

Adam in the Beginning and Jesus at the End: The Intertextual Construction of ‘Adam-Christ Typology’ in the Lucan Narrative

David Chengxin Li
South China Normal University, Guangzhou, China

This paper is a study of the intertextual relationship between the Gospel of Luke and Genesis, focuses on a close reading of the crucial narrative in Luke 3:48-4:13 and 23:32-43, and suggests that the author of Luke-Acts (hereafter referred to as Luke) characterizes Jesus as the eschaton Second Adam by constructing the intertextual relationship between relevant narratives of Luke and the ‘Lost Paradise’ story in Genesis (ch. 2-3). Concretely speaking, utilizing the concept of ‘Son of God’, ‘kingdom’, ‘Paradise’ and the theme of temptation, the evangelist relates the identity and works of Jesus to Adam and the universal disaster brought about by him (and Eve) in a remedial sense. This intertextuality leads to a unique understanding of Jesus’ pivotal role in divine history and of the origin of this role in Genesis.

The earliest Christian theological speculation of the relationship between Jesus and Adam was in Paul’s Letter to Romans (5:12-21) and the First Letter to Corinthians (15:20-28, 45-49) in the classic form of ‘Adam-Christ typology’. Thus there are two versions of ‘Adam-Christ typology’ with different focuses and languages in different contexts in Paul’s undisputed letters. Despite this typology’s significant influence on later theological speculations, it has always been taken as mere special discourse strategy for concrete contexts or even as a rhetoric tool for exhortation. The author of this paper, however, agrees with the interpretations proposed by R. B. Hays (2002/1983, 2004), N. T. Wright (1991, 1992, 2013), B. Witherington III (1994), J. D. G. Dunn (1998) and E. Adams (2002). They accept the insights of the ‘new-perspective’ and have made the further proposition that Paul’s thought world was actually built on the basis of a salvation narrative which embraces the whole history from the beginning of

creation to the End, and that his references to Genesis and the construction of 'Adam-Christ typology' in two letters represented the framework which connects the beginning (humans lost Paradise and being under the power of Sin & Death), the axis (Jesus fixed Adam's mistake and restored Paradise), and the End (humans sharing the benefit of Jesus' restoration) in a comprehensive divine history. In this perspective Adam-Jesus relationship has a realistic meaning for Paul.

The evangelist Luke had been considered as Paul's loyal companion in church tradition. But since the rise of historical critical study of the New Testament in the 19th century, the academic consensus has tended to suggest that the author of Luke-Acts was not the doctor 'Luke' mentioned in Philemon 1:23-25 and that the evangelist might be much younger and even that he did not have personal contact with Paul. The obvious theological 'generation gap' between Luke-Acts and undisputed Pauline letters has been allegedly exposed (W. W. Gasque, 1989, pp. 24-26, 32-38, 62-64, 75-86; P. Vielhauer, 1963/1951; R. Bultmann, 2007/1951-1953)¹. On the other hand, reception history studies in the new century have strongly emphasized the multi-dimension character of the so-called 'Pauline tradition', that is, that the plural Pauline traditions are not only represented by the written words in undisputed letters, but also included such elements as personality, oral preaching and organizational rules made by Paul himself. Reviving the message and image of Paul for their own historical and pastoral contexts in various critical ways, Luke and the authors of deutero-Pauline letters, together with the later authors of apocryphal Acts of Paul, should also be considered as inheritors and interpreters of Pauline traditions (F. Bovon, 2009; D. Marguerat, 2012)². We can even propose that the framework

¹ Early German scholars, Ferdinand C. Baur, Karl Schrader, and Eduard Zeller, had already supposed that there were two images of Paul in the New Testament canon, the one Paul represented in his own letters, the other represented by the author of Acts. In the mid 20th century, Philipp Vielhauer, for the first time and systematically, discussed the theological differences in thought between Luke-Acts and Pauline letters on natural theology, Christology, theology of Law, and eschatology, and established an interpretive scholarly 'tradition' based on the sharp confrontation between two authors. An additional foundation for Vielhauer's interpretation was Rudolf Bultmann's classic reconstruction of the historical development of the Christian thought at the end of the first century. He thought that Luke 'historized' the Pauline 'imminent End' eschatology to satisfy the need of the emerging universal Church.

² Daniel Marguerat, further expanding and refining a supposition made by François Bovon, suggested that there were three main forms of reception of Pauline tradition in history: documentary form, biographical form, and the didactic form. The documentary form y was mainly the Christian actions of collecting and editing the Pauline letters scattered across the local churches; the biographical form was represented by the compositions of Acts

of salvation narrative should be seen as the crucial feature of Pauline heritage, and that Luke could adapt this divine narrative to his historiography project about the life of Peter, Paul, Mary and Jesus Christ. To detect the hints of ‘Adam-Christ typology’ in Lucan narrative intertextually could contribute to further understanding of Lucan theology and its connection with Pauline theology.

The author of this paper tries to argue that Luke referred to the ‘Lost Paradise’ story of Genesis in his narrative to set the background of Jesus’ earthly works, passion, and resurrection as the decisive triumph for reversing Adam’s disobedience and transgression. More specifically, Luke emphasizes Jesus’ fundamental identities as ‘Son of God’ and the ‘Lord’ of the kingdom of God, and these two identities correspond to Adam’s identities as the first Son of God and the ex-lord of the Paradise. Secondly, Luke constructs the narrative of the temptations in the wilderness to imply that Jesus’ successful resistance against Satan’s temptations concerned life, power and bodily desire, which were exactly what Adam (with Eve) were confronted with and failed to resist. The temptations in the wilderness were Jesus’ opening battle against Satan, and he went on purging the power of Satan through challenging the social injustice brought about by sinful power relationships. Finally, the unique ‘Paradise dialogue’ in the passion narrative reveals the eschatological significance of the ‘kingdom of God’ and the whole earthly career of Jesus as ‘Second Adam’, who has regained the lost Paradise for human beings, and made possible the promise of the resurrection and eternal blessing life at the End.

1 Jesus the other Son of God

Luke does not mention the name ‘Adam’ directly with the exception of the last sentence in the ‘Genealogy’ (Luke 3:23-38)³, and therefore we must firstly clarify the significance of this genealogy, especially the ‘son of God’ phrase in

and later Apocryphal biographies of Paul; and finally the didactic form was represented by the far-reaching influence of Pauline theology and rhetoric in teaching reflected in later deutero-Pauline letters and the Apostolic Fathers. The later reception of the Pauline tradition was no longer controlled or directed by Paul himself or his close circle, with the result that the ‘products’ of the reception were full of tension between what reflected continuity and what reflected variance.

³ Besides Luke and the undisputed Pauline letters, ‘Adam’ appears in New Testament Canon three more times: 1 Timothy 2:13, 14, and Judas 1:14.

3:38, and then reveal the special significance of this title in the Lucan narrative as a whole and its intrinsic relation to the ‘Second Adam’ identity of Jesus. In this section, therefore, the ‘Son of God’ title will be interpreted in relation to three aspects: firstly, Lucan redaction of the source (Mark); secondly, the close relation between the ‘Son of God’ and ‘Lord’ title, and finally the supernatural revelation of the ‘Son of God’ identity of Jesus.

At the very beginning of Mark, the title ‘Son of God’ is emphasized and presented as the one of chief titles of Jesus: “ἀρχὴ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ” (Mark 1:1)⁴. Although uses of ‘Son of God’ in both Luke and Matthew are chiefly inherited from Mark, Luke focuses more on this title than Matthew, who rather tends to emphasize Jesus’ identity as ‘King’ (ὁ βασιλεὺς) i (Matthew 2:2). This royal identity is the core of a series of units in his infancy narrative, including Magi’s gifts, the massacre of the infants, and the holy family fleeing to Egypt. On the other hand, having a totally different infancy narrative, Luke arranges the angel as the supernatural revealer of Jesus’ first identity: the unborn child is ‘the Son of the Most High (υἱὸς ὑψίστου)’ (Luke 1:32) and again ‘he will be called Son of God (υἱὸς θεοῦ)’ (Luke 1:35). Thus the title ‘Son of God’ is the first title Jesus received in Lucan infancy narrative, even more significant, it seems, than ‘Christ’ (cf. Luke 2:11).

