

THE TEMPTATION OF JESUS

AN account of Jesus' temptation by Satan occurs in each of the Synoptics (Mt 4:1-11; Mk 1:12-13; Lk 4:1-13). Even the most cursory reading of each of these accounts reveals certain similarities and not a few dissimilarities among them. The Markan account is terse and concise. The Matthean and Lukan accounts are much longer, and focus upon a dialogue between Jesus and Satan. In a word, a comparison of the three accounts of Jesus' temptation is a classical example of the Synoptic problem. The two-source theory, now generally accepted as a working hypothesis towards the solution of the Synoptic problem, sheds some relationship upon the three accounts by indicating that the shorter, Markan, account serves as a source for the longer accounts and by pointing to Q, the discourse source, as supplying the material for the dialogue which we find in the Matthean and Lukan accounts. Such literary analysis, while interesting and necessary, can only be the beginning of an attempt to understand the temptation narratives. In fact, the temptation narrative fills a different function in each of the Synoptic Gospels. It is these different functions which is the principal concern of the present article.

MARK

We can begin with Mark because his account of Jesus' temptation is the shortest and is generally accepted to be one of the sources used by Matthew and Luke in the composition of their own narratives. His brief, two-verse narrative contains traces of Mark's redactional activity. The use of 'immediately' in v. 12 and the diminutive form of the Greek 'wild beasts' are characteristics of Mark's style. The wilderness of vv. 12-13 seems to have a different function from the wilderness of v. (3 +) 4. In the pericope about John the Baptizer, the wilderness is the locus of contact with God, the place for conversion. In the temptation pericope, the wilderness represents the place of alienation from God: it is the abode of demons. Because of this difference of meaning as well as the fact that the pericope begins with a typically Markan linking phrase ('and immediately'), there is every reason to believe that it was Mark the evangelist himself who added the temptation narrative to a tradition

about Jesus' baptism which came to him from another source.¹

Before considering the purpose of Mark's redactional addition, some consideration can be given to the narrative itself. V. 12 indicates that it is the Spirit who drove Jesus into the wilderness. This is the same Spirit who descended upon Jesus after he had come up out of the baptismal waters (Mk 1:10). In neither place does Mark indicate that there is any witness to the action of the Spirit other than Jesus himself. Nonetheless he notes that the action of the Spirit in leading Jesus into the wilderness is a forceful action, for Mark writes that the Spirit 'drove' him into the wilderness. We need not think of the raptured movement of such Old Testament figures as Elijah (1 Kg 18:12), but we must be aware that Mark intends to underscore the fact that the coming of the Spirit to Jesus in baptism is a necessary preliminary to the temptation, that the Spirit of God is therefore active in the calling of Jesus and the empowering of him unto his mission. After his initial work of setting Jesus in the temptation scene, the Spirit disappears from the Markan pericope and indeed from virtually the entire Gospel.²

In v. 13 Mark turns his attention to the presence of Jesus in the wilderness. No further indication is given of the locale of the temptation; nor does Mark, unlike Mt and Lk, attempt to describe the nature of the temptation. Using a periphrastic construction, he simply states that Jesus endured a forty-day period of temptation from Satan. Although some commentators have attempted to interpret the forty days as an allusion to Israel's forty years of wandering in the wilderness, it is preferable to be content with the idea that forty (10 × 4) denotes a fullness of time in Biblical and post-biblical literature.³ (Ex 24:18; 1 Kg 10:9). According to Jewish tradition, all the great leaders of the nation were confronted by Satan. Thus the rabbis spoke of the confrontation between Satan and Abraham, Moses, and David as well as between Satan and great rabbinic figures like Rabbi Akiba and Rabbi Meir.⁴ So, too, Jesus was confronted by Satan, and this for a fullness of time. The tempter is called 'Satan', one of the many names used of the chief of the evil

¹This conclusion was also reached by Ernst Lohmeyer. Cf. *Das Evangelium des Markus*, KEK, 2. 16th ed. Goettingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1963. pp. 26-27.

²Cf. Mk 3:29; 12:36; 13:11.

³E.g. Ex 24:18; 1 Kg 19:9.

