

SOUTHWESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY

PUBLIC MINISTRY NARRATIVES IN LUKE

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

LUKE 4:1-13

SUBMITTED TO DR. LORIN CRANFORD

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SEMINAR

NEW TESTAMENT CRITICAL METHODOLOGY

NEW TESTAMENT 651-771

BY

MARK E. TAYLOR

JANUARY 27, 1997

INTRODUCTION

All the Synoptics record the temptation of Jesus in the wilderness following his baptism as a prelude to his public ministry. Mark's account is brief and omits the dialogue between Jesus and the devil and other details. Matthew and Luke, while containing some differences, are for the most part parallel.

A detailed analysis of the synoptic accounts raises numerous exegetical and theological issues. The initial question concerns genre. What form classification best describes the temptation pericope? Another important issue is historicity. Is the temptation narrative a real event in the life of Jesus? If real, did the event occur in the literal manner stated in the text, or is this a real experience expressed in symbolic terms? Other questions reflect source, redaction, literary, sociological, and theological concerns. Is Mark a summary of Matthew and Luke or did Matthew and Luke expand upon Mark with a common source (Q)? How does one account for the significant differences between Matthew and Luke, especially with regard to the order of the temptations? Does the difference in order reflect theological or literary motivations? Does the preservation of this story reflect a *Sitz im Leben Jesu* or a *Sitz im Leben Kirche*?

The difficulty of interpretation is compounded when one attempts to discern the main thrust of the temptation narrative.¹ Is Jesus tempted as Son of God, Messiah, or both? What is the exact nature of the temptation? In light of the quotations from Deuteronomy is Jesus tempted as the new Israel, or is there also a new Adam motif present, especially in light of Luke's

¹John Nolland, Luke 1:1-9:20. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 35a (Dallas, TX: Word, 1989), 178.

genealogy tracing Jesus to Adam immediately preceding the temptation story? To what extent are the temptations of Jesus unique and to what extent are they exemplary? Such questions reveal the numerous exegetical and theological issues involved in interpretation.

This paper is restricted to the temptation account recorded by Luke. The focus is two-fold. First, a consideration of the *Kleingattung* of the temptation narrative will explore important background issues and will seek to establish the sub-genre of this pericope utilizing insights from form criticism. Other background issues are equally important such as historical, redactional, and source concerns. Second, a detailed exegesis of Luke 4:1-13 will consider the content of the temptation narrative. This section on exegesis will conclude with theological and homiletical reflections. An attempt will be made throughout the paper to apply the relevant New Testament critical methodologies.

CHAPTER ONE

BACKGROUND ISSUES

The most important background issues include matters of form, historicity, sources, and redaction (Synoptic relationships). A brief survey of the tenets of form criticism and the major developers of this methodology will prove helpful. In addition various appraisals of historicity will further amplify form considerations. Some initial attention to source criticism and redaction criticism is also a necessary prelude to exegesis. The most important redactional issue is the order of the temptations. Other minor redactional issues can be addressed in chapter two.

Form Criticism

A consideration of the *Kleinegattung* of the Temptation relies upon the investigations and results of form criticism. Form criticism “seeks to describe the characteristics of existing forms in the New Testament and then attempts to investigate how those forms emerged in the history of the oral transmission of the church.”¹ The fundamental presupposition of form criticism is that the fixed literary form of stories about Jesus was preceded by a long period of oral transmission. In addition, form criticism assumes that the Gospel writers were “collectors” of tradition more than they were “authors.” In this sense, the fixed form is more of a community product and reflects a *Sitz im Leben* in the life of the early Christian community. This contribution to the life

¹Darrell Bock, “Form Criticism,” in New Testament Criticism and Interpretation, ed. David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1991): 176.

of the community is what gave “form” its value, whether it contributed to exhortation, defense of the gospel, instruction in baptism, or other community concerns.²

In his essay on form criticism Darrell Bock mentions six key axioms of the discipline:

(1) The Gospels are “popular” or “folk” literature. (2) Individual units of gospel tradition circulated in a long period of oral transmission. (3) Individual units were used as the occasion required, that is, the *Sitz im Leben* of the community. (4) As the materials were used in the same types of settings, they took up a particular form. (5) Form criticism assumes Markan priority. (6) Other criteria are utilized for secondary elements: dissimilarity, multiple attestation, and coherence.³ Key figures in the history of gospel form criticism include Martin Dibelius, Rudolf Bultmann, and Vincent Taylor. A survey of their contributions will establish various judgments regarding the form of the temptation narrative.

Martin Dibelius

Herman Gunkel’s form-critical analysis of the Old Testament⁴ paved the way for similar studies in the New Testament. The scholar who first applied *Formgeschichte* to the Synoptics in a comprehensive fashion was Martin Dibelius. In his book From Tradition to Gospel, Dibelius isolated several categories or “forms” to be applied to the Synoptic gospels: paradigms, tales, legends, and myths.

²Ibid., 176-78.

³Ibid., 178-79.

⁴Herman Gunkel, Genesis (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1901).

According to Dibelius paradigms have five primary characteristics. First, “Either in a word or deed of Jesus the action reaches a high point which is never again surpassed.”⁵ Dibelius called this an “external rounding off.”⁶ Second, paradigms are marked by brevity and simplicity. Third, paradigms are colored in a thoroughly religious manner.⁷ Fourth, paradigms usually reach their high point or conclude with a word of Jesus. Fifth, the narrative of this category should end in a thought useful for preaching purposes.⁸

Tales, on the other hand, are differentiated from paradigms by the introduction of a miraculous element. According to Dibelius these miracle stories were developed by story-tellers for purposes different from that of preaching.⁹ Tales are individual stories, complete in themselves. They lack devotional motives and rarely include the words of Jesus. In addition there is no practical use for preaching, and the absence of didactic motives is characteristic of this form.¹⁰

Legends, Dibelius’ third category, is a religious story. In particular it is “a religious narrative of a saintly man in whose works and fate interest is taken.”¹¹ Dibelius placed the

⁵Martin Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram L. Woolf (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1934), 44.

⁶Ibid.

⁷Examples: “He preached the word to them” (Mk. 2:2) or “being grieved at the hardening of their heart” (Mk. 3:5).

⁸Ibid., 48-58.

⁹Ibid., 70.

¹⁰Ibid., 72-80.

¹¹Ibid., 104.

Passion Narrative in this category. Unlike other forms, Dibelius believed that the Passion Narrative attained a relatively fixed form early for preaching purposes due to its relatively fixed form in the Synoptics and the unique agreement in the Gospel of John.¹²

Finally, Dibelius specified a category he called Myth. He states, “Myths can only be understood to mean stories which in some fashion tell of many-sided doings of the gods.”¹³ A primary characteristic of a “myth” is interaction between heaven and earth. Dibelius placed three gospel narratives in this final category: Jesus’ Baptism, Temptation, and Transfiguration.¹⁴

Concerning the Temptation, Dibelius states:

But a conversation between the devil and Jesus was handed down in the source Q, and that Marcan note which mentions the Temptation gave the occasion to Matthew 4:1-11, and to Luke 4:1-13, to narrate the dialogue here. Thus the framework of the conversation became mythological; the very homage of the angels (Mt. 4:11) makes this impression. The conversation itself, however, is concerned with the question of Messiahship. Its first point is to confirm the fact and the reason why Jesus had not done certain miracles; no miracle of self-help, no miracle of display like casting Himself down from the Temple. It is intended in the same way to demonstrate that He had done nothing to obtain power by human means. The conversation teaches that all this is of the devil and thereby it gives Christian exhortation.”¹⁵

¹²Ibid., 105, 23.

¹³Ibid., 266. Bock notes that the English term “myth” has a very negative connotation which does not adequately represent this category. To be sure, many form critics consider these accounts to be embellishments beyond the actual historical events. Concerning the term “myth” Bock states, “It is really a way of saying that God or Satan deals directly with Jesus in these accounts and that these encounters, in turn, point to the mystery of His person.” Bock, “Form Criticism,” 186.

¹⁴Ibid., 277.

¹⁵Ibid., 274-75.

These comments reflect not only a description of Dibelius' category of "myth" but the some of the presuppositions of form criticism as well, namely the *Sitz im Leben* of the early Christian community.

Rudolf Bultmann

Rudolf Bultmann basically followed the same form categories as Dibelius with minor deviations. In his classic work on form criticism, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, Bultmann divided form-critical categories into two major divisions: Tradition of the Sayings of Jesus and Tradition of the Narrative Material. The sayings of Jesus are then divided into two categories: Apophthegms¹⁶ and Dominical Sayings. Likewise, the tradition of the narrative material includes Miracle Stories and Historical Stories and Legends. Bultmann did not include the category of Myth specified by Dibelius.¹⁷

The final category, Historical Stories and Legends, deserves further comment, for this is where Bultmann placed the Temptation.¹⁸ Legends for Bultmann are those parts of the tradition which are not miracle stories but are religious and edifying instead of being historical in character.¹⁹ Historical Stories have elements of history upon which they are based but cannot be separated from Legends because "the historical stories are so much dominated by the legends that

¹⁶This category corresponds to paradigms.

¹⁷Rudolf Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, 2nd ed., translated by John Marsh (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968).

