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ABSTRACT

It is the aim of this paper to draw the attention to intertextual similarities between some motifs found in both LXX pretexts and Luke's Gospel.


Secondly, an intertextual analysis, especially of the similarities regarding the syntactical- and semantical levels of the language of both the LXX pretext and the text of Luke, is presented regarding two major motifs, i.e. the Desert-motif and the Elijah-motif. The paper ends with a short synthesis and conclusion.

Any text is an intertext; other texts are present in it, at varying levels, in more or less recognisable forms: the texts of the previous and surrounding culture. Any text is a new tissue of past citations. Bits of codes, formulae, rhythmic models, fragments of social languages, etc. pass into the text and are redistributed within it, for there is always language before and around the text.

(Barthes 1987:39)

‘Intertextuality has taught us that reality is not directly available or accessible, but that it is always mediated through language’ (Lategan 1989:106), because all texts consists of language and since it is on this linguistic level that ‘bits of codes, formulae, rhythmic models, fragments of social languages, etc. pass into the text and are redistributed within
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it, for there is always language before and around the text' (Barthes 1987:39).

1 RETROSPECTION AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 The character of the Greek of the New Testament

The language of the New Testament (NT) has been a subject of great controversy over the ages. On the one hand, so-called 'Purists' have claimed that the character of the Greek of the NT is 'pure' and comparable to that of Greek classics. On the other hand, so-called 'Hebraists' have claimed it to be full of Hebraisms and other Semitisms. The era between the 16th and 18th centuries clearly manifested the peak of this debate in which some exegetes tried to substantiate the 'purism' of the Greek used by the NT writers, while still others tried to convince their opponents of the contrary by way of identification of Semitic words, phrases or syntactical constructions in the Greek NT.

During the late 19th century, discoveries of papyri in Egypt led to Adolf Deissmann's contributions (Bibelstudien 1895; Neue Bibelstudien 1897; Licht vom Osten 1908) suggesting that the Greek language used by the NT writers showed great similarities with the discovered papyri. The result of these studies led to an almost general assumption today that the Greek language used by the NT writers was the common language (koinē dialektos) of this time; better known as Hellenistic Greek.

The Greek of the NT was thus no longer seen as the 'pure' Attic Greek used by classical authors such as Thucydides. It was seen as a product of several influences. The Greek language of the NT had developed not only within the borders of the general dynamic character of language (intracultural development), but also in syncretism with the influence of other languages spoken by different cultures (inter-cultural development). Especially after the conquests of Alexander the Great, traces of the Egyptian, Syrian, Semitic and other languages became evident.

One of the most important inter-cultural influences on Greek during this time was the use of this lingua franca to translate the Jewish religious documents, ie the Torah, the Prophets and the Psalms/Scriptures. These Greek translations consisted not only of translational equivalents for the Hebrew or Aramaic words, but also manifested the use of Greek terminology for Jewish dogmas. It was later called the 'Septuagint', a title originally given only to the Pentateuch and much later to the whole corpus. It was the first main translation of the Scriptures we know of, and also formed, chronologically, some of the first documents of which the corpus hellenisticum consists.

Finally, we thus found the LXX as a corpus of Hebrew writings translated in the Greek language of that time. These LXX-documents provided the NT writers (who wrote about three centuries later) with a kind of præparatio evangelica (Bertram 1957:225-249); or was used as a 'vehicle' by early Christianity (Mussies 1983:356-369) so that, when they created their documents and wanted to refer to the Old Testament (OT), they could easily make use of the already translated terminology which was found in these documents. Greek was thus no longer used as medium for the religion of Olympus alone, but also for other religions, including the monotheistic religion of Jahweh — who became the κύριος in Greek.
Seen from a historico-critical point of view, the Greek of the NT therefore consists, on the one hand, of the common language of that time which reveals the background and style of the specific author, but on the other hand, also reveals the stylistic features of the source material which was used when this author created his text (cf also Vorster 1990).

1.2 The Semitic element in the Greek of the New Testament

After the long debate between the Hebraists and the Purists (cf Kruger 1975:15-26), Winer finally concluded during the 19th century that the degree of Semitic influence on the language of the NT differed from writer to writer, between subdivisions of the NT and even between the NT documents (Kruger 1975:26, Mussies 1984:430-431):

Various explanations for the cause of these Semitisms have been postulated and vigorously defended over the years. Martin (1987:295) have summed these up under the following points:

i) The use of Semitic sources;

ii) Translation of an entire Semitic Gospel or, in the case of Acts, a Semitic document roughly equivalent to Acts 1-15 (C C Torrey and C F Burney);

iii) Thinking in Hebrew or Aramaic (N Turner), whether as a result of a) those languages being the writer's vernacular, and/or b) the writer's familiarity with the Septuagint which has resulted in a 'Biblical Greek' vernacular;

iv) Conscious imitation of the language and style of the Septuagint.

However, according to Martin 'the question arises whether it is possible to distinguish between those Semitisms which indicate underlying sources and traditions, rather than merely being features of the writer's natural or consciously-artificial Semitic style' (1987:295).