⁴For references, cf. Hermann L. Strach-Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, I. Munich: C.H. Beck, 1955. pp. 136-141.

powers of late Judaism. In fact, in the literature of late Judaism Satan had many different functions. At times he whose name means 'accuser' is presented as the chief prosecutor before the divine assize. At other times, Satan appears as the instrument of divine vengeance. At still other times, he appears as a malevolent and personalized power who would deter man from his divinely appointed purpose. In fact, to the extent that dualism increasingly pervaded Jewish thought, as at Qumran and in the apocalyptic literature, the notion of the wily tempter who would turn man from the ways of God increasingly appears.

V. 13b-c present an unusual scene: 'and he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered to him.' The paratactic style of the entire verse shows that it is Jesus himself who stands in the presence of the wild beasts, just as it is Jesus who is ministered to by the angels. Undoubtedly, Satan is also in the presence of the wild beasts. Nonetheless Mark presents a scenario in which Jesus is the focal point; thus his construction underscores Jesus' presence with the wild beasts. Undoubtedly the wild beasts are a symbol of evil power, just as they occasionally are in the Old Testament,⁵ and as they are even more frequently in the literature of late Judaism.⁶ The angels and beasts stand over against one another; but it is not said of the beasts that they are in the service of Satan even though it is said of the angels that they are in the service of Jesus.

The scene is obviously apocalyptic. Angels and personified evil powers are traditional themes in apocalyptic literature. The massing together of the forces of evil, here symbolized by the presence of Satan and the wild beasts, is also a feature of apocalyptic literature. Yet Mark's apocalyptic scenario is strange. He mentions neither the conflict between the forces of evil and the chosen one of God, nor does he mention the ultimate victory of God's appointed one. At best there is the suggestion of confrontation between Jesus and Satan. No mention is made of a conflict between the wild beasts and the angels; nor is it stated that Jesus, with the angels, has won out over Satan and his forces.

It is this strange silence which provides the key to Mark's interpre-

⁵Ps 22:11-12; Ez 34:5, etc. Cf. Ernst Best, *The Temptation and the Passion. The Markan Soteriology*. SNTS, Ms. 2. Cambridge: University Press, 1965. pp. 7-10.

⁶E.g. Test. Neph 8:4.

tation of the temptation pericope. Willi Marxsen is one of several recent authors who have attempted a study of the redactional composition of Mk 1:1-13.⁷ With Marxsen I would agree that this prologue to Mk consists of five pericopes, each introduced by a temporal term or phrase: (1) the beginning of the gospel (vv. 1-3); (2) the presentation of John the baptizer (vv. 4-6); (3) the contrast between the persons and ministry of John and Jesus (vv. 7-8); (4) the baptism of Jesus (vv. 9-11); (5) the temptation of Jesus (vv. 12-13). Each of these pericopes not only introduces, but also serves as the hermeneutical key to the following pericope. An eschatological note is already introduced into the Markan prologue by the citation of Mal 3:1 in Mk 1:2. As Mark develops his prologue, by joining the pericopes to one another, the eschatological tone develops in crescendo. From the third pericope to the fifth, apocalyptic themes are introduced to accentuate the eschatological theme. The presence of the Spirit is the common note of these three pericopes. To the presence of the Spirit Mark adds in the fourth pericope the apocalyptic idea of the heavens which are rent. The final scenario is patently apocalyptic. The scene for the eschatological drama is set: the chosen one of God, served by angels, is in the presence of Satan and the wild beasts. No conflict ensues nor is any victory described, because it is precisely the eschatological conflict and the vindication of Jesus as God's chosen one which is the theme of Mark's Gospel. It is in Jesus' ministry that the eschatological kingdom of God breaks into man's history. In brief, then, the function of the temptation scene in Mk is to set the tone for the Gospel which follows. It is the means by which Mark would have his readers understand that the ministry of Jesus, culminating in his death and resurrection is indeed the eschatological conflict *par excellence*.

MATTHEW AND LUKE

Both Matthew and Luke make use of the Markan account of Jesus' temptation. Indeed their narratives (i.e., as distinct from the dialogue) agree with one another virtually only insofar as their two accounts also agree with Mk. Both Mt and Lk have, however, changed somewhat the function of the temptation narrative. By introducing material from the Q source into their accounts, Mt and Lk have historicized the account of Jesus' temptation. Nonetheless each uses the account, drawn from Mk

⁷Cf. W. Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1969. pp. 30-44.

and augmented by material taken from Q, for his own purpose.