¹⁸Ibid., 254-57.

¹⁹Ibid., 244.

they can only be treated along with them.”²⁰ Concerning the Temptation, Bultmann writes, “It is clear that here we have the rudiments of an originally detailed legend.”²¹

In addition Bultmann argued that the temptation account represents scribal Haggada, a form of Rabbinic disputation. Evidence for this is to be found in the three-fold quotation of Scripture in the dialogue between Jesus and the devil.²² The *Sitz im Leben* which gave rise to this “form” reflects the issue of miracles and obedience to the will of God for Jesus and the Church. For Bultmann the temptation of Jesus shows “how obedient submission to the will of God characterizes Church and Messiah alike - particularly in regard to the problem of miracle.”²³

Others have followed and elaborated upon Bultmann’s appeal to Rabbinic disputation as the *Gattung* to which the temptation narrative belongs. In his detailed study of the temptation, The Testing of God’s Son, Birger Gerhardsson assigns the narrative to the category of “haggadic midrash” which bears the stamp of late-Jewish and early Christian scribal tradition. Specifically, Gerhardsson regards the temptation narrative as “an example of an early Christian midrash.”²⁴ As such, “the temptation narrative reveals much about the didactic activity of the early church; it is an unusually clear example of the work of a qualified scribal expositor.”²⁵ Although haggadic

²⁰Ibid., 245.

²¹Ibid., 253.

²²Ibid., 254.

²³Ibid., 256.

²⁴Birger Gerhardsson, The Testing of God’s Son (Matthew 4:1-11 & Par.): An Analysis of An Early Christian Midrash. Translated by John Toy. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1966), 11.

²⁵Ibid., 13.

midrashes are of different types, some general characteristics may be outlined. First, they are “torah-centric,” acknowledging the Torah as the authoritative teaching given by God, a teaching which has the character of tradition. Second, midrash is composed from the already-existing authoritative tradition. The text is not merely explained. Rather, its meaning may be extended. Third, when the expositor is a scribe, other Bible passages are incorporated. However, the whole complex of the authoritative exegetical tradition may be included in the midrash.²⁶ One can readily see the attractiveness of applying this category to the temptation narrative from only a cursory reading.

The analysis of Martin Albertz reflects a similar position. The temptation narrative is a *Streitgespräch*, a disputation speech between Jesus and the Devil.²⁷ Heinz Schürmann, however, disagrees with Albertz: “Der dreifache Versuchungsgang hat nicht einmal de Form Streitgespräches, etwa der schriftgelehrten Haggada.”²⁸ The devil only quotes Scripture once and Jesus never really disputes with the Devil.

Vincent Taylor

Vincent Taylor represents a more conservative approach to form criticism than Bultmann and Dibelius. His form-critical categories include Pronouncement Stories, Sayings and Parables,

²⁶Ibid., 13-15.

²⁷Martin Albertz, Die Synoptischen Streitgespräch (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921), 41-48.

²⁸Heinz Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium: Kommentar zu Kap. 1, 1-9,50, Vierte Auflage. Herders theologischen Kommentar zum Neuen Testament (Freiburg: Herder, 1990), 209.

Miracle Stories, and Stories About Jesus.²⁹ For Taylor “Stories about Jesus”³⁰ represented a better classification than “myth” or “legend” because of the negative overtones for the English speaking world.³¹ The term “legend” prejudices the historical value of the narrative. In addition Taylor argued that this genre has no structural form and therefore is impossible to classify them on formal principles. Each story must be examined on its own merits. According to Taylor there are fifty such “stories” in all the Gospels combined outside of the accounts of the birth, death, and resurrection of Jesus.³² Taylor classified the Temptation as a “Story about Jesus.”³³

Taylor subdivided “Stories about Jesus” into three smaller categories for descriptive purposes. First, there are stories which are literary compositions put together by the Evangelists from fragments of existing tradition. The Baptism and Temptation are assigned to this subdivision. Taylor states, “In the Baptism Jesus experienced a vision which led to the Temptation.”³⁴ Second, there are stories of a popular nature which are reproduced very much as they are received. Third, there are stories which came the Evangelists along personal lines. Peter’s Confession and the Transfiguration are examples of “personal” stories.³⁵

²⁹Vincent Taylor, The Formation of the Gospel Tradition, 4th ed. (London: MacMillan & Co., 1957).

³⁰Taylor uses the phrase “Narrative-Tradition” interchangeably with “Stories about Jesus.”

³¹Ibid., 10.

³²Ibid., 142-43.

³³Ibid., 78.

³⁴Ibid., 147.

³⁵Ibid., 148-50.

Taylor regarded the Gospel of Luke as a better illustration of the narrative tradition of an early Palestinian community than Mark due to Mark's association with an eyewitness, Peter. Three characteristics stand out in Luke. First, there is a tendency for details to pass over from one story to another. Second, Lukan stories are typically representative. Third, there is a symbolic aspect of the Lukan tradition. They suggest ideas precious to the community and to Luke himself.³⁶

Conclusion

One can see from this brief survey that form-critical analysis has resulted in divergent opinions regarding the *Kleinegattung* of the temptation narrative. Form critics have utilized terms such as "myth," "legend," and a "story about Jesus" to designate the sub-genre to which the pericope belongs. An awareness of the presuppositions of form criticism is important at this point, and it appears that Taylor's analysis is particularly important at the point of historical value judgments. One's view of historicity certainly affects exegesis as well as the form-critical presupposition of community emphasis. Historical judgments and other critical methodologies must be taken into consideration as a prelude to exegesis.

Historicity

Scholars assign various degrees of historicity to the temptation narrative. The preceding survey of form-critical categories proposed by Dibelius and Bultmann indicates little if any historical value given to the narrative and credits the creation of the account to the early church.

³⁶Ibid., 153-57.

Different views emerge, however, even among those who prefer a tighter connection between narrative-form and history.

I. Howard Marshall states that “it is one thing to show how a narrative was used in the early church, and quite another thing to claim that because it was used for a particular purpose in the church, it must have been created by the church without any historical basis.”³⁷ Marshall, however, prefers to view the temptation narrative as “an inward experience of temptation expressed in dramatic form.”³⁸ This does not diminish the temptation narrative as an actual event in the life of Jesus or the fact that the origin of the narrative derives from Jesus. Rather, the temptations described in Luke reflect similar temptations on numerous occasions to “prove the reality of his calling by signs and to adjust his ideas of his calling to those of his contemporaries.”³⁹ Marshall further states, “It is by no means impossible that he communicated something of his inner experience to his disciples, and indeed highly likely that he did so.”⁴⁰

Joseph Fitzmyer agrees with Marshall in that the opposing forces which confronted Jesus throughout his ministry constitute the real historical basis of the temptation narrative. Historicity is impossible to establish due to lack of a basis for historical judgments or controls. The primary value of the temptations must be viewed in terms of symbolic value.⁴¹ According to Fitzmyer,

³⁷I. Howard Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, The New International Greek Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 168.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Joseph Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke I-IX, Anchor Bible (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 509.

interpretation must avoid a “naive literalism” because “in the long run, their theological import is of greater importance than any salvaging of their historicity.”⁴² To understand the temptation scenes in this manner traces the source back to Jesus (instead of the early church) yet means that they did not take place in a real external confrontation between Jesus and Satan.⁴³

Darrell Bock prefers a view that does not divorce symbolism from history so much. He asserts that separation of symbol and history reflects a world-view judgment. While acknowledging that some of these temptations may have been inward and supernatural in character (Lk 4:8), Bock asserts that “to religiously sensitive eyes, history is full of symbolic import.”⁴⁴

It becomes immediately obvious that judgments regarding historicity vary among commentators yet there is a common point of departure from earlier form criticism in that there is openness to tracing the temptation narrative to Jesus as opposed to the early church. This distinction is important for exegesis in terms of the function of the pericope. Is the temptation narrative a projection of the experience of the early church back onto Jesus for the purposes of exhortation and encouragement? Or is the temptation narrative conveying important theological truths concerning the person of Christ as the obedient Son or his Messianic mission? Can both be argued legitimately from the text? Further analysis of the text is necessary before seeking definite answers to these questions.

⁴²Ibid., 510.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Darrell Bock, Luke 1:1-9:50, 2 vols. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Moises Silva (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994), 364.

Sources

There is good reason for assuming that the ultimate source of the Temptation goes back to Jesus himself. But what about written sources available to the gospel writers? To what extent did Matthew and Luke depend upon Mark? To what extent is there dependence upon Q? Such questions reflect the concerns of source criticism.

There appears to be a general consensus that Matthew and Luke primarily derive their narrative from Q.⁴⁵ Marshall, for example, proposes that the occurrence of similar themes in the Baptism and Temptation (Son of God/Holy Spirit) demonstrates the use of a common source in which these two pericopes stood together.⁴⁶ A related question involves the issue of synoptic relationships.

Synoptic Relationships and Redaction

One Tradition or Two?