The ‘Son of God’ title in Luke is closely related also to the title, ‘Lord’, playing the role of further revealing Jesus’ special relationship with God the ‘Father’. Focusing on firstly on the three phrases with ‘Lord’ word in Luke 1:38, 43, and 45, people should notice that the word, ‘Lord,’ in the first and third phrases refers to God, but the middle one refers to the fetus Jesus in Mary’s womb. All three sentences are about Mary and her child’s identity and destiny, and all three ‘Lord’ words not only interact with each other in the same Marian motif, but also highlight the identity of the central figure Jesus as sharing God’s lordly glory, and consequently Jesus can be properly addressed as ‘my Lord’ by the spiritually inspired Elizabeth even before he was born. The same

⁴ This opening sentence of Mark has a crucial textual critical problem: whether the ‘υἱὸς θεοῦ’ belongs to the original text? While the shorter reading without ‘υἱὸς θεοῦ’ is reserved by minority manuscripts represented by Codex Sinaiticus, the majority manuscripts reserve the longer reading with ‘υἱὸς θεοῦ’, including Codex Vaticanus. Bruce M. Metzger (1994) supposed that the shorter reading was caused by scribal confusion of genitive ‘Christ’ (ΧΥ) with ‘God’ (ΘΥ) in form of *nomina sacra*. The opposite opinion is held by Bart D. Ehrman (1993), who pointed out that the shorter reading was not a scribal confusion, but an earlier reading of an earlier textual tradition. Whether the shorter reading is the original one or not in Mark, it does not influence our interpretation of Luke and his emphasis of Jesus’ Son of God identity.

‘God-Jesus-God’ pattern of the ‘Lord’ textual references reappears in three sentences of the birth narrative, Luke 2:9, 11, and 15. God sent his angel to declare to the humble shepherds the good news of the birth of the Lord Jesus, and they recognized that this is the good news from the Lord God. It is also noteworthy that the Lord title in Luke 2:11 is in the deliberately constructed climactic relationship alongside two other titles: Saviour and Messiah. In this textual relationship, the ‘Messiah’ specifies that Jesus was not one of many saviours claimed by the powerful in the time such as the *imperator* Augustus, but the unique one whose title was attributed to God by Mary (cf. Luke 1:47), and also the one who was ‘promised to our ancestors’ (cf. Luke 1:55) for all the people (cf. Luke 2:10).

The above two textual interactions with ‘A-B-A’ pattern of interacting ‘Lord’ words and the climactic ‘Saviour-Messiah-Lord’ arrangement could make further reference to each other in close reading of infancy narrative as a whole, implying the identity of Jesus as Son of God. Therefore the narrative setting and its detail implications reveal that Jesus’ holy Sonship is the foundation for understanding his Lordship: he is the Lord because he is the Son of God who came down to earth through miraculous conception, and his identity as the Messiah depends on this eminent Lordship. This very important point gets the further confirmation in the later narrative unit, ‘the parable of the wicked tenants’ (Luke 20:9-18).

In the common synoptic tradition, the earliest version of ‘The parable of the wicked tenants’ is in Mark 12:1-12, and Matthew (21:33-46) and Luke respectively made different redactions for their own purposes. First of all, the evil tenants, in Markan version, killed the beloved son and some of servants sent before, and Matthew follows this arrangement, but Luke makes it different: the evil tenants killed only the beloved son. This Lucan redaction highlights the unique identity of the son as the rightful inheritor of the vineyard, and this identity is the precise reason why he gets killed. Since the ‘beloved son’ could be reasonably identified with Jesus himself and his being killed points to his future crucifixion, then Luke must emphasize that Jesus as Son of God would be the inheritor of God the Father’s title and ‘property’, and so be the Lord and specifically the Lord of the ‘vineyard’, that is, the Kingdom of God. On the eve of his being arrested, Jesus, and only in the Lucan narrative, thus confirmed that he had already inherited the Kingdom from God:

I confer on you just as my Father has conferred on me (καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου) a kingdom, so that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου).....' (Luke 22:29-30a).

Differing from the parallel sayings in Matthew, the Lukan version does not just communicate an eschatological expectation, but also reveals that Jesus had already been the Lord of the Kingdom of God that had been brought down on earth by himself, and that he was capable of sharing this reality of kingdom with his followers.

To sum up, by the subtle arrangements of textual interactions within specific narrative units and the redaction of the traditional synoptic parable, Luke closely relates the Sonship of Jesus with his Lordship, and the Kingdom of God is, at the same time, the Kingdom of His beloved Son Jesus (cf. Luke 14:15, 24, 22:16). Jesus is considered as the co-Lord of the Kingdom of God and the sharer of ultimate Lordship, mainly because he is the rightful heir from the beginning of his earthly life who was to be killed according to the plan of salvation. In this paradoxical way, Jesus shares the Kingdom with his followers. In this perspective, Jesus' 'Son of God' identity becomes the ultimate foundation of other titles such as 'Christ/ Messiah', 'son of David', 'prophet' and 'teacher/ rabbi'.⁵ Finally Luke addresses Jesus as Lord with God is not for the purpose of manifesting the divinity of Jesus, but to reveal Jesus' special authority as 'Son of God', the heir of God's Kingdom, and consequently the co-Lord of that Kingdom. This is perhaps the real reason that John the Baptist did not preach the 'the Kingdom of God' in Lucan narrative, rather than Conzelmann's explanation (1969/1954 pp. 24-27, 102).

The third and the final crucial point about the special nature of the 'Son of God' title is that Luke prudently limits his references to this title. We should

⁵ Paul also attached great importance to Jesus' titles, 'Son of God' and 'Lord' and their relation to Jesus' passion and resurrection, and accordingly he also adopted earlier christological traditions in his letters, such as in Romans 1:3-4 and Philippians 2:6-11. See M. Hengel (1986/1975, pp. 57-58). These two critical passages reveals that Paul might connect 'Son of God' with 'the Lord' on the basis of Jesus' resurrection and his heavenly glory, and this, of course, does not presuppose that Jesus became Son of God and the Lord after his resurrection and ascension in Paul's mind, but just confirms Paul's post-Easter perspective about Jesus and his reign. See Romans 5:10, 8:3, 29, 32; 1 Corinthians 1:9, 15:28; 2 Corinthians 1:19; Galatians 1:16, 2:20, 4:4-6; 1 Thessalonians 1:10. On the other hand, Luke clearly confirms that Jesus inherited the Kingdom of God even before his birth, and brought it into the world through his powerful preaching, so that 'Son of God' and 'the Lord' are naturally and closely connected with each other in the ongoing gospel narrative, which Luke presents from a pre-Easter perspective.