The trend to identify 'Semitisms' or a 'Semitic element' in the Greek of the New Testament was introduced by the Purist-Hebraist debate of the previous centuries and was sometimes over-stressed in the past. Silva (1980:216) also stated that,

One of the distinctive developments in the linguistics of the last two decades is its concern with the analysis of parole, in contrast with the almost exclusive preoccupation of earlier scholars with langue.

Much of the debate has, sometimes explicitly, assumed that the differences between the two parties can be resolved arithmetically, depending upon whether there is a large enough number of Semitisms.

These kinds of studies were strengthened by the upcoming of the grammatical-historical and historico-critical methods. The centrifugal point of these studies was formed by a fragmentary approach. Stress was laid on the identification and analysis of single words, phrases and citations without always paying enough attention to the specific context. Comparative studies, such as the hermeneutical field of the use of OT material by NT writers, particularly showed the signs of this fragmentary approach. It was the popular mode of the day — until recently — to identify, analyse, compare
and describe Semitisms, introductory formulae, citations and words which were found in the NT on a rather ad hoc basis and relate these to LXX materiaL. One just has to take a few older commentaries in hand in order to recognise this approach and to substantiate these statements (cf Voelz 1984; Louw 1990 for a detailed survey of the handling of the language of the NT. The former even draws attention to the appearance of a few Latinisms in the NT).

1.3 A paradigm shift: holistic-functional approach

The first signs of explicit attention to the broader context and a more functional approach, came from Saussure and the structuralists during the middle of our current century. The focus was slowly but definitely moving from the author and the text to the reader, his environment and interpretation of the text. With this paradigm-shift, went the collapse of the one-sidedness of the diachronical methods, such as the grammatio-historical and historico-critical methods and the coming to the fore of synchronical methods such as structural analysis, narrative analysis and reader-response criticism. However, the problem of one-sidedness still remained until cries went up for a more comprehensive approach which could accommodate both the diachronical and synchronical approaches, as well as the relationship author-text on the one hand and text-reader on the other hand. One such solution was found by linguists with their theory of 'Intertextuality'. It was postulated that intertextuality pays attention to the relationship between texts: 'Die' Theorie der Intertextualität ist die Theorie der Beziehungen zwischen Texten' (Pfister 1985:11).

But not only between the texts proper — also the difficult underlying relations between the histories of these texts and that of their readers and creators:

Interpretation is shaped by a complex of relations between the text, the reader, reading, writing, printing, publishing and history: the history that is carried by the readers' reading. Such a history has been given a name: intertextuality.

(Plottel 1978:XX)

The text is not an autonomous or unified object, but a set of relations with other texts. Its system of language, its grammar, its lexicon, drag along numerous bits and pieces — traces — of history so that the text resembles a Cultural Salvation Army Outlet with unaccountable collections of incompatible ideas, beliefs, and sources. The 'genealogy' of the text is necessarily an incomplete network of conscious and unconscious borrowed fragments. Manifested, tradition is a mess. Every text is intertext.

(Leitch 1983:59)

Although the origin of this thesis of intertextuality is to be found within the broader parameters of the deconstructionist movement, it definitely shows the positive side of this 'destructive' approach and seems to be definitely more functional.

Within this framework of deconstruction, where 'the condition of any text whatsoever, cannot...be reduced to a problem of sources or influ-
ences' (Barthes 1987:39), this might thus present the best starting point for our purpose of understanding (at least) some of the complex intertextual relationships between Luke's Gospel and its LXX pretexts. It is used, however, only as starting point, because 'the study of sources and influence of texts on other texts is the historical forerunner of intertextuality' (Vorster 1989:19). In this sense it will be used in this paper only as a theory concerning the ancient texts and not as a model or method by which these texts will be analysed.

One of the most usable features of intertextuality is its distinction of several forms of intertextuality. Translation, quotation, allusions (Anspielungen), paraphrase, imitation, parody, adaptation, Gattung, etcetera are all seen as specific forms of intertextuality (Broich & Pfister 1985:353-357). The identification and function of these forms could be helpful in a comparative study of the ancient texts involved.

Therefore, this author is of the opinion that the text-theory of intertextuality today seems the best choice in order to understand the similarities in the material of the different LXX traditions/versions as compared to that which is found in the documents of the NT writers. The relationship between author-text-reader receives the necessary attention, as well as the diachronical and synchronical aspects of the specific text. Not only is explicit matter (quotations, references, etc) seen as borrowed and reinterpreted material from certain pre-texts, but implicit similarities (imitation, etc) are also allowed a place as a certain form of intertextuality.

It would therefore not be wrong to describe the method which will be used in this comparative analysis as a comprehensive approach, which in a certain sense still operates within the parameters of a historico-critical approach — however, with the difference that it is not used to reconstruct some pre-written texts underlying the text of Luke's gospel, but to show how this Gospel re-uses some Old Testament-traditions and re-writes it with a specific theological aim in mind.