There are a number of possible scenarios regarding the short narrative of Mark and the longer narratives in Matthew and Luke. The three main possibilities have been summarized by Gerhardsson. (1) There is only one tradition. The question then arises: which version is original? Is the short version an abbreviation, or is the long version a scribal elaboration? (2) There are two different traditions. Mark summarizes a popular story while Matthew and Luke

⁴⁵Peter Doble, "The Temptations," Expository Times 72 (1960-61): 91. A. W. Argyle, however, argues that Matthew and Luke have drawn their accounts from two different sources which go back to a tradition antecedent to both. His basis for such an argument is Matthew and Luke's quotation of the LXX, even where the LXX differs from the Hebrew. This is also founded upon a presupposition that Q was written in Aramaic. A. W. Argyle, "The Accounts of the Temptation of Jesus in Relation to the Q Hypothesis," Expository Times 64 (1952-53): 382.

reproduce a narrative from scribal circles. (3) The longer versions are a conflation of two traditions. Both Matthew and Luke used Mark and an already-existing dialogue of scribal character.⁴⁷ Gerhardsson is certainly right in opting for the third possibility, i.e., Mark is an abbreviated form of a longer tradition. Both the longer and shorter tradition recount Jesus in the wilderness for forty days following his baptism. In addition, both traditions are based on Deuteronomy. Therefore, Gerhardsson concludes, “It seems unnecessarily complicated to suggest that there are here two quite different traditions; the only reasonable supposition is that we have two versions of one and the same tradition.”⁴⁸

Redaction (Order of the Temptations)

A detailed comparison of the synoptic accounts reveals numerous differences in detail. The major difference concerns the altered order of the temptations between Matthew and Luke. Matthew’s order is as follows: (1) turn stones to bread, (2) jump off the temple, and (3) worship Satan. Luke reverses the last two. A natural question arises. As Heinrich Zimmerman states, “Allerdings ist es strittig, welchem Evangelisten die Umstellung zugeschrieben werden muss.”⁴⁹

⁴⁶Marshall, Luke, 165.

⁴⁷Gerhardsson, The Testing of God’s Son, 9-10.

⁴⁸Ibid., 10. See also Rudolf Schnackenburg, “Der Sinn der Versuchung Jesu bei den Synoptikern.” In Schriften zum Neuen Testament: Exegese in Fortschritt und Wandel (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1971), 101-28. Also A. Feuillet, “L’episode de la tentation d’apres l’Evangile saint Marc (1, 12-13),” Estudios biblicos 19 (1960): 49-73. Also Henry Kelly, “The Devil in the Desert,” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 26 (1964): 190.

⁴⁹Heinrich Zimmerman, Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre: Darstellung der historischen-kritischen Methode, 7. Auflage (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1982), 228.

Fitzmyer states, “The sequence has to be explained in terms of something either theological or literary.”⁵⁰

Andre Feuillet points out, “La très grande majorité des exègetes pense que c’est l’ordre de Matthieu que doit être regardé comme original.”⁵¹ Arguments in favor of the Matthean order proceed as follows. First, Matthew’s order provides a natural progress; desert, pinnacle, mountaintop. Second, Matthean citations of Deuteronomy are given in reverse canonical order. Feuillet considers this to be the most convincing argument. He states, “La raison la plus convaincante en faveur de la tradition Matthéenne est peut-être le parallélisme avec l’Exode.”⁵² Third, the first two temptations challenge Jesus as the “Son of God” and may point to the use of an original pair. Fourth, the clearest temporal adverbs occur in Matthew 4:8 (παλιν) and 4:10 (τοτε). Fifth, the summary dismissal of Satan (Upage, Satana) argues for Matthean order as original and explains why Luke omits it.⁵³

If the above arguments are correct, then why did Luke reverse the last two temptations? The phenomenon is usually explained in terms of a theological motif involving Jerusalem as a climactic focal point of conflict in the life of Jesus (Lk 19:45-24:53). As W. Wilkins states, “Zielpunkt der Versuchungsgänge nach Lukas is die Tempelversuchung in Jerusalem, die Versuchung an der heiligen Stätte Israels.”⁵⁴ Wilkins also argues for a literary pattern which

⁵⁰Fitzmyer, Luke I-IX, 507.

⁵¹Andre Feuillet, “Le récit lucanien de la tentation (Lc 4, 1-13),” Biblica 40 (1959): 615. Also Zimmerman, 228.

⁵²Feuillet, “Le récit lucanien de la tentation,” 616.

⁵³Fitzmyer, Luke I-IX, 507-08. Bock, Luke, 366.

reflects this motif and explains the Lukan order. For example, the bread temptation corresponds to themes in Luke 4:14-9:50, the kingdoms temptation to 9:51-19:27, and the temple temptation to 19:28-24:53.⁵⁵ Other literary arguments have been offered.⁵⁶ Those who argue for Matthean redaction also argue along similar lines, such as a theological motif of the mountain as the place of revelation.⁵⁷ The order of the temptations reflects the major difference between Matthew and Luke. Other redactional features will be discussed in the next chapter on exegesis.

Conclusion/Summary

Considerations of form, history, sources, and redaction lays the foundation for exegesis. Further elaboration upon these matters may be necessary and can be raised at the appropriate place in the text. Likewise, the issue of the Old Testament background/parallels of the temptation narrative can be addressed in the analysis of the text. To summarize, the form of the temptation account belongs to the narrative tradition as a “Story About Jesus,” to use Vincent

⁵⁴W. Wilkins, “Die Versuchungsgeschichte Luk. 4, 1-13 und die Komposition des Evangeliums.” Theologische Zeitschrift 30 (1974): 265.

⁵⁵Ibid., 265-72.

⁵⁶Karl H. Rengstorf proposes a Lukan order which reverses the first three petitions of the Lord’s Prayer: may your name be sanctified, may your kingdom come, give us our daily bread. See Karl H. Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Teilband 3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), 63. Also H. Swanson sees a connection between the Lukan order and Psalm 106. See Hamish Swanson, “The Lukan Temptation Narrative,” Journal of Theological Studies 17 (1966): 71. Peter Doble argues that Luke placed the “kingdom” temptation in the middle for “symmetry and artistry.” Doble, “The Temptations,” 92.

⁵⁷Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium, 218. “Es wird Matth gewesen sein, der sich eine äusserlich dramatischere Klimax erstellt hat und der den so entstehenden schriftlichen Dialog 4, 4-7 so zusammenfügte. Ausserdem steht bei Matth der Berg der Versuchung und die Versuchung, die Weltherrschaft aus den Händen des Teufels entgegenzunehmen, in redaktionell bewusster Gegenüberstellung zu dem Berge der Sendung, auf dem sich Jesus dann am Ende im Besitz der Vollgewalt über Himmel und Erde zeigt (Mt 28, 16-20).”

Taylor's terminology. In addition the narrative also resembles haggadic midrash which draws attention to the literary features of the pericope. As has been shown, there is good reason for tracing the story back to Jesus himself who in turn related the event to his disciples. Synoptic relationships raises the plausibility of common sources pointing to a unified tradition. The different order of the temptations demonstrates that theology is more important than chronology. The stage is now set for further analysis of the text.

CHAPTER TWO

EXEGESIS OF LUKE 4:1-13

Translation

¹Now Jesus, full of the Holy Spirit, returned from the Jordan and was being led by the Spirit in the wilderness ²where he was tempted forty days by the devil. And he ate nothing in those days and when the days were completed he hungered. ³And the devil said to him, “If you are the Son of God, speak to this stone so that it might become bread. ⁴And Jesus answered him, “It is written, **Man shall not live from bread alone.** ⁵And the Devil led him up and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in an instant. ⁶And the devil said to him, I will give to you all this authority and its glory because it has been given to me and to whomever I wish I can give it, ⁷therefore if you would bow down in worship before me all will be yours. ⁸Jesus answered and said to him, “It is written, **You shall worship the Lord your God and you shall serve only him.** ⁹Then the Devil led him to Jerusalem and placed him upon the pinnacle of the temple and said to him, “If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down from here ¹⁰for it is written that, **He has commanded his angels concerning you to watch over you** ¹¹and that **they will carry you upon their hands, lest you should strike your foot against a stone.** ¹²And Jesus answered and said to him, “It has been said **You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.** ¹³And having tempted Jesus in every manner, the Devil departed from him until an opportune time.

Setting the Parameters/Literary Context

In all Synoptic accounts the temptation narrative is preceded by the baptism of Jesus in the Jordan river and serves as prelude to Jesus’ public ministry. Luke, unlike Matthew and Mark, inserts a genealogy tracing Jesus to Adam. In Luke literary markers and themes connect the temptation narrative to the baptism. At the baptism the Spirit descends upon Jesus and a voice from heaven declares him to be the Son of God. Likewise, the temptation narrative emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit (Jesus is full of the Spirit and led by the Spirit) and Jesus

tempted as the “Son of God.” In addition the mention of the Jordan is a direct reminder of and link to the Baptism.¹

Setting the parameters of exegesis to Luke 4:1-13 is straightforward. The genealogy of Jesus is completed in 3:38, and Luke proceeds with the temptation narrative. The conjunction *del* marks this transition. Synoptic parallels (Mt 4:1-11, Mk 1:11-12) also provide guidance in setting the limits of the pericope. Luke 4:1-2 introduces the narrative, and 4:13 provides an appropriate conclusion. Literarily, the verb employed and the theme of the Spirit marks a transition to the next narrative. Just as Jesus returns full of the Holy Spirit (*ἰησοῦς πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου ὑπέβηεν*) from the Jordan (Lk 4:1), he also returns in the power of the Spirit (*ὑπέβηεν ὁ ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος*) to Galilee (Lk 4:14).

