

**High Low**  
**Luke 22:28-34**  
**Dr. Pierre Cannings**

**I. Present vs. Future vs. 28-30**

a. Stood By Me

i. Stood- **to continue in association with someone, remain continually**

1. *persistent loyal*

ii. In My Trials

1. Trials - *when the devil had exhausted every way of tempting*

a. The pattern here is that the great bend low ultimately to be raised by God to even greater heights.

b. trials to which He had been subjected during His ministry, and especially the latter portion of it. These, even to Him, were temptations to abandon His work. (4:13).

c. **You are those who have stood by me in my trials.** It is false to think that the time of Jesus between Luke 4:13 and 22:3 was completely free from Satanic temptation (see comments on 4:13). The disciples had continued (a perfect participle in Greek) with Jesus during his times of trial.

d. Jesus takes the larger view and, commending the Twelve for sticking with him through the “humiliation” of his own trials, promises them a share in his coming royal rule. The Twelve show here their interest in appearing great in the eyes of others. As in 9:46, concern for greatness follows incongruously from disclosure of betrayal. Jesus’ intervention makes no attempt to answer the question. It simply challenges the great to particular patterns of behavior.

b. Grant

i. Father Granted

1. To Me- even as My Father appointed to Me dominion

ii. I Grant You

1. Grant - *I confer on you as the Father has conferred on me the right to rule*

a. διατίθεμαι can mean: ‘to issue a decree’; ‘to make a covenant’ (Acts 3:25; Heb. 8:10; 10:16); ‘to assign, confer’; ‘to bequeath’

2. This is the purpose of conferring regal power upon them

3. The term “confer” (*diatithemai*) can also mean *make a covenant with* and thus brings to mind the new “covenant” (*diathēkē*) of 22:20. The covenant established with the apostles in 22:20 ultimately involves the promise of sharing in the future consummation of the kingdom when the Son of Man returns to reign. Whereas in 12:32 the Father confers the kingdom, here Jesus himself does this.
4. Jesus knows himself to be in line for royal rule (see the parable in 19:11–28). He promises to those who have shared his lowly path a share as well in that future royal rule. The end-time future is pictured as a never-ending banquet, at table with Jesus in his kingdom. It is in connection with being meal companions of Jesus, and not at all as free agents, that the Twelve get to sit upon royal thrones and are given a part in exercising judgment in connection with Israel.

c. Recline

i. Eat and Drink

1. My Table - Of the heavenly table at which the Messiah’s companions are to eat at the end of time
  - a. The Jews commonly regarded the Messianic Kingdom as a banquet: Comp. 13:29, 14:15.
  - b. The meaning of the promise is parallel to what precedes. As they have shared the trials, so they shall share the joy; and as they have proclaimed the Kingdom to Israel, so they shall exercise royal power over Israel, judging them according as they have accepted or rejected what was proclaimed. Comp. 1 Cor. 6:2, 3; Rev. 20:4.
2. **Kingdom - kingship, royal power, royal rule**
  - a. the kingly rule referred to here will take place in the consummation at the redemption brought by the Son of Man (21:28). Matthew understood it in this manner, for he spoke of this taking place “at the renewal of all things” (Matt 19:28). Compare 1 Cor 6:2–3; 2 Tim 2:12; Rev 2:26–29; 3:21.
  - b. “Royal rule” is preferred as the translation for βασιλείαν here, since v 30 makes clear that what is involved for the Twelve is more a participation in Jesus’ rule than any kind of independent regal status or rule.

ii. Sit

1. Thrones - or rulers in the time of the final consummation
2. Judging
  - a. Twelve Tribes of Israel

- i. but the former is perhaps to be preferred. The disciples are then promised a share in the rule of Jesus (cf. 2 Tim. 2:12; Rev. 2:26f.; 3:21). There is nothing that completely corresponds to this statement in Mt.; it is in effect replaced by a reference to the new birth, when the Son of man will sit on the throne of his glory, and the reward promised to the disciples is that of sitting on thrones, as in Lk. 22:30b. It seems likely that the reference to the Son of man is a Matthaean addition (cf. Mt. 25:31)
- ii. In Matthew it seems clear enough that the Twelve are to function as “assessors for the sovereign Judge” and this is likely to be close to the original sense of the tradition. In Luke, however, a wider sense, though certainly not without a judicial component, seems to be altogether more likely, since in this case the activity takes place as part of “royal rule.” We may want to think in terms of the judicial function of OT kings (e.g., 2 Sam 15:1–6; 1 Kgs 3:16–28) or of the broad sense of judging associated with the judges raised up by God (e.g., Judg 3:9, 15; 6:11–18).

## II. Heaven vs. Earth vs. 31-32

- a. Heaven
- b. Earth
  - i. Simon, Simon
  - ii. Satan
    - 1. Demanded Permission
      - a. But the power of Satan (who has in any case to seek permission from God to sieve the disciples) is limited; over against him stands Jesus with the power of his intercession. The ὁὐὐ contrasts Jesus and Satan rather than the rest of the disciples and Peter
      - b. **Demand - to ask for with emphasis and with implication of having a right to do so, ask for, demand**
      - c. obtained your release by entreaty
      - d. The nearest analogy is found in Job 1–2, where Satan is permitted to test Job. This and the vocabulary in Amos 9:9 suggests the following interpretation: “Satan is seeking [a dramatic aorist] to shake you disciples violently as one sifts wheat and to cause you to fall.”

- e. Satan's asking for the Apostles is rather like what happens with Job in Job 1–2. Satan hopes to bring them to destruction by showing their lack of integrity in their devotion to God. The trial by ordeal that he plans is pictured with the imagery of a sieve, probably one that holds back the rubbish and lets through the wheat.

iii. Sift

1. Sift - **to sift by shaking in a sieve**

2. Like Wheat

- a. The use of this metaphor is simply intended to indicate the coming time of testing (cf. Luke 3:17; Amos 9:9). One should not interpret this as God's granting a request by Satan for permission to test the disciples as in Job 1–2. The saying speaks primarily of Satan's trying to unsettle the disciples and cause them to become unfaithful.
- b. The third part of Jesus' farewell discourse begins with his statement that Satan, whose activity has intensified since 22:3, had sought to separate the disciples (the "you" in 22:31 is plural) from Jesus. He would not be successful, however, for Jesus had prayed on their behalf. As a result, although Peter (and the other disciples also) would fall, he would return and find restoration. Jesus then commanded Peter to strengthen the church after his restoration. Peter protested that he was prepared to suffer imprisonment and even death for Jesus, but he was told that before the cock crowed he would in fact deny three times that he knew Jesus.

c. On Earth

i. Prayed for You

1. Prayed

- a. As being the leader on whom so much depended, and as being in special need of help, as his fall proved. Jesus prayed for all (Jn. 17:2, 9, 15, 17)
- b. Peter is not kept from stumbling by Jesus' prayer, but he is kept from having his faith quite disappear. Peter is able, therefore, to bounce back from his failure. Though Luke does not provide material on how the other Apostles fared, we are probably to understand that they fared no better than Peter, and perhaps worse. Nevertheless, Satan's intentions for them too are thwarted: after Peter had bounced back from his own failure, he was able to help the others.

- c. strengthens Peter's hand in the situation by praying for him and gives him in turn the task of strengthening the others.
- d. The content of Jesus' prayer is that Peter's faith should not be drained away to nothing by the Satanic onslaught (the verb ἐκλείπειν, "to give out/fail," is used of the running out of money in 16:9).

2. That your faith May Not Fail

- a. **Faith state of believing on the basis of the reliability of the one trusted, trust, confidence, faith, firm, commitment** as true piety, genuine devotion
  - b. **Fail - to cease as state or event, fail, die out**
  - c. "Faith" here refers not to correct doctrinal belief but to "faithfulness." Jesus prayed that Peter (and the other apostles) would not lose their faithfulness, i.e., their loyalty to him
  - d. Rather the prayer was that Peter would not disavow his allegiance and loyalty to Jesus. This Peter did not do; and the reader, who is aware of Peter's leadership role in the early church, knows that Jesus' prayer for Peter was answered.
  - e.
- ii. Turned Again **to change one's mind or course of action, for better or worse, turn, return**

1. Strengthen Your Brother

- a. Strengthen - **to cause to be inwardly firm or committed, confirm, establish, strengthen**
- b. How Peter fulfilled this is seen in Acts by his leadership in completing the number of the disciples to twelve (1:15–26), his preaching at Pentecost (2:14–40), his early preaching and leadership in Jerusalem (chaps. 3–5), and his role in the expansion of the church to Samaria (8:14–25) and to the Gentiles (chaps. 10–11; 15:7–11). "Brothers" therefore refers to more than just the other apostles and is essentially a synonym for "believers" (cf. Acts 1:15; 15:23). For the Johannine parallel to this, cf. John 21:15–19.
- c. Despite the promise of future exaltation, a difficult time of Satanic sifting stands before the Apostolic band. Jesus makes provision for this through his prayer for Peter, and through the strengthening role that he prescribes for Peter. In this way, the disciple band will successfully make their

way beyond the damaging reversals of that period and on into a new place of stability. Nevertheless, despite his protestations of being ready for anything, even Peter stands on the threshold of shameful acts of denial.

- d. Strengthen your brothers” uses language that has its natural home in the account Luke gives in Acts of the life of the early church (for “brothers,” cf. Acts 1:15; 9:30; 15:23; etc for “strengthen,” cf. 18:23 [but also Luke 9:51; 16:26 for this verb]).

### **III. High vs. Low vs. 33-34**

- a. I am Ready
  - i. Prison
  - ii. Death
- b. Peter- For the first and last time in the Gospels Jesus addresses him by the significant name which He had given him. Rock-like strength is not to be found in self-confidence, but in humble trust in Him
  - i. Denial
    - 1. Peter’s fall is part of Satan’s scheme which was aimed at procuring the apostasy of all the disciples; but it is withstood by Jesus who prays that Peter’s faith may not completely lapse under temptation, so that he may ultimately be the means of strengthening his fellow-disciples. The temptation is thus placed in a cosmic setting

# Word Studies

Stood - **to continue in association with someone, remain continually**<sup>1</sup>

**Trials**- *when the devil had exhausted every way of tempting*<sup>2</sup>

**Granted** - *I confer on you as the Father has conferred on me the right to rule*<sup>3</sup>

**Table** - Of the heavenly table at which the Messiah's companions are to eat at the end of time<sup>4</sup>

Kingdom- **kingship, royal power, royal rule**<sup>5</sup>

**Throne** - or rulers in the time of the final consummation<sup>6</sup>

Demanded - **to ask for with emphasis and with implication of having a right to do so, ask for, demand,**<sup>7</sup>

**Sift**- **to sift by shaking in a sieve**<sup>8</sup>

**Fail** - **to cease as state or event, fail, die out**<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 233.

<sup>2</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 793.

<sup>3</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 238.

<sup>4</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1013.

<sup>5</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 168.

<sup>6</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 460.

<sup>7</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 344.

<sup>8</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 924.

<sup>9</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 306.

**Turned** - to change one's mind or course of action, for better or worse, *turn, retu*<sup>10</sup>

**Faith** - state of believing on the basis of the reliability of the one trusted, *trust, confidence, faith, firm, commitment*<sup>11</sup> as true piety, genuine devotion<sup>12</sup>

**Strengthen** - to cause to be inwardly firm or committed, *confirm, establish, strengthen*<sup>13</sup>

**28. οἱ διαμεμενηκότες μετ' ἐμοῦ.** The idea of *persistent loyalty* is enforced by the compound verb, by the perfect tense, and by the preposition (Lft. on Gal. 2:5): "who have perseveringly remained with Me and continue to do so" (1:22; Heb. 1:11; 2 Pet 3:4).

**ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου.** The trials to which He had been subjected during His ministry, and especially the latter portion of it. These, even to Him, were temptations to abandon His work. Comp. ἄχρι καιροῦ (4:13).

