

The Greatest Life Ever Lived

A Study in the Incarnate Life of Jesus Christ and An Exposition of the Four Gospels

LESSON XXX: THE HEALING OF THE DEMONIAK ON THE SABBATH / PETER'S MOTHER-IN-LAW HEALED

Matthew	Mark	Luke	John	related passages
8:14-17	1:21-34	4:31-41		

Jesus Teaches and Heals in the Synagogue

Mk 1:21 And they went into Capernaum; and straightway on the Sabbath day He entered into the synagogue, and taught.

Lk 4:31 [And came down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee,] and taught them on the Sabbath days.

This week's lesson describes a busy Sabbath day in Capernaum, first in the synagogue and then at Peter's mother-in-law's house. Luke adds it was a city of Galilee for the benefit of Theophilus and other readers unacquainted with the geography of the Holy Land.

The healing took place on the Sabbath in the synagogue as evidenced by Lk 4:33, 38 and Mk 1:21. Luke records five Sabbath healings (4:31-37; 4:38-41; 6:6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6), providing a balance teaching of the Sabbath principle. Isaiah 58:13,14 gives the importance of the Sabbath being the Lord's day, yet the Lord healed on the Sabbath in opposition to the Pharisaical ordinances.

Taught: literally, *was teaching*, denoting continuance

Mk 1:22 And they were astonished at His doctrine: for He taught them as one that had authority, and not as the scribes.

Lk 4:32 And they were astonished at His doctrine: for His word was with power.

So impressive was His presentation that the people was astonished, i.e. dumbfounded, literally "struck out of their senses". Wuest: "*and they were struck with astonishment to the point of a mental imbalance by reason of His teaching.*" The reason for this amazement was the manner in which He taught. Hendriksen lists the following comparisons between His teachings and the teachings of His day:

Jesus spoke the truth (Jn 14:6; 18:37)	Corrupt and evasive reasoning marked the sermons of many of the scribes (Mt 5:21ff)
He presented matters of great significance, matters of life, death, and eternity	They often wasted their time on trivialities (Mt 23:23; Lk 11:42)
There was a system to His preaching	As their Talmud proves, they often rambled on and on
He excited curiosity by making generous use of illustrations	Their speeches were often dry as dust
He spoke as the Lover of men, as One concerned with the everlasting welfare of His listeners, and pointed to the Father and His love	Their lack of love is clear from such passages as Lk 20:47
He spoke with authority for His message came straight from the heart and mind of the Father (Jn 8:26) and from scripture	They were constantly borrowing from fallible sources, one scribe often quoting another scribe. They even prided themselves on never saying anything that was original!

{ adapted from Hendriksen, *Luke* }

The response of the Jews illustrates the fact that being astonished or giving lip service to the teachings of Christianity isn't enough. Genuine faith is required. Without doubt most of those listening to Jesus that were so impressed walked away lost.

His word was with power: literally, *with authority*. "He assumed the tone and manner of a new Lawgiver; and uttered all His doctrines, not in the way of exhortation or advice, but in the form of precepts and commands, the unction of the Holy Spirit accompanying all He said." [Clarke, *Commentary*]

Mk 1:23,24 And there was in their synagogue a man with an unclean spirit; and he cried out, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth? art Thou come to destroy us? I know Thee who Thou art, the Holy One of God.

Lk 4:33,34 And in the synagogue there was a man, which had a spirit of an unclean devil, and cried out with a loud voice, saying, Let us alone; what have we to do with Thee, Thou Jesus of Nazareth? art Thou come to destroy us? I know Thee who Thou art; the Holy One of God.