1.4 LXX pretexts and Luke's Gospel
As long ago as 1920, Cadbury found that Luke's style is, in many passages, about the best in the NT (1920:36-39). But this is only one side of the story. The other side reveals the existence of a definite Semitic element. According to Ellis (1983:3), Luke's Semitic idiom is usually attributed to his source materials, whose style he retained. Marshall (1984:55) explicitly postulated the fact that Luke's style of writing is frequently reminiscent of the LXX. Marshall also stated that Luke explicitly moves in an environment formed by the LXX and that it is right that we should regard it as exercising the more important influence upon his ideas — concerning the OT context of ideas (1984:96).

Silva (1976:108) found it 'interesting to note that Septuagintalisms (other than theological terms) are found primarily in Luke-Acts and in Revelation....Conversely, Aramaisms are hard to find in these writings, thus supporting the view (shared by the writer) that the authors in question intentionally imitated the style of the LXX.'

Du Plessis (1983:144) also agreed with this group, and declared Luke the one synoptist who was influenced the most by the LXX and stated that the largest part of his vocabulary is also found in the LXX.
Apart from all this external evidence of some relationship between Luke's Gospel and the LXX, we also find internal evidence of the use of other (OT) pretexts when this Gospel states explicitly that it was compiled with great care (Lk 1:1-4) and that the Law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms have been fulfilled with the coming of Christ (Lk 24:27, 44-45).

Therefore the Gospel of Luke seems to be a workable choice for uncovering complex intertextual relations between LXX pretexts and this Gospel.

However, one of the most important methodological issues which should be reckoned with, is that an investigation aimed at dealing with LXX pretexts and their relationship to New Testament texts has to define its understanding of 'Septuagint' more clearly (Steyn 1989a). It must take cognisance of the various written LXX text-variations which existed between the first three centuries B.C. and the first two centuries A.D. The interwovenness and interdependence among them have to receive definite attention (cf Silva 1983:52; Steyn 1989b:10).

The complex situation of the diversity of LXX texts during this time can be illustrated by a schematic exposition as found in the representation in the addendum.

Therefore attention to ascertaining (Schriftverwandnis) and interpreting (Schriftverständnis) the LXX pretext(s) which were used, is of crucial importance in order to understand the context of the specific NT pericope which the NT exegete wants to work on (Silva 1983:52; Koch 1986:1).

The Gospel of Luke is thus chosen to illustrate the relationship between LXX pretexts and the newly created and imitated text of Luke. It looks as if it was the trend in this Gospel to take a certain OT motif (from the LXX) and to rewrite it in terms of (that) contemporary history (cf the study of Weren 1989 as an example of this). Gross (1959) and Berg (1979) used the word Motivtransposition to describe this process. Such an OT motif could be as small as a single term within a metaphor (eg the vineyard of Isaiah as a comparison for the people of Israel), or as extensive as a whole story or tradition (eg the wandering of the Israelites in the desert (Dt 6-8) and its rewriting with 'Jesus' wandering and temptations in the desert — Luke 4:1-13; or the re-writing of the birth narratives of Jesus and John in terms of some important narratives in the OT (Steyn 1989c)). It could also form only a part of the newly created text, as in the last third of Luke's genealogy in chapter 3 (Steyn 1989d).

Alter (1981) worked on the same issue of OT motifs which were re-used in the NT. However, he did this from a narratological point of view and preferred to typify it as 'type-scenes' (cf the discussion of Botha 1989:124 on this matter with reference to the betrothal type-scene in John 4).

Several studies on the same issue were also done by Brodie (1983, 1984, 1986). He preferred to use the ancient Graeco-Roman rhetorical method of mimesis (Latin = imitatio) in order to understand and describe the implicit similarities between OT material and its reappearance in the NT. Brodie describes this rhetorical technique as follows:

i.e. the common literary practice of taking sources, particularly old sources, and transforming them in various ways, often highly ingenious

Imitation is described variously as a process of inspection, contemplation, wrestling, pioneering, digesting, honey-making, a process of being impregnated by the old text, so that the old text and the author combine to produce something quite new.

The actual practice of imitating or emulating involved a considerable range of techniques of adaptation. Among the most basic were those of compression (or abbreviation) and expansion. A more complex technique was that of fusing and dividing (1983:462).

Concerning the Gospel of Luke (on which Brodie had done several studies), he concluded:

In view of all these arguments — not only Luke's general affinity with rhetoric and the spirit of imitation, but also his more detailed resemblance to the imitative practices of particular Greco-Roman authors — it seems reasonable to conclude that this work should be classified as an imitatio, or at least should be regarded as involving imitative techniques. (1986:261-262).

According to Van Wolde (1989:43-44) this trend of imitating other texts continued from ancient times until the Renaissance when the situation gradually began to change.

2. ANALYSIS: INTERTEXTUAL SIMILARITIES AS MANIFESTED IN THE LANGUAGE

2.1 The motif of the testing of God's son in LXX pretexts and in Luke's account (Lk 4:1-13)

Within this temptation narrative, we find that one form of intertextuality stands out prominently, that is the explicit citation. The three answers of Jesus to Satan are explicit quotations which were taken from Deuteronomy (Dt) 6-8. The rest of the material makes it very evident that the writer of this newly created text surely knew the motif of Israel's wandering in the desert. He re-used this motif by way of imitation and applied it to Jesus.