**κἀγὼ διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν.** "And / on My part, in return for your loyalty, hereby appoint to you dominion, even as My Father appointed to Me dominion." As in 1:33, βασιλεία is here "dominion" rather than "a kingdom": comp. 23:42; Rev. 17:12; 1 Thes. 2:12. See on 11:2. Comp. τὴν βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρῶν διέθετο (Jos<sup>14</sup>. *Ant.* xiii. 16. 1).

A connexion with διαθήκη (ver. 20) is doubtful. The καινὴ διαθήκη is with all the faithful; this διατίθεμαι seems to be confined to the Apostles. The verb does not necessarily mean "covenant to give" or "assign by bequest," which would not fit διέθετο here, but may be used of any formal arrangement or disposition (Hdt. i. 194, 6; Xen. *Anab.* vii. 3, 10; *Mem.* i. 6, 13; *Cyr.* v. 2. 7, 9).

**30. ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε.** This is the purpose of conferring regal power upon them. Some make from καθὼς to βασιλείαν a parenthesis and render, "I also (even as My Father appointed to Me dominion) appoint to you that ye may eat and drink," etc. So Theophyl. Nösg<sup>15</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 382.

<sup>11</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 818.

<sup>12</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 819.

<sup>13</sup> William Arndt et al., [\*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature\*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 945.

<sup>14</sup>Jos. Josephus.

<sup>15</sup>Nösg. Nösgen.



Hahn. But βασιλείαν belongs to both διατίθεμαι and διέθετο. So Euthym<sup>16</sup>. De W<sup>17</sup>. Mey<sup>18</sup>. Weiss, Schanz, Godet.

**ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου.** The Jews commonly regarded the Messianic Kingdom as a banquet: Comp. 13:29, 14:15. *Cibus potusque, ille de quo alias dicitur. Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam* (Bede).

**καθῆσθε ἐπὶ θρόνων.** The meaning of the promise is parallel to what precedes. As they have shared the trials, so they shall share the joy; and as they have proclaimed the Kingdom to Israel, so they shall exercise royal power over Israel, judging them according as they have accepted or rejected what was proclaimed. Comp. 1 Cor. 6:2, 3; Rev. 20:4.

As to the verb, the readings are very various: καθίξεσθε (<sup>19</sup>A <sup>20</sup>F <sup>21</sup>K <sup>22</sup>M <sup>23</sup>S <sup>24</sup>U V <sup>25</sup>X Γ <sup>26</sup>Δ), καθίσησε (H), καθέζησθε (<sup>27</sup>D). But the choice lies between καθῆσθε (<sup>28</sup>B\* <sup>29</sup>T <sup>30</sup>D), which must depend upon ἵνα, and καθήσεσθε (<sup>31</sup>κ <sup>32</sup>A <sup>33</sup>B<sup>3</sup> <sup>34</sup>G <sup>35</sup>L Q), which rather gives this

---

<sup>16</sup>Euthym. Euthymius Zigabenus.

<sup>17</sup>De W. De Wette.

<sup>18</sup>Mey. Meyer.

<sup>19</sup>A A. Cod. Alexandrinus, sæc. v. Once in the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria; sent by Cyril Lucar as a present to Charles 1. in 1628, and now in the British Museum. Complete.

<sup>20</sup>F F. Cod. Boreeli, sæc. ix. In the Public Library at Utrecht. Contains considerable portions of the Gospel.

<sup>21</sup>K K. Cod. Cyprius, sæc. ix. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>22</sup>M M. Cod. Campianus, sæc. ix. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>23</sup>S S. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. x. In the Vatican. The earliest *dated* MS. of the Greek Testament. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>24</sup>U U. Cod. Nanius, sæc. x. In the Library of St. Mark's, Venice. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>25</sup>X X. Cod. Monacensis, sæc. ix. In the University Library at Munich. Contains 1:1–37, 2:19–3:38, 4:21–10:37, 11:1–18:43, 20:46–24:53.

<sup>26</sup>Δ Δ. Cod. Sangallensis, sæc. ix. In the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>27</sup>D D. Cod. Bezae, sæc. vi. Given by Beza to the University Library at Cambridge 1581. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>28</sup>B B. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. 4. In the Vatican Library certainly since 1533<sup>1</sup> (Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul 3, etc.*, p. 86).

<sup>29</sup>T T. Cod. Borgianus, sæc. v. In the Library of the Propaganda at Rome. Greek and Egyptian. Contains 22:20–23:20.

<sup>30</sup>D D. Cod. Bezae, sæc. vi. Given by Beza to the University Library at Cambridge 1581. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>31</sup>κ κ Cod. Sinaiticus, sæc. iv. Brought by Tischendorf from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; now at St. Petersburg. Contains the whole Gospel complete.

<sup>32</sup>A A. Cod. Alexandrinus, sæc. v. Once in the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria; sent by Cyril Lucar as a present to Charles 1. in 1628, and now in the British Museum. Complete.

<sup>33</sup>B B. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. 4. In the Vatican Library certainly since 1533<sup>1</sup> (Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul 3, etc.*, p. 86).

<sup>34</sup>G G. Cod. Harleianus, sæc. ix. In the British Museum. Contains considerable portions.

<sup>35</sup>L L. Cod. Regius Parisiensis, sæc. viii. National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

as an independent promise. In Mt. 19:28 καθήσεσθε is right, and may have been transferred to this passage, as δώδεκα has been in some authorities (<sup>36</sup>κ <sup>37</sup>D <sup>38</sup>Χm a b c d f1 q) with θρόνων.

### 31–34. The Prediction of Peter’s Denial.

Both the prediction and the fulfilment are given in all four Gospels. A comparison of them shows that Lk. and Jn. are quite independent of one another and of the other two. We have three separate narratives. Lk. agrees with Jn. (13:36–38) in placing the prediction in the supper-room. Mt. (26:30–35) and Mk. (14:26–30) place it on the way from the room to Gethsemane. It is not likely that it was repeated; and the arrangement of Lk. and Jn. is to be preferred. But some make three predictions; two in the room (Lk. being different from Jn.), and one during the walk to Gethsemane. Godet regards a repetition of such a prophecy *impossible de supposer* (2. p. 476).

31. Lk. makes no break in Christ’s words, but it is possible that a remark of Peter’s, such as Jn. records, is omitted. The apparent want of connexion between vv. 30 and 31 has led to the insertion εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος (<sup>39</sup>κ <sup>40</sup>A <sup>41</sup>D <sup>42</sup>Χ, Latt<sup>43</sup>.), as if to mark the beginning of a new subject. <sup>44</sup>B <sup>45</sup>L <sup>46</sup>T.

**Σίμων Σίμων.** The repetition of the name is impressive: see on 10:41. Contrast Πέτρε ver. 34. The whole of this address (31, 32) is peculiar to Lk. It tends to mitigate Peter’s guilt, by showing how sorely he was tried. Lk. “ever spares the Twelve.” See pp. 146,, 172, 511,.

ὁ Σατανᾶς ἐξητήσατο ὑμᾶς “Satan *obtained* you by asking” (RV<sup>47</sup>. *marg.*); “procured your being surrendered to him,” as in the case of Job (1:12, 2:6): *exoravit vos*. Neither *postulavit*

---

<sup>36</sup>κ κ Cod. Sinaiticus, sæc. iv. Brought by Tischendorf from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; now at St. Petersburg. Contains the whole Gospel complete.

<sup>37</sup>D D. Cod. Bezae, sæc. vi. Given by Beza to the University Library at Cambridge 1581. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>38</sup>X X. Cod. Monacensis, sæc. ix. In the University Library at Munich. Contains 1:1–37, 2:19–3:38, 4:21–10:37, 11:1–18:43, 20:46–24:53.

<sup>39</sup>κ κ Cod. Sinaiticus, sæc. iv. Brought by Tischendorf from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; now at St. Petersburg. Contains the whole Gospel complete.

<sup>40</sup>A A. Cod. Alexandrinus, sæc. v. Once in the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria; sent by Cyril Lucar as a present to Charles 1. in 1628, and now in the British Museum. Complete.

<sup>41</sup>D D. Cod. Bezae, sæc. vi. Given by Beza to the University Library at Cambridge 1581. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>42</sup>X X. Cod. Monacensis, sæc. ix. In the University Library at Munich. Contains 1:1–37, 2:19–3:38, 4:21–10:37, 11:1–18:43, 20:46–24:53.

<sup>43</sup>Latt. Latin.

<sup>44</sup>B B. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. 4. In the Vatican Library certainly since 1533<sup>1</sup> (Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul 3, etc.*, p. 86).

<sup>45</sup>L L. Cod. Regius Parisiensis, sæc. viii. National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>46</sup>T T. Cod. Borgianus, sæc. v. In the Library of the Propaganda at Rome. Greek and Egyptian. Contains 22:20–23:20.

<sup>47</sup>RV. Revised Version.

(Tert<sup>48</sup>. Cypr<sup>49</sup>.), nor *quæsiuit* (c), nor *expetivit* (f Vulg<sup>50</sup>.) is adequate. The aorist of the compound verb necessarily implies *success* in the petition. In class. Grk. the mid. would generally have a good sense: “obtained your release by entreaty.” See instances in Wetst<sup>51</sup>. and Field. As in 10:18 Jesus is here communicating a portion of His divine knowledge. See notes there and on 8:12. Note the plur. ὑμᾶς, which covers both σὺ and τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου. Satan was allowed to try them all (Mt. 26:31, 56; Mk. 14:27, 50); *Judâ non contentus* (Beng<sup>52</sup>.). Comp. *Apost. Const*, vi. 5, 4: *Test. XII. Patr.* Benj. iii.

**τοῦ σινιάσαι.** See on 1:74: “in order to sift.” Neither verb nor substantive (σινίον, “a sieve, winnowing riddle”) is classical. They are probably colloquial for κόσκινον and κοσκινεύειν which survives in modern Greek. In Amos 9:9 we have λικμᾶν. See Suicer, *s.v.*

*Ut ventilet* (e f ff<sub>2</sub> i l q r, Ambr<sup>53</sup>.), *ut vexaret* (Cypr<sup>54</sup>. Aug<sup>55</sup>.). *ut cerneret* (d, Tert<sup>56</sup>. Hil.), *ad cernendum* (c), *ut cribraret* (Vulg<sup>57</sup>.).

**32. ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην.** See on 5:12. The ἐγὼ δέ and the aor. are in marked contrast to Satan and his request. We may regard ἐξητήσατο and ἐδεηθή as contemporaneous.

περὶ σοῦ As being the leader on whom so much depended, and as being in special need of help, as his fall proved. Jesus prayed for all (Jn. 17:2, 9, 15, 17). The interpolator of Ignatius understands this as a prayer for all: ὁ δεηθεὶς μὴ ἐκλείπειν τὴν πίστιν τῶν ἀποστόλων (*Smyrn.* 7.) For ἵνα after δέομαι comp. 9:40, 21:36.

μὴ ἐκλίπη. “Fail not utterly, once for all.” *Defecit in Petro ἡ ἐνέργεια τῆς πίστεως ad tempus: at ἔξιiv labefactavit, non extinxit* (Grotius).

καὶ σὺ. Answering to ἐγὼ δέ. Christ has helped him: he must do what he can for others.

ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον. “When once thou hast turned again, stablish” (RV<sup>58</sup>.). It is unnatural to take ποτε with στήρισον (Mey<sup>59</sup>. Weiss); and it is a mistake to make ἐπιστρέψας a sort of Hebraism (Ps. 85:7, ἐπιστρέψας ζωώσεις ἡμᾶς), meaning “in turn” (Grot<sup>60</sup>. Maldon<sup>61</sup>. Beng<sup>62</sup>.), a use which perhaps does not occur in N.T. See Schanz. On the other hand, “when thou art converted” is too strong. It means turning again after a temporary aberration. Yet it is not turning *to the brethren*, but turning *from the fault* that is meant. It is not likely that the

---

<sup>48</sup>Tert. Tertullian.

<sup>49</sup>Cypr. Cyprian.

<sup>50</sup>Vulg. Vulgate.

<sup>51</sup>Wetst. Wetstein.

<sup>52</sup>Beng. Bengel.

<sup>53</sup>Ambr. Ambrose.

<sup>54</sup>Cypr. Cyprian.

