The Davidic motif is well recognised in the Lukan narrative but David's identity as God's shepherd king has not seemed to influence how scholars have understood the Lukan Jesus and his mission to seek and save the lost. This thesis argues that David's identity as God's shepherd cannot be separated from his kingship, and that Luke takes this aspect of David into his narrative. I use a narrative methodology that relies heavily on exegetical discussion to explore the text. Luke's own intention to write a διήγησις that is orderly (καθεξῆς) and written from the beginning (ἀνωθεν) is thus followed. In light of the path Luke has set, I pay particular attention to the primacy effect as this sets the trajectory for a narrative, the cumulative and cohesive nature of narrative, gaps and blanks in narrative which invite the reader to find meaning, and the use of Leitwortstil to reveal and clarify meaning. I also use Hays' test for echoes since Luke's writing uses a number of implicit tools to direct the reader to understand Jesus' mission and ministry.

The thesis considers, first, the pervasive nature of the shepherd king motif in Israel's history and especially 'Kingdoms' portrayal of David in the Septuagint. Second, it takes the motif in Luke's infancy narrative and after reviewing the well recognised motif of David in Luke 1, asks again why the angels went to the shepherds in the birth narrative? I conclude that Micah 5:2-5 lies behind Luke's expression of the 'City of David, Bethlehem' and that here Luke points to Jesus as Micah's messianic shepherd. Further, in Luke's genealogy, which follows a different path to Matthew, we find Luke draws on Zech 12:10-14 and Jer 22:30-23:6 where the end of the kingly line from Jeconiah would be superseded by the Davidic shepherd king who brings God's salvation.

Third, four shepherd sayings and passages are considered in Luke-Acts (Luke 10:3; 12:32; 15:1-7; Acts 20:28). These demonstrate that the motif of the Davidic shepherd king has an on-going influence on how the reader understands Jesus' ministry to the marginalised. I note that this shepherd task is passed onto the wider discipleship group in the household mission and also influences Paul's Abschiedsrede at Miletus. God's concern for the disciples' welfare...
in Luke 12:22-32 is as their faithful shepherd, and Jesus is the faithful shepherd in 15:1-7 and challenges the scribes and the Pharisees' view of God's mission.

Finally, I consider the story of Zacchaeus and especially 19:10 where the Son of Man is said to come to seek out and save the lost (sheep). I note that this well-recognised Davidic shepherd king echo of Ezekiel 34 creates a link back to the Nazareth sermon (4:18-19) by echoing its content and adding a strong statement that Jesus' ministry to the poor, the captive, the blind and the oppressed is enacted as God's faithful shepherd. This resonance leads to the conclusion that Luke has a second saying (19:10) which is programmatic for Luke. At the beginning of Jesus' ministry in 4:18-19 we hear to whom Jesus' mission is directed and at the end of Jesus' ministry outside Jerusalem in 19:10, the reader hears how this mission is enacted: Jesus is God's faithful Davidic shepherd king who is constantly reaching to the margins of society to seek out and save the lost sheep. I therefore conclude that the two sayings work together as a programmatic inclusio for the Lukan narrative. Finally, I show that the Zacchaeus story resonates with, complements and completes Jesus' ministry where universal salvation is for the clean and the unclean, for women and men, for the poor and the rich and ultimately for Jew and Gentile. For the Lukan Jesus no-one should be lost, as the faithful shepherd is the one who seeks the lost sheep until he finds it.
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Chapter 1
The Davidic Shepherd King in Luke's Narrative

While sitting in an undergraduate class and discussing the Lukan birth narrative I became intrigued with why Luke places such a narrative emphasis on the shepherds on the hillside (2:8-20). The birth of Jesus is told simply and with little narrative space, while the shepherds are prominent figures whose experiences and movements fill the text. I began to wonder how Luke viewed the shepherds. At that time I was aware that Lukan theology emphasised the gospel coming to the poor, visible in many texts including the programmatic saying in 4:18-19, and that first-century Palestinian shepherds were examples of just such people. However, the more I heard echoes of Jewish scripture in the narrative, the more I became convinced that the role of the shepherds meant something more for Luke. I further noted that Luke placed considerable emphasis on the Davidic motif in the infancy narrative with many direct statements and echoes. Also I recalled how David's role as a shepherd was central to his kingship. It made me wonder if Luke was suggesting something about Jesus' kingship and the kingdom he came preaching and proclaiming.

As my study continued I then became intrigued with the parable of the lost sheep in Luke 15 and how this parable, which Bovon notes falls at the mid point of the Gospel,1 seems to return to the shepherd tones of the infancy narrative. Then when I reached the story of Zacchaeus, the place most scholars define as the final encounter in the travel narrative, and I heard the strong echo of the Davidic shepherd king in 19:10, I decided that it would be valuable to explore Luke's theological interest in the motif of the shepherd in a comprehensive and systematic way.

I. H. Marshall has previously suggested that Luke 19:10, where the reader hears the well-supported Davidic shepherd king echo, 'sums up the central message of the Gospel.'2 More re-

ently, Yuzuru Miura in his study on David in Luke-Acts writes that, 'in Luke 19, Jesus' earthly ministry is summarized with Davidic Shepherd imagery,' while not explaining how this is true in his monograph. I agree with these two statements and recognise that these scholars have noted something significant for reading Luke; but no study including their own, has fully explored the Davidic shepherd king in the Lukan narrative. This study aims to fill that lacuna.

The problem of recognising the Davidic shepherd king in the narrative comes because there is no direct statement where Jesus is named as a 'shepherd' in the Gospel. In contrast, the Gospel of Matthew has one verse where Jesus is named as shepherd of Israel (Matt 2:6) and so studies have explored the motif in that Gospel. However Luke's lack of a direct reference does not necessarily mean that he has not woven this theme into his narrative. As the curtain goes up in the Gospel, the reader steps into the Septuagintal world grounded firmly in the stories of Israel, where one cannot but recall the story of David, God's chosen shepherd king with Luke's six-fold repetition of David (1:27, 32, 69; 2:4 [twice], 11).

Bovon's survey of christological titles for Jesus from the last fifty-five years, identifies the Lukan Jesus as Prophet, Master, Son of Man, Servant, Son of David, Son of God, Messiah, Lord, Saviour, and even Guide. These categories are further identified in major biblical

---

5. A review of scholarly discussion about David in Luke-Acts is found in chapter 4.1. Similarly, there is a discussion of the shepherds in the birth narrative in chapter 4.4.5.1. As there has been no study about the shepherd motif in Luke-Acts there is no literature to survey at this point.
commentaries.\textsuperscript{7} As Tuckett rightly points out, 'Luke does not present a single Christology but rather a whole variety of Christologies.'\textsuperscript{8}

This study aims to show that Luke's portrayal of Jesus as David is implicitly coloured by his nature as a shepherd king, which Luke demonstrates in explicit and implicit ways. While Luke 4:18-19 describes Jesus' mission to the poor, Luke 19:10 summarises how he brings good news to the poor. That is, he does so as God's faithful shepherd king who always seeks out and saves the lost sheep. The Lukan Jesus, whom all scholars note is constantly reaching out to the margins of society, does so at least in part because he is God's faithful shepherd.

1.1 Methodology

This study will use a narrative critical methodology that relies heavily on exegetical discussions to recover the picture of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd king. In using this methodology I acknowledge that the biblical narrative is not a mere compilation of unconnected stories, but is a carefully crafted narrative. Furthermore, it takes seriously Luke’s specific intention given in 1:1 to write a διήγησις (an orderly account), and therefore it aims to follow Luke's lead by drawing attention to his narrative landmarks, structure and detail. Beginnings, middle and endings of narrative units and the greater Gospel narrative must be considered. A balanced exegesis relies on contextual interpretation, and this study assumes that not only the pericopes that immediately surround a text are necessary for interpretation, but also the entire Gospel narrative. That is, Luke's Gospel from 1:1 to 24:53 is a narrative unity, and it is also in unity with the second volume in the Acts of the Apostles.\textsuperscript{9}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{9} I agree with major scholarly thought that Luke and Acts are written by the same author and contain an authorial unity. Luke's own reference to his first book (Acts 2:1), the naming of Theophilus (Luke 1:3; Acts 1:1), the linking of the ascension narratives in 24:5-51 and Acts 1:9-11, and the consistency in themes such as salvation, mission, the Holy Spirit, the role of prayer etc. suggest there is unity between Luke-Acts. For the purpose of this study, I am primarily looking at Luke's first volume and
\end{flushleft}
While narrative concerns have not been entirely absent from Lukan scholarship, in the late 1950's scholars began to consider Luke's theological concerns more systematically and to 'pick up one of the loose threads left by form criticism.' Redaktionsgeschichte helped uncover the role of the author/s who created a unified story through editing their sources. This method of study has given special emphasis to the way insertions, modifications, re-ordering and shaping give theoretical meaning to a Gospel.

Redaktionsgeschichte in Lukan studies has its beginnings in Conzelmann's watershed work, The Theology of St. Luke where he argues that Luke is a theologian rather than an historian and that he wrote a salvation-historical account to explain why there was a delay in the parousia. This work took Lukan studies in new directions as scholars considered the theology within the Gospel.

The rise of biblical narrative criticism in the last thirty years arose within the greater movement of literary criticism. Scholars such as Martin Buber, Franz Rosenzweig, Erich Auerbach, Robert Alter, Meir Sternberg, Kenneth Gros Louis, Shimon Bar-Efrat and Yairah Amit how this can be read as a narrative in its own right. See Green, The Gospel of Luke, 6-10; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 35; John Nolland, Luke 1-9:20 (WBC 35A; Dallas: Word, 1989), xxxiii; Marshall, Luke, Historian and Theologian, 13. Generic, narrative and theological unity are however open to question, and this has been opened up by the work of Parsons and Pervo. See Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).
have spear-headed study in the Hebrew Bible while NT scholarship turned with great interest to the narrative in its texts.\textsuperscript{16}

Narrative and literary methodologies have become well accepted and within the field of Lukan studies there have been a plethora of books written using narrative methodologies in full or in part.\textsuperscript{17} Therefore, the choice of methodology for this thesis stands in a growing tradition of narrative studies which are adding greatly to Lukan scholarship.


1.2  The contours of narrative methodology used in this study

There are six key narrative features which will be considered in this study; each is a tool an author uses to convey meaning to a reader. They are:

1. The cumulative nature of narrative
2. The cohesive structure of a narrative
3. The order of a narrative
4. Gaps and blanks in the text
5. The role of repetition
6. Echoes within the text

Firstly, narrative methodology takes seriously the cumulative nature of a story which has a beginning, middle, and an end that are inextricably linked.\(^{18}\) It recognises the causal connections between situations and events in Luke's writing. This means one event or situation gives rise to another and the causal chain leads to the 'goal' in the sense of the conclusion of the story line.\(^{19}\) The significance of each event in the narrative is therefore incomplete, if it is viewed apart from the whole.\(^{20}\)

This approach has merit because an original audience is likely to have heard a Gospel story in its entirety and not as isolated pericope, thus allowing the cumulative telos of the story to emerge.\(^{21}\) This will be important for this study of the Davidic shepherd king motif because the motif is not centred in one text. Luke begins the picture in the infancy narrative, but it gradually gains details as the narrative moves toward its goal.

---

Secondly, a narrative approach assumes, as this study does, that Luke wrote a cohesive story of Jesus crafted to shape his readers' understanding. We cannot expect that the author ever intended for Luke to be read in one hand, with Mark's Gospel in the other hand for comparison. Therefore, the primary context for interpreting any part of the text is the text itself. Verseput writes of the Synoptic context that

the exegete who wishes to confront the Evangelist face to face must do so on the grounds of the entire text; ... It is the completed text which stands between the author and the reader, and it is that text against which all meaning must ultimately be measured.22

Narrative criticism therefore understands the text as a coherent unity in comparison to a redaction critical approach which tends toward seeing the text's lesions and parts.23 Critics of this methodology suggest narrative scholars can try to make the text more homogeneous than it really is and can deny the possibility of internal contradictions.24 To guard against this the narrative critical approach in general and this study in particular must allow the proof of unity to come from a cumulative rather than a singular strand of thought in the narrative. This approach also does not preclude analysing a triple tradition or Q passage where there is a shared tradition. Rather this approach ensures that these are the appetiser and not the main course.

Thirdly, narrative methodology assumes the order of the narrative is essential for semantic understanding. This is consistent with Lukes prologue where he states he has written καθεξῆς (an orderly account).25 The use of καθεξῆς conveys the notion of sequential action.26 This does not necessarily imply a chronologically ordered narrative, neither does it exclude it, but it does point to an account that has been deliberately ordered to convey meaning.27 Narrative methodology, therefore, is appropriate as it highlights narrative direction and location.

