The Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Faculty of Humanities
Department of Comparative Religion

Expelling Demons from the *Gospel of Luke*: Recovering the Sense of Δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek Literature

Samuel (Shmuel) Rausnitz

Under the supervision of Dr. David Satran

Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

December 2015

Abstract

Common knowledge and modern translations assume that by δαιμόνιον the author of the *Gospel of Luke* and the *Acts of the Apostles* meant *demon*. More specifically, it is alleged that he had in mind spirit-beings that are innately evil, being entirely devoted to frustrating the intentions of the good God and antagonizing righteous humans, and also subservient to God's evil arch-nemesis, the devil. The present study criticizes this assumption that in *Luke-Acts* δαιμόνιον corresponds semantically with *demon*. The familiar, demonic version of δαιμόνιον derives from the dualism of Patristic-Christian discourse of the second to fourth centuries. *Luke-Acts*, however, ideologically belongs to the discourse of Jewish-Greek writings of the Second Temple period. Δαιμόνιον in those variegated texts entails no association with a moral side but rather consistent representation of the divinities honored by non-Israelite(/non-Jewish) nations via idolatry. The word among Jews conveyed not dualistic evil spirits but rather henotheistic foreign/forbidden ones—the rivals of Yhwh. The Lukan δαιμόνιον harmonizes not with the Patristic *demon* but with this contemporary-Jewish *foreign god*. This understanding of δαιμόνιον, restored to *Luke-Acts*, renders the text more meaningful, especially by emancipating δαιμόνιον ἀκάθαρτον and πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον from redundancy or obscurity and also by accounting for the correlation between these terms and the action of the narrative within or outside the Land of Israel.

Table of Contents

Introduction to the Problem

Whoever penned the composite narrative that came to be called the *Gospel of Luke* and the *Acts of the Apostles* evidences far more than the writers of the other Synoptic Gospels an affinity for the word δαιμόνιον. Appearing twenty-two times in *Luke* and once in *Acts*, its frequency bests that of *Matthew* twice over. It is nearly double that of *Mark*, for "Luke" preferred δαιμόνιον when reiterating Markan pericopes that used other, related terms. The superior frequency of δαιμόνιον in *Luke-Acts* portrays an author who assigned to this word specific semantic content that conveyed considerable import for his story. But what did Luke mean by δαιμόνιον?

English translations of NT offer the seemingly obvious answer: Luke was writing about demons. For the sixty-two occurrences of δαιμόνιον from *Matthew* to *Revelation*,[1] NRSV renders sixty of them as *demon*(*s*).[2] This translation seems self-evident. It is traditional, etymologically faithful, and evokes Christian demonology—*Luke-Acts* is, after all, a Christian text.

Yet scholars of the fields intersecting at the early Jesus Movement continue to dispute Christianity's claim to the first-century texts in its canon. This process entails intellectually separating the first-century material from its second-century inheritors and then reading the texts within Jewish theological discourse of the Second Temple period. Since words convey semantic content, and semantic content draws on the web of ideas that comprises the culture of a speaker and audience,[3] interpretation of a text's terminology must correspond with the author's cultural milieu. In the following investigation I will verify this principle by showing how the meaning of δαιμόνιον differed within Jewish discourse of the Second Temple period

1. See "δαιμόνιον," *CGNT* 182–83.
2. NRSV inaccurately translates *Rev* 16:14's πνεύματα δαιμονίων adjectivally: "demonic spirits."
3. Clifford Geertz, *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 5.

from that which it gained in Patristic-Christian discourse, namely, the Dualistic *demon*. That special meaning may figure likewise in the first-century texts of the early Jesus Movement that are now being reclaimed for Jewish discourse—among them, *Luke-Acts*.

By way of identifying the stakes in ascertaining what Luke intended by δαιμόνιον, I will first consider the meaning of δαιμόνιον/δαίμων in the ancient-Hellenic and Patristic discourses. The latter fixed the semantic content of δαίμων/δαιμόνιον with the ideas enmeshed in the typical rendering of *demon*. I will propose that despite the regnant approach to *Luke-Acts*, which perceives the text and its language as congenial to Patristic discourse, Luke's δαιμόνιον should be understood instead according to Jewish-Greek discourse of the Second Temple period.

In Part Two, I evaluate the usage of δαιμόνιον in texts written by Jews in Greek during the Second Temple period. These texts include constituents of the LXX, Pseudepigrapha, *1 Enoch*'s *Book of the Watchers* and *Epistle*, Philo, Josephus, and NT. They serve as windows into one edifice of discourse, providing different angles on δαιμόνιον as an interior fixture. Not withstanding differences in genre, provenance, rhetorical interest, and sectarian affiliation, the texts express ideas in circulation throughout the Jewish communities. One of the outcomes of this assessment is to demonstrate that just as there was a (variegated) Greek δαιμόνιον and also a Christian δαιμόνιον, so was there a Jewish δαιμόνιον.

In Part Three I present the δαιμόνιον passages of *Luke-Acts*. Each passage receives my own exegetical attention as well as the perspectives of François Bovon for passages in *Luke*, Richard Pervo for the occurrence in *Acts*, and Wahlen for both installments. In assembling the primary and secondary material, I intend to illustrate some of the weak points of reading *Luke-Acts* according to Christian Demonology.

Finally, in Part Four I conclude my study by restoring the Jewish δαιμόνιον to *Luke-Acts*. Therein I evaluate whether the Jewish δαιμόνιον corroborates other textual elements: locally (in four pericopes in which δαιμόνιον figures) as well as thematically (in contradistinction to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον). If the Jewish δαιμόνιον indeed matches the role Luke assigned to the term, we should expect as an outcome a more-comprehensible story than the typical reading afforded by *demon*. At the end of this section I offer my conclusions.

Part One—Regarding the Ambiguity of Δαιμόνιον and Demonology

OED lists as *demon*'s primary definition, "An evil spirit,"[4] and *NEB* has the more expansive, "any of numerous malevolent spiritual beings, powers, or principles that mediate between the transcendent and temporal realms."[5] *Demon* thus assumes moral and structural realities that determine the stakes and environment whence demons derive their identity: that they are "evil" implies a moral framework consisting of two conflicting sides (good and evil); and that they bridge "transcendent and temporal realms" portrays a world comprised of two distinct yet symbiotic spaces (the earthly/secular and the heavenly/spiritual). Evidently a predetermined and rather elaborate conception of the world belies the definitions offered by *OED* and *NEB*.

1.1. Δαίμων/Δαιμόνιον among Ancient Greeks

Yet *demon* hardly represents its etymological progenitors, δαίμων or δαιμόνιον, in certain ancient discourses—including their native ones. In epic-, classical-, and Hellenistic-Greek literature, δαίμων and δαιμόνιον convey no inherent moral quality and nearly always refer to those divinities that the Greeks otherwise called θεοί. In Homer, Athena Οὔλυμπόνδε βεβήκει δώματ' ἐς αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς μετὰ δαίμονας ἄλλους—"was forthwith gone to Olympus to the palace of Zeus, who beareth the aegis, to join the company of the other gods" (*Il.* 1:221–222). The poet describes Aphrodite, too, as both θεά and δαίμων (3:396, 420).[6] Solon invokes Γῆ as the μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων Ὀλυμπίων—"great mother of the Olympian *daimónōn*."[7] One of Euripides's cyclopses equates gods and δαίμονες when he derisively declares that the

4. "Demon, n. (and adj.)" *OED*.
5. "Demon," *NEB* 4:7.
6. Murray translates both words (θεᾶ and δαίμων) as "goddess."
7. Aristotle quotes him in *Ath. pol.* 12.4. See Aristotle, *La Constituzione di Atene* (ed. A. Casattini; Florence: Le Monnier, 1900), 19.

sacrifices of his flocks go θεοῖσι δ' οὔ, καὶ τῇ μεγίστῃ, γαστρὶ τῇδη, δαιμόνων—"not to the gods but to this stomach, the greatest of the *daimónōn*" (*Cycl*., lns. 334–335).[8] Centuries later, Polybius describes a treaty Ἐναντίον Διὸς καὶ Ἥρας καὶ Ἀπόλλωνος, ἐναντίον δαίμονος Καρχηδονίων καὶ Ἡρακλέους καὶ Ἰολάου, ἐναντίον Ἄρεως, Τρίτωνος, Ποσειδῶνος, ἐναντίον θεῶν τῶν συστρατευομένων καὶ—"In the presence of Zeus, Hera, and Apollo: in the presence of the [*daímonos*] of Carthage, of Heracles, and Iolaus: in the presence of Ares, Triton, Poseidon; in the presence of the gods who battle for us," etc. (*Hist.* 7.9.2). Δαιμόνιον functioned similarly. Several of Euripides's plays conclude with, πολλαὶ μορφαὶ τῶν δαιμονίων, πολλὰ δ' ἀέλπτως κραίνουσι θεοί [....] τῶν δ' ἀδοκήτων πόρον ηὗρε θεός—"Many are the forms of the *daimoníōn*; many things do the gods accomplish unexpectedly [….] But god found a means of the unexpected" (*Alc.*, lns. 1,388–1,392).[9] Here the playwright elaborates on δαιμόνια by setting θεοί (which Euripides elsewhere describes as δαίμονες)[10] in parallel syntax. Aeschylus refers to Zeus as a δαιμόνιον (*Suppl*., ln. 100). In Plato's *Apology*, Meletus charges that Socrates θεοὺς οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει οὐ νομίζοντα, ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καινά—"does not believe in the gods the state believes in, but in other new spiritual beings" (24b). The accusation rested not on Socrates's regard for δαιμόνια instead of θεοί; rather, that this set of δαιμόνια were *other* gods, different from those whom Athens formally recognized. These examples span centuries and genres of Greek literature. Yet throughout, δαίμων and δαιμόνιον refer to gods.[11]

To be sure, the Greek δαίμων could, like *demon*, entail mediation and, therefore, taxonomical distinction from θεός. In Plato's *Symposium* Diotima defines δαίμων as μεταξύ

8. Translation my own.
9. Translation my own. Cf. *Andr*., lns. 1,284–288, *Hel*., lns. 1,688–692, and *Bacch*., lns. 1,388–392.
10. See n. 8.
11. "*Daimon* and, for the matter of that, *theos*, *theoi*, *to theion* are constantly used to denote the incalculable non-human element in phenomena." Arthur D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933), 222.

[...] θεοῦ τε καὶ θνητοῦ—"between divine and mortal" (202e). But this model of the divine cannot have represented traditional or popular impressions of it. Diotima adds, θεὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ οὐ μείγνυται—"God with man does not mingle" (203a), which contradicts Homer and Greek mythology's countless instances of direct interaction between god and man. Her definition of δαίμων, then, at best represents terminological appropriation in philosophical discourse. Centuries on, δαίμων continued to admit a broad semantic range: Strabo explains that δαίμονες are οὐ πρόπολοι θεῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ θεοὶ προσηγορεύθησαν—"not only ministers of gods, but also gods themselves" (*Geogr*. 10.3.19).[12] His clarification portrays the taxonomical contours of δαίμων as unclear to his contemporaries. Yet his statement is hardly polemical; he confidently draws on prior centuries' usage of δαίμων for reference to full-fledged gods, giving us the impression that thusly was the word understood by most.

Though typically synonymous, there was sometimes semantic variation between δαίμων and δαιμόνιον. When Diotima asserts that Eros is a mediating δαίμων, she subsumes him within τὸ δαιμόνιον (202e). Her statement shows that δαιμόνιον could exceed δαίμων semantically in its capacity as a neuter substantive, describing divinity. In the *Republic* Socrates, after pondering whether a θεός could lie, concludes, ἀψευδὲς τὸ δαιμόνιόν τε καὶ τὸ θεῖον—"deceitless is the divine and the godly" (382e).[13] Here δαιμόνιον seems inclusive of but not synonymous with δαίμων or θεός. And yet one of the most famous δαιμόνια in classical-Greek literature is Socrates's guide (*Apol*. 31c–d).[14] Plato, then, used the term for the divine as a class and also, like δαίμων, for particular divine entities.

12. Translation my own.
13. Translation my own.
14. See also Xenophon, *Mem*. 1.1.2, 4: διετεθρύλητο γὰρ ὡς φαίη Σωκράτης τὸ δαιμόνιον ἑαυτῷ σημαίνειν—"For it was spread that Socrates asserted that the *daimonion* would indicate to him."

The epic, classical, and Hellenistic δαίμων and δαιμόνιον were general terms alluding to divinity, as a collectivity or as the particular gods. The Hellenic δαίμων/δαιμόνιον rarely entail sub-god/super-human mediation and never represent a divinity of *either* good or evil nature. Whither, then, should the demonic sense of δαίμων/δαιμόνιον be attributed?

1.2. The Patristic Origins of *Demon*

Demon reflects theological conceptions consolidated in Patristic-Christian discourse.[15] A discussion in Origen's *Contra Celsum* exhibits δαίμων/δαιμόνιον's semantic shift from the Hellenic broad and morally-neutral sense to the demonic. Origen's long rebuttal to Celsus, a second-century Greek critic of the Christian movement,[16] showcases both the persistence of the Hellenic δαίμων/δαιμόνιον and also Christianity's appropriation of the term. Origen quotes Celsus's query: τίνας τούτους [ἀγγέλους] λέγετε; θεοὺς ἤ ἄλλο τι γένος [....] ὡς εἰκός, τοὺς δαίμονας—"What do you mean by them [these messengers], gods or some other kind of being?" He resolves, ἄλλο τι ὡς εἰκός, τοὺς δαίμονας—"presumably […] some other kind, the daemons" (*Cels*. 5.4).[17] Celsus intuited divinities that serve Israel's god as a kind of δαίμων. This usage indeed reflects the mediating-role ascribed to δαίμονες in *Symp*. It also shows that by the second century, δαίμων could still describe "good" divinities.

Origen's response, in contrast, limits the semantic potential of δαίμων to intermediary, evil spirits. He "corrects" Celsus's definition, asserting, Ἀεὶ δ' ἐπὶ τῶν φαύλων ἔξω τοῦ παχυτέρου σώματος δυνάμεων τάσσεται τὸ τῶν δαιμόνων ὄνομα, πλανώντων καὶ περισπώντων

15. See Anders Petersen, "The Notion of Demon," in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (ed. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K. F. Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 32.
16. For an overview of Celsus's perception of and attacks against the Christians of his time, see Robert L. Wilken, *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003), 94–117.
17. Greek quotations from Origenes, *Contra Celsum* (Libri 8; ed. M. Marcovich; Leiden: Brill, 2001); English quotations from Origen, *Contra Celsum* (ed. and trans. H. Chadwick; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953).

τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ καθελκόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ὑπερουρανίων ἐπὶ τὰ τῇδε πράγματα—"The name of daemons is always applied to evil powers without the grosser body, and they lead men astray and distract them, and drag them down from God and the world beyond the heavens to earthly things" (*Cels*. 5.5).[18] This δαίμων articulates the primary elements in the modern-English definition of *demon*: a spirit-being serving evil and traversing between the temporal and eternal realms. The semantic continuity from this sense of δαίμων to *demon* exemplifies Patristic influence on Orthodoxy's progeny societies. *Demon* retains its etymological forebear's early-Christian character.[19]

1.3. Summation of the Semantic Background of *Demon*

The polyvalence of δαίμων/δαιμόνιον derives from the simple fact that Greco-Roman peoples conceptualized deity and morality in ways fundamentally different from their Christian contemporaries and successors. The Greek pantheon consisted of personae of no inherent and absolute moral affiliation. Consequently, δαίμων and δαιμόνιον in Hellenic literature convey no such sense. But for early Christians and their modern intellectual descendants, these terms signified *demon*. This semantic variation exemplifies a principle of human language: the semantic value of a word is conditioned by a given culture. Δαίμων/δαιμόνιον embodies incompatible theological conceptions, reflecting either Hellenic or Patristic discourses.

18. In early Christianity, "[t]wo views might be held of pagan deities. First, that they were figments of the imagination, or at least not existing supernatural beings; second, that they were in fact supernatural beings but evil *daimones* or *daimonia*." Nock, *Conversion*, 221.

19. The semantic congruity between *demon* and Origen's δαίμων obtains likewise with his δαιμόνιον; he shifts seamlessly between the Greek terms. In *Cels.* 1.31 he portrays Jesus's crucifixion, which defeated μεγάλου δαίμονος καὶ δαιμόνων ἄρχοντος—"a great daemon, in fact the ruler of daemons," as fulfillment of the concept that a just man's death can neutralize φαύλων δαιμονίων—"evil daemons" (*Cels*., 30–31). Chadwick's *daemon* for both δαίμων and δαιμόνιον reflects their synonymity as far as Origen is concerned. Similarly, in *Cels.* 1.6, speaking of the power of the name of Jesus over δαίμονες, Origen invokes *Matt* 7:22's Τῷ ὀνόματί σου δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν—"In your name we expelled *daimónia*." To Origen, δαιμόνιον and δαίμων were the same.

Yet these words were also in the mouths and at the styluses of Jews of the Second Temple period. The theological tradition of the Jewish communities entailed a configuration of the divine quite different from the capricious gods of Greece and the Dualism of early Christianity. Orthodoxy claimed continuity with the Jewish Scriptures, but are the demons of Christianity the δαιμόνια of Jewish-Greek theological discourse?

1.4. Jewish Demonology Pertaining to the Second Temple Period

Ancient- to modern-Jewish dialogue on spirit-entities of dubious character has long garnered scholarly interest, resulting in an entire academic field of study known as Jewish Demonology. The succinctness of Karel van der Toorn's definition of Demonology, "a doctrine of demons,"[20] portrays the general subject as straightforward. Indeed, the idea of the demon is axiomatic in Demonology and encompasses all spiritual entities depicted throughout history as malicious, dangerous, taboo, and/or morally base. Yet the word and field, as Anders Petersen has it, have "develop[ed] towards a higher degree of complexity and multiplicity," resulting in considerable obscurity.[21] The difficult modern situation, though, represents expansion on a concept already long-regarded as vague.[22]

This obscurity obtains in the branch of Demonology that deals with the biblical and Second Temple periods. The *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*, for example, lacks a clear distinction between *deity* and *demon*. In its preface the editors explain that the catalogue "discusses all the gods and demons whose names are found in the Bible."[23] But

20. Karel van der Toorn, "The Theology of Demons in Mesopotamia and Israel: Popular Belief and Scholarly Speculation," in *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitsch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt* (ed. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and D. Römheld; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 61.
21. Petersen, "The Notion," 23.
22. For example, Petersen quotes the mid-nineteenth-century existentialist, Søren Kierkegaard, who in *The Concept of Anxiety* called for a definition of "demon" since "in the course of time the demonic has denoted several different things, and at last has come to mean almost anything." Ibid.
23. Ed. Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (2d ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), xv.

which entities should be thought of as gods, and which, demons? The editors seem cognizant of these labels' imprecision, for they explain, "[t]he deities and demons dealt with in this dictionary are not all one of a kind," and yet "the distinction between major and minor gods is a delicate one."[24] What subsumes a divinity under one label or the other? Without resolving this categorical vagueness, the editors proceed to apply the words *god* and *demon* to an unqualified allusion to supremacy/inferiority among divinities. They describe the dynamics of rank and relation as relative to the ancient societies that affected the biblical texts—yet while offering no evidence that these ancient peoples even developed terminology that reflected clearcut distinctions matching and validating the dictionary's posited taxonomy. Rather, it seems that the study is constructed on the basis of predetermined and imported categories. They in fact resemble those which Origen determined in the third century.[25]

This tendency to apply the god/demon distinction to ancient literature is both chronic and internationally apparent in scholarship of Jewish Demonology. The consultants and editors of *DDD* hail from six countries, and the contributors represent several more. That scholars of different tongues so readily employ the term *demon* despite its nebulous relationship with other divinity-words demonstrates a universal *conceptual* problem. An external case-in-point is Esther Eshel's doctoral study, *האמונה בשדים בארץ-ישראל בימי הבית השני*. Eshel provides a comprehensive overview of the Jewish literature of the Second Temple period that contains references to the questionable spiritual characters that would typically be

24. Ibid.

25. *DDD* does attempt differentiation between deities, but only in terms of recognizability in the biblical texts. Thus, the first group includes "gods […] mentioned by name in the Bible" (ibid.); constituents of the second group are "mentioned in the Bible, not independently, but as an element in personal names and place names" (xvi); "a third group […] consists of gods mentioned in the Bible, but not in their capacity as gods. They are the so-called demythologized deities" (the example given is the Hebrew word for "moon," which corresponds etymologically with the Ugaritic moon-god) (ibid.); the fourth group alludes to "gods whose presence and/or divinity is often questionable" (ibid.); and finally the fifth group is the "category of gods […] constituted by human figures who rose to attain divine or semi-divine status" (xvii). None of these categories, however, pertain to the rank to which the editors originally referred nor do they offer a distinction between *god*/*deity* and *demon*.

labeled *demons*. At the outset of the project, she provides the following definition for the subject she wishes to tackle: [האמונה בכוחות קיימים אמנם הבדלים ניכרים בפרטיה של אמונה זו דמוניים] בין תרבויות ועמים שונים, אולם דומה כי ניתן להצביע על מכנה משותף לכולם, והיא ההנחה כי לכוחות הדמוניים יש יכולת להשפיע ולפעול בעולם.[26] This formulation serves as the common semantic denominator for the various terminology and depictions in the literature that Eshel examines. It implies more broadly that throughout the multifarious conceptions of divinity among human societies, mutual characteristics can be distilled and labeled כוחות דמוניים—"demonic powers."

This notion, however, reflects a common but precarious conceptual foundation of inquiry for two reasons. It assumes a ubiquitous, dyadic worldview, i.e. the transcendent/ imminent spatial divide reflected in the *OED* and *NEB* definitions of *demon* and noticeable in Origen. The dyad certainly bespeaks perceptions of reality relevant to many societies, but it is not universal. But Eshel's reasoning is especially problematic because logically it should include *God* and *angels*. They are absent from her investigation because in the Western conception of divinity, God and his angels are intrinsically *opposite* to and separate from demonic powers. But Jewish literature of the Second Temple period does not necessarily reflect Western conceptions of divinity. These weak points of Eshel's approach reveal a preconception of *demon* brought to the ancient texts: that of the Western intellectual tradition, the inheritor of Patristic-Christian discourse.

Demon thus signals an *a priori* commitment to a taxonomy suitable to Christianity yet imprecise in the case of ancient-Jewish theological paradigms and its terminology. The term's

26. אסתר אשל, *האמונה בשדים בארץ-ישראל בימי הבית השני* (חיבור לתואר דוקטור; האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, תשנ"ט), 1.

universal acceptance in spiritual parlance and the academic field that fortifies it obscure its weaknesses as a hermeneutical tool for comprehending ancient Jewish theological discourse.

1.4.1. Zoroastrian Dualism

The weaknesses inherent in applying *demon* to Jewish theological conceptions of the Second Temple period elude detection partly thanks to the perception of the dualization of contemporary Jewish theological discourse. Scholars of the Second Temple period commonly discern this moral-theological framework in the ancient Jewish evidence, especially when δαιμόνια figure. They in fact attribute the Patristic δαιμόνιον ultimately to Jewish-Zoroastrian syncretism in the post-exilic Jewish world. Edward Langton provides the following description of Zoroastrianism doctrine:

> According to the world-view presented in this system, the world is divided into two groups of opposing powers. On the one side stand the angels and archangels under the leadership of *Ahura Mazda*, the great Creator. On the other side are the demons and wicked men which […] are conceived to be under the rule of *Angra Mainyu*, who is the personal head of the kingdom of evil [….] The whole universe is made to share in the cleavage between good and evil. Everything belongs to one realm or the other.[27]

Several characteristics of Zoroastrianism evoke Christian orthodoxy. The overarching dyad of absolute good and evil obtains in both. Both describe a supreme creator at whose behest are lower, graded spirits. Both conceive of an opposite hostile camp organized comparably, with a leader-divinity that embodies evil, whose directives a host of inferior spirits obey.

Since it was from Persia that the Jewish exile-community returned, it seems reasonable to assume that they inherited more than Aramaic during their sojourn abroad. Accordingly, scholars discern in Jewish usage of δαιμόνιον the major aspects of Zoroastrian Dualism. Greg Riley explains that while "all deities in the classical period were morally ambiguous,"

27. Edward Langton, *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine; Its Origin and Development* (London: Epworth, 1949), 63 and 66.

> During the intertestamental period and the rise of Jewish literature in Greek, the terms *daimon* and *daimonion* began to assume among Jews the negative connotation of "demon in league with the Devil." The inspiration for this shift in meaning was the encounter during the Exile and later with Zoroastrian dualism. This cosmology postulated two warring spiritual camps controlled by their leaders, the Zoroastrian God and Devil, and commanded by archangels and archdemons and their descending ranks of lesser spirits.[28]

In other words, δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek discourse insinuated Dualism (generally) and the divinities serving exclusively the side of evil (specifically). Riley intimates that as a result of the relatively new Dualistic inclinations Jews were feeling, several words in the biblical Hebrew literature were "demonized" in translation.[29]

But this narrative presumes certain conditions about contemporary Jewish thought. If Dualism indeed indoctrinated the diverse Jewish groups responsible for the surviving written material, such a level of syncretism implies that Jews formerly lacked interest in or a solution for the source of evil. Such a development in the discourse would, of course, imply that Jews already conceived of good and evil in a way comparable to Zoroastrians. It also entails that Zoroastrianism actively prevailed over Biblical Henotheism. Given the central status of the biblical material throughout the Jewish communities of the Second Temple period, both in Israel and in the diaspora, the claim that the latter profoundly overrode major principles of the former seems at least suspect.

Indeed, key components of Dualism are absent from episodes in Jewish-Greek writing that feature δαιμόνιον. According to this system, the spirits of evil are subordinate to a leader who epitomizes evil. In the case of the LXX, then, δαιμόνιον should portray a relationship between them and an evil arch-enemy of Yhwh since, according to Riley, the LXX translators read Dualism into the text. Yet no such portrayal accompanies δαιμόνιον in LXX. As for the

28. Greg J. Riley, "Demon," *DDD*, 238.
29. Ibid.

role that Christian Orthodoxy eventually attributed to השטן/ὁ Σατανᾶς/ὁ διάβολος as the evil archetype and conductor of demonic forces, it is nowhere in the biblical literature in Greek.[30] Nor does it figure in the δαιμόνιον passages of extrabiblical Jewish-Greek literature. Even in NT association between ὁ διάβολος/ὁ Σατανᾶς and the δαιμόνια is hardly clear: Paul, though he speaks of both δαιμόνια and ὁ διάβολος, never draws a connection between the two; James refers to δαιμόνια but mentions no leader; the Synoptics portray δαιμόνια operating mainly independently[31]; the *Apocalypse* evokes no connection. What is more, though the Synoptics speak of ὁ Σατανᾶς as the ἄρχων of the δαιμόνια, Luke portrays ὁ διάβολος under the authority of God, obviating the Zoroastrian configuration.[32] Thus, while every instance of δαιμόνιον in ancient Jewish-Greek literature supposedly epitomizes Dualism's imposition on Jewish culture, the aforementioned hardly exhibit one of the major pillars of Dualism. The scholarly assessment is a paradox: Dualism simultaneously affected a perfect and imperfect impact on Jewish theological discourse of the Second Temple period.

Another key component of Dualism that hardly figures in the Jewish-Greek literature is the configuration of divine forces. Dualism imagines equal opposition in roles, if not power: good–evil, supremely good deity–supremely evil deity, subordinate good spirits–subordinate evil spirits. Riley takes the δαιμόνια of Jewish literature to constitute half of this last set, which implies that their opposites are the good spirits serving the supreme good deity. But again Jewish-Greek literature does not furnish an impression of comprehensive Dualization: nowhere are δαιμόνια described as the opposites of the various servant-spirits of Yhwh (ἄγγελοι and πνεύματα). Instead, the texts usually apply δαιμόνιον to *rivals of Yhwh*

30. It certainly had opportunities, e.g. in the freely-translated OG-*Isa* 13 and 35, which mention δαιμόνια among several creatures the translator did not recognize.

31. In contrast, they describe the activity of ἄγγελοι in *direct* relation to the will of κύριος.

32. Regarding this figure and the Synoptics' ἄρχων of the δαιμόνια, see §4.4.

himself.[33] Of the rare appearances of δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek literature, that in *Tobit* most closely resembles the Dualistic paradigm—yet imperfectly so. While God sends an ἄγγελος to deal with a jealous δαιμόνιον, the messenger requires human assistance. This dynamic does not match the Dualistic order. Similarly, the Synoptic authors set δαιμόνια/πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα in contrast to τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον and its human hosts rather than to ἄγγελοι.[34] Thus another major principle of Dualism does not manifest in Jewish-Greek literature.