In an attempt to arrive at this purpose, we can begin by comparing the setting of the scene in Mk (1:12-13b) with Mt (4:1-2) and Lk (4:1-2), and the Markan epilogue (Mk 1:13c) with that of Mt (4:11) and Lk (4:13). A very quick analysis necessarily points to redactional activity on the part of both Mt and Lk. In the scenario itself, Mt and Lk show minor agreements between themselves (over against Mk) in that they each cite Jesus by name and that they each refer to the protagonist of Jesus as the 'devil', the adversary. Both have deleted Mk's reference to the wild beasts. Both have made of the wilderness a geographical place insofar as it is a place without food. Thus both Mt and Lk agree with one another that Jesus 'was hungry' (v. 2). Nevertheless the description of Jesus' fast differs somewhat in the Matthean and Lukan accounts.

The presentation of the scenario by both Mt and Lk gives evidence of each redactor's hand. Two traits of the Matthean account are particularly noteworthy. First of all, Mt writes that Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness 'to be tempted' by the devil. The use of an infinitive phrase to express the purpose of God vis-à-vis Jesus is characteristic of Mt, as we find the same construction used in Mt 3:13 of Jesus' baptism. Secondly, Mt describes the duration of Jesus' fast. It lasted for 'forty days and forty nights.' Although forty days is a conventional figure to designate a considerable length of time, 'forty days and forty nights' is given as the length of Moses' fast in Ex 34:28. Similarly, we can point to two characteristics of Lukan redaction in the presentation of the scenario. First of all, the double mention of the Spirit in v. 1 bespeaks Lk's particular concern with the Spirit. Indeed the expression, 'full of the Holy Spirit' is typically Lukan.⁸ Secondly, the verb 'returned' is a characteristically Lukan turn of phrase.

As our attention turns to the epilogue of the temptation scene, redactional activity by both Mt (4:11) and Lk (4:13) is readily apparent. Their manner of treating the epilogue is an indication of the way in which each of the authors made use of his sources as well as the way in which each author allowed his Christology to colour the temptation narrative. Following his Q source, Mt mentions the devil's departure. Yet he combines Q's conclusion to the narrative with Mk's, which he renders in his own fashion. Whereas Mk simply states that 'the angels ministered to him', Mt reports that 'angels came and ministered to him.'

⁸ Acts 6:5; 7:55; 11:24.

The use of the verb 'to come' with the connotation of reverential approach to the Lord is characteristic of Mt, and is used in the temptation narrative even of the approach of the tempter to Jesus (Mt 4:3).

Whereas Mt normally uses both of his principal sources to the full, Lk generally makes a choice when parallel material is contained in both of his sources. Thus Lk, following Q, makes mention of the devil's departure, but does not mention the service which the angels render to Jesus. It may well be that this omission is due to more than merely stylistic considerations. Christological considerations may well explain the use which Lk has made of his Q material. In the third Gospel, angels do not appear in the service of Christ. God alone has dominion over the angels. In fact, angels are characteristically called the 'angels of God' (Lk 12:8-9; 15:10). Conzelmann has shown that the manner in which Lk works with the mention of angels in his sources is one of the ways chosen by Lk to assert the pre-eminence of God.⁹ On the other hand, Christological concerns are equally at work in the manner in which Lk presents Jesus' entrance into the wilderness. Of all the Synoptics, Lk presents Jesus much more as one who, full of the Spirit, acts in the Spirit.