23. Coleridge goes so far as to say that redaction criticism shows a 'deeply fissured collection of a diversity of elements.' Coleridge, Birth, 18.
26. 'καθεξῆς', BDAG, 490.
27. Tannehill is in agreement here with Dillon that this does not have to imply a chronological order that is historically accurate. Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:9-10; Richard J. Dillon, 'Previewing Luke's Project From his Prologue,' CBQ 43 (1981): 221-22.
as possible rhetorical devices. For example, Luke's geographical structure is well known in its movement first from Galilee toward Jerusalem (9:51) and later in Acts, out from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8). This is an example of ordering the text where there is a spatial centre in Jerusalem and a progression to and from it that is woven into the text. However, for Luke this structure is less about geography than the nature of a universal gospel where good news must spread to all people. Another example of narrative order is the 'royal section' where I argue Luke has ordered and connected stories at the end of the travel narrative to enable the reader to identify Jesus as king, and specifically the Davidic shepherd king. This section begins in 18:35 with the story of the blind man who names Jesus as the Son of David (18:35-43). This is followed by the Zacchaeus pericope where, as I will show, Jesus is the Davidic shepherd king (19:1-10); the parable of the minas which is full of the language of power and kingdom (19:11-27); climaxing in the triumphal entry into Jerusalem where Jesus is named as ὁ βασιλεύς (19:28-44).

In studying the order of a narrative, attention will also be paid to the special role of the beginning of a narrative. This effect was recognised as early as Plato in the Republic who noted that first impressions are formed at the beginning of a work, and so they are of primary importance. Much work has since been done in literary theory on the effects of literary beginnings. Sternberg and Perry's description of the primacy effect in literary texts has highlighted the same dynamic, and beginnings are increasingly being recognised as of enduring importance in reading the biblical text. Perry documents studies from psychologists since 1946 where information situated at the beginning of a message was used to persuade and change peoples' attitudes and impressions. In several studies he shows how an argument presented first had the effect of gaining the reader's trust. More importantly he has demonstrated how beginnings affect one's comprehension, and how people's tendency is to persist in a direction

29. Plato, Republic II.377b.
when a trajectory has been set.\textsuperscript{32} Perry notes the remarkable consistency of the primacy effect when a text introduces a character and initial impressions are formed. He shows that even when contradictions occur later, the final impression was determined by what came first. He cites examples where two groups are given the same list of six personality traits but reversed in order. Group A’s list began with a positive trait, while Group B’s list began with a negative trait. When they are asked to describe the person Group A had a favourable impression of the person, while Group B did not. Each group’s answers was affected by the directionality of the information, and particularly what information was presented first. The psychologist Asch maintains,

The first terms set up in most subjects a \textit{direction} which exerts a continuous effect on the latter terms. When the subject hears the first term, a broad, uncrystallized but directed impression is born. The next characteristic comes not as a separate item but is related to the established direction ...later characteristics are fitted – if conditions permit – to the given direction.\textsuperscript{33}

Sternberg’s comments on life and literature are also helpful where he says,

In literature, as in life, we tend to judge people based on the first impression they make on us; but there is in this respect a basic difference between the two....The impressions we receive in life come in an essentially unplanned, accidental, and sporadic manner...In literature, unlike life, it is therefore not only profitable but necessary to pose such questions as: Why has this complex of events been presented first and that delayed? Why has this facet of character been portrayed before that? Why has this piece of (verbal, actional, structural, or even generic) information been conveyed – or on the contrary, suppressed or ambiguated – at precisely this point?\textsuperscript{34}

Sternberg points out that choices are made in literature which should be understood as the author's intentional device that requires the reader to ask questions of the text's beginning. Maxwell has recently demonstrated that this is an ancient rhetorical tool where the reader is given access to privileged information early in the narrative, and that such omniscient knowledge becomes important as the story progresses.\textsuperscript{35}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{32} Perry, 'Literary Dynamics,' 53.
\item \textsuperscript{33} Perry, 'Literary Dynamics,' 55.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Sternberg, \textit{Expositional Modes}, 96-97.
\item \textsuperscript{35} Maxwell, \textit{Hearing Between the Lines}, 49.
\end{itemize}
This study stresses the literary force of the *primacy effect* and the effect it has on reading a narrative whole. As a result we will pay particular attention to the beginning of David's story from Kingdoms in chapter three, and the story of the Lukan Jesus in chapter four.

Fourthly, a narrative methodology allows the reader to approach gaps and blanks in the text, not primarily as the writer's inability to handle his sources or write coherent narrative, but as a deliberate decision to place a gap in the narrative that the reader is expected to fill.\(^{36}\) The laconic nature of the text, therefore, is an opportunity and an invitation for the reader to make links between words and phrases. Maxwell has recently shown the ancient's use of gaps or omissions in a text, and states that Aristotle believed audiences were more persuaded by arguments when they required some effort on the audience (*Rhet.*, 3.10.4).\(^{37}\) She quotes Theophrastus, the ancient rhetorician on this practice saying,

> Not all possible points should be punctiliously and tediously elaborated, but some should be left to the comprehension and inference of the hearer, who when he perceives what you have left unsaid becomes not only your hearer but your witness, and a very friendly witness too. For he thinks himself intelligent because you have afforded him the means of showing his intelligence. It seems like a slur on your hearer to tell him everything as though he were a simpleton (*Eloc.* 222).\(^{38}\)

\(^{36}\) This does not entirely rule out the possibility that: (1) textual corruption could occur; or (2) that there is incorrect information. For example, there is the possibility that the census in 2:1 is not correctly recorded.


This has become an accepted strand of literary study in the last twenty or thirty years, with Wolfgang Iser of the Constance School of reception theory becoming well known for this identification. In an elementary form, biblical scholarship has been doing this for years by noticing the change of scenes in the Gospels where Jesus' story has time lapses or scene and location shifts. For example, in the birth narrative we are given limited knowledge or windows with which to view and interpret Jesus' early life, and yet, from the laconic details we can build up a picture of it. These Iser calls gaps in the narrative and describes them much like scene shifts between chapters of a novel.

Iser also identifies other types of structured blanks in the narrative. He describes these as unseen joints of a text that are to be connected even though the text does not say so. These require the reader to construct meaning from the narrative's implicit connections, to fill in gaps, and make the responses to the process of reading or listening to its demands or requires, we hope to experience more precisely and fully what the Epistle is meant to communicate.' J. P. Heil, Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Reader-Response Commentary (New York: Paulist, 1987), 1; W. Randolph Tate, Reading Mark From the Outside: Eco and Iser Leave their Marks (San Francisco: International Scholars Publication, 1994); Kurz, Reading Luke-Acts, 31-36; Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 37-39.

39. Alter, Art of Reading, 179; Wolfgang Iser, The Acts of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response, (London: Routledge and Keegan Paul, 1978), 180-231; Sternberg, Poetics, 186-229; Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 37-39; Terry Eagleton, Literary Theory: An Introduction (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 65-78. Anthony C. Thiselton, New Horizons in Hermeneutics: The Theory and Practice of Transforming Biblical Reading (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992). Alter describes the laconic nature of text and Iser's theory of 'blanks' and 'gaps' is well known. Eagleton gives a clear overview of this literary development and Thiselton provides a helpful orientation to biblical hermeneutical issues. It has been used in Rowe's recent work in Luke, Tate's work on Mark and Heil's commentary on Romans. In Heil's commentary he writes, 'By mentally placing ourselves in the position of the implied reader(s) of the text and making the responses to the process of reading or listening to its demands or requires, we hope to experience more precisely and fully what the Epistle is meant to communicate.'

40. The 'Constance School' of literary theorists from the University of Constance, Germany was made up of Wolfgang Iser, Wolfgang Preisendanz, Manfred Fuhrmann, Hans Robert Jauss, and Jurij Striedter. Reception theory takes the role of the reader seriously. After the nineteenth century's focus on the author, and the period of 'New Criticism' where the focus was on the text, the focus has shifted to include the role of the reader who materializes a text. In reception theory the reader is as vital as the author. Eagleton, Literary Theory, 64-65.


42. Rowe writes 'that the reader is involved in the reading process at the point of filling in gaps and silences is beyond question.' Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 37.

43. For example, in the infancy narrative the only details we hear regarding Jesus are the angel’s announcement to Mary that Jesus will be conceived (1:26-38), that he is born in Bethlehem (2:6-7), that he is circumcised on the eighth day (2:21), that he is taken to Jerusalem for the rites of purification (2:22-40), and that when Jesus is twelve he accompanies Joseph and Mary to the temple in Jerusalem (2:41-52).

44. Iser, How To Do Theory, 64.
to draw inferences and test hunches while drawing on their growing body of prior knowledge. This process may not be as radical as it may seem. As Iser rightly notes of literature, 'No author worth his salt will ever attempt to set the whole picture before his reader's eyes.'

The process of finding these unseen joints is dynamic and requires more than a linear reading movement, since in the process of foregrounding and excluding units or items in a text, the reader must be able to allow a retrospective transformation to take place. Iser names this process retention and protention. That is, a reader comes to a narrative unit with a belief in what the author has already said (a memory), this decision then becomes the yardstick ('horizon') by which the following unit is measured. This unit creates new possibilities and thus the innate task of retention and protention occurs as the reader engages with the game of creating new meaning.

This style of reading allows for considerable freedom to make links in the text, and yet Iser is clear that for those links to be true, there must be internal consistency. Indeed, this whole process is one of establishing norms and reducing the polysemantic potential to one of order and not one of limitless possibilities. He explains that,

> The discontinuities of textual segments trigger synthesizing operations in the reader's mind, because the blanks lead to collisions between the individual ideas formed, thus preventing 'good continuation,' which is a prerequisite for understanding. These colliding ideas condition each other in the time flow of reading.

This process is open to critique as a reader can claim a God-like gnostic knowledge in the text that is somehow denied to other readers; the possibility that the reader is simply taking her own knowledge or 'concretization' into the text and therefore in measuring the text can

---

ever only deal with one's own concretization. As Eagleton vividly describes, it is the age old problem of how one can know the light in the refrigerator is off when the door is shut! Eagleton suggests that Iser's view is made viable by the reader who must be 'logically constrained to the text itself,' and not wander into total indeterminacy. He notes that there are constraints on readers' interpretations through the academy which legitimate ways of reading works; however, this argument must be tempered by his opening challenge that literature cannot be viewed as an unchanging object.

The value of Iser's reception theory and the reason I will refer to it in this study are that it gives a frame of reference with which to consider Luke's implicit picture of Jesus the Davidic shepherd king. As already stated, there is no one direct reference to Jesus as a Davidic shepherd king, and if the reader is not looking for the possibilities of intentional gaps and blanks s/he may miss an important nuance of Luke's Davidic strand.

Fifthly, narrative criticism also notices the role of both direct and implied repetition of words and phrases as a literary semantic tool. Martin Buber's well known identification of the role of repetition of a leading word (Leitwort) both in close proximity and over a large narrative area will be important for this study. He describes a 'lead word' as,

a word or word root that is meaningfully repeated within a text or a sequence of texts or complex of texts; those who attend to these repetitions will find a meaning of the text revealed or clarified, or at any rate made more emphatic.

The purpose of a Leitwort then is to direct the reader's attention to the themes of the narrative. This device allows for a writer to establish and shape themes, to give emphasis by indirect means and to let the narrative proceed without disruption or distortion. Buber de-

---

49. Eagleton, Literary Theory, 73. Jeffrey Weima writes that Iser's reader centered approach is conservative unlike the later and more radical Stanley Fish who claims the wholly determinative in creating meaning. J. A. D. Weima, 'Literary Criticism,' in Interpreting the New Testament: Essays on Methods and Issues, ed. by David Alan Black and David S. Dockery (Nashville: Broadman and Holman, 2001), 160.
50. Eagleton, Literary Theory, 73.
51. Ibid.
52. Eagleton, Literary Theory, 76-77.
53. Buber, Scripture and Translation, 114-128.
54. Buber, Scripture and Translation, 114.
scribes the device as allowing the message to be 'infused by the descending spirit,' a particularly apt description for the Lukan narrative which favours allusions and echoes over direct quotes. For Buber and other scholars, repetition is not incidental to the narrative but is skillfully interwoven and is one of the strongest of all techniques for making meaning. These repeated words can come from a single word but also a root word. Buber even suggests that when there is diversity in the use of a word or 'paronomasia,' this strengthens its overall semantic effect. He pays particular attention to the nature of paronomasia at a distance in a text showing how repetition at a distance works to create semantic connection between stories. He cites the example of Egyptian Hagar's flight (Gen 16:6, 9, 11), where the repetition does not occur until chapter 29. This creates a connection in the story that draws together the history of the patriarchs with the history of the people. We will come to see that Luke establishes the Davidic shepherd motif clearly in the infancy narrative, and though the motif recurs in occasional places, it does so most clearly at the end of the travel narrative when Jesus enters Jerusalem as the Davidic shepherd king (see chapter 6.3). Thus, the vision cast at the beginning of the narrative is reestablished and further shaped in the later narrative so that a semantic connection between the stories reaffirms Luke's theological interest in Jesus as the Davidic king. With a prior understanding of Iser's theory of retrospective transformation we note how this Davidic shepherd king motif casts a shadow backward into the period of Jesus' ministry and new meaning is both reinforced and created. We will also see in chapter 6.4 that Luke uses paronomasia at a distance with 19:10 recalling 4:18-19. The use of repetition thus supports Iser's insights into gaps and blanks and gives further reasoning for celebrating the cohesive and cumulative nature of the narrative.