notice that ‘Son of God’ never appears in the mouth of a normal human being with the exception of 22:70 (we will discuss this below). This phenomenon is unique to Luke. For instance, whereas in Matthew 14:33 (par. Mark 6:45-52) people who saw Jesus walking on the water ‘worshiped him saying “Truly you are the son of God!”’, Luke makes no such addition to this story. Again Peter confessed that Jesus is ‘Messiah and the son of the living God’ in Matthew 16:16, whereas in the Lucan version only ‘Messiah’ is mentioned (Luke 9:20). In passion narrative of Matthew, ‘son of God’ appears in the mouths of the people mocking and of the Roman centurion (Matthew 27:40, 53, 44, par. Mark 15:39), whereas it is not mentioned in Lucan passion narrative at all. Respectively, the important fact of Jesus being ‘Son of God’ is expressed in the Lucan narrative through the revelatory ‘voice’ from the ‘cloud’ (Luke 3:22) and from ‘heaven’ (9:35), and in the mouth of superhuman characters such as angels (1:32, 35), Satan (4:3, 9), demons (4:41, 8:28), and Jesus himself (Luke 2:49; Acts 1:4, 7). Luke is likely emphasizing that Jesus as Son of God is not a simple fact that can be easily and directly picked up or recognized by this-worldly human wisdom and experiences. Even Mary and the disciples’ close personal contact with Jesus is not sufficient for their understanding before they witness his resurrection and ascension (e.g. Luke 2:50-51, 9:45). Supernatural revelation by God and his angels, and the reluctant recognition by otherworldly being such as Satan and demons are the preconditions for perceiving Jesus as the special Son of God. For Luke, this is a transcendent message that is too subversive for normal human cognition. The episode of ‘boy Jesus in the Temple’ (Luke 2:41-52) is the crucial and distinct presentation of this subversiveness of Jesus’ identity as Son of God. In this narrative unit, when Mary found Jesus in the temple sitting among religious teachers, she asked: ‘Child, why have you treated us like this? Look, your father (ὁ πατήρ σου) and I have been searching for you (ἐζητοῦμέν σε) in great anxiety.’ Jesus, however, answered: ‘Why were you searching for me (τί ὅτι ἐζητεῖτέ με)? Did you not know that I must be in my Father’s house (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου)?’ (Luke 2:48-49) Jesus’ response not only makes his parents confused, but also seriously challenges the readers (Fitzmyer, 1981, pp. 443-444)⁶. In this conversation, we should notice that Jesus

⁶ It is important to notice that this is the first phrase said by Jesus in the whole narrative, and also the first self-revealing statement concerning his particular identity, and that its subversiveness characterizes his actions and speeches. In fact, the key words ‘ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου’ can express three levels of meaning in the context: (a) in God’s Temple where; (b) to join the work of the God, that is his saving plan; (c) in the midst of people who

in fact made a tit-for-tat response to his mother. Firstly he replaced ‘your father’ in Mary’s question with ‘my Father’ to refer to his Sonship with God, and the Temple as the location for conversation also implies the presence of God. Secondly, Jesus directly challenged Mary’s ‘search’ (ζητέω) and this exact verb has the meaning of ‘understanding’ in the cognitive dimension. In this sense, Jesus pointed out that the way by which his parents understand or ‘search’ for their ‘child’ is partial or even totally wrong, and they should have come to the Temple directly, but not have been wandering around Jerusalem for three days. This distinctive opening story implants in the narrative the recurrent theme of Jesus’ subversion of common human cognition and experiences by his mysterious identity, critical message, challenging actions, and even his death. After the crucifixion, the angel gently criticized those women who saw the empty tomb, echoing the response made by boy Jesus: ‘Why do you look for (τί ζητεῖτε...) the living among the dead?’ (Luke 24:5) And after the ascension of Jesus, the angels again challenge the disciples in similar manner: ‘Why do you stand looking up towards (τί ἐστήκατε ἐμβλέποντες...) the heaven?’ (Acts 1:11). So these ‘Why do you...’ questions in crucial scenes of the narrative are serious challenges to the audience, reminding people to self-scrutinize the manner in which they understand Jesus carefully and continuously and to correct their misunderstanding.

We now turn to the only scene in which ‘Son of God’ appeared in the mouth of human being, that is the short conversation between the Jewish authority and the arrested Jesus (Luke 22:66-70). Luke made significant redactional changes to the original version he inherited from Mark 14:55-60. The most impressive one is the deletion the false accusations made by false witnesses. The effect is that the scene is no longer depicted as an interrogation, but rather as a dialogue about the problem of Jesus’ identity (J. A. Fitzmyer, 1981, p. 1461). The two questions by the chief priests are: ‘If you are the Messiah’ and ‘are you then the Son of God?’ To understand deeper meaning of these words, we need to go back to the opening section of Luke’s narrative. When Jesus drove out demons from men, the demons cried out ‘You are the Son of God!’ Luke makes the additional comment: ‘because they knew that he was the Messiah.’ (Luke 4:41) This is the first time that ‘Son of God’ is connected with ‘Messiah’ directly in the narrative and shows that Jesus’ true identity is not incomprehensible for evil

belong to God. All three levels of meaning refer to the close relation of Jesus and his ‘Father’.

superhuman beings. On the eve of crucifixion Luke has arranged to have this ‘Messiah-Son of God’ connection reappearing in the mouths of the hostile priests in a clearly negative and sneering sense, because they took for granted that Jesus was just another Messianic-pretender. In another words, the priests gave expression to exactly the same truth as the evil demons had done, but at the same time denied it immediately. This contradiction indicates the subversiveness of Jesus’ Son of God identity again. The final response of Jesus to the question of the priests is not a simple ‘I am’, but ‘You say that I am (ὁμοῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι).’ (Luke 22:70) This response points out subtly that even if these most learned religious leaders found out the truth through the dialogue, they cannot accept it and were even further away from the truth than the demons were.

To summarize this section, it has shown that Luke takes Jesus’ ‘Son of God’ title very seriously in his unique narrative. Taking Jesus’ divine Sonship as the most critical indicator of his identity, making it the foundation of other titles such as ‘Messiah’, ‘Lord’, ‘Saviour’, and finally emphasizing its cognitive subversiveness and transcendence as far as human beings were concerned, Luke differentiates Jesus from any other prophet or angel sent by God before and makes him the marker of the new age. He has a very special existence with an unprecedented relationship with God, has undeniable authority, and also has a special position in God’s salvation plan expressed with a paradox. The paradoxical and mysterious characteristics of Jesus’ identity might echo Paul’s words about the cross of Jesus which is ‘a stumbling-block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles’ (1 Corinthians 1:23). It seems that Luke transformed the single turning point of the crucifixion, that is Paul’s sole focus, into a biographical narrative encompassing Jesus’ whole earthly career from birth to ascension. This Lucan transformation was not only according to the synoptic traditions and reflecting his historiography interest, but was also for the purpose of developing further the Pauline ‘Adam-Christ typology’. The following section will expound how Luke made intertextual references to the Adam story of Genesis in the opening and closing scenes of the Gospel.

2 The Two Sons of God

The large narrative unit of ‘Baptism--Genealogy--Temptation’ (Luke 3:21-4:13) is the second opening section after the infancy narrative in the Gospel of Luke, and here Luke presents his own version of ‘Adam-Christ typology’ in a more or less subtle way. The implication behind the unique and strange order of these three sub-units is the focus of our discussion. Among them, Jesus’ genealogy (Luke 3:23-38), which addresses Adam as the ‘son of God’ directly, is the starting point for our interpretation.

2.1 Genealogy (Luke 3:23-38)

Luke emphasizes Jesus’ special relationship with God, but the infancy narrative also presents Jesus as a normal Jewish baby born under the Law and as the offspring of the royal bloodline of David (Luke 1:27, 69, 2:4). The obvious tension between the two identities, Son of God and Seed of David, is generated by this twofold focus. A similar problem exists also in Matthew’s genealogy (Matthew 1:1-17), where the virginal conception of Jesus makes the relationship between Jesus and the Davidic royal line unreal, and the author of Matthew inserts Mary into the genealogy and specifically points out that Jesus ‘ἐξ ἧς ἐγεννήθη’ (Matthew 1:16) to blur the Jesus-Joseph relationship. Furthermore, a series of texts indicate that contemporary people who considered Jesus as the Davidic Messiah were totally wrong (Matthew 1:1, 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 20:30-31, 21:9, especially 22:41-46). This tension over Jesus’ identity was present already in earlier synoptic tradition (Mark 10:47-48, 11:10, 12:35-37, cf. Luke 18:35-43, 20:41-44; Acts 2:25-36). We will show that Luke not only inherits the negative aspect of this idea to point out who Jesus is not, but also the positive to point out who Jesus really is⁷.