The temptation narrative divides into three major sections. First, Jesus is led by the Spirit into the wilderness for a period of testing. Second, the devil tempts Jesus. Jesus, quoting from Deuteronomy, endures each temptation. Third, the temptations are completed, and the devil leaves Jesus for a season.

Text

Jesus Enters the Wilderness for a Period of Testing (4:1-2a)

These initial verses set the stage for what follows. The firm link with the baptism has already been established (here the mention of the Spirit and the Jordan). Additionally, Luke

¹See Nolland, *Luke 1:1-9:20*, 176-77; Marshall, *Luke*, 167. Also Joachim Jeremias, *Die Sprache des Lukasevangelium: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 115. Jeremias argues that the mention of the Spirit in all three gospels denotes a pre-gospel tradition which connects the Baptism and Temptation. Peter Doble asserts that the “Baptism” and “Thou art My Son” gives the key to the exegesis of the passage. Doble, “The Temptations,” 91-92.

describes Jesus in terms of the Spirit, the activity of the Spirit, the place of temptation, the length of temptation, and the tempter.

Luke's double reference to the Spirit is significant and emphasizes his role beyond that of Matthew and Mark.² The Spirit's leading is also described in different terms than the synoptic parallels. For Mark, the Spirit drives (εἰσβαλεῖ) Jesus into the wilderness, while Matthew states that Jesus was led up by the Spirit (ἀνέβη αὐτὸν τὸ πνεῦμα). Luke employs the imperfect passive³ with the dative to describe the Spirit's activity (ἠγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῷ ἐρημῷ). This construction provides a clearer allusion to Israel being led around by God in the wilderness in order to be tested than Matthew or Mark.⁴ Geldenhuys states, "He was led *in* the wilderness and not merely *to* the wilderness, and not merely *by* the Holy Ghost but *in* Him. He was thus guided throughout in the wilderness by the Spirit, equipped with his fullness and enjoying the fullest communion with God."⁵ The role of the Spirit is primarily guidance. But Luke's emphasis and wording may also point to the power of the Spirit as Jesus' source of victory over temptation.⁶

All three synoptics mention the wilderness (ἐρημὸν) as the place of temptation. The wilderness for Luke is a region of demonic activity as well as a place to retreat for communion

²Schürmann, 207-08. Schürmann argues that Jesus is the first of all led by the Spirit (*Ur-Pneumatiker*).

³Nolland notes that this is the "divine passive." Nolland, 178.

⁴Marshall, Luke, 169. Both Matthew and Mark state that Jesus was led (driven) εἰς τὴν ἐρημὸν instead of ἐν τῷ ἐρημῷ.

⁵J. N. Geldenhuys, The Gospel According to Luke. New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1950), 163.

with God.⁷ More significant, however, is Luke's allusion to the Old Testament. As mentioned above, the phraseology ἐν τῇ ἐρημῷ alludes to Deuteronomy 8:2. The passive form of the verb (ἠγέτο) also parallels Israel "being led" by God in the wilderness.⁸ Further allusion is provided in the time frame (ἡμέραι τεσσαράκοντα) of the temptations.⁹ To be sure these are not exact parallels. Israel was tested for forty years while Jesus is tested forty days.¹⁰ The number forty, however, is common in Scripture.¹¹ Likewise, in the Old Testament God is the one who tests Israel while in Luke it is the Devil who tests Jesus. However, as Marshall points out, "the mention of the leading of the Spirit shows that the devil's role falls within the purpose of God."¹² These parallels deserve close attention at the outset of exegesis, especially in light of Jesus' quotations, all of which are taken from Deuteronomy and occur in the context of Israel's testing in the wilderness.

⁶Marshall, 169.

⁷Bock, Luke, 369. See Lk 1:80, 3:2, 5:16, 7:24, 8:29, 11:24. Also Schürmann, 207-08; Gerhardsson, 40.

⁸Nolland, 178.

⁹Matthew mentions "forty days and forty nights" (Mt 4:2). Mark also states the time frame of forty days (Mk 1:13).

¹⁰Another possible parallel is the forty-day fast of Moses mentioned in Ex 34:28. This may involve a "Moses" typology, especially in Matthew where "forty days and forty nights" parallels the Exodus account. See Jacques Dupont, "L'arrière-fond bilique du récit des tentations de Jésus," New Testament Studies 3 (1957): 295-96. Marshall warns against pressing the typology too far, however, because the passage in Exodus does not speak of a period of temptation by God or the devil. Marshall, 169. See also Fitzmyer, 514.

¹¹See Bock, Luke, 370.

¹²Marshall, 169.

Two further matters deserve attention in this opening section. First, was Jesus led around in the wilderness for forty days, or was he tempted for forty days? Second, the meaning of the word *peirazō* needs to be addressed. Was Jesus tested or tempted? Is there a difference? Concerning the first matter, the present participle suggests a temptation of forty days. If so, the temptations involved more than just the three recorded in Luke. These were merely the “concluding act of the drama since Luke says that these three tests came at a point of hunger after forty days of fasting.”¹³ Concerning *peirazō*, a wide range of meanings is possible. The verb can be used in a good sense of God or Christ putting men to the test to prove them true (Jn 6:6, Hb 11:17) or in a bad sense of enticement to sin (Jm 1:13).¹⁴ In some contexts both meanings may be in view depending upon the outcome of the test. There may be a need to make the failure of the temptation specific, i.e., Satan tried to make Jesus sin but was unsuccessful.¹⁵ The agent of temptation is the Devil. Luke consistently employs the title *diabolos*. Mark uses “*Satana*” (Mk 1:13) while Matthew adopts “*diabolou*,” “*ol peirazwn*,” and “*Satana*.” (Mt 4:1, 3, 10).

These opening verses prepare the reader for the temptations that follow. Three main characters have been introduced: Jesus, the Holy Spirit, and the Devil. Old Testament allusions are already apparent, notably the time element (forty days) and the place (wilderness). The quotations from Deuteronomy that occur following each temptation will provide incentive for further analysis along the lines of Old Testament parallels. The context also allows for a possible

¹³Bock, Luke, 370. See also Marshall, 169.

¹⁴ Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Cambridge: University of Chicago Press, 1957), 646.

Second-Adam motif (preceding genealogy). The stage is set. The Spirit-filled Son of God and the Serpent of old meet in confrontation.

The Devil Tempts Jesus (4:2b-4:12)

Jesus Endures the First Temptation (4:2b-4)

A consistent pattern emerges as Luke describes each temptation: (1) the setting of the temptation is described, (2) the devil tempts or “tests” Jesus, and (3) Jesus responds. These three elements occur in the first temptation as follows. First, Jesus ate nothing for forty days and is hungry. Second, the devil tempts Jesus to turn a stone into bread. Third, Jesus responds that man does not live by bread alone. Exegetical issues include the nature of the temptation (an issue with all of the temptations), the difference between “stone” (Luke) and “stones” (Matthew), and the shortened quotation from Deuteronomy 8:3.

Luke begins with the setting. While Matthew uses a more religious word to describe Jesus’ abstinence from food, i.e., he “fasted” (νηστεύσα), Luke simply states that Jesus ate nothing (οὐκ ἐφαγεν οὐδέ τι). The structure of the sentence and the use of the ingressive aorist (ἐπεινάσεν) suggests that the hunger pangs did not occur until after the forty days were completed. As Geldenhuys observes, “Although for days on end he had taken no food, it was only at the end of that period that He was conscious of hunger.”¹⁶ If an Adam-Christ parallel is intended, then the setting incurs a deeper significance. Adam fell in favorable circumstances while Jesus was victorious in the worst of circumstances.¹⁷

¹⁵Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains, 2 vols, (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1988), 775.

¹⁶Geldenhuys, 158. See also Bock, Luke, 371; Schürmann, 209.

Questions concerning the nature of the temptation arise in the devil's challenge, "If you are the Son of God . . . (Eij uibw' Eij tou' qeou)." But what does this mean? Is Satan questioning the sonship of Jesus by casting doubt on his miraculous powers, or is he affirming Jesus' sonship (since you are ...) ? If the latter is the case, then the temptation concerns the nature of Jesus' sonship, i.e., what kind of a son he is.¹⁸ Surely the fact of Jesus' sonship is not in view here, especially in light of the Baptism. Rather, this statement is "a concession intended by Luke to show Satan's recognition of the messiahship of Jesus."¹⁹

What then is the nature of the temptation? Jesus is being tempted to use his own power as the Son of God for his own ends rather than being obedient to the Father. Therefore, the filial relationship between the Father and the Son is the real issue. As Marshall states, "It is suggested that Sonship can be expressed in independent authority rather than in filial obedience. Behind the temptation lies the desire to turn Jesus aside from the fulfillment of his messianic task by striking at his relationship to the Father."²⁰

A redactional issue involves Luke's singular "stone" instead of Matthew's "stones." There is no reason immediately apparent for the shift. Bock suggests that "Luke chose to use the singular to focus the request and to bring it into conformity with the singular *ar tw* of the Old

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Robert Holst, "The Temptation of Jesus," Expository Times 82 (1970-71): 343. Also Ernst Lohmeyer, Das Evangelium des Matthäus (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956), 57. He states, "Die Versuchung geht nicht auf die Person Jesu ... sondern auf sein Werk und seinen Weg."