56. Buber, Scripture and Translation, 115.
57. The UBSGNT 4th Rev. Ed. notes that the Lukan Gospel uses 34 direct quotes, while it conservatively suggests there are 267 allusions. See the 'Index of Allusions and Verbal Parallels,' 887-901.
59. Buber, Scripture and Translation, 114.
60. Buber, Scripture and Translation, 114, 125.
As repetition is an inherent part of language, the process of classification of a word as a 'leading word' is problematic when innumerable leading words can hypothetically be found. Restrictions therefore need to be made to enable a balanced analysis.\textsuperscript{61} They are:

1. The use of estrangement, where two remote texts are related and their meaning is recalled by the reader. The function of estrangement is to attract the reader to what is unique or exceptional, or what is altered or is being altered, and to allow for significant emerging meaning. However, Buber also allows for two adjoining stories to work in a similar manner,\textsuperscript{62} calling them a 'matrix of homonyms' which work to bring phonetic focus. These he also calls a form of estrangement.

2. The identification of 'leading words' must bring coherence to the narrative. That is, you must be able to reach the same semantic reasoning by other means. He labels the leading word as a 'directing tool' which reveals more emphatically a conclusion that is already plausible.

Buber further acknowledges that not every repetition can be viewed as a leading word, and that some leading words carry more weight. He also acknowledges that not every leading word has equal status.\textsuperscript{63}

Robert Alter expanded upon Buber's application of repetition to include the repetition of motifs, themes, sequences of action and type scenes,\textsuperscript{64} as does William Freedman in his work on literary motif.\textsuperscript{65} Freedman makes a useful observation, that repetition can be a single unchanging motif or an associated cluster of words.\textsuperscript{66} This is helpful because it is not always one unchanging word that an author uses to build an idea or theme, but it can be a collection of related words which act subtly and cumulatively, as we will see in chapter four where I

\textsuperscript{61} Amit discusses Buber's theory and his restrictions in, 'Multi-Purpose,' 101-105.
\textsuperscript{62} Buber, Scripture and Translation, 125.
\textsuperscript{63} Yairah Amit notes that Buber does not create a system to distinguish how a leading word's weight can be evaluated. See Amit, 'Multi-Purpose,' 102.
\textsuperscript{66} Freedman, 'Literary Motif,' 124.
discuss Luke's motif of David. Freedman rightly says that a motif can be slipped into the author's vocabulary, dialogue and imagery where it becomes part of the total perspective, 'part of the book's atmosphere, and becomes an important thread in the fabric of the work.'

As with Buber's identification of the repetition of leading words, there are the possibilities of multiple motifs that the author may or may not have intended. Freedman therefore suggests three criteria to help determine a motif's efficacy which will help us ascertain Luke's Davidic motif. Firstly, the more frequent the motif is used the greater the effect. This is a logical first step in assessing its strength; however, Buber's work on estrangement must be held in tension as two carefully connected ideas or phrases can be used powerfully in shaping writing. Frequency is therefore a valuable tool but low frequency does not have to exclude a word or associated cluster from being identified.

Secondly, he draws attention to the greater efficacy of a motif when it is placed at significant or climactic points in the narrative. This is significant for this study as we will see how Luke has placed the motif strategically in his narrative suggesting he views its efficacy highly. We will especially note the motif at the beginning of the narratives of David and Jesus in chapters 3.1 and 4.2 and note that the semantic choice made by the author demonstrates the *primacy effect*. We will also consider that Luke returns to the motif near the beginning of the travel narrative in the household mission mandate in chapter 5.1, at the midpoint of the Gospel in chapter 5.3, and the end of the travel narrative in the story of Zacchaeus in chapter six.

Thirdly, Freedman stresses that a motif carries more weight when it is relevant to the principal purpose of the narrative as a whole. This is consistent with Buber's idea of coherence and Hays' test for satisfaction. As we are working with the statement that Luke 19:10 is summative for the Gospel, this study will show that this repeated Davidic shepherd king mo-

67. Fokkelman describes 'varied repetition' as having the purpose of expanding the richness of meanings and keeping surprises in store for the reader by avoiding monotony. Fokkelman, *Reading Biblical Narrative*, 112.
68. Freedman, 'Literary Motif,' 125.
tif resonates with the Lukan Jesus who has come to bring good news to the poor. These considerations will help assess the likelihood and strength of a motif in the Lukan narrative.

Finally, a narrative focus in the Lukan text helps the reader enter not only into the Lukan narrative but the narrative world of Israel. Luke's extensive use of the style, vocabulary and stories from the LXX is well known, and therefore, this study will use and explore the LXX

---


text and not the MT as the basis for reading Luke.\textsuperscript{73} Furthermore, although this is the appropriate text with which to engage the Lukan narrative, previous studies on the shepherd king motif in Matthew's Gospel have focussed on recovering the Davidic shepherd king motif from the MT as Matthew's audience was predominantly Jewish-Christian.\textsuperscript{74} We will see in chapter 3.3.3 that the LXX has subtleties which have been unexplored in a narrative Gospel study and which are valuable when we consider David as a shepherd.

Luke's use of the LXX stories is so profound that they have been recognised as the hermeneutic by which he weaves and reinterprets the LXX narratives in light of Jesus Christ. Indeed Luke states that he writes περὶ τῶν πεπληρωμένων ἐν ἡμῖν προγμάτων (1:1), suggesting to the reader that he sees something of their fulfilment in the story of Jesus. Del Agua identifies this when he says, 'the Old Testament tradition... is the hermeneutic reference of meaning sought in his narration,'\textsuperscript{75} and goes on to say that 'the author’s profound knowledge of biblical traditions, as well as his expertise in the art of reapplying and updating them for the Christian community, constitutes his theological and hermeneutical world.'\textsuperscript{76} Similarly, Litwak states, 'the Scriptures of Israel pervade Luke-Acts from its beginning until its end... and that they play a critical hermeneutical role in shaping the entirety of Luke's narrative.'\textsuperscript{77}

In appreciating Luke's use of scripture scholars have noted his profound mastery of the Jewish scriptures,\textsuperscript{78} which suggests not only he, but his named recipient Theophilus (Luke 1:3; Acts 1:1), had considerable knowledge of the scriptures. This resonates with Kurz when he says, 'Luke generally alludes to Old Testament passages without announcing he is doing so,'\textsuperscript{79}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{73} Where there is a Göttingen version of the LXX, I will follow this, and where there is not yet or this is not yet published, I will use Alfred Rahlfs, Septuaginta: With Morphology. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.

\textsuperscript{74} Nolland states, 'Mark seems to have been written with non-Jews in mind, but all the features in Mark that point to a non-Jewish readership disappear in Matthew’s editing. Matthew promotes mission to all peoples, but he promotes it to Jewish Christians and to a constituency that appears not to have had any significant Gentile membership...' See John Nolland, The Gospel of Matthew (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans/Bletchley: Paternoster, 2005), 17.


\textsuperscript{76} del Agua, 'Lucan Narrative,' 641, nt. 8. Emphasis added.

\textsuperscript{77} Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 1. Emphasis original.

\textsuperscript{78} For Strelan this led him to posit that Luke must be a Jewish priest and not a Gentile God-fearer. Rick Strelan, Luke the Priest: The Authority of the Author of the Third Gospel (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008).

and that he presupposes readers with a knowledge of the LXX. In acknowledging this, it is necessary to clarify that while Luke makes reference and pays some attention to his temporal world, it is primarily the story of God and God's people within which he seeks to interpret the story of Jesus.

Therefore, uncovering these stories, identifying echoes, and then assessing their strength and significance is an important task in this study. The process however, is not an exact science and requires a framework to work within. This study will employ Hays' seven tests for hearing echoes which allow us to test an echo's strength. These are tests of availability, volume, recurrence, thematic coherence, historical plausibility, history of interpretation and satisfaction.

1. Availability

The test for availability asks if there is evidence that the author had access to the suggested source. At the outset we know that Luke's knowledge and use of the LXX is vast and so, like Hays' findings of Paul's use of scripture, this criterion can be considered satisfied.

2. Volume

The test of volume covers the degree to which the suggested source is replicated in the NT text by use of syntax and the repetition of words. It then considers the degree to which Luke may have used the same source in his other writing. Lastly it reviews how prominent the text is within its OT location and then the degree of rhetorical stress within the Lukan text. For example, in 19:10 Luke uses the combined ideas of ζητέω, σῴζω, and ἀπόλλυμι which all resonate with Ezek 34, making this echo score highly in the test for volume. The volume is then heightened by the strategic location of the respective text in Ezekiel's argument and in Luke's narrative.

3. Recurrence

The test for recurrence looks at whether Luke refers to the same text in other parts of his writing. This test may help to suggest how crucial a particular passage was to Luke's understand-

80. Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 29-32.
ing of Jesus. Hays further suggests this should not be limited to a single narrative, but include larger units within scripture. We will come to see in chapters five and six that Ezek 34 is a passage which Luke drew on many times, suggesting that for Luke this is an important emphasis with regard to Jesus' ministry.

4. Thematic Coherence

In assessing thematic coherence the test considers whether the intertext's argument fits comfortably within the picture of the whole narrative. This stage looks toward the likelihood of an interpretation aligning with Lukan theology. If it does align with Lukan theology then the echo is regarded as more likely.

5. Historical Plausibility

Historical plausibility considers Luke's original audience and asks if the echo would have been able to be conceived by them. As Hays identifies, this test is hypothetical and his readers may have not picked up the echoes he intended. That is, while the Jewish and early Christian world had a good knowledge of the Greek scriptures, Luke's vast knowledge and use of scripture may have been superior. This test aims to keep the task linked to the historical world.82

6. History of Interpretation

The test for the history of interpretation is a wise attempt to stay connected to reception history and take seriously whether others have also heard an intertextual link. This by its very nature is a conservative test and Hays proposes that it should not be used as a negative test or new connections will not be discovered. However, as it is possible that there have been earlier voices that have been 'dampened or drowned out,'83 a survey of what has been said before is helpful.

7. Satisfaction

82. Hays' critique of the use of methods of interpretation grounded solely in the world of the implied author and reader is their lack of historical connectedness. He writes this option is, 'heuristic fiction, an attempt to facilitate criticism by bracketing out the messy complications of history behind the text.' Hays, Echoes of Scripture, 27.
The final test of satisfaction asks whether the echo creates a resonant reading with the surrounding narrative context. That is, does the echo create a satisfying end-result for the reader? This test may be regarded as subjective; but informed by the previous six tests, it may become the most important in keeping alive the possibility of new intertextual connections.

Hays' seven tests are concluded with a final note that there are occasions when an intertextual connection has a dynamic power that cannot be contained, and meaning has a way of leaping over a carefully maintained hedge. In many ways, this acknowledges that interpretation is also an art and a matter of intuition. This dynamic is made even more appropriate by Luke's emphasis upon the role of the Spirit for Jesus (1:35; 3:16; 4:1, 14, 18; 10:21) and the disciples (1:15, 41, 80; 2:25, 26; 11:13; 12:12; Acts 1:2, 5, 8; 2:4). This study therefore seeks to open up narrative possibilities and to leave room for life beyond the hedges.

One last thing to be considered is the relationship between narrative methodology and history. A valid critique is levelled that narrative criticism is too distant from an historical anchor and at its extremes, can be totally removed from history. Here it is helpful to state my assumptions. The Gospel is a product of its culture which is rooted in time and space and therefore understanding the historical matrices remain an essential part in reading an ancient text. It is these two worlds of narrative and the ancient soil that I seek to navigate between. Luke's Gospel is a text that is firmly linked to historical markers in the Graeco-Roman world where Herod is King of Judea (1:5), Augustus is Caesar (2:1) and the Emperor Tiberius reigns (3:1). Luke makes an effort to assure his hearers that he has fully investigated everything for his δήγησις (1:3) and his accuracy as an ancient historian is well supported.
Therefore, any study of Luke's writing must follow his lead and consider his 'text in the world.' As a result we will pay particular attention to the historical development of the shepherd-king motif in chapter two and then consider the historical references in the Gospel particularly in the infancy narrative in chapter four. As this narrative methodology aims to rely on a solid exegetical base, this methodology will also ensure historical-grammatical considerations are met.