<sup>55</sup>Aug. Augustine.

<sup>56</sup>Tert. Tertullian.

<sup>57</sup>Vulg. Vulgate.

<sup>58</sup>RV. Revised Version.

<sup>59</sup>Mey. Meyer.

<sup>60</sup>Grot. Grotius.

<sup>61</sup>Maldon. Maldonatus.

<sup>62</sup>Beng. Bengel.

transitive sense is meant: “convert thy brethren and strengthen them”. comp. 1:16, 17; Jas. 5:19, and contrast Acts 3:19, 28:27; Mt 13:15; Mk. 4:12. See *Expos. Times*, Oct 1899, p. 6.

This metaphorical sense of *στηρίζειν* is not classical: comp. Acts 18:23; Rom. 1:11, 16:25; Jas. 5:8, etc. The form *στήρισον* for *στήριξον* is late.

Some Latin texts add. without any Greek authority, *et rogate nen iniretis in temptationem* (a b c e ff<sub>2</sub> i q).

**33. μετὰ σοῦ.** First. with enthusiastic emphasis: “With *Thee* I am ready.” The impulsive reply is thoroughly characteristic. As at the feet-washing (Jn. 13:6, 8) he has more confidence in his own feelings than in Christ’s word; but this version of the utterance is less boastful than that in Mt. 26:33 and Mk. 14:29.

**34. Λέγω σοι, Πέτρε.** For the first and last time in the Gospels Jesus addresses him by the significant name which He had given him. Rock-like strength is not to be found in self-confidence, but in humble trust in Him. Mt. and Mk. have Ἀμὴν λέγω σοι: Jn. Ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λ. σοι. The solemn earnestness with which this definite prediction was uttered made a deep impression upon all.

**σήμερον.** Mt. his ταύτη τῇ νυκτί. Mk. has both. The new day began after sunset. See 4:40, 13, and 23:38 for similar cases in which Mt. and Lk. have different parts of an expression, of which Mk. has the whole.

**οὐ φωνήσει ... ἀλέκτωρ.** The third of the four Roman watches was called ἀλεκτοροφωνία, *gallicinium* (Mk. 13:35; *Apost. Const.* viii. 34, 1; Strabo, vii. 35; *Geopon.* 1153). The expression here is equivalent to “Before this night is past.” Mk. alone mentions the double cock-crowing, and the fact that Peter, so far from being silenced, kept on protesting with increased vehemence.

**ἕως τρίς με ἀπαρνῆση εἶδέναι.** This is the true reading (<sup>63</sup>κ <sup>64</sup>B <sup>65</sup>L <sup>66</sup>M Q <sup>67</sup>X <sup>68</sup>T), The τρίς is in all four Gospels: the εἶδέναι in Lk. alone.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>κ κ Cod. Sinaiticus, sæc. iv. Brought by Tischendorf from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; now at St. Petersburg. Contains the whole Gospel complete.

<sup>64</sup>B B. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. 4. In the Vatican Library certainly since 1533<sup>1</sup> (Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul 3, etc.*, p. 86).

<sup>65</sup>L L. Cod. Regius Parisiensis, sæc. viii. National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>66</sup>M M. Cod. Campianus, sæc. ix. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

<sup>67</sup>X X. Cod. Monacensis, sæc. ix. In the University Library at Munich. Contains 1:1–37, 2:19–3:38, 4:21–10:37, 11:1–18:43, 20:46–24:53.

<sup>68</sup>T T. Cod. Borgianus, sæc. v. In the Library of the Propaganda at Rome. Greek and Egyptian. Contains 22:20–23:20.

<sup>69</sup> Alfred Plummer, [\*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke\*](#), International Critical Commentary (London: T&T Clark International, 1896), 502–505.

## Commentary Studies

### viii. The Future Role of the Twelve 22:28–30

In sharp contrast to the previous conversation, which emphasised the need for lowly service without thought of reward, but tightly connected with it, stands the promise of Jesus to the disciples who have been faithful to him during his trials. Just as his Father has appointed kingly rule for him, so Jesus promises a share in this rule to his disciples; they will enjoy the privilege of being seated at his table, and also of sitting upon thrones to rule the twelve tribes of Israel. The language is that of traditional apocalyptic, and appears to refer to the final coming of the kingdom of God, as is the case in Mt. where there is reference to the 'new birth' and the glorious coming of the Son of man. Nevertheless, it is possible that Luke has seen in the saying reference to the Lord's Supper and to the position of Jesus' faithful disciples as leaders in the church; the thought may also have been broadened to refer to disciples in general rather than to the Twelve in particular. The language is that of a covenant or testamentary disposition, so that the saying has a decisive significance in the establishment of the new covenant. This makes it attractive to adopt the hypothesis of Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 54–63, that the saying was originally connected with the institution narrative, from which it has been separated by the insertion of other material.

But the saying raises considerable difficulties. It reappears in a different form in Mt. 19:28, where it is an insertion into Marcan material. There has been indecisive debate regarding which form of wording stands nearest to the primitive saying which, it can be safely assumed, underlies both texts. The majority of scholars regard the Matthaean wording as standing closer to the original (Bultmann, 170f.; Klostermann, 209; Kümmel, 47; Vielhauer, 67f.; Higgins, 107f.; Roloff, *Apostolat*, 148–150; Schulz, 330–332), but the basic originality of the Lucan form is upheld by Schweizer, *Matthäus*, 251f.; Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 37–54; cf. Jüngel, 239f. With some hesitation we are inclined to accept the latter position, while acknowledging that to some extent Luke has edited the saying. Matthew has nothing corresponding to vs. 29–30a, and since these verses are unlikely to be due to Lucan redaction the possibility arises that the two Evangelists were dependent on different sources (Manson, *Sayings*, 216) or, more probably, on two different recensions of Q. E. Bammel<sup>70\*</sup> claims that the present passage may have formed the conclusion of Q, giving to the document the character of a testamentary disposition.

Bultmann, Vielhauer and Schulz ascribe the saying to the self-consciousness of the early church, and Schulz, 333, assigns it to the later stages of the Q tradition when the use of 'the Twelve' had developed. But Manson, *Sayings*, 217, rightly objects that it is hard to imagine the early church ascribing a throne to Judas—a difficulty which Luke may have attempted to meet by dropping 'twelve' before 'thrones'. Further, there is no evidence for the development of such a self-consciousness by, or on behalf of, the Twelve in the church, especially at the comparatively late stage suggested by Schulz. Although the saying stands somewhat isolated in the teaching of Jesus, its very uniqueness and dissimilarity from the teaching of the early church favour its authenticity. Certainly it fits in with the promise of rule made by Jesus to the disciples

---

<sup>70\*</sup> The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

(cf. 12:32) and forms the background to the request in Mk. 10:37. It expresses the hope of Jesus in the ultimate coming of the kingdom of God. On the setting of the saying in the ministry of Jesus see especially J. Dupont<sup>71\*</sup>, 386–389.<sup>72\*</sup>

**(28)** For Luke's connective *δέ*, Matthew has *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν* which is probably original, in view of Luke's known tendency to suppress *ἀμὴν*; Luke's *δέ* brings out the contrast between Jesus (v. 27) and the disciples. In Mt. the saying begins with a hanging nominative (*ὑμεῖς οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι*); this appears as a clause in Lk. with the addition of *ἐστε. διαμένω* (1:22<sup>73\*</sup>) is 'to continue'; the perfect tense expresses the situation which has existed during the ministry and still continues—loyalty to Jesus during his trials. The claim of Conzelmann, 74–76 (cf. Ott, 85–89), that the reference is not to the past, but to the present, comes to grief on the meaning of the perfect tense (Brown, 8f.); consequently the verse cannot be used to defend Conzelmann's view of a Satan-free or temptation-free period before the passion. For *πειρασμός* cf. 4:13. The word has more the force of 'dangers, tribulations' than 'temptations', as in Acts 20:19 (H. Seesemann, TDN<sup>74</sup>T VI, 35; cf. Lk. 8:13 diff. Mk.). Behind the word lies the thought of Satanic opposition to Jesus; the saying, therefore, is not a promise that the disciples will rule over the Jews who formerly persecuted them. For the whole phrase Matthew has *οἱ ἀκολουθήσαντές μοι*. Schulz, 330f., argues that Luke's formulation is secondary: *ἀκολουθέω* is the traditional word for following Jesus, and the reference to *πειρασμός* is a sign of Lucan redaction and refers to the coming passion, as characterised by Luke (cf. C. Colpe, TDN<sup>75</sup>T VIII, 447f.). It is a moot point whether *ἀκολουθέω* was the catchword which led Matthew to include the saying after Mt. 19:27, or was substituted by him to provide a link with Mt. 19:27, but the latter is perhaps more probable (Schürmann, op. cit., 37). The use of *διαμένω* is unusual, and Schürmann, op. cit., 38, conjectures (not implausibly) that it replaces an original *ὑπομένω*, reflected in 2 Tim. 2:12; Jas. 1:12 (for Luke *ὑπομένω* means 'to wait behind', 2:43). As for *ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου*, this could be a Lucan insertion to give a link with the present context, but the linguistic evidence is not compelling.

**(29)** The saying continues in its Lucan form with a promise by Jesus; *καὶ γὰρ* expresses the contrast between the faithfulness of the disciples and the action of Jesus in vindicating them. What he will do for them is on the pattern (*καθὼς*; 1:2; *et al.*) of what his Father has done for him. For *ὁ πατήρ μου* cf. 2:49; 10:22 (*par*<sup>76</sup>. Mt.) 24:49; the phrase is not especially

---

<sup>71\*</sup> The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

<sup>72\*</sup> See Bultmann, 170f.; Manson, *Sayings*, 216f., 339; Kümmel, 47f.; Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 37–63; Tödt, 62–64; Higgins, 107f.; J. Dupont, 'Le logion des douze trônes (Mt. 19, 28; Lc 22, 28–30)', *Bib.* 45, 1964, 355–392; Vielhauer, 67f.; Roloff, *Apostolat*, 148–150; E. Bammel, 'Das Ende von Q', in Böcher, 39–50; Schulz, 330–336.

<sup>73\*</sup> All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

<sup>74</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>75</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>76</sup>*par.* is parallel to

characteristic of Luke (cf. 9:26, diff. Mk. 8:38; 22:42, diff. Mk. 14:36). διατίθεμαι can mean: ‘to issue a decree’; ‘to make a covenant’ (Acts 3:25; Heb. 8:10; 10:16); ‘to assign, confer’; ‘to bequeath’ (Heb. 9:16f.\*<sup>77\*</sup>). Since God is the subject, the idea of a will or testament is excluded (pace Zahn, 681 n. 58; Wellhausen, 124), and the meaning must be ‘to assign’ (J. Behm, TDN<sup>78</sup> II, 104–106; Schürmann, op. cit., 41 n. 145; similarly, Lagrange, 551; Klostermann, 212; Schlatter, 424). The object is βασιλεία, here in the dynamic sense of ‘rule, authority’ (cf. 19:12, 15; Mt. 16:28; 20:21; Lk. 12:32). It is not clear whether the idea of a covenant is contained in διατίθεμαι; elsewhere this is made clear by the use of διαθήκην with the verb. Here, however, διαθήκη is present in the context (22:20), and the thought may be present for Greek readers (cf. Morris, 308; Danker, 223, finds influence from 2 Sa. 5:3). In the same way, Jesus makes an assignment to the disciples; the object is either βασιλείαν (supplied from the use in the subordinate clause; NE<sup>79</sup>B; J<sup>80</sup>B; TE<sup>81</sup>V); NI<sup>82</sup>V; Klostermann, 212; Schürmann, op. cit., 44f.) or in effect the ἴνα clause (RS<sup>83</sup>V; TN<sup>84</sup>T; Barcla<sup>85</sup>y; Lagrange, 551; Creed, 269; Morris, 308; J. Behm, ibid.). Both constructions give the same basic meaning, since the content of ‘rule’ is detailed in v. 30, but the former is perhaps to be preferred. The disciples are then promised a share in the rule of Jesus (cf. 2 Tim. 2:12; Rev. 2:26f.; 3:21). There is nothing that completely corresponds to this statement in Mt.; it is in effect replaced by a reference to the new birth, when the Son of man will sit on the throne of his glory, and the reward promised to the disciples is that of sitting on thrones, as in Lk. 22:30b. It seems likely that the reference to the Son of man is a Matthaean addition (cf. Mt. 25:31) to explain the meaning of the unusual phrase παλιγγενεσία, which will then have stood in Matthew’s source (Schürmann, op. cit., 43f.). Arguments to the effect that Matthew would not have substituted this concept for that found in Lk. (Schulz, 331 n. 62) are thus beside the point. Now ἐν τῇ παλιγγενεσίᾳ in Mt. corresponds to ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου in Lk. 22:30a (Schürmann, op. cit., 50f.); it could be original here, and altered to an easier expression by Lk. So there is in fact nothing corresponding to v. 29 in Mt., and it is possible that Matthew or his source dropped the verse (although Schürmann’s reasons for this (op. cit., 40f.) are not convincing). It is more likely that the verse is an addition to the present saying, which was not known to Matthew, but which was handed down in Luke’s tradition as an authentic saying of Jesus. This is the more probable, since Luke may be dependent upon a different source from Matthew (who was presumably using Q) at this point (cf. Manson, *Sayings*, 216, who ascribes the two forms to M and L respectively).

