

Dual Witness and Sabbath Motif in Luke

VERNON E. McEACHERN

THERE IS AS YET no commonly accepted explanation of Luke's elaborate system of dating in 3:1f., which affords to the gospel a definite focus on a specified time and place in human history. Such detail establishes St. Luke as the first deliberate Christian historian, but his historical knowledge and exactitude are called into question by some inaccuracies and by an outright error in the case of Annas, more properly Hannas, who was deposed from the office of high-priest in A.D. 15; also Acts 4:6, where St. Luke makes a similar error again.¹ The inaccuracies are: Pontius Pilate was "prefect" of Judaea, not "governor" (*hegēmōn*); strictly speaking, Ituraea was not part of Philip's tetrarchy; nothing certain is known of Lysanias and little of Abilene in this period except for a brief reference in Josephus² and one or two inscriptions which provide very scanty means of identification or dating.³ Numerous attempts have been made to reconcile Luke 3:1f. with the recorded events of history, but none has succeeded in harmonizing them in a convincing way. It is not my intention to add another such effort to an already lengthy list, but rather to look in a different direction for a solution to the problem.

It is my conviction that modern scholars have been approaching Luke 3:1f. from a twentieth-century historical viewpoint when they might more profitably have sought to fathom St. Luke's first-century concept of salvation-history, which may be quite a different matter. St. Luke was, of course, dependent on various sources for his material, as he states in his prologue (1:1-4), which also intimates that he was not among the original "eyewitnesses and ministers of the word," although he probably had personal contact with them later. Almost everyone admits that one of his sources was the Gospel of Mark. For reasons that we cannot go into in detail here, I take the position, along with A. M. Farrer, B. C. Butler, M. S. Enslin, A. W. Argyle, Samuel Sandmel, and others, that St. Luke also had the Gospel of Matthew before him when composing the Third Gospel. Only thus can we consistently explain the three-way relationship which exists between the Synoptic Gospels, especially the hundreds of Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark in the triple tradition where St. Matthew and St.

1. See H. J. Cadbury's note on Acts 4:6, in F. J. Foakes Jackson and K. Lake (eds.), *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. IV (London: Macmillan, 1933), pp. 41f. Cf. also John 18:13-24, where again Annas plays a leading role in Jesus's trial by the Jewish hierarchy.

2. *Antiquities*, XX, 7: "Now this [Abila] had been the tetrarchy of Lysanias."

3. Cf. J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930), pp. 307-9.

Luke are supposedly following Mark as their major source.⁴ In addition to Mark and Matthew, St. Luke also had a collection of diverse matter, oral and written, usually known as L-material, which he used to supplement Mark and Matthew whenever he deemed it appropriate. In the latter category comes Luke 3:1, 2a, and with the above presuppositions in mind let us turn now to that passage.

Luke and Matthew agree in eliminating Mark 1:1—*archē tou euangeliou Iēsou Christou*—since both have begun their Gospels with Birth and Infancy stories, but St. Luke rejects Matthew's indefinite (*en de tais hēmerais ekeinai*) opening to John's ministry (3:1) in favour of an introduction which is dated by Roman political and Jewish hierarchical rulers in a "six-fold" scheme of reference. Immediately we are faced with the problem of St. Luke's error in the identity of the high-priest or his puzzling presentation of the high-priesthood as a dual office held by two incumbents, Annas and Caiaphas. Following Mark, Luke does not give the name of the high-priest during Jesus' trial (ch. 22–23), but in Matthew 26:3, 57, Caiaphas is named correctly. Since on our supposition we cannot plead that St. Luke did not know Matthew 26:3, 57, it appears that he was either wrongly informed or confused about the identity of the high-priest and was unwilling to take Matthew's word on the matter. Luke's use of the singular *archieōs* (3:2) "rightly suggests that there could only be one high-priest, but the combination of the two names is strange."⁵ Several scholars⁶ suggest that Annas was still the power behind the scene as a sort of high-priest emeritus and head of the leading Jewish family. This is possible but has too much of the ring of a modern rationalization to be completely convincing. Creed cites Loisy as suggesting that the words *kai Kaiapha* may be a later addition by some scribe,⁷ but Acts 4:6 seems to exclude this theory. In view of the other inaccuracies in Luke 3:1f., our conclusion is that St. Luke himself must bear full responsibility for the error and the passage as it stands.

My study of Luke leads me to believe that St. Luke's editorial insertions are usually fashioned with some plan or purpose in mind. What then does

4. A detailed compilation of the Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark (see my T.H.M. thesis, "Testing the Q Hypothesis in Luke's Gospel," Emmanuel College, Toronto, 1957) reveals a total of at least 821 agreements—555 common inclusions and 266 common omissions—in about 330 Lucan verses which have some parallel in both Mark and Matthew. Only one short summary paragraph out of 68 in the triple tradition fails to disclose such agreement, viz. Lk. 4:40f. This evidence of St. Luke's use of Matthew occurs consistently throughout the triple tradition in Luke and has never been adequately explained by any other theory, including the well-known Q hypothesis. I concur with A. M. Farrer's charge against B. H. Streeter of having mismanaged the Matthew-Luke agreements against Mark in *The Four Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1924). See Farrer's essay "On Dispensing with Q," in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), pp. 61f., and William R. Farmer, *The Synoptic Problem* (New York: Macmillan, 1964), pp. 118–77.

5. Creed, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. 49.

6. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 50; A. R. C. Leaney, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: A. & C. Black, 1958), p. 48; G. B. Caird, *The Gospel of St. Luke* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963), p. 27; A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (5th ed., New York: Scribner's, 1902), p. 84.