Consequently, δαιμόνιον should not be interpreted according to Dualism. The hypothesis of Jewish-Zoroastrian syncretism represents scholars' explanation for δαιμόνιον's semantic shift: δαιμόνιον accrued Zoroastrian properties among Jews, and the Church Fathers adopted the term as such. But this hypothesis lacks textual support. Nevertheless, this claim bolsters a presupposition in Jewish Demonology of the Second Temple period. As a result, modern readers project Dualism onto δαιμόνιον, propagating misunderstanding.[35]

1.4.2. *Demon* as in *Evil Spirit* and *Fallen Angel*

In investigating the meaning of δαιμόνιον in ancient Jewish-Greek discourse, I encounter another common presupposition: the conflation of *demon* with *evil spirit* and *fallen angel*. The "Demons and Exorcism" entry in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, for example, opens with, "Belief in demons or evil spirits was widespread among Jews in the Second Temple Period," mentioning the "most notable example" among "the handful of

33. See Parts Two and Four.
34. See Part Four.
35. The major components of Zoroastrian Dualism are detectable in a strand of Jewish literature from the Second Temple period, namely that of the Qumran sect. Esther Eshel and Daniel Harlow point out "the dualist worldview of the Qumran sect, as represented mainly in the *Community Rule* (1QS), the *War Scrolls* (1QM), and 4QBerakhot (4Q286–287). According to these texts, the world is divided between the sons of light and the sons of darkness," i.e., the first component—the dyad; "Each side has angelic forces that participate in the cosmic battle," i.e., the third component—equal-opposite, subordinate divinities; "The good angels are led by the angel of light, Michael, whereas the evil angelic forces are led by Belial," i.e., the second component—the partisan paragon. Esther Eshel and Daniel C. Harlow, "Demons and Exorcism," *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, 531.

references to demons" in the Hebrew Bible as the רוח רעה that tormented Saul (*1 Sam*. 16:23).[36] Yet of the several words translated into δαιμόνιον in the LXX, the phrase רוח רעה is not among them. By presuming that *evil spirit* and *demon* are synonyms, the *Eerdmans* article represents several ancient terms as referring to the same thing. But the synonymity that this approach supposes obscures the contours of the ancient terminology.[37]

Like the Dualistic sense of δαιμόνιον, the synonymization of *demon*, *evil spirit*, and *fallen angel* originates in Patristic discourse.[38] The nascent conflation appears in Justin Martyr's appropriation of the Enochic *Book of the Watchers*. He summarizes, Οἱ δ' ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τήνδε τὴν τάξιν, γυναικῶν μίξεσιν ἡττήθησαν καὶ παῖδας ἐτέκνωσαν, οἵ εἰσιν οἱ λεγόμενοοι δαίμονες—"Mais les anges transgressèrent cet ordre, s'abaissèrent à des unions avec des femmes, et les enfants nés de ces unions sont les êtres que l'on appelle les démons" (*2 Apol*. 4.5.3).[39] Annette Reed explains that Justin draws upon the content and language of *1 En.* 15:8–16:1, consciously equating "the fallen angels' […] sons with demons"—whereas *1 Enoch* refers to them only as πνεύματα πονηρά (15:8).[40] Justin either misunderstood or innovated these terms' synonymity, fixing for subsequent Christian discourse the sameness of πνεύματα πονηρά and δαίμονες/δαιμόνια, and associating the amalgamation with the Enochic Angelic Fall.[41]

---

36. Ibid.
37. Dale Martin displays this tendency via several examples dating from the 1990s. D. B. Martin, "When Did Angels Become Demons?" *JBL* 129.4 (2010): 657.
38. According to Martin, certain Church Fathers deployed the Enochic myth of the Angelic Fall to account for the origins of demons. Their innovations include "Satan [as] an angel who rebelled against God and was cast out of heaven" and "[o]ther angels [who] rebelled along with him and became his minions," that is, "fallen angels [who] became demons" (ibid.).
39. Greek and French from Justin, *Apologie Pour Les Chrétiens* (ed. and trans. Charles Munier; Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2006), 330–331.
40. Annette Y. Reed, *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 163.
41. According to Reed, proto-orthodox Christians "appeal[ed] to the fallen angels and their teachings to explain the corruption of humankind" (idem*,* 160). Justin attributes the world's corrupt state to this group of smitten angels.

Synonymization progressed in the writings of Justin's younger contemporaries, Tatian (c. 120–c. 180) and Tertullian (c. 155–c. 240). Tatian, Martin explains, describes "an arch-rebel, surely an angel and no doubt Satan," "appointed to be a demon (δαίμων ἀποδείκνυται)" and leading those angels—"demonic apparitions"—that mixed with human women.[42] Likewise, Tertullian "explicitly mentions Enoch as his source for information about 'demons and spirits,' which he glosses as 'the apostate angels.'"[43] Like Justin, these two Church Fathers borrowed from *Watchers*. They agreed with their predecessor's conflation of *demon* and *evil spirit* and sealed the semantic fusion of these terms by association with *fallen angel*.[44] These early Christians exhibit the conceptualization that eventually bloomed into the Christian *demon*. However, when scholars interpret δαίμονες/δαιμόνια in Jewish predecessor literature according to these Patristic innovations, they perpetuate anachronism.

Jewish demonology of the Second Temple period thus seems profoundly influenced by the Patristic-Christian worldview, categories, and narratives. Scholars regularly project a Christian, Dualistic taxonomy and moral reality onto the Jewish literature that preceded it. The word *demon* exemplifies the problem: the unquestioned association with evil and angels perpetuates a category that dictates interpretation of the ancient-Jewish texts.

1.5. Wahlen and the Impurity of Spirits

These Patristic notions, embedded in *demon*, dominate even the most comprehensive assessment of δαιμόνια in the Synoptic Gospels: Clinton Wahlen's *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* (2004). Wahlen sets out "to discover whether or not the Synoptic writers deliberately associate spirits with impurity in order to convey something that

42. Martin, "When," 676, citing Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos* 7–8.
43. Martin, "When," 676.
44. This conflation and association with the narrative in *Watchers* was not universal for some time: "we see only a gradual identifying of evil spirits and demons with the fallen angels themselves" (idem, 677). Regardless of when it became normative, the semantic fusion occurred long after the Second Temple period.

'demon' and 'evil spirit' do not."[45] But he applies analytical categories that do not suit the text. For example, he assesses the evangelists' ideas of *impure spirit* through a dyadic conception of impurity (moral/ritual), a hermeneutical dichotomization that presumes ancient-Jewish cognizance of such a distinction.[46] But as Jonathan Klawans points out, "the adjectives 'ritual' and 'moral' […] do not appear in the texts, and neither one is a category as such in biblical or postbiblical Jewish literature."[47] The purity dyad presumes ideas in ancient Jewish discourse that the texts do not articulate. Instead, the Mosaic Law presents טמאה as that which is forbidden to Israel by reason of the nation's (and its god's) holiness (*Lev* 11). Whatever is טמא is to be considered *foreign* to the Israelite. Yet Wahlen resolves that "for Luke 'impure' is important […] primarily in an ethical sense."[48] The term "serves by way of ironic contrast to emphasize moral imperatives," ultimately embodied in "the contrast between the demonic and the kingdom of God."[49] Luke apparently intends by ἀκάθαρτον the evil nature of demons; his interest in purity amounts to a rhetorical channel for Dualism. But this explanation does not explain certain aspects of *Luke-Acts*: Why does Luke mention

45. Clinton Wahlen, *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 3. This issue pertains specially in the case of *Luke-Acts* because Luke introduces πνεύμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον in combination (*Luke* 4:33). What Luke means by the former seems to bear on the latter.
46. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 12.
47. Jonathan Klawans, *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 22. Klawans actually contends for these categories. He notes that ritual impurity results in "exclu[sion] from participation in certain ritual acts and [being] barred from entering sacred precincts," whereas moral impurity does not (ibid.). He thus posits *exclusion* as the distinguishing element between the two types of impurity. But this definition fails to account for the fact that the Torah sometimes punishes "moral impurity" with cutting offenders off from the people—the ultimate exclusion. He adds, "ritual purity is achieved […] *ritually*, that is by means of sacrifices, sprinklings, washings, and bathings" (idem, 22–3). Yet both the Hebrew biblical literature and the Synoptics describe types of sacrifices and washings as acts of repentance from *sin*, e.g. *Num* 15:27–28 prescribes the proper sacrifices in the case of sin in errancy; *Mark* 1:4 describes John's washing of "repentance for the forgiveness of sins." That the texts lack articulation of a conceptual divide between ritual/moral suggests that Israelites/Jews did not view life this way, which makes exegesis based on these categories prone to err.
48. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 161.
49. Ibid.

πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον—like δαιμόνιον—only in the land of Israel? Why is its first appearance in *Luke-Acts* combined with δαιμόνιον, a term that presumably already means *evil spirit*?[50]

Wahlen's mishandling of ancient Jewish discourse produces several contradictions. Luke, he says, is "a moralist,"[51] yet one for whom "ritual and moral requirements are upheld with neither automatically taking precedence over the other."[52] He distills no meaningful content from Luke's spirit-terminology, yet he deems Luke's pneumatology "the most developed."[53] Wahlen discerns Lukan redaction in several passages with πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον yet relegates these instances to "the earlier, historical Jesus tradition"—the term is only a Markan relic.[54] Regarding Satan, the "ultimate author" of evil,[55] "a gulf seems to be fixed in Luke-Acts between [him] and the demons," yet in his conclusions Wahlen states that in *Luke* "Satan is linked more closely with the demons than in the other Gospels."[56] These obscurities derive partly from Wahlen mistaking *Luke-Acts* for Christian literature, for in doing so he subordinates the ancient evidence and his own analytical tools to a different theological

50. Wahlen's only explanation for the formula in *Luke* 4:33 (πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου) is Luke's disinterest in impurity (*Jesus*, 168–69). Regarding the cessation of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον in *Acts* once the narrative leaves the land of Israel, Wahlen discerns no significance from the correlation. Rather, he attributes the appearance of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον in both *Luke* and *Acts* "to underlying traditions" (idem, 168). However, he contradicts his claim that Luke imported the term into *Acts* when he describes Luke "mov[ing] away" from it in favor of πνεῦμα πονηρόν" (idem, 161). Wahlen thus presumes that Luke felt constrained to reiterate the language of his source even though it meant little to him personally—a strange construal of the data when Luke evidences willingness to excise Markan terminology, which he even admits: "Luke eschews the one-word labels [such as ὁ δαιμονιζόμενος] which are so prevalent in Matthew and Mark" (*Jesus*, 150, n. 47). Even if Wahlen's notion that "underlying traditions" inspired πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον in *Luke-Acts* were to bypass scrutiny in the case of the first installment, the second originates with Luke. That the term continues to function therein conveys its special relevance—one related to the territory of the Jews, which πονηρός does not evoke.

51. Idem, 147.

52. Idem, 168.

53. Idem, 148.

54. Idem, 174. Wahlen presumes the Two-Source Hypothesis (140), so the earlier tradition to which he refers is the combination of *Mark* and *Q*, not e.g. proto-*Mark*.

55. Idem, 169.

56. Idem, 169, 174.

discourse from that informing Luke's pneumatology. An analysis of the Lukan δαιμόνιον vis-à-vis πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον should instead reflect the text's native theological discourse.

1.6. Reorienting the Approach to *Luke-Acts*'s Native Discourse

Wahlen's book and the typical translation of the Jewish δαιμόνιον into *demon* project Patristic discourse onto Jewish writings. Each presumes ideological continuity between the first-century texts about Jesus and the Patristic discourse that later claimed them. Some scholars have criticized this approach. William Arnal calls into question this tendency "to act as though these New Testament documents […] serve as sources for, and stand in social, historical, and/or conceptual continuity with, the ecclesiastical structures and ideologies of the second century and later."[57] To read first-century material such as *Luke-Acts* according to Patristic discourse is to assume that they are cut from the same cloth. As a result, "to at least some degree the ideas or at least core commitments and convictions found in one text might be taken for granted in other texts in which they do not actually appear."[58] The dubious approach that Arnal here attacks is precisely at issue in interpreting δαιμόνιον in *Luke-Acts*. The semantic scope of the word that became standardized in Christian orthodoxy regularly impedes upon reading the word in the ancient Jewish context.

Arnal's criticism follows scholarship that interrogated the narrative of the "parting of the ways." In Adam Becker and Annette Reed's *The Ways that Never Parted* a team of scholars exhibits the shortcomings of the "master narrative" of the Christian and Jewish communities' institutionalized separation by the end of the first or beginning of the second century.[59] That separation cast the first two generations of the Jesus movement and their

57. William Arnal, "The Collection and Synthesis of 'Tradition' and the Second-Century Invention of Christianity," in *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (2011): 194.
58. Ibid.
59. Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 4.

writings in the same vein as Patristic theology. Becker and Reed make clear in the book's outset that contrary to this narrative, "the earliest Christian communities are now approached as a part of the landscape of first-century Judaism."[60] This landscape continued to exist after 70 C.E. and included Luke's community.[61]

This reorientation responds to the deeply-entrenched habit of reading *Luke-Acts* as a Christian text. According to Isaac Oliver, scholars of the post-World War II era deemed Luke a "Gentile Christian, hostile to Judaism," "often relegating the Jewish elements recorded [in *Luke-Acts*] to earlier strata of a fossilized period bearing no relevance for understanding [Luke's] *Sitz im Leben*."[62] Especially Hans Conzelmann cultivated this feeling among scholars regarding Luke. Championing Redaktiongeschichte, he "has led many away from appreciating Luke's […] affirmation of Judaism in all of its aspects," asserting that "Luke should be viewed more as a [Christian] 'theologian' than a 'historian.'"[63] Conzelmann's work represents a recent generation of scholarship that maintained, in accordance with the "parting of the ways" narrative, Luke's perception as a Christian writer spiritually in league with the Church Fathers. "Luke," explains Oliver, "is still regarded by conventional scholarship […] as the most 'Greek' or 'Hellenistic' documents within the New Testament corpus" due to "the allegedly universal concepts and positive outlook toward the Gentiles and Roman worlds

60. Idem, 13.
61. "If there was no complete and final separation between Judaism and Christianity before the fourth century CE," as *The Ways* argues, "then certainly the boundaries between the two remained fluid even after the destruction of the temple in 70, the period when […] Luke most likely composed [his] works." Isaac W. Oliver, *Torah Praxis After 70 C.E.: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 4.
62. Idem, 22. This take on Luke (and Matthew), says Oliver, reflects Redaktionsgeschichte, a methodology that gained favor among scholars of the Gospels after the second world war (idem, 18).
63. Idem, 21. Oliver elaborates on the weaknesses of Conzelmann's convictions by describing the consistent portrayal throughout *Luke-Acts* of Jesus and his followers upholding the Law of Moses, Conzelmann's interpretation of the Jerusalem Council as a separation between the Church and the Torah and temple, and Paul's maintained adherence to both of the latter. He opines that Paul's activities are the "Achillean heel that could lead to the downfall of [Conzelmann's] entire *Heilsgeschichte* empire" (ibid.).

appearing within his writings."[64] Scholars continue to block Luke from membership in Jewish discourse, anticipating in his writings a Christian worldview instead, as Wahlen exemplifies.

Yet Luke affiliates emphatically with the Jewish world.[65] *Acts* thematically conveys the heart of Luke's concerns: "While Luke undeniably ends his narrative in Rome, he brings the reader along with Paul time and time again back to *Jerusalem*"; and so does Luke's language: "he regrets that the holy city of Jerusalem 'is trampled on by the Gentiles, *until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled*' (Luke 21:24 […]) and never denies the hope for the restoration of the kingdom of Israel (Acts 1:8), only postponing it until the unknown time of the Parousia.[66] The central human characters throughout are Jews, the scenes mainly in biblical Israelite territory. The author demonstrates intimate familiarity with Jewish law and custom, presenting Jesus in messianic terms current throughout the Jewish world. Luke's Jesus emphatically resembles the Israelite prophets.[67] He also demonstrates considerable familiarity with Hebrew/Aramaic.[68] But especially relevant to the present investigation: *Luke-Acts*, like the majority of Jewish-Greek texts of the Second Temple period, features δαιμόνιον

64. Idem, 26. Some scholars have tried to relate the text to Jewish discourse of the Second Temple period. Jacob Jervell claimed in the 1970's that *Luke-Acts* consists of "'Jewish-Christian' documents written by a Torah-observant Jew," and Oliver proposes that scholarship was not yet prepared "to swallow the revolutionary perspective on Luke-Acts Jervell had to offer" (29).
65. John Squires considers it "likely" that Luke was "a Hellenized Jew." J. T. Squires, "The Gospel According to Luke," in *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels* (ed. Stephen C. Barton; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 161.
66. Oliver, *Torah*, 27–8.
67. See Brian J. Tabb's recent "Is the Lucan Jesus a 'Martyr'? A Critical Assessment of a Scholarly Consensus" in *CBQ* 77.2 (2015): 280–301. Tabb assesses whether conventional attribution of Luke's portrayal of Jesus's death to that of Socrates or of Maccabean martyrdom stories coheres. He criticizes these claims and shows instead that Luke casts Jesus's death in the likeness of the passions of Israelite prophets.
68. *Luke* 2 describes the dedication of Jesus in the Temple, as prescribed in Israelite law. Luke focuses on one Simeon, who was promised μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν ἂν ἴδῃ τὸν χριστὸν κύριον—"he would not see death before he would see the anointed of *kurios*" (2:26)—a regal epithet from *1 Samuel*. Upon taking Jesus into his arms, Simeon poetically acknowledges the fulfillment of God's promise to him, ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτηριόν σου—"for my eyes saw your salvation" (2:30). "Your salvation," i.e. "the salvation of Yhwh," translates יהושע, which is the Hebrew antecedent of the transliterated Ἰησοῦς. Based on both the poetic context of this Hebraism and Luke's knowledge of Jewish law, evident in the narrative context, the play-on-words seems intentional. Cf. Zechariah and John: μνησθῆναι ἐλέους (1:54), ποιῆσαι ἔλεος […] καὶ μνησθῆναι (1:72).

and never δαίμων. The latter is far more frequent in Patristic writings and occurs regularly in Classical-Greek literature. Preference for δαιμόνιον is common to Luke and Jewish-Greek literature, signaling cultural/ideological distinction from Hellenism and Patristic Christianity and, in contrast, affinity to Jewish discourse of the period.

1.7. Israelite Henotheism

The decision to relate *Luke-Acts* to Jewish discourse of the Second Temple period implies correlation with the theism that typified Jewish thought of the time. For ancient Jews, who fills the divine space and what are divinities' relationships to each other? The semantic candidates for δαιμόνοιν derive from this conception of the divine. The inherited Israelite law, cult, and history, as well as Hellenism, Roman political domination, and Zoroastrianism all affected Jewish views regarding the divine during the Second Temple period. These various influences produced syncretic ideologies and followings.[69] But the texts that came to be called "biblical"—particularly the Pentateuch and the Prophets—formed "the foundation of all ancient Jewish literature."[70] Luke exemplifies such ideological deference, frequently quoting from these texts and thus evidencing that they constituted for him a lens through which he wished to portray Jesus and his first followers.

Though monotheism is commonly attributed to the biblical literature, the various texts thereof portray in fact multiple אלהים over whom Yhwh rules in primacy and unrivaled power. Michael Heiser discerns from, for example, *Deut* 4 and 32 a "worldview that accepted the reality of other gods, along with Yahweh's utter uniqueness among them, not a worldview that denied the existence of lesser אֱלֹהִים."[71] This configuration manifests throughout biblical

69. I.e. the varying degrees of Hellenization (from the competing groups before and during the Hasmonean period to the philosophically-inclined types like Philo), Josephus's four philosophies, the Qumran groups, and the various esoteric communities.
70. Klawans, *Impurity*, v.
71. Michael Heiser, "Monotheism, Polytheism, Monolatry, or Henotheism? Toward an Assessment of Divine Plurality in the Hebrew Bible," in *BBR* 18.1 (2008): 13. The uniqueness-statements therein are

literature. Heiser observes that "Deutero-Isaiah is consistent with Deuteronomy," noting, "scholars of the book of Isaiah have long recognized the presence of the divine council" throughout.[72] These examples represent the ubiquity of the divine-council model both in Israelite law as well as in the prophetic writings. Heiser concludes from his study, "the statements in the canonical text […] inform the reader that, for the biblical writer[s], Yahweh was an אֱלֹהִים, but no other אֱלֹהִים was Yahweh."[73] The operative assumption in the most foundational literature of the Jewish world preceding and surrounding the story Luke tells, the sources from which he derived it, and perhaps even his own personal context was that the god of Israel is unique *among gods*. Ancient Jewish discourse, then, can hardly be described as strict monotheism.[74] *Henotheism* labels the ancient paradigm of the divine more accurately.[75]

The henotheistic outlook certainly persisted into the post-exilic Jewish world. Jews like other nations of the Mediterranean social and cultural milieu held "[t]hat the gods of

---

commonly cited as evidence for monotheism's crystallization in Israelite/Jewish thought prior to and during the Second Temple period. But Heiser posits that these are rhetorical expressions of incomparability rather than assertions of taxonomical exclusivity (5–6).

72. Idem, 13.

73. Idem, 29.

74. Paula Fredriksen has portrayed ancient Christians, Jews, and also "pagans" (thanks to *paideia*) as subscribing to monotheism since each of these groups conceived of "everything […,] including lower deities, devolv[ing] from a single, highest god." "The Birth of Christianity and the Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism," in *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism: Reading the New Testament After the Holocaust* (ed. P. Fredriksen and A. Reinhartz; Westminster: John Knox, 2002), 21. But since each of these groups believed in many gods subordinated to a supreme god, *henotheism* seems to me a suitable label.

75. Heiser in fact takes issue with both *henotheism* and *monotheism* as descriptors of the theology reflected in biblical literature. Beyond explaining the seventeenth-century origins of "monotheism" (idem, 27), he regards the frequent scholarly attempts at qualifying the modern vocabulary insufficient, proposing instead to "stick to *describing* what Israel believed" (idem, 28). In this vein, monotheism "is inadequate for describing Israelite religion" (ibid.), and "'[h]enotheism' and 'monolatry,' while perhaps better, are inadequate because they do not say *enough* about what the canonical writers believed. Israel was certainly 'monolatrous,' but that term comments only on what Israel believed about the proper object of worship, not what it believed about Yahweh's nature and attributes with respect to the other gods" (idem, 29). His terminological exactitude is exemplary, especially in the present philological investigation. Nevertheless, "henotheism" seems sufficient presently for conveying Israelite thought about Yhwh's status among gods, alluding both to his primacy and sovereignty and also the existence of other beings of comparable nature.

others existed […,] demonstrated by the existence of that god's people," explains Paula Fredriksen.[76] National cohesion indicated the participation of the group's deities, whose existence Jews did not deny. That "[g]ods and humans were the two key populations of ancient society" was taken for granted internationally.[77] Fredriksen points out a basic polytheism evident in Jewish material from different points during the Second Temple period: the OG-*Exodus* translator reflects Israelite henotheism when he rendered *Exod* 22:27, θεοὺς οὐ κακολογήσεις—whereas he could in conformity with the many other instances of אלהים have opted for the singular;[78] Philo extrapolated from the same verse that wars originate with members of different nations reviling each others' gods; and "a wealth of epigraphical evidence supports" the claim that in general, Jews of the Second Temple period "acknowledged the existence of foreign gods."[79] So long as acknowledgement did not contravene the national law code, which forbade devising images of and interacting with other gods, Jews perceived no contradiction in their henotheism. Such were the foundations of Jewish theological discourse of that time, contrasting both the volatile intra-divine power dynamics in Greek and Roman polytheism and especially the Patristic rendition of the Dualistic divine landscape.

1.8. Good and Evil

Ancient-Jewish henotheism involves a perception of good and evil profoundly distinct from the Patristic discourse that appropriated Israelite/Jewish texts. This difference bears directly on interpreting δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek literature because, as explained above, the

76. Fredriksen, "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel," in *NTS* 56 (2010): 236.
77. Idem, 235.
78. See Pieter W. van der Horst, "Thou Shalt not Revile the Gods: The LXX Translation of Ex. 22:28 (27), its Background and Influence," in *SPhilo Annual* 5 (1993): 1–8.
79. Fredriksen, "Judaizing," 237. See idem, n. 11 for several examples dating from the third century B.C.E. to the first century C.E.

beings in questions are typically considered innately *evil* as a corollary of Dualism. In the Hebrew tradition, however, *good* and *evil* reflect benefit/harm and the arbitrary will of the divine authority. John Walton explains,

> It is very rare for the gods of the ancient Near East to be described as good, though the hope is commonly expressed that the gods will *do* good to the worshiper, that is, act favorably or for their benefit. This is an expression of favor rather than a sense of intrinsic goodness [….]
>
> Theologians would typically understand God's goodness as affirming that God could do no evil. In the ancient Near East there would be no outside standard to measure by, so good and evil would not be categories that could easily be applied to the gods. For Yahweh the standard is Yahweh's own character, therefore making it impossible for him to do evil—good is defined by what he does.[80]

Walton refers to an intellectual tendency that assumes, as he puts it, an "independent standard of goodness." He notices this tendency among theologians (presumably of the Christian intellectual heritage). Unsurprisingly, this sense of good and evil figures in *Contra Celsum*, and its discreet domination in Western culture calls to mind (and incidentally corroborates) the aforementioned history of *demon*. Yet according to Walton, ancient Israelites (and the post-exilic generations) did not subscribe to this paradigm.

The biblical material portrays *good* as alluding either to prosperity or to correspondence with Yhwh's standards. The measure of good and evil was, theoretically, Yhwh's instructions to the nation. In train with this conception of good and evil, Moses exhorts Israel,

> שמור ותשמרון את מצות יהוה אלהיכם ועדתיו וחקיו אשר צוך ועשית הישר והטוב [LXX: τὸ καλὸν] בעיני יהוה למען ייטב לך (*Deut* 6:17–18)

> Guard, indeed, the commandments of Yhwh your god, and his testimonies and his laws that he commands you; and do what is right and good in the eyes of Yhwh so that he will do good to you.[81]

80. John H. Walton, *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 109.
81. Translation my own.

Yhwh's prescriptions and laws determine what is "right" and "good"—that which is such "in [his] eyes," the upholding of which results in his benefaction—also expressed as "good." The prophet then invokes the exodus from Egypt, specifically,

ויתן יהוה אותת ומפתים גדלים ורעים [LXX: πονηρὰ] במצרים, בפרעה ובכל ביתו לעינינו (*Deut* 6:22)

> And Yhwh gave great and bad signs and indications to Egypt, to Pharaoh, and to his whole house before our eyes.[82]

Translators meet this instance of the word רע/πονηρός with dissonance, balking at the possibility of ascribing evil to God: they opt instead for terms that focus, appropriately, on the *harm* done to the Egyptians. NRSV has, "The LORD displayed before our eyes great and *awesome* signs and wonders against Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his household" (italics my own). The connotations of *evil* clearly do not match those of *Deuteronomy*'s רע; they imply an irreconcilable conception of good and evil. This inconsistency among translators demonstrates that the sense regularly ascribed to טוב and רע reflects the Christian intellectual tradition's domination of reading ancient Israelite/Jewish literature. Unsurprisingly, it represents the meaning of these terms inadequately. If according to biblical henotheism there is no existential good and evil, then there are no demons in the sense Origen would have us believe since divinities cannot be classed as either *good* or *bad*. Ancient Jewish texts that refer to δαιμόνια must, therefore, host other semantic content.

1.9. Section Conclusions

The ancient-Jewish sense of δαιμόνιον must be sought according to Israelite henotheism, which entails multiple gods and good/evil as relative to Yhwh's will. It is according to this theological framework that the biblical writings depict obscurer divinities, e.g. מלאכים/ἄγγελοι, רוחות/πνεύματα, השטן/ὁ διάβολος, גד/איים/סעירים/אלילים/שדים/δαιμόνια.

82. Translation my own.

Presumably the same holds for Luke: his manifest deference to the biblical texts implies ideological reliance on Israel's Law and Prophets, which his language should reflect. If *Luke-Acts* were to be read disconnected from Patristic theological commitments, in light of biblical henotheism, and by philological comparison with other Jewish-Greek literature of the Second Temple period, how would the resultant sense of δαιμόνιον differ from *demon*? It remains now to compare the use of δαιμόνιον within Jewish-Greek literature from the Second Temple period and to test the semantic outcome of that investigation in *Luke-Acts*. I turn first to the surviving instances of δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek literature aside from the Synoptic Gospels.

Part Two—Δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek Texts of the Second Temple Period

Luke-Acts contributed to a dialogue with other Jewish-Greek writings, several of which feature δαιμόνιον. What are the recurring associations inhering in Jewish usage of this word? Here I evaluate the few instances of δαιμόνιον that appear in biblical, apocryphal, pseudepigraphic, and NT literature. I analyze first the several instances in LXX.[83] The OG translations represent in Greek Israelite conceptions of divinity that were at the foundation of Jewish theology and culture of the Second Temple period. The LXX usage of δαιμόνιον presumably reflects the translators' perception of those conceptions. Other writings (later labeled "apocryphal" and "pseudepigraphal") attained a more-peripheral status but impacted the dialogue. When δαιμόνιον appears in these texts, it complements usages in LXX. The writings of Philo and Josephus likewise figure among Jewish-Greek writings. Though consciously Hellenistic in content and purpose, the semantic content of δαιμόνιον therein confirms the distinctness of intra-Jewish usage of the term in comparison with the traditional meaning in Greek literature. Finally, a few voices of the early Jesus Movement refer to δαιμόνιον, channeling the same sense of divinity found in the other affiliates of contemporary Jewish discourse.

83. I follow Emanuel Tov's distinction between the Septuagint/LXX, which refers to "the collection of sacred Greek writings" canonized by the first centuries C.E. and the Old Greek "original translation" (henceforth OG). *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 135. Critical/eclectic editions of LXX, such as the Göttingen *Septuaginta* and Rahlfs's *Septuaginta*, represent scholars' greatest effort to represent OG—an endeavor that assumes part of Paul Anton de Lagarde's *Urtext* theory, namely "that there once existed an original [translated] text of" each biblical/apocryphal book. Tov, *Textual*, 140. See idem, 183–89 for discussion of de Lagarde's theory, its opponents, and Tov's assessment of both sides. For the present investigation, I concur with Tov that "the opinion of de Lagarde […] is acceptable" even if imperfect (idem, 189). Accordingly, when I refer to the reconstructed Greek version of a specific biblical/apocryphal book, I use "OG." When referring to the corpus of the reconstructed OG texts, I use "LXX."