**(30)** There is also nothing corresponding to v. 30a in Mt., and it gives the impression of being an insertion into the saying; but if v. 29 is an insertion, it is probable that vs. 29 and 30a originally belonged together (Creed, 268); despite the objections made by Schürmann, op. cit.,

<sup>77\*\*</sup> All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

<sup>78</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>79</sup>NEB *New English Bible*

<sup>80</sup>JB *Jerusalem Bible*

<sup>81</sup>TEV *Today’s English Version* (1966 edition)

<sup>82</sup>NIV *New International Version*

<sup>83</sup>RSV *Revised Standard Version*

<sup>84</sup>TNT *Translator’s New Testament*

<sup>85</sup>Barclay W. Barclay, *The New Testament: A New Translation*, London, I, 1968

45–47, especially n. 176, there is no real discrepancy between v. 29 and v. 30a, since the thought of a meal in the heavenly kingdom is common enough (14:15; 13:29; 22:16). The language (ἔσθω for ἐσθίω; cf. 10:7<sup>86\*</sup>; ἔσθητε rather than φάγητε) is not particularly Lucan, and the concept of the messianic banquet is traditional. It has been objected that in the phrase ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου we have a local sense of ‘kingdom’ instead of the dynamic sense in v. 29, but the phrase here is probably a Lucan insertion when the sayings were joined together. Again, Schürmann argues that in v. 29 the thought is of the handing over of office, whereas here it is of reward for faithful disciples; but this is being over-pedantic, since the two thoughts can well go together (cf. Rev. 3:20/21). The thought is primarily eschatological, but there could also be an allusion to fellowship with the risen Lord in the Lord’s Supper.

In the second part of the saying the mood is indicative; this is possible in a ἴνα clause (12:58; Jn. 15:8; Acts 21:24; *et al.*), but here it indicates that two sources have been joined. The disciples will sit on thrones (not seats)—a reminiscence of Dn. 7:9—and share the judicial functions of the Son of man (cf. Mt.). Luke has probably deleted δῶδεκα, since the promise is addressed in this context to the eleven disciples; perhaps too the aim is to generalise the saying to apply to all faithful disciples. The function is exercised over the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. 2:36; Jas. 1:1; Rev. 7:4–8; 21:12). Many commentators see a reference to the literal Israel (J. Dupont<sup>87\*</sup>, 388) which persecuted the disciples (Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 53), but a reference to the new Israel is more likely, at least for Luke (Ellis, 255; Stuhlmüller, 158; Danker, 223); cf. Ps. 122:4f. for the thought. κρίνοντες (placed after φυλάς in  $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$  <sup>88</sup>B <sup>89</sup>T 892; before τὰς ... in *rell*; T<sup>90</sup>R; *Diglot*<sup>91</sup>) conveys the ideas of rule and judgment (cf. Dn. 7:10; 2 Cor. 6:2).

#### ix. The Prediction of Peter’s Denial 22:31–34

The thoughts of apostasy, self-seeking and betrayal which have been thematic throughout the Supper scene reach a new peak in this brief episode in which the denial of Peter is prophesied; it is true that Peter protests his loyalty to the point of readiness for imprisonment and death, but this protestation only makes his eventual failure the more heinous. Nevertheless, although the denial is inevitable, there is a new motif in the Lucan account which sheds light on what is happening. Peter’s fall is part of Satan’s scheme which was aimed at procuring the apostasy of all the disciples; but it is withstood by Jesus who prays that Peter’s faith may not completely lapse under temptation, so that he may ultimately be the means of strengthening his fellow-disciples. The temptation is thus placed in a cosmic setting.

---

<sup>86\*</sup> All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

<sup>87\*</sup> The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

<sup>88</sup>B Baptist source

<sup>89</sup>T Temple source

<sup>90</sup>TR *Theologische Rundschau*

<sup>91</sup>*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)



Vs. 33f. have a parallel in Mk. 14:29–31 where they form part of an extended conversation held after the disciples have left the upper room (Mk. 14:26–31). Opinion is divided as to whether both verses are derived from Mk. (Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 21–35; cf. Finegan, *Überlieferung*, 14f.), or only v. 34 is from Mk. (Manson, *Sayings*, 339f.; Taylor, *Passion*, 65f.), or neither verse is from Mk. (Zahn, 667; Plummer, 503; Schlatter, 137; Rengstorf, 240; Rehkopf, 84 n. 1). Apart from linguistic arguments, Schürmann, op. cit., 34, argues that, since Lk. 22:54–62 is based on Mk., and is a late addition to the passion narrative (see, however, 22:54–62 note), and since a source containing a prophecy of the denial must also have contained an account of the denial, Luke was not using an alternative source here. But this is not self-evident, especially if 22:31f. (which for Schürmann is not based on Mk.) was understood as a prophecy of the denial; the argument would apply only to v. 34, and it is not inconceivable that a non-Marcian source could have consisted mainly of sayings of Jesus. Other considerations must, therefore, be given weight. The change in address from ‘Simon’ to ‘Peter’ in v. 34 strongly suggests that at least this verse is from Mk. and the contents reinforce this conclusion; but it is noteworthy that similar wording is to be found in Jn. 13:38, and (if John is not dependent on the Synoptics at this point) this might suggest that Luke has remodelled a non-Marcian source on Marcian lines. The dependence of v. 33 on Mk. 14:29 and 31 is much less certain. It could well have stood as the last part of the source used in vs. 31f., especially in view of the continued dependence on 2 Sa. 15:20f. LXX which appears throughout the section.

Although Finegan, *Überlieferung*, 14f., regards vs. 31f. as a Lucan creation to replace the Marcian picture of the fleeing disciples (cf. Mk. 14:26–29, 50, diff. Lk.), there is general agreement that the verses contain a pre-Lucan tradition (Bultmann, 288; E. Fuchs, TDN<sup>92</sup>T VII, 291f.; Klein, 61–65; Linnemann, *Studien*, 72). Luke’s hand, however, may be visible in v. 32b. The verses combine the motifs of testing by Satan (Job 1–2), the sifting of faith, and the typology of David and Ittai (2 Sa. 15:20f.). While most scholars regard it as originally an allusion to the denial by Peter, this is doubted by Linnemann, *Studien*, 72–77 (cf. Dibelius, 201), who regards the saying as the utterance of a Christian prophet to prepare the church for a situation of persecution and temptation (cf. 1 Pet. 5:6, 8; Rev. 2:10). But we cannot solve our critical problems by inventing Christian prophets whenever we need them. Nor is it easy to imagine the kind of situation postulated by Linnemann. Klein argues that the saying is pre-Lucan; it cannot, however, go back to Jesus since he would not have prayed only for Peter; moreover, it stands in contradiction to the tradition of Peter’s denial, since (on Klein’s interpretation) Peter’s faith does not fail. But Klein’s interpretation of the saying is wrong (Dietrich, 118–139), since it does allow that Peter’s faith will nearly vanish, and therefore it is not incompatible with the tradition of his denial of Jesus. Nor is it obvious why Jesus should not have prayed especially for Peter as the one who was to be exposed to the gravest temptation. The saying makes good sense in its present context.

While Schenke, 348–423, regards the pericope in Mk. as being entirely due to Marcian redaction, R. Pesch<sup>93\*</sup>, 52–58, claims that it belonged to the pre-Marcian passion story. This view

---

<sup>92</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>93\*</sup> The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

is confirmed by the existence of what is probably a separate form of the tradition in Jn. 13:36–38 (Dodd, 55f.; Brown, *John*, II, 614–616). The problem of relating the various forms of the tradition to one another may well be insoluble. Lk. 22:31f. stand apart from the rest of the tradition, and therefore the saying is open to the suspicion of reflecting a theological development of the episode. On the other hand, it is possible that it derives from a separate tradition which has been associated with the prophecy of the denial at a secondary stage (cf. Manson, *Sayings*, 339f.).<sup>94\*</sup>

**(31)** Just as the announcement of the treachery of Judas follows directly on from the cup saying, so the announcement of Peter's betrayal follows without a pause after the promise to the disciples (so  $\text{P}^{\text{75}}$   $\text{B}^{\text{95}}$   $\text{L}^{\text{96}}$   $\text{T}^{\text{1241}}$   $\text{pc}$   $\text{sy}^{\text{s}}$   $\text{sa}$   $\text{bo}^{\text{pt}}$ ; other MSS add εἶπεν ὁ κύριος, as in 22:35a; cf. Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 100, n. 340). Whereas in Mk. Jesus is concerned first of all with the apostles as a group, and then Peter brings himself to the forefront, here Jesus takes the initiative—and does so with regard to Peter who stands at the centre of attention; the failure of the other disciples is incidental. Klein, 66f., sees evidence here of a Lucan tendency to paint the apostles as those who remained faithful to Jesus throughout the ministry, and did not flee or fall away. The use of the name Σίμων by itself appears to be characteristic of Luke's special source (5:3; *et al.*), and the doubling of the vocative (8:24, diff. Mk.; 6:46, *par*<sup>97</sup>. Mt.; 10:41; 13:34, *par*<sup>98</sup>. Mt.; Acts 9:4, *par*<sup>99</sup>. 22:7; *par*<sup>100</sup>. 26:14) is probably pre-Lucan. Dietrich, 134 n. 240 notes the suggestion of D. Gewalt in an unpublished dissertation, *Petrus* (Heidelberg, 1966), that the form of the present saying is close to that of 13:34f. This suggests that, unless Luke is imitating the latter passage (which is surely unlikely), the use of ἰδοῦ to introduce a threat is pre-Lucan. For Σατανᾶς cf. 10:18; *et al.* and especially 22:3 where Satan instigates Judas to treachery; here the same idea is present, but the attack is not directed so much against Jesus as against the disciples themselves in order to lead them to apostasy and loss of salvation (cf. 8:12; Dietrich, 128f.). The background of thought is to be seen in Job 1:6f. ἐξαίτηομαι\*<sup>101\*</sup> is 'to ask for, demand', more precisely, 'to demand the surrender of' (G. Stählin, TDN<sup>102</sup>T I, 1964); the verb is used of demonic activity in T. Benj. 3:3; Plutarch, *Def. Orac.* 14 (II, 417d) (*ibid.*). The implication is that the petition is directed to God; and the use of the aorist has been thought to imply the

<sup>94\*</sup> See Finegan, *Überlieferung*, 14f.; Manson, *Sayings*, 339f.; Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 21–35, 99–116; W. Foerster, 'Lukas 22, 31f.', *ZNW* 46, 1955, 129–133; Klein, 49–98 (originally as 'Die Verleugnung des Petrus', *ZTK* 58, 1961, 285–328); Ott, 75–81; Linnemann, *Studien*, 70–108 (originally as 'Die Verleugnung des Petrus', *ZTK* 63, 1966, 1–32); Schenke, 348–423; Dietrich, 116–139; Taylor, *Passion*, 65f.; R. Pesch, 'Die Verleugnung des Petrus', in Gnllka, *Neues Testament*, 42–62.