¹⁹E. Earle Ellis, The Gospel of Luke, New Century Bible (Greenwood, S. C.: The Attic Press, 1966), 94.

²⁰Marshall, 171.

Testament quotation.”²¹ He also adds, “The number difference influences only the possible implications one might draw from the event.”²²

Jesus responds by quoting Deuteronomy 8:3. The wording is identical with that of the LXX. The quotation from Matthew is lengthened to include “but from every word that proceeds from the mouth of God.” Some manuscripts include the longer rendering in Luke, but the evidence shows that this was added later to conform to the Matthean passage.²³ The phrase “man shall not live by bread alone” is a figure of speech and should not be interpreted literally. The meaning is something like “to live means more than eating.”²⁴ More specifically, human life does not depend primarily on physical food; the will of God expressed in his Word takes priority.²⁵ The Old Testament citation occurs in the context of God’s provision for the nation. The temptation, therefore, is to act independently from God, to distrust God’s provision. Fitzmyer summarizes the thrust of the first temptation well: “The devil challenges his filial status, exploits his hungry situation, and seeks ultimately to thwart his role in salvation-history.”²⁶

²¹Bock, Luke, 372.

²²Ibid.

²³See Appendix Four.

²⁴ Louw and Nida, A Greek-English Lexicon, 49.

²⁵Marshall, 171.

²⁶Fitzmyer, 515.

Jesus Endures the Second Temptation (4:5-8)

The same basic pattern emerges in the second temptation: the scene is set, the Devil tempts, Jesus responds. Luke's wording clearly brings out the visionary nature of this temptation, and several differences from the Matthean parallel give insight to key Lukan emphases. Jesus is tempted to worship the devil in exchange for the kingdoms of the world. Some of the same questions arise in this temptation that emerged in the first, namely, the nature of the temptation, the significance of the Lukan redactions, and the issue of Old Testament parallels.

The stage is set for the temptation. Luke simply states that the Devil led Jesus up (αἰαγὰγωῆ) and showed him all the kingdoms of the world.²⁷ Matthew is more specific concerning the place (εἰς τὸ ὄρη τὸ ἕν). Why does Luke omit the reference to the mountain? Several scenarios are possible. First, Luke may have omitted the mountain because he saw that the account must be understood in metaphorical terms.²⁸ Second, the presence of theological motif may explain the absence of "mountain" in Luke and its presence in Matthew.²⁹ Dupont argues for a Moses/Christ motif as the underlying reason for the mention of "mountain" in Matthew. For Dupont, the parallel is to be found in Deuteronomy 34:1-4. He states, "Le paysage que Jésus contemple du haut de la montagne n'est qu'une simple transposition littéraire

²⁷Schürmann argues that this took place on the way to Jerusalem and sees an analogy between the "leading" of the Spirit (4:1) and the "leading" of the Devil (4:5). Schürmann, 210.

²⁸Marshall, 171. Also Plummer, 111.

²⁹Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 29.

de la vision de Moïse sur le mont Nébo dans Deut. 34:1-4.”³⁰ Luke’s focus, unlike that of Matthew, is on Jerusalem. In fact, the only locale mentioned in the three temptations from Luke’s perspective is Jerusalem, which may allow for a steadier progression as the narrative builds to a climax.³¹ Another possibility is simply that Luke focuses on time over place, i.e., Matthew omits “in an instant” (ἐν στιγμή/ χρόνῳ).³²

Two other redactional features deserve comment in the prelude to the second temptation. First, Luke prefers οἰκουμένη to Matthew’s κόσμος. Luke’s choice presumes the inhabited earth. It is a Lucan term which is comprehensive in scope.³³ Second, Luke’s description of time points to the visionary character of the event. The devil showed Jesus the kingdoms of the world “in a moment of time” (ἐν στιγμή/ χρόνῳ). The idiom means something like “in an instant.”³⁴

The words of the devil recorded in the offer of the kingdoms of the world to Jesus are more fully expanded in Luke than in Matthew. The basic thought is unaffected but there is an interesting element in Luke in that he refers to “all this authority” (ἐξουσίαν) and the claim of the devil that these authorities have been given to him with the prerogative to bestow them upon whomever he wishes. Several questions arise. What prompted Luke’s choice of words? Is the devil’s claim legitimate? What do the differences between Matthew and Luke reveal at a source-

³⁰Dupont, “L’arrière-fond biblique des tentations de Jésus,” 296-97. Author’s translation: “The landscape that Jesus surveys from high upon the mountain is only a simple literary transposition of the vision of Moses upon Mt. Nebo in Deut. 34:1-4.”

³¹Bock, Luke, 375.

³²Fitzmyer, 516.

³³Bock, Luke, 375. Geldenhuys, 164. Fitzmyer, 516. See Lk 2:1; 21:26; Acts 11:28; 17:6, 31; 19:27; 24:5.

critical level? Is there a connection between this temptation and the messianic task of Jesus (a temptation to be a political messiah)?

Authority is generally used by Luke in a political sense (Lk 12:11; 20:20; 23:7).³⁵ Bock notes that it is unusual for Luke to attribute political and institutional power to Satan because Luke is usually benevolent toward Rome.³⁶ The assumption behind the offer is that to some extent the political and institutional powers are in the hands of the evil one until redemption is complete. There is some scriptural corroboration to the devil's claim,³⁷ but the devil's offer was overexaggerated. As Bock states, "Satan's offer is at best characterized as an oversell, and at worst it is a lie."³⁸ The elaboration found in Luke may reveal the presence of different sources. Additionally, Luke's wording is expressive of the authority given to the Messiah in Psalm 2:8 and the Son of Man in Daniel 7:14. Therefore, a messianic context is possible.³⁹

Jesus responds, again quoting from Deuteronomy, that worship and service belong only to God. Again Luke follows the LXX, only here with slight variation. Both Matthew and Luke have *proskunew* instead of *fobeomai* (LXX) and both insert *monw* to bring out the full force of

³⁴Fitzmyer, 516.

³⁵Ibid.

³⁶Bock, Luke, 375-76. Schürmann cites this very reason as evidence for a pre-Lukan tradition. Schürmann, 211.

³⁷See especially Jn 12:31; 14:30; 16:11; Rv 13:2.

³⁸Bock, Luke, 376. Marshall, 172. Marshall states, "Whereas in the OT this realm and authority lie in the hands of God, here the devil claims that it has been given to him and that consequently he has the right of disposal. Ultimately, however, the devil's claim was not true, nor was his word to be trusted."

³⁹Nolland, 180. Marshall, 172. Bock, Luke, 376.

the original meaning.⁴⁰ Jesus' response reveals that the focus of the temptation again strikes at the filial relationship of the Son to the Father. Subsidiary to this is the way in which Jesus will pursue his mission. As Nolland states, "The worship of Satan to which Jesus is enticed is the temptation to pursue his task in the ways of the world and to become indebted to Satan in the manner that every successful man of the world is."⁴¹

Jesus Endures the Third Temptation (4:9-12)

The temptation of Jesus climaxes in Jerusalem in the Lukan narrative. The same pattern emerges which has been established in the previous two tests. The scene is Jerusalem, the only locale mentioned by Luke in the temptations. Twice bested by Scripture, the devil now challenges Jesus with the Word of God. Key issues involve the precise location in the temple, the public vs. private character of the challenge, and once again, the precise nature of the temptation.

The third temptation, like the second, may be visionary in character as well.⁴² The place is Jerusalem, a key locale for Luke (9:53; 17:11; 18:31; 19:11), but the exact location in the temple (pterugion) "remains puzzling."⁴³ The term serves to designate the tip or extremity of something.⁴⁴ It is usually taken to refer to the royal colonade of the temple on the south side of

⁴⁰Marshall, 172.

⁴¹Nolland, 180.

⁴²Geldenhuis, 162. Bock, Luke, 378.

⁴³Nolland, 181.

⁴⁴Bauer, 734.

the outer court.⁴⁵ Other suggestions have been proposed. Jeremias believes it is the lintel or superstructure of a gate of the temple.⁴⁶ Gerhardsson suggests that the name is used deliberately to give contrast to the “wings” of God in Psalm 91:4.⁴⁷ The literary context supports Gerhardsson’s proposal yet a precise meaning remains uncertain. The point remains clear, and a proper interpretation of the passage does not hinge upon the precise meaning of pterugion. Jesus is at a height which would require divine protection should he jump.