2.1. LXX (Biblical)

In LXX's non-apocryphal texts δαιμόνιον appears only eight times. OG-*Deuteronomy* features it once, OG-*Psalms* thrice, and OG-*Isaiah* four times. These writings constituted the "prime textual residence of Israel's god";[84] they were foundational for Jewish identity internationally. The heavenly paradigm they reflect, whence δαιμόνιον accrues meaning, presumably bore on their perception of spiritual realities. Accordingly, I first assess the meaning of each Hebrew text and then consider how the LXX rendering of δαιμόνιον relates.

Since the LXX translators chose δαιμόνιον to convey ideas expressed in Hebrew, I provide the MT version[85] and note Qumran variants (if any survive).[86] I then include the LXX passage,[87] followed by the *NETS* translation.[88]

2.1.1. OG-*Deut* 32:16–17, 21

יקנאהו בזרים בתועבת יכעיסהו: [17]יזבחו לשדים לא אלה אלהים לא ידעום חדשים מקרב באו לא שערום אבתיכם [….] [21]הם קנאוני בלא אל כעסוני בהבליהם[89]

> [16]παρώξυνάν με ἐπ᾽ ἀλλοτρίοις, ἐν βδελύγμασιν αὐτῶν ἐξεπίκρανάν με· [17]ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ, θεοῖς, οἷς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν· καινοὶ πρόσφατοι ἥκασιν, οὓς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν οἱ πατέρες αὐτῶν [….] [21]αὐτοὶ παρεζήλωσάν με ἐπ᾽ οὐ θεῷ, παρώργισάν με ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν
>
> [16]They provoked me with foreign things; by their abominations they embittered me. [17]They sacrificed to demons and not to God, to gods they did not know. New, recent ones have come, whom their fathers did not know [….] [21]They made me jealous with what is no god, provoked me with their idols.

84. Fredriksen, "Judaizing," 236.
85. All MT quotations from *BHS*.
86. According to the pertaining volumes of the *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* series (Oxford: Clarendon, 1955–2009).
87. *Septuaginta* (ed. Alfred Rahlfs; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1979).
88. *NETS* (ed. A. Pietersma and B. G. Wright; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
89. Two fragments of this passage appear among the Qumran archive, in 4QDeut^{k1} and 1QDeut^{b}. The extent of the Song of Moses that remained in the discovery of the DSS is rather limited. For vv. 17–18 (in 4QDeut^{k1}) see Eugene Ulrich et al, *DJD* XIV (1995), 97; for v. 21 (in 1QDeut^{b}) see D. Barthélemy and J. T. Milik, *DJD* I (1955), 60.

The Hebrew and Greek manuscripts represent very similar *Vorlagen* for this passage from the Song of Moses. 4QDeut[k1] barely retains this passage, but it has שדים and traces from the rest of the verse—enough to show resemblance with MT. The OG translation is literal, differing from MT in two ways. The direct object of the verbs יקנא/παρωξύνω and יכעיס/ ἐξεπίκράνω in v. 16 is *him* in MT, whereas in OG it is *me*. In both versions, the object is Yhwh, but the perspective in OG creates a more vivid parallel between vv. 16 and 21. The OG translator likely used the בלא אל of v. 21 to clarify the elided אלה of v. 16 (that is, if his *Vorlage* was the same as MT in this place).

NRSV exemplifies the typical rendering of שדים as "demons." Martin challenges this conventional interpretation of שד, however, by assessing it in its Semitic context. "[T]he word שד," he explains, "originally meant simply 'lord' and served as a divine title like 'Baal' or 'Adonai,'" and evoked bull statues anterior to Assyrian palaces.[90] Martin therefore infers that the term in *Deut* 32 "could […] be taken to refer to ancient gods of Canaan and other surrounding peoples, who could have viewed them as *good* powers or gods."[91] שד was a reverent title for a divinity; it did not convey the Dualistic sense of *demon*. Since the OG translator prized literalness, the Semitic sense of שד seems to be the primary semantic candidate for δαιμόνιον. In this case, δαιμόνια as an equivalent simply conveys divinity. Indeed, Martin confirms, "The Jewish translators […] used the word δαιμόνια to refer to the gods of other peoples."[92] To read δαιμόνιον as *demon* presumes that the OG translators imposed Dualism onto the biblical material, i.e. "demonized" the nations' gods.[93] But this

90. Martin, "When," 658. See also Riley, "Demon," 237.
91. Martin, "When," 658–659.
92. Idem, 659.
93. "As the gods of the nations were demonized, so 'demon' in the dualistic sense is found in the Septuagint (LXX) as a designation of pagan deities and spirits." Riley, "Demons," 238.

reasoning is cyclical: it is based on the presumption that Jews meant *demon* by δαιμόνιον. Yet no other textual element in this passage was dualized. Such a translation would also constitute abnormal defection from literalness.

Rather, the terms' context affirms that the OG translator understood שדים as *gods*. He selected δαιμόνια for translating this meaning, which the context affirms. In this part of the song, Moses criticizes Israel for her unfaithfulness to Yhwh. The prophet sets the שדים/ δαιμόνια in parataxis: they are זרים/ἀλλοτρίοις—"strangers," the תובעת/ βδελύγμασιν—"abominations" by which Israel enraged Yhwh, they had been recipients of Israelite sacrifices, they are אלהים לא ידועם/θεοῖς οἷς οὐκ ᾔδεισαν—"gods they [the patriarchs] did not know," they were חדשים/καινοί—"new" and were unrecognized by Israel's fathers. The text thus describes the שדים as *gods*; they are simply *foreign* to Israel and periodically usurping the rightful place of the only god she is to regard: Yhwh. V. 21 then adds that Israel rendered her treacherous service to these gods בהבליהם/ἐν τοῖς εἰδώλοις αὐτῶν—"via their idols." The Hebrew and the literally-rendered Greek portray idolatry as involving real gods, which belong to the other nations. OG deems these, δαιμόνια.

In general the henotheism of *Deuteronomy* supports this reading of δαιμόνια as *gods*. Nathan MacDonald takes *Deut* 32 as his point of departure when he explains, "the rest of the book presents a similar account of deities other than YHWH: they are 'other gods' or 'gods of the nations.'"[94] He points out 32:8, where Moses calls Yhwh, עליון/ὑψίστος. In both Hebrew and Greek the word is comparative, implying in this case other entities of similar but inferior nature. Moses then elaborates on Yhwh's "highestness" by recalling the nations's division

94. Nathan MacDonald, *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of 'Monotheism'* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 146.

according to the "sons of god."[95] He depicts human groups associated with beings comparable but subservient to Yhwh. Similarly, in *Deut* 4:19 Moses warns Israel from making idols for the sun, moon, stars, and host of heaven, and adds, אשר חלק יהוה אלהיך אתם לכל העמים תחת כל השמים—"which Yhwh your god apportioned to all the peoples under all of the skies." Since the subsequent verse emphasizes Israel's distinction from the nations in that she serves Yhwh alone, the scenario of this passage is likewise comparative. The nations regard the heavenly bodies; Israel however serves only Yhwh.[96] But as the text nowhere condemns the nations' allotment, but rather reiterates it in 32:8, it seems to acknowledge what the Song of Moses makes clear: other gods exist and, from Israel's point of view, are associated with the other nations. The Hebrew text that lay before the OG translator promoted a world of gods, including שדים. He chose δαιμόνια in accordance with this worldview.

2.1.2. *Ps* 91 [OG-*Ps* 90]:6

[97]מדבר באפל יהלך מקטב ישוד צהרים[6]

[6]ἀπὸ πράγματος διαπορευμένου ἐν σκότει, ἀπὸ συμπτώματος καὶ δαιμονίου μεσημβρινοῦ

[6]of a deed that travels in darkness, of mishap and noonday demon

MT and 4QPs[b] agree. It is not clear, however, whether OG reflects a slightly different *Vorlage*. The OG translator's interpretation of דבר as דָּבָר (at variance with the vocalization in MT) does not reflect a variant. The second half of the verse, though, might. Δαιμονίου represents either a misreading of ישוד, a "correction" of it, or else a *Vorlage* that had ושד.

95. See Michael Heiser, "Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God," in *BSac* 158 (January–March 2001): 52–74 for elucidation of the disagreement between the MT, DSS, and OG regarding this verse. Furthermore, he argues convincingly for a reading that supports a divine council, and has written extensively on the subject in "Monotheism."
96. Cf. Philo: καὶ γὰρ οὗτοι [οἱ ἀστέρες] χυχαὶ ὅλαι δι᾽ ὅλων […] θεῖαι" (*Giants* 8).
97. Cf. 4QPs[b] in E. Ulrich et al, *DJD* XVI (2000), 27.

If ישוד indeed appeared in the OG translator's *Vorlage*, he may not have recognized it since it is a hapax legomenon in the biblical literature. The Greek might therefore constitute guesswork or correction: the translator might have known of שד in *Deut* 32 and mimicked its translation.[98] In other words, it may only incidentally figure here, on the authority of OG-*Deuteronomy*. If such were the circumstances, then δαιμονίου sheds scant light on what contemporary Jews meant by it.

Yet elements throughout the psalm suggest that the translator intuited δαιμονίου's relevance. The psalmist frames his psalm with reassurance for ישב בסתר עליון. By referring to and promoting עליון he invokes the comparison-theme of *Deut* 32, describing Yhwh as superior to something—presumably to other deities. In this context, the psalmist's exhortation that the ישב fear neither פחד לילה, חץ יומם, דבר באפל, nor קטב ישוד could be read as a list of deities. Indeed, John Goldingay confirms that these terms "correspond to Middle Eastern ways of describing the activity of hostile gods or demons."[99] According to this understanding, this psalm describes an Israelite's hope of escaping the hostility of various gods by affiliating with his own, who is superior.

It is tempting to read δαιμόνιον according to Christian demonological conceptions because these hostile entities oppose Yhwh even while paling before him. But this reading lacks other dualistic elements that would support it. No subservient good divinities are commissioned to defend the יושב בסתר עליון from the alleged demons, and no evil mastermind conducts the work of these malicious spirits. Instead the psalm contrasts them to

98. In other words, remote exegesis. See Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (ed. M. J. Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 173.

99. John Goldingay, *Psalms 90–150* (vol. 3 of *Psalms*; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 45. Note that in *Deut* 32 Yhwh himself threatens חצים and רעות (v. 23). Artur Weiser in *The Psalms: A Commentary* (London: SCM, 1959) likewise referred to "the familiar view, held by popular belief, according to which […] demonic powers are held to be the cause of the epidemics" (608).

Yhwh himself. It bears the mark of Israelite henotheism, according to which heavenly drama was certainly possible. If the OG translator read it thusly, then δαιμονίου describes inferior gods hostile to Yhwh and his associated humans. This reading complements the instance in *Deut* 32 and perhaps draws upon it through consulting the single other appearance of the similar שד in the Hebrew Bible.

2.1.3. *Ps* 96 [OG-*Ps* 95]:4–5

כי גדול יהוה ומהלל מאד נורא הוא על כל אלהים: [5]כי כל אלהי העמים אלילים ויהוה שמים עשה [4]

> [4]ὅτι μέγας κύριος καὶ αἰνετὸς σφόδρα, φοβερός ἐστιν ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς θεούς· [5] ὅτι πάντες οἱ θεοὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν δαιμόνια, ὁ δὲ κύριος τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐποίησεν
>
> [4]because great is the Lord and very much praiseworthy; he is terrible to all the gods,
> [5]because all of the gods of the nations are demons, but the Lord made the heavens

The OG translation is thoroughly precise and literal. It represents every element in MT even at the expense of grammatically-sound Greek. The *Vorlage* before the OG translator must have been identical (or nearly so) to MT, which renders the absence of a DSS-*Ps* 96 discovery less integral for evaluating this case of δαιμόνιον.

Scholarly contention surrounds MT's אלילים. Some argue that it means "vanities" or "non-entities," while others discern henotheism.[100] Scholars in the vanities camp suppose that the psalmist deems the gods as "nothing [….] They do not exist."[101] But v. 4 reveals the weakness of this interpretation: there the psalmist compares Yhwh to other אלהים. Heiser, in

100. Ludwig Koehler, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Stamm acknowledge both "nichtig" and "Heidengötter, immer geringschätzig als Nichtse, Götzen." "אליל," *HAL* 54. Takamitsu Muraoka's *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1998) neatly portrays the two possible senses and the OG-translators' inconsistency: אליל can be taken either as an adjective, in which case it is translated in the LXX as μάταιος (once) and μικρός (once), or else as a substantive (18). The latter understanding was apparently far more common, though its translation varied from βδέλυγμα (once), δαιμόνιον (once), εἴδωλον (twice), θεός (once), κακός (once), οἰώνισμα (once), to χειροποίητος (once).

101. Samuel Terrien, *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 676.

the henotheism camp, concisely describes the logical deficiency of ascribing monotheistic polemics to the psalm: "How hollow it would be to have the psalmist extolling the greatness of God by comparing Him to beings which do not exist."[102] This aphorism applies likewise to the comparison terminology in *Deut* 32 and *Ps* 91: if there are no other gods, how could Yhwh be "highest"?

Instead, the laudation-via-comparison in *Ps* 96 evokes ancient Semitic polytheism. Samuel Terrien attributes the rhetoric of this psalm to "the politico-mystical image of 'king,' borrowed from the ancient Near East, impl[ying] a whole hierarchy of priests, princes, and submissive public servants," referencing in particular Egyptian attributions of royalty "especially to the god Amon, 'king of the gods.'"[103] To Terrien *Ps* 96 rhetorically undermines the Egyptian theological-political model. But the opposite could also be assumed: the psalmist conceived of divinity *akin* to his Egyptian contemporaries but with Yhwh as king over all. To this effect Hans-Joachim Kraus says of this psalm, "Yahweh is described as the powerful one who is enthroned above all gods. Cultic traditions of the preexilic Yahweh as King hymns […,] recall the monarchic transcendency of the God-King over all other deities."[104] These henotheistic notions characterize אלילים. Indeed, Kraus observes that it is "the term used especially by Isaiah for the gods of the foreign nations toward which also Israel strayed away."[105] In *Leviticus* and *Joshua* too the term appears in the context of idolatry.[106] The monarchical themes in Semitic theological conceptions underscore the logic of *Ps* 96:4–5 in favor of אלילים as gods.[107]

102. Heiser, "Deuteronomy," 72.
103. Terrien, *Psalms*, 675–76.
104. Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary* (trans. H. C. Oswald; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 253.
105. Ibid.
106. *Lev* 19:4; 26:1; *Josh* 2:8, 18, 20; 10:10, 11; 19:1, 3; 31:7.
107. Goldingay's interpretation constitutes a sort of middle ground between the vanities and henotheism camps. He takes אלילים to basically mean "nonentities" but perceives the psalmist as

The OG translator faithfully represented the Hebrew both quantitatively and qualitatively. Every element of these verses in MT finds direct representation in OG, and the words' meanings are represented literally. Δαιμόνιον must be assessed according to this pattern. Even if the translator was ignorant of the Egyptian monarchical allusions Terrien cites or of the similar pre-exilic Israelite conceptions of deity that Kraus invokes, v. 4 premised v. 5 with a comparison of Yhwh with other gods. Prompted by אלילים, the translator used δαιμόνια to portray comparison between gods and, simultaneously, the inferiority of all of them before Yhwh. Furthermore, the psalm explicitly designates the אלילים as the gods of the nations. *Ps* 96 therefore joins *Deut* 32 in evidencing a specialized sense of δαιμόνια: they are those gods the other nations serve through idolatry, who rival Yhwh for Israel's loyalty.

2.1.4. *Ps* 106 [OG-*Ps* 105]:35–38

> [35]ויתערבו בגוים, וילמדו מעשיהם: [36]ויעבדו את עצביהם, ויהיו להם למוקש: [37]ויזבחו
> את בניהם ואת בנותיהם לשדים: [38]וישפכו דם נקי דם בניהם ובנותיהם אשר זבחו
> לעצבי כנען ותחנף הארץ בדמים

> [35]καὶ ἐμίγησαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν καὶ ἔμαθον τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν· [36]καὶ ἐδούλευσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐγενήθη αὐτοῖς εἰς σκάνδαλον· [37]καὶ ἔθυσαν τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν τοῖς δαιμονίοις [38]καὶ ἐξέχεαν αἷμα ἀθῷον, αἷμα υἱῶν αὐτῶν καὶ θυγατέρων, ὧν ἔθυσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς Χανααν, καὶ ἐφονοκτονήθη ἡ γῆ ἐν τοῖς αἵμασιν

> [35]and they mingled with the nations and learned their works. [36]And they were subject to their carved images, and it became to them a stumbling block. [37]And they sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the demons, [38]and they poured out innocent blood, blood of their sons and daughters whom they sacrificed to the carved images of Chanaan, and the land was murdered with blood

The Greek translation is highly literal, representing a *Vorlage* identical with MT. The psalmist mentions שדים within a chronological enumeration of Israel's national

writing, rhetorically: the word "looks so like the word for a proper God […,] but in itself it apparently designates something as ineffective, worthless, and futile," noting, "the psalm does not reckon we should be disrespectful of other people's religions. It is more important to honor the real God." Goldingay, *Psalms 90–150*, 104.

transgressions. Among them recurs Israel's betrayal of Yhwh through serving other gods (vv. 19, 28, 35, 37–38), specifically her sacrifices to שדים, which she learned from the Gentiles (v. 35). The Song of Moses's theological terminology recurs here. The psalmist appropriates שדים and other language found in its immediate vicinity in *Deut* 32.[108] The psalmist takes שדים as אלהים that Israel served through idolatry in similar terms as the Song of Moses:

A—ויעבדו את עצביהם [של הגוים]
καὶ ἐδούλευσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς αὐτῶν [τῶν ἐθνων]
And they served the nations' images (v. 35–36)

B—ויזבחו [...] לשדים
καὶ ἔθυσαν […] τοῖς δαιμονίοις
And they sacrificed to *shedim* (v. 37)

C—זבחו לעצבי כנען
ἔθυσαν τοῖς γλυπτοῖς Χανααν
They sacrificed to the images of Canaan (v. 38)

By partaking in the nations' idolatry Israel sacrificed to δαιμόνια. The comparable language and themes between this psalm and *Deut* 32 imply inspiration and/or affiliation with the same henotheism. The OG translator seems to have based his choice of δαιμόνιον on both the equivalent for שד in OG-*Deuteronomy* as well as the thematic similarity of the two Hebrew passages.[109] He reiterates the association of δαιμόνιον with strange gods.

2.1.5. *Isa* 13:21–22

[21]ורבצו שם ציים ומלאו בתיהם אחים ושכנו שם בנות יענה ושעירים ירקדו שם: [22]וענה איים באלמנותיו ותנים בהיכלי ענג[110]

108. E.g. בגוי נבל אעכיסם […] כעסוני בהבליהם […] מכעס בניו ובנתיו ויזבחו לשדים (*Deut* 32:17–21), […] ויתנם ביד גוים […] ויחר אף יהוה בעמו […] ויזבחו את בניהם ואת בנותיהם לשדים (*Ps* 106:37–41).

109. Martin affirms the passages' similarity. "When," 658.

110. [21]ורבצו שם ציים ומלאו בתיהם אחים ושכנו שמה בנות יענה ושעירים ורקדו שם [22]וענה א֯ם באלמנותו ותנים בהיכלו ענוגו (1QIsa[a]).
E. Ulrich and Peter W. Flint, *Qumran Cave 1, vol. II: The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII.I, 2010), 22–3.

> [21]καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐκεῖ θηρία, καὶ ἐμπλησθήσονται αἱ οἰκίαι ἤχου, καὶ ἀναπαύσονται ἐκεῖ σειρῆνες, καὶ δαιμόνια ἐκεῖ ὀρχήσονται, [22]καὶ ὀνοκένταυροι ἐκεῖ κατοικήσουσιν, καὶ νοσσοποιήσουσιν ἐχῖνοι ἐν τοῖς οἴκοις αὐτῶν
>
> [21]But wild animals will rest there, and the houses will be filled with noise; there sirens will rest, and there demons will dance. [22]Donkey-centaurs will dwell there, and hedgehogs will build nests in their houses

MT and 1QIsa[a] are nearly identical, aside from the matres lectionis ו and י. Evidently the *Vorlage* of the OG translator was similar to MT and 1QIsa[a] since generally it accounts for the Hebrew units. But OG-*Isaiah* falls into Emanuel Tov's list of the "free and […] periphrastic" LXX translations.[111] This translation method guarantees difficulty for ascertaining the translator's *Vorlage*(*n*) and how he interpreted the Hebrew text before him.[112] For example, do the two instances of ἀναπαύσονται in v. 21 imply identical antecedents in a *Vorlage* at variance with MT and 1QIsa[a], or does the repetition derive from the translator's free/periphrastic method? Ambiguity inheres in analysis of OG-*Isaiah*.

MT and 1QIsa[a] list several creatures occupying the ruins of Babylon. It appears from OG that the translator did not recognize many of these words: e.g. ἤχου transliterates אחים and seems to be the result of contextual exegesis; σειρῆνες may reflect a literal interpretation of בנות יענה. In contrast to these, שעיר appears *passim* in the biblical texts in reference to mere goats. It is usually translated in LXX with χίμαρος (e.g. *Lev* 4:23; 9:3; *Num* 7:16; 29:11). The translator perhaps took a cue from בנות יענה, perceiving that this instance of שעיר alluded to a divine goat-creature, hence δαιμόνια.[113]

111. Emanuel Tov, *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Yuval, 1981), 63.
112. See the *NETS* introduction to *Esias* (823–24).
113. The translator seems to recognize the Greek-mythical associations with σειρῆνες. His familiarity may owe to his Alexandrian context. See Ronald L. Troxel, *LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (JSJ Supplements 124; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 8, and Tov, *Textual*, 134.

Indeed, popular notions of divine goats may have encouraged this translation. Martin explains that שעיר "referred to a goat-human hybrid common in Near Eastern mythology" that had cult in Samaria and Judea.[114] The translator may have intended by δαιμόνια (alongside σειρῆνες) to portray Chaldean gods dancing in the ruins of Babylon, perhaps in betrayal. Such an image is consistent with the theme of Yhwh's superiority over other gods that, as we have seen in *Deuteronomy* and *Psalms*, typifies Israelite henotheism.

The connection between goats and gods appears even in Israelite law. *Lev* 17:7 lists שעירים as divinities to which Israel had once sacrificed. This verse provides a precedent in the Hebrew scriptures that would support reading שעיר as a divine being that received sacrifice, i.e. a god. In this vein, *Isa* 13 portrays Babylonian gods powerless before Yhwh's wrath. This outcome itself is consistent with the oracle's primary concern of announcing Yhwh's impending judgement of Babylon. The translator may have inferred this message and used δαιμόνια for its known connotations of gods foreign to Israel.

2.1.6. *Isa* 34:13–14

והיתה נוה תנים חציר לבנות יענה: [14]ופגשו ציים את איים ושעיר על רעהו יקרא אך שם [13]
הרגיעה לילית ומצאה לה מנוח[115]

[13]καὶ ἔσται ἔπαυλις σειρήνων καὶ αὐλὴ στρουθῶν [14]καὶ συναντήσουσιν δαιμόνια ὀνοκενταύροις καὶ βοήσουσιν ἕτερος πρὸς τὸν ἕτερον· ἐκεῖ ἀναπαύσονται ὀνοκένταυροι, εὗρον γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀνάπαυσιν

[13]It shall be a habitation of sirens and a courtyard of ostriches. [14]Demons shall meet with donkey-centaurs and call one to another; there donkey-centaurs shall repose, for they have found for themselves a place of rest

114. Martin, "When," 659.

115. והייתה נוה תנים חצר לבנות יענה [14]ופגשו ציים את אייאמים ושעיר על רעהו יקרא אכ שמה ירגיעו ליליות [13]
ימצאו להמה מנוח (1QIsa[a]).

Ulrich and Flint, *The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII.I, 2010), 56–7.

As with *Isa* 13, in MT and 1QIsa[a] these verses are nearly identical. One significant disagreement is לילית/ליליות. It is paired appropriately with ירגיעו, ימצאו, and the prepositional unit להמה. OG's *Vorlage* resembled 1QIsa[a] more than MT, evidenced by rendering these elements in the plural. Also akin to 1QIsa[a] and not MT, OG represents ירגיעו in the future. But in spite of overall similarity to the Hebrew versions, the Greek translation is inconsistent on several counts. For both נוה תנים and חציר לבנות יענה the translator rendered the same genitive construction: ἔπαυλις σειρήνων and αὐλὴ στρουθῶν. He also omits an equivalent for אך, and he represents two different roots (רגע and נוח) with ἀναπαυσ-. Thus, while some elements in the translation point to a shared history with 1QIsa[a], free translation predominated.

Presumably the translator intended δαιμόνια to render ציים, but the passage is unclear. Whereas Isaiah pairs ציים and איים and then refers to שעירים, the OG translator ignores שעיר while maintaining the -ו, as if only the homophonous pair figured in his *Vorlage*. Martin regrets that "which Greek words are intended to translate which Hebrew words is not […] clear."[116] It seems at least that δαιμόνια (nominative) was meant for ציים (the subject). Yet the translator was demonstratively inconsistent: he uses ὀνοκένταυροι both for איים and also for ליליות.[117] It is possible that just as modern commentators cannot offer a definition for either ציים[118] or איים, neither could the second-century-B.C.E. Jewish translator.[119]

Regardless, the translator derived from the text a general impression of gods with divine associates. Regarding ὀνοκένταυρος, for example, Martin explains the term's meaning

116. Martin, "When," 660.
117. Ibid.
118. See William L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 2* (Hermeneia; ed. Paul D. Hanson; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 420-21 for commentary on ציים את איים, which appears in Jeremiah 50:39–40.
119. Martin explains, "The commentators are generally unhelpful, agreeing that we do not know what creatures these were." He notes that the words appear again in combination in *Jer* 50:39. The OG version (27:39) replaces them with ἰνδάλματα, "probably meaning 'idols' or 'apparitions.'" Martin, "When," 660–61, n. 13.

as "some kind of ass-human hybrid, such as a 'donkey-centaur.'"[120] Such a creature alongside the textual presence of שעיר may have conjured an image of "daimons […] cavorting with satyrs and centaurs."[121] This image complements the oracle's earlier condemnation of Edom: just as in *Isa* 13 Yhwh announces his intention of destroying Babylon, so here he seeks retribution for Israel (vv. 5–6). The prophecy has animals dispossessing the Edomites (vv. 11–15), to which OG appends divinities. The OG translator depicts front-and-center Yhwh's supreme authority, which the δαιμόνια neither challenge nor regret. They do not figure here as God's demonic enemies; they are simply divine entities in the ruined territory of Edom, instigated in accordance with Yhwh's will.

2.1.7. *Isa* 65:3, 11

[3]העם המכעיסים אותי על פני תמיד זבחים בגנות ומקטרים על הלבנים:
[11]ואתם עזבי יהוה השכחים את הר קדשי הערכים לגד שלחן והממלאים למני ממסך[122]

[3]ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ὁ παροξύνων με ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ διὰ παντός, αὐτοὶ θυσιάζουσιν ἐν τοῖς κήποις καὶ θυμιῶσιν ἐπὶ ταῖς πλίνθοις τοῖς δαιμονίοις ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν.
[11]ὑμεῖς δὲ οἱ ἐγκαταλιπόντες με καὶ ἐπιλανθανόμενοι τὸ ὄρος τὸ ἅγιόν μου καὶ ἑτοιμάζοντες τῷ δαίμονι τράπεζαν καὶ πληροῦντες τῇ τύχῃ κέρασμα

[3]These are the people who provoke me to my face continually; they sacrifice in the gardens and burn incense on bricks to the demons, which do not exist
[11]But as for you forsake me and forget my holy mountain and prepare a table for the demon and fill a mixed drink for Fortune

The Hebrew MSS resemble each other except for —ומקטרים—וינקו ידים, הלבנים האבנים, and מסכה—ממסך. These variations occurred mainly due to graphical similarity.

120. He criticizes the LSJ definition, which cites only the LXX and Aelian, *Nat. an.* 17.9, deriving, "a kind of tailless ape." Martin shows that this interpretation is plainly erroneous. Martin, "When," 660, n. 12.
121. Idem, 661.
122. [3]העם המכעיסים אותי על פני תמיד המה זובחים בגנות וינקו ידים על האבנים [11]ואתמה עוזב[י]יהוה השכחים את הר קודשי העורכים לגד שולחן וממלאים למני מסכה (1QIsa[a])
Ulrich and Flint, *The Isaiah Scrolls* (DJD XXXII.I, 2010), 102–05.

Between the two Hebrew versions, OG resembles MT. Unlike both MT and 1QIsa[a], the translator took the liberty of harmonizing the number agreement of "the nation" and its verb, "anger." OG also contains the plus, τοῖς δαιμονίοις ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν.

2.1.7.1. Analysis of Δαιμονίοις

The Hebrew MSS contain no traces that explain OG's τοῖς δαιμονίοις ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν. The phrase expands on the sacrifices Israel made that aroused Yhwh's ire. In addition to the absence of corresponding text in the Hebrew, the fact that the phrase is elaborative suggests that it originated with the OG translator, who apparently relied on OG-*Deuteronomy*. Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs notes that this plus in OG-*Isa* 65:3 resembles the δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ of OG-*Deut* 32:17.[123] Another source of inspiration, she says, is the gods that are mentioned in OG-*Isa* 65:11.[124] Both of these sources allude to gods and their association with Gentiles and idolatry, imbuing the present instance of δαιμόνιον accordingly.

