
11. 10:12-14: ἀνεκτότερον, ἀνεκτότερον
12. 10:23: βλέποντες, βλέπετε
13. 10:24: ἀκοῦσαι, ἀκούετε, ἤκουσαν
14. 11:29: σημεῖον, σημεῖον, σημεῖον
15. 11:29: γενεὰ, γενεὰ
16. 11:34-36: φωτεινόν, φωτεινόν, φωτεινὸν, φωτίζῃ
17. 11:34-36: σκοτεινόν, σκότος, σκοτεινόν
18. 11:46: φορτίζετε, φορτία, φορτίοις
19. 12:43-47: δοῦλος, δοῦλος, δούλου, δοῦλος,
20. 13:2-5: οὐχί... ἀπολεῖσθε; οὐχί... ἀπολεῖσθε
21. 13:20: ὁμοιώσω, ὁμοία
22. 13:25-27: οὐκ... ἐστέ, οὐκ... ἐστέ
23. 13:32-33: σήμερον καὶ αὔριον, σήμερον καὶ αὔριον
24. 17:9-10: ἐποίησεν, ποιήσητε, ποιῆσαι, πεποιήκαμεν
25. 17:22-31: ἡμέραι, ἡμερῶν, ἡμέρα, ἡμέραις, ἡμέραις, ἡμέρας, ἡμέραις, ἡμέρα, ἡμέρα, ἡμέρα
26. 19:17-19: πόλεων, πόλεων

38. *Zeugma: Inst.* 9.3.62-64.
   1. 10:22: omission of οὐδεὶς γινώσκει in the second clause
   2. 11:17: omission of ἐφ’ ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα in second clause
   3. 12:23: omission of πλεῖόν ἐστιν in second clause
   4. 15:22: omission of any verb in the clause: ὑποδήματα εἰς τοὺς πόδας
   5. 20:25: omission of ἀπόδοτε in second clause

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahern, Barnabus M. "Staff or No Staff?" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 5 (1943): 332-37.

Alexander, L. C. A. "Acts and Intellectual Biography." Pages 31-63 in *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Vol. I: Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter, and Andrew D. Clarke. Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 1993.

———. *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1-4 and Acts 1.1.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Aristotle. *The Art of Rhetoric.* Translated by John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

———. *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum.* Translated by W. S. Hett. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Barreto, Jairo Alfredo Roa. "The Pedagogy of Jesus as a Transforming Practice." *Ministerial Formation* 111 (2008): 13-17.

Bauer, Johannes B. "Wer sein Leben retten will." Pages 7-10 In *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mußner. Regensberg: Pustet, 1963.

Beavis, Mary Ann. "Parable and Fable." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 473-98.

Black, C. Clifton. *The Rhetoric of the Gospel: Theological Artistry in the Gospels and Acts.* St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2001.

Blass, Friedrich, and Albert Debrunner. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature.* Translated by Robert W Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought 300 B.C.E. To 200 C.E.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome.* Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1977.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Borg, Marcus J. "Portraits of Jesus." Pages 83-106 in *The Search for Jesus: Modern Scholarship Looks at the Gospels: Symposium at the Smithsonian Institution, September 11, 1993*. Edited by Hershel Shanks. Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society, 1994.

———. *Jesus: Uncovering the Life, Teachings, and Relevance of a Religious Revolutionary.* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 2006.

Bovon, François. *Luke the Theologian.* 2nd rev. ed. Waco, Tx: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Bradley, C. B. "The Classification of Rhetorical Figures." *Modern Language Notes* 1 (1886): 140-42.

Brawly, Robert L. "Canon and Community: Intertextuality, Canon, Interpretation, Christology, Theology, and Persuasive Rhetoric in Luke 4:1-13." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 31 (1992): 419-34.

Bullinger, Ethelbert William. *Figures of Speech Used in the Bible.* Grand Rapids, Mi: Baker Book House.

Bultmann, Rudolf Karl. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition.* Translated by John Marsh. New York: Harper & Row, 1963.

Burney, C. F. *The Poetry of Our Lord: An Examination of the Formal Elements of Hebrew Poetry in the Discourses of Jesus Christ.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1925.

Burridge, Richard A. *What Are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography.* Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 2004.

Burton, Gideon. *Silva Rhetoricae.* Online: http://www.humanities.byu/rhetoric.

Cadbury, Henry Joel. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke.* Harvard Theological Studies, 6. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

———. *The Making of Luke-Acts.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

Cain, Rebecca Benson. *The Socratic Method: Plato's Use of Philosophical Drama.* New York: Continuum, 2007.