The location of the temple has led some to view this temptation as a public miraculous event instead of a private confrontation between Jesus and devil as the previous two. Fitzmyer states, “The devil’s second challenge to Jesus’ sonship is a temptation to use his power to manifest himself with èclat before his contemporaries and to conform to their ideas about God’s emissaries.”⁴⁸ There is no mention of spectators, however, and the context points to another private exchange between Jesus and Satan. The issue is not a public display of power but rather a private affair the testing of God’s promise of protection, a sin for a man of faith. T. W. Manson states, “There is no hint that the Messiah was expected to prove his title by leaping from the roof.”⁴⁹

⁴⁵Marshall, 172. Josephus mentions a part of the temple which overlooked a deep ravine and was high enough to cause giddiness. *Antiq.* 15.11, 5. A rabbinic tradition states that the Messiah would reveal himself on the roof of the temple: “When the King, the Messiah, reveals himself, he will come and stand on the roof of the Temple.” *Peshiqta rabbiti* 36. Quoted in Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 517.

⁴⁶Joachim Jeremias, “Die ‘Zinne’ des Tempels,” *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Veriens* 59 (1936): 195-208.

⁴⁷Gerhardsson, 59.

⁴⁸Fitzmyer, 517.

The challenge of the devil reflects the same initial wording as the first (Eij uibw' Eij tou' qeou). Again, the question of Jesus' sonship is not the issue. The same meaning should be read into this phrase, i.e., since you are the Son of God, as the first.⁵⁰ Satan challenges Jesus as the Son of God to throw himself from the temple. Luke adds the adverb ehteuqen for emphasis. This time, however, Satan quotes Scripture (Psalm 91:11-12). The wording in Matthew and Luke of the quotation is identical except for the addition by Luke of tou' diaful akai se, which emphasizes the focus of the temptation, the testing of God's protection. The locale of the temple also enhances this theme for it is where God "is to be found as a refuge for protection."⁵¹

Jesus quickly corrects Satan's twisted hermeneutic. The introductory formula is changed from gegraptai to ei|htai, the only occurrence in the New Testament. There is no apparent reason for the change. Perhaps Nolland's suggestion is correct: "As if the Devil's use has contaminated his form Jesus now says ei|htai."⁵² Once again, Jesus quotes Scripture. The quotation is taken from Deuteronomy 6:16 which occurs in the context of Israel's testing of God at Massah (Exodus 17:1-7). Marshall notes that there does not appear to be any messianic interpretation of this Psalm in Judaism, but is a promise to the godly in general. The temptation is to prove God's promise by putting it to the test, something the godly need not do because of

⁴⁹T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, (London: SCM Press, 1949), 44.

⁵⁰Although see A. B. Taylor, "Decision in the Desert: The Temptation of Jesus in Light of Deuteronomy," Interpretation 14 (1960): 307. Taylor wants to translate the first occurrence as affirming Jesus' sonship and the second as questioning it. He states, "Here at last the essential Father-Son relationship between Jesus and God is called into question." Taylor's assertion does not appear to be justified.

⁵¹Bock, Luke, 380. Also Gerhardsson, 56-58.

⁵²Nolland, 181.

faith in God.⁵³ Such a test would not be faith at all but presumption, “unbelief masquerading as faith.”⁵⁴ Of note is the different form of the word “test” (ἐκπειράσει). The word is used in Scripture only of testing God.⁵⁵

The Devil Leaves Jesus Temporarily After the Completion of All the Temptations (4:13)

Luke 4:13 provides a fitting conclusion to the temptation narrative yet looks forward to a time of further temptation in the future. The phrase *sunteleōsa panta peirasmon* points to the comprehensiveness of the temptations, i.e., Jesus was tempted in every way.⁵⁶ Luke omits the ministry of angels included by Matthew yet adds that the devil departs from Jesus *apri kairou*, until a suitable or opportune time.⁵⁷ Conzelmann argues that Jesus is free from all further testing until Luke 22.⁵⁸ A better suggestion is that of Nolland: “The unique time that Luke anticipates is the passion period with its heightened activity of Satan - Lk 22:3, 31, 35.”⁵⁹

⁵³Marshall, 173.

⁵⁴Bock, Luke, 381.

⁵⁵Bauer, Greek-English Lexicon, 243.

⁵⁶Lowe and Nida, A Greek-English Lexicon, 658. Geldenhuys translates, “When the devil had ended every possible kind of temptation ...” Geldenhuys, 163.

⁵⁷The same expression, *apri kairou*, occurs in Acts 13:11, indicating a temporary period.

⁵⁸Conzelmann, Theology, 28.

⁵⁹Nolland, 182.

Conclusion - Theological/Homiletical Reflection

A summary of the results of exegesis with a view toward theological reflection/summation and relevant homiletical application is now in order. Several significant issues have been raised both in the classification of the pericope and in the exegesis of the text which bear upon the interpretation and theology of the temptation narrative which in turn affects how one might approach the text homiletically. For example, does this narrative reflect a *Sitz im Leben* in the early church which gave rise to its present form? If so, this will carry the interpreter/preacher in a different direction from one who views the pericope as a narrative with a primary Christological focus instead of an ecclesiastical one. If the person of Christ is the locus of emphasis, then how should one preach the temptation narrative? Is Jesus a model of how one overcomes temptation? In what sense are the temptations unique to Jesus and in what sense are they the common experience of all men? Is there a messianic motif or does the reference to Jesus as the “Son of God” override this particular emphasis? If the focus is Christological, then what is Luke trying to convey concerning the person of Christ? What is one to do with the major redactional issue between Matthew and Luke, the order of the temptation? And what about the Old Testament allusion? To what extent may the exegete press an Israel-Christ typology, Adam-Christ typology, or even a Moses-Christ typology without reverting to eisegesis instead of exegesis.? All of these questions seek to address the proper direction and use of this passage of Scripture.

From a form-critical viewpoint the classification of the temptation narrative as a “Story about Jesus” is the most satisfying in many respects but especially in that it calls attention to the primary focus of the narrative, the person of Christ. Other concerns may be legitimate, such as the exemplary nature of Jesus’ endurance, but first and foremost the Christological emphasis is

central. This is particularly evident from the context in all synoptic accounts where the temptation scene follows Jesus' baptism and precedes his public ministry. Furthermore, Jesus is tempted precisely as the "Son of God." But what kind of a son is he? He is faithful and obedient, always submissive to the will of the Father. The obvious Old Testament allusions recall unfaithful Israel and the Lukan insertion of the genealogy recalls Adam's disobedience. The typology is definitely present but should not be pressed unduly. Both the Israel-Christ and Adam-Christ motifs serve to highlight the faithfulness Jesus.

The temptation narrative also gives impetus for much theological reflection concerning the nature and uniqueness of Jesus' temptation. Luke does not raise the ontological issue of the peccability or impeccability of Christ. Rather, Jesus is genuinely tempted and emerges victorious. But is the temptation of Jesus unique or representative of that experienced by all men? The answer is both with an emphasis on the former. Jesus' temptation is unique in that he is tempted as the "Son of God." No one has experienced the exact same temptations. However, in light of the exodus typology and the quotations of Jesus from Deuteronomy, one might draw legitimate parallels applied corporately to Israel and perhaps from a contemporary perspective corporately to the Church.⁶⁰ But while the temptations of Jesus are unique to him there is a sense in which temptation, by its very nature, has a common element; to draw men away from the will of God into sin. In this sense there is a definite parallel and commonality between Jesus and the experiences of Israel and Adam.

The uniqueness of Jesus' temptation raises a further issue. To what extent is Jesus our model? Is it legitimate to analyze the elements which produced victory for Jesus as a paradigm

for individual believers? To put it in simple, straightforward terms, is one justified to preach from this passage under the title, “How to Overcome Temptation?” It is the opinion of this writer that this is not the primary focus or function of the temptation narrative. However, a legitimate secondary application in this regard may be appropriate if one keeps the primary focus in view. In other words, the narrative maintains a Christological locus yet Jesus’ reflective use of Scripture in overcoming temptation and submitting himself obediently to the will of God as expressed in the Old Testament is instructive. Therefore, faithfulness to the will of God as expressed in Scripture while tempted to succumb to Satan’s alternative remains a secondary, but legitimate application of the temptation narrative. “The narrative presents moral challenge as well as Christological affirmation.”⁶¹

Beyond a consideration of the main thrust of the temptation narrative, Lukan redaction may provide other keys to the kerygmatic use of the pericope in the early church. David C. Hester, in an article devoted to preaching the temptation narrative mentions several possibilities. Examples would include Luke’s emphasis on the Holy Spirit, the more imaginative description of the temptations involving the kingdoms of the world and the concept of authority, and the emphasis upon Jerusalem as the focal point of conflict in the life of Jesus.⁶² This of course presupposes that Lukan redaction equals kerygmatic significance. Hester offers good advice from a literary perspective. He states, “The homiletic ‘temptation’ of the temptation story is its attractiveness for a three-point sermon

⁶⁰Especially in light of Paul’s parallels of Israel and the Church in the context of temptation. See 1 Co 10:1-13.

⁶¹Nolland, 182.

⁶²David C. Hester, “Luke 4:1-13.” *Interpretation* 31 (1977): 54-56.

with each temptation providing a type of our temptations and Jesus' rebuffs offering antidotes. The validity or invalidity of this approach must at least wait upon the hearing of the story as a literary whole."⁶³ In addition, relevant issues for the contemporary church would include the faithfulness of God, the "how" of Christ's Lordship, and the issue of the Church's obedience.⁶⁴ To be sure one might draw other applications of the text which could be corroborated with other texts. The primary focus, however, remains Christological. Jesus is the obedient, faithful Son who emerged victorious from the heights of spiritual conflict. Indeed, Jesus is our sympathetic High Priest.