At the beginning of the genealogy, Luke inserts ‘ὥς ἐνομίζετο’ to describe the Jesus-Joseph relationship, in order to point out more directly that the father-and-son relationship is an illusion. This is the first hint given by Luke to remind people not to interpret the genealogy superficially. Then what is the function of the Lucan genealogy’s enumerating so many names? The key to answer this question is the coverage of the genealogy with its unique ending words: ‘τοῦ

⁷ Some of the ideas reflected in the following interpretation draw upon are the insightful article by Craig A. Evans (1995).

Ἀδὰμ τοῦ θεοῦ' (Luke 3:38). Different from the genealogy of Matthew, the Lucan genealogy is not just in reverse order, but also covers the whole human lineage from Jesus to the first human, and even astonishingly includes God. This is the second hint for interpreting the genealogy. Following the logic of the genealogy, 'τοῦ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ θεοῦ' does not just mean 'Adam was from the God' or 'Adam was made by the God', but also means 'Adam the son of the God'. J. Jeremias (1985a) proposed that the key point of the Lucan genealogy is to construct the direct relationship between Jesus and Adam, because they were both special sons of the God. In our view M. D. Johnson (1988) mistakenly criticized Jeremias' interpretation imposing the Pauline 'Adam-Christ' thought on the Lucan text, and supposed that the focal point of the genealogy is just to emphasize Jesus as the 'Son of God'. In doing so Johnson made a distinction between the genitive 'God' and the genitive of other names, especially 'Adam', and thereby missed one of the important clues for interpreting the genealogy. The genitive 'God' cannot be separated from the main body of the genealogy. It modifies 'Adam', showing that Adam was the very son of the God and that Jesus is another one. The implication of this reading is that both Jesus and Adam, on the one hand, have a closer relationship with God than any other human; and, on the other hand, that both, Jesus and Adam, came into the world in a very special manner: Adam was made by God's hand directly, and Jesus was born by a virgin chosen by God mysteriously. In the other words, though Adam and Jesus are indeed human, they are not from any natural human bloodline. Adam, however, was the beginning of the whole human lineage, and now Jesus was about to create a new human lineage by bringing into the old world a new reality. In this perspective, Jesus, it seems, is like Adam's brother, not rather than his progeny.

We may push the interpretation of this link between Adam and Jesus as sons of God further by noting its implication, namely that what Jesus as Son of God enjoys is what Adam once enjoyed, or rather, the privileges which Jesus has are drawn from that of the other son of God, Adam, including sonship with God, the status of being heir of the property, and the lordship over this property. In the canonical Genesis, the making of Adam was the climax of the creation, and he was appointed as the steward of the created world with the special authority to name everything (Genesis 1:28, 2:7-15). All in all, Adam was the former lord of God's kingdom, Paradise. But after failing to resist the temptation of Satan (serpent) and violating God's commandment, Adam lost his privileges. This

was the origin of the sad human situation of being far away from God and under the dominion of Satan.

If this is a sound suggestion for the function of the genealogy, it may provide a framework for understanding the basic meaning of ‘salvation’ brought by Jesus the second Son of God in the Lucan thought world. Jesus’ main mission is to fix the mistakes made by Adam (and Eve also). This is in order to retake Paradise, regaining the privileges and glory of the human being, and finally subverting the power of Satan, thus bringing renewal to the world, and rebuilding God’s kingdom. And most importantly, the follower of Jesus the Lord will be the beneficiaries of Jesus’ success. Examining the above suggestion will be the basic concern of the following interpretations of the other two narrative sub-units and the ‘Baptism--Genealogy--Temptation’ unit as a whole.

2.2 The Spirit in Jesus’ Baptism

We must now consider such the question of why the genealogy is inserted between the two subunits ‘Baptism’ and ‘Temptation’. In the Gospel of Matthew, the genealogy is put on the beginning of the narrative, having no close relation with the ‘Baptism’ and ‘Temptation’ (Matthew 3:13-4:11). In this Matthew follows the arrangement in Mark 1:9-13. Luke however does not do so because he wants to highlight something by having the genealogy dominate the interpretation of the whole unit.

If the significance of the genealogy is based on the identity of Jesus as the son of God and the intertextual reference to the Adam story, then Jesus’ baptism and temptation must be relevant for this perspective. First, the climax of the baptism scene is the divine voiced from heaven which declared: ‘You are my beloved son (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός)……’ (Luke 3:22); and later in the wilderness the devil said to Jesus twice ‘If you are the Son of God (εἰ υἱὸς εἶ τοῦ θεοῦ)……’ (Luke 4:3, 9) in the challenging words of the first and last temptation, showing that the three temptations are actually directed at Jesus as Son of God. Thus Jesus’ identity as ‘Son of God’ is the common theme of all three sub-units and connect Jesus’ birth and infancy narrative with the stories of his public ministry in Galilee. In this narrative arrangement, the genealogy referring to the first Adam is surrounded by the other two sub-units and

becomes the core for making sense of them, the ‘Paradise Lost’ story in Genesis is the logical intertextual interpretive lens through which to read them.

In the baptism scene, the actions of the Holy Spirit are related to the dominating ‘Son of God’ theme. In the earlier story of ‘Annunciation’, the angel’s key message is ‘The Holy Spirit will come upon you (πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ), and the power of the Most High will overshadow you, therefore the one to be born will be called holy and Son of God (διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ).’ (Luke 1:35) This unique revelation not only showed the essence of the Spirit (πνεῦμα) as the active power of God, but also closely connected the quality of Jesus’ identity as Son of God with this Spirit in a generative sense. This connection is re-narrated vividly in the baptism scene, in which the solemn pronouncement and the acting Spirit came upon Jesus at the same time. Therefore the virginal conception and baptism both point to the extraordinary physical ‘creation’ of the Son of God, Jesus. As shown in the genealogy that Jesus and Adam both have superhuman origin, we can suggest that the Jesus’ birth or being named as Son of God is cross-referenced to the creation of the man in Genesis (Genesis 2:7) deliberately by Luke, because the Spirit also played an important life-bestowing role there. Genesis 2:7 reads: ‘……and (God) breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and the man became a living being.’ The word ‘πνοή’ has the same origin with ‘πνεῦμα’, that is the verb ‘πνέω’, means ‘blow’ or ‘breath’. These two nouns were applied in Christian literature as early as the end of 1st century and early 2nd century in exchangeable manner referring to the Holy Spirit specifically and the power of God in general⁸. Although not in exact the same wording, the noun ‘πνεῦμα’ may guide the readers to think about the similar word ‘πνοή’ and the parallel scenes in narrative of Genesis.

But in contrast to the more or less passive ‘πνοή’, ‘πνεῦμα’ in the Lucan narrative is a more active and more public personalized characteristic. This characteristic of Spirit is specifically shown in Jesus’ baptism scene, where the whole narrative in needs to be considered. For first of all, in contrast to Mark 1:10, the Spirit’s coming down is objectified and presented in a more public manner through deleting the ‘εἶδεν’ which implies the subjective viewpoint of Jesus. The whole scene, including heavenly sound and the interaction between Jesus and the Spirit, is presented as a public event, not Jesus’ private

⁸ BDAG, p. 838. Also see *I Clement* 21:9, 57:3.

experience. Secondly, Luke visualizes the Spirit further by adding ‘in bodily form’ (σωματικῶ εἶδει) before the original ‘like a dove’ (Luke 3:22, par. Mark 1:10), thus redactionally transforming the metaphoric expression into an objective description and making the scene more open to visual imagination. Finally, the objectification and visualization of the Spirit made by Luke’s redaction lays open the path for the Spirit’s further personalized interactions with other human characters in the later narrative. Whereas the Spirit effects people such as Zechariah, Elisabeth, Simeon, and John through indirect ‘inspiration’ or their being filled with the Spirit (Luke 1:15, 41, 67; 2:25-27), after Luke 4:1 and especially in the volume of the Acts of Apostles, the Spirit more and more acted as an angelic character, interacting with people directly, whom people can seek to deceive and reject (Acts 5:3, 7:51) and having dialogue with people without mediation (Acts 8:29, 10:19, 11:12, 13:2, 16:6), and even being considered to be the co-witness with the apostles for Jesus’ exaltation (Acts 5:32). We can say that the Spirit is characterized as a loyal companion to Jesus or his followers, and a helpful assistant, just as Eve was a helper to Adam.