As for the supplementary ἃ οὐκ ἔστιν, it is difficult to perceive the translator's point. It might be rhetorical in accord with Heiser's assessment of the uniqueness-language in *Deuteronomy*. If so, the translator does not discount the existence of other gods but their comparability vis-à-vis Yhwh. Even if the translator meant here to articulate monotheistic sentiments, he chooses δαιμόνιον not to represent evil spirits but rather the rival deities of Israel's god.

2.1.7.2. Analysis of גד/Δαίμονι

Here the translator apparently used δαίμων in reference to a divinity recognized as a god. It is unclear, though, whether the OG had δαίμων or δαιμόνιον. The former appears in

123. Mirjam van der Vorm-Croughs, *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses* (Atlanta: SBL, 2014), 371. Cf. idem, 55, n. 116.
124. Idem, 55.

Codex Sinaiticus only, whereas Alexandrinus and Vaticanus have the latter.[125] Δαιμόνιον seems original considering both its earlier appearance (v. 3) and its usual preference in Jewish-Greek writing.

Its usage for rendering גד shows that the translator understood the Hebrew as referring to a god. Martin explains that the OG translator took both גד and מני to be "names of gods in surrounding cultures."[126] He accordingly represented these with τύχη, "easily recognized as a goddess," and δαίμων/δαιμόνιον, which could occur as a name for "the deity that protects the household."[127] S. Sperling adds, "the verb עזב […] is regularly employed in contexts where Israel leaves Yahweh for other gods (Judg 2:12, 13; 10:6; 1 Sam 8:8); as is the verb שכח […] (Deut 8:14; Jer 13:25; Hos 2:15)."[128] Isaiah's intent, then, seems to have been to depict Israel interacting with other gods, a message that the translator's use of τύχη and δαίμων/δαιμόνιον affirms. His use of δαίμων/δαιμόνιον therefore figures consistently among the other instances of δαιμόνιον in the biblical literature, representing gods who are foreign to Israel and whom the nations serve through idolatry.

2.2. LXX (Apocryphal) and Pseudepigrapha

In comparison to the Law and the Prophets, the apocryphal and pseudepigraphic texts influenced Jewish communities sporadically. Nevertheless, the meaning they ascribed to δαιμόνιον contributes to the general Jewish theological discourse of that period. With what

125. "Δαίμων," *HRCS*, 283.

126. Martin, "When," 659. As for the meaning of גד and מני, Sergio Ribichini notes the attestation of Gad "in texts from Canaan, Phoenicia (and the Punic world), Hauran and Arabia." "Gad," *DDD*, 339, and S. Sperling notes, "It has been suggested […] to relate Meni to Menītum, an epithet of Ishtar found in a Mesopotamian god-list," though gives more stock to a Nabataean sources referring to Manutu. "Meni," *DDD*, 567.

127. *Ibid*. He cites Aristophanes's *Wasps* 525 and Plutarch's *Table Talk* 3.7.1. See idem, n. 8, and also Isaac L. Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948), 99.

128. Sperling, "Meni," 567.

notions did these texts' writers or their circles imbue δαιμόνιον, and how do they compare with those inhering in the word in the biblical texts of LXX?[129]

2.2.1. *Tobit*[130]

The separateness of Israel informs the distinction of divinities in the text. Tobit conceives of his loyalty to Yhwh in terms of being "mindful of my God […,] the Most High" with "my whole soul" (1:12–13), whom he also calls, "the king of heaven" (1:18). As I discussed regarding *Deuteronomy* and the *Psalms*, the efficacy of these epithets necessitate the existence of other gods above whom Yhwh figures in primacy and power and over whom he rules.

This supremacy bears out through the subversion of Asmodaios, the שדא באישא/ δαιμόνιον πονηρόν[131] that harasses Sarah and kills all seven of her potential husbands (3:8).[132]

129. Of the instances of δαιμόνιον in extrabiblical Jewish literature, I exclude *Jub* 17:16. The earliest Greek manuscripts of *Jubilees* contain δαιμόνιον but date to the ninth and eleventh centuries (Georgius Syncellus and Georgius Cedrenus, respectively). *Jubilees* was redacted in Hebrew during the second century B.C.E., but no surviving Hebrew MS has surfaced that reflects a precedent for the one instance of δαιμόνιον. The verse also lacks a Latin or Syriac witness, and the full Ethiopic version apparently lacks an equivalent for τῶν δαιμονίων. For the date of *Jubilees*, see George W. E. Nickelsburg, "Chapter Three: The Bible Rewritten and Expanded," in *CRINT* (ed. M. E. Stone; Van Gorcum: Assen; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 101. For the Greek manuscripts containing the verse, see Georgii Syncelli, *Ecloga Chronographica* (Teubner; ed. A. A. Mosshammer; Leipzig: Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1984) and Georgius Cedrenus, *Historiarum Compendium* (ed. I. Bekker; Bonn: Weber, 1838). James C. Vanderkam, *The Book of Jubilees* (CSCO; trans. J. C. Vanderkam; Peeters, 1989) covers the ancient sources that quote or preserve sections of *Jubilees* (vii–xxxi). Besides the lack of manuscript support for the later Greek versions, δαιμόνιον appears in the formula, Μαστιφὰμ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων […] προσελθὼν τῷ θεῷ (Syncellus)/Μαστιφὰτ ὁ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων προσελθὼν τῷ θεῷ (Cedranus). The phrase seems to fuse Luke's Βεελζεβοὺλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων (*Luke* 11:15) and *Job*'s image of heavenly beings (among them השטן/ὁ διάβολος) presenting themselves before Yhwh (1:6). The verse in *Jubilees* thus seems to be a Christian theological interpolation. Therefore it does not bear on this investigation.

130. There are two major versions of the Greek *Tobit*, conventionally called G^{I} and G^{II}. I quote the *NETS* translation of G^{II}, the earlier version. See *NETS*, 456–58.

131. The Aramaic is partially inferred from fragments 1 and 4 of 4QTobit^{b} ar. See Broshi et al, *Qumran Cave 4: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XIV), 41 and 44.

132. Translations render πονηρόν as "evil" or "wicked" but this adjective and its Aramaic original may, like *Deuteronomy*'s רע, evoke harm rather than evil. The former emphasizes Asmodaios's activities and correspond with his name. Indeed, he inflicts harm more so than acting as an agent of an absolute evil. If the author intended באישא/πονηρόν in the latter sense, we might expect Asmodaios to lead

Throughout the story Asmodaios figures as an inferior opposite to Yhwh. Terms and names in *Tobit* drive home this message. The δαιμόνιον's designation as πονηρόν juxtaposes the name of the human agent of Yhwh responsible for Asmodaios's undoing: Tobias (טוב-יה).[133] Furthermore, similarity between Asmodaios and Sennacherib adds to thematic contrast between Israel–Yhwh and Gentiles–δαιμόνια: a δαιμόνιον and the king of Assyria (the representative of his nation) are the only characters in the story who kill Israelites. Furthermore, by murdering Sarah's would-be husbands, Asmodaios prevents her from bearing children, which inhibits the perpetuation of Yhwh's nation. Asmodaios contradicts the principle that inspires Tobit's wishes for his son (4:12), manifesting opposition to Yhwh. In name, in affiliation with a Gentile king and land, and in deed the text characterizes this δαιμόνιον over against Israel's (superior) deity.

2.2.2. *1 Bar* 4:7, 35[134]

> [7]παρωξύνατε γὰρ τὸν ποιήσαντα ὑμᾶς θύσαντες δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ
> [35]πῦρ γὰρ ἐπελεύσεται αὐτῇ παρὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου εἰς ἡμέρας μακράς, καὶ καθοικηθήσεται ὑπὸ δαιμονίων τὸν πλείονα χρόνον.
>
> [7]For you provoked the one who made you by sacrificing to demons and not to God.
> [35]For fire will come upon her from the Everlasting for many days, and for a rather long time she will be inhabited by demons.

Jews away from Yhwh, as per Celsus's definition of a δαίμων. See §1.2.

133. Carey Moore notices that the names of the story's divine characters allude to their role in the story. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (ABD; trans. C. A. Moore; New York: Doubleday, 1996), 25. As for Asmodaios, scholars have not reached a consensus on the name's etymology. If it comes from the Hebrew, שׁמד (to destroy), then it reiterates his role in the story. If from the Persian, *aeshma daēva* or *aesmadiv*, it either evokes "'the demon of anger,' who accompanied Ahriman […,] the God of Evil," or else functions as "a Jewish 'demotion' of the Zoroastrian Ahura Mazda 'from chief god to chief devil'" (idem, 147, quoting from Gray [1934]).

134. The original language of this section has been debated for nearly two centuries. Proffered dates range from the sixth century B.C.E. to the second C.E. Doron Mendels, "Baruch, Book of," *ABD*, vol. 1 (1992), 619, and David G. Burke, *The Poetry of Baruch: A Reconstruction and Analysis of the Original Hebrew Text of Baruch 3:9-5:9* (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982), 23–8. According to Burke, however, "The majority of investigators prefer to locate the bulk of the Baruch material between 200–60 B.C.E." He argues for the second century B.C.E. (idem, 32).

In both instances of δαιμόνιον the author of *1 Baruch* imports language and imagery from LXX. Every element in v. 7 appears in OG-*Deut* 32:16–17. The author seems to maintain the message of the biblical text, but through exhortation rather than chastisement. He recalls that Israel forsook the law of Yhwh (vv. 12–13), served δαιμόνια instead (v. 7), and as a result went into exile (vv. 5–6). This sequence figures in *Deuteronomy*, especially in 28:64 and the Song of Moses. Since *Deuteronomy* acknowledges the existence of the nations' gods and uses δαιμόνιον accordingly, the impression the text made on Baruch's terminology suggests corresponding ideological harmony.

The author employed the same technique in v. 35, but here he draws from OG-*Isa* 13 and OG-*Gen* 19:24. Like *Isa* 13, Baruch describes Babylon's impending destruction (4:33). The image of fire sent by τοῦ αἰωνίου draws from OG-*Isa* 13:19, which invokes the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by πῦρ παρὰ κυρίου (OG-*Gen* 19:24).[135] Just as Baruch's fiery forecast precedes his prediction that Babylon will be settled by δαιμόνια τὸν πλείονα χρόνον, so the reference to Sodom and Gomorrah's fate in *Isa* 13 immediately precedes the promise that no one—aside from several animals or divinities including δαιμόνια (v. 21)—will dwell there εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον (v. 20). Despite his reliance on *Isaiah* it is difficult to perceive what exactly δαιμόνιον meant to the author of *1 Baruch*. His primary purpose seems to be to invoke the prophet Isaiah and depict the downfall of Babylon so as to encourage his audience. If written in Greek, allusion to δαιμόνια may simply have strengthened association with OG-*Isaiah*, commending his exhortation through the prophet's prestige. But even so, the fact that he repeats δαιμόνια rather than replacing it might demonstrate the term's relevance to the writer and his audience for depicting divinities in a foreign land.

135. Idem, 238.

2.2.3. *1 En.* 19:1, 99:6[136]

> 19 [1]καὶ εἶπέν μοι Οὐριήλ Ἐνθάδε οἱ μιγέντες ἄγγελοι ταῖς γυναιξὶν στήσοτναι, καὶ τὰ πνεύματα αὐτῶν πολύμορφα γενόμενα [*sic*] λυμαίνεται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ πλανήσει αὐτοὺς ἐπιθύειν τοῖς δαιμονίοις μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης κρίσεως, ἐν ᾗ κριθήσονται εἰς ἀποτελείωσιν. [2]καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν τῶν παραβάντων ἀγγέλων εἰς σειρῆνας γενήσονται[137]
>
> 99 [6]καὶ λατρεύ[οντες φαν]τάσμασιν καὶ δαιμονίοι[ς καὶ βδελύγ]μασι καὶ πνεύμασιν πονη[ροῖς][138]

2.2.3.1. Analysis of Δαιμονίοις in *Watchers*

This passage involves several kinds of beings. Uriel mentions ἄγγελοι, γυναίκες, ἄνθρωποι, δαιμόνια, θεοί, and σειρῆνες. Involved in this story but described elsewhere are the giants—the offspring of ἄγγελοι and γυναίκες described also in *Gen* 6.[139] According to *1 Enoch*, after the giants' bodies perished, their spirits endured: "they will call them evil spirits upon the earth, for their dwelling will be upon the earth [….] And the spirits of the giants <lead astray>, do violence, make desolate, and attack and wrestle and hurl upon the earth and <cause illnesses>" (15:8, 11).[140] The spirits left over from the giants earn the designation

136. The first passage comes from the *Book of the Watchers* (*1 En.* 1–36); the second is from the *Epistle of Enoch* (*1 En.* 92–105). Fragments from both originally-Aramaic compositions were found at Qumran. As a result, scholars can confirm the antiquity and longevity of *Watchers* and *Epistle*. Based on Józef T. Milik's *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumrân Cave 4* (1976), Stone considers *Watchers* "to be even older than the writing down of its present form which […] took place some time in the third century B.C.E.," meaning that it is among "the oldest, extra-biblical Jewish religious literature." *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 189. Nickelsburg argues that a Greek version of *1 Enoch* "was in place by the end of the first century," produced by "a Jewish translator who worked before the turn of the era." *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 14. Greek *1 Enoch* therefore represents the Jewish-Greek of the late Second Temple period. The semantics of δαιμόνιον therein should accordingly conform to the contemporary Jewish version of the term.

137. Robert H. Charles, *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch, Edited from Twenty-Three MSS, Together with the Fragmentary Greek and Latin Versions* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1906), 51.

138. Campbell Bonner, ed., *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek* (London: Waverly, 1937), 45.

139. According to Stone, *1 Enoch* draws on lore that "is not an exegetical extrusion from Gen 5:22-24" (which mentions Enoch). Rather, "He is presented in these diverse sources with new, distinct and clearly articulated features that are by no means hinted at in Genesis," such that some scholars "urged the view that the figure of Enoch as the sage of heavenly wisdom draws on Mesopotamian sources." Stone, *Selected*, 190.

140. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 267. Nickelsburg's translation takes into account the major Greek and Ethiopic manuscripts of *Watchers*; see *1 Enoch 1*, 12–15. It is not certain that a Greek version of the

πονηρά. Violence characterizes them, and they cause illness. These πνεύματα πονηρά evoke the biblical sense of רע/πονηρόν and specifically that afflicting Saul in *1 Sam* 16, 18, and 19.

These harmful spirits are distinct from the δαιμόνια. While Enoch looks upon the ἄγγελοι that mixed with women, Uriel explains that it is their spirits—not they themselves—that mistreat and mislead humans.The spirits of these ἄγγελοι—it is not clear whether they are the same as those of their children—lead humans ἐπιθύειν τοῖς δαιμονίοις, which alludes to cult. The text thus portrays two distinct groups: the πνεύματα πονηρά of the ἄγγελοι/giants who harm humans, and the δαιμόνια (which are neither ἀγγελοί nor πνεύματα πονηρά), who receive cult.[141] *1 Enoch* thus depicts the δαιμόνια as gods. Nickelsburg confirms, "Demons here are not evil spirits that lead humankind astray […] but the spirit powers known as the gods of the nations."[142] Indeed, the connection between Gentile cult, idolatry, and δαιμόνια figures even more clearly in the *Epistles* passage.

2.2.3.2. Analysis of Δαιμονίοις in *Epistles*

This second and last appearance of δαιμόνιον in *1 Enoch* likewise refers to gods. Ch. 99 contains a list of woes for sinners and encouragement for the righteous. V. 6 promises idolators no aid from their images through which they serve δαιμόνια and πνεύματα πονηρά. Just as in *Watchers*, the author conceives of δαιμόνια as distinct from πνεύματα πονηρά. Both are construed as objects of idolatry, evoking the nations and their gods.

---

units of *1 Enoch* was the *Vorlage* for the Ethiopic version, which is the fullest of all the manuscript evidence. But Nickelsburg affirms this assumption (15–17). In any case his translation of 19:1–2 takes into account the Greek codices as well as the Ethiopic. See idem, 18 for his method of comparing the manuscripts.

141. Martin, too, notices this distinction: "Nowhere in the Enochic material are the fallen angels […] themselves said to be demons or evil spirits," and "it is a mistake to identify these evil spirits with 'demons'" ("When," 667).

142. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 287.

2.3. Philo and Josephus[143]

All Jewish-Greek texts of the Second Temple period are Hellenistic to one degree or another. But some Jewish authors explicitly applied Greek modes of thought to Jewish theology. Philo is paradigmatic: this first-century Jewish nobleman of Alexandria posited that the Jewish Law affirmed Platonic and Stoic philosophy.[144] Other Jewish writers simply tailored their works to a Greco-Roman audience even as biblical ideology guided their historical perspective. Josephus, the Levite rebel-commander-turned-Roman-citizen, exemplifies this type.[145] How do their usages of δαιμόνιον accord with their intended audiences and the associated Greco-Roman discourse?

2.3.1. Philo, *Moses* 1:276

> ἔνθα καὶ στήλην συνέβαινεν ἱδρῦσθαι δαιμονίου τινός, ἣν οἱ ἐγχώριοι προσεκύνουν
>
> where it chanced that in honour of some deity a pillar had been set up which the natives worshipped

2.3.1.1. Analysis of Δαιμονίου

Philo uses δαιμόνιον in relation to a monument on the hill where Balak led Balaam to curse Israel. OG-*Num* 22 mentions no such slab, so Philo either based his retelling on another source or else devised it himself.[146] Whatever the case, he notes that it was erected to "some

143. All quotations from Philo's and Josephus's writings conform to the Loeb Classical Library series: *Philo* (trans. F. H. Colson et al; 10 vols; LCL; London: W. Heinemann, 1929–1962) and *Josephus* (trans. H. St. J. Thackerey et al; 10 vols; LCL; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965).
144. Martin, "When," 671.
145. Josephus states in the *Judean War* 1.3, "I […] propose to provide the subjects of the Roman Empire with a narrative of the facts." Among Josephus's goals in *War* was "to draw an appreciative and favourable picture of his benefactors, the Flavian emperors, Vespasian and Titus." Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988), 76. As for *Antiquities of the Jews*, Josephus writes, "And now I have undertaken this present work in the belief that the whole Greek-speaking world will find it worthy of attention" (*Antiquities* 1.5).
146. Philo must have availed himself of LXX. He "seems not to have known Hebrew," nor was he "careful in his writings to distinguish between Hebrew and Aramaic, both of which he called 'Chaldaean.'" Seth Schwartz, "Language, Power, Identity in Ancient Palestine," in *Past & Present* 148 (1995): 38–9.

deity" to which the locals bowed down. The word therefore applies, in usual Jewish-Greek fashion, to a god foreign to Israel, which Gentiles approach via idolatry.

2.3.1.2. Δαίμων vis-à-vis Δαιμόνιον

But Philo's δαίμων shows the extent to which his thinking and language were Hellenized. He uses δαίμων fifteen times throughout his works in clear preference to δαιμόνιον, sometimes intending *god*, sometimes *intermediary divinity*. As an example of the former: he accuses arrogant men of fancying themselves οὔτε ἄνδρα οὔτε ἡμίθεον ἀλλ' ὅλον δαίμονι—"neither man nor demigod but wholly" δαίμονα (*Virt*. 172).[147] Yet he uses δαίμονες to describe servants of Poseidon (*Decal*. 53–54). Both instances somewhat contravene his definition of δαίμων as a soul that occupies the air (*Giants* 6).[148] This inconsistency in fact evokes the semantic generality of δαίμων in Greek literature. Lack of moral affiliation adds to the similarity between Philo's δαίμων and that of Greek literature.[149] His language—both by favoring δαίμων over δαιμόνιον and by using δαίμων flexibly—thus demonstrates closeness with Greek theological discourse. Accordingly, the sense imputed to δαιμόνιον in biblical and extrabiblical literature does not appear; Philo's writing represents a different discourse in Greek, which his terminology reflects.

2.3.2. Josephus

Josephus mentions δαιμόνιον and δαίμων several times in the *Judean War* and the *Antiquities of the Jews*, refers to a δαιμόνιον once in *Against Apion*, and speaks of a δαίμων

147. Colson translates this instance of the noun δαίμονα imprecisely, opting for "divine" (adj.).

148. Martin groups Philo's δαίμων according to three meanings: "Gods as daimons"; "Personal guide, fate, or 'genius'"; "Avenging the dead or causing madness" ("When," 671). He subsumes the instance of δαιμόνιον under the first δαίμων-group.

149. Philo "never […] [portrays] an evil, harmful daimon" even though he theorizes the existence of "'good' and 'bad' souls." Martin, "When," 671.

once in *Life*.[150] Even more than Philo's, Josephus's usage reflects the normal Greek register: the terms overlap semantically, describing a number of divinity-types. As Martin has it, δαιμόνιον and δαίμων occur in Josephus "in all sorts of situations and look just like Greek notions of [δαιμόνιον/δαίμων] and divine forces, both helpful and harmful."[151]

Josephus's δαιμόνιον and δαίμων approximate semantic consistency according to text. In *War*, Josephus uses δαιμόνιον in reference to πονηρῶν […] ἀνθρώπων πνεύματα τοῖς ζῶσιν εἰσδυόμενα καὶ κτείνοντα—"spirits of wicked men which enter the living and kill them" (7:185), possibly one's genius (1:613), and even to the god of Israel (1:69, 84). This last usage sets Josephus apart from other Jewish writers, who never apply the term to the Most High. Instead it resembles the Greek δαιμόνιον, referring to deities otherwise called θεοί. As for δαίμων in *War*, Josephus almost always uses it for the spirits of the murdered, e.g. for Hyrkanus and Mariam (1:521), and for Alexander and Aristobulus (1:599, 607). Only Vespasian's reference to Fortune as a δαίμων resembles the common Greek allusion to a god (4:41). But Josephus did not write *War* in Greek. It is therefore difficult to ascertain how precisely δαιμόνιον and δαίμων convey his theological perspectives. They might instead conform to the personal lexicon of his translator.[152]

Josephus did, however, pen the *Antiquities* in Greek, so the semantics of δαιμόνιον and δαίμων should more accurately represent Josephus. As in *War*, δαίμων can describe the spirit of the murdered (13:317, apparently 415, and 416). Yet it also invokes deity broadly (14:291; 16:210). Δαιμόνιον on the other hand refers to independent divinities. In 16:76 it refers to

150. I refer to Josephus's works in conformity with Daniel R. Schwartz, "'Judaean' or 'Jew'? How Should we Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?" *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Frey, D. R. Schwartz, and S. Gripentrog; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 3–27, esp. 11.
151. Martin, "When," 672.
152. Josephus introduces *War* by explaining that he translated it from Hebrew/Aramaic (1.3). It seems unlikely that he himself translated, for he discusses his initial reluctance to pen the later *Antiquities* in Greek, calling the language "foreign and unfamiliar" (1.7).

Israel's god. Elsewhere it describes beings that seize people (8:46), which one Eleazar managed to expel by means of a root (8:46). Josephus also portrays δαιμόνια involved in Saul's suffering, which *1 Sam* 16 ascribes to a רוח רעה sent by Yhwh in place of his own spirit. Josephus elaborates on *1 Sam* 16: it is not one spirit that depresses Saul but several δαιμόνια that physically attack him (4:166). He even draws a distinction between δαιμόνια and πνεύματα πονηρά, speaking of David's success in expelling *both* the πονηρόν πνεῦμα *and* the δαιμόνια that would settle on Saul (6:211). Josephus does not replace or imply synonymity between the רוח רעה with δαιμόνια.[153] This passage portrays Josephus ascribing to δαιμόνιον specific semantic content. Yet viewed alongside the other instances of the word in *Antiquities*, it has a rather flexible meaning. In sum, Josephus's δαιμόνιον and δαίμων are "typical of popular […] notions of daimons among Greeks."[154] Although his and Philo's usages of these terms do not add to the evidence for a special Jewish δαιμόνιον, they do support my claim that semantically the term differed relative to Jewish or to Greek discourse. Δαιμόνιον in the writings of both Josephus and Philo accords semantically with the Greek of a Greco-Roman audience, which the very presence of δαίμων in their writings evidences.

2.4. NT (Other than the Synoptic Gospels)[155]

As I indicated in Part One, scholars now include in the Jewish literary milieu of the first-century the texts of the corpus that would later be designated the "New Testament."

153. Contra Martin, "When," 672.
154. Ibid.
155. Greek quotations come from *The Greek New Testament* (ed. K. Aland, M. Black, C. M. Martini, B. M. Metzger, and A. Wikgren; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1983). The UBS edition includes textual variants in the critical apparatus. The editors indicate their level of certainty by prefacing each variant with a bracketed letter code: [A] ("virtually certain"), [B] ("some degree of doubt"), [C] ("considerable degree of doubt"), and [D] ("very high degree of doubt concerning the reading selected for the text") (xii–xiii). UBS identifies only a few variants in the δαιμόνιον passages—none of which are significant in the present study. Nevertheless, I emulate the UBS edition by bracketing the variants. English translations come from NRSV.

They partook in and contributed to the contemporary, Jewish theological discourse. At least those texts originally penned in Greek convey semantic content generally representative of the Jewish world, especially of the earliest generations of Jesus's followers. The usage of δαιμόνιον therein and its resemblance to or variation from the usages in earlier Jewish-Greek literature will help clarify the range of ideas that Jews ascribed to this word.

2.4.1. *John*

This non-synoptic recollection of Jesus's life was finalized in the last decade of the first century.[156] John uses δαιμόνιον ten times over the course of six verses—all in the short range of three chapters. His ideas and concerns about δαιμόνια starkly contrast those of the Synoptic authors: it seems that John thought relevant neither the presence of the δαιμόνια in Israel nor Jesus's authority over them. Nor does he mention harmful or unclean spirits; the only πνεῦμα he refers to is God's or Jesus's. He invokes δαιμόνιον only in accusations made against Jesus and in the messiah's defense against those accusations.

John associates madness with the possession of a δαιμόνιον. When Jesus inquires of an audience at the Temple why some seek his life, the crowd responds, Δαιμόνιον ἔχεις· τίς σε ζητεῖ ἀποκτεῖναι;—"You have a demon! Who is trying to kill you?" (7:20). The answer is not an explanation; it is an accusation. It seems irrelevant unless it implies that one who has a δαιμόνιον has a false impression of things. It appears in 8:48–52, again in order to contradict a statement Jesus makes. After he challenges his hearers about their nature and ability to perceive truth, they respond, οὐ καλῶς λέγομεν ἡμεῖς ὅτι Σαμαρίτης εἶ σὺ καὶ δαιμόνιον ἔχεις;—"Are we not right in saying that you are a Samaritan and have a demon?" (v. 48). Jesus denies that that is so, and promises that belief in what he says neutralizes death as far as

156. יורג פריי, *הבשורה על פי יוחנן: מן היהודים ולמען העולם* (בעריכת כ. ורמן; מתורגם ע״י ד. עמארה וט. רוזמן; באר שבע: אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון, תשע״ד), 37.

the believer is concerned. The answer he receives reiterates the earlier accusation: Νῦν ἐγνώκαμεν ὅτι δαιμόνιον ἔχεις—"Now we know that you have a demon" (v. 52). Their statement introduces an attempt to show the absurdity of Jesus's statement. Finally, in 10:20–21 a debate arises regarding the reliability of Jesus's teachings. Some argue, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει καὶ μαίνεται—"He has a demon and is out of his mind"; others, Ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἔστιν δαιμονιζομένου· μὴ δαιμόνιον δύναται τυφλῶν ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀνοίξαι;—"These are not the words of one who has a demon. Can a demon open the eyes of the blind?" The coupling of ἔχειν δαιμόνιον with μαίνεσθαι clarifies that the major outcome of possessing a δαιμόνιον is, in John's mind, insanity giving way to verbalizing nonsense.

John's δαιμόνιον differs from the usual usage in Jewish discourse and instead evokes Hellenic conceptions of deity. His focus on madness and nonsense whenever he mentions δαιμόνιον correlates with general impressions among the Greeks regarding interaction with the divine. Classical descriptions of madness use the word δαιμονάω, e.g. Plutarch, *Marc*. 20.6; Xenophon uses it to describe Socrates's attitude toward those who suppose that the human mind can ascertain all knowledge (*Mem*. 1.9)—its proponent must be δαιμονᾶν to sponsor such an absurd opinion. Through this usage of δαιμόνιον, John demonstrates simultaneously participation in the early Jesus Movement yet cultural distance from Jewish discourse. Yet he does not evidence Dualism akin to the Church Fathers. He never links with Satan or the side of evil the accusation of Jesus's possession of a δαιμόνιον. The usage of the term is neither specially-Jewish nor dualistic; it is simply Hellenic.[157]

2.4.2. Paul, ***1 Cor*** **10:20–21**

157. On Dualism in *John*, see 95–92 ,הבשורה ,פריי.

> [20]ἀλλ᾽ ὅτι ἃ θύουσιν, δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ [θύουσιν]· οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι. [21]οὐ δύνασθε ποτήριον κυρίου πίνειν καὶ ποτήριον δαιμονίων, οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων.
>
> [20]No, I imply that what pagans sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not to God. I do not want you to be partners with demons. [21]You cannot partake in the table of the Lord and the table of demons.

Though Paul hardly refers to δαιμόνια in his surviving letters, here he applies it when exhorting his Gentiles to abandon foreign gods and idolatry. Earlier in *1 Corinthians* he exhorts his readers to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, since although εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ […,] ἀλλ᾽ ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς—"there are many gods […] yet for us there is one God" (8:5–6). Just like *Deuteronomy*, Paul acknowledges the existence of many gods. But both Israel and those who would join themselves to her are to regard only one particular god.