<sup>95</sup>B Baptist source

<sup>96</sup>T Temple source

<sup>97</sup>*par.* is parallel to

<sup>98</sup>*par.* is parallel to

<sup>99</sup>*par.* is parallel to

<sup>100</sup>*par.* is parallel to

<sup>101\*\*</sup> All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

<sup>102</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

success of the petition (R<sup>103</sup>V mg, Plummer, 503; cf. Lagrange, 553). All the disciples constitute the object of the request, and ὑμᾶς should be translated ‘all of you’ to make this clear in English. The expression of purpose by τοῦ ... is Lucan. σιניάζω\*<sup>104</sup>\* is a late form for Classical σήθω (B<sup>105</sup>D 108<sup>3</sup>), ‘to shake in a sieve, sift’. The usage is metaphorical, but the precise manner of application is not clear. Three possibilities for the use of the sieve have been suggested: 1. to separate the wheat from the chaff (Grundmann, 406f.); 2. to hold back large pieces of foreign matter, while letting the wheat through (Sir. 27:4); 3. to hold back the corn while letting tiny waste (sand, etc.) through. If there is uncertainty about the precise metaphorical picture, there is even more about the application to the disciples: a. Jeremias, *Parables*, 216, thinks of the sifting of the disciples in ‘the tempest of tribulation’, apparently so that the true may be separated from the false believers. b. W. Foerster<sup>106</sup>\* envisages Satan collecting evil evidence in the sieve with which to accuse the disciples (cf. Rev. 12:10; similarly, G. Stählin, *ibid.*; Dietrich, 123). c. Lagrange, 551; E. Fuchs, TDN<sup>107</sup>T VIII, 291f.; Ott, 78f., and Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 104f., think that the phrase refers simply to a shaking of the disciples (cf. Amos 9:9) in order to prove their faith; there is no stress on the result of the sieving. Since it is the disciples who are being sifted, view b. would seem less likely, and the picture is rather of the proving of the disciples themselves. But the point of sifting wheat is to separate off the rubbish, and it is unlikely that this point is missing here. The question is whether the disciples will survive the testing by Satan which leads to their standing or falling as believers.

**(32)** But the power of Satan (who has in any case to seek permission from God to sieve the disciples) is limited; over against him stands Jesus with the power of his intercession. The ὅς contrasts Jesus and Satan (Dietrich, 124) rather than the rest of the disciples and Peter (Klein, 63). Nevertheless, there is a contrast between the disciples and Peter; the latter is singled out for special intercession by Jesus, but with the ultimate purpose that he may strengthen them. For ὀλομαι, cf. 5:12; although the word is a favourite of Luke, it expresses an essential thought in the saying (Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 105). W. Foerster, TDN<sup>108</sup>T VII, 156f., regards Jesus as acting as intercessor for the disciples over against the accusations of Satan (cf. Michael in Rev. 12:7–12); although this allusion is denied by Ott, 75–81, it is a probable one. But although these roles are associated with the last judgment, here the reference is to the present time, and to the continual opposition of Satan to the people of God. περί can mean ‘in the interests of’ (cf. 6:28 *diff.* Mt.; Acts 8:15; 12:5). σοῦ limits the interest of Jesus to Peter who is to be the means by which the other disciples will be strengthened. (This at least is true for the present form of the saying; if v. 32b is secondary, the original saying may have lacked this thought.) ἵνα expresses both the purpose and content of prayer, and is not Lucan (Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 106). The verb

<sup>103</sup>RV *Revised Version*

<sup>104</sup>\*\* All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

<sup>105</sup>BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

<sup>106</sup>\* The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

<sup>107</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>108</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

ἐκλείπω (16:9; 23:45; Heb. 1:12\*<sup>109\*</sup>) has the force ‘to disappear’. Although Klein, 63f., claims that the effect of the prayer is that Satan will have no success with Peter, it is more probable that Luke understood it rightly as being that Satan would not be able totally to destroy Peter’s faith; the process of sifting would not lead to its intended end (cf. Danker, 224; Finegan, *Überlieferung* 15 n. 2). The nuance is important, since Bultmann, 288, and Klein, *ibid.*, have argued that the saying precludes the denial by Peter and represents a different tradition which did not know of the denial. But the story of the denial—with Peter’s tears of remorse—is perfectly compatible with the tradition here, especially since it is admitted that Satan’s request has been granted. The aorist ἐκλίπη is replaced by the present ἐκλείπη in A Γ Δ ρ; T<sup>110</sup>R; *Diglot*<sup>111</sup>; it is arguable that scribes substituted aorists for Hellenistic presents, but the MS evidence is weak. ΠΙΣΤΙΣ appears to have the sense of ‘faithfulness’ (‘confessional fidelity’, E. Fuchs, TDN<sup>112</sup>T VII, 292); cf. 18:8. Bultmann, 288 (cf. Ott, 81), argues that in view of ἐπιστρέψας we should expect the meaning ‘faith’, in the sense of Christian faith which may be lost by apostasy and regained by conversion; if so, ἐπιστρέψας is a Lucan addition which has misunderstood the original meaning of the saying. Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 112, likewise finds the idea of ‘faith’ present (especially in view of the use of ἐκλείπω), and thinks that the word may be due to Lucan redaction. But the case for understanding ΠΙΣΤΙΣ as meaning anything other than fidelity (even for Luke) is weak, and the concept is best understood as in 18:8; Acts 14:22; 16:5.

If Jesus prays for Peter, an obligation also rests upon him (καὶ σὺ). ΠΟΤΕ, used indefinitely, is found here only in the Gospels, and, since it has no Aramaic equivalent (Jeremias, *Parables*, 216 n. 39), it may be a Lucan addition. ἐπιστρέφω (1:16; *et al.*) can be used transitively (‘to convert’, 1:16f.; so here Zahn, 683), or intransitively (‘to be converted’, Acts 3:19; *et al.*; so here Plummer, 504; Schürmann, *op. cit.*, 109; Ott, 79 n. 26). Jeremias, *ibid.*, suggests that it is a Semitism for ‘again’ with the following verb (cf. his interpretation of στρέφω in Mt. 18:3), but this is not very likely. Behind the text we may trace the influence of 2 Sa. 15:20 LXX, which suggests that the intransitive use is present, not in the technical sense of Christian conversion, but in the sense of return to a former state (cf. G. Bertram, TDN<sup>113</sup>T VII, 727). στηρίζω, ‘to strengthen’ (9:51; 16:26; Acts 18:23), is used elsewhere in the NT of strengthening Christians in their faith amid persecution and temptation (1 Thes. 3:2, 13; 1 Pet. 5:10; *et al.*; G. Harder, TDN<sup>114</sup>T VII, 653–657); cf. Luke’s use of ἐπιστηρίζω, Acts 14:22; 15:32, 41; the variant στηρίζον

---

<sup>109\*\*</sup> All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

<sup>110</sup>TR *Theologische Rundschau*

<sup>111</sup>*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

<sup>112</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>113</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

<sup>114</sup>TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

(D Γ Δ *al*; T<sup>115</sup>R: *Diglo*<sup>116t</sup>) for στήρισον is weakly attested. ἀδελφοί as a term for the other disciples may be used under the influence of 2 Sa. 15:20, but is also to be associated with the Christian use of the term, Acts 1:15f.; *et al.* Dietrich, 173f., goes so far as to link the two passages by suggesting that Peter's activity of 'strengthening' the brothers lay in his filling up the empty place in the Twelve caused by the defection of Judas; this is very speculative. The saying in any case presupposes defection on the part of the other disciples, and this makes it unlikely that the whole of v. 32b is a Lucan addition to harmonise vs. 31–32a with the denial tradition, since the latter (as recorded by Luke) does not refer to the defection of the other disciples. There is more reason to suspect the originality of ἐπιστρέψας, but in any case the denial of Peter is forecast in the earlier part of the saying.

**(33)** Peter's reply in Lk. is concerned simply with his own standing and ignores the scattering of the other disciples, diff. Mk. ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτῷ could be redaction of Mk. 14:29, 31, but there is no proof that this is the case, especially since Luke prefers πρὸς αὐτόν to αὐτῷ. The use of the vocative κύριε could be Lucan (cf. 2 Sa. 15:21), but the link with Jn. 13:37 makes this verdict insecure (Rehkopf, 84 n. 1). For the sentiment expressed cf. Acts 21:13; 23:29. Peter expresses his readiness for imprisonment (φυλακῆ; cf. 23:19, 25) or death with Jesus (cf. 2 Sa. 15:21); cf. Jn. 13:37f. for the same thought. Ott, 80, suggests that Peter's words here refer to what he actually did suffer for Jesus (Acts 12 and his martyrdom), so that he is here 'rehabilitated' in contrast to Mk. 14:31 where he promises to be faithful to Jesus, and then fails to keep his promise. But the presence of v. 34 makes this interpretation unlikely. The vocabulary of the saying is largely Lucan, but there is no clear evidence that it rests on redaction of Mk.

**(34)** This verse is more plausibly seen as being based on Mk. The addition of the vocative Πέτρε is odd, especially after v. 31, but may be due to the influence of Mk. 14:29; it is just possible that there is an ironic reference to the meaning of the name. The omission of ἀμήν, diff. Mk., is typically Lucan. For οὐ (ϝ<sup>75</sup> κ<sup>117</sup>B Q Θ ρc) οὐ μή is read by *rell*; T<sup>118</sup>R; *Diglo*<sup>119t</sup>; cf. Jn. 13:38. Mark's time note is abbreviated, and ἀλέκτωρ ('cock', 22:60f.<sup>120\*</sup>) becomes the subject, par<sup>121</sup>. Jn. 13:38. The use of ἕως diff. Mk. πρίν, is another link with Jn. (ἕως οὔ). Only Mark refers to the cock crowing twice. After ἀπαρνῆση Luke adds εἰδέναι (cf. 22:57). But the text is uncertain. UB<sup>122</sup>S has με ἀπαρνῆση εἰδέναι (ϝ<sup>75</sup> vid κ<sup>123</sup>B L Θ f1<sup>124</sup>3 *al*); other readings are με

<sup>115</sup>TR *Theologische Rundschau*

<sup>116</sup>*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

<sup>117</sup>B Baptist source

<sup>118</sup>TR *Theologische Rundschau*

<sup>119</sup>*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

<sup>120\*</sup> All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

<sup>121</sup>par. is parallel to

<sup>122</sup>UBS *The Greek New Testament* (3rd edition), United Bible Societies, London, 1976)

<sup>123</sup>B Baptist source

<sup>124</sup>f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

ἀπαρνήση μὴ εἶδέναι με (D; cf. *Synopsis*<sup>125s</sup>, omitting the final με); ἀπαρνήση μὴ εἶδέναι με (A W Γ Δ pm; T<sup>126</sup>R; *Diglo*<sup>127t</sup>); ἀπαρνήση με εἶδέναι (Q Ψ f<sup>128</sup>1 pc). Schürmann, op. cit., 26 n. 105, apparently follows *Synopsis*<sup>129s</sup> on the grounds that μὴ εἶδέναι is Lucan; but this text has no MS authority. The UB<sup>130</sup>S text is the most difficult and should be preferred; the inclusion of μὴ is probably due to scribes who knew that ἀπαρνέομαι often takes this construction (cf. Sophocles, Ant. 442, cited by A<sup>131</sup>G; cf. B<sup>132</sup>D 429).<sup>133</sup>

28 ὤμεις δέ, “but you,” is probably meant to take us back to v 24 with its dispute over who was great. Though the desire to appear as great ones has reared its head, this is not the whole story. These people are the same as those who have stuck with Jesus along the lowly road of his trials (though it has had a number of supporters, there is no real credibility to the view of Conzelmann [*Luke*, 80–81, 83] that the perseverance here begins only with the fresh initiative of Satan in 22:3). While perseverance is an important matter in the Lukan frame (cf. at 8:15 and note the way that in the passion narrative Luke softens the Markan emphasis upon the abandonment of Jesus by the Twelve), the emphasis here is likely to fall more upon “in my trials” (ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς; the singular is translated as “temptation” at 4:13, “trial” in 8:13, and “that which is a trial” in 11:3; 22:40, 46), with the language of trials itself understood in close connection with “like a servant” of v 27. (For the link between πειρασμός, “trial,” and the commitment in vv 25–27 to being “like a servant” and not like “the kings of the nations,” cf. at 4:1–13, where the linking of these ideas [but not the precise language] is set in the context of Satanic temptation of Jesus to depart from the divinely ordained pattern for his ministry.) It would not be inappropriate to comb through the Gospel narrative and point to the adversities experienced by Jesus in company with the Twelve, but these need then to be seen in connection with that orientation of his ministry to which he committed himself against the pressure of Satanic temptation in 4:1–13 and to which he remained true despite the ensuing difficulties. In connection with the movement from trials to royal rule for the disciples, it is also relevant to call to mind Luke’s preoccupation with the idea that Jesus can achieve heavenly

---

<sup>125</sup>*Synopsis* K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, Stuttgart, 1964 (cited as giving the text of E. Nestle-K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1963)<sup>25</sup>

<sup>126</sup>TR *Theologische Rundschau*

<sup>127</sup>*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

<sup>128</sup>f1 Family 1 (Lake)

<sup>129</sup>*Synopsis* K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, Stuttgart, 1964 (cited as giving the text of E. Nestle-K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1963)<sup>25</sup>

<sup>130</sup>UBS *The Greek New Testament* (3rd edition), United Bible Societies, London, 1976)

<sup>131</sup>AG W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, 1957

<sup>132</sup>BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

<sup>133</sup>I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, New International Greek Testament Commentary (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 814–823.

glory only through suffering (see esp. 24:26; and for a wider application, Acts 14:22; cf. Lohfink, *Sammlung*, 82).