To sum up this section, the ‘Baptism-Genealogy-Temptation’ unit in general is constructed with the aim to emphasize the identity of Jesus as Son of God corresponding to the first son of God, Adam. Based on the interpretation above, further clarification of the narrative logic of the order of this unit is possible. First of all, Jesus’ being baptized by the Spirit is objectified as a public event open to witness, implying that this implies that Jesus’ identity as another Son of God beyond Adam is not a secret, the guidance of angelic and the Spirit’s revelation being a reliable source. Secondly, the genealogy is put after the baptism to explain the ‘Beloved Son’ pronouncement and show that Jesus was the second Son of God after the first one Adam, thus referring back to the creation and the narrative of ‘Paradise Lost’ in Genesis. Finally, Jesus’ confrontation with Satan in the wilderness was the second face to face confrontation between a Son of God and Satan. Jesus’ unprecedented victory in the wilderness made him the only human being who got rid of the power of Satan. This was the foundation for his preaching, healing and bringing the new reality of God’s kingdom into the world for salvation. In other words, Jesus was not only characterized as the second Adam, but also achieved what Adam failed to do, that is, to resist attacks from the Devil, and therefore he became the only channel for human salvation and the restoration of Paradise. The following

section will examine the specific intertextual correspondences between ‘Temptation in the wilderness’ and ‘Paradise Lost’.

2.3 Temptations in the wilderness

The key for the narrative logic of the ‘Temptation in the wilderness’ is the order of three temptations. Given that there are two versions of the temptation narrative in Matthew and Luke with the almost same content in different order, we cannot decide which one is the original from Q and may assume that two evangelists ordered the temptations according to their own purposes. We will show that Lucan order is according to the Second Adam (Son of God) theme.

Because of the obvious citation of Deuteronomy 6:13, 16, 8:3 in this narrative unit, some scholars suggested that Jesus’ ‘temptation in the wilderness’, in both versions, in Matthew and Luke, refers to the 40 years’ wandering in the wilderness of the people of Israel and that Jesus’ success critically reversed the repeated failure of Israel (J. A. Fitzmyer, 1981, pp. 509-510; L. T. Johnson, 1991, p. 76). The unsatisfactory aspect of this interpretation is that it isolates the temptation scene from the narratives before and after, and ignores the connections between them. R. E. Brown (1961) thought the temptations narrative is the dramatization of Jesus’ private experiences. On the other hand, J. Jeremias (1985a) focused on the connection of the temptation scene and the genealogy and proposed that the three temptations as a whole, no matter in what order, refer to the ‘Paradise Lost’ story figuratively. Jeremias’s opinion is insightful, but without substantial justification.

In the concise ‘Paradise Lost’ story in Genesis 3:1-6, it is the evil serpent who began the dialogue: ‘Did God say, you should not eat from any tree in the garden?’ Eve replied: ‘We may eat of the fruit of the trees in the garden, but God said, you shall not eat of the fruit……nor shall you touch it, or you shall die.’ Then the serpent said: ‘You will not die, for God knows that when you eat of it your eyes will be opened, and you will be like God, knowing good and evil.’ Listening to this, Eve ‘saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a delight to the eyes, and that it was to be desired to make one wise’. She ate the fruit and Adam did the same.

Although the serpent seems to converse with Eve alone, the words ‘with her’ (μετ’ αὐτῆς) in Genesis 3:6b LXX may imply Adam’s presence at that moment, and the decision to transgress the command was not made by Eve alone,

because Adam should also have remembered God's command (cf. Genesis 2:16--17). Thus Adam and Eve were confronted with three temptations in different ways. (a) Firstly, the serpent's first question led Eve to mention God's command and especially death as the serious consequence of transgression, but the serpent totally denied the truth of this consequence and implied that God was a liar, in order to alienate the human from God. (b) Secondly, serpent stirred up the greed and lust of human hearts by pointing out benefits of eating the fruit, as becoming wise and 'knowing good and evil' like God, and also by implying that the command made by God was due to his fear and jealousy. (c) The final aspect of the temptation was not provided by the serpent directly but was the consequence of denying the death penalty and believing in the fruit's benefits, and that 'the tree was good for food.....it was a delight to the eyes' (Genesis 3:6a), namely the the desire of human fleshly appetite. Looking closely, these three temptations have a particular order based on the seriousness of each of them. The first one, the concern about death and the human-God relationship is the deadliest. The second one is about possessing godly wisdom and power, and this might deny the absolute domination of God in an intellectual sense. The final temptation about the fleshly desire is on the lowest level. Therefore the seriousness of the three temptations in Genesis is gradually diminishing, concerning life, power and bodily desire respectively.

Turning to Jesus' temptations in wilderness in the light of the observations above, it is clear that the devil continued tempting the Son of God Jesus in the same ways: life, power and bodily desire, but in exactly the reverse order in the Lucan version: bodily desire, power and life. When Jesus finished fasting in the wilderness and felt hungry, the devil's temptation began. He firstly encouraged Jesus to satisfy his fleshly appetite. Jesus, of course, can easily turn stones into bread according to the later story of the 'Five Loaves and Two Fishes', but the purpose of the devil is to encourage Jesus to use his power to satisfy his own will instead of God's will and plan and to sow the seed of disobedience. When the first attack failed, devil lured Jesus to rebel against God openly and to be under the authority of devil for the reward of 'kingdoms of the world' and their 'glory and authority' and so to gain power for himself. We should notice that devil did not call Jesus 'Son of God' in this second attack, because he wanted Jesus to abandon his godly Sonship, and to be the 'son of the devil'. As the serpent lured Adam and Eve to transgress the only command of God to destroy his absolute authority, the devil here pushed Jesus to transgress the 'the greatest

commandment', that is, to be obedient to the one God wholeheartedly (Deuteronomy 6:13, 10:20; Luke 10:25--28). When both attacks totally failed, the devil launched his final attack by advising Jesus to test God with his own earthly life. This challenge was, in fact, a lethal strategy intending to alienate Jesus from God because it posed a question to Jesus: 'Was God reliable, or worthy of trust? You should confirm it by a test!' As by denying God's command, the serpent had told Adam and Eve that the God was a liar and he envied of human being, the devil confronted Jesus similarly here. Furthermore, testing with one's life could also cause Jesus to fear death and make him hesitate to risk his life in preaching and challenging the authorities. The fear of following his destiny is an important element in the common synoptic scene of 'Prayer on the Mount of Olives' (Luke 22:39--46, cf. Mark 14:32--42, Matthew 26:36--46), which reveals that Jesus was indeed once troubled by this kind of fear at that critical moment. Unlike Adam, Jesus refused to put God to the test and confirmed his absolute faith in God without any doubt.