Before explicitly addressing our thoughts to the function of the temptation narrative in both Mt and Lk, we should first reflect on the triple-temptation found in both Mt (4:3-10) and Lk (4:3-12). In the Q source which they used, the narrative undoubtedly began with a mention of Jesus' name. This would explain why the name of Jesus is one of the minor agreements between Mt and Lk. It would also seem to indicate that the temptation account was an independent narrative in the Q source. This is an interesting fact when we consider that Mk's temptation narrative was also an account independent of the traditional material which precedes it in the present redaction of Mk's Gospel. Another curious feature is that whereas Mt has a period of fasting after which the tempter approaches Jesus with the triple temptation (v. 3), Lk's version of the temptation presents Jesus as being tempted by the devil during the forty day period (v. 2) and then, after the completion of the forty-day fast, Jesus is subject to the three-fold temptation (v. 3). It is normally unlike Lk to duplicate his material. He seems to have done so in this instance for his own redactional purposes. This analy-

⁹Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*. London: Faber and Faber, 1960. p. 173, n. 3.

sis is confirmed by v. 13 in which Lk mentions 'every temptation' to which Jesus had been subject.

Since Lk is generally more faithful to the sequence and content of the material contained in his sources, we can avoid a lengthy discussion about the original sequence of the three temptations. Whereas Mt orders the temptations in a bread – temple – kingdoms sequence, Lk follows a bread – kingdoms – temple sequence. We trust that later considerations will show that Lk has preserved the original sequence of the Q material. For the time being, we will allow Lk's greater fidelity to his sources to lead us to follow Lk's order when we mention the first temptation (bread: Lk 4:3-4; Mt 4:3-4); the second temptation (kingdoms: Lk 4:5-8; Mt 4:8-10); and the third temptation (temple: Lk 4:9-11; Mt 4:5-7). In each of these temptation scenes the response of Jesus to the devil is a citation from Deuteronomy: respectively, Dt 8:3; 6:13; and 6:16.

THE FIRST TEMPTATION

The first temptation (Lk 4:3-4; Mt 4:3-4) centers upon the nature of the Messiah as a wonder worker. The devil – Mt calls him 'the tempter' – approaches Jesus with the words, 'If you are the Son of God.' In the present redaction of the Gospels these words recall the baptismal scene (Lk 3:22; Mt 3:17). They indicate that the subject of the jousting between Jesus and the devil is the role of the Son of God. Although the 'Son of God' title is rare in Hebrew and Jewish literature, we would support the contention of Iohannes Weiss, Ethelbert Stauffer, Rudolf Bultmann, Werner Kuemmel, and others who claim that the Christian use of this title is derived from royal messianism. At any rate the title was used of the Messiah in the apocalyptic literature (4 Ez) and the rabbinic traditions, at a time roughly contemporary with the composition of our Gospels.

In some ways Lk's account is more plausible than that of Mt. In the Lukan account Jesus is urged to address one stone to turn it into bread to satisfy his own hunger; whereas in Mt Jesus is urged to perform a useless nature miracle: to turn a mass of stones into loaves of bread. Although some authors would attribute the greater plausibility of the Lukan account to Lukan redaction, it seems entirely consistent with the nature of a nature miracle that nature itself be addressed directly (Mk 4:39; 12:14). Moreover a miracle tradition has a tendency to aggrandize the extent of the miracle as the tradition develops. Thus we

would opt for the originality of the Lukan account. The response of Jesus to the devil, 'Man shall not live by bread alone' (Dt 8:3), is somewhat longer in the Matthean than in the Lukan version. This is entirely in keeping with Matthean redactional practice.¹⁰ In parallel passages, Mt consistently cites the O.T. at greater length than does Lk.

A clue to the meaning of this first temptation is provided by the context of Dt 8:3. There we learn that it is God and only God who provides for his chosen people. It was not generally expected that the Messiah would authenticate himself by demonstrating thaumaturgic powers. Indeed the royal Messiah was not generally expected to be a worker of miracles, yet there was a general expectation that the messianic times would be times of plenty.¹¹ The first temptation account, therefore, centers primarily upon the role of the Messiah: is he content with the nature of Messiahship as determined by God or will he seek to supplant God by taking upon himself the function of providing food? Is the Messiah to usurp God's function or is he satisfied with his own? That is the real question in the first temptation. The satisfaction of his own personal hunger is quite secondary to the temptation. It is especially the Matthean account which, by its expansion of the tradition, shows that the satisfaction of Jesus' hunger is of secondary importance in the account. It serves as the occasion for the temptation, but it is not the essence of the temptation itself.