7. Cf. Creed, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. 49. H. J. Cadbury, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, Vol. IV, pp. 41f., suggests that the addition of Caiaphas in Acts 4:6 may also be an interpolation, but agrees that the traditional explanation of Luke's mistake in terms of the high-priest-emeritus concept has no evidence to support it.

he mean by 3:1f? As a recent writer states, "it remains an unsolved question why Luke mentions these apparently unimportant regions and princes. . . ."⁸ Conzelmann notes that "Samaria and Peraea are missing" from the regions named, but this observation does not seem pertinent here.⁹

I would suggest that the secret of Luke 3:1f. lies in a combination of two Lucan patterns found elsewhere in his Gospel, viz. his motifs of "dual witness" and "the sabbath"—the latter being the familiar Hebrew term denoting the act of God's creation in *seven* days (cf. Gen. 1:1–2:3). Professor Leaney¹⁰ finds a "sixfold" scheme in 3:1f., presumably made up of Caesar, Pilate, Herod, Philip, Lysanias, and Annas-Caiaphas, who all rule in certain temporal realms. But "six" realms need another for completion in the biblical sense, viz. the Kingdom of God which John announces as about to appear in the person of the Messiah: "Prepare the way of the Lord . . . and all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (Luke 3:4–6). "This is for Luke apparently equivalent to the Messiah, or the Messiah and his kingdom."¹¹ Just as the creative word of God brought order out of chaos "in the beginning" (Gen. 1:1ff.), so "the word of God came to John the son of Zechariah *en tē erēmō* (Luke 3:2b), urging him to clear the Messiah's way, to straighten the crooked, bridge the gullies, level the cliffs, and smooth the rough spots. A new age is about to begin when the Messiah appears, a *seventh* Kingdom similar to the Sabbath rest of Gen. 2:3, a time when the power of Satan will be largely suspended (Luke 4:13–22:3), an epoch when "the poor" hear "good news," "captives" are set free, "the blind" receive sight, and "the oppressed" are relieved (Luke 4:18). This is "the acceptable year [*eniauton*—'cycle of time'] of the Lord" (4:19). In this context the meaning of Luke 17:20f. becomes quite clear—viz. the person of Christ embodies the presence of the Kingdom of God.

Thus St. Luke's "sixfold" scheme in 3:1f. takes on new significance in the light of what is about to begin, viz. the reign of Messiah (cf. 23:2f., 37f.), but its import is not to be found in such technicalities as whether Pilate was governor or procurator of Judaea or when and where Lysanias ruled. These details are incidental to St. Luke's concept of *salvation-history*. This is not to say or suggest that he invents names to fill out his historical framework in 3:1f. On the contrary, all those named are real, not mythical, people. It simply means that such figures as Philip and Lysanias are unimportant in themselves and thereafter disappear from view. Pilate and Herod are more important, since their kingdoms clash directly with that of the Messiah (cf. 13:1, 31; 23:1–25). From St. Luke's standpoint it is a matter of selection rather than invention of the appropriate persons and events to complete his picture of *Heilsgeschichte*.

What then shall we say about St. Luke's addition of *kai Kaiapha* to the

8. Leaney, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, pp. 49f.

9. Cf. H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (London: Faber & Faber, 1960), p. 18.

10. Cf. Leaney, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. 48: see also Caird, *Gospel of St. Luke*, p. 27.

11. Leaney, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. 106.

incorrect *Hanna* in 3:2? His error in the high-priest's identity is an indication that St. Luke was not specially interested in who the high-priest was, but more in the fact that there was such an office whose occupant(s) sought to destroy Jesus with the help of various co-operators.¹² The significance of the dual high-priesthood of Annas and Caiaphas is rather to be found in St. Luke's "dual witness" motif, which appears repeatedly throughout his Gospel, both in dual personages, groups, places, or objects¹³ and parallel events or pericopes,¹⁴ and often in what I call his "dual witness" method of composition.¹⁵ He does not originate the "dual witness" method or motif, which may be found also in Mark and Matthew, but he makes much more extensive use of it and introduces L-material featuring this duality, e.g. in Luke 1-2 as cited above, the second Mission Charge (10:1ff), a second recension of Jesus' teaching (10:25-18:30),¹⁶ the parable of Two Sons (15:11-32), Dives and Lazarus (16:19-31), Lot added to Noah (17:28f.), the Pharisee and the Publican (18:9-14), two swords (22:35-38), two men saved at Jericho (18:35-19:10), the double trial before Pilate

12. Cf. Lk. 19:47; 20:19; 22:2, 4, 52, 66; 23:1f., 4f., 10, 13, 18, 21, 23, 25, 35.

13. E.g.: Zechariah and Joseph, Elizabeth and Mary, John and Jesus, Caesar Augustus and Quirinius, Galilee and Judaea, Nazareth and Bethlehem, a pair of turtledoves and two pigeons, Simeon and Anna (all in Lk. 1-2); tax collectors and soldiers (3:12-14), Holy Spirit and fire (3:16), wheat and chaff (3:17), Elijah and Elisha (4:25-27), a widow and a leper (4:26f), Pharisees and law-teachers (5:7), Pharisees and scribes (5:30, 6:7; etc.), six pairs of Apostles (6:14-16), Judaea and Jerusalem, Tyre and Sidon (6:17), two blind men (6:39), disciple and teacher (6:40), log and speck (6:41f.), figs-thorns and grapes-brambles (6:44f.), two disciples of John (7:19), the people and tax collectors (7:29), Pharisees and lawyers (7:30), no bread and no wine (7:33), a glutton and a drunkard, tax collectors and sinners (7:34), two debtors (7:41f.), cities and villages (8:1), Moses and Elijah (9:30), foxes-holes and birds-nests (9:58), "two by two" (10:1), serpents and scorpions (10:19), Father and Son (10:22), prophets and kings (10:24), two denarii (10:35), Mary and Martha (10:38), fish-serpent or egg-scorpion (11:11f.), lamp and eye (11:33f.), cup and dish (11:39), prophets and apostles (11:49), Abel and Zechariah (11:51), two pennies (12:6), cloud-shower and south wind-heat (12:54f.), "his ox or his ass" (13:15), "an ass or an ox" (14:5), etc.