Right in the synagogue does the demon (using the man's voice) cry out "Ha!". "By means of this exclamation, found only here in the New Testament, the demon was giving expression to his surprise, disgust, and hostility." [Hendriksen, *Luke*] "It is a strange commentary on the spiritual situation in Capernaum that a demoniac could worship in their synagogue with no sense of incongruity, until confronted by Jesus, and apparently with no desire to be delivered from his affliction." [Cole, *Mark*]

What the demon cried out is reminiscent of Jesus' comment to Mary at the wedding in Cana [see lesson 23]. There Jesus literally said, "what to me and to thee?" while here it is literally "what to us and to thee?". Wuest: "*Ha! What is there between us and you, Jesus, Nazarene?*" Adam Clarke translates it, "*What is it to us and to thee? or, What business hast thou with us?*". "Literally the question he asked was, 'what (is there) to us and you,' i.e., 'what have we in common that you would want to have anything to do with us? Why not leave us alone?'" [Hendriksen, *Luke*]

"When the demon declares, 'I know,' he is not telling a lie. There are certain things that are known to the prince of evil and his servants. Moreover, some of this knowledge causes them to tremble, to be frightened, to shudder (James 2:19). They know that for them there is no salvation, only dreadful punishment." [Hendriksen, *Luke*] "In one respect those who were 'demonised' exhibited the same phenomenon. They all owned the Power of Jesus." [Edersheim, *Life of Messiah*] It is sad when many today reject the position and teachings of Christ when even Satan and his emissaries admit them to be true!

Unclean: the Greek word *achathartos* meaning unclean, impure, vicious, evil. Cp our modern words cathartic, catharsis having the basic meaning in medicine of purging; the name Catherine means pure, virtuous.

Mk 1:25,26 And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the unclean spirit had torn him, and cried with a loud voice, he came out of him.

Lk 4:35 And Jesus rebuked him, saying, Hold thy peace, and come out of him. And when the devil had thrown him in the midst, he came out of him, and hurt him not.

Jesus did not accept the acknowledgment from such a corrupt being. Jesus commands the demon to come out of the man and he obeys immediately. In leaving he throws the man in the midst of the congregation in convulsions, with the man shrieking wildly. "We receive the impression that the expulsion of the evil spirit took but a few moments. The demon, moreover, did not win, not in any sense. Contrast all this with the exhausting, time-consuming ritual — and what happened to the priests? — as described in W.P. Blatty's *The Exorcist*." [Hendriksen, *Luke*]

hold thy peace = literally means to be muzzled, silenced; here it is a passive command meaning to be silent, still, quiet. Wuest: "*your mouth be muzzled, and come out of him at once.*"

Had torn him: the sense of the word is not that in which lacerations are involved but convulsions, coinciding with Luke's account that the demon did no harm to the man. Hendriksen: "*and the unclean spirit threw the man into convulsions.*" Wuest: "*and when the unclean spirit had torn him with convulsions.*"

"And hurt him not: Though he convulsed him and threw him down in the midst of them, probably with the design to take away his life, yet our Lord permitted it not; and this appears to be the meaning of the place. The spirit was not permitted essentially to injure him at that time." [Clarke, *Commentary*]

Mk 1:27,28 And they were all amazed, insomuch that they questioned among themselves, saying, What thing is this? what new doctrine is this? for with authority commandeth He even the unclean spirits, and they do obey Him. And immediately His fame spread abroad throughout all the region round about Galilee.

Lk 4:36,37 And they were all amazed, and spake among themselves, saying, What a word is this! for with authority and power He commandeth the unclean spirits, and they come out. And the fame of Him went out into every place of the country round about.

Note that while the religious leaders professed to be able to cast out demons (Mt 7:22; 12:27), what Jesus did here was so unique that news of this event was quickly spread throughout all Galilee. The news was so good and exciting that one person told his neighbor, then he told another, until it was all people talked about. Wuest: "*and there kept on proceeding forth a resounding report concerning Him to every place in the surrounding countryside.*"

"They questioned among themselves: stronger than Luke, who has *they spake together*. Tyndale, *They demanded one of another among themselves.*" [Vincent, *Word Studies*] Wuest: "*and they were all amazed, so that they kept on inquiring and demanding of one another, saying, what is this?*"

At least initially there was no opposition to Jesus' healing on the Sabbath. That concept was imported later from the religious leaders in Judea and became a great point of conflict between them and Jesus.