Accordingly, Jesus faced the same evil attacks with the same strategy that Adam and Eve once confronted. The evangelist set the order of temptations in this specific way to emphasize the connection between the 'Paradise Lost' story in Genesis and his narrative of Jesus' temptations, in order to show that the second Son of God Jesus succeeded in repelling devil in the same war in which the first son of God Adam failed. Although 'πειρασμός' and its verb form 'πειράζω' do not appear in the LXX Genesis, Luke inherits this vocabulary from Mark and puts the Genesis 'Paradise Lost' story into the matrix of the meaning of the theme of 'temptation' through the intertextual connection demonstrated above. This 'temptation' theme is further developed in the narratives of the Gospel and Acts, Jesus' success in this first confrontation is a prelude to a series of battles, in which Jesus and his followers are on one side, power of Satan and his supernatural and earthly dominion are in the opposite camp. So although we cannot say that Jesus had gained the final victory in the wilderness, he had brought new reality of God's kingdom down to earth, and the monopoly of evil power over human beings had already been broken, and the fate of Satan and his kingdom had also been determined.

3 Temptations, Sin, and the Power of Satan

After the temptations in the wilderness, Jesus began his public life. Luke summarized the first phase of Jesus' activities in region of Galilee (Luke 4:16-9:50) with one sentence (Luke 4:14-15). The key words of this sentence, 'Jesus filled with the power of the Spirit' (ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος), together with 4:1 'πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου', indicate Jesus' being empowered by the Holy Spirit. This state may be the mark of his identity as Son of God and explains the origin of the force or power Jesus had in the battles of the wilderness temptation and his resistance against further temptations in his ministry.

Beyond deception and luring, 'temptation' appears in Lucan narrative also in the form of offending and persecution. We should notice that this second aspect of the meaning of 'πειρασμός' has its roots in the LXX, expressing 'testing', 'refutation', 'offending' and 'doubt', and the object of these actions usually is God⁹. The author of Luke-Acts uses both categories of meaning of 'πειρασμός' (and verb 'πειράζω') flexibly in his construction of the temptation theme in the ongoing narrative, in which Jesus and his followers, as Adam were, were tempted by the devil to test God, or were threatened fiercely by enemies to persuade them to abandon their preaching¹⁰. All in all, testing or temptation expresses a hostile relation in general, and specifically in Luke-Acts as a whole, they actually manifest a cosmic structure of relationships in which human beings, Satan and God are in a battle against each other, being each being the enemy of the other. The builder of this structure is Satan with the help of the first human couple in Paradise. This cosmic relationship structure dominates

⁹ In Exodus 17:2, 7 'why do you test the Lord (τί πειράζετε κύριον).....because the Israelites quarreled and tested the Lord (τὸ πειράζειν κύριον)', saying that the people of Israel complained about God's arrangement and did not trust God's guidance. In Numbers 14:22, God pointed out that 'they have tested me these ten times (ἐπειράσαν με τοῦτο δέκατον) and have not obey my voice'. 'Test' or 'tempt' here obviously means violate God's rules. One of the best examples is Psalm 78:18, 41, 56 'They tested God in their heart.....they tested God again and again and provoked the Holy One of Israel.....they tested the Most High God, and rebelled against him, they did not observe his decrees (ἐπειράσαν καὶ παρεπίκραναν τὸν θεὸν τὸν ὑψίστον καὶ τὰ μαρτύρια αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐφυλάξαντο).' 'Test' is placed side by side with 'rebel' and 'not observe'. Another similar example is Malachi 3:15, where 'test' even means 'doing evil things' and 'greed'.

¹⁰ The most horrible event about testing God is the sudden death of Ananias and his wife Sapphira who 'lied to the Holy Spirit' (Acts 5:3). Peter criticized them: 'How it is that you have agreed together to put the Spirit of the Lord to the test (πειράσαι τὸ πνεῦμα κυρίου)?' (Acts 5:9).

fundamentally the life setting of humans on earth. The human 'war' against God is also extended to the various fields of personal relationships, interactions among people being dominated by indifference, deception (testing), hostility, envy, and even social oppression in a macro-dimension. As has long been recognized by interpreters, Luke-Acts is concerned about the unjust social power relationships in Roman and Jewish societies in political and economic terms, especially the disparity between the rich and the poor, and between the political authorities and the powerless. It seems reasonable that the evangelist considered the unrighteous social power relationship as the visible symptom of the invisible cosmic war, because Jesus' social criticism not only against human evil, but at the same time also against the power of Satan diffused in the world, and Jesus' ethical teaching are always accompanied by his exorcisms and miraculous healings. Therefore we should not think about the topics in the Gospel such as power of Satan, sin and the forgiveness of sin in the narrow sense of spirituality and morality, but in a sense of social power structure and the deeper cosmic struggle between Satan and God.

Based on the above interpretation, we may observe in what manner our evangelist reshapes the classic Pauline statement that 'sin came into the world through one man' (Romans 5:12-21), and why the forgiveness of sin is considered as the main dimension of salvation. If the meaning of 'sin' in Lucan narrative could be grasped from the perspective of unjust social relationship and its Satanic origin, we must answer the following questions: Why do the offended or the oppressed ones also share the responsibility for sin? Why must they also be forgiven by Jesus? And what is the exact meaning of forgiveness?

We should bear a harsh observation of reality in mind, namely that everyone, no matter if he or she in the position of oppressor or oppressed, is a participator in a concrete social power relationship, and, morally speaking, everyone has a share in the unrighteousness (or righteousness) of this social structure, more or less. On the one hand, the oppressors struggle to keep themselves in this powerful position of advantage by various means; on the other hand, the oppressed may feel satisfied with or be used to their weak, powerless, and exploited positions without any attempts to resist, and may even agree with the ideologies of the exploiters. We can easily find that Adam and Eve got themselves trapped by the devil out of their own ignorance and greed, and brought about the unrighteous relationship structure on earth. They are the victims, but at the same time they are the co-builders of this system, and shared

responsibility and are guilty in this sense. ‘Sin’ is not an abstract ethical concept, but the everyday running of this unrighteous social system. Under its power, people tend to treat each other in the same way in which Satan treated Adam and Eve. Then ‘sin’ is like a force field controlling everything being put under its influence, even including the whole human race. In this perspective, forgiveness of sin brought by the ‘second Adam’ Jesus is the series of actions to destroy this sinful structure or system made by Adam (and Eve), rescue the human race from this evil world, and finally even transform the world by the new order, that is the ‘Kingdom of God’. Examples from the Gospel may shed light on this interpretation of ‘Sin’ and salvation.

In the story of ‘Healing a Paralytic’ (Luke 5:17--26), Jesus ‘saw their faith’ (ἰδὼν τὴν πίστιν αὐτῶν) and declared to the paralytic ‘your sins are forgiven for you’ (ἄνθρωπε, ἀφέωνταί σοι αἱ ἁμαρτίαι σου) (Luke 5:20), and then the man was healed. This visible ‘faith’ is the paralytic’s and his friends’ positive response to Jesus’ preaching, so that they even opened the roof of the house to seek healing. What they wanted to get rid of was not only the physical disability, but also the social marginalization and disadvantaged social-economic position brought about because of this bodily handicap. The appearance of Jesus and his preaching provided the opportunity to improve the situation and he was no longer satisfied with the existing reality. The paralytic’s sin was forgiven in this sense, and the new reality with the new order was presented visibly among the people. Jesus’ action of preaching, forgiving and healing was obviously subversive, and annoyed the scribes who represented the authority in communities. We can find the similar scene in Luke 7:36--50. The woman considered by Jesus as ‘sinful’ was guilty not because of the reason (not so clear in the text) imposed by the Pharisees and inhabitants of the town, but because of her cooperative attitude towards stigmatization and discrimination. But she caught the opportunity to meet Jesus and totally trust in him for giving her power to achieve a renewal of life. Jesus specifically pointed out that ‘your faith has saved you’ (ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε) (Luke 7:50). The same declaration also appears in other stories, such as ‘Healing of the Hemorrhaging Woman’ (Luke 8:48), ‘Cleansing the Lepers’ (Luke 17:19), and ‘Healing the Blind Beggar’ (Luke 18:42). We can suppose that ‘faith’ in the mouth of Jesus in these scenes is the positive attitude to Jesus’ preaching followed by actual practices to break free from the Satanic shackles. Forgiveness of sins was Jesus’

authoritative action to challenge the social relation structure through enlightening people's spirits and changing people's oppressed life setting.