In the context of Deuteronomy 6-8 Israel wanders in the desert because God wanted 'to test his son'. It forms part of the Desert-tradition or -motif. This motif is used and paralleled in Luke 4:1-13 where it is modernised. Jesus is God's son, and He wants to test him, just like his other son, Israel, in the desert.

The following elements of the two traditions come to the fore and stress the syntactical and semantical similarities between the two versions:

* In the desert under the leadership of God:
  Dt 8:2 = ἔν ἡγαγέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
  Lk 4:1 = ἦγετο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ
**Forty years/days:**
Dt 8:4 = ἵδοι τεσσαράκοντα έτη
Lk 4:2 = ἥμερας τεσσαράκοντα

**The son of God:**
Dt 8:5 = δόλος εἰς τις παιδεύσαι ἄνθρωπος τον υἱόν αὐτοῦ, οὕτως κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου παιδεύσαι σε
Lk 4:2 = εἰ υἱὸς εἰ τοῦ θεοῦ

**Testing:**
Dt 8:2 = ὅπως ἀν κακώσῃ σε καὶ ἐκπειράσῃ σε καὶ διαγνωσθῇ τὰ ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου, εἰ φυλάξῃ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ ἢ οὔ
Lk 4:2 = πειραζόμενος ύπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου

**Bread:**
Dt 8:3 = καὶ ἐκάκωσεν σε καὶ ἐλιμαχοῦσεν σε καὶ ἐνώμισεν σε τὸ μαννα, ὅου ἐκέφαλαν οἱ πατέρες σου, ἵνα ἀναγείλῃ σοι δόλος ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ὑζεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥηματί τῷ ἐκπειρασμένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ὑζεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.
Lk 4:2-4 = οὐκ ἐφαγεν...ἐπείνασεν...ἵνα γένηται ἄρτος...οὐκ ἐπ' ἄρτῳ μόνῳ ὑζεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος.
Lk 4:4 is a verbatim quotation of Dt 8:3 (LXX).

**A promised land for God’s son:**
Dt 8:11-10 = ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου εἰλαγεῖ σε εἰς γῆν ἀγαθήν καὶ πολλήν, οὗ κείμαιροι ὕδαταν καὶ πηγαί ἀμύσουν ἐκπειρασμέναι διὰ τῶν πεδίων καὶ διὰ τῶν ὅρων· γῆ πυροῦ καὶ κριθῆς, ἅμπελοι, συκαί, βόαι, γῆ ἑλάεως ἑλαίου καὶ μέλιτος· γῆ, ἔφ' ἣς οὐ μετὰ πτωχείας φάγη τὸν ἄρτον σου καὶ οὐκ ἐνδηπερήθη οὐδὲν ἐπ' αὐτῆς· γῆ, ἣς οὶ λίθοι σιδήρος, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὅρων αὐτῆς ἐκτάλλευσεν χαλκὸν καὶ φάγη καὶ ἐμπληθήκη καὶ εὐλογήθης κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς τῆς ἁγάθης, ἣς ἐδωκέν σοι.

In Luke Satan usurps God’s place when promising the world to Jesus, Lk 4:5-6: ἐδείξεν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν στιγμῇ χρόνου...Σοι δώσω τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἀπάσαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν...

**The condition of the promise — worship of God alone:**
Dt 8:11-14, 19 = πρόσεχε σεπατυ, μὴ ἐπιλάθῃ κυρίον τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ μὴ φυλάξαι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ κρίματα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα αὐτοῦ, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλεσα σοι σήμερον...ὕπωσθ' ἐς καρδίας καὶ ἐπιλάθῃ κυρίον τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἔξαγαγόντος σε ἐκ γῆς λίγουπτο εἰς οἶκον δουλείας...καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν λήθη ἐπιλάθῃ κυρίον τοῦ θεοῦ σου καὶ πορευθῇ ὅπισω θεοῦ ἐνέργος καὶ λατρεύσεις αὐτοῖς καὶ προσκυνήσεις αὐτοῖς, διαμαρτύρομαι ὑμῖν σήμερον τὸν τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν ὅτι ἀπώλεσε ἀπολείφθη.

In Luke Satan usurps God’s place when commanding worship from God’s son: Lk 4:4, 7 = σοὶ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσῃς ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, ἔσται σοι πᾶσα.

Jesus’ answer to this is the verbatim quotation from Dt 6:13: κύριον τὸν θεὸν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις...

Smits (1952:66) has already shown that the text of Q imitates the LXX reading as found today in codex Alexandrinus which adds μόνῳ and substitutes φοβησία with προσκυνήσεις. A possible reason for Luke’s preference of this reading might be found in the semantical difference between
According to Louw and Nida, the latter appears to emphasise 'more the semantic component of position or attitude involved in worship' (1988a:540). The Hebrew equivalent of this citation was part of the daily schēma-prayers of the Jews (Grundmann 1984:116).