This study assumes Markan priority and that there is a likely common and separate source that both Luke and Matthew knew, known as Q. I do not assume Luke knew Matthew's Gospel and so Matthew will not play a significant role in this study, but may be used as a comparison.

1.3 The outline of this study

In assessing the Lukan use of the Davidic shepherd king motif, in chapter two we will first establish that the shepherd motif is repeatedly used in the LXX and that God is understood as the shepherd of Israel. We will further see that David is God's chosen shepherd king (Ezek 34:23-24), and his kingship maintains a special role in Israel's future hope for a king. We will also consider texts from the Second Temple period providing a window into a first-century worldview, a task which will become especially important in chapter 4.4.5.1 as we address the role of the shepherds in the birth narrative and Jeremias' view that shepherds were thought to be sinners. This chapter aims to provide the historical scaffolding for the thesis, establishing the significance of the motif in Jewish understanding, while this study does not seek to replicate the comprehensive study of the shepherd motif by Vancil.

In chapter three we will examine the story of David told in the book of Kingdoms, through a narrative critical lens. This will highlight how David's nature as a shepherd is crucial to un-

---

91. I refer to the book of Kingdoms as it is presented in the LXX rather than I and II Samuel, I and II Kings. Most scholars have studied Samuel primarily from the MT and when I refer to their works I will use the
nderstanding his God-appointed kingship. By using the LXX as the text behind Luke's echoes we will find in chapter 3.3.3 that the LXX translator explicitly drew attention to David as a shepherd king of God's flock at the end of 2 Kingdoms, a narrative feature which is significant for this study. Chapters two and three will prepare us to read the Lukan narrative.

In chapter four we will turn to the opening of Luke's narrative in Luke 1-2 taking our understanding of the Davidic shepherd king, and consider how Luke uses his many echoes and references to David. We will especially evaluate the various ways in which scholars have understood the function of the shepherds in the birth narrative and then consider how the echo of David as a shepherd king helps us read the Lukan narrative with fresh eyes.

In chapter five we will note where the motif continues in Luke-Acts. We will first turn to the household mission in Luke 10 where the disciples are sent out as lambs into the midst of wolves, a text which prefigures the Acts household mission into Gentile territory, and then how Jesus calls his disciples τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον when he teaches them about God's provision (12:32). At the mid-point of the Gospel we will explore the parable of the faithful shepherd who goes into the wilderness to find the lost sheep (15:3-7), and see how Jesus enacts this parable in his ministry by being God's faithful shepherd. In Acts we will note the motif recurs in Paul's Miletus speech, suggesting it is not only a useful motif to describe Jesus' ministry years, but it maintains currency in the early stages of the church (Acts 20:28-29). Finally, we will ask why Luke omits to use Mark 6:34 and 14:27, shepherd texts which were available to him.

In chapter six we will examine at the story of Zacchaeus, the final event in Jesus' ministry outside Jerusalem, and explore its nature as a salvation story where the Davidic shepherd king has come to seek out and save the lost sheep. We will consider how Marshall's statement that 19:10 sums up the message of the Gospel is supported by the way this pericope coheres with the wider narrative, and also how the story finally demonstrates the fullness of the universal salvation offered by the Lukan Jesus. While our study acknowledges that this is only one of several motifs that Luke has given the reader to understand Jesus, we do suggest

---

book titles they designate. The Greek text, particularly as it pertains to David's fight with Goliath is significantly shorter and more focussed than the MT and this study will follow the contours of the LXX narrative.
that Luke's use of shepherd imagery is more cohesive and systematic than has been acknowledged. The motif comes at key places in the narrative and gradually builds a picture where the reader can see that one of the lenses Luke provides in understanding Jesus, is as God's faithful Davidic shepherd king. He is the one who is constantly reaching out to the lost sheep, saving them and leading them back to the community.

Now we turn to the ancient world where an understanding of gods began in the motif of a shepherd. It is into this world that the Jewish scriptures were born, and from which we begin to see the motif used to convey something of God's identity. We will trace the motif of shepherd as it grew and developed in the times of Moses, David and the coming Messiah.
Chapter 2
The Growth of the Davidic Shepherd King Motif

This chapter will explore the roots of the shepherd king motif in the LXX within their Ancient Near Eastern setting. This motif played a constant role in the story of Israel as the people came to relate to God as their shepherd, and themselves as his flock. The picture began to emerge in the story of Genesis and in the exodus where God led the people from slavery to freedom, and became more prominent and developed in the Psalms and prophetic writings.

This chapter is in three sections. Firstly, we will consider the early use of the motif in the story of Israel, and secondly, the use of the shepherd motif in the prophets Isaiah, Micah, Ezekiel and Zechariah, as they form a backdrop to Lukan passages. Finally, we will conclude with a survey of Second Temple period texts to demonstrate that the shepherd motif still had currency at the time Luke was crafting his narrative. David's relevance as God's shepherd king for Israel will be addressed here in the light of the various texts that address him as shepherd king, but his story will be fully retold in light of that prevailing metaphor and with a narrative critical lens from the book of Kingdoms in chapter three.

2.1 The Early Use of the Motif

Vancil writes, 'Man's religious quest does not start from scratch, but he rather stands in relation to his past and his heritage.'\textsuperscript{92} It is to be expected that in understanding the world, humans seek this religious quest through elements and experiences of life known to them. As civilisation grew up around rivers which supplied fresh water for daily life,\textsuperscript{93} one of the lenses

\begin{itemize}
  \item [92.] Vancil, 'The Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 2.
  \item [93.] Settlements also grew up around fertile land in other parts of the ancient world: Egypt, Armenia, Greece, the Persian Plateau, alongside the Indus river in the South East and the Yellow River in China. In Egypt notably sheep and goat farming was not a native occupation, and flocks were established through travellers from outside their borders. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 13.
\end{itemize}
through which life was interpreted was that of farmers or shepherds who cared for flocks and crops.

The shepherd motif is found consistently in the literature and inscriptions of Mesopotamia, Egypt and Greece from as early as the third millennium, and each civilisation uses the motif in titles of kings and deities who cared for the people, much like actual shepherds cared for their flocks.⁹⁴ Therefore, it is to be expected that the Jewish understanding of God and the leaders of Israel also reflected the motif.

⁹⁴. There are Assyrian inscriptions to King Shalmaneser I as, 'shepherd of all people' (ARAB, 1:38), and again, 'Shepherd, duly appointed' (ARAB, 1:41). This is also true of Tukulti-Urta I who is called, 'rightful ruler; true shepherd' (ARAB 1:63), Tiglath-pileser I, 'exalted shepherd' (ARAB 1:73), and Assur-Nasir-Pal, 'the king of all kings, the lord of lords, the shepherd' (ARAB 1:140). The Babylonian creation myth says of Marduk, 'Most exalted be the Son...may he shepherd the black-headed ones, his creatures' (ANET 69, nt 110), and later in Tablet VII he is called, 'the faithful shepherd' (ANET 71). On the Cyrus Cylinder, which is considered the first civil rights document it reads that, 'he (Marduk) shepherded in justice and righteousness the black-headed people whom he had put under his care. Marduk, the great lord, who nurtures his people, saw with pleasure his fine deeds and true heart. In the Gilgamesh Epic, the question is asked, 'Is this Gilgamesh, the shepherd of the ramparted Uruk? Is this our shepherd, bold, stately, wise?' (ANET 73). The Sumero-Akkadian Hymn to the Sun God praises Shamash, the universal god who is, 'Shepherd of the lower world, guardian of the upper' (ANET 388). A lamentation from the early Post-Sumerian period sings that, 'Enil has abandoned...Nippur, his sheepfold...His wife Ninil has abandoned her stable, her sheepfold' (ANET 455). In Egypt kings and deities were also called shepherds, and the people were seen as their flock. Seti-Merneptah, son of Amon-Re, was called, 'the good shepherd who preserved soldiers alive' (ARE 1:86), and in his speech he says, 'I am the ruler who shepherds you; I spend time searching out – you, as a father who preserves alive his children' (ARE 1:243). This is true also of Amenhotep III who is called the 'good shepherd, vigilant for all people' (ARE 2:365). Furthermore, Wright shows that the shepherd's staff was also an early symbol that represented the king, and has been found in drawings of the Late Pre-dynastic period in Egyptian drawings (3200-3000 B.C.E.). G. Ernest Wright, 'The Good Shepherd,' The Biblical Archaeologist 2 (1939): 44-48 (44). It is first traceable to the god Osiris who was always depicted carrying a staff, while there are many sculptures and statues of Tutankhamen (Eighteenth Dynasty) and Ramesses II (1279-1213 B.C.E.) carrying a staff. See Jack W. Vancil, 'Sheep, Shepherd,' ABD 5:1188. Hayes also notes that it was a symbol of kingly power that represented the nature of Egyptian kings as shepherds of the people. William C. Hayes, The Scepter of Egypt: A Background for the Study of the Egyptian Antiquities in the Metropolitan Museum of Art (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1960). 28. As a symbol it was tied to the king's nature as a shepherd of his people, and there was an expectation that justice and compassionate concern for humanity would characterise shepherd rulers. Vancil, 'Sheep, Shepherd,' ABD 5:1187-1190. The symbol came into use in Mesopotamia in the second millennium BCE as the transference from the literal use with flocks was made to kings who shepherded their flock, although its symbolic use was not as prevalent as that in Egypt. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 31. This text of Hammurabi reflects the prevailing thought, 'The great gods called me, so I became the beneficent shepherd whose sceptre is righteous' (ANET 177). Greek culture also took the symbols of shepherd to reflect the authority and status of leadership but showed an absence of the compassionate role of kings in Mesopotamia and Egypt. See Vancil, 'Sheep, Shepherd' ABD 5:1188-89. In the Iliad and Odyssey from which Greek culture is said to be shaped and formed, Homer uses the term 'shepherd of the people' describing individuals in the Greek and Trojan military and uses the sceptre as a symbol of kingly rule to show rank and authority.
The motif is used sparsely in the early OT narrative, and yet many of the earliest characters in the scriptures are shepherds. Abel is a shepherd (Gen 4:2), so too are Abram (Gen 13:7), Lot (Gen 13:7), Laban (Gen 29:1-10), and Jacob and his sons (Gen 46:32, 34; 47:3). Even Jethro who was a priest and Moses' father-in-law kept a flock (Exod 3:1). Many Israelites in Egypt were shepherds and so when the Israelites were released from slavery, they left with their flocks (Exod 12:32, 38). Therefore, some of the earliest theology we have of the Israelites is their attempt to understand God in the midst of their daily life and experience as shepherds.

Early in Genesis there is an interesting story in which Abel's sacrifice to the Lord as a shepherd is compared favourably with Cain's grain offering (Gen 4:2-4). While the text does not provide the reason why the shepherd's offering found favour and Abel's grain offering did not, traditions grew up to explain this event. One such tradition suggests shepherding was a more virtuous occupation. Philo says,

One of them labours and takes care of living beings…gladly undertaking the pastoral work which is preparatory to rulership and kingship. But the other occupies himself with earthly and inanimate things (Philo, Questions and Answers in Genesis 1:59).

Josephus also followed this tradition where Abel's profession was elevated over that of Cain's, stating,

Now the brothers took pleasure in different pursuits. Abel, the younger, has respect for justice [or righteousness], and, believing that God was with him in all his actions, paid heed to virtue: he led the life of a shepherd. Cain, on the contrary, was thoroughly depraved and had an eye only to gain: he was the first to think of plowing the soil (Josephus, Ant. 1.53).

This tradition was followed by Ambrose of Milan who later explained,

Plowing the earth…is inferior to pasturing sheep…Quite rightly then, when the brothers are born, the chronological order is preserved in Scripture [that is, Cain is mentioned before Abel, Gen 4:1-2]. When however their way of life is mentioned, the younger comes before the older [that is, shepherding comes first, showing its superiority; Gen 4:2] (Ambrose of Milan,

---

96. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 133.
97. Other solutions to the problem are that Cain's sacrifice was defective and that Abel's 'firstborn' was superior; and Cain had a long history of sins and evil deeds and this is why his sacrifice was rejected. James L. Kugel, Traditions of the Bible: A Guide to the Bible as it was at the Start of the Common Era (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1998), 149-151.
98. This is also found in The Sacrifices of Cain and Abel 14, 51.
Amalekites (Exod 17:8-13), and the text also shows twelve staffs used in the story of the choosing of provision. It was the ‘weapon’ of authority that Moses held up in his hand so Israel prevailed over the Amalekites (Exod 17:8-13), and the text also shows twelve staffs used in the story of the choosing of Aaron (Num 17). These twelve ῥάβδοι represent the twelve houses of Israel.