Catchpole, David R. "The Son of Man's Search for Faith (Luke 18:8b)." *Novum Testamentum* 19 (1977): 81-104.

Charlesworth, James H. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha & the New Testament: Prolegomena for the Study of Christian Origins*. Harrisburg, Pa: Trinity Press International, 1985.

Cheong, C. S. Abraham. *A Dialogic Reading of the Steward Parable (Luke 16:1-9).* New York: Peter Lang, 2001.

Cicero. *De Oratore.* Translated by Harris Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

———. *De Partitione Oratoria.* Translated by Harris Rackham. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1942.

———. *De Inventione.* Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

———. *Orator.* Translated by H.M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Clarke, M. L. *Rhetoric at Rome: A Historical Survey.* London: Cohen & West, 1953.

Cohen, Shaye J. D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1987.

Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St. Luke.* London: Faber, and Faber, 1960.

———. *Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas.* Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1954.

Cotter, Wendy J. "The Parable of the Children in the Market-Place, Q (Lk) 7:31-35: An Examination of the Parable's Image and Significance." *Novum Testamentum* 19 (1987): 289-304.

Courthial, Pierre. "La Parabole du Semeur en Luc 8:5-15." *Etudes Théologiques et Religieuses* 47 (1972): 397-420.

Crossan, John Dominic. "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1972): 285-307.

———. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant.* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1991.

Culpepper, R. Alan. *Luke.* New Interpreter's Bible 9. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.

Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization.* Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Daube, David. *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism.* New York: Arno Press, 1973.

Deatrick, Eugene P. "Salt, Soil, Savior." *The Biblical Archaeologist* 25 (1962): 41-48.

Demetrius. *On Style.* Translated by Doreen C. Innes. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Two 'Harsh' Sayings of Christ Explained." *The Downside Review* 103 (1985): 218-29.

Doble, Peter. "Luke 24:26,44–Songs of God's Servant: David and his Psalms in Luke-Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 28 (2006): 267-83.

Douglas, Mary. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1966.

———. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology.* 2nd ed. London: Barrie and Jenkins, 1973.

Ennius. "Annals." Pages 1-215 in *Remains of Old Latin.* Translated by E. H. Warmington. Loeb Classical Library. Edited by T. E. Page, E. Capps, and W. H. D. Rouse. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1935.

Esler, Philip F. ed. *The Early Christian World.* Vol. 1. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel According to Luke.* 2 vols. Anchor Bible 28-29. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981.

Fuhrmann, M. *Die antike Rhetorik: Eine Einführung.* 2nd ed. Munich: Artemis, 1987.

Galup, Patrice. "Trois remarques sur la parabole dite du "Bon Samaritain" (Lc 10:25-37)." *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 83 (2008): 413-18.

Gamble, Harry Y. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Gathercole, Simon. "The Justification of Wisdom." *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 476-88.

Geldenhuys, Norval. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke.* Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 1954.

Gempf, Conrad. "Public Speaking and Published Accounts." Pages 259-304 in *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Volume 1 Ancient Literary Setting.* Edited by Bruce W. Winter, and Andrew D. Clarke. Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 1993.

Giblin, Charles Homer. "'The Things of God' in the Question Concerning the Tribute to Caesar (Lk 20:25; Mk 12:17; Mt 22:21)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 33 (1971): 510-27.

Godet, F. *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke.* 2 vols. Translated by M. D. Cusin. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1870.

Gowler, David B. "'At His Gate Lay a Poor Man': A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32 (2005): 249-65.

Green, Joel B. "Jesus and a Daughter of Abraham (Luke 13:10-17): Test Case for a Lucan Perspective on Jesus' Miracles." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1989): 643-54.

———. *The Gospel of Luke.* New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 1997.

Hamm, M. Dennis. "The Freeing of the Bent Woman and the Restoration of Israel: Luke 13:10-17 as Narrative Theology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31 (1987): 23-44.

Hanson, K. C., and Douglas E. Oakman. *Palestine in the Time of Jesus: Social Structures and Social Conflicts.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.

Harrington, Hannah K. *Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman World.* New York: Routledge, 2001.

Hartsock, Chad. *Sight and Blindness in Luke-Acts.* Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Hertig, Paul. "The Subversive Kingship of Jesus and Christian Social Witness." *Missiology: An International Review* 32 (2004): 475-90.

———. "The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes." *Missiology: An International Review* 26 (1998): 167-79.