⁶³Ibid., 54.

⁶⁴Ibid., 58.

APPENDIX ONE: BLOCK DIAGRAM
Luke 4:1-13

- 4:1 de;
pl hwh" pneumato" adji ou
(1) *Jhsou" upēstreyen*
apo tou' J ordamou
kai ;
- (2) *hgeto*
ejn tw/pneumatī
ejn th'/ejhōw
4:2 *hūrewa" tesserakonta*
pei razomeno" upo; tou' di abolou
kai ;
- (3) *ouk efragen oujten*
ejn tai " hūrewai " ekei nai "
kai ;
suntel esqei swh aujtwh
(4) *epei nasen*
- 4:3 de;
(5) *Ei pen aujt w o J di abol o"*
Ei j ui o" Ei j tou' qeou'
ei pe; tw/ li qw/ toutw
i na gemhtai afto".
- 4:4 kai ;
(6) *apekriqh pro; aujton oj Jhsou":*
Gegraptai
oti /Ouk zhsetai o J a h q r w p o".
ep aftw/ nomw
- 4:5 Kai ;
ajagagwnvaujton
(7) *epei xen aujt w pa sa" ta v ba si lei a" th" oi kou men h"*
ejn sti gn h/ cronou
4:6 kai ;
(8) *ei pen aujt w o J di abol o"*
Soi v dw w thn ejkousi an tau thn apasan
kai ;
thn doxan aujtwh
oti ejmi ; para de u dotai
kai ;
w/ e j an qelw
di dw mi aujt h n:
4:7 ouh
su; e j an proskunh sh' e j w pi on ejrou'
e stai sou' pa sa.
4:8 kai ;

- (9) *apokri qei ;*
oJ Jhsou" ei pen autw
 Geqraptai
 Kuwion ton qeom sou proskunhxei "
 kai ;
 autwmonwlatreusei "
- 4:9 de ;
 (10) *hgagen auton*
 ei j' J erousal hm
 kai ;
- (11) *efthsen*
 epi ; to ; pterugi on tou' i erou'
 kai ;
- (12) *ei pen autw*
 Eij ui o" Eij tou' qeou'
 balve seauton ejteuqen katw
 4:10 gar
 geqraptai
 oti Toi " aggelvoi " autou' ejtel ei tai
 peri ; sou'
 tou' di aful axai se
- 4:11 kai ;
 Epi ; cei rwh
 oti ajrousim se
 mh pote proskoyh' ton poda sou.
 pro" liqon
- 4:12 kai ;
 apokri qei ;
- (13) *ei pen autw oJ Jhsou"*
 oti Ei fhtai
 Ouk ekpeirasei " kuwion ton qeom sou.
- 4:13 Kai ;
 suntel esa" panta peirasmon
- (14) *oJ di abolo" apexth*
 ap autou'
 acri kai rou'.

APPENDIX TWO: EXEGETICAL OUTLINE

Luke 4:1-13

Based on Semantic Diagram

- I. (1-2) Jesus entered the wilderness for a period of temptation (testing).
 - A. Jesus returned from the Jordan following his baptism.
 - B. Jesus was led by the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil.

- II. (3-13) Jesus was tempted by the devil.
 - A. Jesus endured the first temptation.
 - 1. Jesus fasted in the wilderness and became hungry.
 - a) Jesus ate nothing while in the wilderness.
 - b) Jesus hungered.
 - 2. Jesus resisted the temptation to turn a stone into bread.
 - a) Satan tempted Jesus to turn a stone into bread.
 - b) Jesus answered Satan that man does not live by bread alone.
 - B. Jesus endured the second temptation.
 - 1. Satan showed Jesus all the kingdoms of the world in an instant.
 - 2. Jesus resisted the temptation to worship Satan.
 - a) Satan tempted Jesus to worship him in exchange for the kingdoms of the world.
 - b) Jesus answered that man must worship and serve only God.
 - C. Jesus endured the third temptation.
 - 1. Satan led Jesus to Jerusalem for the third temptation.
 - a) Satan led Jesus to Jerusalem.
 - b) Satan stood upon the pinnacle of the temple.
 - 2. Jesus resisted the temptation to throw himself from the temple.
 - a) Satan tempted Jesus to throw himself from the temple.
 - b) Jesus answered that one must not put God to the test.

- III. (14) The devil left Jesus temporarily after all of the temptations had been completed.

APPENDIX THREE: SEMANTIC DIAGRAM

LUKE 4:1-13

	<u>Connective</u>	<u>Sent. Function</u>	<u>Verb Analysis</u>		<u>Num.</u>	<u>Subj.</u>	<u>Other Links</u>
			<u>Tense</u>	<u>Pers.</u>			
	(1) deI	declar.	Aorist	3	S	ih sou"	pneumato" upestreyen
	(2) kaiV	declar.	Imperf.	3	S	(He)	pneumati
	(3) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	(He)	sunteles...
	(4) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	(He)	
	(5) deI	declar.	Aorist	3	S	diabol o"	
	(6) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	ih sou"	
	(7) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	(He)	
	(8) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	diabol o"	
	(9) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	ih sou"	
	(10) deI	declar.	Aorist	3	S	(He)	
	(11) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	(He)	
	(12) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	(He)	
	(13) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	ih sou"	
	(14) kaiV	declar.	Aorist	3	S	diabol o"	sunteles a"

APPENDIX FOUR: TEXTUAL VARIANT ANALYSIS

PASSAGE: Luke 4:4

APPARATUS USED: UBS³

CLASSIFICATION OF WITNESSES

Variant Readings	Alexandrian (Aland I-II)	Western (Aland IV)	Unclassified (Aland III)	Byzantine (Aland V)
(1) αἰὲρ ἄπο"	Ⲛ, B, L, cop ^{sa} , cop ^{bo}	syr ^s	W, 1241	
(2) αἰὲρ ἄπο" αἰ j εἰ ; παντι ; ρῆμα τι θεου'	33		A, D, Q, Y, f1, f13, 565, 700, 1009, 1079, 1195, 1216, 1230, 1242, 1344, 1365, 1546, 1646, 2148, 2174, l ^{226.854.} ¹⁷⁶¹ , syr ^{p,h} , arm geo	P, 28, 1010, Byz, goth
(3) αἰὲρ ἄπο" αἰ V εἰ ; παντι ; ρῆμα ι θεου'	0102, 892	D, it ^{a, aur, b, c, d, e, f, ff2, l,} q, r1	1253, vg	
(4) αἰὲρ ἄπο" αἰ ej πι ; παντι ; ρῆμα ι εκπορευομενω δια ; στοματος θεου'	cop ^{bo}	Diatessaron		1071 (ρῆματι θεου' εἰ κπορευομενω Lect, eth, Theophylact

EVALUATION OF EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

1. Date.

Reading 1 is well attested among the Alexandrian manuscripts. Reading 4 is present in the Diatessaron (II) and the Boharic Coptic (IV) which are also early readings. Reading 2 has one early reading in goth (IV).

The canon of date favors Reading 1 in number of manuscripts but Reading 4 has the earliest manuscript in the Diatessaron.

2. Geographical Distribution.

The geographical distribution favors Reading 2.

3. Textual Relationships.

Reading 1 has the attestation of the best Alexandrian mss., **Ⲙ** and B. Reading 4 also has one early Alexandrian witness in cop^{bo} while Reading 2 and Reading 3 both have late Alexandrian witness. Reading 2 is favored in the unreliable Byzantine witnesses. In addition f¹ and f¹³ point to a local text.

Summary of the External Evidence

The external evidence favors reading one with early attestation and strong textual relationship (**Ⲙ** and B).

EVALUATION OF THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE

1. Transcriptional Probabilities, i. e. what scribes likely did when copying the N. T.

(1) Shorter/Longer Reading.

Preference should be given to Reading 1 which is the shortest reading.

(2) Reading Different from Parallel.

Reading 1 is different from the parallel in Matthew 4:4. Readings 2-4 may be attempts to harmonize with Matthew or the LXX.

(3) More Difficult Reading.

Reading 3 is the most difficult but could represent an attempt to smooth out the Greek (εἰ instead of ἐπι).

(4) Reading Which Best Explains Origin of Other (s).

Reading 1 best explains the origin of 2-4. A scribe is unlikely to have shorted a longer reading, especially if this would destroy the parallel to Matthew and the LXX. Rather, the other readings are most likely attempts to harmonize Luke with Matthew and/or the LXX.

2. Intrinsic Probabilities, i. e. what the author himself likely wrote.

Luke usually quotes from the LXX. The quotation here does not divert from the LXX, it is only a shortened form of quotation.

Summary of Internal Evidence

The internal evidence also points to Reading 1.