Therefore Jesus was waging a war against Satan's power and went toward the triumph step by step. H. Conzelmann (1969/1954, pp. 16, 156, 180) suggested in his classic monograph that Jesus' public preaching career in Luke has a very special characteristic, namely that Satan or the devil was absent in this period, and this is a 'Satan-free period' with marked out by Luke 4:13 and 22:3, and that the disciples of Jesus were protected from Satanic attack during this period. S. Brown (1969, pp. 5-11), however, pointed out that Jesus and his follower were always faced with the hostility from the earthly evil system, and especially the testing imposed by Jewish authorities, and that therefore a 'Satan-free period', is meaningless in the Lucan narrative. The author of this paper agrees with Brown, because Jesus clearly said that exorcism is the combat operation against 'the kingdom of Satan' with the power of God's Kingdom (Luke 11:14-23). Jesus also corrected the disciples' optimism by pointing out that 'I am sending you out like lambs into the midst of wolves' (Luke 10:3), in the other words, being a disciple of Jesus is a risky career. The hostility from the Jewish authorities is described by Luke as 'testing', for example, Luke 10:25 which records that 'a lawyer stood up to test him (Jesus)' (ἐκπειράζων αὐτόν), and 11:6 writes of the actions of 'others to test him (πειράζοντες), kept demanding from him a sign from heaven'. On his last night on earth, Jesus said to the disciples: 'you are those who have stood by me in my temptations (ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου)' (Luke 22:28), and he also predicted that 'Satan has demanded to sift all of you like wheat' (22:31). This prophecy was fulfilled immediately after Jesus' ascension, when the followers of Jesus continued to be persecuted by authorities, and be tested from inside, as narrated in Acts. Faced with the disputes and the danger of schism, Peter questioned the believers who 'came down from Judah' critically: 'why are you now putting God to the temptation (νῦν οὖν τί πειράζετε τὸν θεὸν.....)?' (Acts 15:10). Finally, we should also notice that the Lucan version of Lord's Prayer which ends with 'do not bring us to the temptation (καὶ μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν)', also fits the general theme of temptation, and perhaps emphasizes it intentionally.

To sum up this section. In the narrative world of Luke-Acts, Satan's temptation or testing of the 'Second Adam' Jesus and his followers is one of the most important themes and key clues. Sin could be understood in the sense of being an unrighteous power relation structure which dominates the human

social world, that is the visible kingdom of Satan. This evil system is rooted in the invisible disturbed cosmic relation structure brought by Satan's successful temptation in Paradise and Adam's failure. The forgiveness of sin is a series of subversive actions against the evil system accompanied by preaching, exorcism, and healing. Jesus' authority for these actions is based on his special identity of the second Son of God, and also based on his unprecedented overcoming of Satan's temptations in the wilderness with the power of the Spirit.

4 Paradise and the Kingdom of God

Crucifixion followed by the resurrection is the climax of the narrative in all four Gospels. It implies the turning point of the general salvation narrative. In this critical scene of the crucifixion, Luke refers to Jesus' identity as 'Son of God' or specifically speaking, to the 'second Adam' theme again through intertextual references to one of the key words of Genesis 2-3, 'Paradise', and this 'Paradise' reference concerns the human situation at the after-life and the eschaton. Our focus is the unique dialogue of Jesus with one of the criminals beside him. The criminal recognized Jesus' innocence, and then he said to Jesus: 'Please remember me when you come into your kingdom (μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου).' Jesus answered: 'Truly I tell you, today you will be with me in Paradise (σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ).' (Luke 23:39-43)

This mysterious dialogue has caused debates among scholars. M. Dibelius (1971/1919, p. 203) contended that the ideological context of this dialogue was the Jewish idea about martyrs receiving a reward from God immediately after their death. But it is hard to say that Luke saw Jesus and the criminal as martyrs of the normal kind. R. Bultmann (1963/1921, pp. 309-310) suggested that this dialogue is on the track of the 'splitting' theme of Lucan Gospel, that is, when faced with Jesus' preaching, people split into two camps, some accepted the good news, the others not. Thus there were differences of opinion between the two criminals. This interpretation, however, left the words 'Paradise' and 'kingdom' unexplained. Fitzmyer (1981, pp. 1508-1509) proposed that Jesus' answer implied he would give the righteous criminal more than he required, that this criminal was even considered by Luke as a Christian, because this promise echoed the after-life idea presented in 1 Thessalonians 4:17 and Philippians 1:22-23, that Christians would be with the Lord Jesus immediately after their

death. Fitzmyer's proposal makes sense, especially in noting the possible thought contact between Luke and Paul, but the phrase 'ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ' seems to mean more.

We can start with the request of the righteous criminal. On one hand, the concrete request implies that the criminal had a specific idea about after-life, and that his request was based on this idea, his own situation, and his understanding of Jesus. Luke might assume that his readers would know about this idea. On the other hand, Jesus' answer was a correction to the criminal's idea through replacing 'kingdom' (βασιλεία) with 'Paradise' (παράδεισος), and was also a revelation of the truth of after-life or eschaton.

Some interpretative questions we must consider first: why did the righteous criminal request such a thing of Jesus? In mentioning that Jesus would enter his 'kingdom', did he believe that Jesus would be a king at future? What we can be sure of is that the criminal thought Jesus was innocent, and that the political accusation imposed on Jesus was false, and that Jesus was not a Messiah pretender, and had not wanted to be king in the normal sense. Although we have no any direct evidence concerning the ground why the criminal was condemned, his conclusion about Jesus' innocence may have been made by comparing Jesus with himself, and he, together with the other one, may have been members of the rebellion movement seeking to subvert Roman rule. This guess is reasonable because crucifixion was normally the punishment for treason or rebellion in the Roman world, and the description of Barabbas as the man 'had been put in prison for an insurrection that had taken place in the city and for murder' (Luke 23:18-19, cf. Mark 15:7) may be a further clue. It is very possible that it had been arranged that Barabbas and the other two criminals were to be crucified together before the Passover, since they were belonged to the same movement that had earlier instigated turmoil in Jerusalem and they were the leaders, but Jesus now took the place of Barabbas when they were crucified. If this suggestion can be accepted, the righteous criminal would have been agreeing with Pilate that Jesus was not a rebel like others and that it was unjust to crucify him even according to the Roman law. On the other hand, the righteous criminal might have heard that Jesus was indeed preaching a kingdom and this kingdom was so real that it was threatening to Jewish and Roman authorities, and have come to believe that this preaching among the people might have been more pleasing to God than his failed attempt at rebellion, so that Jesus would receive the reward from God for this preaching after being unjustly executed, and so

might finally share the reward with him in the afterlife, so that this is what 'remember me' means.

Therefore the request of the criminal was based on his vague but positive understanding of Jesus, and on the idea that righteous people will receive a reward from God immediately after their death. The presentation of the similar idea can be found in the famous Lucan parable 'The Rich Man and Lazarus' (Luke 16:19-31). As Jesus always composed his parables according to his audience's agricultural life contexts in a sophisticated way, this parable may reflect some vulgar beliefs among the Jewish people about judgement by God immediately after death, which would reverse their fate in this life. The parable implies that Lazarus who was enjoying his reward of comfortable peace has the right or is able to share his reward with other people who cannot get the reward by themselves. The criminal on the cross was dying and anxious about his fate in the afterlife, and he considered Jesus would be in the position of Lazarus and be able to help him.