14. E.g.: two appearance of Gabriel (Lk. 1), dual cycles of Birth and Infancy stories (Lk. 1-2), two males healed (5:12-26), two parables (5:36-38), two Sabbath law-breakings (6:1-11), double quartets of Beatitudes and Woes (6:20-26), two males healed (7:1-17), two females healed (8:40-56), dual Mission Charges (9:1-6; 10:1ff.), parallel questions by the lawyer (10:25-28) and the ruler (18:18-21), the strong man's house and the garnished house (11:21-26), two parables on possessions (12:13-34), the Galileans and Siloamians (13:1-5), the mustard seed and the leaven (13:18-21), an important saying duplicated (13:32f.), parallel healings on the Sabbath (13:10-17; 14:1-6), the cost of building a tower and of waging war (14:28-32), the lost sheep and the lost coin (15:3-10).

15. Usually indicated by pairs of persons, places, groups, objects, phrases, clauses, or sentences joined by *kai*. Cf. e.g., the naming of the Twelve in Lk. 6:14-16 with its six balanced pairs, each pair joined to its neighbour(s) by *kai*, with an initial *kai* which links the list with v. 13. Twelve *kai*'s are thus found, one for each Apostle, as contrasted with Mark's fourteen *kai*'s (3:16-19) in five pairs, balanced at each end by one Apostle, viz. Simon Peter and Judas Iscariot, or Matthew's eight *kai*'s (10:2-4) in six pairs with single *kai*'s after the first and sixth sets. St. Luke thus presents the most balanced list—a compromise between his two major sources. Cf. also Acts 1:13 where again a pattern emerges in his use of *kai*, this time a broken pattern—seven *kai*'s instead of eight—because of false Judas's demise, necessitating the choice of a new Apostle from two candidates to fill the gap (Acts 1:23-26).

16. Cf. John Rowley Marsh, "The Theology of the New Testament," in M. Black and H. H. Rowley (eds.), *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* (London: Nelson, 1962), p. 763: "Lk. retains the Exodus formulation of the pattern of the ministry, though he gives his new Law, as the Pentateuch had given the old, in two recensions."

and Herod (23:1-16), two men by the open tomb (24:4-7), two disciples on the way to Emmaus (24:13-35). Indeed St. Luke was the first Evangelist to compose two books¹⁷ as a dual witness to Christ and the Kingdom of God (cf. Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8; 28:23, 30f.).¹⁸

But what is the significance of "dual witness" in Luke 3:2? It lies (a) in St. Luke's concern for consistency in establishing the corporate guilt of "all the people of Israel" in the death of Jesus (cf. Acts 4:5-12), and (b) in his wish to counterbalance the dual witness of Rome to Jesus's life and death in the persons of Pilate and Herod (Luke 3:1, cf. 9:7-9; 23:6-16).

As for (a), there is a definite tendency in Luke to place the responsibility for Jesus' crucifixion more widely and firmly on the Jewish people as a whole; cf. *idou ochlos* (22:47), *hapan to plēthos autōn* (23:1), *tous archiereis kai tous ochlous* (23:4), *kai ton laon* (23:13; cf. Acts 4:10), *anekragon de pamplēthei* (23:18), *katschuon hai phōnai autōn* (23:23; cf. *epischuon* in 23:5), *to aitēma autōn* (23:24), *ētounto* ("kept demanding"), and *tō thelēmati autōn* (23:25). "The writer thus emphasizes the enormity of the transaction."¹⁹ At the same time the double trial before Pilate and Herod tends to relieve Rome of some of the responsibility for Jesus' unjust death, since both Roman rulers find Jesus innocent and want to release him (23:14-16, 20, 22), but the Jews demand his crucifixion.

As for (b), Herod is counterbalanced in Luke's system of dual witness by Caiaphas—i.e. Rome by Israel. In this connection Acts 4:24-28 may be seen as St. Luke's commentary on Luke 3:1f., which names "the kings of the earth" *kai* "the rulers" who "set themselves against the Lord *kai* his Christ," including "both Herod *kai* Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles *kai* the peoples of Israel," "to do whatever God's hand *kai* plan had predestined." St. Luke's system of "dual witness" runs throughout Acts 4:24-28; to be exact, there are nine instances: the five *kai*'s already cited, "the Gentiles" *kai* "the peoples" (v. 25), plus "the heaven *kai* earth" *kai* "the sea *kai* everything" (v. 24). In this respect Acts 4:24-28 constitutes a chiasmic pattern in a more complex form of dual witness than usual. It is composed of seven duos centring or focusing on "the Lord and his Christ" (v. 26c) as follows:

4. "God made the heaven-earth *kai* the sea-everything"
3. "Gentiles *kai* peoples (*laoi*)"
2. "the kings *kai* the rulers"
1. "the Lord *kai* his Christ"

17. A. Q. Morton has recently pointed out that Luke and Acts are almost identical in length if we allow for the greater number of paragraphs in Luke—1886 lines in Luke and 1884 in Acts. See A. Q. Morton and G. H. C. Macgregor, *The Structure of Luke and Acts* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), p. 20. This observation supports our "dual witness" theory.