Who was spreading the news abroad? The newly-developed circle of disciples (from last week's lesson)? They did, but **the fame of Christ was spread abroad by many throughout the territory.** This is as it should be. **Did they have the deeper knowledge of those closer to Christ? No, but they could tell what they knew!**

The fame = Gk word *āchos* meaning sound, noise, rumor, news. Cp *echo*. Wuest: “*and there went out the report concerning Him immediately throughout the whole region of Galilee.*” “This is a very elegant metaphor. The people are represented as struck with astonishment, and the sound goes out through all the coasts; in allusion to the propagation of sound, by a smart stroke upon any substance, by which the air is suddenly agitated, and conveys the report made by the stroke to distant places. So this miracle was told to others by those who saw it, and they to others still, till it was heard through all the coasts of Galilee.” [Clarke, *Commentary*]

Jesus Heals Peter's Mother-in-Law

Mt 8:14 And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, He saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever.

Mk 1:29,30 And forthwith, when they were come out of the synagogue, they entered into the house of Simon and Andrew, with James and John. But Simon's wife's mother lay sick of a fever, and anon they tell him of her.

Lk 4:38 And He arose out of the synagogue, and entered into Simon's house. And Simon's wife's mother was taken with a great fever; and they besought him for her.

Jesus and His small band of disciples apparently went directly from the synagogue to Peter's and Andrew's house to spend the rest of the Sabbath. Peter's mother-in-law was home with a high fever, and they asked Jesus to come to her aid. Wuest: *Jesus saw Peter's mother-in-law bedridden and burning with a fever* (Mt 8:14).

An obvious observation of the text is that **Peter was married**, conflicting with the teachings of Roman Catholicism. Paul even notes that Peter's wife accompanied Peter on some of his evangelistic journeys (1 Cor 9:5). Concerning the celibacy of the priesthood, Emmett McLoughlin wrote this describing his priestly training in St. Anthony's Seminary, Santa Barbara, CA during the years 1922 -27: “The robe of every Franciscan monk is girded with a rope. One strand hangs from his side. It has three knots on it symbolizing the three vows — poverty, chastity, and obedience.... We were warned constantly about the danger of any association with women. The saints had characterized them as tools of the devil, devils themselves in beautiful forms, instruments permitted by God to exist and test man's virtue of chastity.” [McCloughlin, *People's Padre*; quoted in Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*] “By celibacy, in the present discussion, is meant the sectarian requirement of the Roman Catholic Church that its priests, monks, and nuns abstain from marriage. It is not to be confused with the vow of chastity, which is also taken by the members of these groups, and which means abstention from sexual relations. According to Canon Law the vow of celibacy is broken if the priest marries, but not if he engages in sexual relations. Pardon for sexual relations can be had easily at any time by confession to any fellow-priest. But absolution for any priest who marries can be obtained only from the pope, with accompanying severe penalties. And to obtain such pardon it is required that he forsake his wife.” [Boettner, *Roman Catholicism*] “Learn hence that marriage is no hindrance to virtue, since the chief of the apostles had his wife. Marriage is one of the first of Divine institutions, and is a positive command of God. He says, the state of celibacy is not GOOD, Genesis 2:18. Those who pretend to say that the single state is more holy than the other slander their Maker, and say in effect, ‘We are too holy to keep the commandments of God.’” [Clarke, *Commentary*]

“As soon as Peter began to follow Christ, his family began to benefit by it. It is always profitable to contract an acquaintance with good men. One person full of faith and prayer may be the means of drawing down innumerable blessings on his family and acquaintance. Every person who knows the virtue and authority of Christ should earnestly seek his grace in behalf of all the spiritually diseased in his household; nor can he seek the aid of Christ in vain.” [Clarke, *Commentary*]

Sick of a fever: *puretōi*, derived from *pur*, *fire*. Our word *fever* comes through the German *feuer*.” [Vincent, *Word Studies*]

anon = *eutheōs*, an old English word meaning “immediately, straightway”

Mt 8:15 And He touched her hand, and the fever left her: and she arose, and ministered unto them.

Mk 1:31 And He came and took her by the hand, and lifted her up; and immediately the fever left her, and she ministered unto them.

Lk 4:39 And He stood over her, and rebuked the fever; and it left her: and immediately she arose and ministered unto them.