* The protection of God:
Dt 8:4 = τὰ ἱματιά σου οὗ κατετρίβη ἀπὸ σου, οἱ πόδες σου οὐκ ἐτυλώθησαν, ήδον τεσσαράκοντα ἑτη.

In Luke's account Satan draws the attention to the fact of God's protection, when quoting from Ps 90:11-12 (LXX): τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ ἐνελείτιν περὶ σοῦ τῷ διαφυλάξαι σε...ἐπὶ χειρῶν ἀρουσίν σε μήποτε προσκόψης πρὸς λίθον τὸν πόδα σου...

If Hyldahl (1961:126) is correct, the place where Jesus stood might have been the same place from which heretics (especially blasphemers) were thrown down before stoning them. This was probably the 'tip or high point' of the building (Louw & Nida 1988a:89). Within this context, it could be seen as the final test: If Jesus is really a divine son, he will not die the death of a blasphemer.

There might also be a connection between the πέρυγιαν of the temple on which Jesus stood and the 'wings' (πέρυγιας) of the Lord (Ps 90 LXX) under which his favoured Son is protected.

* God’s son attempting to test his father:
Dt 6:16 = οὐκ ἐπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου, ὅν τρόπον ἐξεπειράσασθε ἐν τῷ Πειρασμῷ.
Lk 4:12 is a verbatim quotation of Dt 6:16 (LXX) when Jesus answers Satan: οὐκ ἐπειράσεις κύριον τὸν θεόν σου.

The broader context of the temptation narrative proves that all three quotations could be classified within the modernised group of quotations according to Fitzmyer's classification (1961:305). The modernised group were depicted by Fitzmyer as quotations in which 'the same general sense of the Old Testament text is preserved, but it is applied to a new subject' (1961:309). 'According to Shires (1974:6) this has to be called representative quotation. Representative quotation means that only a phrase is mentioned in the new text, but the whole context out of which it is taken, is supposed (cf also Holtz 1968:61-64; Stendahl 1968:47 and Pokorny 1974:116).

During the rewriting of this OT-motif, the co-texts of Mt and Lk differ in wording from each other on some points as the result of each writer's own stylistic preferences:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mt</th>
<th>Lk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ νηστεύσας</td>
<td>καὶ οὐκ ἔφαγεν οὔδεν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>νηστεύσας</td>
<td>πειρατόμενος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κόσμου</td>
<td>οἰκουμένης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραλαμβάνει αὐτόν</td>
<td>ἤγαγεν αὐτόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν</td>
<td>εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the main point of difference between Luke's account and that of Matthew is to be found in the structure of the motif when the order of the temptations is changed. The second temptation of Matthew became the third in Luke's account and vice versa. Ascribing the change in order to Luke, some possible reasons for this, which were presented in the past,
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include the following:

i) It is the result of a shift in a logical geographical order (Fascher 1949:24, Fitzmyer 1983:507).

ii) It symbolizes the reversed order of the ‘Our Father’ (Schweizer 1984:191).

iii) The context of Ps 106, from a liturgical point of view, has influenced the change in order (Swanstori 1966:70).

Some (if not all) of these possible solutions borders on speculation. The present reader holds the opinion that the key to the answer possibly lies in the context of Dt 6-8. Satan’s logic becomes evident with this knowledge of the context in mind:

If Jesus is God’s son (with which Satan confronts Jesus: ἐὰν υἱός ἐστιν θεοῦ) he should be able to make bread out of these stones (of which God could have made children of Israel; Lk 3:8 = ὅτι δύναται θεός ἔκ τῶν λίθων τούτων ἐγείρα τέκνα τῷ Ἰσραήλ). Jesus is related to the position of God’s son of the past when Israel was tested by their father in the desert in order to discipline them and to show them that man will not live by bread alone. Satan then also uses the background of this OT tradition to make his next move. Israel was promised a land — so he shows Jesus the kingdoms of the world which could be his (sic!) if he would worship Satan. It has to be remembered that Palestine, the promised land, was at that stage part of the Roman imperium! But Jesus knows the condition for the promised land — worshipping of God alone. Satan then makes his next move. He uses the context of God’s son worshipping him alone and his father’s protection of his favoured child. Satan proceeds not only to quote from Scripture too (thus regarding the discussion between him and Jesus a haggadaic midrash (Dupont 1957:287, Gerhardsson 1966:11-13, 70), but he also quotes from a Psalm (90:11-12 LXX) which refers to God’s protection of his son, who knows God and worships him. Jesus, however, still relates his position to that of Israel being tested by their father, and tells Satan that he must not tempt God — referring to Israel’s situation at Massah.

The theological motive of the creator of Luke’s text might have been to show that Jesus was tested as God’s son, using the parallelism of Israel’s test in the desert. Luke’s changes of the Q-material makes more sense when it is presumed that he changed it because of his knowledge of the context of the OT pretext. Luke’s order of the bread, the promised land and the son’s attempt to test his father, as newly created and imitated text, forms a better interwoven and logical narrative than that found in Matthew’s Gospel.