These remarks prep the audience for Paul's explanation in ch. 10. After reiterating the issue of idolatry in v. 14 (Διόπερ […,] φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας—"Therefore […] flee from the worship of idols"), he explains that the sacrifices of idolatry are offered to δαιμόνιοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ. The singular θεῷ shows that Paul intends not to demote or revile the nations' gods as *demons*, for he does not say, "That which the nations sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons and not gods." The plural would have indicated that Paul meant to critique a misperception about the nature of the Gentiles' divinities: that they are *not gods* even though they are called "gods." He draws instead a rhetorical, comparative difference that is sensible only within henotheism. To do so, he quotes OG-*Deut* 32:17 verbatim: ἔθυσαν δαιμονίοις καὶ οὐ θεῷ. The similarity of his phrasing to that of the Song of Moses suggests that he knew the subsequent phrase in OG-*Deuteronomy* that describes δαιμόνια as a group of θεοί. Indeed Paul's remarks

in ch. 8 confirm that he acknowledged the reality of other gods.[158] His δαιμόνια are those of OG-*Deuteronomy*: the gods that the nations serve through idolatry.

2.4.3. Pseudo-Paul, *1 Tim.* 4:1

> Τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς ἀποστήσονταί τινες τῆς πίστεως προσέχοντες πνεύμασιν πλάνοις καὶ διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων
>
> Now the Spirit expressly says that in later times some will renounce the faith by paying attention to deceitful spirits and teachings of demons

2.4.3.1. A Note on the Pastoral Epistles

Scholars question the authenticity of the Pastorals, rendering the dating and authorship of *1 Timothy* somewhat obscure.[159] If it represents Paul, then we should expect δαιμόνιον to convey notions comparable to those in *1 Cor.* 10. If the letter is pseudepigraphic and stems from the mid-second century, then we can expect it to express Christian Dualism.

2.4.3.2. Analysis of Δαιμονίων

The writer pairs spirits and δαιμόνια in cooperation yet as distinct groups. His omission of definite articles when referring to spirits and δαιμόνια may imply that the latter are to be understood generally, as divinities. Rather than speaking of *the demons* (i.e. a specific group) of later Christianity who are united under the devil's flag against God, the author of this letter perhaps intended gods in competition for mortals' affiliation. In this sense the writer's reference to τὸ πνεῦμα, which informs him of the impending competition, creates

158. Fredriksen confirms that for Paul, "Such gods […] are mere δαίμονες, subordinate deities" ("Judaizing," 241). But as with her analysis of *Ps* 95 (idem, 236), she overlooks the significance of the Jewish-Greek preference for δαιμόνιον over δαίμων, a difference that clues us in to Paul's discourse. Though she does not go into detail here about whether Paul thought these deities are by nature evil and Satanic, she confirms that inferiority characterizes them. The focus on their inferiority shows that Paul was thinking comparatively, i.e. intra-deities.
159. See Gordon D. Fee and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., eds., *The Eerdmans Companion to the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 684.

juxtaposition between it/God and other πνεύματα/other gods, i.e. δαιμόνια. But the author provides no elaboration on the nature of δαιμόνια as he conceives of it.

2.4.4. *Jas* 2:19

> σὺ πιστεύεις ὅτι εἷς ἐστιν ὁ θεός, καλῶς ποιεῖς· καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια πιστεύουσιν καὶ φρίσσουσιν.
>
> You believe that God is one; you do well. Even the demons believe—and shudder.

2.4.4.1. A Note on *James*

As with the Pastorals, Christian tradition has ascribed to *James* (or, more accurate to the Greek: *Jacob*) association with a first-generation leader of the Jesus Movement. But as with the Pastorals, evidence that backs the traditional claims regarding authorship is scarce. Therefore the same questions regarding discourse, and therefore regarding the interpretation of δαιμόνιον, obtain in *James* as in *1 Timothy*. If the author was in fact the brother of Jesus, then he was a contemporary of Paul, expressing the Jewish-Greek of the mid-first century.[160]

2.4.4.2. Analysis of Δαιμόνια

In its immediate context, δαιμόνια serves to contrast the singularity of ὁ θεός. God's uniqueness, he says, inspires the δαιμόνια to φρίσσουσιν. NRSV translates this word as "shudder," giving the impression that the δαιμόνια feel fear. The question then arises, Why does the fact that God is one instill fear in the δαιμόνια? Even if they are taken to be demons in the dualistic sense, which implies an epic antagonism that would generally warrant fear on the inferior side, the cause-and-effect posited by translations like NRSV is deficient. If, however, φρίσσω connotes awe, then Yhwh's oneness as a catalyst for such awe renders the text more sensible, depicting subordinates logically respecting their autocrat. In this case

160. Idem, 700.

James invokes the comparison theme found in especially *Deuteronomy* and *Psalms*. This theme describes Yhwh as the unique god of the gods.

2.4.5. *Revelation*

This book dates to the last quarter of the first century and belongs to the apocalypse genre of Jewish writing.[161] John's is the only one of the surviving apocalypses that represents the early Jesus Movement. As such, the author works with ideological material belonging to Jewish discourse. Though the low quality of John's Greek makes thorough philological analysis futile, he successfully conveys associations with uncleanliness, idolatry, and human political entities. In his first reference to δαιμόνια, he affiliates them with idols. He describes a plague that is unleashed on idolaters because they μὴ προσκυνήσουσιν τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ τὰ εἴδωλα—"did not […] give up worshiping demons and idols" (9:20). John describes a pair of distinct but closely-linked constituents. His perception of an intimate link between δαιμόνια and idolatry reflects that depicted in *Deut* 32 and *1 Enoch*.

In 18:2, John foresees the fall of Babylon, whose ruin δαιμόνια and πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα inhabit. He clearly draws from *Isa* 13:21–2. But whereas OG-*Isaiah* describes various animals alongside dancing δαιμόνια, John describes πᾶς πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον along with πᾶς ὄρνις ἀκάθαρτον. These may represent John's construal of the mysterious creatures listed in the OG-*Isaiah* passage. If so, his rendering of that prophecy clues the scholar in to how he thought of δαιμόνια. If he recognized *Isa* 13's δαιμόνια but either did not understand all the other terms or, alternatively, understood them but wanted to group them together, he seemingly saw in πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα a natural complement. Where there are δαιμόνια, there are πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, as in *1 En*. 99. Indeed, in the seer's final usage of δαιμόνιον (16:14)

161. See M. E. Stone, "Chapter Ten: Apocalyptic Literature," *CRINT*, 393.

he draws an explicit connection between δαιμόνια and πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα. He portrays πνεύματα τρία ἀκάθαρτα […] εἰσὶν γὰρ πνεύματα δαιμονίων—"three foul spirits […] these are demonic spirits."[162] He has in mind particular πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, but he conveys a general notion of δαιμόνια having spirits that are somehow unclean.

In the continuation of this passage, John highlights one last element about the δαιμόνια: their affiliation with human political bodies. He depicts these πνεύματα δαιμονίων as those that go forth ἐπὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης συναγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν πόλεμον τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς μεγάλης τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος—"to the kings of the whole world, to assemble them for battle on the great day of God the Almighty." John depicts the spirits of the δαιμόνια interested in and directly influencing the kings of the world. In other words, he associates them directly with the Gentiles. This image of the δαιμόνια gathering nations to a battle that will take place at Ἁρμαγεδών, which is located in the land of τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ παντοκράτορος, invokes the Israel/Yhwh—nations/gods contrast. John's reference to the οἰκουμένης strengthens this distinction between Israel and the Gentiles.[163] His δαιμόνιον, then, reflects the usage of the term at work in other Jewish texts of the Second Temple period.

2.5. Section Conclusions

The passages above represent different generations of Jewish writers and theological streams of Jewish discourse. Yet several themes regularly characterize their usage of δαιμόνιον, forming a special, Jewish definition that spans the Second Temple period. Their δαιμόνιον referred to a deity in association with Gentiles and idolatry. From an Israelite point of view, this definition is synonymous with "foreign god." Gentile and idolatrous elements

162. *NRSV* inexplicably renders this case of ἀκάθαρτα and of πνεύματα δαιμονίων imprecisely and unlike the similar occurrences in *Luke* 4:33.
163. See §4.4.

characterize δαιμόνιον in OG-*Deut* 32, OG-*Ps* 106, OG-*Isa* 65, *1 Bar* 4, *1 En.* 99, *1 Cor* 10, and in the *Revelation* passages. The term appears with explicit reference to the Gentiles in OG-*Ps* 96, OG-*Isa* 13 and 34, and *Tobit*. Δαιμόνιον signaled contrast with Yhwh, as in OG-*Deut* 32, OG-*Ps* 91 and 96, each of the OG-*Isaiah* passages, *Tobit*, *1 Cor* 10, and *Jas* 2. Rivalry with Yhwh often correlates with the contrast theme, as in OG-*Deut* 32, OG-*Ps* 106, OG-*Isa* 65, *1 En.* 19, and possibly *1 Tim* 4. From the translation of the original LXX to the end of the first century C.E., Jews used δαιμόνιον in reference to the gods of the Gentiles—served through idolatry, historically wooing Israel, inferior to her god.

Many of these instances of δαιμόνιον bear linguistic or ideological impressions of OG-*Deut* 32. Among them, OG-*Isa* 65, *1 Bar* 4, and *1 Cor* 10 import terms and phrases wholesale. The translator of OG-*Ps* 91 seems to have solved his ignorance of the unusual Hebrew word before him by consulting OG-*Deut* 32's translation of שדים. This situation arose apparently because of the book's status; as one of the books of Jewish law, it was foundational for Jewish culture. As such, it dictated Yhwh's standards for Israel within a henotheistic model that accepted the existence of many gods, but relegated them to inferior status and patronage of other nations. When the OG-*Deuteronomy* translator chose δαιμόνιον to convey the Song of Moses's rhetoric against foreign gods, he set a semantic precedent for subsequent Jewish-Greek writing. Consequently the associations in OG-*Deut* 32 reverberate throughout most of the instances of δαιμόνιον.

The Jewish δαιμόνιον lacks the semantic content of *demon*. In the texts above, the δαιμόνια do not appear as evil Satanic minions duping the Gentiles into believing that they are gods. No evil leader presides over the δαιμόνια. They are not locked in cosmic antagonism with angels. Nor are they conflated with πνεύματα πονηρά: δαιμόνια are πονηρά only when

inflicting harm (as in *Tobit*). In sum this portrayal is consistent with Israelite henotheism, according to which good/evil expresses benefit/harm or draws upon the standards of the nation's god. The negativity Jewish authors attached to δαιμόνια is relative to the contract Israel has with Yhwh that forbids her from relating to other gods. To this effect, *foreignness* is the primary characterization that the Jewish texts ascribe to the δαιμόνια/Gentile gods. Having determined the special sense Greek-speaking Jews ascribed to δαιμόνιον during the Second Temple period, it remains now to discover whether Luke's δαιμόνιον coincides.

Part Three—The Δαιμόνιον Passages in *Luke-Acts* (with Parallels in *Mark* and *Matthew*)

Having determined that δαιμόνιον conveyed notions unique to and prominent throughout the various textual representatives of Jewish discourse of the Second Temple period, I now turn to the twenty-three usages of the word in *Luke-Acts* to see whether the same usage obtains. I will present the raw material of *Luke-Acts*, recount the common, scholar-supported interpretation of Luke's δαιμόνιον as *demon*, provide my own analysis of the Greek text, and assess whether the standard interpretation can adequately account for Luke's portrayal of δαιμόνια. I present the passages in the Greek and in their wider narrative context in order to identify recurring imagery and language.[164] I then provide the NRSV translation so as to exhibit the typical understanding of the passages.[165] Therein the Lukan δαιμόνιον is always rendered as "demon" except in the last instance. This translation typifies the mainstream reading of *Luke-Acts*, providing grounds for comparison between standard interpretation and my criticism and alternative analysis. Finally, rather than attempting to address the vast literature on *Luke-Acts*, I include alongside Wahlen's book comments from François Bovon's three-part Hermeneia commentary on *Luke* and Richard Pervo's on *Acts*.[166]

164. As in the last chapter, all quotations of the Greek NT come from UBS.

165. The Preface states that this edition represents an interpretive tradition that has developed over fifty years and continues to enjoy wide and diverse readership. NRSV, xiii. The editors base their translation on current scholarship and claim commitment to representing scholarly consensus. They also mention that "[w]here [consensus] has broken down […] alternatives are mentioned" (ibid.). For Luke's δαιμόνιον passages the editors provide no alternative renderings. NRSV's contributors and projected audience therefore seem to take for granted the dualistic sense of δαιμόνιον, depicting widespread perception of this word.

166. François Bovon, *Luke 1* and *Luke 2* (Hermeneia; ed. H. Koester; trans. C. M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002, 2013) and Richard Pervo, *Acts* (Hermeneia; ed. H. Koester; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009). Bovon lists the three well-known text types of *Luke*: Alexandrian (second century), Western (nearly as old), and A (fourth century). Idem, 1. He assures that "[d]espite numerous variants," the overall text of *Luke-Acts* "is in relatively good condition," and while he points out six major variations across the evidence, the δαιμόνιον passages are not among them (ibid.). Pervo is slightly more pessimistic about the manuscript evidence of *Acts*, which he deems "less secure

The perspectives therein represent two formidable scholars of the field in recent years, and both provide historiographical assessment of each *Luke-Acts* pericope.

Evaluation of *Luke-Acts* naturally involves comparison with *Mark* and *Matthew*. I presume the textual relationship between the Synoptic Gospels that enjoys current scholarly consensus, which entails the Two-Source Hypothesis: "the priority of Mark and the sayings source, Q."[167] As a result, my analysis does not deal comprehensively with the more complex, veritable versions of the textual history, such as Luke's dependence not on *Mark* per say, but on "Ur-*Markus*." Whatever Luke's sources, I take his general coherence, grammatical consistency, and Semitisms to demonstrate autonomy; I regard what Luke says about δαιμόνιον as representative of his perspective, not as merely vestigial or reverential.

3.1. *Luke* 4:33–36

> 33καὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου καὶ ἀνέκραξεν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, 34Ἔα, τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ Ναζαρηνέ; ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς; οἶδά σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. 35καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγων, Φιμώθητι καὶ ἔξελθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ ῥῖψαν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον εἰς τὸ μέσον ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν. 36καὶ ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας καὶ συνελάλουν πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες, Τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ καὶ δυνάμει ἐπιτάσσει τοῖς ἀκαθάρτοις πνεύμασιν καὶ ἐξέρχονται;
>
> 33In the synagogue there was a man who had the spirit of an unclean demon, and he cried out with a loud voice, 34"Let us alone! What have you to do with us, Jesus of Nazareth? Have you come to destroy us? I know who you are, the Holy One of God." 35But Jesus rebuked him, saying, "Be silent, and come out of him!" When the demon had thrown him down before them, he came out of him without having done him any harm. 36They were all amazed and kept saying to one other, "What kind of utterance is this? For with authority and power he commands the unclean spirits, and out they come!"

If Luke took this story from *Mark* 1:21–27, he added Semitisms. Between *Luke* 4 and *Mark* 1 the speech of the δαιμόνιον is identical save for Luke's ἔα. Bovon reckons that Luke

---

than that of Luke." But among the verses evidencing corruption, the one with δαιμόνιον does not figure. Pervo, *Acts*, 2.

167. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 6.

intended it to convey the Jewish-dualistic slant on δαιμόνια.[168] He suggests similarly that Luke keeps Mark's τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί (1:24) because it is familiar "to Semitic ears."[169] Even the title the δαιμόνιον bestows on Jesus, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, is "rooted in the Hebrew Bible"—specifically evoking Samson (*Judg* 13:7 and 16:7) and Aaron (*Ps* 105 [LXX 106]:16).[170] Luke replaces Mark's bland λέγων with φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, which seems to be a Hebraism translating קול גדול.[171] These various Semitisms evidence familiarity with and aim of delivering this story in terminology relevant to Jewish discourse.

The general Jewish theological context accounts for Luke's unique reformulation of the Markan πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον as πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου. According to Wahlen, Luke probably intended through this combination of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον "to acquaint his Hellenistic readers with Jewish terminology."[172] For Wahlen the underlying assumption here is that Jews recognized πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, while δαιμόνιον was easier on the Gentile ear. Wahlen's assessment is partly justifiable: πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον is unique to Jewish literature. But his logic concerning δαιμόνιον is not: the word was hardly irrelevant to Jews, which its appearance throughout the diverse texts of Jewish-Greek literature shows.

Modifying δαιμόνιον with ἀκάθαρτον indeed evidences ideological affiliation with Jewish discourse. As I mentioned in §1.5, Jewish law conceives of טמאה as that which is foreign or forbidden to Israel. Accordingly, the only precedent for deeming a spiritual being ἀκάθαρτον is Jewish literature (*Zech* 13:2); nowhere do the ancient Greeks apply this label.

168. Idem, 162.
169. Ibid. See, for example, *2 Sam* 19:23: מה לי ולכם בני צרויה.
170. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 162, n. 28.
171. The phrase occurs many times throughout the MT, used for a variety of occasions ranging from Esau's grief at losing his birthright (*Gen* 27:34) to Solomon's joyful prayer-dedication of the first Temple (*1 Kgs* 8:55). As for ἀνακράζειν, the phrase twice depicts celebration (LXX-*1 Kgdms* 4:5, *Sir* 50:16) and twice summoning (LXX-*Ezek* 9:1, *1 Macc* 2:27).
172. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 152.

Wahlen's point about πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον's relevance to Jews figures importantly: Greeks unfamiliar with Jewish law would have no conceptual basis for describing a δαιμόνιον as ἀκάθαρτον. The content is meaningful only within Jewish discourse.

This fact eludes Bovon, who equates δαιμόνιον ἀκάθαρτον with *evil spirit*. He deems it "pleonastic to a Jew," relevant only in so far as it "makes an understanding of δαιμόνιον in the positive sense impossible."[173] Bovon's impulse to attribute to δαιμόνιον either a positive or negative sense presumes that Luke promoted a Dualistic worldview: "For [Luke], as for contemporaneous Judaism, the demons stood in the service of the devil, and in opposition to God and his angels."[174] Yet this characterization of δαιμόνιον derives from long-entrenched Christian theology dating to the Patristic era, to which Luke did not subscribe. As a result, Bovon like Wahlen takes ἀκάθαρτον as emphatic of *demon* qua *evil spirit*, signaling foremost "the oppression that [demons] bring upon human beings."[175] But if Luke intended this sense of ἀκάθαρτον, he mind as well have instead utilized πονηρόν. This word directly evokes maliciousness,[176] and Luke indeed employs it in cases wherein ailment and handicap result from the presence of a spirit (e.g. *Luke* 7:21, 8:2, *Acts* 19:12–19). Wahlen notes that Luke is, in fact, "the *only* NT writer who refers to 'evil spirits' per se."[177] This variation in adjectives

173. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 162.
174. Ibid.
175. In attributing these motivations to Luke, Bovon views the stories of Jesus's interaction with δαιμόνια according to an "anthropological orientation"; they amount to a rhetorical utility demonstrating the "liberation of humanity" (ibid.). Such extrapolations seem facile, attributing to Luke universalist interests fitting to Christendom while ignoring Luke's evident interest and focus on the Jewish world. It appears that Bovon's confessional approach, which he describes in the Preface, is borne out in his exegesis. See *Luke 1*, xiii, and compare Wahlen, *Jesus*, 169.
176. Luke in fact adds to the Markan pericope, τὸ δαιμόνιον […] ἐξῆλθεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν—"when the demon had thrown him down before them, he came out of him without having done him any harm." This detail implies the possibility that the δαιμόνιον could have hurt its possessor. But since it does not and Luke calls it ἀκάθαρτον, this adjective presumably describes something other than the spirit's maliciousness.
177. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 162.

discounts haphazard communication; Luke used πονηρός and ἀκάθαρτον each where they were relevant. So, in 4:33–36, he does not couch the expulsion in terms of benefit to the possessor; he prefers ἀκάθαρτον over πονηρόν, focusing not on the malice of the spirit. He instead casts the δαιμόνιον according to Jewish legal terminology: this being is טמא. Luke thereby determines his discussion of δαιμόνια and associated πνεύματα as crucially relative to Jewish law, emphasizing foreignness.

Finally, ἐξουσία has some bearing on Luke's presentation of this δαιμόνιον. He employs it regularly and more than the other Synoptics.[178] He often renders it in the phrase, ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ—a formula found only six times in Greek literature prior to the first century C.E. and rarely in the LXX.[179] There it alludes to political or military authority. Luke ascribed enough relevance to the word to reiterate—yet edit—*Mark* 1:22 (ἐξουσίαν ἔχων) and 27 (κατ' ἐξουσίαν).[180] His valuation of the term manifests through the narrative structure itself since it brackets the incident with the δαιμόνιον: the Capernaum audience first mentions it in connection to Jesus's teaching (4:32) and again when reflecting on the obedience of the δαιμόνιον to Jesus (4:36). In this passage ἐξουσία thus signals Jesus's unusual position of authority. But Luke describes others who possess ἐξουσία. The first is the διάβολος, referring to that which he was assigned for overseeing the nations (4:6). Luke may therefore intend comparison between the ἐξουσία of Jesus and that of the διάβολος. The political overtones of the latter may reveal how Luke sees the nature of the ἐξουσία of the former.

178. Wahlen inexplicably omits this passage from his table though he lists ὑποτάσσειν ἐξουσίᾳ as one of its "descriptors" (*Jesus*, 150).
179. In Isocrates, *De pace* 104.3, Plato, *Gorg*. 526a, and Aristotle, *Eth*. *nic*. 1095b, 1158a, 1159a, *Rhet*. 1384a.
180. Mark makes it a point of comparison to the scribes, which Luke either removed or lacked in his source.

3.2. *Luke* 4:40–41

> [40]Δύνοντος δὲ τοῦ ἡλίου ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενοῦντας νόσοις ποικίλαις ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς πρὸς αὐτόν· ὁ δὲ ἑνὶ ἑκάστῳ αὐτῶν τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς ἐθεράπευεν αὐτούς. [41]ἐξήρχετο δὲ καὶ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ πολλῶν κρ[αυγ]άζοντα καὶ λέγοντα ὅτι Σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. καὶ ἐπιτιμῶν οὐκ εἴα αὐτὰ λαλεῖν, ὅτι ᾔδεισαν τὸν Χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι.
>
> [40]As the sun was setting, all those who had any who were sick with various kinds of diseases brought them to him; and he laid his hands on each of them and cured them. [41]Demons also came out of many, shouting, "You are the Son of God!" But he rebuked them and would not allow them to speak, because they knew that he was the Messiah.

As in the previous passage, while Luke follows the general course of events in *Mark* 1 (again: unless he depicts an earlier, more Semitic Ur-*Mark*), he rephrases and rewords with relevance to Jews. Like Mark, Luke begins with the time of the day, but he excises ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης—"And when evening came," and reformulates ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος—"when the sun had set" (*Mark* 1:32) into a genitive-absolute (*Luke* 4:40). By opening this scene with the fact that the sun had set, Luke tells the reader that Shabbat was quite over.[181] Bovon contests that Luke "is not particularly interested in" the chronology—"only the healing and the exorcisms […] are pertinent."[182] Yet Luke demonstrates the contrary by recounting the course of events relative to the sunset explicitly. This awareness of Jewish custom (if not Israelite law) frames the healing of illness and the departure of the δαιμόνια.

The Lukan reformation of Mark's narrative distinguishes the possession of δαιμόνια from illness. Luke describes the sick in two parallel sentences comprised of participial phrases followed by a main clause: Δύνοντος/εἶχον–ἤγαγον; ἐπιτιθείς–ἐθεράπευεν. But his style changes when the topic shifts to δαιμόνια; he presents the action simply in the aorist and only

181. In that Capernaum brings the ailing at exactly the transition from the Shabbat to the workweek shows both eagerness (alluding to the impression Jesus had made earlier in the day) and perhaps a difference of opinion between Jesus and the majority of Capernaum regarding healing on Shabbat (since Jesus just healed Simon's mother-in-law—before sundown). Luke valued this issue, which its appearance three times in *Luke* compared to once in both of the other Synoptics shows.
182. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 164.

implying action on Jesus's part. Whereas Jesus (actively) places his hands on the ailing (τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτιθεὶς), the δαιμόνια straightaway exit their possessors (ἐξήρχετο) (at Jesus's implied prompting). Placing hands on the sick in order to heal them "is often attested in [*Luke-Acts*] as the effective gesture […] in the context of healing (e.g. Acts 9:12, 17; 28:8)."[183] In contrast, Luke never portrays expulsion of πνεύματα or δαιμόνια via touch. Luke's syntax and diction show that he did not consider the possession of δαιμόνια to be an ailment.[184]

To the δαιμόνιον-half of this passage Luke adds several words that evoke 4:33–36. The pre-positional instance of ἐξέρχομαι seems stylistically intentional. It contrasts the previous two sentences and recalls its emphatic usage throughout the similar incident with the πνεῦμα δαιμονίου.[185] Just as that πνεῦμα "exited," so do these δαιμόνια. Likewise, these yell (κραυγάζοντα) just as the first did (ἀνέκραξεν). They identify Jesus as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ just as the one before called him ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ. As in the first case, so here Jesus ἐπιτιμῶν them. Presumably, Luke inserts each of these terms. He also changes Mark's ἤφιεν λαλεῖν to the more authoritative οὐκ εἴα […] λαλεῖν, supplementing the force of ἐπιτιμέω. His innovations in diction signal rhetorical intention, referring the reader back to the earlier incident and implying that the particularities there obtain here.

That these δαιμόνια recognize Jesus as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ evokes a connection with the διάβολος. *Luke* features ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ only twice outside this passage, both of which involve

183. Idem, 160.
184. Wahlen agrees: "It is probably incorrect to equate demon possession with illness" ("When," 162). Bovon on the other hand asserts, "the exorcism […] and the healing […] are only examples of more extensive activity," implying that in terms of rhetorical function, to Luke they are the same (*Luke 1*, 164).
185. Regarding verses 35–36, Bovon assures, "The redundancy of ἐξέρχομαι […] is neither coincidental nor artless: each occurrence has its narrative function, and its repetition underscores, as in Mark, the significance of Jesus' exorcisms for human beings, and thus for the readers of Luke's Gospel" (*Luke 1*, 163).

the διάβολος (4:3, 9). These precedences prompt Bovon's aphorism, "What the devil knows […] the demons know too."[186] Bovon likely regards this connection as a manifestation of Dualism; indeed, he infers the response of these δαιμόνια to Jesus in light of *Jas* 2:19.[187] Both recourses demonstrate presumption of ideological continuity with Patristic discourse.

3.3. *Luke* 7:31–33

> 31Τίνι οὖν ὁμοιώσω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης καὶ τίνι εἰσὶν ὅμοιοι; 32ὅμοιοί εἰσιν παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις ἃ λέγει, Ηὐλήσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε. 33ἐλήλυθεν γὰρ Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστὴς μὴ ἐσθίων ἄρτον μήτε πίνων οἶνον, καὶ λέγετε, Δαιμόνιον ἔχει. 34ἐλήλυθεν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων, καὶ λέγετε, Ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος φάγος καὶ οἰνοπότης, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν.
>
> 31To what then will I compare the people of this generation, and what are they like? 32They are like children sitting in the marketplace and calling to one another, 'We played the flute for you, and you did not dance; we wailed, and you did not weep.' 33For John the Baptist has come eating no bread and drinking no wine, and you say, 'He has a demon'; 34the Son of Man has come eating and drinking, and you say, 'Look, a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners!'"

In terms of Luke's sources, the entire pericope seems to originate with Q since it appears in *Matt* 11 and not at all in *Mark*. Much of the language is common to both Luke's version and Matthew's, though the differences are significant to the analogy.

One such difference occurs in vv. 29–30 and bears on Luke's reference to a δαιμόνιον. He describes two groups from among "all the people": the tax collectors (who react favorably and undergo John's immersion) and the Pharisees and lawyers (who reject John).[188] The "a

186. Idem, 164.
187. See §2.4.4.
188. Bovon reads πᾶς ὁ λαός inclusive of οἱ τελῶναι and over against the leadership that consists of οἱ Φαρισαῖοι and οἱ νομικοί (*Luke 1*, 279). But this interpretation would create an outlier case of Luke's usage of λαός, where he employs it *passim* for the nation of Israel in its entirety. Neither does the syntax of these verses support Bovon's claim. Luke describes the audience's reaction as diffusive. It begins with the general effect, conveyed in a participle: ὁ λαὸς ἀκούσας—"all the people […] heard," resulting in two opposite reactions by two groups that Luke portrays in enmity (5:30, 15:1), represented in two aorist finite verbs: οἱ τελῶναι ἐδικαίωσαν τὸν θεὸν βαπτισθέντες—"the tax collectors acknowledged the justice of God […,] they had been baptized" and οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ νομικοὶ τὴν

people divided" imagery seems to obtain in the rest of this passage. Bovon expresses uncertainty regarding Luke's "double question,"[189] but in light of the preceding interpolation in v. 21, the evangelist seems to be emphasizing that Jesus addresses each side. Ἀλλήλοις accentuates this bifurcation (more clearly than Matthew's ἑτέροις). Bovon skirts around Luke's diction so as to uphold his interpretation of Jesus's proverb, pitting *us* "the musicians," i.e. "the messengers of God (and those hearers that accept the message)," against *you* "the resistant children," i.e. "the antagonists."[190] However, ἃ λέγει introduces both ηὐλήσαμεν and ἐθρηνήσαμεν, which Luke places in the mouths of the children/servants—they perform *both* the piping *and* eulogizing. Contrary to Bovon's analysis, there is no separate group of musicians in Jesus's analogy. The righteous-vs.-sinner reading reflects the Christian mission, but not Luke.