18. Note St. Luke's use of the term "two whole years" (Acts 28:30); cf. also "two men" (Acts 1:10), the pairs of foreign nations in Acts 2:9-11, and the parallel events in Acts 2:44f. and 4:32-35. "Dual witness" is frequent in Acts; see John A. Hardon, "The Miracle Narratives in the Acts of the Apostles," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 16 (1954), 307-10.

19. Plummer, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, p. 527.

2. "Herod *kai* Pontius Pilate"
3. "Gentiles *kai* peoples (*laoi*) of Israel"
4. "as God's hand *kai* plan had predestined to happen."²⁰

In Luke 3:1f. Tiberius Caesar and John, son of Zechariah, represent the opposing kingdoms of earth and of God, the latter being that which John heralds. Caesar's rule will eventually be offset by Christ's Kingdom, although the Messiah's abode is only temporarily in this world until the Parousia (21:27f.). Thus St. Luke logically concludes his second volume with Paul "preaching the Kingdom of God and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ *quite openly and unhindered*" in Rome, the seat of Caesar's sway (Acts 28:31). The *seventh* Kingdom heralded by John (Luke 3:4-6) and proclaimed by Jesus (4:18f.) in the end overcomes the mightiest temporal power. Thus St. Luke's "dual witness" and "sabbath" motifs shape in a discernible way the composition of Luke 3:1ff. and Acts 4:24-28. The relation between these motifs and the historical events concerned is an exceedingly complex problem and one beyond the scope of this paper, which merely sets out to demonstrate that such motifs are an integral part of St. Luke's method and style of orderly (*kathexēs*) reporting of salvation-history.

The next instance of the "sabbath" motif in Luke is found in the genealogy (3:23-38). Dr. Farrer has brilliantly illumined its scheme by pointing out its construction on eleven *sevenfold* sets of names in which the *fourth* and *eighth* sets mark the Babylonian and Egyptian captivities, respectively.²¹ As Luke's genealogy is written backwards, it becomes obvious that the next advent will be the Parousia, since "the eighty-fourth (12×7 th) 'year' is that perfect period at which the Son of Man, returning, finds faith"²² in some on earth, just as at his first advent the faithful Simeon and Anna (at eighty-four years of age) awaited his coming in constant prayer and expectation (2:25-38; cf. 18:1-8). Jesus, the Son of Joseph and the *seventh* descendant of another Joseph who is *both* the son of a Matthias and the *seventh* descendant of another Matthias,²³ now occupies the seventy-seventh (11×7 th) "year" in his first advent. "The eleven 'weeks' of St. Luke, like the six 'weeks' of St. Matthew [1:17] are an incomplete number (Acts 1:13-26)" and must be completed in due course by "the week of the fall of Jerusalem in which St. Luke lives, a week destined to last until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled (Lk. 21:24)."²⁴ Then comes the End (21:27,

20. Cf. Charles H. Lohr, "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 23 (1961), 403-35, especially p. 426: "In Ap. [Revelation to John] two types of symmetrical structure have been distinguished: numerical and chiasmic. In the former type, a number of elements, generally seven, are arranged so that the fourth figures as the center (3 + 1 + 3)." We have just observed this pattern in Acts 4:24-28.

21. Cf. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," pp. 87f.; 1 Enoch 91:12ff. and 93 may have supplied the pattern; cf. also the seven visions of 4 Esdras, the seven archangels of Tobit and 1 Enoch, and the seven lots of 1QMI.

22. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," p. 88.

23. A double instance of Luke's "dual witness" motif, which is found again in a duplicate Joseph-Jesus sequence of "weeks" of generations just prior to the Babylonian captivity under Shealtiel in the forty-second (6×7 th) and forty-ninth (7×7 th) "weeks." Cf. Joseph-Jesus in the seventieth and seventy-seventh "weeks."

24. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q," p. 88.

34–36). Normally we would expect a genealogy, as in Matthew 1:2–16, to begin in the past and work toward the present, but Luke's has apparently been constructed with its present position in mind, as v. 23 signals the beginning (*archomenos*) of Jesus' ministry (cf. Acts 1:22; 10:37).

Jesus' public ministry in Galilee is introduced by an editorial summary (Luke 4:14f.) including several marks of St. Luke's style.²⁵ "Luke's verses have the character of a heading for what is to follow."²⁶ They replace those of Mark 1:14f. and Matthew 4:12–17, which feature the nearness of the Kingdom, with a digest of a definite period in Jesus' life, viz. his Galilean ministry (Luke 4:16–9:50). Neither Mark's nor Matthew's synopsis is satisfactory for St. Luke, because for him the nearness of the Kingdom is no longer its most salient feature. The Kingdom will come, not with signs to be observed but *suddenly* (cf. 17:24, 30ff.; 21:34), and therefore speculation on the time of its arrival is discouraged by St. Luke (cf. Acts 1:6f.). Instead, Luke 4:18–21 and 4:34f. advise us that the Kingdom of God is now present in the person of the Messiah (cf. 17:20f.).