2.2 The Elijah motif in LXX pretexts and in Luke’s account
The Elijah motif is one of the most prominent OT motifs in the NT (cf the discussions by Crockett 1966; Kaiser 1982; Nützel 1986; Miller 1988; Breck 1989). Fitzmyer (1981:213) stressed the fact that Jesus is depicted using the title of προφήτης for himself in the synagogue in Nazareth when he said that no prophet is accepted in his own country and also when, later in the same episode, he compared himself to Elijah and Elisha. Although Luke treated John the Baptist as ‘Elijah returned’ (cf Kaiser 1982:221-33), he is presented only as the forerunner of Jesus and it is especially the latter who is seen to be a prophet like Elijah. According to Fitzmyer (1981:213-214) the Lucan writings consists of a double Elijah
theme:

On the one hand, Jesus rejects the identification of himself as the ‘One Who Is to Come’, the title of Elia redvitivus derived from Mal 3:1-23.

On the other hand, Jesus is portrayed as Elias redvitivus.

The implication of this double use of the Elijah role appears in the fact that Jesus rejects the idea that he has come as a fiery social reformer; but he tolerates his self identification with Elijah because of his miracles, especially his recognition as ‘a great prophet’ after the raising of the son of the widow of Nain (Lk 7:16; cf 1 Ki 17:23) (Fitzmyer 1981:214; Miller 1988:621).

The ‘other’ Elijah (Lk 1:17, 76)

In Malachi 3 we read about the ‘other’ Elijah who will come. Certain characteristics feature very prominently in this new coming:

3:1 = ἵδον ἐγὼ ἔξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου, καὶ ἐπιβλέπεται ὅσον πρὸ προσώπου μου, καὶ ἐξαίφνης ἤξει εἰς τὸν ναὸν ἑαυτοῦ Κύριος, δὲ ὡμεῖς ᾔπαθε, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος τῆς διαθήκης, δὲ ὡμεῖς θέλετε, ἵδον ἔρξεται ... 3:22 = καὶ ἤδου ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὡμῖν ὧλιαν τὸν θεσμόν πρῶτον ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ :23 = δὲ ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρός πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, μὴ ἔξωθε καὶ πατάξω τὴν γῆν ἄρδευν ... Some of these characteristics were taken up in Luke’s account when the angel said to Zechariah:

Lk 1:17 = καὶ αὐτὸς προελέυσεται ἐνόπιον αὐτοῦ ἐν πνεύματι καὶ δυνάμει Ἡλίου, ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα ... In the Benedictus we find some further exposition of this interwoven OT motif in Luke’s account:

Lk 1:76 = καὶ σὺ δὲ, παιδίων, προφήτης ὑψίστου κληθήσῃ: προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνόπιον κυρίου ἐποίμασαι ὅσον ἐποίμασα αὐτοῦ.

It is possible that Luke here re-uses the same elements as those found in Matthew 11 and 17 (which both of them could have been taken over from the same source/s):

Mt 11:13 = πάντες γὰρ οἱ προφηταὶ καὶ οὐ νόμος ἔχω 'Ιακώνου ἐπροφήτευσαν ... 14 = καὶ εἶ θέλετε δέξασθαι, αὐτός ἐστιν Ἡλίας ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι ... Mt 17:10-13 = τί σοι οἱ γραμματεῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι Ἡλίας δεῖ ἑλθεῖν πρῶτον; ... Ἡλίας μὲν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα: λέγω δὲ ὡμῖν ὃτι Ἡλίας ἴδη ἤλθεν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτὸν ὀλλὰ ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ δα καθέλεσαν οὕτως καὶ οὐ νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ’ αὐτῶν τὸτε συνήκαν οἱ μαθηταὶ ὑπ’ τῷ Ἰακώνου τοῦ βαπτιστοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ... The crux of this motif is found in Luke 4:24-28. With the use of the explicit quotation from Mal 3:1 as a specific intertextual form, Luke applies this OT motif as verba ipsissima from Jesus to John the Baptist.

In view of the above similarities, it looks on the one hand, as if John the Baptist was seen as Elias redvitivus. On the other hand, certain outstanding elements in Jesus’ life might be the result of the same idea applied to Jesus (according to Luke). Could this be one of the reasons for Luke’s parallelism of the birth narratives of Jesus and John at the beginning of his Gospel?
The widow and her dead son (Lk 7:11-17)
Attention has already been drawn to the resemblance between this Nain ac-
count (Lk 7:11-17) and the Sarepta-account (3 Ki 17:17-24) (Marshall 1978;
Fitzmyer 1983; Ellis 1983; Grundmann 1984; Brodie 1986).
When one looks at the synopsis that Brodie (1986:252-253) supplied (cf
also the response of C A Evans, 1987, on this study), the following phra-
seological similarities between the two versions come to the fore:

* Both stories begin with a καὶ ἐγένετο construction:
3 Ki 17:7 = καὶ ἐγένετο μετὰ ἡμέρας...
Lk 7:11 = καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἐξῆς...