While Gen 4:2-4 does not elevate shepherding or suggest Cain had an early history of wickedness, it is interesting that ancient interpreters tried to explain the story in light of a high view of shepherds. This will become important for this study when we consider Jeremias’ view that Luke understood shepherds as sinners (see chapter 4.4.5.1.1).

The shepherd motif is firmly established in the use of ῥάβδος in the exodus narrative. This is a simple shepherding tool but the text uses it to embody symbols of authority and power which is consistent with Egyptian and Mesopotamian cultures. In Numbers there are two key shepherding inferences where the task of leadership is passed from Moses to Joshua (Num 27:12-23). Firstly, when Moses learns that he will not enter the promised land, he requests a new leader for Israel, ὥσις πρόβατα, οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν (Num 27:14-17). In the wilderness journey Moses has functioned as God’s shepherding the people with his staff, and now he asks for a new leader to lead the flock. This phrase specifically draws attention to the shepherd motif.

Secondly, Moses asks for a leader ὅσις ἐξελύσεται πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν καὶ ὅσις εἰσελεύσεται πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν (Num 24:17). There is some evidence that this expression recalls the the exodus story where God as shepherd brought the Israelites out of Egypt.

---

99. The writer of the first Gospel will call the blood of Abel δίκαιος (Matt 23:35), and Luke will use Abel as one who died unjustly (Luke 11:49-51).
100. The ῥάβδος is used as a deliverance tool in the story of Jacob where it has a powerful or even mystical quality which enables him to cross the Jordan (Gen 32:11) and in the story of Tamar and Shelah the staff is a symbol of authority and promise (Gen 38). In the exodus narrative the staff is the primary symbol of power and deliverance, reflecting its immediate Egyptian context. Moses was farming Jethro’s flock in Midian holding his ῥάβδος when God called to him to deliver Israel from Pharaoh (Exod 4:2). Moses struggles with God’s command to him, and so God demonstrates his power to Moses using the ῥάβδος by turning it into a snake and then back into a shepherd staff (Exod 4:2, 4, 17). After explaining to Jethro that he must go back to Egypt, the text says ἐλαβεν δὲ Μωυσῆς τὴν ῥάβδον τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ (Exod 4:20). This signifies that Moses knew the staff was ‘the staff of God’ and the narrative suggests that God was using it as a deliverance tool for the Israelites. As God had promised, the ῥάβδος becomes the tool used in many challenges with Pharaoh, the shepherd leader of Egypt (Exod 7:9, 10, 12, 15, 17, 19, 20; 8:1, 12, 13; 10:13), and ultimately it was the symbol of deliverance for the Israelites themselves when Moses lifted up his staff over the Red Sea and it parted (Exod 14:16). The ῥάβδος continues as an integral feature of the exodus-wilderness record. For example, when the Israelites were complaining of thirst, Moses struck the rock with his ῥάβδος and water flowed out for them to drink (Exod 17:5, 9; Num 20:8-11). This makes it not only a tool of power but one of provision. It was the ‘weapon’ of authority that Moses held up in his hand so Israel prevailed over the Amalekites (Exod 17:8-13), and the text also shows twelve staffs used in the story of the choosing of Aaron (Num 17). These twelve ῥάβδοι represent the twelve houses of Israel.
Anderson with Steven Bishop, Bishop note that there is a particularly Egyptian influence in this ritual of coronation. Bernhard W. Eaton, John H. Eaton, Katherine Doob Sakenfeld, Budd notes that the shepherding imagery can also be military. Philip J. Budd, Numbers (WBC 5; Waco: Word, 1984), 306; Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 138; Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 28.

This expression (ὅστις ἑξελέουσηται πρὸς προσώποις αὐτῶν καὶ ὅστις εἰσελέουσηται πρὸς προσώποις αὐτῶν) also brings connotations of a military conquest where a leader goes out and in before an army. This is consistent with an ANE picture of a powerful shepherd king who protects his flock with military might, and so both pictures of a shepherd who leads and a shepherd who protects and fights for his flock are in view here. It is interesting that the same expression is used in 1 Kgdms 18:13, 16 to describe David after his battle with Goliath where he is also pictured as a shepherd boy equipped to fight (see chapter 3.2.4).

In the Psalms the shepherd motif is used more frequently than in the Pentateuch, and we hear of the covenantal relationship between God and the Israelites often expressed through the motif. Psalm 94:7 is representative of this saying, 'he is our God and we are his people, the sheep of his hand.' In the Psalms it is primarily God who is attributed with the role of shepherd while David is viewed as God's agent on earth.

Psalm 2 is a 'Royal Psalm' whose origin may be the annual enacting of the Davidic king's enthronement and whose voice is heard throughout. In the psalm the language of shepherd-
ing is heard. Psalm 2:9 says ποιμανέως αὐτοῦ ἐν ῥάβδῳ στηρὶ (you shall shepherd them with an iron rod). While this notion of a shepherd king is not attested in the MT of 2:9 which says instead 'you shall break them with an iron rod,' it is present in the Targum Psalms 2:9 which grew out of the Aramaic Psalter, showing that this verse was understood in the first-century as a shepherd king text.

Although this psalm may picture a re-enactment of a symbolic smashing of pottery in a jubilee ritual, it also conveys an eschatological picture of shepherding where the shepherd's staff has a quality of judgment and authority. The concluding phrase, 'and like a potter's vessel you will shatter them,' (Ps 2:9) gives a picture of pottery which is smashed and unable to be repaired. This Davidic shepherd king who is in possession of the whole earth (Ps 2:8), and to whom every nation belongs (Ps 2:8), is pictured as having all authority and power to judge (Ps 2:9-10).

Psalm 22 begins with the words Κύριος ποιμανά με (the Lord shepherds me), with the use of με suggesting that David views the Lord as shepherd in personal terms. This is a development from the communal understanding of the Lord as the shepherd of Israel, and yet the use of the personal pronoun does not exclude a communal sense.

---


108. Willitts shows the Targum uses both the noun ἰδίωμα 'a staff,' and ῥάβδῳ 'to pasture, lead.' Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 68.


111. The superscription may imply this is 'of David,' 'dedicated to David' or 'for David.' Therefore, there is an ambiguity here that may mean David has not written the psalm, yet in the final form v 6 suggests that the 'ideal king' is represented, and so the Davidic king is clearly in view. Anderson, Out of the Depths, 182.


Targum Psalms 23:1\textsuperscript{114} interprets the opening as God feeding his people in the desert, bringing with it an exodus image.\textsuperscript{115} The prevailing image of shepherd may continue in the psalm,\textsuperscript{116} as it is possible the mention of the banqueting table provokes a sacrificial image where a sheep is given for the meal.\textsuperscript{117} Clines notes that the shepherd has the dual role of preserving the life of the sheep but also taking the sheep's life, as ultimately sheep are kept for slaughter. Further, the only reason sheep are taken to the temple is for sacrifice.\textsuperscript{118}

The shepherd in this psalm, as in Psalm 2, reminds the reader that a shepherd's task is not only a gentle domesticated image, but an image of authority and power.\textsuperscript{119} This does not have to suggest the shepherd rules without care, in fact the very opposite. The psalm describes the shepherd's role to provide and protect the sheep (Ps 22:1-4) and this is described in terms of the Lord's ἔλεος (Ps 22:6). This mercy or compassion confirms the righteous role of the shepherd.

The Lord as shepherd leads (ὁδηγέω; Ps 22:3) David, provides pasture and water, and brings comfort with his rod and staff. This brings an echo of the exodus in three ways; Miriam's song of deliverance is heard through the use of ὡδηγέω to express God's leading (Ps 22:1; Exod 15:13), οὐδὲν με ὑπερήψει recalls God's provision for the Israelites in the wilderness (Ps 22:1; Deut 2:7; 2 Esd 19:21), and the ῥάβδος is a key feature of the exodus story.\textsuperscript{120} As we have seen the Targum supports an exodus echo. Thus, the Lord's role as the shepherd of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{114} This is the Targum for the LXX Ps 22:1.
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Stec translates Targum Psalms 23:1, 'It is the Lord who fed his people in the desert; they lacked nothing,' David M. Stec. The Targum of Psalms: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus, and Notes (The Aramaic Bible - The Targums; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2004), 61.
  \item \textsuperscript{116} Michael Wilcock, The Message of Psalms 1-72: Songs for the People of God (BST; Leicester: IVP , 2001), 86; Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 30. There is debate as to whether the shepherd image gives way to an image of the Lord as 'Host' in 22:5-6. Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 204-205.
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 205. Contra, Goldingay who suggests the banqueting table again shows YHWH's provision as it is the place where we feast and rejoice in his presence, and Vancil that oil recalls a shepherd's treatment for an injured sheep. Goldingay, Psalms 1-41, 346; Vancil, 'Symbolism of Shepherd,' 147.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} David Clines, 'Psalm 23 and Method: Reading a Psalm of David,' in The Fate of King David: The Past and Present of a Biblical Icon, ed. by Tod Linafelt, Claudia V. Camp and Timothy Beal, 175-184 (Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies S500; New York: T and T Clark, 2010), 179.
  \item \textsuperscript{119} Goldingay, Psalms 1-41, 348.
  \item \textsuperscript{120} Craigie, Psalms 1-50, 207. Craigie lists the first two points, omitting the ῥάβδος.
the Israelites where he brought them from slavery to freedom is again heard in this text. The Lord is David's shepherd, even as he is the shepherd of the Israelite nation.

In Psalm 27 we find an individual lament of David, followed by a hymn of thanksgiving while the setting is royal. The Lord who saves or delivers David is requested to save (σῴζω), bless (εὐλογέω) and shepherd (ποιµαίνω) the people forever (Ps 27:9). Eaton is correct that the concluding intercession is, 'for the people to experience Yahweh as their shepherd king.' The Psalmist's prayer is that the Lord would pióiµανον αὐτοὺς kai ἔπαρον αὐτοῦς ἐως τοῦ αἰῶνος (shepherd them and lift them up forever; 27:9), making this possibly a picture of the shepherd king who carries the sheep on his shoulder. The Targum Psalms 28:9 says, 'feed and sustain them for ever.'

Psalm 77 begins with a wisdom poem (Ps 77:1-4), but then retells the exodus journey using the voice of a teacher. The purpose of the teacher's instruction (Ps 77:1) is to show how the past informs the present day, and the picture of restoration expresses the confidence that the agent in this coming exodus will be a new David. The Psalmist refers to both the Lord and David as shepherds; the Lord in the exodus-wilderness journey and David from his early days as a shepherd boy (1 Kgdms 16:1-13). The psalm states that the Lord brought them up (ἀνάγω; Ps 77:52) like a flock in the wilderness, and guided them (ὁδηγέω; Ps 77:53) into his holy place (ἁγιάσµατος αὐτοῦ; Ps 77:54). While we know Moses physically led the people (Exod 3-14), the text is clear that the Israelites believed that it was the Lord who came to lead his people out of Egypt and bring them deliverance (Exod 3:8). Jacquet notes this when he says, 'sortie d’Égypte, sous la métaphore, familière à Asaph, du troupeau dont Yahvé est la Pasteur.'

The psalm goes on to show David as the Lord's chosen shepherd in vv. 70-71.

121. Eaton, Kingship, 40.
122. Eaton, Kingship, 40.
123. Schaefer, Psalms, 71.
126. Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 29; Mays, Psalms, 259.
καὶ ἐξελέξατο Δαυίδ τὸν δοῦλον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀνέλαβεν αὐτὸν ἐκ τῶν ποιμνίων τῶν προβάτων... 
And he chose David his slave and took him from shepherding the sheep...

to shepherd Jacob his people and Israel his inheritance (Ps 77:70-71).

This psalm stresses that,

Évocation poétique de l’Élection de David, inspirée de I S. 16:6-13 et II S. 7:8, de pasteur de brebis, David devint, par choix divin, pasteur des Israélites, à l’instar même de Yahvé, ‘le Pasteur d’Israel.’

Thus the psalmist theologises David's role as the Lord's shepherd king. David is the Lord's δοῦλος (Ps 77:70) which recalls the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:5, 8), and his role as king of Israel, is by divine election. However, the text suggests that this election is as a shepherd king. In the same way Moses had led the Israelites in the wilderness (Ps 77:52-53), so now a new Davidic shepherd is the Israelite hope in a new exodus.