In Luke 4:16–30 occurs one of St. Luke's major dislocations in the basic Marcan framework of his Gospel (cf. Mark 6:1–6). According to Luke, Jesus first announces the "good news" in his home-town synagogue "on the sabbath day" (v. 16). Thus the Messiah proclaims publicly the arrival of the new epoch or the *seventh* Kingdom of "the acceptable *eniauton kuriou*" (v. 19) on the *seventh* day of the week in Nazareth "where he had been brought up" (v. 16). In this way St. Luke links the gospel and the new epoch with the old era of Israel—i.e. of the law and the prophets (cf. 16:16). Where else should Jesus and the new aeon begin but in his native synagogue? What is new is the content of his message; cf. the citation from Isaiah 61:1 and 58:6 in Luke 4:18f. St. Luke's "dual witness" method is again evident in the composition of the key passage 4:18f., whose inner symmetry and balance is visible in every line. It is composed of exactly twenty-six words, which may be divided into twelve pairs linked by two words—*kēruxai* and *kai*—which serve to join balancing parts within the system. *Kēruxai* in v. 18 is the central link between the first six and last six pairs, while *kai* links the first two pairs in the second half of the quotation. Further evidence of "dual witness" may be seen in the double use of *kuriou*, *apostellein*, *aphesis*, *kēruxai*, and *me*. (The second *kēruxai* has been inserted into the LXX version of Isaiah 61:1f. in place of *kalesai*, and "to set at liberty those who are oppressed" has been borrowed from Isa. 58:6 with only one change: *apostelle* becomes *aposteilai*.²⁷)

So Jesus proclaims the "good news" and concludes with the significant

25. Cf. Plummer, *Gospel According to St. Luke*, pp. 116f., for the details.

26. K. L. Schmidt, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (Berlin: Trowitzsch, 1919), pp. 37f., quoted by H. Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, p. 30.

27. See Nils W. Lund, *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942), pp. 236–8, on the chiasmic structure of Lk. 4:16–21a. His conclusion is: "Our study of the passage shows that all four changes in Luke's version of the LXX text of Isaiah 61:1f. are made in the interest of a more perfect chiasmus in the centre [i.e. vv. 18f.]. The adaptations are skilfully made" (p. 238).

statement: "*sēmeron* this scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing" (v. 21). This is tantamount to saying that "the Messiah has come and with him the new era of the Lord's favor—the Kingdom of God."²⁸ Now it becomes clear why St. Luke has previously omitted Mark's and Matthew's emphasis on the "nearness of the Kingdom" (cf. e.g. Mark 1:14, Matthew 3:2; 4:17). He sees the Kingdom as present in Jesus and evidenced by the miracles which follow his public preaching (cf. e.g. 4:33-41). However, the End did not come with Jesus's first advent and the uncertainty of the date of his second advent occasions a shift of emphasis in Luke. "The nearness of the Kingdom has become a secondary factor. . . . The Good News is not that God's Kingdom has come near, but that the life of Jesus provides the foundation for the hope of the future Kingdom."²⁹ Neither Mark's nor Matthew's placing of the Rejection at Nazareth was suitable for St. Luke's concept of the gospel (cf. Mark 6:1-6; Matthew 13:54-58). This is the only Marcan pericope placed differently in all three Gospels, and Canon Browning is likely correct in his suggestion that the controlling factor in Luke's sequence here is the device of chiasmus, with a pattern based on the Temptations taken in direct and inverse order, i.e. a b c c b a,³⁰ the key to the system being c, the Rejection in Nazareth, which takes precedence over the others as one of St. Luke's primary principles in the spread of the gospel. In our view chiasmus is yet another manifestation of his "dual witness" method of composition, more refined but still of the same *genre*.

To return to Luke's "sabbath" motif, we have noted that the *seventh* or Sabbath Kingdom of the Messiah appropriately opens in Nazareth "on the sabbath day" (Luke 4:16). Following his rejection in the *patris* Jesus goes down to Capernaum, "a city of Galilee," where again he speaks in the synagogue "on the sabbath" (4:31), this time to a more receptive audience. The next "sabbath" references are found in 6:1 and 6:6, where St. Luke links two Sabbath-controversy incidents by means of editorial signposts: "on the second sabbath after the first"³¹ (6:1) and "on another sabbath" (6:6). The marginal RSV reading is preferable in v. 1, since it is more difficult to explain as an interpolation and it links back in a Lucan way with 4:16, 31. The "second sabbath after the first" can be interpreted to mean the

28. S. McL. Gilmour, "St. Luke," *The Interpreter's Bible*, Vol. VIII (New York-Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952), p. 93.

29. Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, p. 37.

30. Cf. W. R. F. Browning, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: S.C.M. Press, 1960), p. 63; the sequence in Lk. 4:1-5:11 is: (a) miraculous "bread" or "fish" (4:3f.; 5:1-11); (b) rejection of "the devil" or expulsion of "unclean spirits" (4:5-8; 4:31-44); and (c) safe delivery from a dangerous "pinnacle" or "peak" (4:9-12; 4:16-30).

31. *Reading sabbatō deuteroprōtō*, with A C D Theta fam.13 28 and most Byzantine MSS; *sabbato* alone is read by Papyrus 4, Aleph B W fam.1 69, most of the Old Latin, and all Syriac and Egyptian versions. Professor G. D. Kilpatrick believes that the longer text is right because (1) the shorter text may have originated from the longer by the simple omission of one word whose ending is the same; (2) the longer text is the harder to explain; (3) the attempts to explain the longer from the shorter are most unconvincing.

“third” sabbath in Luke’s succession of significant sabbaths in Jesus’ ministry. The phrase seems like an innocent introductory note in 6:1, 6, but since St. Luke neglects to give any *locus* other than anonymous grainfields (v. 1) and an unidentified synagogue (v. 6), one wonders why he bothers to tell us so distinctively what day it is.