* Both resurrectors went into a town:
Elijah went in Sarepta:
3 Ki 17:8 = ἐπορεύθη εἰς Σαρέπτα...
Jesus went in the town, called Nain:
Lk 7:11 = ἐπορεύθη εἰς πόλιν καλουμένην Ναίν...

* It is at the gate of the city that both Elijah and Jesus met a woman:
3 Ki 17:10 = εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα τῆς πόλεως
Lk 7:12 = ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως

* The typical Semitic structural marker appears:
3 Ki 17:10 = καὶ ἴδιοι
Lk 7:12 = καὶ ἴδιοι

* The sons of both women were their only:
3 Ki 17:17 = ὁ υἱὸς τῆς γυναικὸς
Lk 7:12 = μονογενὴς υἱός

* Both women were widows:
3 Ki 17:10 = καὶ ἴδοι ἐκεῖ γυνὴ χήρα...
Lk 7:12 = καὶ αὕτη ἦν χήρα...

* The sons of both women died:
3 Ki 17:18 = θανατώσαε τὸν υἱὸν μου
Lk 7:12 = ἐξεκομίζετο τεθνηκὼς

* Elijah sorrowfully asked the Lord whether he cared and Jesus also felt
compassion for the mother of the child:
3 Ki 17:20 = καὶ ἀνεβόθησεν ἸΗΛΙΟΥ καὶ εἶπεν Οὐίμοι, κύριε ὁ μάρτυς τῆς
χήρας...
Lk 7:13 = καὶ ίδοιν αὐτὴν ὁ κύριος ἐπελαχωρίζεθ ἐπ' αὐτῇ

* Elijah touched the corpse by stretching himself over the body and Jesus
touched the bier:
3 Ki 17:21 = καὶ ἐνεφύσακα τῷ παιδαρίῳ
Lk 7:14 = καὶ προσελθὼν ἤματο τῆς σοροῦ

* Elijah prayed to the Lord for the return of the child's soul and Jesus
commanded the boy to rise:
3 Ki 17:21 = καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν κύριον καὶ εἶπεν Κύριε ὁ θεός μου, ἐπιστραφήτω δὴ ἡ ψυχή τοῦ παιδάριον, τούτου εἰς αὐτὸν
Lk 7:14 = καὶ εἶπεν· νεανίσκε, σοί λέγω, ἐγέρθητι.

* Both Elijah and Jesus resurrected the sons from the dead:
3 Ki 17:22 = καὶ ἀνεβάσεν τὸ παιδάριον
Lk 7:15 = καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρός

* The son of Sarphat cried out and that of Nain sat up and began to talk:
3 Ki 17:22 = καὶ ἀνεβάσεν
Lk 7:15 = καὶ ἀνεκάθισεν ὁ νεκρός καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν

* The sons were given back to their mothers:
3 Ki 17:23 = καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρί αὐτοῦ
Lk 7:15 = καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρί αὐτοῦ

* In both accounts the spectators were astonished:
3 Ki 17:24 = Ἰδοὺ ἐγνώκα ὅτι ἀναφέρεις ὁ θεός ὑμῖν καὶ ῥῆμα Κυρίου ἐν στόματί σου ἀληθινόν
Lk 7:16 = λέγοντες ὅτι προφήτης μέγας ἤγερθη ἐν ἡμῖν καὶ ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θεὸς τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ.

Luke definitely must have known the OT account of Elijah, because earlier in his Gospel he makes explicit reference to the widow of Sarphat when Jesus says (4:25-26):
25 = ἐπὶ ἀληθείας δὲ λέγω ύμῖν, πολλαὶ χήραι ἤραν ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡλίου ἐν τῇ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτε ἐκκλησήθη ὁ οὐρανός ἐπὶ έτη τρία καὶ μήνας ἐξ, ὡς ἐγένετο λιμὸς μέγας ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν
26 = καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίαν αὐτῶν ἐπέψηθε· Ἡλίας εἰ μὴ εἰς Σάρπετα τῆς Σιδωνίας πρὸς γυναικὶ χήρᾳ.

It must be noticed that the phrase εἰς Σάρπετα τῆς Σιδωνίας is identical with 3 Kings 17:9. In the similar accounts of Matthew (13:53-58) and Mark (6:1-6) no corresponding reference of any kind is found.

According to Brodie's conclusions about the relationship between the LXX pretexts and the text of Luke's Gospel, he decided that 'the relationship between the texts is not haphazard, but rather consistent and systematic' (1986:259).

Fire from heaven (Lk 9:51-56)
Another prominent motif linked to Elijah is found at the beginning of the travel narrative. After the rejection of Jesus by the Samaritans, James and John asked him: Κύριε, θέλεις εἶπομεν πῦρ καταβήναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλέσαται αὐτοῦς;

This is a direct quotation from 4 Kings 1:10, 12 and 14:
10 = καταβηθεται πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ καταφάγεται σικα τοὺς πεντήκοντα σου. καὶ κατεβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς πεντήκοντα αὐτοῦ.
12 = καταβηθεται πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ καταφάγεται σικα τοὺς πεντήκοντα σου. καὶ κατεβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν αὐτὸν καὶ τοὺς πεντήκοντα αὐτοῦ.
14 = ἤδου κατεβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν τοὺς δύο πεντήκοντα χρόνους
However, in this case we find that Jesus acts differently. Nützel (1986:169) said: 'Jesus lehnt solche Machterweise ab; seine Voll-Macht erweist sich in Heils-Taten, nicht in Vernichtung'.