Little can be gleaned from this passage regarding the Lukan δαιμόνιον. Jesus intimates that the tax-collectors[191]—the children/servants who piped in the marketplace—supposed a connection between John's strict diet and possessing a δαιμόνιον. Bovon suggests that because

---

βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν […] μὴ βαπτισθέντες—"by refusing to be baptized […,] the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected God's purpose for themselves." As for the timing of the immersion subsequent to John's delegation, the two aorist verbs affirm that such was Luke's intention since he tells the entire story in that tense. Luke's other editorial interpolation in the story (v. 21) likewise portrays the action in the aorist. Bovon considers this tense not only typically "Lukan" (*Luke 1*, 277) but employed in order to convey the immediacy of the action: "The aorist shows that this is not a summary passage, but rather that Jesus decides right at that moment to perform healings, so that the disciples of the Baptist can take back a substantiation of the answer of Jesus that follows" (idem, 278). Bovon's analysis of this verse correlates with Luke's use of the aorist for the whole story. It is unclear why Bovon does not maintain his hermeneutics in the second interpolation.

189. Idem, 279–80. He calls it *parallelismus membrorum*, suggesting that it may be a Semitism.

190. Idem, 286. He asserts, "Despite the editorial phrase προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις […,] Luke does not have two groups in mind." But Bovon does not corroborate this claim.

191. If Luke maintains the distinction between those who accepted John's immersion and those who rejected it, then it is the tax-collectors who have reacted (here Luke switches from the aorist to the perfect) to John's abstinence from prepared food and strong drink by concluding, δαιμόνιον ἔχει, whereas the latter have accused Jesus of being a glutton and drunkard. That the second group consists in at least the Pharisees is clear from the formula, φίλος τελωνῶν καὶ ἁμαρτωλῶν. The phrase appears always in association with Pharisees. See *Luke* 5:30, 15:1–2, 18:10–13.

John's "dietary intake was […] more ascetic than the Law of Moses commanded […,] his lifestyle attracted criticism."[192] But he attributes this criticism to the Pharisees, which contradicts *Luke* 18:12 where the Pharisees are said to habitually fast twice weekly—a strict lifestyle exceeding the strictures of the Torah.[193] Such criticism would be overtly hypocritical. Furthermore, Bovon reads "having a δαιμόνιον" as an accusation. But the comment may be intended to be essentially neutral: in attributing a δαιμόνιον to John, the tax-collectors may simply intend to acknowledge John's prophetic power (i.e. some divinity empowers him). In this case Luke would be using the term in its basic sense in Hellenic discourse. If so, however, he would be transgressing his otherwise consistent rendering of δαιμόνιον as designating a foreign spiritual being.

3.4. *Luke* 8:1–3

> [1]καὶ οἱ δώδεκα σὺν αὐτῷ, [2]καὶ γυναῖκές τινες αἳ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, Μαρία ἡ καλουμένη Μαγδαληνή, ἀφ᾽ ἧς δαιμόνια ἑπτὰ ἐξεληλύθει, [3]καὶ Ἰωάννα γυνὴ Χουζᾶ ἐπιτρόπου Ἡρῴδου καὶ Σουσάννα καὶ ἕτεραι πολλαί
>
> [1]The twelve were with him, [2]as well as some women who had been cured of evil spirits and infirmities: Mary, called Magdelene, from whom seven demons had gone out, [3]and Joanna, the wife of Herod's steward Chuza, and Susanna, and many others.

Of the Synoptic writers Luke alone furnishes this list. Mark mentions in a different context and much later in his narrative, Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ, παρ᾽ ἧς ἐκβεβλήκει ἑπτὰ δαιμόνια (16:9). This clause parallels *Luke* 8:2, though Luke reformulates Mark's τῇ as ἡ καλουμένη, παρ᾽ ἧς as ἀφ᾽ ἧς, and ἐκβεβλήκει as ἐξεληλύθει. It cannot be said whether Luke appropriated the line from Mark or whether Mary was known formulaically as "the

192. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 287.
193. He seems to read this passage in light of *John* 10:20–21 (Bovon, *Luke 1*, 287, n. 80). John, however, conceives of δαιμόνιον in Christian terms, i.e. morally evil and existentially opposed to God.

Magdalene from whom seven δαιμόνια had exited."[194] Nevertheless, that Luke has it in a location and diction of his choosing conveys consciousness and therefore potential significance for its relation to the immediately-preceding πνευμάτων πονηρῶν.

NRSV's punctuation casts Mary, Joanna, Susanna, and the "many others" in elaboration of γυναῖκές τινες. Doing so presumes that δαιμόνιον represents a subset of πνεῦμα πονηρόν. But the translation fails to account for several elements in the Greek. Luke immediately qualifies γυναῖκές τινες with αἳ ἦσαν τεθεραπευμέναι ἀπὸ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ ἀσθενειῶν, which is to say that the group of women Luke intends consists of women who had πνευμάτων πονηρῶν and ἀσθενειῶν. If Mary is to be understood as one of these, supposedly Joanna, Susanna, and the unnamed "many others" too suffered from spirit-oppression or illness. Yet Luke does not describe them as such. As a result, NRSV's list is inconsistent with the Greek. The better reading of this passage sets Mary and her δαιμόνια in distinction from the women who had been relieved of πνεύματα πονηρά.[195] NRSV simply reflects an impulse to read δαιμόνιον and πνεῦμα πονηρόν as synonyms, which I scrutinized in §1.8 and which the δαιμόνιον passages in *1 Enoch* undermine (see §2.2.3.). Rather, just as the רוח רעה/πνεῦμα πονηρόν of *1 Sam* 16 affects Saul's disposition (comparable to an illness), Luke reserves πονηρόν for spirits that oppress people through illness. Luke portrays Jesus dealing with a δαιμόνιον differently, recalling similar grammatical differences in 4:40–41. The conceptual distinction between δαιμόνια/πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and illness/πνεῦμα πονηρόν entails separate problems and relative stakes.

3.5. *Luke* 8:26–39

194. So Bovon, *Luke 1*, 300.
195. Wahlen actually supports this proposed reading. See Wahlen, *Jesus*, 163.

[26]καὶ κατέπλευσαν εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας. [27]ἐξελθόντι δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ὑπήντησεν ἀνήρ τις ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ἔχων δαιμόνια καὶ χρόνῳ ἱκανῷ οὐκ ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτιον καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ οὐκ ἔμενεν ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς μνήμασιν. [28]ἰδὼν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνακράξας προσέπεσεν αὐτῷ καὶ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ εἶπεν, Τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου; δέομαί σου, μή με βασανίσῃς. [29]παρήγγειλεν γὰρ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ ἐξελθεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. πολλοῖς γὰρ χρόνοις συνηρπάκει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐδεσμεύετο ἁλύσεσιν καὶ πέδαις φυλασσόμενος καὶ διαρρήσσων τὰ δεσμὰ ἠλαύνετο ὑπὸ τοῦ δαιμονίου εἰς τὰς ἐρήμους. [30]ἐπηρώτησεν δὲ αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, Τί σοι ὄνομά ἐστιν; ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, Λεγιών, ὅτι εἰσῆλθεν δαιμόνια πολλὰ εἰς αὐτόν. [31]καὶ παρεκάλουν αὐτὸν ἵνα μὴ ἐπιτάξῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς τὴν ἄβυσσον ἀπελθεῖν. [32]Ἦν δὲ ἐκεῖ ἀγέλη χοίρων ἱκανῶν βοσκομένη ἐν τῷ ὄρει· καὶ παρεκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ἵνα ἐπιτρέψῃ αὐτοῖς εἰς ἐκείνους εἰσελθεῖν· καὶ ἐπέτρεψεν αὐτοῖς. [33]ἐξελθόντα δὲ τὰ δαιμόνια ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἰσῆλθον εἰς τοὺς χοίρους, καὶ ὥρμησεν ἡ ἀγέλη κατὰ τοῦ κρημνοῦ εἰς τὴν λίμνην καὶ ἀπεπνίγη. [34]ἰδόντες δὲ οἱ βόσκοντες τὸ γεγονὸς ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ εἰς τοὺς ἀγρούς. [35]ἐξῆλθον δὲ ἰδεῖν τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ἦλθον πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ εὗρον καθήμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀφ᾽ οὗ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐξῆλθεν ἱματισμένον καὶ σωφρονοῦντα παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν. [36]ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς οἱ ἰδόντες πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαιμονισθείς. [37]καὶ ἠρώτησεν αὐτὸν ἅπαν τὸ πλῆθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν, ὅτι φόβῳ μεγάλῳ συνείχοντο· αὐτὸς δὲ ἐμβὰς εἰς πλοῖον ὑπέστρεψεν. [38]ἐδεῖτο δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀφ᾽ οὗ ἐξεληλύθει τὰ δαιμόνια εἶναι σὺν αὐτῷ· ἀπέλυσεν δὲ αὐτὸν λέγων, [39]Ὑπόστρεφε εἰς τὸν οἶκόν σου καὶ διηγοῦ ὅσα σοι ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός. καὶ ἀπῆλθεν καθ᾽ ὅλην τὴν πόλιν κηρύσσων ὅσα ἐποίησεν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

[26]Then they arrived at the country of the Gerasenes, which is opposite Galilee. [27]As he stepped out on land, a man of the city who had demons met him. For a long time he had worn no clothes, and he did not live in a house but in the tombs. [28]When he saw Jesus, he fell down before him and shouted at the top of his voice, "What have you to do with me, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beg you, do not torment me"—[29]for Jesus had commanded the unclean spirit to come out of the man. (For many times it had seized him; he was kept under guard and bound with chains and shackles, but he would break the bonds and be driven by the demon into the wilds.) [30]Jesus then asked him, "What is your name?" He said, "Legion"; for many demons had entered him. [31]They begged him not to order them to go back into the abyss. [32]Now there on the hillside a large herd of swine was feeding; and the demons begged Jesus to let them enter these. So he gave them permission. [33]Then the demons came out of the man and entered the swine, and the herd rushed down the steep bank into the lake and was drowned. [34]When the swineherds saw what had happened, they ran off and told it in the city and in the country. [35]Then the people came out to see what had happened, and when they came to Jesus, they found the man from whom the demons had gone sitting at the feet of Jesus, clothed and in his right mind. And they were afraid. [36]Those who had seen it told them how the one who had been possessed by demons had been healed. [37]Then all the people of the surrounding country of the Gerasenes asked Jesus to leave them; for they were seized with great fear. So he got into the boat and returned. [38]The man from whom the demons had gone begged that he might be with him; but Jesus sent him away, saying, [39]"Return to

> your home, and declare how much God has done for you." So he went away, proclaiming throughout the city how much Jesus had done for him.

Comparable to 4:33–36 and 4:40–41, Luke follows *Mark* closely but changes the wording and sequence to his liking.[196] He replaces two of Mark's three πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον for δαιμόνιον, twice substitutes his δαιμονιζομένος with a prepositional phrase containing δαιμόνιον, adds δαιμόνιον twice, and unusually keeps the one instance of δαιμονισθείς. Just as in 4:33–36, Luke introduces a man possessing (ἔχων) δαιμόνια as opposed to Mark's ἐν πνεύματι ἀκαθάρτῳ. These preservations, substitutions, and additions demonstrate Luke's preference for δαιμόνιον terminology.

By including reference to πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (v. 29) Luke reiterates the foreignness of the δαιμόνια. He neither calls the spirit πονηρόν nor incorporates Mark's description of the harm the man would inflict upon himself under the influence of the πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον (5:5). Luke emphasizes instead the impurity of these δαιμόνια, which correlates with the thematic presence of the issue of impurity in especially this pericope.

The Gentile context affords Luke this opportunity. He sets the action in terms of leaving Israel and entering the Gentiles' world. Instead of Mark's benignly informative, εἰς τὸ πέραν τῆς θαλάσσας εἰς τὴν χώραν τῶν Γερασηνῶν—"to the other side of the sea to the country of the Gerasenes" (v. 1), Luke characterizes this place in comparison: ἀντιπέρα τῆς Γαλιλαίας—"opposite the Galilee" (v. 26). Bovon interprets the phrase as, "land of 'difference' [….] so that Jesus' journey has the form of a concise advance into a strange land."[197] Various unclean/impure elements of the situation correlate with the foreign setting. The man possessing δαιμόνια dwells among tombs, which Bovon notes are "impure for

196. "[C]omparison shows unequivocably [*sic*] that Luke had only Mark as a source" (Bovon, *Luke 1*, 325).
197. Idem, 323.

ancient sensibilities, particularly those of Jews."[198] Wahlen concurs and adds that the Gerasene's behavior and nudity conspicuously contradict Jewish custom.[199] The name that the δαιμόνια furnish is "a not too subtle allusion to the hordes of unclean Roman soldiers occupying Israel."[200] The presence and fate of the pigs add to the impurity of the scene and also evoke Gentile (Roman and Egyptian) militaries. Bovon explains, "Since pigs are unclean animals […,] this is most likely a pagan or semi-pagan environment," and adds, quoting Franz Annen,

> For both contemporary Judaism as well as for the early Jewish Christians, the pig was the signboard of the Gentiles. It comes as no surprise that the Gentile power with which the Jews were then most in conflict, the Romans, were given the title of pig. It is an irony of history that the Romans themselves actually encouraged this not exactly flattering identification by means of the military standard of the Legion X Fretensis stationed in Syria-Palestine.[201]

Annen considers this connection coincidental, but it may be a clue to the evangelists' intentions. If so, typological imagery may inhere in the fate of the δαιμόνια, who "are fittingly disposed of […] like Pharaoh's army in the time of the Exodus."[202] These Roman military references evince a connection between the δαιμόνια and the Romans, both of which Luke portrays in impurity.

Finally, the reaction of the Gentile crowd juxtaposes the Jewish crowd's reception of Jesus. The Gerasenes beg Jesus to leave (v. 37), whereas once Jesus returns to Galilee, ἀπεδέξατο αὐτὸν ὁ ὄχλος· ἦσαν γὰρ πάντες προσδοκῶντες αὐτον—"the crowd received him [favorably], for everyone was seeking him" (v. 40). Luke thus punctuates the pericope with a sharp contrast between Jews and Gentiles. Luke's rhetorical intention seems evident

198. Idem, 327.
199. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 96.
200. Ibid.
201. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 329, quoting Franz Annen, *Heil für die Heiden: zur Bedeutung und Geschichte der Tradition vom besessenen Gerasener (Mk 5, 1–20 parr.)* (Frankfort: Knecht, 1976), 173.
202. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 96.

considering his expansion on *Mark* 5:21, which benignly depicts a crowd gathering to the shore. These various plot elements exhibit Luke's interest in emphasizing the foreignness of the Gentile setting and its contrast to the Jewish Galilee. It is in a thoroughly impure place that Jesus encounters a mass of δαιμόνια. To Luke, δαιμόνια are at home among Gentiles.

3.6. *Luke* 9:1

> [1]Συγκαλεσάμενος δὲ τοὺς δώδεκα ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δύναμιν καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἐπὶ πάντα τὰ δαιμόνια καὶ νόσους θεραπεύειν.
>
> [1]Then Jesus called the twelve together and gave them power and authority over all demons and to cure diseases.

This verse represents Luke's editing of a statement found in *Mark* 6:7 and Q (// *Matt* 10:1). Preference both for an aorist main verb (ἔδωκεν) over Mark's imperfect (ἐδίδου) and for framing the action in a participle typifies Luke. He also replaces Mark's πνεύματα πονηρά with δαιμόνια, and adds δύναμις καὶ ἐξουσία, a phrase that appeared in 4:33–36, as well.

As with 4:40–41, Luke presents treatment of illness separately from dealing with δαιμόνια. Both Wahlen and Bovon intuit the distinction, which Luke's syntax evidences: he pairs δύναμις with νόσους θεραπεύειν, ἐξουσία with ἐπὶ […] τὰ δαιμόνια.[203] Furthermore, Bovon reasons that Luke inserted δύναμις for the very purpose of integrating "the topic of healing diseases," which he found in Q.[204] This passage reiterates Luke's preference for δαιμόνιον over πνεῦμα and exhibits the importance he assigns to Jesus's ἐξουσία regarding the δαιμόνια.

3.7. *Luke* 9:37–42

> [37]Ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἑξῆς ἡμέρᾳ κατελθόντων αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄρους συνήντησεν αὐτῷ ὄχλος πολύς. [38]καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου ἐβόησεν λέγων, Διδάσκαλε, δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου, ὅτι μονογενής μοί ἐστιν, [39]καὶ ἰδοὺ πνεῦμα λαμβάνει αὐτὸν καὶ ἐξαίφνης κράζει καὶ σπαράσσει αὐτὸν μετὰ ἀφροῦ καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ᾽ αὐτοῦ συντρίβον αὐτόν· [40]καὶ ἐδεήθην τῶν μαθητῶν σου ἵνα ἐκβάλωσιν αὐτό, καὶ οὐκ

203. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 163; Bovon, *Luke 1*, 344.
204. Ibid.

> ἠδυνήθησαν. 41ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν, Ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη, ἕως πότε ἔσομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἀνέξομαι ὑμῶν; προσάγαγε ὧδε τὸν υἱόν σου. 42ἔτι δὲ προσερχομένου αὐτοῦ ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάραξεν· ἐπετίμησεν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ ἰάσατο τὸν παῖδα καὶ ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ παρτὶ αὐτοῦ.
>
> 37On the next day, when they had come down from the mountain, a great crowd met him. 38Just then a man from the crowd shouted, "Teacher, I beg you to look at my son; he is my only child. 39Suddenly a spirit seizes him, and all at once he shrieks. It convulses him until he foams at the mouth; it mauls him and will scarcely leave him. 40I begged your disciples to cast it out, but they could not." 41Jesus answered, "You faithless and perverse generation, how much longer must I be with you and bear with you? Bring your son here." 42While he was coming, the demon dashed him to the ground in convulsions. But Jesus rebuked the unclean spirit, healed the boy, and gave him back to his father.

Wahlen and Bovon disagree on Luke's source. Wahlen seems persuaded that Luke's "considerably shorter" account resulted from his "attempts to clarify a less than lucid description of events in" *Mark* 9.[205] Bovon, on the other hand, infers a tradition underlying all of the Synoptic Gospels, which Mark modified but which remained intact and authoritative until Luke's day.[206] Whereas Mark refers to the malicious spirit as πνεῦμα ἄλαλον (9:17), πνεῦμα (v. 20), τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ (v. 25), τὸ ἄλαλον καὶ κωφὸν πνεῦμα (v. 25) (which Matthew calls simply, τὸ δαιμόνιον [once, in 17:18]), Luke elects πνεῦμα (v. 39), τὸ δαιμόνιον (v. 42), and τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀκαθάρτῳ (v. 43). His spirit-terminology reiterates the association he established in the first encounter with a δαιμόνιον, in ch. 4.

Once again Luke describes healing differently from dealing with δαιμόνια. V. 42 contains a sequence of related but distinct actions: Jesus rebukes the πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, heals the child, and returns him to his father. Wahlen, however, fuses the first two actions,

205. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 154.
206. Bovon considers the Markan version elaborative on a simpler story that left several issues unresolved. He calls the supplemental verses in *Mark* 9, "'apocryphal,' since they answer questions left open to the tradition" (*Luke 1*, 383). He goes on to trace the impact of the "traditional unit" (the one both Mark and Luke received), whose popularity imposed itself on Luke, resulting in a rather preserved representation (idem, 384).

portraying the expulsion of the πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον as a healing.[207] He does not take into account the previous encounters with δαιμόνια, wherein rebuke attends expulsion. Rather, the spirit's violence to the boy (ἔρρηξεν αὐτὸν τὸ δαιμόνιον καὶ συνεσπάραξεν) elicits the healing. Bovon, too, portrays the boy as suffering from an "illness."[208] His reading might result from the fact that Matthew describes the boy's trouble in terms of illness and the presumption that the Matthean and Lukan versions reflect the same source. In other words, Bovon's reading of *Luke* appears to be influenced by *Matthew*. He consequently overlooks the Lukan conceptual distinction between sickness and possessing δαιμόνια.

Nevertheless, elements in Matthew's version do potentially elaborate on the Lukan account. Luke's depiction of the boy resembles epilepsy, which ancient peoples associated with a god's touch. Bovon explains, "An educated ancient reader of the Synoptic accounts would interpret this description of the illness as the ἱερὰ νοῦσος ('sacred disease,' *morbus sacer*)."[209] He goes on, "The sickness was called 'holy' because it was attributed to the power of a divinity, especially the mood goddess Selene."[210] God-associations with the boy's epilepsy in *Luke* finds support in Matthew's wording: he calls the boy σεληνιάζεται (17:15). If *Matthew* and *Luke* indeed shared a common source, then Luke's fleshed-out rewording may nevertheless predicate the same notion that a god was inspiring the boys' fits. Contemporaries of Luke were familiar with this situation not as "demon possession" in the sense of an evil spirit's malicious control but rather as a morally-neutral divine event—even a gift. The Gospels clearly portray it as undesirable, evident in the father's request that Jesus expel the

207. "By casting out the demon, Jesus is said to have healed (ἰᾶσθαι) the child." Wahlen, *Jesus*, 154.
208. Bovon, *Luke 1*, 385.
209. Idem, 386.
210. Ibid.

spirit, its harm to the boy, and Jesus's action against it. Still, the Gospels depict this instance of demon-possession in the likeness of what was generally understood as *god*-possession.

Lastly, Jesus's exasperated condemnation of the γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη in v. 41 may shed light on Luke's conception of the δαιμόνια. Wahlen reads the complaint as leveled at the disciples. The father's preceding comment on their failure seemingly contextualizes Jesus's words. Furthermore, Matthew indeed describes Jesus directing criticism at his disciples once he extracts the δαιμόνιον (vv. 19–20). Yet Wahlen's reading leaves several aspects of this moment in the pericope unresolved. Why does Jesus refer to his disciples as a γενεά? Why would their inability to expel the δαιμόνιον imply that they are *perverse*? Furthermore, Luke does not formulate Jesus's response as a clarification. The more logical reading understands Jesus's comments as characterizing *the nation* for creating the situation that the boy's father beseeches Jesus to fix. Bovon concurs, noting that "Jesus speaks like the Jewish figure of rejected wisdom [….] confront[ing] all alone the refractory nation."[211] He expands on this point in relation to other themes in biblical literature that address the "guilt of Israel."[212] Despite these helpful observations, Bovon overlooks the fact that much of such biblical condemnation—including the passages he invokes—relates to Israel's interaction with foreign gods via idolatry. If Bovon is on the right track that Luke presents Jesus invoking this biblical theme in connection to the boy's situation, then the evangelist implies that the δαιμόνια/πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα's presence in and effects on Israel derive from her historical tendency to engage other gods in idol worship.[213]

3.8. *Luke* 9:49

211. Idem, 387.
212. Ibid. Bovon cites *Num* 14:27, *Deut* 32:5 and 20, and *Is* 6:11, 65:2.
213. If such is Luke's goal then it accounts for his unusual omission of πονηρόν in a case involving a harmful spirit. Since Luke already established association between δαιμόνια and πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, he may want this aspect of the δαιμόνιον front-and-center, to complement Jesus's rebuke of idolatry.

> [49]Ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ Ἰωάννης εἶπεν, Ἐπιστάτα, εἴδομέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια καὶ ἐκωλύομεν αὐτόν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν.
>
> [49]John answered, "Master, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, and we tried to stop him, because he does not follow with us."

The sentence is identical in *Mark* 9:38 save for a few terms. Mark used δαιμόνιον, which Luke was content to preserve. This passage ultimately sheds scant light on Luke's δαιμόνιον, but a few details do illuminate. By preserving this brief interchange between Jesus and one of his disciples, Luke implies that whoever does not "follow with" the disciples can nevertheless expel δαιμόνια via Jesus's name. This ability to facilitate expulsion evokes Jesus's ἐξουσία, a topic Luke reiterates periodically in connection with the δαιμόνια. His choice of ἐπιστάτης over Mark's διδάσκαλος adds to the air of authority. Both NRSV and Bovon translate it generally, as "master."[214] Yet it is possible that Luke intended the usual sense of ἐπιστάτης, which would evoke the political and military language that recurs in his presentation of δαιμόνια.

Bovon notices both Luke's syntactic smoothing (e.g. ἀκολουθεῖ μεθ᾽ ἡμῶν rather than Mark's ἠκολούθει ἡμῖν)[215] and an allusion to *Num* 11:24–30. Therein Yhwh places on the seventy elders of Israel the spirit that was on Moses. When it alights on two men in the camp, causing them to prophesy, Joshua urges Moses, κώλυσον αὐτούς (v. 28). Moses then allays Joshua's concern for the sanctity of his authority, approving the prospect of others prophesying. Bovon points out the parallel language and relationships: John "relates to the inner circle of Jesus' disciples as does Joshua to Moses."[216] Bovon's insights reveal the degree

214. Idem, 392.
215. Ibid.
216. Idem, 396.

to which the biblical literature impacted Luke. It also shows that the dynamics of spirit-human interaction in *Num* 11:24–30 may have served as a conceptual precedent for him.

3.9. *Luke* 10:17–20

> [17]Ὑπέστρεψεν δὲ οἱ ἑβδομήκοντα [δύο] μετὰ χαρᾶς λέγοντες, Κύριε, καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ὑποτάσσεται ἡμῖν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου. [18]εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς, Ἐθεώρουν τὸν Σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα. [19]ἰδοὺ δέδωκα ὑμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ πατεῖν ἐπάνω ὄφεων καὶ σκορπίων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς οὐ μὴ ἀδικήσῃ. [20]πλὴν ἐν τούτῳ μὴ χαίρετε ὅτι τὰ πνεύματα ὑμῖν ὑποτάσσεται, χαίρετε δὲ ὅτι τὰ ὀνόματα ὑμῶν ἐγγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.
>
> [17]The seventy returned with joy, saying, "Lord, in your name even the demons submit to us!" [18]He said to them, "I watched Satan fall from heaven like a flash of lightning. [19]See, I have given you authority to tread on snakes and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing will hurt you. [20]Nevertheless, do not rejoice at this, that the spirits submit to you, but rejoice that your names are written in heaven."

These verses conclude a pericope that begins in 10:1, wherein Jesus sends out seventy-two representatives εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν καὶ τόπον οὗ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸς ἔρχεσθαι—"into every city and place that he was intending to go." Since Luke characterizes Jesus as ὁ κύριος, he seems to have in mind LXX *Isa* 40:3 (Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου), a verse that recurs early in *Luke* in relation to John (1:76, 3:4).[217] The language and action carry political overtones, confirmed by the primary message the seventy-two are to convey to their hosts: ἤγγικεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ—"the kingdom of god has become imminent" (v. 9). This theme reappears in the present verses. Luke describes τὰ δαιμόνια/τὰ πνεύματα as ὑποτάσσεται to the seventy—a verb used in LXX for predominance in general and for political authority specifically.[218] The sense is the same one Luke articulates in every passage wherein a

217. Indeed, Bovon remarks on the unusual ἀναδείκνυμι, used here in v. 1 for Jesus's "appointment" of the seventy, it "can take on a certain official flavor […] 1:80 spoke of the 'installation' [ἀνάδειξις] of John the Baptist with respect to Israel" (idem, 25).

218. E.g., οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ οἱ δυνάσται καὶ πάντες υἱοὶ τοῦ βασιλέως Δαυιδ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπητάγησαν αὐτῷ. LXX-*1 Chr* 29:24. Here ὑποτάσσω renders נתנו יד תחת of MT.

δαιμόνιον encounters Jesus: submission. They submit by reason of the ἐξουσία of Jesus, which figures in this passage as well.

Luke also reiterates association between δαιμόνια and spirits as well as σατανᾶς.[219] The common ὑποτάσσεται (vv. 17 and 20) stresses coalition between δαιμόνια and πνεύματα (i.e. ἀκάθαρτα). The connection with σατανᾶς appears here for the first time. As discussed above, the διάβολος in 4:3, 9 and the δαιμόνια in 4:41 name Jesus using the same appellation, which perhaps signals a relation. In the present passage, that association is inexplicit, yet stronger. Luke portrays the vicarious submission of the δαιμόνια to Jesus as entailing the σατανᾶς falling from the sky. The depiction is obscure, though commentaries readily infer הלל בן שחר of *Isa* 14:12, which in the OG ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ—"fell out from the sky." Bovon posits that "[i]n order for [Jesus's] authority to be communicable to Christians, Satan had to be defeated [….] The fall of the tyrant, for example, the king of Babylon (Isa 14:12–14) […] was understood in the intertestamental literature as being the fall of Satan himself."[220] Bovon's analysis derives from a decidedly Christian approach to the passage.[221] His readiness to read Jesus's allusion according to *Isa* 14 evokes the Christian narrative about Satan. But the history of this story parallels that of the fall of the angels: both rose to canonical status and, though read into the pre-Christian biblical literature, do not appear therein nor in contemporary literature. There is certainly basis for comparison between LXX-*Isa* 14:12 and

219. Another Semitism, which equals ὁ διάβολος semantically. Luke seems to use ὁ σατανᾶς only when quoting Jews. In his own words, he prefers ὁ διάβολος.