“The cure was not only sudden, it was also complete. Simon's mother-in-law did not even say, ‘I'm rid of the fever, but completely exhausted.’ Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, one moment, just before Jesus had taken her by the hand and had rebuked the fever, there were still those flushed cheeks, that burning hot skin, profuse sweating, dryness in the throat — or else, depending on the kind of fever, there may have been violent shivering — the next moment every fever symptom had vanished completely. Not only was the woman's temperature normal but such a surge of new strength was coursing through her entire being that she herself insisted on getting up. In fact, she actually got up and started to perform the duties of a busy hostess.” [Hendriksen, *Luke*]

she ministered unto them: the word for minister is the word *diākonei*, our word for deacon. “And what a Sabbath-meal it must have been, after that scene in the Synagogue and after that healing in the house, when Jesus was the guest, they who had witnessed

it all sat at meat with Him, and she who had been healed was the Deaconess.” [Edersheim, *Life of Messiah*] This is not written to support an unscriptural principle of women deacons but rather to illustrate the true meaning of the office of the deacon. **A deacon (or deaconess) is a servant of others, in or outside of the church.**

Mt 8:16 When the even was come, they brought unto Him many that were possessed with devils: and He cast out the spirits with His word, and healed all that were sick:

Mk 1:32-34 And at even, when the sun did set, they brought unto Him all that were diseased, and them that were possessed with devils. And all the city was gathered together at the door. And He healed many that were sick of divers diseases, and cast out many devils; and suffered not the devils to speak, because they knew Him.

Lk 4:40,41 Now when the sun was setting, all they that had any sick with divers diseases brought them unto Him; and He laid His hands on every one of them, and healed them. And devils also came out of many, crying out, and saying, Thou art Christ the Son of God. And He rebuking them suffered them not to speak: for they knew that He was Christ.

So quickly did the news of Jesus’ healings spread that the people could hardly wait for sundown (the end of the Sabbath) to travel to the sight of Jesus. “The people brought their sick at that hour, not only because of the coolness, but because it was the end of the Sabbath, and carrying a sick person was regarded as work.” [Vincent, *Word Studies*] So many gathered that Mark adds the entire city was outside the door of Peter’s house!

“As is clear from Luke 4:40,41; cf. Mark 1:32-34; 6:13, it is not true that the New Testament writers, in common with all primitive people, ascribed all physical illnesses and abnormalities to the presence and operation of evil spirits. It is contrary to fact that demon-possession is simply another name for insanity or for dissociation. The fact is that according to Scripture a *distinct* and *evil* being (here: “a spirit of an unclean demon”), foreign to the person possessed, has taken control of that individual.” [Hendriksen, *Luke*] Compare that with some Charismatic’s teachings that all sickness is the result of being bound by Satan.

“There is a personal touch in that Jesus *laid His hands on every one of them* as He healed them.” [Morris, *Luke*] Wuest: “*and having laid His hands upon one after another separately, He healed them.*” “Jesus did not heal *en masse*, but one by one, tender sympathy going out from Him in each case.” [Bruce, *Gk NT*]

Jesus healed not just fevers but all kinds of diseases and demon-possession (note that *all* were healed, *none* went away unsatisfied. As the demons left, Luke adds they cried out as the one in the synagogue that Jesus was the Son of God. Jesus commanded them to be silent “because they knew Him to be the Messiah.” Probably the most reasonable explanations why Jesus silenced the demons are as follows:

- the demons knew Jesus was the Messiah but if the people believed this, they may have acted upon it and started a movement to make Him king
- along with the first reason, if the religious leaders saw public acknowledgment of Jesus as the Messiah, there would have been a premature crisis; although Jesus had come to die for our sins, there was an appointed time for this death
- being the time of His humiliation, any lifting up of Jesus as the Messiah would have conflicted with His mandate He had to fulfill until the time of the resurrection. His being lifted up as King is reserved for His second coming, not the first.

These explanations may also help us understand why the demons were so quick to pronounce Jesus as the Son of God: to glorify Him? Hardly likely, but if by their announcements the people could be stirred to disrupt the ministry of Christ, then their motive is understandable.