**29** For the appointed royal destiny of Jesus, cf. at 1:32–33; 19:11–28, 29–40; 23:42. Since the understanding of this royal destiny of Jesus is oriented to the future, it is hardly appropriate to draw in here, as some wish to, the horizon of Jesus' impending death and to take διατίθαι as "I bequeath [as in a will or last testament]." Though the verb can bear such a sense, its parallel use in connection with God here hardly encourages us to move in such a direction. The more general sense "confer" is to be preferred. It seems best to take βασιλείαν (tr. here as "royal rule," but elsewhere as "kingdom" or "kingship") as supplying the object for both acts of conferral (the alternative is to make the eating and drinking along with the sitting and judging that which Jesus confers; however, this is less satisfactory in relation to the use καθώς, "just as," and it does not fully bring to expression the parallelism of Jesus' situation with that of the Twelve, a feature here whose importance is confirmed by the presence of "throne" and "thrones" in the Matthean form of this tradition). "Royal rule" is preferred as the translation for βασιλείαν here, since v 30 makes clear that what is involved for the Twelve is more a participation in Jesus' rule than any kind of independent regal status or rule. For Jesus' speaking of God as "my Father," cf. 10:22; 24:49. Despite the various attempts that have been made to find here a ruling role for the Twelve in the life of the early church, the eschatological orientation, in this context, of the rule of Jesus requires the same for the rule of the Twelve. 12:32, while not unrelated, is more general and sees the promised βασιλεία, "kingdom/kingship/royal rule," as possession rather than as activity.

**30** The opening ἵνα clause here is better taken as explanatory than as expressing purpose (to receive royal rule *for the purpose of* eating and drinking at Jesus' table is hardly intelligible). Luke also pairs eating and drinking at 5:30, 33; 7:33, 34; 10:7; 12:19; etc. The shared use of "table" in vv 21 and 30 establishes a link between the Last Supper and the future meal envisaged here. Note the spatial use of "kingdom" here (contrast v 29). The fundamental imagery is of the eschatological banquet of God's People (cf. 13:29; 14:15; etc), but the appeal to it here functions more to establish close linkage to Jesus as foundational for the role of the Twelve in v 30b to follow. This is likely to be Luke's main contribution to the traditional materials he works with here.

Luke is likely to be responsible for removing "twelve" from before "thrones" (cf. Matt 19:28). This is better seen as a simple economy of language than as concerned to avoid the idea that Judas will have a throne (Luke will consider that a throne is designated for Judas, or rather for the slot that Judas occupies, which will be later filled by Matthias [Acts 1:15–26]). The mention of "thrones" follows nicely from the bestowal of royal rule, but κρίνοντες, "judging," is less expected. What does Luke have in mind here? And do we need to reckon here with the possibility that the Lukan sense and that of the earlier tradition run in different directions? The verb κρίνειν is capable of a wide range of meanings, all having to do in some way with the exercise of discrimination. Very often it has judicial overtones, and sometimes the implication is that the judgment to be made is one of condemnation. At times the meaning even becomes "to execute the sentence of judgment upon" (this is more common in the case of the cognate noun). In another direction, the meaning may reach "to govern" (this seems likely in 4 Kgdms 15:5; Ps 2:10, where it is based on the broader sense of the Hebrew וַשָּׁפֵט, *špt*; it is possible in Wis 3:8 and has been claimed for 1 Macc 9:73; *Pss. Sol.* 17:26, 29). In Matthew it seems clear

enough that the Twelve are to function as “assessors for the sovereign Judge” (Dupont, *Bi*<sup>134</sup>*b* 45 [1964] 378), and this is likely to be close to the original sense of the tradition. In Luke, however, a wider sense, though certainly not without a judicial component, seems to be altogether more likely, since in this case the activity takes place as part of “royal rule.” We may want to think in terms of the judicial function of OT kings (e.g., 2 Sam 15:1–6; 1 Kgs 3:16–28) or of the broad sense of judging associated with the judges raised up by God (e.g., Judg 3:9, 15; 6:11–18).

That the activity of judging here, for the Twelve, is directed toward the twelve tribes of Israel is to be understood in close connection with Jesus having made them collaborators with himself in the proclamation of the good news (cf. Dupont, *Bi*<sup>135</sup>*b* 45 [1964] 388). The number of the Apostles already signified the claim upon all Israel of the message Jesus had come to proclaim. The singling out of Israel here is in no sense anti-Jewish: it is only a particular expression of the central place of Israel in the purposes of God (cf. Isa 5:1–6; Amos 3:2; etc).

### **Explanation**

Discussion about the identity of the betrayer moves on to a contention over which of them was the greatest. To this, Jesus responds with his challenge to the great to behave like table servants. Despite the outbreak here of the desire to seem great, Jesus takes the larger view and, commending the Twelve for sticking with him through the “humiliation” of his own trials, promises them a share in his coming royal rule.

The Twelve show here their interest in appearing great in the eyes of others. As in 9:46, concern for greatness follows incongruously from disclosure of betrayal. Jesus’ intervention makes no attempt to answer the question. It simply challenges the great to particular patterns of behavior.

Jesus clarifies his intent by pointing first to the way that gentile rulers make their power felt by those over whom they rule, and then to the way that authority figures use generosity to justify their demand for social recognition: they insist on being glorified as public benefactors. Among the Twelve, things are to be quite different. Instead of demanding public honor, the greatest is to behave as though he had the status only of the youngest member of the group (in a culture where age was a status scale); the leader, instead of making his power felt, is to behave as one whose role is to serve the needs of the others.

There is a clear call for reversal here, as v 27 recognizes with its appeal to table imagery: the one reclining at table to be served the meal is self-evidently greater than the one who is his table servant. But Jesus identifies the practice of his ministry as that of being like a table servant. So soon after vv 19–20 we cannot avoid calling to mind here that the extent of Jesus’ self-giving service reached to the point of giving up his life for his own. Here is a great one who does not take advantage of his greatness for himself and who thereby confuses the categories by which we are humanly accustomed to measure significance.

Jesus’ teaching in vv 25–27 has implicitly been critical of the Apostolic band. But those same men who are caught up in a petty rivalry over stature are the men who have stood by Jesus, not only in his popularity and achievements but also in those buffetings that could have placed in

---

<sup>134</sup>*Bib Biblica*

<sup>135</sup>*Bib Biblica*



question the path of humility upon which he believed himself called to walk (in 4:1–13 Jesus experienced as Satanic temptation—the same Greek word as used for “trial” here—the attractions offered by a more self-promoting manner of carrying out his ministry). In that sense they have already come with Jesus as he acted the part of the table servant.

The Lukan Jesus does not see the table-servant pattern as the whole story. His own destined path was one of humble service that would take him to death. But death itself would be a gateway to exalted glory (see 24:26). The pattern here is that the great bend low ultimately to be raised by God to even greater heights.

Jesus knows himself to be in line for royal rule (see the parable in 19:11–28). He promises to those who have shared his lowly path a share as well in that future royal rule. The end-time future is pictured as a never-ending banquet, at table with Jesus in his kingdom. It is in connection with being meal companions of Jesus, and not at all as free agents, that the Twelve get to sit upon royal thrones and are given a part in exercising judgment in connection with Israel.

The scope of the judging activity of the Twelve is said to be the twelve tribes of Israel. This fits with Jesus’ symbolism in choosing Twelve in the first place, which signified the claim upon all Israel of the message he came to proclaim and in whose proclamation he made the Twelve collaborators. When a worldwide perspective for the gospel emerges, this becomes, in Paul, “Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?” Such promises are designed to strengthen the hand of disciples who need encouragement along the path of lowly service; for they will find themselves at the mercy of those who show no respect for the divinely ordained nature of this following in the footsteps of a Christ who went to his glory through suffering. The lower disciples are called upon to stoop, the higher they can be expected to be raised in the future kingdom of God.

### ***Satanic Sifting and Denial of Jesus (22:31–34)***

Those who have stuck with Jesus through his trials have been promised future exaltation, but there stands before them a difficult time of Satanic sifting, to which Jesus addresses his attention here. The Petrine denial anticipated here is reported in 22:54–62.

The materials of 22:31–32 have no parallel in Mark or Matthew. Luke uses these verses rather than the material in Mark 14:27 to anticipate the coming time of crisis for the disciple band. There is broad scholarly agreement that Luke is not creating freely here but drawing on a distinctive source (or sources). What has proved more difficult, given the considerable level of apparent Lukan intrusion, is to find agreement about the scope of the original tradition. Some have argued for a fusion here of a tradition underlying v 31 (with plural ὑμεῖς, “you”) with a separate tradition behind v 32 (with singular σὺ, “you,” and perhaps including “Simon, Simon” from v 31), but this seems to leave v 32 without adequate motivation. Most identify ΠΟΤὲ ἘΠΙΣΤΡΕΨΑΣ, “when you have turned back,” as a Lukan expansion, introducing an explicit anticipation of the Petrine denials to come. This may indeed be correct, but if the final clause of v 32 reflects tradition (see below), then something is needed at this point to move the time frame on, either into the period of sifting, or beyond. It is actually the preceding ἵνα clause, “that your faith may not give out,” that can be more confidently identified as both Lukan in its

present form and as not needed for the basic structural logic of the traditional piece Luke has used. This clause may be Luke's own elucidation of the prayer of Jesus. Finally, it is hard to conceive of a form of the tradition that singled Peter out for special prayer but contained no rationale for that in terms of a special role for him. It seems best to conclude then that, while a considerable part of the language and some part of the thought here are likely to be distinctly Lukan, the tradition Luke used already had something in the place occupied by each of the phrases and clauses that mark the unfolding thought sequence of vv 31–32, with the sole exception of the clause that elucidates the content of Jesus' prayer for Peter.

It is doubtful whether we should find here a tradition that would exclude any place for Peter's denial of Jesus (as Bultmann, *History*, 267; and argued at length by Klein, *Rekonstruktion und Interpretation*, 49–98). Not that Linnemann's alternative is convincing (*Studien*, 70–108), when she locates the origin of the tradition in an early church prophecy anticipating a coming time of trial (one could do a little better by taking the alleged prophecy as commenting on a *present* time of trial; then nothing would be needed in the "when you have turned back" slot). Dietrich seeks to save the day here with his claim (*Petrusbild*, 130–33) that the use of ἐκλείπειν, "give out," rather than, say, παύεσθαι, "cease," encourages us to think already in terms of the prospect of a progressive weakening of faith, causing Jesus to pray that the process may not reach a terminus in which no faith remains. This would mean that it is not only ΠΟΤὲ ἘΠΙΣΤΡΕΨΑΣ, "when you have turned back," that allows a place for Peter to have experienced difficulty with faith. Dietrich may indeed be right, but since the clause using ἐκλείπειν, "give out," is likely to be a Lukan addition, this is finally of no help. It is actually the probable absence of this clause from the original tradition that destroys the cogency of Klein's position.