Assumption into heaven

Another prominent feature of the Elijah-motif at the beginning of the travel narrative is found in Luke 9:51:

'Εγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληρώσαθι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμματος αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἑστήρασεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ.

In 4 Kings 2:1 we read about Elijah:

καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἄνάγειν κύριον τὸν Ἡλιοῦ ἐν συσσειμᾷ ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν...καὶ ἐπορεύθη Ἡλιοῦ καὶ Ἐλισαέ ἐκ Γαλγαλῶν...

Davies (1964:165) drew attention to this similarity when he said that: 'In both cases a journey is an integral part of an assumption story, and Luke sees Jesus' journey in the same light.' It is also interesting to note that the Hebraism of Lk 9:51 (τὸ πρόσωπον ἑστήρασεν) is a typical phrase which is found several times in the known LXX pretexts (especially in Ez: 6:2; 13:17; 14:8; 15:7; 21:2; 21:7; 25:2; 28:21; 29:2; 38:2).

This author's understanding of the intertextual relationship between the mentioned passages in the specific LXX pretexts and in Luke's Gospel is to be found within the same framework as that of Brodie when he said:

one may account for the data, the complex relationship, by the relatively straightforward explanation that Luke had before him a copy of the text to which his work shows such affinity, the LXX, or at least a part of the LXX which contained the Elijah-Elisha narrative, and that precisely as literary artist he transformed the text, dramatizing and christianizing the ancient narrative.

(1986:259)

(Cf Brodie 1989 for a more detailed comparison between the two accounts of Lk 9:51-56 and 4 Ki 1:1-2:6, although this author is of the opinion that in his presentation Brodie stretched the limits of comparison too far in order to substantiate his point.)

3 SYNTHESIS AND CONCLUSION

Although this kind of comparative study might appear suspicious in the sense that we are once again dealing with 'sources' and their 'influences' on other texts, and that it might seem only as if the terminology has changed while the historico-critical method of a previous era remained, this author wants to draw attention to the fact that it is not the aim of this study to reconstruct some pre-written texts from the written text and to compare these with each other (cf the differences between a Redaktionsgeschichtliche approach and Intertextuality as discussed by Vorster 1989:15-26).

The comparison between the language of certain LXX pretexts and the language of Luke's Gospel is made, because, as Vorster accurately formulated it:

The ancients, similar to what we do, made use of anterior texts, imita-
ted other texts, and alluded to precursor and contemporary texts in producing their own texts.

What is important is the way in which we regard these relationships. All texts can be regarded as the rewriting of previous texts, and also as reactions to texts.

In producing sentences the maker of any text creates a fabric which points to many other prior texts. However, the texts that really matter are those intertexts which have been used in comparable contexts (1989:20-21)

The similarities between the motifs found in Luke's Gospel and those in LXX pretexts might be the result of one or more of the following:

a) Luke's readers might have been Greek-speaking Jews which resulted in his preferring to use LXX pretexts instead of the forerunners of the later Masoretic text.

b) Some kind of 'promise-fulfillment-scheme' might have formed part of the hermeneutical framework used by the creator of the Lucan text.

c) The imitation of syntactical and semantical features from LXX pretexts might explain the intertextual similarities ('intertextemes') in the form and content of the language.

However, the main purpose of Luke's re-use of these OT motifs might be explained by the fact that his text was constructed as a reaction to the LXX pretexts — according to his understanding of Jesus' life and works in relation to prominent moments in the religious past of the Jews.
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ADDENDUM

THE HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN AND TRANSMISSION OF THE SEPTUAGINT

VORLAGE(N)

OLD GREEK VERSION
PENTATEUCH ca 280 BC

OLD GREEK VERSION
PROPHETS & SCRIPTURES
ca 170/150 BC

HYPOTHETICAL VORLAGE(N)

EVIDENCE FROM
CAIRO GENIZA

EVIDENCE FROM
DEAD SEA SCROLLS

MINOR RECENSIONAL CHANGES

UR-THEODOTION
(KAIGE)
1ST CENT BC

AQUILA
ca 135 CE

SYMMACHUS
ca 170 CE

*1 *2 *3 *4 *5 *6

*1: HEBREW
*2: TRANSCRIPTION
*3: AQUILA
*4: SYMMACHUS
*5: OLD GREEK VERSION
*6: THEODOTION

HEXAPLA: ORIGEN
ca 245 CE

PHASE OF TRANSLATION:
JEWISH IN DISPERSSION.

JEWISH RECENSIONAL PHASE

CHRISTIAN RECENSIONAL PHASE

LUCIAN
ca 312 CE

HESGYIAN
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