Mt 8:17 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses. : This is one of the foundational verses for the Charismatic healing movement:

- In error, many Charismatics take this and other verses to teach it is never God’s will for a believer to be sick, healing being part of the atonement. “The very wish of God is that a person prosper, that a person have health, and that his physical health be equal to the health of his soul. It is God’s wish for a person to have a whole mind, a whole spirit, a whole body, and whole finances.... God is a good God! God loves you and cares for you. God wants to make you a whole person.” [Oral Roberts, *The Miracles of Christ*] **“Sickness and disease are not the will of God for His people.** He does not want a curse upon His children. He wants to bless them with health.... **It could not be God’s will for His children to be sick.** It was not His will for even His servants to be sick. Sickness and disease are not of love — and God is love.... Healing and health are the will of God for you. If sickness is the will of God, then heaven will be filled with sickness and disease.... **Healing was in God’s great plan of redemption.** Sin caused the curse to come on us — but Christ bore the penalty for us. “Surely he hath borne our griefs (sicknesses), and carried our sorrows (diseases): yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” (Isa 53:4,5) Matthew quotes a portion of these scriptures: “That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses” (Mt 8:17) “ [Kenneth Hagin, *Redeemed From Poverty ... Sickness ... Death*] “We can be just as certain divine healing is God’s will as we can be that saving the lost is His will. We know it by knowing His Word. God’s Word is His will. The same Bible which gives us John 3:16 also says ‘...Himself took our infirmities, and bare our sicknesses.’ (Mt 8:17)” [Kenneth Hagin, *The Key to Scriptural Healing*] To this error Hendriksen makes this comment:

“Though Peter was a disciple, and we may well assume that all the others who dwelt in this home were also among the Lord’s friends (Andrew, too, being one of the twelve), affliction had been allowed to enter. Yes, in God’s providence believers, too, become ill (Elisha, 2 Kings 13:14; Hezekiah, 2 Kings 20:1; Dorcas, Acts 9:36,37; Paul, Gal 4:13; Epaphroditus, Phil 2:25-27; Timothy, 1 Tim 5:23; Trophimus, 2 Tim 4:20). They even die! The passage, ‘with His stripes we are healed,’ does not mean that they have been exempted from the infirmities of the flesh.” [Hendriksen, *Matthew*]

- In reaction to this error, many non-Charismatics explain this verse in the context of 1 Pet 2:24 to show this healing was only spiritual: “who His own self bare our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: *by whose stripes ye were healed.*”

- I’m not sure of the answer here but I would like to point out some guidelines to understanding this verse:

- to state it is always God’s will to heal is a fundamental error of the Charismatic healing movement. The statements above reveals a lack of understanding on the sovereignty of God and Satan’s role in the providence of God, a lack of understanding on the use and purpose of the means which God uses to teach and train His children, and a misuse of the “love” of God, among other items.

- however I also believe it to be as much of a misapplication to restrict the meaning here to our spiritual healing. “But the difficulty is, how it had its accomplishment in Christ’s healing the bodily diseases of men; since Isaiah speaks not of His actions and miracles, but of His sufferings and death; and not of bearing the diseases of the body, as it should seem, but of the diseases of the mind, of sins, as the Apostle Peter interprets it, 1 Pet 2:24.” [Gill, *Commentary*] The context in which this verse is being used is the physical healing of Peter’s mother-in-law and many in Capernaum. Those people were not being healed spiritually (although some may have truly believed as a result of Jesus’ miracle working). If there is one truth I would like our Sunday School class to embrace wholeheartedly is that **we must be careful to understand each verse in the context, regardless of “denominationally accepted” interpretations. God’s Word does not contradict itself! We do not need to resort to the misinterpreting practices of so many to explain something which we know to be an error.**

- The passage in Peter clearly speaks of our spiritual healing. But Matthew is quoting the verse as applicable to the physical healing of those in Capernaum. Perhaps one answer could be that **while it may not always be God’s will to heal, all healing that does transpire is a result of the Lord’s work on Calvary.** This could be thought of in the same sense in which God is good to the ungodly as well as His children. As no sinner deserves any favor from God, by virtue of Calvary, God’s goodness may be dispensed upon those who will never receive Christ as Saviour. Perhaps as no sinner who ever gets sick deserves to be healed, by virtue of Calvary, God’s physical healing may be dispensed upon all.