Given the difficulty of determining how great Luke's contribution to the sense (as distinct from the wording) of Luke 22:31–32 is, we can only speak quite generally of the thrust of the prior tradition. It does, however, seem reasonable to maintain that Luke's tradition here anticipated, with the imagery of sifting, a time of Satanic trial for Jesus' disciple band, which would be of limited duration. The expectation is that the disciples would by and large make their way successfully through this time, though they would not be unscathed by the experience. Peter's path through the time of difficulty would be helped by the prayer of Jesus, so that he would come out the other side of the experience with inner resources that could be of particular help to others who had been more traumatized by the experience. (Alternatively, and perhaps better, Peter may have been called upon to strengthen the others during the period of trial, so that he, with the help of Jesus' prayer, and they, with his help, will make their way successfully, though not necessarily without difficulty, through this time of trial.)

Schürmann is likely to be right ("Abendmahlsbericht," 130–31) to suggest that the material here was transmitted in the early church in connection with its challenge to church leaders: sustained by the Lord in the midst of trials, they are to lend strength to their fellow Christians.

In connection with the historical Jesus, some have had difficulty with Jesus' confidence here in the power of his prayer, but this seems to me to involve unwarranted caution, given Jesus' confidence of his authority in other respects. Others have difficulty with any kind of prophetic precision, but there is little precision here: one might even suspect that the disciples were much less caught up in the crisis that involved Jesus' death than he here anticipates. Yet others insist on reserving Petrine priority for the post-Easter situation. This is perhaps a more significant cause for reservation, but the Petrine post-resurrection priority is finally best understood as

built upon an existing pre-resurrection prominence in the disciple band. Admittedly the textual base for having the historical Jesus reinforce this prominence is very limited, but we might not reasonably have expected more, since only the horizon of Jesus' departure brings to the fore the issue of leadership in the disciple band.

The shared motif of Luke 22:31–32 and Matt 16:18–19, of some kind of primacy for Peter (Refoulé [*RS*<sup>136</sup>*R* 38 (1964) 22] and others exaggerate the degree of structural parallelism), provides no adequate basis for making a source link between these materials or claiming that they necessarily belong together historically (against Cullmann, "L'Apôtre Pierre"; etc; but there is much to be said for Cullmann's desire to relocate the material of Matt 16:18–19 to the end of the ministry of Jesus). The passion setting provided by Luke for the tradition is apt, given what appears to be the background assumption that Jesus will no longer be present with the disciples. The passion setting also fits well the sense of impending crisis conveyed by the imagery of sifting.

The materials in Luke 22:33–34 are mostly taken to be a rewriting of Mark 14:29–31. There are, however, just enough coincidences with John 13:37–38 to raise the question of a second source here as well (apart from the content links, there is also the agreement in locating the material at the meal rather than on the Mount of Olives). This material cannot have been transmitted apart from a knowledge of the denial story, but that is not quite the same thing as insisting that it needs to have been linked to it in a connected narrative. (The denial story, however, would be quite a different account without the cockcrow, which in turn probably requires that an account of Jesus' prediction was linked with it from the beginning. (See further at 22:54b–62.) A version of Peter's protestation and Jesus' prediction could have been transmitted independently in the early church in connection with its usefulness as a "cautionary tale."

### **Comment**

Jesus warns of an imminent time of Satanic sifting. Through his prayer for Peter, and through the strengthening role for which it prepares him, the disciple band will, however, make their way beyond the damaging reversals of that period and on into a new place of stability. Nevertheless, despite all his protestations of loyalty to death, even Peter stands on the threshold of shameful acts of denial.

**31** None of the language here is notably Lukan. "Simon" is likely to be traditional, since its presence breaks Luke's pattern of using "Simon" before the calling in 6:14 and "Peter" after (the pattern is also broken at 24:34). In the whole Gospel Jesus addresses Simon Peter by name only here (as Simon [repeated]) and in v 34 (as Peter). For the passion period as a time of particular Satanic attack, cf. at v 3. While Simon is addressed, it is clear that Satan has the whole band of disciples in view. "Asked for you all" makes best sense in connection with the kind of image of Satan that is found in Job 1–2: Satan needs God's permission to bring the kind of difficulties upon people that, he (Satan) hopes, will reveal their lack of integrity in their devotion to God. As in Job, God is understood to have given his permission for the trial. The imagery of sieving is used of this trial: the Satanic attack will sort between the wheat and the rubbish (since a double

---

<sup>136</sup>*RSR Recherches de science religieuse*

sieving process was used, it is uncertain whether the grain should be pictured as retained by the sieve or as let through). The sifting image may be dependent upon Amos 9:9.

**32** Unlike v 31, the language here is quite Lukan (cf. Schürmann, *Quellenkritische Untersuchung*, 3:105–12). Over against Satan’s malevolent purpose is set the intervention of Jesus. Jesus addresses himself in two stages to the testing situation to confront all: prayer for Peter, and a directive for Peter to give aid in turn to the others (note the correlation of ἐγὼ δέ, “I,” and καὶ σὺ, “you, for your part”). The content of Jesus’ prayer is that Peter’s faith should not be drained away to nothing by the Satanic onslaught (the verb ἐκλείπειν, “to give out/fail,” is used of the running out of money in 16:9). The spelling out here is likely to be a Lukan development (the difficulty that Schürmann [*Quellenkritische Untersuchung*, 3:106] and Jeremias [*Sprache*, 58] have with Luke using a non-final ἵνα is unreasonable in light of 21:36 [with the same verb]). The survival of Peter’s faith can be contrasted with the unhappy outcome of a time of trial, which is envisaged in 8:13. Presumably, in Luke’s understanding, preservation of a residual faith makes possible Peter’s return after his denial of Jesus (the presence of ΠΟΤΕ, “at some time or other,” makes it unlikely that ἐπιστρέψας should be taken either as a Semitism to be translated “again” [so: “strengthen your brothers again” (cf. 3 Kgdms 19:6; Neh 9:28; etc)] or as a transitive use of the verb [so: “convert and strengthen your brothers”]). We are not to understand that the others have suffered a total failure of faith but only that they are likely not to have fared as well as Peter and that they need help and encouragement after the trauma. “Strengthen your brothers” uses language that has its natural home in the account Luke gives in Acts of the life of the early church (for “brothers,” cf. Acts 1:15; 9:30; 15:23; etc for “strengthen,” cf. 18:23 [but also Luke 9:51; 16:26 for this verb]). Luke probably has no very precise idea about how Peter actually fulfilled this role, beyond its general accord with his sense of the central place of Peter in the disciple band.

**33** The language here is certainly not borrowed from Mark (cf. Mark 14:29, 31), but neither is it strikingly Lukan; Lukan language is likely for “Lord” (cf. at 5:12) and possible for “to go to prison and to death” (cf. Schürmann, *Quellenkritische Untersuchung*, 3:31). There is probably a deliberate echo in Acts 21:13, which suggests that though Peter’s protestation proves false in the immediate context, Luke considered it valid in connection with the post-Easter Peter. Peter is imprisoned in Acts 5:18; 12:3. His death is not reported. For the sentiment here, cf. Mark 10:38–39; and esp. John 13:37. In the present Lukan sequence, v 33 is motivated either by the announcement of Jesus’ prayer or by the clear implication that Peter will fail (and thus need to turn back). This is slightly artificial. In earlier independent transmission of the pericope, the motivation would be the more general sense of threat that characterized the passion period.

**34** The language here is much closer to Mark 14:30, and some influence from the Markan source is likely. But the absence of “this very night” and of “twice” and the move from an infinitive construction to the use of a future negative construction for “crow,” followed by ἕως, “until,” provide suggestive links with John 13:38. Luke will have contributed the vocative “Peter” (to balance the use of Simon in v 31; cf. Claudel, *Pierre*, 423 and n<sup>137</sup>. 203) and the final εἰδέναι, “to know” (probably to weaken the correspondence with Luke 12:9 [cf. the Lukan addition in v 32 about Peter’s faith not giving out]). According to *m. Bab. Qam.* 7:7, it was forbidden to raise chickens in Jerusalem because of the holy things, but this is likely to be later idealization.

---

<sup>137</sup>n. note

Though the first light normally sets the cocks crowing, one might have heard the first cock crow at any time from 2:30 AM onward.

### ***Explanation***

Despite the promise of future exaltation, a difficult time of Satanic sifting stands before the Apostolic band. Jesus makes provision for this through his prayer for Peter, and through the strengthening role that he prescribes for Peter. In this way, the disciple band will successfully make their way beyond the damaging reversals of that period and on into a new place of stability. Nevertheless, despite his protestations of being ready for anything, even Peter stands on the threshold of shameful acts of denial.

Satan's asking for the Apostles is rather like what happens with Job in Job 1–2. Satan hopes to bring them to destruction by showing their lack of integrity in their devotion to God. The trial by ordeal that he plans is pictured with the imagery of a sieve, probably one that holds back the rubbish and lets through the wheat.

As in Job, Satan is allowed to have his way within the constraints that God imposes. Jesus strengthens Peter's hand in the situation by praying for him and gives him in turn the task of strengthening the others. Peter is not kept from stumbling by Jesus' prayer, but he is kept from having his faith quite disappear. Peter is able, therefore, to bounce back from his failure. Though Luke does not provide material on how the other Apostles fared, we are probably to understand that they fared no better than Peter, and perhaps worse. Nevertheless, Satan's intentions for them too are thwarted: after Peter had bounced back from his own failure, he was able to help the others.

No doubt Luke believed that there were patterns here with a relevance for Christians in the early church when they were coping with their own periods of intense trial. He uses for Peter's task language that he will later use in Acts in connection with life in the early church.

Peter reacts by protesting his loyalty unto death. In the longer term, this will be true of Peter, but for now the words prove empty. Before the dawn has come, Peter will have insisted, in a threefold denial, that he does not so much as know Jesus. The shock of the coming denial is somewhat softened for us by Jesus' prediction. There is a cautionary tale here for others as well.<sup>138</sup>

**22:28 You are those who have stood by me in my trials.** It is false to think that the time of Jesus between Luke 4:13 and 22:3 was completely free from Satanic temptation (see comments on 4:13). The disciples had continued (a perfect participle in Greek) with Jesus during his times

---

<sup>138</sup> John Nolland, [Luke 18:35–24:53](#), vol. 35C, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1993), 1065–1074.

of trial. This can only mean that throughout Jesus' past trials (not just the recent ones in Jerusalem) they were with him. Yet they only joined him after the temptation (cf. 5:1f.). Thus, whereas Jesus may in his ministry have been spared from a direct frontal attack of Satan such as 4:1–13, this does not mean that Satan was not active in seeking to undermine and thwart his ministry. During all this time, the disciples were with him. (Compare Acts 1:21–22, where the only requirement listed for being the twelfth apostle was to “have been with us the whole time.”) Although the disciples would themselves face trials in the future (Luke 12:4–12; 22:36; Acts 20:19), the trials in this verse look backward, not forward, and are associated with Jesus, not them.

**22:29 And I confer on you a kingdom, just as my Father conferred one on me.** For the description of Jesus as King, cf. Luke 1:32–33; 2:4, 11; 19:11–40 (esp. 19:12, 15); 23:42. For the parallel between the relationship of the disciples to Jesus and Jesus to the Father, cf. John 15:9; 20:21 (cf. also Luke 9:48; 10:16). The term “confer” (*diatithemai*) can also mean *make a covenant with* and thus brings to mind the new “covenant” (*diathēkē*) of 22:20. The covenant established with the apostles in 22:20 ultimately involves the promise of sharing in the future consummation of the kingdom when the Son of Man returns to reign. Whereas in 12:32 the Father confers the kingdom, here Jesus himself does this.