In Ps 79 the Lord is the shepherd king who brings salvation. Verse 2 says,

ὁ ποιμαίων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, πρόσχες, 
ὁ ὀδηγὸν ώσεὶ πρόβατα τὸν Ἰωσηφ, 
ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίν, ἐμφάνηθι.

This contains three titles: (1) the Lord is ὁ ποιμαίων τὸν Ἰσραὴλ (shepherd); (2) ὁ ὀδηγὸν ώσεὶ πρόβατα τὸν Ἰωσηφ (guide); and (3) ὁ καθήμενος ἐπὶ τῶν χερουβίν, he is (the king) on the throne. Yet as Jacquet notes, '3 titres, une seule et même fonction.'

At the beginning of the psalm the Lord is petitioned twice to save (σῴζω) the people (Ps 79:3-4) and this is repeated in the final verse (Ps 79:20), forming an inclusio around the plea for salvation. The king is therefore a shepherd king with the text recalling the Lord's role as shepherd of the flock from the exodus, and his task is to bring the Lord's salvation.

Thus we find the image of a shepherd king is a familiar one in the Psalter. In addition to the role of a shepherd to provide and protect the sheep, Pss 2 and 22 show that the shepherd king metaphor also conveys the notion of authority and power. Psalm 27 highlights the compassionate nature of a shepherd king who would carry a sheep on his shoulders, and with Ps 79

129. Jacquet, Les Psaumes, Psaumes 42 à 100, 570.
the task of the shepherd king is seen within the context of the verb σῴζω. The shepherd king brings God's salvation and deliverance.

Many other psalms in fact describe the Lord as shepherding his people. Psalm 47:15b shows the eternal nature of God's role as shepherd; Ps 67:8 again describes the Lord going out before his people, and Ps 76:21 as guiding his people like sheep. Psalm 73:1 reminds the reader that the Lord's anger can be kindled against his flock, Pss 94:7 and 99:3 that the sheep belong to God, and Ps 120:4 that he is the faithful shepherd who will not slumber or sleep on duty. Other Psalms use words that implicitly suggest the shepherding task and Vancil rightly notes, 'this indicates that the work of shepherding was so well known that it could be used as a symbol any place where such a figure was appropriate.' The motif of shepherd king was one that was used repeatedly for God and for the Davidic king in the psalms. The motif was also used to recall the care and provision of the people of God during the exodus deliverance where the Lord was their shepherd guide and saviour.

2.2 The Prophets' Use of the Motif

There is much explicit and implicit use of the shepherd motif in the prophets which has been adequately surveyed. For the purposes of this thesis which seeks to establish Luke's use of

---

130. Ps 47:15b, αὐτός ποιμανεῖ ἡμᾶς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, 'He himself will shepherd us for ages.'
131. Ps 67:8, δὲ θεός, ἐν τῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι σε ἐνώπιον τοῦ λαοῦ σου, ἐν τῷ διαβαίνειν σε ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, 'O God, when you were going out before your people, when you were marching in the wilderness.'
132. Ps 76:21, ὁδήγησας ὡς πρόβατα τὸν λαὸν σου ἐν χειρὶ Μωυσῆ καὶ Λαρων, 'You guided your people like sheep by the hand of Moses and Aaron.' The significance of this verse is that it relates humans with the role of shepherd, especially as undershepherds or subordinates for God's flock. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 156-157.
133. Ps 73:1, ὁργάζῃ ὁ θυμός σου ἑπί πρόβατα νομῆς σου; 'Was your anger aroused against the sheep of your pasture?'
134. Ps 94:7, ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστιν ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ ἡμεῖς λαὸς νομῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ πρόβατα χειρὸς αὐτοῦ, (the Israelites are to worship and weep before the Lord), for he is our God and we are the people of his pasture and sheep of his hand.' Ps 99:3, γνώτε ὅτι κύριος, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, αὐτός ἐποίησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ οὗ ἡμεῖς, λαὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ πρόβατα τῆς νομῆς αὐτοῦ, 'Know that the Lord, he is God. It is he who made us and not we, his people and the sheep of his pasture.'
135. Ps 120:4, ἵδον οὖν νυστάξει ὁ ἐχθροῦ τῶν Ἰσραήλ, 'Behold, he who keeps Israel will neither slumber nor sleep.'
136. For example Ps 30:4-5 says the Lord guides (ὁδηγεῖν), nourishes (διατρέφειν), and brings David out (ἐξέγειρεν) of the enemy's snare. This is language that can commonly suggest a pastoral setting.
137. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 149.
138. The most comprehensive study of the shepherd motif is still that of Jack W. Vancil, 'The
the Davidic shepherd king motif we will focus on key passages in Isaiah, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Zechariah which form the backdrop for Luke's narrative.

2.2.1 Isaiah

Isaiah 40:1-11

The opening of Isaiah 40:1-11 comes many years after chapter 39 and begins a new section of Isaiah where the prophet is writing in the time of Babylonian exile. While the text has been read canonically from the first century, with the text falling near the centre of the book, a fresh Sitz im Leben suggests the writer is presenting a new beginning for a people displaced from their land and temple who were therefore being threatened in their identity as a nation. This means that the passage does have some level of primary interpretive function for this new Isaianic voice.

The passage is dialogic in character with the voice of God speaking first to the divine council (vv. 1-5, 8) and then the voice of the prophet is heard (vv. 6b-7, 9-11). The divine council is commanded to παρακαλεῖτε παρακαλεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου. This opening plural imperative pictures the Lord as preeminently powerful where he 'exercises an authority untrammelled

Symbolism of the Shepherd in Biblical, Intertestamental and New Testament Material.' Unpublished Ph.D. diss., Dropsie University, 1975. This has been used extensively by Chae and Willitts in their studies in Matthew's use of the motif. See Young S. Chae, Jesus as the Eschatological Davidic Shepherd (WUNT 2, Reihe 216; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006); Joel Willitts, Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel' (BZNW 147; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2007).

Childs argues in line with Seitz, that Isa 40 is an intertextual parallel with Isa 6, that both texts are set in the heavenly court and Isa 40 is a reapplication of Isaiah's call. This demonstrates the role of Isa 40:1-11 in providing a new beginning to the second half of Isaiah, a function Childs describes as a prologue. See Brevard S. Childs, Isaiah (Old Testament Library; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 295, 302-303; Christopher R. Seitz, 'How is the Prophet Isaiah Present in the Latter half of the Book? The Logic of Chapters 40-66 Within the Book of Isaiah,' JBL 115/2 (1996): 219-240. Contra, Oswalt who argues that Isaiah of Jerusalem is the author of the entire book with the later chapters predicting what would take place. J. N. Oswalt, The Book of Isaiah 1-39 (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986); The Book of Isaiah 40-66 (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 3-6.

Scholars have noticed that Isaiah 34-35 conveys similar language and themes and is likely to be written also by Second Isaiah and therefore its ordering is a result of the editing process. Paul D. Hanson, Isaiah 49-55: Interpretation, A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1995), 2, 21.


The image of God as king is expressed linguistically here in terms of ἵσχος (Isa 40:10), κυρεία
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by argument, rivalry and compromise.\textsuperscript{143} The words spoken demonstrate first and most importantly, the Lord’s compassionate concern for his people.\textsuperscript{144} This compassionate call is repeated in Isa 40:2 and then recapitulated in Isa 40:11 where the metaphor of God as shepherd is explicit.

\begin{align*}
\text{ὁς ποιμὴν ποιμανεῖ τὸ ποιμνιον αὐτοῦ} \\
kαὶ τῷ βραχίονι αὐτοῦ συνάξει ἄρνας \\
kαὶ ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσας παρακαλέσει.
\end{align*}

He will \emph{tend} his flock like a \emph{shepherd} and \emph{gather} the lambs with his arm and \emph{comfort} those that are with young (Isa 40:11).

This restatement of \textit{παρακαλέω} functions as an \textit{inclusio} which marks the beginning (Isa 40:1) and ending of this new section, and which is further strengthened by the use of τὸν λαὸν μου in v. 1 with τὸ ποιμνιον αὐτοῦ at v. 11.\textsuperscript{145} Therefore, the opening thrust of Isaiah’s portrayal presents God’s rule as that of not only the all-powerful king, but specifically as the \textit{shepherd king} of Israel who shows comfort and care for his flock. Merendino notes, 'Das bile Jahwes als Hirte, der seine Herde weidet, ist innerhalb von Jes 40-66 einmalig,'\textsuperscript{146} although this fails to take into account the implicit imagery in Isa 49:8-11.\textsuperscript{147} Koole insightfully notes from the

\textup{(Isa 40:10), ποιμὴν (Isa 40:11), and ἡ δόξα κυρίου (Isa 40:5). However, the whole eleven verses speak of God’s authority and power where he commands the heavenly council to act and they do so. It is his will that is carried out without debate, as Goldingay points out. Goldingay, \textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 11.

\textsuperscript{143} Goldingay, \textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 11.

\textsuperscript{144} Muraoka classifies \textit{παρακαλέω} meaning ‘to encourage,’ while Schmitt-Stählin ‘to comfort.’ Schmitt-Stählin say, ‘Comforting is God’s proper work. He turns earlier desolation into perfect consolation both in individuals... and also in the people of God.’ It is here they classify \textit{παρακαλέω} in Isaiah 40:1. \textit{GELS}, 527; Otto Schmitt and Gustav Stählin, ‘παρακαλέω,’ \textit{TDNT} 5:773-788.

\textsuperscript{145} Blenkinsopp notes vv. 1-8 are loosely connected to vv. 9-11 but does not suggest a strong link, while Childs argues vv. 9-11 form the climax of vv. 1-11. Blenkinsopp, \textit{Isaiah 40-55}, 185; Childs, \textit{Isaiah}, 295.


\textsuperscript{147} Isa 49:8 begins with οὕτως λέγει κύριος, which is a strong opening stressing the oracle is spoken by the Lord. Therefore when ν. 11 says, καὶ θῆσον πᾶν δρόσο εἰς δόδαν καὶ πᾶσαν τρίβον εἰς βόσκημα αὐτοῖς (And I will turn every mountain into a road and every path into a pasture for them), the use of the first person singular of τῆθημα assures the reader that it is the Lord who is providing pasture for the sheep. This is clearly a shepherd’s task and the Lord is the implied shepherd. When Isaiah describes this shepherdrole it is within the context of ἐν ημέρᾳ σωτηρίας (the day of salvation; Isa 49:8). Therefore, it is as a \textit{shepherd} that the Lord brings salvation in this passage. As shepherd he brings βοηθέω (help; Isa 49:8), βόσκω (food; Isa 49:9), νομή (pasture; Isa 49:9), ἔλεος (mercy, compassion; Isa 49:10) and \textit{παρακαλέω} (comfort; Isa 49:10). The shepherd also brings πηγῶν υδάτων (springs of water; Isa 49:10) and it is the Lord who ἀξεῖ αὐτοὺς (will lead them; Isa 49:10). This repeated language of shepherd draws the reader’s attention to the shepherd’s task as salvific and one of practical help.\textsuperscript{147}}
opening Παρακαλέτε, 'how does God wish to be present? As the Good Shepherd. In the historical context God ultimately does this through the defeat of Babylon by Cyrus in 539 B.C.E., but Isaiah's words are clear that in the midst of the great discomfort and uncertainty of life as an exiled people, it is God who is still at the centre and who comforts and brings renewed hope to his people, as he is the shepherd king.

In bringing a voice of hope into this difficult setting, Isaiah draws on many stories; therefore, it is not unexpected that we hear echoes of the exodus and wilderness. Isaiah describes the people as ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (Isa 40:3), a recollection that undoubtedly recalls the experiences of the exodus from Egypt and the wilderness time in the desert. As Merindino points out the words 'the way' and 'the wilderness' lead to one place: 'In der alttestamentlichen Tradition waren sie sinnbeladene Wörter: sie erinnerten sofort an den Auszug aus Ägypten.' Watts also notes the pervasive paradigm of the exodus in Isaiah's writing, and this picture of the wilderness wanderings is full of hope and comfort in the midst of exile life. It is, therefore, not unexpected that these words of comfort show the Lord as their shepherd. This Isaianic exilic motif forms a strong basis for Luke's exodus motif in which we will find he situates Jesus as a shepherd; this will be addressed in chapter 5.3.3.1.