THE SECOND TEMPTATION

The second temptation (Lk 4:5-8; Mt 4:8-10) appears in a different sequence and a slightly different version in Mt and Lk. More clearly than does Lk, Mt localizes the temptation by describing Jesus as rapt by the devil to a high mountain from which all the kingdoms of the world could be seen. Such a mountain was well known to Jewish apocalyptic tradition. Baruch was reputed to have been instructed to teach the people for forty days after which he is to go up to 'the top of that mountain, and there shall pass before thee all the regions of that land, and the figure of the inhabited world, and the top of the mounts, and the depths of the valleys, and the depths of the seas, and the number

¹⁰Cf. E.P. Sanders, *The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition*. SNTS, MS 9. Cambridge: University Press, 1969. p.70.

¹¹e.g. En 10:17-21.

of the rivers.¹² There he was to await the coming of the Messiah. This narrative implies, but does not state, that the kingdoms of the earth belong to the devil. Rabbinic tradition speaks of the devil as the ruler of the world above all men;¹³ only Israel, the son of God, escapes domination by the devil. The temptation is that Jesus, the Messiah, will not be content with his mission but will seek to possess all the kingdoms of the earth. An early strand of the gospel tradition knows that Jesus was sent to the house of Israel;¹⁴ the devil would entice him by the thought of possessing all the kingdoms of the world.

The Lukan account speaks more of a visionary experience: the devil took him up and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. Perhaps Lk has deleted the mention of the mountain from the tradition which he used because, even more so than for the other evangelists, the mountain is for Lk a place of communication with God. It is a place for prayer and the scene of revelations. The object of the temptation is not so much the possession of the kingdoms of the earth, but the possession of political power. 'Authority' is a word which the third Gospel typically uses of political power.¹⁵ Jesus is put to the test insofar as the devil would suggest that he assume the role of a political Messiah.

In each account Jesus responds to the devil's temptation with a citation of Dt 6:13, slightly amended to fit the situation: 'You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.' As this temptation is the final temptation in Mt's version of the temptation narrative, Jesus is presented as giving a command to Satan that he should depart. Then in v. 11 the devil obeys the command by leaving Jesus. In fact, the command addressed to Satan appears to be a Matthean addition to the tradition which he has received. In the Q tradition, the tempter is consistently called 'devil' rather than Satan. Moreover the phrase 'begone, Satan' is one which Mt knows and uses in another context (Mt 16:23), where he borrows it from his Markan source. The Matthean addition dramatizes the climatic position of this third temptation in Mt's account and brings the reader's attention to the monolatry of Jewish tradition. Nonetheless in both the Matthean and Lukan accounts,

¹²Apoc. Bar 76:3.

¹³Lev. R. 18 (118a).

¹⁴Cf. Mt 10:6.

¹⁵Lk 20:20; 23:7, etc.

it is clear that the temptation is that the Messiah should usurp a role that was not given to him by God. The response of Jesus indicates, in effect, that even the Messiah is but God's servant.

THE THIRD TEMPTATION

The third temptation (Lk 4:9-11; Mt 4:5-7) is localized on Mount Sion,¹⁶ and more precisely on the pinnacle of the temple itself. Our authors are undoubtedly making reference to the royal colonnade on the south side of the outer court of the temple. The colonnade of the second temple overlooked a deep ravine. When Josephus, the Jewish historian, wrote of the temple, he noted that even peering over the temple would make a man dizzy.¹⁷ Yet it is not the location of the pinnacle alone which provides the key to the meaning of the temptation. The temptation is clearly messianic in character. Rabbinic tradition taught¹⁸ that when the king, the Messiah, would come, he would come and stand on the roof of the temple. There he will reveal himself to Israel. Thus both Mt and Lk present the devil as phrasing the messianic question: 'If you are the Son of God ...'

Is the Messiah to reveal himself to Israel as one who puts Yahweh to the test or is he to subject himself to the demands which Yahweh makes of him is the burden of the third temptation. Foiled in his previous attempts to turn Jesus from fulfilling his messianic role in subjection to the will of Yahweh by appealing to the classical human need for food and power, the devil appeals to the Scriptures. He cites Ps 91:11-12. The psalm was apparently seldom used in rabbinic debate. Yet it is one of the royal psalms and must, at least in its present context, be interpreted messianically. God, the devil says, has made a promise to his Messiah; if you are the Messiah, you must let him fulfill it.