220. Bovon, *Luke 2*, 31.

221. He introduces the pericope as "a text from which the church draws its missionary zeal […,] its rules of evangelization," "promis[ing] the backing of God and Christ" (idem, 21). In processing the verses at hand, Bovon invokes, "The Christian conviction," derives from them Luke's presentation of "[t]he source of Christian joy" (namely, "the unshakable assurance of being loved by God"), and calls the seventy a paradigm of "God's children" (idem, 31). His commentary on this passage has an air parenesis more than scholarly exegesis. His language exposes the imposition of Christian theology on his hermeneutics.

Luke 10:18, but the language does not correspond neatly. If Luke meant to invoke *Isaiah*, why did he remove the prefix and preposition (ἐξ- and ἐκ), and why did he add lightning to the imagery?[222] Wahlen articulates preconceptions similar to Bovon's when he equates σατανᾶς with the ἐχθρός to which Jesus refers.[223] But what, other than tradition, vouches for their synonymity? Both he and Bovon infer the Satan narrative's portrayal of an archvillain whose *raison d'être* entails opposition to God and commitment to evil. Their scope is plainly dualistic and their exegesis builds upon the presumed relationship between this passage and *Isa* 14.

3.10. *Luke* 11:14–20

> 14Καὶ ἦν ἐκβάλλων δαιμόνιον [καὶ αὐτὸ ἦν] κωφόν· ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐξελθόντος ἐλάλησεν ὁ κωφὸς καὶ ἐθαύμασαν οἱ ὄχλοι. 15τινὲς δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν εἶπον, Ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ τῷ ἄρχοντι τῶν δαιμονίων ἐκβάλλει τὰ δαιμόνια· 16ἕτεροι δὲ πειράζοντες σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἐζήτουν παρ' αὐτοῦ. 17αὐτὸς δὲ εἰδὼς αὐτῶν τὰ διανοήματα εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πᾶσα βασιλεία ἐφ' ἑαυτὴν διαμερισθεῖσα ἐρημοῦται καὶ οἶκος ἐπὶ οἶκον πίπτει. 18εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν διεμερίσθη, πῶς σταθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ; ὅτι λέγετε ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐξβάλλειν με τὰ δαιμόνια. 19εἰ δὲ ἐγὼ ἐν Βεελζεβοὺλ ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ἐν τίνι ἐκβάλλουσιν; διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὶ ὑμῶν κριταὶ ἔσονται. 20εἰ δὲ ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ [ἐγὼ] ἐκβάλλω τὰ δαιμόνια, ἄρα ἔφθασεν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ.
>
> 14Now he was casting out a demon that was mute; when the demon had gone out, the one who had been mute spoke, and the crowds were amazed. 15But some of them said, "He casts out demons by Beelzebul, the ruler of the demons." 16Others, to test him, kept demanding from him a sign from heaven. 17But he knew what they were thinking and said to them, "Every kingdom divided against itself becomes a desert, and house falls on house. 18If Satan also is divided against himself, how will his kingdom stand?—for you say that I cast out the demons by Beelzebul. 19Now if I cast out the demons by Beelzebul, by whom do your exorcists cast them out? Therefore they will be your judges. 20But if it is by the finger of God that I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you.

222. Wahlen suggests that Luke describes the fall of σατανᾶς like lightning so as "to suggest the prominence and visibility of Satan's fall" (*Jesus*, 157). Yet the obscurity of this imagery is evident when Wahlen notes the "difficulty of locating Satan's 'fall' in a single event" (idem., n. 75)—Jesus's anointing? His successful elusion of the temptations in *Luke* 4? The crucifixion? The resurrection? Some eschatological event?

223. Idem, 157.

Wahlen and Bovon mainly agree that Luke's source for this pericope was Q and that he represents it faithfully.[224] Wahlen deduces, however, that Q had πνεῦμα κωφόν, which Luke replaced with δαιμόνιον κωφόν.[225] If he is correct, then this instance conveys Luke's preference for δαιμόνιον. Yet his selectivity reaffirms δαιμόνιον's relation to πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον since Jesus goes on to describe an expelled spirit's wandering, regrouping, and return (vv. 24–26). This instance of δαιμόνιον with an adjective is the only other in *Luke-Acts* besides the δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου of 4:33. Here it figures probably for relevance to the narrative.

In this passage the terms δαιμόνιον, Βεελζεβοῦλ, and σατανᾶς represent associated beings. Wahlen and Bovon readily concur with NRSV that these terms should be translated as "demon," "Beelzebul," and "Satan" (i.e. the Christian axis of evil). Bovon thus reads this passage explicitly in terms of Dualism; Wahlen implies the same. The former hedges his assumptions in a rhetorical question: "did not the enemy, operating with the dualistic concept so widely held in those days, seek to supplant God, to imitate him, to construct a similar and illusory counter-reality?"[226] His take on the situation in this passage abides by the Orthodox Christian depiction of the cosmic war between good and evil, which portrays an arch-"enemy" who "seek[s] to supplant" the one "God." Bovon, like Wahlen, thus takes Βεελζεβοῦλ and ὁ σατανᾶς as synonyms for *Satan*, the great rebel of the Christian narrative.

Yet the relevance of this narrative is by no means certain. Q (and, by presumably preserving the tradition, Luke) introduces the supposed archvillain as Βεελζεβοῦλ τὸ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων, and not as ὁ σατανᾶς τὸ ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων. By doing so, the tradition

224. Wahlen devotes an entire appendix to discussion of the source of this pericope (*Jesus*, 179–85). He concludes, "Luke's version is substantially the same as Q" (idem, 184). The similarity between Luke's version vis-à-vis Matthew's inspires Bovon to "accept the hypothesis of a common dependence on Q" (*Luke 2*, 115). He adds, "when they disagree, Luke seems to have been the most respectful of Q" (ibid.).
225. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 125 and 155.
226. Bovon, *Luke 2*, 118.

presents the figure primarily as Βεελζεβοῦλ and secondarily as the σατανᾶς—the latter elaborates on the former. If this sequence should be honored, then the figure in question is ὁ σατανᾶς *in so far as* he is Βεελζεβοῦλ. Associations with Βεελζεβοῦλ would therefore expound on his relationship to the δαιμόνια, providing a clearer picture of who they are.

Scholars agree that Βεελζεβοῦλ transliterates the same בעל זבוב of *2 Kgs* 1.[227] Wolfgang Herrmann explains, "For etymological reasons, Baal Zebub must be considered a Semitic god; he is taken over by the Philistine Ekronites and incorporated into their local cult."[228] Hermann concludes that the proper interpretation of this name is, "Baal the Prince."[229] Why do the Gospels portray the "head," "chief," or "commander" of the δαιμόνια as a particular Canaanite deity? Why not a Greek or Roman god? If Bovon and Wahlen are right that Luke addressed primarily a Gentile audience, then exchanging Βεελζεβοῦλ for a Greek appellation would seem opportune. Rather, the answer may lie in the role of Baal in biblical literature as the most recurrent figure of Israel's liaisons. If so, then Luke, through Q, portrays the δαιμόνια in the terms of idolatry most recognizable to Jews. Indeed, the sense the Gospels intend for Βεελζεβοῦλ as ἄρχων of the δαιμόνια may mean *foremost of the foreign gods* rather than the dualistic *ruler of demons* opposite to God.

As a result of his pre-commitment to Dualism, the relevance Bovon ascribes to Βεελζεβοῦλ derives from its literal meaning only. He interprets it as, "Master of the Abode on high."[230] Herrmann, however, shows that this interpretation, which follows a nineteenth-

227. See Wolfgang Herrmann, "Baal Zebub," *DDD*, 154–56. Regarding the corruption of בעל זבול, see especially 154–55.
228. Idem, 154.
229. Idem, 155.
230. Bovon, *Luke 2*, 118.

century tradition, is problematic: it is based on a fallacious etymology.[231] Bovon's attraction to this interpretation seems to result from its utility for dualizing the pericope. "Even though God is certainly the 'Master of the Abode on high,' the God of heaven and the God residing in the temple," Satan sought to enthrone himself in his stead, says Bovon.[232] But even if his interpretation of בעל זבול/Βεελζεβοῦλ is correct, his argument accounts for only part of the significance of the name Baal. It does not engage its most prominent connotations. Nor, for that matter, does it explain why Luke preserves the transliterated Hebrew title. But if allusion to idolatry and Israel's history of unfaithfulness to Yhwh characterize this figure, then his role as ἄρχων τῶν δαιμονίων attributes this waywardness to them, as well.

According to my proposed reading, it is not clear whether Luke equates σατανᾶς and Βεελζεβοῦλ. Bovon and Wahlen assume so, though the former concedes that the wording is ultimately ambiguous.[233] As a result, he proceeds to read the passage strictly according to Christian soteriology: "Being detached from the Evil One and his troops is one of the two aspects of salvation. Being tied to God and his Son is the other."[234] For Bovon, ὁ σατανᾶς/ Βεελζεβοῦλ is the devil—the personification of evil, who rules an evil βασιλεία comprised of subservient δαιμόνια. But this image of Dualism fails to reckon the διάβολος's delegated ἐξουσία (4:16) and the impurity of the δαιμόνια. It also overlooks this passage's thematic connection with that of the Gerasenes. When Jesus describes his power over the δαιμόνια as ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, he recalls, like the Legion pericope, imagery from the Exodus narrative. In *Exod* 8:15 אצבע אלהים refers to one of the plagues on Egypt, which constitute Yhwh's

231. Franz Movers and Stanislas Guyard "explained the notion […] by referring to the Akk **zabal*, 'residence' or 'lofty house' (though, in fact, there is no such word in Akkadian)." Herrmann, "Baal Zebub," 155, referring to F. C. Movers, *Die Phönizier*, vol. 1 (Bonn: E. Weber, 1841) and S. Guyard, "Remarques sur le mot assyrien *zabal* et sur l'expression biblique *bet zeboul*," in *JA* 7: (1878).
232. Bovon, *Luke 2*, 118.
233. Ibid.
234. Idem, 114.

judgement of Egypt's gods.[235] Wahlen and Bovon agree on the likelihood that Luke consciously approved this expression, even if it came from Q.[236] Furthermore, vv. 24–26, wherein Jesus describes the fate of expelled πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα, are "embellished by Luke with military imagery."[237] Wahlen attributes much of this language to Lukan redaction rather than to inherited tradition.[238] In light of Luke's substantial preserving and redacting, this passage reiterates themes in other δαιμόνιον passages, namely the one with the most vivid connection between the δαιμόνια and Gentiles.

3.11. *Luke* 13:32

> [32]καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς, Πορευθέντες εἴπατε τῇ ἀλώπεκι ταύτῃ, Ἰδοὺ ἐκβάλλω δαιμόνια καὶ ἰάσεις ἀποτελῶ σήμερον καὶ αὔριον καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ τελειοῦμαι.
>
> [32]He said to them, "Go and tell that fox for me, 'Listen, I am casting out demons and performing cures today and tomorrow, and on the third day I finish my work.

These words to Herod are unique to Luke, though *Matt* 23 has the same subsequent "judgment oracle," which Bovon confidently attributes to Q.[239] Jesus directs this response to "some Pharisees" (v. 31) who urge Jesus to flee since Herod means to kill him. Jesus replies to Herod, as it were, rather than challenging or allaying these Pharisees' concern. Excising δαιμόνια and performing healings are somehow meant to challenge Herod's threat. As usual for Luke, he "mak[es] a distinction between exorcisms and healings at the same time that he

235. See *Exod* 12:12, 18:11, and *Num* 33:4. "It has long been maintained that Egyptian local color and a specific degrading of Egyptian deities are evident in the plague narratives." James K. Hoffmeier, "Egypt, Plagues in," *ABD* 2 (ed. D. N. Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992), 376.
236. Cf. *Matt* 12:28, which instead of ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ has ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ. According to Wahlen, "weighty considerations favour Lukan alteration: anthropomorphisms are rather common for him," and Matthew would have likely preserved the expression if it were in Q (*Jesus*, 157, n. 76). In contrast, Bovon presumes that Q had δακτύλῳ since "[i]t would be hard to conceive of Luke's having avoided a word he loved, 'Spirit,' in order to substitute it for an anthropomorphism" (*Luke 2*, 121). Wahlen's logic, reinforced by several examples of anthropomorphisms in *Luke-Acts*, is superior.
237. Wahlen, *Jesus*, 158.
238. Idem, n. 79.
239. Bovon, *Luke 2*, 322.

paired them."[240] The recurrence of these activities throughout *Luke* and their appearance here as the aspects of Jesus's activities most relevant to Herod's ire indicate their significance in how Luke perceived Jesus. In Bovon's words, "Jesus laid more stress on his ministry as an exorcist than as a preacher."[241] But more exactly: Luke chooses to represent Jesus by his authority over the δαιμόνια and his ability to heal as somehow a challenge to the threats of Rome's puppet king. The derisive appellation for Herod confirms that the content of Jesus's answer is meant provocatively.[242]

3.12. *Acts* 17:18

> [17]τινὲς δὲ καὶ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων καὶ Στοϊκῶν φιλοσόφων συνέβαλλον αὐτῷ, καί τινες ἔλεγον, Τί ἂν θέλοι ὁ σπερμολόγος οὗτος λέγειν; οἱ δέ, Ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι, ὅτι τὸν Ἰησοῦν καὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν εὐαγγελίζετο.
>
> [17]Also some Epicurean and Stoic philosophers debated with him. Some said, "What does this babbler want to say?" Others said, "He seems to be a proclaimer of foreign divinities." (This was because he was telling the good news about Jesus and the resurrection.)

Of its sixty-two appearances in the NT texts, this instance of δαιμόνιον commonly escapes translation as "demon," as NRSV demonstrates. Implicitly translators recognize that the English term unsuitably reflects Luke's intention here. However, he used the same word as he had for describing the encounters with πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα in the Galilee with no indication of a special meaning for Epicureans and Stoics. Instead, it comes across in the narrative as a natural choice for Greeks to describe what they perceive are divine entities of ambiguous moral quality.

240. Idem, 325.
241. Ibid.
242. According to Bovon, "The metaphor of the fox seems to have a double significance: it suggests (a) that Herod resorted to a ruse and (b) that his power was negligible. Often contrasted in antiquity with the lion, the 'fox' (here Herod) did not measure up when he was faced with Pilate or the Roman power, or especially Jesus and the divine power" (ibid.). Bovon errs in one respect, however: Herod was appointed by Rome. Consequently, he quite represented Roman power.

Pervo notes indirect references to Socrates, both in Paul's relationship to the city and in the Epicureans' and Stoics' reaction to his message.[243] It seems no accident that their words resemble "the capital charge of which Socrates was convicted," and Pervo supposes that Paul's subsequent visit to the Areopagus in order to provide an explanation amounts to "an ominous development."[244] In this sense, here δαιμόνιον may not convey the associations embedded in its earlier usage but rather serve stylistically for evoking Socrates. Yet this passage is devoid of the suspicion and violent reactions Paul occasioned among other Gentile crowds that Luke portrays time and again in *Acts*.[245] Indeed, Pervo himself cannot determine the point of the author's apparently intentional allusions to the simple-minded masses' execution of the philosopher. He asks, "Is the Areopagus holding a former trial, conducting some sort of preliminary investigation, or sponsoring a seminar for a visiting intellectual?"[246] Neither the language nor the course of events suggest that the Athenians seek Paul's life. Rather, the Epicureans and the Stoics focus their scorn on Paul's lack of rhetorical propriety when they call him a σπερμολόγος.[247] As for those in attendance on the Areopagus, they seem genuinely curious when they ask Paul to elaborate and explain, βουλόμεθα οὖν γνῶναι τίνα θέλει ταῦτα εἶναι—"For we want to know what these wish to be" (i.e., what these things are) (v. 21). If Luke meant by ξένα δαιμόνια to allude to the the trial of Socrates, he fails to convey the a sense of persecution, a narrative theme from which Luke usually does not shy away.

While Luke may have intended his audience to hear an echo of Socrates, here the primary function of δαιμόνιον seems to be to portray the confusion of Paul's hearers. As such, the passage employs the basic meaning of δαιμόνιον: a divinity, such as a god. This definition

243. Pervo, *Acts*, 425.
244. Idem, 427, n. 27.
245. See *Acts* 13:50; 14:5, 19; 16:22.
246. Pervo, *Acts*, 425.
247. Pervo translates this term into, "a bird-brain devoid of method," which is to say that it is directed at Paul's delivery (idem, 427).

obtains even if Socrates's trial was in the forethoughts of the writer because (as noted in §1.1) the δαιμόνια ξενά of the *Apology* were considered illicit *gods*.

In light of both the difference between the Hellenic and the Jewish δαιμόνιον, this passage may in fact convey through ξένων δαιμονίων a bitingly ironic message. Luke introduces Paul's activity in Athens in v. 16, where he says that as Paul awaited his companions, παρωξύνετο τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ θεωροῦντος κατείδωλον οὖσαν τὴν πολίν—"his spirit was provoked in him as he beheld the city being full of idols." If scholars like Fredriksen are right that Paul maintained his Jewish identity rather than converting to Christianity,[248] then this verse describes the predictable reaction of a Jew to a place full of content forbidden to Israel. Athens, the heart of Greek culture, becomes the foil of Israel. In this sense ξενά δαιμόνια evokes the opponents of Israel's god and the historical object of the Jewish nation's infidelity. If Luke intended the word in this way, he points the Epicureans' and Stoics' comment back at them in criticism.

3.13. Section Conclusions

The author of *Luke-Acts* readily reprised the activity of spiritual beings portrayed in his sources. Most of the δαιμόνιον passages above figure in parallel pericopes or brief phrases in the other two Synoptic Gospels. But Luke's regard for the raw material—whether *Mark* and *Q*, *Ur-Mark*, or whatever combination—did not inhibit his portrayal of δαιμόνια according to his own understanding of the dynamics and stakes involved. He frequently inserts δαιμόνιον where *Mark* and *Matthew* have πνεῦμα (*Luke* 4:33–36; 8:26–32; 9:1, 37–42; 11:14–20). Sometimes in spite of his sources, he ensures that his syntax distinguishes between illness and possessing δαιμόνια (*Luke* 4:40–41; 8:1–3; 9:1, 37–42; 13:32). He

248. See the section on conversion in Fredriksen, "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time has Come to Go," in *SR* 35.2 (2006): 232–38.

sometimes embellishes the material he received with Semitisms and military imagery (*Luke* 4:33–36, 40–41; 8:26–39; 9:1, 49; 10:17–20; 11:14–20). All of this editing exhibits intentionality. Luke did not piously copy tradition; his additions, subtractions, and rewording indicate that his preservations and redactions alike represent his opinion. The way in which he renders interaction with δαιμόνια communicates his understanding of who they are.

For Luke, the most prominent aspect of the δαιμόνια is טמאה. Firstly, their introduction confirms so: in 4:33–36, Luke presents a δαιμόνιον and calls it ἀκάθαρτον. He thereby explains why πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα are such—i.e. they are of δαιμόνια ἀκάθαρτα—and casts subsequent references to δαιμόνια accordingly. Secondly, he elaborates on the implications of this designation in passages involving other forms of טמאה. In Jesus's visits to the Gerasenes, Luke displays the thorough impurity/foreignness of a Gentile environment, which includes impure/foreign spirits. In the refutation of the allusion to Βεελζεβοῦλ, Luke shows that the foremost of the δαιμόνια evokes that which is forbidden to Israel: regard for an alien deity, typified biblically by service to Baal. Thirdly, Luke's effort to keep illness and δαιμόνιον expulsion conceptually separate iterates the difference between πονηρόν and ἀκάθαρτον: whereas ailment often derives from πνεύματα πονηρά, possession of δαιμόνια and πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα entails superhuman abilities (e.g. revealed knowledge [4:33–36, 40–41; 8:26–39] or unusual strength [8:26–39]). Fourthly, Semitisms and allusions to biblical material among these passages commend Luke's consciousness and empathy for Jewish legal concerns, which supports the notion that he draws his sense of ἀκάθαρτον from the same discourse. Luke's depiction of the Gerasenes as over against Jewish Galilee evinces a Jewish perspective on biblically-Israelite territory, brought home by the disappearance of the terms πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον from *Luke-Acts* once the story removes from the land of

Israel. The lone cameo of δαιμόνιον in *Acts* is in the mouth of Gentiles who reveal the basic sense of the term, which evidences that for Luke it was *deity* or *god*.

Wahlen and Bovon along with, implicitly, the NRSV translation fail to intuit the collective significance of these features of Luke's writing regarding δαιμόνια. Their commitment to Christian tradition about *Luke-Acts* and demons determines their exegesis—not withstanding their insights. But the Lukan δαιμόνιον confirms common discourse with the Jewish-Greek texts that feature the term, as I showed in Part Two. With a historically- and hermeneutically-sound conception of the Jewish δαιμόνιον, I now by way of concluding this investigation apply my findings to rereading passages in *Luke-Acts* to observe their effects.

Part Four—Restoring the Jewish Δαιμόνιον to *Luke-Acts*

In this chapter I restore the Jewish sense of δαιμόνιον to *Luke-Acts* and conclude my investigation. If Luke indeed intended for this term the semantic content particular to Jewish discourse, then by interpreting δαιμόνια accordingly, a reading more comprehensible than that which *demon* affords should result. I will show the relevance of the Jewish-Greek δαιμόνιον by considering its effect locally: in four pericopes (*Luke* 4:33–36, 8:26–39, 9:37–42, and 11:14–20), as well as thematically: in contradistinction to the πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Each pericope emphasizes at least one of the semantic qualities imbued in δαιμόνιον by Jewish-Greek literature (see §2.5). I offer my own translation so as to present δαιμόνιον in as literal yet sensible a rendering of Luke's writing as possible. In doing so I bypass some of the loaded terms that typify translations yet do not necessarily reflect Luke's participation in Jewish discourse. The reader can refer to Part Three for NRSV translations of each pericope.

4.1. A Foreign Deity's Incursion into Israel (*Luke* 4:33–36)

> [33]And in the gathering was a man having a spirit of a foreign deity, and he shouted in a loud voice, [34]"Ea! What's there between us and you, Jesus the Nazarene?! Did you come to destroy us? I know who you are—the holy one of god!" [35]And Jesus rebuked it, saying, "Be silent and exit out from him!" And the deity, throwing him [the man] into the midst [of the gathering] exited out from him and harmed him not at all. [36]And astonishment was upon all, and they conversed with each other, saying, "What is this thing, that in authority and ability he commands the foreign spirits, and they exit?"

The Jewish δαιμόνιον immediately affects the relevance of its neighboring ἀκάθαρτον. Of the Synoptic authors only Luke describes a δαιμόνιον as ἀκάθαρτον. He does so apparently because for him and his audience δαιμόνιον means basically *deity*. This general and amoral meaning suggests that Luke was familiar with the word in Hellenic/Hellenistic discourse. He indeed uses it in this way again, in *Acts* 17:18. But by modifying this instance with

ἀκάθαρτον, he clarifies that δαιμόνιον in his story accords with the Jewish register, for gods or spirits are never called ἀκάθαρτον in non-Jewish Greek literature. For Jews, on the other hand, uncleanliness/impurity alluded to a major legislative category: טמא/ἀκάθαρτον, describing exclusion. Alongside the Jewish version of δαιμόνιον, ἀκάθαρτον is hardly "pleonastic," as Bovon judged. Rather, Luke uses it purposefully, assigning biblical connotations of foreignness to this deity.

His reference to a Jewish legal category draws out the relevance of other narrative elements relating to Jewish custom. The traditional reading ascribes little relevance to the fact that Jesus teaches on Shabbat and in a Jewish gathering, for the demonic interruption could have occurred anywhere public and maintained the same relevance. But the Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading amplifies the significance of this deity's foreignness: it is in a place it should not be, among Jews who are meeting in observance of the stipulations of the Mosaic covenant. The context thus joins with ἀκάθαρτον in rendering the δαιμόνιον's actions a matter of group significance. This δαιμόνιον is imposing on Jewish space, implying that it is from elsewhere.

The Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading also determines the meaning of the δαιμόνιον's self-reference in the plural. The demon-reading would take "us and you" and "to destroy us" as allusions to Satan's evil minions. But as seen in the biblical literature, the Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading pertains to Israelite henotheism. According to this theological discourse, the plural self-references of this δαιμόνιον refers not to dualistic demons but to the many gods presiding over the Gentiles.

Finally, the deity's foreignness complements this passage's Semitisms. As I explained in Part Three, Bovon notices that Luke formulates phrases in a fashion familiar to Hebrew/Aramaic-speakers and periodically evokes biblical content. Jews found the δαιμόνιον's εἆ and

τί ἡμῖν καὶ σοί aurally familiar, Luke portrays the possessor behaving in Hebraic terms (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ), and he characterizes Jesus by biblical allusion (ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ). But in light of the Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading, these cultural signs extended beyond phonetic familiarity, contributing to the Jewishness of the environment, casting the δαιμόνιον as an intruder. The Jewish δαιμόνιον thus suits several aspects of this passage that together render a more consistent, meaningful portrayal. By surrounding this first mention of δαιμόνιον in Jewish cultural elements, Luke sets a precedent for the rest of his narrative: just as in other Jewish-Greek literature, here δαιμόνιον describes a deity that is foreign to Israel.

4.2. Reviling the Gentiles' Gods (*Luke* 8:26–39)

> [27]A man from the city possessing many [foreign] deities encountered him as he stepped onto the land. And for a considerable [amount of] time he had not worn clothes nor stayed at home but rather in the tombs. [28]Seeing Jesus he, crying out, fell before him and in a great voice said, "What's there between us and you, Jesus, son of the highest god?! I beg you, do not examine me!" [29]For he [Jesus] was commanding the foreign spirit to come out from the man. For many times it [the foreign deity] had seized him [the man], and he was fettered in chains, kept in shackles; and breaking his bonds, was driven by the [foreign] deity into the wilderness. [30]Jesus asked him, "What is your name?" And he said, "Legiō," for many [foreign] deities had entered into him. [31]And he [the foreign deities] were entreating him [Jesus] that he would not command them to go out into the abyss. [32]And there a herd of a considerable [number of] pigs was grazing on the mountain; so they [the foreign deities] were entreating him that he would indulge them to go out into the these; and he indulged them. [33]Exiting from the man, the [foreign] deities went into the pigs, and the herd rushed down the bank into the lake, and drowned.

The Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading strengthens the Jew–Gentile distinction that I described in §3.5. There I explained how Luke arrays the Gerasene environment with qualities that make the place "a land of 'difference'" vis-à-vis Jewish Galilee, foreign to Jewish custom and standards, laden with imagery of hostile political powers. The Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading adds another element of alienation to Jews: a multiplicity of foreign gods. No longer are they

random demons occupying a random, hapless victim. Instead they are the deities associated with the unclean world of the foreign nations: they are the Gentiles' gods, forbidden to Israel.

By conceptually linking these δαιμόνια with the Gentile environment, Luke retains the term's comparative sense at work in the LXX passages featuring δαιμόνιον, turning the Markan pericope into a darkly comic portrayal of Gentile gods that matches the reasoning found in LXX-δαιμόνιον passages. He uses the Markan story to evidence the sentiments of, e.g., *Ps* 96 [LXX 95], which calls Yhwh, נורא [...] על כל אלהים / φοβερός […] ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς θεούς (v. 4). Just as the Jews are on one side of the Galilee, upholding an orderly law and receiving the teaching and power of the messiah whereas the Gentile Gerasenes are on the other side, living according to their customs and avoiding the messiah, so the contrast obtains with the respective deities: the former serve one benevolent god who empowers individuals to heal and prophesy whereas the latter host many gods who drive their possessors into shame and chaos. My interpretation accounts for why Luke keeps the title that Mark's δαιμόνια bestow on Jesus, υἱὲ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (v. 28). The δαιμόνια are suddenly confronted with the primary representative of the highest god in his own, occupied territory (they accordingly express dismay, corresponding with their human associates' fear of Jesus). "Son of the highest god" emphasizes that Luke thinks of the δαιμόνια as the Gentiles' inferior gods. Consequently, the Jewish-δαιμόνιον reading charges the passage with polemical energy.

4.3. Addressing Israel's Infidelity (*Luke* 9:37–42)

> [41]O disloyal and perverse generation! For how long will I be among you and endure you? Bring your son here. [42]When he [the boy] was yet approaching, the [foreign] deity rent and attacked [him]. But Jesus rebuked the foreign spirit, and he healed the boy, and he returned him to his father.

Among the δαιμόνιον passages in *Luke-Acts*, this one most nearly portrays the activity of δαιμόνια among Jews as the result of Israel's age-old tendency to stray to other gods. As I expressed in §3.7, whom Jesus means by γενεά is somewhat ambiguous in *Luke*. Whereas Matthew depicts Jesus making similar comments to his disciples, no such elaboration occurs in *Luke*. Even so, Matthew's version does not explain why the inability to expel a δαιμόνιον means that the disciples are "perverse." The solution is first to understand γενεά as referring to the entire house of Israel in Jesus's day, and second, that his label for the nation, ἄπιστος, does not mean *faithless*, as NRSV has it, but rather, *disloyal*.[249] This interpretation is consistent with the "Jewish figure of rejected wisdom" and role of the Israelite prophet "confront[ing] all alone the refractory nation," as Bovon explains.[250]

One of the prophets' major contentions with Israel regarded her habit of serving other gods. Indeed, if we understand δαιμόνιον according to the connotations at work in other Jewish-Greek literature of the period, which describes the deities to which Israel turns in betrayal of Yhwh, γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη becomes relevant, rendering the entire account comprehensible. Luke draws from LXX associations with δαιμόνιον (gods inferior to Yhwh, regularly luring Israel away into idolatry) and implies that the present instance of the boy dealing with a δαιμόνιον/πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον resulted directly from Israel's current disloyalty and perversion, that is, interaction with other gods. The passage thus shows that by δαιμόνιον, Luke indeed intended *foreign god*. This reading furthermore accounts for the way in which contemporary peoples understood epilepsy, namely as the touch of a god. But since Israel is forbidden from other gods, Luke is content to portray as destructive that which Greeks might have considered a gift.