A survey of Luke reveals that exactly *seven* pericopes begin with a special notice that what ensues takes place “on the sabbath,” viz. 4:16, 31; 6:1, 6; 13:10; 14:1, and 23:56b. While St. Luke follows Mark 6:2; 1:21, and 2:23 in his first three sabbath notices, the last four are of his own insertion or composition. There is little doubt, therefore, that St. Luke divides the epoch of Jesus into *seven* “sabbaths” or “days,” i.e. “weeks” or “periods of time”; cf. *kai egeneto en mia tōn hēmerōn* (5:17) and *eidomen paradoxā sēmeron* (5:26). As we might expect, Jesus’s seven days of ministry are occupied in six days of work and one of rest. Thus, after six of the “sabbath” notices there follows preaching or teaching (4:16–30; 6:1–5) or combined teaching and healing (4:31–44; 6:6–11; 13:10–17; 14:1–6). Other intervening material falls naturally under the preceding “sabbath” notice. The *seventh* sabbath is that of Jesus’s death, on which he and his followers “rested according to the commandment” (23:56b).

Now it becomes apparent why St. Luke began ch. 3 with a “sixfold” temporal outline pointing to the epoch of Jesus, which is the seventh or sabbath Kingdom, i.e. the Kingdom of God. Luke 3:1f. synchronizes with his “sabbath” motif, which runs through the sequence of events in his Gospel. Now we know why St. Luke alone adds to Mark’s and Matthew’s versions of the Easter Eve events: “It was the day of Preparation, and the sabbath was beginning” (23:54), and “On the sabbath day they rested according to the commandment” (23:56b). As the conjunctive particles *men* (23:56b) and *de* (24:1) will testify, Luke 23:56b is the preface to 24:1–53, which recounts the events of the day of Resurrection, which ushers in the new age of the Spirit and the Church (cf. 24:49). Thus St. Luke’s sweep of salvation-history is balanced and complete from his point of view: (a) prior to Jesus there is a sixfold era comprised of Caesar, Pilate, Herod, Philip, Lysanias, and Israel represented by Annas-Caiaphas (the law) and John (the prophets) (cf. 16:16a); (b) the epoch of Jesus consists of six “sabbaths” or periods of activity culminating in the “day of rest” when Jesus’ body lies in the tomb (cf. 16:16b); and (c) the new age of the Spirit and the Church, which actually begins in 24:1—“on the first day of the week, at early dawn”—although there is a gestation period of fifty days before the Holy Spirit formally descends upon the faithful (Acts 2:1–4).

In the light of all this, the word *kathexēs* (Luke 1:3) takes on new meaning and significance. As used by St. Luke, it probably means “in order” or “successively” (cf. Acts 11:4; 18:23); i.e. it refers to the successive cycles of time and significant events in God’s ongoing plan of *Heilsgeschichte*. St. Luke’s plan is to portray a meaningful flow of events before,

after, and during Jesus' life in the flesh. In this respect he is a true historian, even though his method and schemata may seem strange to twentieth-century historians. This fact makes it all the more imperative that we understand how St. Luke assembles and shapes the material of his two major sources—Mark and Matthew—according to his plan and purpose in the Third Gospel. There is no reason or need to suppose that Luke's "sabbath" notices indicate the passage of any particular amount of time between any two notices, since they are not at all evenly dispersed in the Gospel. Rather, these are the seven *significant* sabbaths or periods of work and witness in Jesus' ministry, the most important naturally being the "sabbath" of his Passion, which begins midway in the journey to Jerusalem (14:1). Sabbaths one, two, three, and five would be relatively short periods, if we were to judge by the amount of material or events included in them, but St. Luke probably does not want his readers to make any such judgment. The "sabbaths" are not of equal length or importance, but each is significant in its own right as part of God's "predestined plan" of salvation-history (Acts 4:28).

By means of the "sabbath" motif we are now able to suggest why Luke 13:32f. is located where it is. This double oracle is uttered by Jesus on the "fifth" sabbath of his ministry (cf. 4:16, 31; 6:1, 6; 13:10), occurring not long before the "sixth" sabbath notice (14:1). Jesus has now only two "sabbaths" left in his ministry besides the present one. Therefore, when he says, "I cast out demons and perform cures *sēmeron* and *aurion*, and the third day I finish my course" (13:32), there can be little doubt that he refers *sēmeron* to the "fifth" sabbath, *aurion* to the "sixth" (which includes his Passion), and there can be no doubt about what is meant by "the third day," viz. his death (23:54-56). For good measure St. Luke has Jesus repeat the saying in the next verse, introducing it with two favourite Lucan words—*plēn dei*—and thereby creating another instance of his "dual witness" method of composition. These two motifs of "sabbath" and "dual witness" are quite influential in St. Luke's arranging and editing of his sources.

The "sabbath" motif gives added meaning and importance to the fact that there are *seven* "table-talk" episodes in Luke: 5:29-39; 7:36-50; 10:38-42; 11:37-52; 14:1-24; 22:14-38, and 24:28-35. Only two of these, the first and the sixth—Levi's Feast and the Last Supper—are found in Mark and Matthew. The other five either were added by St. Luke from his L-material or fashioned by him for the occasions concerned. The second, fourth, and fifth involve Jesus in "table-talk" with Pharisees at their invitation, and on each occasion the host and his fellow Pharisees are accused and/or castigated by Jesus, especially on the fourth. This rather strange behaviour on the part both of the Pharisees and of the invited guest gives rise to the suspicion that these "table-talk" incidents are a Lucan formulation which hardly accords with the tradition found in Mark and Matthew, where the Pharisees are such bitter enemies of our Lord that his being

invited into their homes in a friendly way seems most unlikely. The third episode depicts Jesus in the home of Martha and her sister, Mary. The seventh table-talk at Emmaus is one of the Resurrection events peculiar to Luke. Just *six* (the first six) of the "table-talk" incidents occur during the six active "sabbaths" of Jesus's ministry in the flesh. There can be none on the seventh sabbath when he rests "according to the commandment" (23:56b). The seventh episode occurs "on the first day of the week" (24:1, 13) after Jesus' death, and is probably intended as an earnest or guarantee of that blessed "table-fellowship" to be enjoyed by all faithful Christians in the Kingdom of God (cf. Luke 22:16-30). Luke 22:24-27, which has probably been composed from Mark 10:42-45 and Matthew 20:25-28, further points up the importance of "table-fellowship" in St. Luke's Gospel, as also does his transference and revision of Matthew 19:28, resulting in Luke 22:28-30. Paul Minear claims that there are certain common features in the first six episodes of Lucan table-talk:

In all passages where there is a common tradition, Luke gives the longest account and the length is largely due to didactic material. In all but the possible exception of 5:29f., Luke (or his source) has rearranged the setting and has subtly adapted the teaching to the setting. In all, the table is the scene of controversy between hosts and guests. In all, this controversy illuminates the mode of salvation wherein both Jesus' example and his teaching collide with prevailing norms. All are used for training disciples to understand and to adopt the way of life which is most clearly revealed in Jesus' Passion.³²

Dr. Minear's observations serve to underline our contention that St. Luke's "table-talk" incidents are part and parcel of the "sabbath" motif, which is one of the major chords struck repeatedly throughout his Gospel.

Another instance of the "sabbath" motif may be found in St. Luke's use of *sēmeron*, which is inserted into his sources or included in his L-material no less than nine times—viz. in 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 13:32, 33; 19:5, 9; 22:61; 23:43.³³ On one occasion (12:28) it is included from Matthew 6:30 with no special significance, but as inserted by St. Luke himself *sēmeron* always has messianic reference, in that it denotes or delineates *six* important days of Jesus' life in the flesh, viz. the first day of his earthly life (2:11), the first and second "sabbaths" of his ministry (4:21; 5:26), the fifth and sixth "sabbaths" of his ministry (13:32f.; 19:5, 9), and the last day of his life (22:61-23:43), which covers the final portion of the sixth "sabbath" of his ministry. St. Luke thus differentiates between the "week" of Jesus' ministry, i.e. his seven "sabbaths" (4:16-23:56), and the six "days" of his earthly life, i.e. from 2:11 to 23:43. The *seventh* "day" of the Messiah will be the Parousia—*hē hēmera ekeinē* (21:34), *en tē hēmera*

32. Paul S. Minear, "A Note on Luke 22:36," *Novum Testamentum*, 7 (1964), 134.

33. A possible tenth insertion is the marginal RSV reading of Lk. 3:22—"Thou art my Son, *sēmeron* I have begotten thee"—read by D it Justin, Clement, Origen, the Ebionite Gospel, Methodius, Hilary. Scholarly opinion is divided here, but I believe the marginal reading is secondary, since St. Luke later includes this quotation from Ps. 2:7 in Acts 13:33, where it is applied to Jesus's Resurrection, not to his Baptism.

auton (17:24), or *en ekeinē tē hēmera* (17:34)—“the Day when the Son of man is revealed” (17:30) in all his glory “suddenly” (21:34) “to all who dwell upon the face of the whole earth” (21:35). On the last three recorded “days,” viz. 13:32f.; 19:5, 9; 22:61–23:43, *sēmeron* is used *dually* to designate each “day”—further illustration of St. Luke’s “dual witness” method of composition. On two of these “days” this phenomenon is quite obvious; cf. 13:32f. and 19:5, 9, where *sēmeron* occurs twice in close conjunction in each pericope, almost as if the first occurrence were echoed. Its dual use on Jesus’ last “day” is more complex; cf. 22:61 and 23:43 where it demarcates the beginning (22:61 cf. 22:66) and the end (23:43 cf. 23:44–46) of that climactic “day.”

St. Luke’s use of only *six* “Amen” sayings in his Gospel, in contrast to Mark’s thirteen and Matthew’s thirty “Amens,” may well be another example of the “sabbath” motif in Luke; cf. 4:24; 12:37; 18:17, 29; 21:32, and 23:43. J. C. O’Neill has aptly pointed out that “the Amen sayings bind up two things: God’s plan of salvation in history, and the call to a Christian life within that setting.”³⁴ He adds: “The Amen sayings are a guide to ordinary Christians, produced when it became clear that they would live and die without seeing the end of history or the coming of the Kingdom. We are witnessing the beginning of Pastoral Theology, its faithful sayings selected from the words of the Lord himself.”³⁵ In other words, St. Luke keeps only those “Amen” sayings which will apply directly to the lives of Christians who read them around the end of the first and beginning of the second centuries. But why did he not include a *seventh* “Amen” saying to complete another “sabbath” motif? His reason was that the *seventh* “Amen” is to be the great final “Amen” of the Parousia, when Christ will return and reign as King of kings and Lord of lords for ever and ever. That will be *the End* (cf. Rev. 22:13, 20), and only the risen Lord Jesus himself can utter the last “Amen.”