- Edersheim puts another twist on the reference, one I like: “I can scarcely find words strong enough to express my dissent from those who would limit Isaiah 53:4, either on the one hand to spiritual, or on the other to physical ‘sicknesses.’ **The promise is one of future deliverance from both, of a Restorer from all the woe which sin had brought.**” [Edersheim, *Life of Messiah*]

- Common among many authors I’ve read is that the verse here is **a reference to the physical as a picture of the spiritual.** “The rabbins understand [Isaiah 53:4] to speak of the sufferings of the Messiah for the sins of Israel; and say that all the diseases, all the griefs, and all the punishments due to Israel shall be borne by Him. Christ fulfils the prophecies in all respects, and is Himself the completion and truth of them, as being the lamb and victim of God, which, bears and takes away the sin of the world. The text in Isaiah refers properly to the taking away of sin; and this in the evangelist, to the removal of corporeal afflictions: but, as the diseases of the body are the emblems of the sin of the soul, Matthew, referring to the prediction of the prophet, considered the miraculous healing of the body as an emblem of the soul’s salvation by Christ Jesus.” [Clarke, *Commentary*]

What are Demons?

Originally angels which chose to follow the leading of Satan, demons are spiritual beings forever locked into the state of evil, not having redemption provided for their sins. “As demon was used both in a good and bad sense before and after the time of the evangelists the word unclean may have been added here by St. Luke, merely to express the quality of this spirit. But it is worthy of remark, that the inspired writers never use the word daimōn, demon, in a good sense.” [Clarke, *Commentary*] “The New Testament uses two kindred words to denote the evil spirits which possessed men, and which were 60 often cast out by Christ: daimōn, of which *demon* is a transcript, ... and daimonion, which is the neuter of the adjective daimonios, *of, or belonging to a demon....* The derivation of the word is uncertain. Perhaps daiō, *to distribute*, since the deities allot the fates of men. Plato derives it from danmōn, *knowing or wise....* In Homer daimōn is used synonymously with theos and thea, *God and goddess*, and the moral quality of the divinity is determined by the context.... Demon always bears the evil sense in the New Testament as well as in the Septuagint. Demons are synonymous with *unclean spirits* (Mark 5:12, 15; 3:22, 30; Luke 4:33). They appear in connection with Satan (Luke 10:17, 18; 11:18, 19); they are put in opposition to the Lord (1 Corinthians 10:20, 21); to the faith (1 Timothy 4:1). They are connected with idolatry (Revelation 9:20; 16:13, 14). They are special powers of evil, influencing and disturbing the

physical, mental, and moral being (Luke 13:11,16; Mark 5:2-5; 7:25; Matthew 12:45).” [Vincent, *Word Studies*]

Demon Possession

I profess no authority in the area of demon possession and the topic is one which I would like to pursue at a later date. Some comments by others:

- Three common interpretations: “Should the possessed mention by the evangelists be regarded simply as persons afflicted after the same manner as our lunatics, whose derangement was attributed by **Jewish and heathen superstition** to supernatural influence? Or did God really permit, at this **extraordinary epoch in history**, an exceptional display of diabolical power? Or, lastly, should certain morbid conditions now existing, which **medical science attributes to purely natural causes**, either physical or psychical, be put down, at the present day also, to the actions of higher causes? These are the three hypotheses which present themselves to the mind.... [Jesus] gives the apostles and disciples power to *cast out devils* (Lk 9:1), and to tread on *all the power of the enemy* (Lk 10:19). In Mark 9:29, He distinguishes a certain class of demons that can only be driven out by prayer (and fasting?). In Luke 11:21 and par. He explain the facility with which He casts out demons by the personal victory which He had achieved over Satan at the beginning.” [Godet, *Luke*]
- An author defending the thought that demon possession was limited to the NT era: “A man of high reputation, with thorough theological, medical, and psychiatric training, the late Dr. J. D. Mulder, in a series of articles on ‘Mental Disease and Demon Possession,’ wrote as follows, ‘For six years I have worked as medical missionary among the Navahoes, a tribe of Indians still deeply steeped in fear of evil spirits, witchcraft, and related subjects, while the last ten years I was in daily contact with mentally disturbed of all types.... Daily conversations with these ... patients, however, and careful delving into their inner thoughts have made me convinced that, whereas there might well be demoniacal *influence*, the picture of *possession*, as found in the New Testament, was always absent. I therefore fully agree with Prof. Schultze when he writes, **“I venture to suggest that demon possession was a phenomenon limited almost exclusively (if not entirely) to the period of special divine manifestations during the period in which the New Testament church was born.”**” [Hendriksen, *Mark*]
- **“The term ‘demoniacal possession’ occurs not in the New Testament.** We owe it to Josephus, from whom it has passed into ecclesiastical language. We dismiss it the more readily, that, in our view, it conveys a wrong impression. The New Testament speaks of those who had a spirit, or a demon, or demons, or an unclean spirit, or the spirit of an unclean demon, but chiefly of persons who were ‘demonised’.... In view of the fact that in St. Mark 9:21, the demonised had been such ‘of a child,’ it is scarcely possible to ascribe it simply to *moral* causes. Similarly, personal faith does not seem to have been a requisite condition of healing. Again, as other diseases are mentioned without being attributed to demoniacal influence, and as *all* who were dumb, deaf, or paralyzed would not have been described as ‘demonised,’ it is evident that all physical, or even mental distempers of the same class were not ascribed to the same cause: some might be natural, while others were demoniacal.... On the other hand, there were more or less violent symptoms of disease in every demonised person, and these were greatly aggravated in the last [sudden, violent outburst] when the demon quitted his habitation.... Neither the New Testament, nor even Rabbinic literature, conveys the idea of permanent demoniac indwelling, to which the later term ‘possession’ owes its origin.” [Edersheim, *Life of Messiah*]
- To balance the above, our church was recently brought a message on the “spiritual warfare” by a missionary last week. Many of his comments bordered on Charismatic teaching which, as he reminded us, is one of our problems: we’ve become so scared of being labeled Charismatic that we avoid mentioning these areas. I am not sure whether he is correct or not, and the message was not your standard Baptist message (as he mentioned, he would not preach this to a church he was candidating at). But what interests me is that other missionaries have brought the same message. Are we protected from seeing true demonism due to the Biblical heritage we’ve been privileged to live under? If we traveled to “pagan” countries, would we see more examples of what occurred in the NT? If that be true, then we in America do need this message since we are rapidly becoming pagan.

“Doctor Luke”

- Luke 4:35 “Had thrown: used in connection with disease by Luke only, and only here. In medical language, of convulsions, fits, etc.”
- Luke 4:35 “Hurt him not: literally, *in no possible way*. Mark omits this detail, which a physician would be careful to note. *Blaptein, to injure*, occurs but twice in New Testament, here and Mark 16:18. It is common in medical language.”
- Luke 4:37 “The fame: literally, *noise*. RSV, *rumor*. Only here, chapter 21:25 Acts 2:2. Hebrews 12:19 is a quotation from the Septuagint. It is the word used in Acts 2:2 of the mighty rushing wind at Pentecost. Mark uses *akoā*, in its earlier sense of a *report*. The same word occurs in Luke, but always in the sense in which medical writers employed it — *hearing* or the *ears*. See chapter 7:1; Acts 17:20; 28:26. *Ākon* was the medical term for sound in the ears or head.”
- Luke 4:38 “A great fever: another mark of the physician. The epithet *great* is peculiar to Luke. The ancient physicians distinguished fevers into *great* and *small*.”
- Luke 4:39 “He stood over her: as a physician might do. Peculiar to Luke.”
- Luke 4:41 “Saying: The articulate utterance. Mr. Hobart (‘Medical Language of St. Luke’) remarks that the medical bias of Luke may be seen from the words he abstains from using as well as from those he does use in respect of disease. Thus he never

uses *malakia* for *sickness*, as Matthew does (4:23; 9:35; 10:1), since this word is never so used in medical language, but is confined to the meaning of *delicacy*, *effeminacy*. So, too, he never uses *basanizein*, *to torment*, of sickness, as Matthew does (8:6), as it is never so used in medical language, the word there meaning to examine some part of the body or some medical question.”

{ from Vincent, *Word Studies* }