Isaiah 40:10 shows the Lord coming with strength and authority, and then v. 11 as a shepherd. In v. 10 the prophet describes the victorious king who comes with ἴσχύς and κυριεία, and then v. 11 uses βραχίων, also signifies the strength of the shepherd (Gen 49:24; Exod 6:1, 6; Job 35:9). These verses suggest the flock is returning with the Lord and has not been left alone even though it has sensed their isolation from God in its separation from the temple and land.

The prophet says that God will tend and lead to pasture (ποιμαίνω) the sheep, he will gather (συνάγω) the sheep, and he will bring them comfort (παρακαλέω). This is familiar shepherd-

149. Michael Thompson, Isaiah 40-66 (Epworth Commentaries; Peterborough: Epworth Press, 2001), 5; Childs, Isaiah, 299.
150. Merendino, Der Erste und der Letze, 46.
152. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 192.
ing language and pictures the faithfulness of God as the Israelites' shepherd. These verses also picture sheep who require an increasing level of support because of their dependence, from a ποίμνιον, to a ἄρνος, and finally ἐν γαστρὶ ἐχούσας in v. 11. These metaphors aptly describe exilic Israel's need of deliverance from the Egyptians in the past and their current need under Babylonian rule.

Alongside themes of shepherd, comfort, and king in this passage, there are linguistic themes of εὐαγγελίζω, σωτήριον, and παρακάλεω which will recur in conjunction with the shepherd motif (Isa 49:10, 13; 61:1-14) in Second Isaiah. Εὐαγγελίζω is used twice in 40:9 and will be used in Isa 60:6 and Isa 61:1, the latter of which is also in the context of God as shepherd (Isa 61:5) and the Davidic covenant (Isa 61:8-10). Salvation is expressed with σωτήριον and σώζω cognates repeatedly in Isaiah, and in this context it is salvation which comes from the shepherd king.

This opening picture therefore, which may be considered a prologue to the second part of Isaiah, leaves the reader with an image of God as shepherd king. He comes first as a compassionate shepherd, but also as a victorious warrior shepherd. The text's locus at the beginning of a new historical Sitz im Leben, and almost certainly with a new author, means the reader's awareness of its content and themes should be well noted as the text of Isaiah proceeds. Isaiah wanted to show God in the time of exile as Israel's faithful and powerful shepherd king.

---

155. Εὐαγγελίζω is another feature of Second Isaiah (40:9 [2x]; 52:7; 60:6; 61:1).
156. For example; σωτήριον (Isa 40:5; 51:5, 6, 8; 56:1; 59:17; 60:6, 18; 61:10; 62:1; 63:1), σώζω (Isa 43:3, 11, 12; 45:17, 20, 22; 46:2, 4, 7; 47:13; 49:24, 25; 51:14; 59:1; 60:16; 63:9; 66:19), σωτήρ (Isa 12:2; 17:10; 45:15; 62:11), σωτηρία, (Isa 45:17; 46:13; 47:15; 49:6, 8; 52:7, 10; 59:11; 63:8).
Isaiah 52:13-53:12

This is traditionally assigned as a 'servant' passage and falls within the bracket of servant material (Isa 40-55). It is considered the most crucial yet difficult of the poems. The interesting feature of this passage for this study is that both the servant and the people are likened to sheep. This feature is striking as it sets up a comparison between the servant figure and sinful humans. Oswalt notes,

> When we are compared to sheep, it is their tendency to get themselves lost that is given prominence (v. 6). But when the servant is compared to sheep, it is their non-defensive, submissive nature that becomes the basis of comparison. Both he and we may be compared to sheep, but when we are two different pictures emerge. In us the negative characteristics are seen, whereas in him it is the positive ones. He shares the same nature with us, but in him it is transformed.

We do not see a shepherd in this passage, but we do see a suffering servant who is a sheep like the rest of the flock. We have seen God in the role of shepherd in the Isaiah corpus while this passage is different. There is no latent shepherd information, but there is a great deal of talk about πρόβατον (Isa 53:6; 7), ἠμνῷς (Isa 53:7), and the problem of ἀμαρτία. The problem of sin was at the forefront of Isaiah’s early message (Isa 1:4), is the focus of his own call narrative (Isa 6:7) and is a prominent feature of this passage (Isa 53:4, 5, 6, 11, 12 [twice]).

---

157. The 'servant' passages identified by Bernhard Duhm (Isa 42:1-9; 49:1-7; 50:4-9; 52:13-52:12) have been seen as a distinct literary group and analysed as a group, but more recently they are being viewed as an integral part of the surrounding text and are being studied in their canonical locus. These passages come within the larger text of Isa 40-55 which portrays the servant figure. The figure is called 'my servant' in Isa 41:8, 9; 42:1, 19; 44:1, 2, 21; 45:4; 49:6; 52:13, an expression that is found infrequently outside Isaiah (Jos 1:7; 22:2; Jer 26:28). The servant is somewhat enigmatic as the figure appears to be Israel and the figure has a mission to Israel. Traditionally Jewish scholars have viewed the servant as Israel and Christian scholars as a single figure. There is no consensus as to who the servant is and Clines suggests that it is best to give up the search for the historical servant and pay attention to the imagery and suggestion of the poetry. Brueggemann, Isaiah 40-66, 13-14, 110; David J. A. Clines, I, He, We, and They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53 (JSOTSS 1; Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1976).

158. Brueggemann, Isaiah 40-66, 13; R. N. Whybray, Thanksgiving for the Liberated Prophet: An Interpretation of Isaiah's Chapter 53 (JSOTSS 4; Sheffield: University of Sheffield, 1978); Clines, I, He, We, and They, 11.


160. Vancil suggests the possibility that there is an intentional link between Isa 1:5-6 and Isa 53:5-6 since a suffering figure features in both passages. I note the people had rejected the Lord (Isa 1:2), a pastoral scene is described (Isa 1:3), and then the problem of sin is outlined (Isa 1:4). In Isa 53 the people (sheep) had strayed from the shepherd (Isa 53:6), a pastoral scene is described (Isa 53:6-7) and the problem is named as sin (Isa 53:4, 5, 6, 11, 12 [2x]). If Vancil is correct then this may give some centrality to Isa 53's place in the corpus and makes the sheep metaphor of added interest. Vancil, 'Symbolism and the Shepherd,' 196-197.
Verse 6 has a confessional aspect where the sheep have gone astray. According to Num 27:16-17 this is as disastrous as sheep without a shepherd. In Isa 53:7 the narrator speaks again and describes the ill-treated sheep that has not broken the law (53:9), and who is the agent by which the problem of sin is dealt with (53:11, 12). The author does this in the poem writing of the sheep who is a sin offering (53:10). It should be considered significant that in this extended metaphor about sheep, they are the primary animals of sacrifice.

Verse 12 says, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη, which literally means, 'and he let himself be counted with the transgressors/sinful.' Hanson notes that the verb is reflexive and not passive, conveying the understanding that the Servant, 'was not the pawn in the hands of an arbitrary god but one who had committed himself freely to a deliberate course of action.

Aside from the sheep metaphor in Isa 53, there are some linguistic echoes that resonate with other Isaianic shepherding passages. The servant grew up ὡς ῥίζα ἐν γῇ διψώσῃ (like a root in a thirsty land; Isa 53:2). The use of ῥίζα is the same expression used of the 'root of Jesse' (Isa 11:1, 10). Sirach 47:22 picks up this word in relation to David, and Isa 37:21 repeats 4 Kgdms 19:30 in a promise to Judah that from Jerusalem and Mount Zion, the remnant will be saved. The use of διψάω recalls Isa 49:10, another servant passage with shepherd imagery, and draws from exodus images of thirst (Exod 17:3; Pss 62:2; 106:5; Isa 48:21). The exodus story has the shepherd motif embedded within it (see chapter 4), which is drawn upon in the prologue of Second Isaiah (Isa 40:1-11). Διψάω for Isaiah also has an eschatological perspective (Isa 25:4, 5; 32:2; 35:1, 6, 7; 41:18; 55:1).

In Summary: Isa 40:1-11 is set within the historical landscape of the Babylonian exile and portrays the familiar figure of the Lord as compassionate shepherd king of his people. The opening words of comfort function with v. 11 where God is presented through a feminine motif of a nurturing mother sheep caring for her young. It is within this inclusio that the reader hears the theme of salvation and good news for all people. In Isa 52:13-53:12 both the servant figure and the people are pictured as sheep. The text sets up a comparison between the

161. The text is clear that the servant ἀνομίαν ὴκ ἐποίησεν, ὄδε ἐυρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ (Isa 53:9). He has committed no lawlessness and no deceit was found in his mouth.
163. Hanson, Isaiah 40-55, 160.
two, with the primary difference being the problem of sin (ἁμάρτία) which the servant carries on behalf of the people.

2.2.2 Micah

There are two passages in Micah which use a shepherd metaphor and are relevant for this study (Mic 2:12-13; 5:2-5), and both passages are found in salvation oracles. The nature of salvation oracles in a predominantly judgment-driven text has led many scholars to suggest the text contains historical and theological matter written after the time of Micah. Waltke cites Willis' study which shows that Micah's pre-exilic language is also found in Jeremiah making an earlier dating possible. As Allen rightly comments, 'an expression of hope is not necessarily a pointer to nonauthenticity.' The setting therefore for Micah is most likely late eighth century B.C.E. and in the reign of the Judean kings Jotham (742-735 B.C.E.), Ahaz (735-715 B.C.E.) and Hezekiah (715-687 B.C.E.). During this time the Northern Kingdom fell to Tiglath-pileser III and the Assyrian Empire (722 B.C.E.). Micah pictured the eventual fall of the Davidic monarchy and the Southern Kingdom due to the perverted leadership which did not reflect the justice of God.

2.2.2.1 Micah 2:12-13

Micah 2:12-13 is a salvation oracle which falls directly between a strong indictment of leaders and false prophets in Israel (Mic 2:1-11; 3:1-12). This disjunction has led many to question if this oracle was delivered at another time and place, however, a change of tone and

---

164. Other shepherd references are Micah 5:5b-6 and 7:14 and describe shepherd rulers of the eighth century. This shows that this language was still being used for kings and rulers at this time. The first passage pictures an Assyrian invasion where seven shepherds will be raised up in opposition, and the second is the beginning of a prayer for the Lord to bless Israel and punish her enemies (7:14-17). While they contain clear examples of ANE rulers known as shepherds, with the growing quantity of shepherd passages that relate directly to God or to David, for the sake of space, they will not be addressed here.


scene does not have to mean an editorial hand and a later dating. The setting is likely to be Sennacherib's invasion (701 B.C.E.), and the promise is given of a safe place where the remnant of Israel can gather. In Mic 4:6-7 the remnant are described as those who have been shattered and rejected, while Mic 5:5b-6 describes them as a strong people. The prophet shows that this transformation of a people comes through the intervention of a shepherd king (Mic 2:12-13; 5:2-5).

The main image in 2:12 is one of a shepherd who is gathering (συνάγω; Mic 2:12) and leading the flock (ἡγέω; Mic 2:13), while in 2:13 the central image is of the king (βασιλεύς) who breaks down the path before them (διά τῆς διακοπῆς πρὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν διέκοψαν; Mic 2:13). It is interesting that v. 12 is in the first person and appears to be the Lord speaking, while v. 13 is in the third person and the prophet is now speaking. This may suggest v. 13 is an expansion of v. 12, as the two images work together so that the combined pastoral and militaristic images reflect deliverance through a shepherd king. This is a combination which is the natural ANE and Jewish understanding of a shepherd. This king is pictured as a 'breaker,' which Chae describes as the one who leads and goes before the flock in order to break down the gate. What a 'breaker' means is uncertain, but it does suggest the king has a role in going ahead to prepare a way for the people.

This short oracle is another image of the divine shepherd from the exodus (Pss 77:52f; 79:1). As Allen rightly describes it, 'God who had led Israel of old out of their oppressors' reach was leading his people still.' The city of Jerusalem is described as 'the gate' (Mic 1:9), from which the king goes to lead his people out as shepherd before the city falls (Mic 2:13). Allen likens this to the Lord going before the people with a pillar of cloud and a pillar of fire (Exod 13:21), and notes this same power is present here to deliver his people. Jerusalem is the city of David, and Micah speaks of hope for the city even when towns of Judah had fallen one after another. Micah appears to draw on the Davidic tradition when he

---

uses the language of συνάγω (gathering and bringing together). As Waltke says, in both verses language is taken from the Davidic tradition... "gather" and "assemble" in v. 12 and ..."break forth" in v. 13, to link the I AM with the ideal shepherd-king David.