Thus the “sabbath” and “dual witness” motifs play an important role in St. Luke’s editing and shaping of his sources. But whence came these motifs? The most obvious answer is: from his sources, including Mark and Matthew and the Old Testament. In the Old Testament both the “sabbath” and “dual witness” motifs are found from the very beginning in the “seven-day” act of creation (Gen. 1:1–2:4a) followed by a second version of the creation story (Gen. 2:4b–25). Both the “sabbath” and the “dual witness” motifs are very common in the Hebrew Bible, which is noted for its Semitic parallelism, as well as for the dominant “sabbath” or “seven-day” system governing Israel’s social and religious life. To move on from the Old Testament, in our view St. Luke had before him *two* major sources in continuous written form—Mark and Matthew—and it is unlikely that he had others as extensive. What is more logical, then, than that he should compose his

34. J. C. O’Neill, “The Six Amen Sayings in Luke,” *Journal of Theological Studies*, N.S., 10 (1959), 9.

35. *Ibid.*

Gospel along the lines of *two* of the most prevalent biblical motifs from the two major sources available to him, especially when "dual witness" is present in Mark and Matthew, e.g. in the parallel Feedings of the Multitude.⁸⁶ The "sabbath" motif is also to be found in Matthew, as Edgar Krentz has recently pointed out;⁸⁷ cf., e.g. the seven parables in Matthew 13; seven woes in Matthew 23; seven demons in Matthew 12:45; seven loaves and seven baskets in Matthew 15:34, 37; sevenfold forgiveness in Matthew 18:21f.; seven brothers in Matthew 22:25-27; Matthew's genealogy, composed of three groups of fourteen names (3 × 7 doubled); and seven Old Testament formula quotations in Matthew's opening section (1:1-4:16), viz. 1:23; 2:6, 15, 18, 23; 3:3; 4:15f.⁸⁸ While St. Luke does not use all of these "sevens," some of which originate in Mark, it seems unlikely that he was completely unaware of their presence.

To illustrate once more the influence of the "sabbath" and "dual witness" motifs in St. Luke's composition, let us compare one of the Matthaean "sabbath" references (Matthew 18:21f.) with its Lucan counterpart (Luke 17:4). Here we have a dominical oracle which in both Gospels emphasizes the necessity of "sevenfold" or unlimited forgiveness. Note how St. Luke has apparently revised this saying in order to relate it to his favourite motifs and theological concepts: "And if he sins against you *seven* times in *the day*, and turn to you *seven* times, and says, 'I repent,' you must forgive him." He omits Matthew's "seventy times seven" and instead uses three common Lucan words—*hēmera*, *epistrephein*, and *metanoein*, each of which is a key word in his theology. *Epistrephein* and *metanoein* are used often by St. Luke to indicate "turning to God" (or "the Lord"), e.g. in Luke 1:16f.; Acts 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18, 20, or "conversion," e.g. in Luke 22:32; Acts 3:19; 15:3; 28:27. *Hēmera* is inserted in his sources or included from L-material some sixty times by St. Luke in his Gospel, often with messianic reference.⁸⁹ In view of these facts, a *double entendre* is quite possible in Luke 17:4. Its surface meaning is the imperative of "sevenfold" or unbounded forgiveness among Christians, but its deeper nuance may be an allusion to "the Day" of the Lord, now provisionally present in Jesus, that Day in which human forgiveness, like the divine, "shall" (*aphēseis*) be unlimited. This is another sign of the Kingdom of God, both as present reality and future promise, somewhat reminiscent of Satan's absence during most of the Messiah's "week of sabbaths"

36. This particular duo is not found in Luke because of the so-called "great omission" of Mk. 6:45-8:26. There has been much speculation about this oversight; to me the most cogent arguments are presented by Vincent Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926), pp. 91f., followed by Hans Conzelmann, *Theology of St. Luke*, pp. 54f.

37. Cf. E. Krentz, "The Extent of Matthew's Prologue," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 83 (1964), 409-14.

38. G. Strecker, *Der Weg der Gerechtigkeit: Untersuchung zur Theologie des Matthäus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962), pp. 38, 151, claims that there were originally only seven beatitudes.

39. Cf., e.g., Lk. 1:20, 80; 2:6, 21f., 46; 4:42; 5:17; 6:12, 23; 8:22; 9:23, 36f., 51; 17:22, 24, 30f.; 19:47; 20:1; 21:34, 37; 22:66; 23:54; 24:7, 13, 18, 21, 46.

on earth, i.e. from Luke 4:13 to 22:3. The verse as presented by St. Luke displays his "dual witness" style throughout; cf. *heptakis (bis)*, *hamartēsē eis se*, which balances *epistrepse pros se*, and *kai (bis)*—once to link the verse with preceding verse, with which it forms another duo, and once to join the balancing halves of v. 4). There are exactly eight words before and eight words after the second *kai* which bisects the verse. In the couplet 17:3f., v. 3 has fourteen (or sixteen)⁴⁰ words and v. 4 has sixteen after its initial *kai* which links the two verses. Thus the "sabbath" motif of sevenfold forgiveness during Jesus's "day" on earth is accompanied, as is so often the case, by St. Luke's "dual witness" method of composition.⁴¹

While the above examples by no means exhaust the incidence of the "dual witness" motif and do not necessarily cover all occurrences of the "sabbath" motif in Luke, they do indicate that St. Luke's concept of "salvation-history" is distinctive and yet strongly influenced by certain literary patterns in the Old and New Testament sources available to him. My contention is that henceforth we should pay close attention to these patterns when wrestling with either textual or exegetical problems in the Third Gospel, because in some instances—e.g. the text of 6:1 and the exegesis of 13:32f.—at least they provide leading clues to the correct solution.

40. D ⊕ the Byzantine text and vg. include *eis se* after *hamartē* in 17:3. This addition balances 17:3 and 4 exactly.

41. *Prosechete heautois* (17:3) is frequent in Luke-Acts and peculiar to the Lucan writings in the New Testament. *Epitiman* (17:3) is also common in Luke—a further sign of the Lucan hand.