**22:30 So that you might eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.** The difference in wording between this and the parallel in Matt 19:28 reveals that Luke was consciously tying this saying to Luke 22:16, 18, where Jesus spoke of his not eating or drinking with the apostles again until he does so with them in God's kingdom. Compare also 13:29; 14:15. Note “my table” and “my kingdom.”

**And sit on thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.** Compare Matt 19:28, where Matthew mentioned sitting on the “twelve” thrones and judging the twelve tribes. Luke may have omitted the reference to the twelve thrones because due to Judas's betrayal (Luke 22:3–6, 21–23) there were only eleven apostles at the time. This would be remedied in Acts 1:15–26. Exactly what was meant by this verse is debated. Does this refer to a future restoration and rule over Israel (cf. Luke 13:35; 21:24);<sup>41393</sup> the future judgment of the literal Israel, which rejected Jesus (cf. 11:31–32); a glorious reward in heaven; or the disciples' future rule over the church as seen in Acts? In light of the future dimension of the parallel sayings in 22:16, 18, it is best to understand this promise as referring to that time when the believer will share in the benefits of Jesus' kingly rule (cf. 22:29–30a). Like the first promise in 22:30a, this one is best understood metaphorically as referring to participating in the consummated kingdom where believers experience the blessings of their Lord's reign. Although there is a sense in which Jesus already at his resurrection reigned as King (22:69; Acts 2:33; 5:31), the kingly rule referred to here will take place in the consummation at the redemption brought by the Son of Man (21:28). Matthew understood it in this manner, for he spoke of this taking place “at the renewal of all things” (Matt 19:28). Compare 1 Cor 6:2–3; 2 Tim 2:12; Rev 2:26–29; 3:21.

## The Lukan Message

---

<sup>13943</sup> See J. B. Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer, 1988).

Luke reminded his readers, and especially the leaders among them, that greatness in God's kingdom is contrary to the world's values, for it involves serving rather than being served. If there were "deacons" among Luke's readers, they might have been reminded that their "office" was one of service (cf. Acts 6:1–6). The rich were reminded that they should serve the poor (cf. Acts 4:34–37). Luke, like Jesus, was well aware that even within the fellowship of the believing community a this-world attitude toward power and greatness could still be present.<sup>41404</sup> Greatness, however, means service; it means to live as if one were the youngest or least. Such faithfulness, however, will not go unrewarded. Jesus in his reign (Luke 22:29) promises his followers that they will share in the benefits of that rule. The degree to which the language of 22:30 is metaphorical is uncertain, but the reality to which it refers is concrete. What awaits Jesus will be shared with his followers. Luke's readers are encouraged to seek a role of servanthood because Jesus has promised that such faithfulness, endurance (8:15; 21:19), and following (9:23–24) will result in "treasure in heaven (18:22, 30; 19:17–19). Such people will "dine" with Jesus in God's kingdom (13:28–30; 14:14; 22:16, 18, 30).

Associated with the pericope's teaching concerning true greatness are several important Christological assertions concerning Jesus' kingship and unique relationship to God. He who announced the coming of God's kingdom is its King and will in the consummation reign as king (22:29; cf. 19:12, 15, 27; 23:42). Already at his entry into Jerusalem, Luke has shown that Jesus entered as the awaited King (19:28–40; cf. Mark 11:9–11; Matt 21:4–9). Luke added a comment about Jesus' kingship in 23:2 and included traditional material in 23:3, 37–38, 42–43. This kingship will also be witnessed to indirectly in Acts 17:7. Luke wanted Theophilus and his other readers to remember that the Jesus in whom they believe is Lord and that the consummation of history brings with it the reign of their Lord as King.

### **(6) Peter's Denial Foretold (22:31–34)**

<sup>31</sup> "Simon, Simon, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat. <sup>32</sup> But I have prayed for you, Simon, that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers."

<sup>33</sup> But he replied, "Lord, I am ready to go with you to prison and to death."

<sup>34</sup> Jesus answered, "I tell you, Peter, before the rooster crows today, you will deny three times that you know me."

### **Context**

The third part of Jesus' farewell discourse<sup>41415</sup> begins with his statement that Satan, whose activity has intensified since 22:3, had sought to separate the disciples (the "you" in 22:31 is

---

<sup>14044</sup> Cf. L. Sabourin, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (Bombay: St. Paul Society, 1984), 363: "That the warning against seeking honours finds such varied expression in the gospels and elsewhere in the NT, shows it was needed already in the early Church."

<sup>14145</sup> The material is a mixture of Lukan (L) material (22:31–32) and traditional material found in the other Gospels (cf. Mark 14:29–30; Matt 26:33–34; John 13:37–38). The much debated relationship of Luke's account to these other accounts is unresolved. Luke may have been influenced not only by the Markan account (see Introduction 5) but also by other forms of the tradition, both oral and written, such as witnessed to in John 13:37–38.

plural) from Jesus. He would not be successful, however, for Jesus had prayed on their behalf. As a result, although Peter (and the other disciples also) would fall, he would return and find restoration. Jesus then commanded Peter to strengthen the church after his restoration. Peter protested that he was prepared to suffer imprisonment and even death for Jesus, but he was told that before the cock crowed he would in fact deny three times that he knew Jesus.

## Comments

**22:31 Simon, Simon.** See comments on 10:41. The use of Peter's "pre-Christian" name (see comments on 6:14) instead of "Peter," the name he was called as one of the great leaders of the church, is probably intentional. Peter shortly would revert back to an earlier life-style and behavior, predating his following Jesus (6:13–14).

**[Behold.]** The NIV leaves this Greek term (*idou*) untranslated and loses the dramatic intensification placed upon the following words.

**Satan has asked to sift you as wheat.** The meaning of this verse is uncertain. Its interpretation is further complicated by the fact that the word translated "asked" (NIV) or "demanded" (RSV) is found nowhere else in the NT or LXX. The nearest analogy is found in Job 1–2, where Satan is permitted to test Job. This and the vocabulary in Amos 9:9 suggests the following interpretation: "Satan is seeking [a dramatic aorist] to shake you disciples violently as one sifts wheat and to cause you to fall." The metaphor of sifting wheat should not be pressed in order to determine what is "wheat" and what is "chaff," for this contrast is not mentioned. The use of this metaphor is simply intended to indicate the coming time of testing (cf. Luke 3:17; Amos 9:9). One should not interpret this as God's granting a request by Satan for permission to test the disciples as in Job 1–2. The saying speaks primarily of Satan's trying to unsettle the disciples and cause them to become unfaithful. Although Luke tended to avoid emphasizing the disciples' failures (note his omission of Mark 8:32–33; 14:27–28, 50), he was aware of their faults and was not averse to mentioning them. The "you" here (*hymas*) is plural and refers to Peter and the other disciples (not Peter and Judas). By mentioning the role of Satan in Peter's denial, Luke may have been seeking to increase his readers' empathy toward the apostle.

**22:32 I have prayed.** The "I" is emphatic. Jesus' prayer would prove greater than Satan's attempt to undo his disciples' allegiance. Jesus prayed as their advocate against Satan ("the accuser"). Compare John 17:6–26; 10:27–29. For the importance of prayer and Jesus' practice of prayer, see Introduction 8 (7). Compare 1 John 2:1, where the risen Christ continues to intercede before the Father for his followers.

**For you, Simon.** The "you" (*sou*) here is singular, and Jesus' attention turned from the disciples in general to Peter in particular.

**That your faith may not fail.** The "that" (*hina*) reveals the purpose of Jesus' prayer as well as its content. "Faith" here refers not to correct doctrinal belief but to "faithfulness." Jesus prayed that Peter (and the other apostles) would not lose their faithfulness, i.e., their loyalty to him (cf. Luke 18:8; Acts 14:22) during this sifting period. Jesus, as well as Luke's readers, knew that Peter would deny the Lord (Luke 22:34, 54–62). Thus the content of this prayer should not be understood as a prayer that Peter would not deny Jesus. If this were so, then Jesus' prayer failed completely. Rather the prayer was that Peter would not disavow his allegiance and loyalty to



Jesus. This Peter did not do; and the reader, who is aware of Peter's leadership role in the early church, knows that Jesus' prayer for Peter was answered.

**When you have turned back.** The "you" is emphatic. The issue was not whether Peter would repent but what he would do after he repented. Jesus foreknew that Peter's faith would not fail but that after his denial he would repent because he prayed for him. Although the verb (*epistrephas*) can mean "having physically returned" (back to Jerusalem), it must be understood here as referring to Peter's repenting.<sup>41426</sup> Note how it is used together with "repent" (*metanoein*) in Acts 3:19; 26:20. Although *turn back* is not used in the parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11–32), what *turning back* means is described metaphorically in the action of the prodigal son (re)turning back to his father. Peter's true faith and perseverance would be revealed in his repentance, not in his sinlessness.

**Strengthen your brothers.** In the NT this verb frequently describes the process of helping someone grow in the Christian faith.<sup>41437</sup> How Peter fulfilled this is seen in Acts by his leadership in completing the number of the disciples to twelve (1:15–26), his preaching at Pentecost (2:14–40), his early preaching and leadership in Jerusalem (chaps. 3–5), and his role in the expansion of the church to Samaria (8:14–25) and to the Gentiles (chaps. 10–11; 15:7–11). "Brothers" therefore refers to more than just the other apostles and is essentially a synonym for "believers" (cf. Acts 1:15; 15:23). For the Johannine parallel to this, cf. John 21:15–19.

**22:33 Lord, I am ready.** Compare John 13:37. For the fulfillment of the first part of Peter's confession, cf. Acts 5:17–42; 12:1–11. The fulfillment of the latter part of his confession is not recorded in Acts but was no doubt known both to Luke and his readers. Note the parallels in Acts 21:13; 23:29.

**22:34 You will deny ... that you know me.** The Lukan account differs here slightly from Mark 14:30 and Matt 26:34. In Mark and Matthew, Peter would "disown" Jesus, whereas in Luke he would "deny knowing" Jesus. Luke may have been seeking to avoid a misconception that Peter by his denial disowned Jesus in the sense of Luke 12:9 (cf. 9:26). The fulfillment of Jesus' prophecy will be recounted in 22:54–62.

## The Lukan Message

A familiar Lukan emphasis is seen most clearly in 22:32. The importance of prayer in the life of Jesus and in the early church has been referred to on several occasions. See Introduction 8 (7). Luke in this account revealed to his readers that prayer was the means by which Peter and the disciples were kept from falling away from the faith. Because Jesus prayed, Peter's failure did not result in apostasy. Luke by this incident also foreshadowed the future role of the great apostle, which was well-known to his readers. He revealed how Peter, despite his denial (22:34c), was able to be restored (22:32b) and how he was commissioned by Jesus for the leadership role he played in the early church. Whether Luke's readers were troubled with this issue is impossible to know. What is clear is that by this account Luke helped them understand how, despite his denial, Peter was able to play such an important role in the early church. Apart

---

<sup>14246</sup> The term "turn back" is also used in this sense of "repent" in Luke 17:4; Acts 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18, 20.

<sup>14347</sup> Cf. Rom 1:11; 16:25; 1 Thess 3:2, 13; 2 Thess 2:17; 2 Pet 1:12; cf. Acts 18:23.

from Jesus' prayer, however, this would not have been possible. Thus Luke's readers needed to continue in prayer (18:1; 22:40, 46).

Another theme involves Jesus' foreknowledge. Once again Luke wanted his reader to see Jesus as one who knows the future. He knew the future exactly, for he knew that Peter would deny him three times before the cock crowed. Like the prophets of old, Jesus knew what would take place, but unlike the OT prophets who received their knowledge from God, nothing is said of the Father's revealing this to Jesus. He knew because of who he is. Luke did not develop the Christological implications of this, but just as he could speak of the future messianic banquet as Jesus' table and of God's kingdom as his kingdom (22:30), so he could speak of Jesus himself knowing the future.<sup>144</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup> Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, vol. 24, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992), 549–554.