Following one of the classical models of rabbinic debate, that of interpreting one passage of Scripture by quoting another, Jesus responds by citing Dt 6:16: 'You shall not tempt the Lord your God.' Following the accepted norms of rabbinic exegesis, Jesus has won the debate: he has bested the devil by citing the earlier passage in the Scriptures, a passage from the Torah itself. The passage which he

¹⁶Lk refers to Jerusalem; Mt, in a somewhat more Semitic fashion, refers to the holy city.

¹⁷Ant. XV, 11:5. *

¹⁸Pesikta R. 36 (162a).

cites had reference to the events at Massah where it is related that the Israelites put Yahweh to the test by forcing his hand, rather than trusting in his promise. For man to voluntarily test God's fidelity is, in reality, for him to prove his own lack of faith. Israel has shown its own lack of faith by testing God at Massah. Unlike Israel of old, Jesus, the Messiah, did not show himself to be faithless; rather he proved to be the faithful Messiah, content with the role that Yahweh had appointed for him when he designated him as his Son during the baptismal event.

INTERPRETATION AND PURPOSE

Within the respective contexts of the Matthean and Lukan narratives, the three-fold temptation account is a theologoumenon which focuses upon the nature of Jesus' Messiahship. Even Lk, who inserts the temptation account after his genealogy (Lk 3:23-38), clearly links the temptation(s) to the baptism of Jesus. Thus coming after the Messianic statements of John the Baptist and the designation of Jesus as the Messiah by a *bath qol*, the voice from heaven, the temptation narrative describes the nature of Jesus' messiahship. The temptation is specifically messianic and generally corresponds to the realities of Jesus' life. On more than one occasion, he was called upon to produce a sign, a miracle for the sake of miracle.¹⁹ Even more than the Synoptics, Jn²⁰ shows that Jesus' messiahship was not to be realized in the exercise of political power, but there was frequently that expectation on the part of the people. Thus the temptation narrative demonstrates in a single account what is shown by several pericopes of the gospels. As Messiah, Jesus is not principally a thaumaturge. As Messiah, Jesus does not seek after political power. As Messiah, Jesus does not tempt God — rather it is precisely as Messiah that he is found to be faithful. Indeed his Messiahship is according to the Scriptures.

Such is the general significance of the temptation narrative which Mt and Lk have taken over from Q. Some authors, perhaps motivated by the catechetical nature of most of the Q material, interpret the three-fold temptations in a moralistic sense. They illustrate the temptations to which each human being is subject insofar as the three temptations appeal to the weakness in every man. Each man is subject to his physical appetites, the lust for power, and the thirst for admiration. This

¹⁹Mt 16:1-4, etc.

²⁰Jn 6:15; 18:36.

was known to man²¹ even before Freud developed his theory on the libido and Adler his theory on power.

Among modern exegetes a refinement of the moralistic interpretation of the temptation narrative is sometimes presented in terms of Lk's clear attempt to link the temptation account to the baptismal narrative. According to this view, Christ appears as the model for the baptized Christian who is subject to the sort of temptations which are the lot of every man. Further support for this type of exegesis is occasionally found in Gen 3:6: 'So when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that the tree was to be desired to make one wise, she took of its fruit and ate; and she also gave some to her husband, and he ate.' In the aetiological Genesis narrative, the prototypical sin is presented as resulting from a temptation which is agreeable to the palate, delightful to the eyes, and would make man like unto God. The sequence of these three qualities is remarkably similar to the bread – power over what is seen – testing of God sequence which is found in the Lukan temptation narrative. Although it is true that a paraenetic interest lies behind much of the catechetical material contained in the Q source, it is to be doubted that such a paraenetic interest is primary in the present context of the Matthean and Lukan temptation narratives. The principal interest of the Matthean and Lukan accounts is Christological and the function of the pericope serves something other than a catechetical purpose.