249. See, for example, Aeschylus, *Sept*. ln. 876.
250. See §3.7, n. 209.

4.4. Addressing the Tempters of Israel (*Luke* 11:14–20)

> [14]And he [Jesus] was expelling a deaf [foreign] deity; and it was that when the deity had exited, the deaf [man] spoke, and the crowd was astonished. [15]But some of them said, "By Baal Zevul the chief of the [foreign] deities he expels the [foreign] deities." [16]Others, testing [him], were seeking from him a sign from heaven. [17]But he, knowing their thoughts, said to them, "Every kingdom divided upon itself is desolated, and house falls upon house. [18]And if also the *satan* is divided upon itself, how does his kingdom stand? For you say that by Baal Zevul I expel the [foreign] deities. [19]If I by Baal Zevul expel the [foreign] deities, by whom do your sons expel [them]? On account of this they will be your judges. [20]And if I by the finger of god expel the [foreign] deities, then the kingdom of god reached you."

The Jewish δαιμόνιον complements and gives sense to these references to Baal Zevul. In §3.10 I addressed the peculiarity of this figure. If Βεελζεβοῦλ is the evil archenemy, Satan, why do the Synoptics assign two designations to this one figure? Why is Βεελζεβοῦλ the primary of the two? What relevance do the biblical associations with Baal have in this passage? If we dispense with dualistic-Christian presumptions about this passage and examine Βεελζεβοῦλ and σατανᾶς separately, Luke's reference to the latter clarifies. Beginning with this passage's focus on δαιμόνια: if taken to mean *foreign god*, reference to Baal becomes quite relevant. As the deity paradigmatically in competition with Yhwh for Israel's allegiance, Baal's recurrence in biblical literature places him at the forefront of the gods Israel is forbidden from serving. In the LXX such gods are, of course, labeled δαιμόνια. According to this reading, Luke portrays skeptics in Jesus's crowd who suggest that he derives his power from the most odious of Yhwh's rivals. In this sense, Baal is one of the δαιμόνια—their ἄρχων in so far as he is historically the most problematic of Israel's suitors.

Since Jesus refers to σατανᾶς in answer to his skeptics' accusations, Luke either equates the word to or expands on Βεελζεβοῦλ (i.e. the connotations of Israel's infidelity with the δαιμόνια). If expansion, contemporary associations with σατανᾶς might clarify for us

Luke's intention. In the biblical material, שטן can refer to a general capacity of antagonism, i.e. *opponent*. The psalmists speak of שטני נפשי (*Ps* 71:13) and שוטני (*Ps* 109:20, 23); Philistine princes worry that David *1*) יהיה לנו לשטן במלחמה *Sam* 29:4); David rebukes his nephews *2*) כי תהיו לי היום לשטן *Sam* 19:23); Moses describes even the messenger of Yhwh as fixing himself in Balaam's path לשטן לו (*Num* 22:22). In each of these examples, שטן describes opposition—with no dualistic overtones. If Luke intended *σατανᾶς* in this sense, he calls Baal and other foreign gods a collective "opponent." Doing so implies the same Israelite ideological base as the term δαιμόνιον: both presume the theo-national distinction of us/Jews/Yhwh vs. them/Gentiles/δαιμόνια.

But the Hebrew tradition known to Luke and his audience also portrayed a particular שטן. Chad Pierce distinguishes him as "the celestial שטן," and it is this character that became the dualistic archenemy of God in the post-classical period.[251] This figure is prominent in *Job*, which describes ויבא בני האלהים להתיצב על יהוה ויבא גם השטן בתוכם—"And the sons of god came to appear before Yhwh, and also השטן came among them" (1:6). The narrator thus places השטן among בני האלהים, representing a particular persona (as the definite article implies). But in *Job* he is hardly the supremely evil divinity opposing the good God. Rather, Yhwh sits in authority over all these spiritual entities, including השטן. As a ruler addressing a minister, he inquires of השטן as to his recent activities and the latter obediently reports. This portrayal of the celestial opponent reiterates the divine council of Israelite henotheism. As a subordinate of Yhwh, השטן present himself to his master (1:6; 2:1), furnishes an account of his recent activities (1:7; 2:2), and requests permission (1:11; 2:5). His primary function in

251. Chad Pierce, "Satan and Related Figures," *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*, 1,197–198.

Job is not to frustrate the rule of Yhwh, but to evaluate faithfulness to the king of the gods. In this capacity he is the opponent of human beings—not of Yhwh.

Does Luke build on this conception of השטן when Jesus refers to the δαιμόνια in association with ἡ βασιλεία of the σατανᾶς? The first encounter with the διάβολος in *Luke* 4,[252] which immediately precedes the introduction of the δαιμόνια, might reveal Luke's mind. There, in the wilderness with Jesus, the διάβολος proposes a trade: if the messiah will serve the tempter, the latter will hand over τὴν ἐξουσίαν and τὴν δόξαν of the βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης, adding, ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ᾧ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν—"it has been given to me, and to whom I wish, I give it." This statement is absent from the Matthean and Markan versions. This acknowledgement that his authority has been delegated to him implies subordination, recalling his namesake's status and function in *Job*. Luke therefore sets the διάβολος's authority over human kingdoms in relation to the divine council headed by Yhwh. As known from foundational Jewish texts like *Deut* 32, Yhwh established the borders of the nations according to the בני אלהים, who, from the Israelite/Jewish point of view, are foreign gods, i.e. δαιμόνια. Luke seems to conflate the biblical role of the celestial שטן with his relationship with δαιμόνια, rendering him a spirit-administrator over the Gentiles.[253]

As such, the διάβολος's "kingdom" (the nations and δαιμόνια) is separate from Yhwh's (Israel–Yhwh). The Roman presence in the land of Israel and the ongoing problem of idolatry—naturally elements of the kingdom of the σατανᾶς and therefore manifestations of *opposition* to Israel and Yhwh—may explain why Jesus invokes the term. If Luke indeed meant by δαιμόνια the gods of the Gentiles, then the connection with the celestial opponent

252. The LXX chooses ὁ διάβολος to translate the celestial השטן (*passim* in *Job*; *Zech* 3:2).

253. My interpretation of this figure accounts for the fact that, unlike Christian orthodoxy's Angelic Fall narrative (see §1.4.2.), the NT never calls the διάβολος a δαιμόνιον.

evokes the age-old problem of Israel's infidelity to Yhwh by interaction with other gods. Whether Βεελζεβοῦλ is emblematic of the δαιμόνια and thus the quintessential opponent, or whether Βεελζεβοῦλ is the foremost δαιμόνιον under the jurisdiction of the celestial tester is not clear. But in either case, the same connotations of idolatry, Gentiles, and divine rivalry that inhabit the Jewish δαιμόνιον obtain.

4.5. The Δαιμόνια in Thematic Antithesis to Yhwh

Thus far I have shown that by restoring the Jewish-Greek sense of δαιμόνιον to *Luke-Acts*, the portrayed encounters deliver a more comprehensive message than that afforded by translation as "demon." As a final test of my thesis, I turn to the restoration's broad effect in Luke's writings. In *Luke-Acts*, the writer employs δαιμόνιον in a thematic antithesis with the god of Israel, specifically through their relationships with πνεύματα.[254] Whereas πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα share a direct bond with gods foreign to Israel, the πνεῦμα ἅγιον directly represents Yhwh.

The LXX provides a precedent for the association of unclean spirits with foreign gods. *Zech* 13:2 reads,

> והיה ביום ההוא נאם יהוה צבאות אכרית את שמות העצבים מן הארץ ולא יזכרו עוד וגם את הנביאים ואת רוח הטמאה אעביר מן הארץ

> καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, λέγει κύριος, ἐξολεθρεύσω τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν εἰδώλων ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, καὶ οὐκέτι ἔσται αὐτῶν μνεία, καὶ τοὺς ψευδοπροφήτας καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον ἐξαρῶ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς

The prophet foresees eradication of the names of idols, their prophets, and the spirit of foreignness from the land. This grouping thus connects רוח טאמה with gods foreign to Israel, along with their human representatives. Arguably, the triad appears in *Luke* 4: ἄνθρωπος ἔχων

254. Wahlen affirms that Luke consciously sets up this juxtaposition (*Jesus*, 57).

πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου. As I noted in §3.1, Luke does not portray the man possessing this spirit as distressed. Instead, his announcement that Jesus is the son of god shows that he has access to hidden knowledge through divine empowerment, which is the dynamic of prophecy. If δαιμόνιον means "a god foreign to Israel," then Luke, when he introduces the δαιμόνια into his narrative, manages to evoke all three elements of *Zech* 13. Jesus's expulsion of the deity answers the latter part of Zechariah's prophecy (further evidencing Luke's ideological inspiration).

The רוח טאמה of *Zech* 13 bears on the Lukan πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα and πνεῦμα ἅγιον because of its translation into Greek. LXX-*Zech* 13 renders the construct state of רוח טאמה in attributive-adjectival form: τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον (correlating with the Synoptics' πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον). Πνεῦμα ἅγιον undergoes a similar conversion in LXX: in *Ps* 51 the psalmist begs Yhwh ורוח קדשך אל תקח ממני (v. 13), but in Greek he asks, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιόν σου μὴ ἀντανέλῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ (50:13). It appears that רוח הקודש—a construct state—underlies the Synoptics' πνεῦμα ἅγιον—attributive-adjectival, just as רוח טמאה stands behind πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον. The similar translation phenomenon contributes to the conceptual parallelism, accentuating juxtaposition.

The parallel translation correlates with thematic antithesis throughout *Luke-Acts*. For example, it is only after Luke describes Jesus πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (4:1), ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος (4:14), and announcing πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ (4:18) that a man ἔχων πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτου (4:33) enters the story. Luke utilizes the linguistic similarity of πνεῦμα ἅγιον/רוח קדש and πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον/רוח טאמה for narrative effect, imbuing the action of his narrative with rivalry between the spirits of gods. Thus, if δαιμόνιον indeed alludes to beings of certain comparability to Yhwh, then this divine clash is all the more apparent.

Furthermore, the contrast between the two spiritual parties hinges on association with Jew or foreigner. The πνεῦμα ἅγιον indwells mainly Jews but also Gentiles who turn to the god of Israel (which, of course, implies forsaking idolatry).[255] Its "holiness" corresponds with that of the god of Israel and his people, both of which are, as in *Lev* 11, "holy." This coalition of the holy god, spirit, and nation contrasts that of uncleanliness/foreignness, seen most vividly in the Gerasene pericope.

Finally, the inclusion of nations in these coalitions entails their geographical apportionment. In *Luke-Acts* the most apparent manifestation of this idea is the disappearance of the terms πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον (except for one instance, in the mouth of skeptical Gentiles) once the narrative displaces from the Land of Israel. Since Luke continues discussing spiritual activity throughout *Acts* (mainly of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), the sudden cessation of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον and δαιμόνιον points to a conceptual connection between deities and territory. Various kinds of πνεύματα (πύθωνα and πονηρά) continue to figure, though sparsely, in *Acts*. But it seems that deeming them ἀκάθαρτα no longer obtains. By limiting the category of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον to only those δαιμόνια that are active in the Land of Israel, Luke implies that the uncleanliness/impurity of the δαιμόνια relates to the ancient boundaries of the Israelite nation (those delineated in the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants). In other words, the δαιμόνια of *Luke-Acts* are unclean insofar as they intrude in the territory of the god of Israel; they are foreign to it. The label is irrelevant among the nations where idolatry is customary and thus where the δαιμόνια natively reside. This territorial association fits the reading of δαιμόνιον as *gods of the Gentiles*. Again, *Zech* 13:2 supports this

255. "[W]e should see clearly what Paul is asking of his pagans, and what (so far as we know) absolutely all of the apostles in the early years of this messianic movement were demanding of their Gentiles: No λατρεία to native gods" (Fredriksen, "Judaizing," 251).

interpretation by linking τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἀκάθαρτον with false prophecy and idolatry, and even more so by describing them as foreign to הארץ. Jesus's role in expelling τὰ πνεύματα τὰ ἀκάθαρτα/τὰ δαιμόνια further evokes *Zech* 13:2 by answering the promise להעביר את רוח הטמאה מן הארץ. The theological conceptions Luke promotes thematically uphold distinction between Israel and the nations, between her supreme god and the Gentiles' δαιμόνια, and between her god's spirit and those of the δαιμόνια.[256]

4.6. Final Conclusions and Suggestions for Subsequent Research

I began this investigation with the seemingly simple query as to the meaning of δαιμόνιον in *Luke-Acts*, which elicited a seemingly simple answer: demon. But by interrogating the content of *demon* and the connotations embedded in its etymological ancestors (δαίμων/δαιμόνιον), I have shown that the word's semantic evolution corresponded relative to Hellenic, Patristic, and ancient-Jewish discourses. For the Greeks of the epic, classical, and Hellenistic periods, δαιμόνιον alluded to abstract divinity or to singular deities. The Greeks hardly distinguished between δαιμόνιον and θεός, and they never ascribed to a δαιμόνιον absolute moral affiliation. For this reason, *demon*, which evokes an innately-evil spirit-being, does not suit the Hellenic δαιμόνιον. English translations of ancient-Greek texts demonstrate in their choice of other, amoral terms that *demon* would misrepresent the

256. Another reason to suppose that the term τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον builds on the association of πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα and foreign territory is the historical-linguistic implications of לשון הקדש. S. Schwartz addresses the meaning of לשון הקדש in rabbinic literature, arguing that it does not mean precisely "the holy tongue" but rather "temple language," i.e. the language of the temple ("Language," 33). As shown above, since the Hebrew behind τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον seems to be רוח הקדש and not הרוח הקדושה, both the Hebrew and its Greek counterpart may primarily allude to *the Jerusalem Temple* rather than to an abstract notion of "holiness." If so, then Luke's frequent discussion of "the spirit of the holy [place]" asserts even more strongly the notion of territorial distinction since it sets the spirit of Israel's god in terms of specific geographical location, directly associating it with the territory Yhwh allotted to himself according to *Deut* 32. Consequently, the contrast with πνεύματα ἀκάθαρτα has even more to do with territory and nation.

Hellenic δαιμόνιον. In contrast, Origen shows that in Patristic literature, semantically δαιμόνιον equals *demon*. Since this father of Christian orthodoxy portrays controversy with the "pagan" Celsus over the precise meaning of δαιμόνιον and, in so doing, appropriates the word to represent dualistic-Christian theology, *Contra Celsum* depicts the semantic turning point of δαιμόνιον. Its English translation accordingly applies *demon* to the ancient terminology without qualm. But if the turning point occurred during the second-third centuries C.E., application of *demon* to δαιμόνιον in Jewish-Greek literature of the Second Temple period entails semantic retrojection that produces anachronistic exegesis. By first dispensing with assumptions of ideological continuity between the Jewish literature of this era and the writings of the Church Fathers, and then by examining the usages of δαιμόνιον within the ideological scope of Jewish literature, I have recovered a more accurate conception of the Jewish δαιμόνιον. Jews writing in Greek ascribed to δαιμόνιον the basic Hellenic content of *deity*, but internally (from Israel's position as a henotheistic and monolatrous nation) reserved the word for *other* gods—those deities over whom theirs is supreme and authoritative. This conception of the δαιμόνια contrasts the dualistic framework of Patristic Christian thought, for to Jews the Gentiles' gods were neither absolutely evil nor the counterparts of angels. Rather, as the gods of Gentiles and occasional suitors of Israel, they were Yhwh's rivals. Upon interrogating the common and traditional assumption that the Lukan δαιμόνιον is none other than the Patristic *demon*, and by reassessing the function of δαιμόνιον in *Luke-Acts*, I have determined that Luke meant by δαιμόνιον the very same thing as the prior usage in Jewish-Greek literature. By way of conclusion, I propose that "demon"

be appended to those terms Fredriksen considers "ripe for retirement," for it "obscure[s] more than [it] clarif[ies], usually by inviting us along the path of anachronism."[257]

This investigation reveals the biases inhering in tradition and prevailing in both common knowledge and scholarship alike. The very decisiveness of English translations, e.g. NRSV, to render Luke's δαιμόνιον as *demon* indicates an *a priori* commitment to a theological framework suitable to Patristic thought, but not to Jewish discourse of the Second Temple period. This unself-conscious representation of Lukan Greek correlates with the traditional narrative of the parting of the ways, which subsumed *Luke-Acts* within the Christian tradition and thereby attributed to it Christian ideology. Accordingly, scholars such as Wahlen cannot discern meaning from Luke's πνεῦμα/δαιμόνιον ἀκάθαρτον, which depends on Jewish conceptions of foreignness, implying that Luke drew not on Christian but Israelite/Jewish discourse. As Arnal explains, it is imperative to dispose of the incorrect assumption that the first-century materials belong to the Christian tradition if we hope to attain to historicity in our exegesis. Thus this investigation, dealing with a single word, evidences the need to recognize the profound effect and significance of reading an ancient text according to the correct cultural context.

My conclusions affirm the trajectory of current scholarship that sets *Luke-Acts* well within Jewish discourse of the first century. As such my thesis exemplifies the potential for yielding from *Luke-Acts* and kin literature a more comprehensible and vivid image of the contemporary Jewish world. I suggest that comparable philological studies be pursued in an effort to identify the contours of Jewish-Greek vocabulary compared to the same terminology in other "dialects" like classical or Patristic-Christian. Similarly, my criticism of the common attribution of Dualism to post-exilic Jews should be tested in Hebrew and Jewish-Aramaic

257. Fredriksen, "Mandatory," 244.

literature. Do instances of שד, for example, lack the primary markers of Dualism as is the case with δαιμόνιον? If so, how does this absence change our understanding of notions of good/evil among ancient Jews? What are its consequences for the perceived ancient taxonomy of the divine?

My conclusions also raise questions about ancient Jews' perception of their political situation. If the Gentiles' divine patrons are portrayed inhabiting the land and people of Israel (outside of their jurisdiction), then presumably they are there as a corollary of the Gentile presence, which the Gerasene pericope of *Luke* intimates. What political implications, then, did the early Jesus Movement attribute to the notion of Jesus "throwing out" δαιμόνια? The related question arises of how or why some Jews came to possess δαιμόνια, though I have already suggested that *Luke* 11:14–20 traces this phenomenon to ongoing idolatry. Further investigation must incorporate evidence for the contemporaneous practice of foreign cult in the land of Israel and the extent to which Jews participated. If such evidence is attainable, how do Jesus's teachings compare to those of the biblical prophets, who engaged a comparable situation albeit usually under Israelite political sovereignty? What are the implications for the role of the messiah? All of these leads inspire, one hopes, the incremental clarification of what the ancient authors meant by the stories they told.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Aland, Kurt, Matthew Black, Carlo M. Martini, Bruce M. Metzger, and Allen Wikgren, eds. *The Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1983.

Aristotle. *La Constituzione di Atene*. Edited by Achille Casattini. Florence: Le Monnier, 1900.

Bonner, Campbell, ed. *The Last Chapters of Enoch in Greek*. London: Waverly, 1937.

Bovon, François. *Luke*. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. 3 vols. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002–2013.

Cedrenus, Georgius. *Historiarum Compendium*. Edited by Immanuel Bekker. Bonn: Weber, 1839.

Charles, Robert H. *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch, Edited from Twenty-Three MSS, Together with the Fragmentary Greek and Latin Versions*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1906.

Discoveries in the Judaean Desert. 40 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1955–2009.

Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1997.

Euripides. *Alcestis*. Edited by A. M. Dale. Oxford: Clarendon, 1954.

Euripides. *Cyclops*. Edited by Werner Biehl. Leipzig: Teubner, 1983.

Goldingay, John. *Psalms 90–150*. Vol. 3 of *Psalms*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Holladay, William L. *Jeremiah 2*. Hermeneia. Edited by Paul D. Hanson. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

Homer. *Iliad*. Translated by A. T. Murray. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.

Josephus. Translated by H. St. J. Thackerey et al. 10 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926–1965.

Justin. *Apologie Pour Les Chrétiens*. Translate and edited by Charles Munier. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2006.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989.

Moore, Carey A. *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. The Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1996.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001–2002.

Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Edited by M. Marcovich. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Origen. *Contra Celsum*. Translated by Henry Chadwick. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.

Pervo, Richard. *Acts*. Hermeneia. Edited by Helmut Koester. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.

Philo. Translated by Francis H. Colson et al. 10 vols. LCL. London: W. Heinemann, 1929–1962.

Plato. Translated by Harold N. Fowler. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1982.

Polybius. *Histories*. Translated by William R. Paton. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft Stuttgart, 1979.

Syncellus, George. *Ecloga Chronographica*. Bibliotheca scriptorvm graecovm et romanorvm. Edited by Alden A. Mosshammer. Leipzig: Teubner, 1984.

Vanderkam, James C., ed. *The Book of Jubilees*. Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalum. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.

Weiser, Artur. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. London: SCM, 1959.

Scholarly Sources

Arnal, William. "The Collection and Synthesis of 'Tradition' and the Second-Century Invention of Christianity." *Method and Theory in the Study of Religion* 23 (2011): 193–215.

Becker, Adam H., and Annette Yoshiko Reed. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Burke, David G. *The Poetry of Baruch: A Reconstruction and Analysis of the Original Hebrew Text of Baruch 3:9-5:9*. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982.

Annen, Franz. *Heil für die Heiden: zur Bedeutung und Geschichte der Tradition vom besessenen Gerasener (Mk 5, 1–20 parr.)*. Frankfort: Knecht, 1976.

Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and Their Importance*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1988.

Coogan, Michael D., ed. *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version with the Apocrypha*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Eshel, Esther, and Daniel C. Harlow. "Demons and Exorcism." Pages 531–33 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2010.

Fee, Gordon D., and Robert L. Hubbard, Jr., eds. *The Eerdmans Companion to the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011.

Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.

Fredriksen, Paula. "The Birth of Christianity and the Origins of Christian Anti-Judaism" *Jesus, Judaism, and Christian Anti-Judaism: Reading the New Testament After the Holocaust.* Edited by P. Fredriksen and A. Reinhartz. Westminster: John Knox, 2002.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel." *New Testament Studies* 56 (2010): 232–52.

Fredriksen, Paula. "Mandatory Retirement: Ideas in the Study of Christian Origins Whose Time has Come to Go." *Studies in Religion* 35.2 (2006): 231–46.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays*. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Guyard, Stansilas. "Remarques sur le mot assyrien *zabal* et sur l'expression biblique *bet zeboul*." *Journal Asiatique* 7 (1878): 220–25.

Heiser, Michael. "Deuteronomy 32:8 and the Sons of God." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 158 (2001): 52–74.

Heiser, Michael. "Monotheism, Polytheism, Monolatry, or Henotheism? Toward an Assessment of Divine Plurality in the Hebrew Bible." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 18 (2008) 1–30.

Herrmann, Wolfgang. "Baal Zebub." Pages 154–156 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2d ed. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Hoffmeier, James K. "Egypt, Plagues in." Pages 374–78 in vol. 2 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Horst, Pieter W. van der. “Thou Shalt not Revile the Gods: The LXX Translation of Ex. 22:28 (27), its Background and Influence” *Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 1–8.

Klawans, Jonathan. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, Johann J. Stamm, eds. *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1967.

Langton, Edward. *Essentials of Demonology: A Study of Jewish and Christian Doctrine; Its Origin and Development*. London: Epworth, 1949.

MacDonald, Nathan. *Deuteronomy and the Meaning of “Monotheism.”* Tübingen: Mohr Siebec, 2003.

Martin, Dale B., “When Did Angels Become Demons?” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129.4 (2010): 657–77.

McHenry, Robert, ed. In vol. 4 of *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Mendels, Doron. “Baruch, Book of.” Pages 618–20 in vol. 1 of *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.

Moulton, William F., and A. S. Geden, eds. *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1967.

Movers, Franz C. *Die Phönizier*. 2 vols. Bonn: Weber, 1841–1856.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint*. Baker Academic: Grand Rapids, 1998.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. “Chapter Three: The Bible Rewritten and Expanded,” in *Compendium rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum* (ed. M. E. Stone; Van Gorcum: Assen; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984) 89–156.

Nock, Arthur D. *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933.

OED. Third edition (March 2014): Oxford University Press. Accessed November 2015. Online: http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/49788.

Oliver, Isaac W. *Torah Praxis After 70 C.E.: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.355. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.

Petersen, Anders. "The Notion of Demon." *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt*. Edited by Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and K. F. Römheld. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Pierce, Chad. "Satan and Related Figures," Pages 1,196–1,200 in *The Eerdmans Dictionary of Early Judaism*. Edited by John J. Collins and D. C. Harlow. Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2010.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint: and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Reed, Annette Y. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Ribichini, Sergio. "Gad." Pages 339–41 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2d ed. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Riley, Greg J. "Demon." Pages 235–240. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2d ed. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Schwartz, Daniel R. "'Judaean' or 'Jew'? How Should we Translate *Ioudaios* in Josephus?" *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Jörg Frey, D. R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripentrog. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Schwartz, Seth. "Language, Power, Identity in Ancient Palestine." *Past & Present* 148 (1995): 3–47.

Seeligmann, Isaac. *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of its Problems*. Leiden: Brill, 1948.

Squires, John T. "The Gospel According to Luke." Pages 158–181 in *The Cambridge Companion to the Gospels*. Edited by Stephen C. Barton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Sperling, S. David. "Meni." Pages 566–68 in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. 2d ed. Edited by Karel van der Toorn, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Stone, Michael E. "Apocryphal Literature." Pages 383–442 in *Compendium rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum*. Edited by M. E. Stone. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984.

Stone, Michael E. *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition*. Leiden: Brill, 1991.

Tabb, Brian J. "Is the Lukan Jesus a 'Martyr'? A Critical Assessment of a Scholarly Consensus" *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 77.2 (2015) 280–301.

Terrien, Samuel. *The Psalms: Strophic Structure and Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Toorn, Karel van der. "The Theology of Demons in Mesopotamia and Israel: Popular Belief and Scholarly Speculation." *Die Dämonen: Die Dämonologie der israelitsch-*

jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt. Edited Armin Lange, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Diethard Römheld. Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck: 2003.

Tov, Emanuel. "The Septuagint." *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Tov, Emanuel. *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*. Jerusalem: Yuval, Jerusalem, 1981.

Tov, Emanuel. *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001.

Troxel, Ronald L. *LXX Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 124. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Vorm-Croughs, Mirjam van der. *The Old Greek of Isaiah: An Analysis of its Pluses and Minuses*. Atlanta: SBL, 2014.

Wahlen, Clinton. *Jesus and the Impurity of Spirits in the Synoptic Gospels*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.

Walton, John H. *Ancient Near Eastern Thought and the Old Testament: Introducing the Conceptual World of the Hebrew Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006.

Wilken, Robert L. *The Christians as the Romans Saw Them*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2003.

אשל, אסתר. *האמונה בשדים בארץ-ישראל בימי הבית השני*. חיבור לתואר דוקטור. ירושלים: האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים, תשנ"ט.

פריי, יורג. *הבשורה על פי יוחנן: מן היהודים ולמען העולם*. בעריכת כנה ורמן. מתורגם ע"י דליה עמארה וטל רוזמן. באר שבע: אוניברסיטת בן-גוריון, תשע"ד.

תקציר

מקובל להניח כי בשימושו בנוסח δαιμόνιον, הסופר של *הבשורה על פי לוקס* ו*מעשי השליחים* התכוון ל-דֶּמוֹן. ליתר דיוק נטען כי התכוון לרוחות שהן רעות במהותן, אשר הן מוקדשות לחלוטין לסכל את תוכניתו של האלהים הטוב ולהטריח את צדיקיו, והן כפופות לאויב הראשי הרע של אלהים: השטן. תיזה זו מבקרת את ההנחה הזאת, שב*לוקס-מעשי השליחים* המילה δαιμόνιον מתייחסת סמנטית ל-*דמון*. הפרוש של ה-δαιμόνιον הדמוני כפי שמוכר לרוב נבע מהדואליות בשיח אבות הכנסייה במאה השנייה עד לרביעית. אולם *לוקס-מעשי השליחים* שייך מבחינה אידיאולוגית לשיח של טקסטים יהודיים-יווניים של ימי הבית השני. בטקסטים המגוונים האלה לא כרוך ב-δαιμόνιον השתייכות לצד מוסרי אלא תאור עקבי של אותם אלים אשר הגוים עובדים באמצעות פולחן האלילות. בקרב יהודים המילה לא הזכירה רוחות רעות דואליות אלא אלים זרים/אסורים: יריבי יהוה. ה-δαιμόνιον של לוקס מתאר את קו המחשבה של החברה היהודית בימיו ולא מתאימה ל-*דמון* של אבות הכנסייה. מובן זה של δαιμόνιον ב*לוקס-מעשי השליחים* חוזר על כנו ומבהיר את הטקסט, במיוחד כאשר הוא משחרר את πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον-ו δαιμόνιον ἀκάθαρτον מעודפות וערפול, ומברר את הקשר בין מונחים אלו לבין פעילות הנרטיב בתוך או מחוץ לארץ.

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים

הפקולטה למדעי הרוח

החוג למדע הדתות

גירוש שדים מהבשורה על פי לוקס:

מגלים מחדש את המובן היהודי של Δαιμόνιον

בספרות יהודית-יוונית

שמואל ראוזניץ

בהנחייתו של ד״ר דוד סתרן

עבודת גמר מחקרית (תיזה)

מוגשת כחלק מהדרישות לקבלת תואר מוסמך

תשע״ו