Herzog, William R. *Parables as Subversive Speech: Jesus as Pedagogue of the Oppressed.* Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.

———. *Jesus, Justice, and the Reign of God.* Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox press, 2000.

———. *Prophet and Teacher: An Introduction to the Historical Jesus.* Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2005.

Hock, Ronald F. "Homer in Greco-Roman Education." Pages 56-77 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity.* Edited by Dennis R. McDonald. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.

Hogan, Derek K. "Paul's Defense: A Comparison of the Forensic Speeches in Acts, Callirhoe, and Leucippe and Clitophon." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 29 (2002): 73-87.

Hogan, Derek K. *Forensic Speeches in Acts 22-26 in Their Literary Environment: A Rhetorical Study.* Electronic Resource. Waco, Tx: Baylor University, 2006.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Parables of Jesus.* Translated by S. H. Hooke. New York: Scribner, 1955.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke.* Sacra Pagina 3. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington. Collegeville, Mn: Liturgical Press, 1991.

Kennedy, George Alexander. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

———. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition From Ancient to Modern Times.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1980.

———. *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

———. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

———. *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric.* Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.

———. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

———. "Historical Survey of Rhetoric." Pages 3-41 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400.* Edited by Stanley Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

———. "The Genres of Rhetoric." Pages 43-50 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400.* Edited by Stanley Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Kennedy, John F. "Inaugural Address 20, January, 1961." Pages 311-314 in *Presidential Documents: The Speeches, Proclamations, and Policies that have Shaped the Nation from Washington to Clinton*. Edited by J. F. Watts, and Fred L. Israel. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Kimball, Charles A. III. "Jesus' Exposition of Scripture in Luke 20:9-19: An Inquiry in Light of Jewish Hermeneutics." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 3 (1993): 77-92.

King, Martin Luther, Jr. "I Have a Dream." Pages 101-106 in *I Have a Dream: Writings and Speeches the Changed the World*. Edited by James Melvin Washington. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996.

Kinukawa, Hisako. "The Miracle Story of the Bent-Over Woman (Luke 13:10-17): An Interaction-Centered Interpretation." Pages 292-314 in *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed*. Edited by Ingrid Rosa Kitzenberger. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Knight, George W. "Luke 16:19-31: The Rich Man and Lazarus." *Review and Expositor* 94 (1997): 277-83.

Kraus, Thomas J. "'Uneducated', 'Ignorant', or even 'Illiterate'? Aspects and Background for an Understanding of Agrammatoi (and Idiotai) in Acts 4.13." *New Testament Studies* 45 (1999): 434-49.

Kurz, William S. "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 251-68.

Lacocque, André. "L'herméneutique de Jésus au sujet de la loi dans la parabole du Bon Samaritain." *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 78 (2003): 25-46.

Landry, David and Ben May. "Honor Restored: New Light on the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Luke 16:1-8a)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 119 (2000): 287-309.

Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms: A Guide for Students of English Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968.

Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 2nd ed. München: Max Heuber, 1973.

———. *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*. Edited by David E. Orton, and R. Dean Anderson. Translated by Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen, and David E. Orton. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

Leigh, James H. "The Use of Figures of Speech in Print Ad Headlines." *Journal of Advertising* 23 (1994): 17-33.

Lenski, Gerhard E. *Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.

Lentz, John Clayton, Jr. *Luke's Portrait of Paul.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Lentz, Tony M. *Orality and Literacy in Hellenic Greece.* Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois University Press, 1989.

Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon.* 9th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1940.

Ljungvik, Herman. "Zur Erklärung einer Lukas-Stelle (Luk. XVIII.7)." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964): 289-94.

Longinus. *On the Sublime.* Translated by W.H. Fyfe. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Lys, Daniel. "Les Richesses Injustes: Luc 16:1-13." *Études Théologiques et Religieuses* 76 (2001): 391-98.

Mack, Burton L. *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels.* Sonoma, Ca: Polebridge Press, 1989.

———. *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q and Christian Origins.* San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1993.

Mahfouz, Hady. "Une relecture de Lc 16,8b." *Theological Review* 25 (2004): 39-56.

Malina, Bruce. J. *The New Testament World: Insights From Cultural Anthropology.* Rev. ed. Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.

———. *The Social Gospel of Jesus: The Kingdom of God in Mediterranean Perspective.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

Malina, Bruce, and Jerome Neyrey. "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World." Pages 25-65 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts.* Edited by Jerome Neyrey. Peabody, Ma: Hendrickson, 1991.