CONCLUSION

Reading 1 is favored on the basis of good external witness (⌘ and B especially) and transcriptional probabilities.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Albert, Martin. Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche. Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921.
- Best, Ernst. Temptation and Passion: The Markan Soteriology. Cambridge: University Press, 1965.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. 2nd ed. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1968.
- Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. London: Faber and Faber, 1960.
- Cranford, Lorin L. Exegeting the New Testament: A Seminar Working Model, 2nd revised ed. Fort Worth, TX: Scripta, 1991.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Translated by Bertram L. Woolf. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet & Co., 1952.
- Donaldson, Terence L. Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1985.
- Dupont, Jacques. Les Tentations de Jésus au désert. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968.
- Ellis, E. Earle. The Old Testament in Early Christianity: Canon and Interpretation in the Light of Modern Research. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1991.
- Flender, Helmut. St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History. Translated by Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. The Testing of God's Son (Matt. 4:1-11 & Par): An Analysis of An Early Christian Midrash. Translated by John Toy. Lund, Sweden: CWK Gleerup, 1966.
- Hultgren, Arland J. Jesus and His Adversaries: The Form and Function of the Conflict Stories in the Synoptic Tradition. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1979.

- Jeremias, Joachim. Die Sprache des Lukasevangelium: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980.
- Kloppenborg, John. The Formation of Q. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Köppen, K. P. Die Auslegung der Versuchungsgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Alten Kirche. Tübingen: No publisher given, 1961.
- Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1949.
- Mauser, Ulrich. Christ in the Wilderness. Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, 1963.
- Metzger, Bruce. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Neusner, Jacob. What is Midrash?. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Panier, Louis. De la tentation de Jésus au désert. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1984.
- Robertson, A. T., and Hershey Davis. A New Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament. 10th ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 1958.
- Steiner, Maurice. La tentation de Jésus dans L'Interprétation patristique de Saint Justin á Origéne. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1962.
- Strack, Herman L. and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. 4 vols. Munich: C. K. Becksche, 1922-28.
- Talbert, Charles H. Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts. Society of Biblical Literature. Monograph Series 20. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974.
- _____. Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- Tannehill, Robert C. The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Taylor, Vincent. The Formation of the Gospel Tradition. 4th ed. London: MacMillan & Co., 1957.
- Thielicke, Helmut. Between God and Satan. Translated by C. C. Barber. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1958.
- Wright, Addison. The Literary Genre Midrash. Staten Island: Alba House, 1967.

Commentaries

- Bock, Darrell L. Luke 1:1-9:50. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament, ed. Moises Silva, 2 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994.
- Caird, George B. The Gospel of Luke. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. New York: Seabury Press, 1968.
- Ellis, E. Earle. The Gospel of Luke. The New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Gospel According to Luke I-IX. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1981.
- Geldenhuis, J. N. The Gospel According to Luke. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1950.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst. Das Evangelium des Matthäus. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke. Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Richard R. Smith, 1930.
- Marshall, I. Howard. The Gospel of Luke. The New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978.
- Morris, Leon. Luke. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Nolland, John. Luke 1-9:20. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 35a. Dallas, TX: Word, 1989.
- Patte, Daniel. The Gospel According to Matthew. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Plummer, Alfred. Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke. 3rd ed. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1900.
- Rengstorff, Karl H. Das Evangelium nach Lukas, Teilband 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962.
- Schlatter, Adolf. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. 3rd ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1975.
- Schürmann, Heinz. Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50. 4th ed. Herders theologischen Kommentar zum Neuen Testament, Band III/1. Freiburg: Herder, 1990.

Tiede, David L. Luke. Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament. Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1988.

Articles

Argyle, A. W. "The Accounts of the Temptation of Jesus in Relation to the Q Hypothesis." Expository Times 64 (1952-53): 382.

Charlier, Celestin. "Les tentations de Jésus au désert." Bible et vie chrétienne 5 (1954): 85-92.

Doble, Peter. "The Temptations." Expository Times 72 (1960-61): 91-93.

Dupont, Jacques. "L' arrière-fond biblique du récit des tentations de Jésus." New Testament Studies 3 (1957): 287-304.

_____. "Les tentations de Jésus dans le récit de Luc (Luc, 4, 1-13)." Sciences ecclésiastiques 14 (1962): 7-29.

Duquoc, C. "La tentation de Christ," Lumière et Vie 53 (1961): 21-41.

Edgar, S. L. "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament." New Testament Studies 9 (1962-3): 55-62.

Feuillet, Andre. "L' episod de la tentation d' apres l'Evangile saint Marc (1, 12-13)." Estudios biblicos 19 (1960): 49-73.

_____. "Le récit lucanien de la tentation (Lc 4, 1-13)." Biblica 40 (1959): 613-31.

_____. "Die Versuchung Jesu." International Katholische Zeitschrift Communio 8 (1979): 226-37.

Flusser, D. "Die Versuchung Jesu und ihr jüdischer Hintergrund." Judaica 45 (June 1989): 110-28.

Funk, Robert. "The Wilderness." Journal of Biblical Literature 78 (1959): 205-14.

Glendening, F. J. "The Devil and the Temptations of Our Lord According to Saint Luke." Theology 52 (1949): 102-5.

Graham, E. "The Temptations in the Wilderness." Church Quarterly Review 162 (1961): 17-32.

Hester, David C. "Luke 4:1-13." Interpretation 31 (1977): 53-59.

- Hoffman, Paul. "Die Versuchungsgeschichte in der Logien-quelle: Zur Auseinandersetzung der Judenchristen mit dem politischen Messianismus." Biblische Zeitschrift 13 (1969): 207-23.
- Holst, Robert. "The Temptation of Jesus." Expository Times 82 (1970-71): 343-44.
- Humphrey, Hugh. "Temptation and Authority: Sapiential Narratives in Q." Biblical Theology Bulletin 21 (1991): 43-50.
- Hydahl, Niels. "Die Versuchung auf der Zinne des Temples." Studia Theologica 15 (1961): 113-27.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Die 'Zinne' des Tempels (Mt. 4, 5; Lk. 4, 9)." Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins 59 (1936): 195-208.
- Johnson, S. L. "The Temptation of Christ." Biblica Sacra 123 (1966): 342-52.
- Kelly, Henry A. "The Devil in the Desert." Catholic Biblical Quarterly 26 (1964): 190-220.
- Kirk, J. A. "The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative: A Contemporary Perspective." Evangelical Quarterly (1972): 11-29, 91-102.
- Lohmeyer, E. "Die Versuchung Jesu." Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie 14 (1937): 619-50.
- Mason, A. "The Temptation in the Wilderness: A Possible Interpretation." Theology 4 (1922): 127-36.
- Olson, Dennis T. "Temptations and Trials in Deuteronomy 6-11, Luke 4, and Luke 22-24: the Significance of a Recurring Three-Fold Pattern." Word and World Supplement 1 (1992): 21-28.
- Pokorny, P. "The Temptation Stories and Their Intention." New Testament Studies 20 (1974): 115-27.
- Stegner, William Richard. "The Temptation Narrative: A Study in the Use of Scripture by Early Jewish Christians." Biblical Research 35 (1990): 5-17.
- Swanson, Hamish. "The Lukan Temptation Narrative." Journal of Theological Studies 17 (1966): 71.
- Taylor, A. B. "Decision in the Desert: The Temptation of Jesus in the Light of Deuteronomy." Interpretation 14 (1960): 300-9.

- Thompson, G. H. P. "Called-Proved-Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke." Journal of Theological Studies, n. s. 11 (1960): 1-12.
- Wilkins, W. "Die Versuchungsgeschichte Luk. 4, 1-13 und die Komposition des Evangeliums." Theologische Zeitschrift 30 (1974): 262-72.
- Zeller, D. "Die Versuchungen Jesu in der Logienquelle." Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift 89 (1980): 61-73.

Essays

- Berger, Klaus. "Hellenistische Gattungen im Neuen Testament." In Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt, ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, II. 25.2: 1428-69. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.
- Riesenfeld, Harald. "The Messianic Character of the Temptation in the Wilderness." In The Gospel Tradition. Translated by E. M. Rowley, 75-93. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1970.
- Robinson, J. A. T. "The Temptations." In Twelve New Testament Studies. London: SCM, 1962.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Der Sinn der Versuchung Jesu bei den Synoptikern." In Schriften zum Neuen Testament: Exegese in Fortschritt und Wandel, 101-28. Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1971.

Exegetical Tools Consulted

- Arndt, William F. and F. Wilbur Gingrich. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Cambridge: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Kubo, Sakae. A Reader's Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and a Beginner's Guide for the Translation of New Testament Greek. Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press, 1975.
- Louw, Johannes P and Eugene A. Nida. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains, 2 vols. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1988.
- Rienecker, Fritz. A Linguistic Key to the Greek New Testament. Translated by Cleon Rogers, Jr. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1980.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, 3d ed. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.

Zerwick, Max and Mary Grosvenor. A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament. Vol 1, Gospels-Acts. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1974.

Filename: TEMPTJesus
Directory: D:\My Documents\BIBLE\NT
Template: C:\WINDOWS\Profiles\Lorin\Application
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: INTRODUCTION
Subject:
Author: Unknown
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 06/17/2000 8:18 PM
Change Number: 6
Last Saved On: 06/17/2000 8:25 PM
Last Saved By: Lorin L. Cranford
Total Editing Time: 9 Minutes
Last Printed On: 06/17/2000 8:40 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 52
Number of Words: 10,169 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 57,966 (approx.)