Jesus no doubt appreciated the positive attitude and the humble request of the criminal, and did not deny his defective belief directly, but gently revealed to him the more precious reward and profound prospect, that is of being with him (and God) in Paradise forever (J. Jeremias, 1985b; D. M. May, 1997). The key word 'Paradise', which appears in Jesus' mouth in this critical moment, again links Jesus' primary identity as Son of God and second Adam and saving action to the Genesis story of 'Paradise Lost', to show that Jesus' saving action now decisively regains Paradise for human beings. This conversation on the cross can also be considered as the final saving action of the earthly Jesus, for the criminal was accepted by the Lord of Paradise and his sin was forgiven by this Lord just as with the paralytic and the so-called 'sinful woman' in the earlier stories. If this interpretation is acceptable, a further implication about the relation between 'Paradise' and the traditional concept 'Kingdom of God' can be clarified: on one hand, the 'Kingdom' is the concept emphasizing the reality of absolute authority of God from a top-down perspective; on the other hand, 'Paradise' manifests the future perfect human existence status under the just rule of God from the bottom-up human being perspective. Thus the two concepts refer to the same eschatological reality from different perspectives. Replacing the 'kingdom' with 'paradise', Luke does not deny the concept Kingdom of God, but replaces the earthly or political-military kingdom with a more powerful Kingdom which had already been present but would be finally

realized in the eschatological ‘Paradise’ ruled by God and his beloved Son, Jesus¹¹.

5 Conclusion

To summarize our exploration. We began with the special nature of the ‘Son of God’ title of Jesus and its relationship to the Kingdom of God concept. The subversiveness of Jesus’ Sonship, more or less implies Luke’s intent to define ‘Son of God’ beyond what was present in the synoptic tradition, by subtly presented it in a new way in the unit, ‘Baptism--Genealogy--Temptation’. By referring to the other Son of God, Adam, and his losing Paradise, Luke theologically defines Jesus’ fundamental mission of Jesus as the second Son of God. If Adam was the origin of human beings, then the second ‘Adam’, Jesus, would create a new lineage of human beings, that would be a second creation. In this narrative framework, ‘sin’ is defined as the consequence of the Satanic temptations and disobedient actions of a man which brought the hostility into the human-to-human and human-to-God relationships on the earth, and is the root of social reality dominated by unrighteous power relations. Accordingly, Jesus’ successful resistance to Satanic temptations and his totally obedience to death was the powerful sign of liberation of humans from the dominance of evil power. He also brought liberating and renewing order (the Kingdom) into the human social world through preaching, challenging, healing, and forgiving. Finally, his ‘paradise saying’ on the cross reiterates the ‘regaining Paradise’ theme directly, and points to the cosmic and eschatological dimension of the Kingdom of God.

¹¹ There might be another possible source of Lucan idea of ‘regaining Paradise’ and Jesus as Second Adam beyond the influence of Pauline heritage, namely, ‘The Life of Adam and Eve’ narrative traditions of Jewish origin. This narrative tradition in general told the story about why and how did Satan deceived Adam and Eve, and how they were expelled from Paradise and lived a hard life with heavy labour and terrible diseases, but finally repented of their sin before death and were buried back in Paradise with the God’s promise of future resurrection and eternal life. This ‘returning to Paradise’ narrative pattern with obvious eschatological meaning must have been familiar to some early Christians, perhaps including our evangelist. This narrative tradition might play an important role in the process of Lucan reconstruction of Pauline ‘Adam-Christ typology’. Paul might also know some features of this narrative tradition, see: 2 Corinthians 11:2-3, 13-15, and 12:2. For some important studies on eschatological dimension of this narrative tradition, see: W. Zemler-Cizewski (2004), R. M. Jensen (2004), L. R. Lanzillotta (2007), B. Murdoch (2009).

6 Bibliography

- Adams, E. (2002). The Story of How God Fulfills His Purpose In Creation. In B. W. Longenecker (Ed.), *Narrative Dynamics In Paul: A Critical Assessment* (pp. 19-43). Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Bovon, F. (2009). Paul As Document And Paul As Monument. In F. Bovon, G. Snyder (Ed.), *New Testament And Christian Apocrypha: Collected Studies II*, (pp. 307-317). Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Brown, Raymond E. (1961). Incident Units That Are In The Synoptic Gospels But Dispersed in St John. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 23(2), 143-160.
- Bultmann, R. (1963). *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (John Marsh Trans.). Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson. (Original work published 1921).
- Bultmann, R. (2007). *Theology of the New Testament* (Kendrick Grobel Trans.). Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press. (Original work published 1951-1953).
- Conzelmann, H. (1969). *The Theology of St. Luke* (Geoffrey Buswell Trans.). London, United Kingdom: Faber and Faber. (Original work published 1954).
- Dibelius, M. (1971). *From Tradition to Gospel*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: J. Clarke. (Original work published 1919).
- Dunn, J. D. G. (1998). *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Ehrman, B. D. (1993). *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York, United States: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, C. A. (1995). Source, Form and Redaction Criticism: The Traditional Methods of Synoptic Interpretation. In S. E. Porter, D. Tombs (Ed.), *Approaches to New Testament Study*, (pp. 17-45). Sheffield, United Kingdom: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. (1981). *The Gospel According To Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. New York, United States: Doubleday & Company.
- Gasque, W. W. (1989). *A History of the Interpretation of the Acts of the Apostles*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson.
- Hays, R. B. (2002). *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, Mich.: W. B. Eerdmans. (Original work published 1983).
- Hays, R. B. (2004). Is Paul's Gospel Narratable? *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 27(2), 217-239.
- Hengel, M. (1986). *The Cross of the Son of God* (John Bowden Trans.). London, United Kingdom: SCM Press. (Original work published 1975).
- Jensen R. M. (2004). *Interpreting Christian Art: Reflections on Christian Art*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.

- Jeremias, J. (1985a). Ἀδὰμ. In G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (Ed.), *Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament* (Vol. 1) (G. W. Bromiley Trans.) (pp. 141-143). Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Jeremias, J. (1985b). Παράδεισος. In G. Kittel, G. Friedrich (Ed.), *Theological Dictionary Of The New Testament* (Vol. 5) (G. W. Bromiley Trans.) (p. 772). Grand Rapids, Michigan: W.B. Eerdmans.
- Johnson, M. D. (1988), *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies: With Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*, (2nd edn). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, L. T. (1991). *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, Pennsylvania: Liturgical Press.
- Lanzillotta, L. R. (2007). The Envy of God in the Paradise Story According to the Greek Life of Adam and Eve. In Flores Florentino (Ed.), *Dead sea scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (pp. 537-550). Leiden, Dutch: Brill.
- Marguerat, D. (2012). Paul after Paul: A History of Reception. In D. P. Moessner, D. Marguerat (Ed.), *Paul and the heritage of israel: Paul's Claim Upon Israel's Legacy in Luke and Acts in the Light of the Pauline Letters* (pp. 70-89). London, United Kingdom: Bloomsbury T&T Clark.
- May, D. M. (1997). The Straightened Woman (Luke 13:10-17): Paradise Lost and Regained. *Perspectives in Religious Studies*, 24(1), 245-258.
- Metzger, B. M. (Ed.). (1994). *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.). Stuttgart, Germany: Deutsch Bibelgesellschaft.
- Murdoch, B. (2009). *The Apocryphal Adam and Eve in Medieval Europe: Vernacular Translations and Adaptations of the Vita Adae Et Evae*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Vielhauer, P. (1963). On the Paulinism of Acts. *Perkins journal*, 3, 5-17. (Original work published 1951).
- Witherington, B. (1994). *Paul's Narrative Thought World: The Tapestry of Tragedy and Triumph*. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press.
- Wright, N. T. (1991). *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh, United Kingdom: T&T Clark.
- Wright, N. T. (1992). *The New Testament and the People of God* (London, United Kingdom: SPCK).
- Wright, N. T. (2013). *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (Vol. 1-2). Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press.
- Zemler-Cizewski, W. (2004). The Apocryphal Life of Adam and Eve: Recent Scholarly Work. *Anglican Theological Review*, 86 (2004), 671-677.