Malina, Bruce, and Richard L. Rohrbaugh. *Social Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Marrou, H. I. *A History of Education in Antiquity.* Translated by George Lamb. London: Sheed & Ward, 1956.

Martin, Josef. *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode.* Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft; 2. Abt., 3. T. München: Beck, 1974.

Martin, Michael. "Progymnastic Topic Lists: A Compositional Template for Luke and Other Bioi." *New Testament Studies* 54 (2008): 18-41.

Matthews, Shelly. *First Converts: Rich Pagan Women and the Rhetoric of Mission in Early Judaism and Christianity.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.

Maxwell, Kathy Reiko. *Hearing Between the Lines: The Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and Its Literary Milieu.* Electronic Resource. Waco, Tx: Baylor University, 2007.

McDonald, J. Ian H. "Rhetorical Issue and Rhetorical Strategy in Luke 10:25-37 and Acts 10:1-11, 18." Pages 59-73 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference.* Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.

Meier, John P. *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus.* Vol. 4. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.

Moessner, David P. "The Lukan Prologues in the Light of Ancient Narrative Hermeneutics. Παρακολουθηκότι and the Credentialed Author." Pages 399-418 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts.* Edited by J. Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Morgenthaler, Robert. *Lukas und Quintilian.* Zürich: Gotthelf, 1993.

———. *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes.* Zürich: Gotthelf, 1958.

Neusner, Jacob. "First Cleanse the Inside: The 'Halakhic' Background of a Controversy-Saying." *New Testament Studies* 22 (1976): 486-95.

Neusner, Jacob, William Scott Green, and Ernest S. Frerichs, eds. *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Neyrey, Jerome H. ed. *The Social World of the New Testament: Insights and Models.* Peabody, Ma: Hendrickson, 2008.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

Nolland, John. *Luke.* 3 vols. Word Biblical Commentary 35a-35c. Dallas: Word Books, 1989-1993.

O'Toole, Robert, F. "Some Exegetical Reflections on Luke 13:10-17." *Biblica* 73 (1992): 84-107.

———. "The Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts." Pages 147-162 in *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation*. Edited by Wendell Willis. Peabody, Ma: Hendrickson, 1987.

Oakman, Douglas E. "Jesus and Agrarian Palestine: The Factor of Debt." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 57-73.

Origen. "Contra Celsum." Pages 395-669 in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers.* Edited by Alexander Roberts, and James Donaldson. Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 1979.

Paffenroth, Kim. "The Testing of a Sage: 1 Kings 10:1-13 and Q 4:1-13 (LK 4:1-13)." *Expository Times* 87 (1985): 142-43.

Parsons, Mikeal C. "The Quest of the 'Rhetorical' Jesus." Pages 30-44 in *Literary Encounters with the Reign of God*. Edited by Sharon H. Ringe, and H. C. Paul Kim. New York: T&T Clark International, 2004.

———. *Body and Character in Luke and Acts: The Subversion of Physiognomy in Early Christianity.* Grand Rapids, Mi: Baker Academic, 2006.

———. "Landmarks Along the Way: The Function of the 'L' Parables in the Lukan Travel Narrative." *Southwestern Journal of Theology* 40 (1997): 33-47.

Patillon, Michel. *Aelius Theon Progymnasmata.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997.

Pellegrini, Silvia. "Ein 'ungetreuer' οἰκονόμος (Lk 16,1-9)." *Bibische Zeitschrift* 48 (2004): 161-78.

Perelman, Chaïm, and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation.* Translated by John Wilkinson, and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Petty, Richard E., John T. Cacioppo and Martin Heesacker. "Effects of Rhetorical Questions on Persuasion." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 40 (1981): 432-40.

Plümacher, Eckhart. *Lukas als Hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Porter, Stanley E. ed. *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C.-A.D. 400.* Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Porter, Stanley E., and Thomas H. Olbricht eds. *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays From the 1995 London Conference.* Journal for the study of the New Testament. Supplement series; 146. Sheffield, UK: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Pseudo-Cicero. *Rhetorica Ad Herennium.* Translated by Harry Caplan. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1964.

Quintilian. *Institutio Oratoria.* Translated by Harold Edgeworth Butler. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1921.

Rabinowitz, Peter J. *Before Reading: Narrative Conventions and the Politics of Interpretation.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1987.

———. "Truth in Fiction: A Reexamination of Audiences." *Critical Inquiry* 4 (1977): 121-41.