As we consider the function of the narrative in Mt and Lk, let us return to the presupposition that Lk represents the original sequence of the material more faithfully than does Mt. Our working hypothesis was that Lk generally is more faithful to the order and content of Q. That same fact should now be introduced as an argument in favor of the priority of the Lukan sequence. Moreover, the Matthean sequence leads to such a dramatic climax (vv. 10-11) that it is difficult to imagine that Lk would have changed that sequence were it at his disposal. Granted Lk features Jerusalem and its temple in his narrative, but he is also faithful to the material at his disposal. Thirdly, there is a certain dramatic movement in the Lukan sequence which is internally consistent in that it is only in the third temptation narrative that the devil enters into Scriptural argumentation with Jesus. Finally, there is likewise a geographical movement in the Lukan narrative which is internally consis-

²¹ Cf. Strach-Billerbeck, I. p. 143.

tent and programmatic for the Gospel narrative – a movement from the Jordan to Jerusalem. Since this is so, it is clear that the original sequence of the material in Q focuses on citations from Dt in this order: 8:3; 6:13; 6:16.

What, then, is the function of the temptation narrative in Lk? The programmatic movement of the narrative provides a first clue. Lk's epilogue, 'he (the devil) departed from him until an opportune time,' provides a second. Jerusalem is a focal point of interest in Luke-Acts. The Gospel opens in the temple of Jerusalem and closes in the outskirts of Jerusalem. Acts opens at Jerusalem, and from there the Gospel message is spread to Rome then the center of the world. In the Gospel, Lk is at his editorial best when he directs our attention to Jerusalem during the journey to Jerusalem (9:51-19:44). The entire journey narrative takes its theme from Lk 9:51: 'When the days drew near for him to be received up, he set his face to go to Jerusalem.' It is in Jerusalem that the Messiahship of Jesus is fulfilled. It is in Jerusalem that Satan enters once again the Lukan narrative (22:3), at the outset of the Passion narrative. Indeed it is in connection with Jerusalem that Lk again picks up the temptation theme. In brief, the Lukan temptation narrative is programmatic in that it announces Jesus' journey from the baptism to Jerusalem. It prefigures the Passion narrative in that the devil occupies much more the centre of interest in the Lukan than in the Matthean narrative. In Lk the devil has more to say than in Mt. In Lk, the devil tests Jesus in every way, and then takes his leave. His departure is only 'until an opportune time.' The opportune time is the time of the Passion,²² which is announced and prefigured by the temptation narrative. Thus, Luke's temptation narrative looks forward, insofar as the temptation account is linked to the Passion still to come.

On the other hand, the Matthean narrative is arranged in terms of Mt's own Christology. It looks backward, to the Exodus and to Moses. Mt uses the same three citations from Dt and the Q source as does Lk, but he reorders them so that their sequence is Dt 8:3; Dt 6:16; and Dt 6:13. By reordering his material Mt has reconstituted the history of the temptations of Israel at the time of the Exodus, as this history is presented in the book of Exodus. Ex 16 speaks of the grumbling of Israel in the wilderness, prior to God's gift of the manna – an event to which Dt 8:3 refers. Ex 17:1-7 narrates the story of Israel finding fault

²²Cf. H. Conzelmann, *o. c.*, p. 28.

with Yahweh and putting its God to the test at Massah – an event to which Dt 6:16 refers. Finally Ex 32 narrates Israel's impatience with God and the erection of the golden calf – a violation of Israel's unique bond to Yahweh of which Dt 6:13 is a firm reminder.

Thus, according to the Matthean narrative, Jesus relives the experience of Israel. Whereas Israel failed at the moment of temptation, Jesus proves faithful at the moment of temptation. Jesus who is the Son of God (Mt 2:11; 3:17) proves to be the son with whom God can indeed be pleased (Mt 3:17).

Never far removed from the Matthean theme of the new Israel is that of Moses as a type of Jesus. The rabbis speak of a triple temptation of Moses, and they portray Moses as one who gave the devil a command to flee.²³ It may well be this typology which had led Mt to add 'Begone, Satan' in v. 10 and climax his narrative with the words, 'You shall worship the Lord your God, and him only shall you serve' – words that can only recall the experience of Moses and the temptations of Israel at the time of the great Exodus.

RAYMOND F. COLLINS

²³Cf. Strach-Billerbeck, I. pp. 146, 149.