Ringe, Sharon H. *Luke.* Louisville, Ky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

Robbins, Vernon K. "A Socio-Rhetorical Look at the Works of John Knox on Luke-Acts." Pages 91-106 in *Cadbury, Knox, and Talbert: American Contributions to the Study of Acts*. Edited by Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joseph B. Tyson. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Roosevelt, Franklin D. "First Inaugural Address 4, March, 1933." Pages 259-263 in *Presidential Documents: The Speeches, Proclamations, and Policies that have Shaped the Nation from Washington to Clinton*. Edited by J. F. Watts, and Fred L. Israel. New York: Routledge, 2000.

Rothschild, Clare K. *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Rouwhorst, Gerard. "Table Community in Early Christianity." Pages 69-84 in *A Holy People: Jewish and Christian Perspectives on Religious Communal Identity*. Edited by Marcel Poorthuis, and Joshua Schwartz. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

Rowe, Galen O. "Style." Pages 121-158 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period: 330 B.C. - A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley Porter. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society.* Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 2001.

Sanders, James A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." Pages 46-69 in *Luke and Scripture.* Edited by Craig A. Evans, and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

Schellenberg, Ryan S. "Which Master? Whose Steward? Metalipsis and Lordship in the Parable of the Prudent Steward (Lk. 16.1-13)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 10 (2008): 263-88.

Schmidt, Thomas E. "Burden, Barrier, Blasphemy: Wealth in Matt 6:33, Luke 14:33, and Luke 16:15." *Trinity Journal* 9 (1988): 171-89.

Schweizer, Eduard. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas.* Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982.

———. *The Good News According to Luke.* Translated by David E. Green. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1984.

Scott, Bernard Brandon. *Hear Then the Parable: A Commentary on the Parables of Jesus.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.

Smith, Mahlon H. "No Place for a Son of Man." *Foundations & Facets Forum* 4 (1988): 83-107.

Stegemann, Ekkehard W., and Wolfgang Stegemann. *The Jesus Movement.* Translated by O. C. Dean, Jr. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Stigall, Josh. "The Progymnasmata and the Characterization of God in Luke's Parables: The Parable of the Rich Fool as a Test Case." Paper presented at Baylor University. Waco, Tx, April 2005.

Sylva, David D. "The Cryptic Clause *en tois tou patros mou dei einai me* in Lk 2:49b." *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschafte und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 78 (1987): 132-40.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel.* New York: Crossroad, 1982.

———. "Once again: Gospel Genre." *Semeia* 43 (1988): 53-73.

———. *What is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.

———. *Reading Luke-Acts in Its Mediterranean Milieu.* Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation.* Vol. 1: The Gospel According to Luke. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1991.

———. *The Sword of His Mouth: Forceful and Imaginative Language in Synoptic Sayings.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Thucydides. *The History of the Peloponnesian War.* Translated by Charles Forster Smith. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Tolbert, Malcolm O. *Luke.* The Broadman Bible Commentary 9: Luke-John. Edited by Clifton J. Allen. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1970.

Torgerson, Heidi. "The Healing of the Bent Woman: A Narrative Interpretation of Luke 13:10-17." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 32 (2005): 178-86.

Trudinger, Paul. "Ire or Irony? The Enigmatical Character of the Parable of the Dishonest Steward (Luke 16:1-13)." *The Downside Review* 116 (1998): 85-102.

Tuckett, Christopher M. "The Temptation Narrative in Q." Pages 479-507 in *The Four Gospels: Festschrift Frans Neirynck*. Vol. 1. Edited by F. Van Segbroeck et. al. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.

Vinson, Richard B. *Luke.* Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary. Macon, Ga: Smyth & Helwys, 2008.

Wifstrand, Albert. "Lukas 18:7." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1964): 72-74.

Wilder, Amos. *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1971.

Wimsatt, W. K. and M. C. Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review* 54 (1946): 468-88.

Wimsatt, W. K. and M. C. Beardsley. "The Affective Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review* 57 (1949): 31-55.

Winter, Bruce W. "Official Proceedings and Forensic Speeches." Pages 305-336 in *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting: Volume 1 Ancient Literary Setting.* Edited by Bruce W. Winter, and Andrew D. Clarke. Grand Rapids, Mi: Eerdmans, 1993.

Wright, A. G. "The Widow's Mites: Praise or Lament? –A matter of Context." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1982): 256-65.

Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.

Younger, Brett. "Luke 10:25-37--Preaching Like the Good Samaritan." *Review and Expositor* 90 (1993): 393-98.

Zillmann, Dolf. "Rhetorical Elicitation of Agreement in Persuasion." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 21 (1972): 159-65.