2.2.2.2  Micah 5:2-5
This passage is another salvation oracle with three guiding motifs; shepherd imagery, messianic expectation, and future hope for Israel. Chae rightly suggests that the integrating theme is the 'Davidic Shepherd'. This passage clearly talks of the one who is coming to rule, implying a king. Micah 4:13-14 begins with a picture of the harsh invasion of Sennacherib where the tribes of Judah were struck on the jaw with his ῥάβδος, an instrument of a shepherd authority. This picture of kingly rule is contrasted with the coming messianic shepherd king who will bring a reign of peace (Mic 5:5).

David is not named in the text but he seems to be the messianic shepherd king in view through the reference to Βηθλεεμ οἶκος τοῦ Ἐφραθα (5:2), and the combined picture of one who is to rule (ἄρχων), one who will be great (μεγαλύνω), who is a shepherd (ποιμαίνω), who functions in the strength of the Lord and who will bring peace (εἰρήνη) to the ends of the earth. This is apparent in two ways.

Firstly, Bethlehem recalls the home of David's father, Jesse (1 Kgdms 16:1, 4), and more especially points to David's early years as a shepherd and when he was anointed as king by Samuel (ἐκλέγω; 1 Kgdms 16:8). His election was a matter of divine choice, confirmed by the Spirit springing upon David (1 Kgdms 16:1-13). It is of interest then that Micah draws attention to Bethlehem and not Hebron where David is anointed king over all Israel (2 Kgdms 5:1-3), or Jerusalem the place where his rule would be centred. Smith suggests that Micah saw Jerusalem as too corrupt for a political solution to come from there, and so centred the ruler in Bethlehem. Wolff notes Bethlehem was a militarily insignificant place (Mic

175.  Waltke, Micah, 12, 142-143.
176.  Waltke, Micah, 142.
177.  Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 36.
178.  Bethlehem was in the region of Ephratha (Gen 35:19; 48:7; Ruth 4:11).
179.  Smith, Micah-Malachi, 44.
The location of Bethlehem may function as support for a shepherd king ruler whose strength is not born out of military power like Sennacherib, but whose strength is in the Lord (ἐν ἰσχύι κυρίου; 5:4). Similarly, while Allen is right that the ruler's heredity functions to provide validation for this ruler, this is about more than simple lineage, it is about God’s covenant faithfulness. This location of Bethlehem is also a feature of Luke's birth narrative and his accentuation of this location will also suggest a non-militarised rule which presents a kingdom of peace.

Second, the picture presented of this messianic figure recalls one like the Davidic king. The features of this figure recall aspects of David's story. David was a ruler (ἄρχων; 2 Kgdms 5:2; Mic 5:2) who in the Davidic covenant was named as great (μεγάλος; Mic 5:4), is a shepherd (ποιμάνω; 1 Kgdms 16-17; 2 Kgdms 7:8; Mic 5:3), functions in the strength of the Lord (2 Kgdms 16:13, 18; 17:45; Mic 5:4) and will bring peace (εἰρήνη; Mic 5:5) to the ends of the earth. The universal nature of this kingdom is of note. This Davidic shepherd king was to bring more than simply temporal peace which an earthly army might bring, or which Sennacherib had just destroyed. This passage suggests a permanent establishment of God's reign on earth through his shepherd king.

In Summary: Micah 2:12-13 and 5:2-5 are two salvation oracles which picture a shepherd king figure who will bring peace and stability for Israel after the invasion of the Assyrian king Sennacherib. The latter passage has a strong resonance with the story of David and so it is quite possible that the messianic shepherd in view is a Davidic king. The figure will be great, will bring peace to the ends of the earth and will function in the strength of the Lord. The figure has both a military and compassionate concern for Israel.

---

2.2.3 Jeremiah

Jeremiah's text in the LXX is considerably different from the MT in its ordering and length\textsuperscript{182} and the reasons for this have been discussed ever since Jerome first accused the Septuagintal scribes of truncating the text.\textsuperscript{183} When 4Q71, 72A were discovered at Qumran, scholars found that these two fragments were closer to the LXX than the MT, so there has been a renewed impetus in interpreting the Greek text of Jeremiah. Shead's recent analysis of Jer 32 has led him to state that while the two texts vary greatly, the difference is in degree and not in kind,\textsuperscript{184} and it is from this assumption that I am viewing the Greek text of Jeremiah.\textsuperscript{185}

The book of Jeremiah is set during the time of the Babylonian invasion (598 B.C.E.), the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple (587 B.C.E.), and Josiah's reforms (622 B.C.E.). These defining events in Jerusalem are theologised thoroughly by the prophet Jeremiah who speaks τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ θεοῦ (1:1). Judah was situated between the two significant forces with Babylon in the north and Egypt in the south, and politically the leaders of Judah after Josiah formed various alliances. They vacillated politically until Babylon settled the equation by conquering Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E., incorporating Judah into the Babylonian Empire and deporting many of their citizens. For Jeremiah this meant they had rejected God as shepherd king.

The shepherd motif is a dominant motif that spans the entire text,\textsuperscript{186} and so sheer quantity demands that this study will be confined to only the main thread of the motif. We will consider the scope of shepherds (ποιμήν) in Jeremiah's text and then in Jer 3:15-18 and 23:1-6 where the Davidic shepherd king emerges in contrast to the shepherd kings of Israel and Judah.

\textsuperscript{182} The LXX of Jeremiah is one eighth shorter than the MT, and omits words and some text (33:14-26 and 39:4-13). The order varies greatly after 25:13 where the LXX places chapters 46-51. E. Tov, The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint (Leiden: Brill, 1999).

\textsuperscript{183} For a detailed discussion of the two versions see Andrew G. Shead, ‘Jeremiah 32 in its Hebrew and Greek Recensions: The Prophet, the Text, Its Translators and His Critics’ (Ph.D. diss., University of Cambridge, 1998). See also Peter C. Craigie, Page H. Kelley and Joel F. Drinkard, Jr. Jeremiah 1-25 (WBC 26; Dallas: Word, 1991), xli-xliv.

\textsuperscript{184} Shead, Jeremiah 32, 169.

\textsuperscript{185} The LXX additions in Jeremiah (30:10-11; 22:14-26; 48:45f; 52:28-30) are not shepherd passages and so do not affect this study. Further, the considerable reordering of Jeremiah begins after the key shepherd text of chapter 23, so neither will this be addressed.

2.2.3.1 Ποιμήν in Jeremiah's Text

There are many references to ποιμήν in the text of Jeremiah. Kings of Israel are shepherds (Jer 2:8; 10:21; 12:10; 22:22; 23:1, 4), as are foreign rulers (3:1, 3; 6:3; 27:44; 28:23), the Davidic shepherd king (23:5-6) and literal pastoral shepherds (40:12). A shepherd in Jeremiah is the king or leader who governs, and the term is sometimes set within a military context (6:3). In the background of the text we see God as the shepherd of the flock, but human leaders as shepherds are in the foreground. It is they who are primarily under attack in this text.

The basic charge is laid that the shepherds of Israel, the kings, have failed to lead the nation in accordance with God's justice and so God announces that the throne of David as represented in the line of Jehoiachin would cease. Jeremiah explains,

Hear a word O king of Judah who sits on the throne of David – you and your house and your people and those who enter by these gates. This is what the Lord says: Do justice and righteousness, and deliver one seized from the hand of one who does him wrong. And do not oppress, and do not act impiously against guest and orphan and widow, and do not shed innocent blood in this place...and if you do not do these words...this house shall become a desolation (Jer 22:2-5).

Jeremiah's message oscillates between judgment and hope. In terms of judgment the Israelite shepherds are charged with their lack of care for the people, not seeking the Lord as a shepherd should (Jer 10:21), prostituting themselves with foreign shepherds (3:1-14) and the resulting scattering or exile of God's flock (10:21). They abandoned the διαθήκη of the Lord their God (22:9) and worshipped foreign gods (22:9). As a result, it was the shepherds' fault that Jerusalem was sacked and the Israelites were taken into exile, even though it is God who has raised up their oppressor. Thus, the shepherd kings are addressed sharply and decisively in Jeremiah's text.

This judgment is offset however, by a message of hope where God says δώσω ὑμῖν ποιμένας κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου (Jer 3:15). It is not the concept of shepherd king that God has an is-

---

187. NETS translation.
188. The theme of hope has led to scholars considering a later dating for Jer 3:15-18 as it echoes Ezekiel's message and particularly Ezek 34. However, this study adopts Brueggemann's position that 'vv. 15-18 form an important counterpoint to the poetry of alienation...the prose articulates God's resolve in spite of the fickleness (of Israel).' Walter Brueggemann, A Commentary on Jeremiah: Exile and Homecoming
sue with in Jeremiah, but the problem lies in the type of leadership that the shepherd kings exercise.

### 2.2.3.2 Jeremiah 3:15-18

For Jeremiah, a true shepherd is one who governs in a way that reflects God’s heart (Jer 3:15). The text says,

καὶ δώσω ὑμῖν ποιμένας κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, καὶ ποιμανόσιν ὑμᾶς ποιμαίνοντες μετ’ ἐπιστήμης

And I will give you shepherds after my own heart, and in shepherding they will shepherd you with skill (Jer 3:15).

This verse brings an allusion to David's story to the fore in three ways. Firstly, God says he will give shepherds after his own καρδία. In 1 Kgdms, God said to Samuel to choose a king not by their outward appearance, but what was in their heart (1 Kgdms 16:7). David is contrasted to Saul whom the people chose on the basis of his outward appearance (1 Kgdms 9:2), while God chose on the basis of David's heart. This verse in Jeremiah concerning God's desire for good shepherds for Israel, may allude to the suitability of one like David.

Secondly, the passage pictures a reunifying of the northern and southern kingdoms. This desire for a king to reign over all of Judah and Israel recalls the time of David's anointing as shepherd king when he was to reign over all Israel and Judah at Hebron (2 Kgdms 5:1-3). This is the ideal picture of monarchy.

Finally, there is a Davidic covenant echo when the text says, Πατέρα καλέσετέ με, (You will call me Father; Jer 3:19). In 2 Kgdms 7:14 God says to David, 'I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me.' As God calls Israel and Judah to repent (Jer 3:6-14), his desire is that they will recognise themselves as God's children and he as the parent (3:19).

---

(Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 46.
189. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 205. Vancil says, ‘The concept of a Davidic dynasty, and the ideas which are connected with the shepherd motif, are often developed side by side, and at times converge, as in this passage.’
These three recollections of David's story work together to suggest this passage is indeed recalling the ideal shepherd as a Davidic figure. A new Davidic shepherd king is finally made explicit in chapter 23.

### 2.2.3.3 Jeremiah 23:1-6

Jeremiah 23:1-6[^190] is a defining passage about God’s judgment on the shepherd kings of Israel and Judah, and God’s plan to ισοδέχωμαι (gather together) his flock again (Jer 23:3). He will help his flock in two ways; he will raise up (ἀνίστηµι) good shepherds for them (23:4), and he will raise up David as a king for them (23:5). It is through David's reign that the tribes of Israel and Judah will be reunited (23:6).[^191]

Jeremiah 23:1-4 summarises the message of 21:11-22:30 which ends with the prophecy that Jeconiah's kingly line will cease.[^192] As king of Judah, Jeconiah ruled over the house of David (21:12) and God's anger at his oppressive and unjust governance is stark and pointed. Jeremiah attributes the exile to the failure of the monarchy and says they have scattered and destroyed the sheep of their pasture (οἱ διασκορπίζοντες καὶ ἀπολλύοντες τὰ πρόβατα τῆς νοµῆς αὐτῶν; 23:1).

The use of ἀπόλλυµι in 23:1 speaks of the severe destruction the monarchy has brought upon the people.[^193] This language shows God's anger towards the shepherds. The word is used repeatedly in the LXX to mean physical harm in Isaiah (forty times), Ezekiel (twenty-six times) and Jeremiah (twenty-eight times). Ἀπόλλυµι is the predominant word used to describe the physical destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah.[^194] It is used repeatedly in Leviticus to describe being cut off from your family through breaking the law[^195] and is used again for the death of

---

[^190]: The LXX omits vv. 7-8 which equates the exile with the exodus. This recalls how God led the Israelites out of Egypt (as shepherd in the context of Jer 23:1-6), so he will lead them in exile.

[^191]: Willitts notes that 'Judah is never referred to as lost without a holistic reference to both Israel and Judah.' Willitts, *Messianic Shepherd-King*, 61.

[^192]: Jer 21:1-23:8 concern Judah's kings. Judah's last kings are all referred to here: Josiah implicitly (22:10); Shallum/Jehoahaz (22:11-12); Jehoiakim (22:18-19); Jeconiah (22:24-30).

[^193]: Muraoka notes the transitive use of ἀπόλλυµι with the accusative means 'to destroy.' Muraoka, *GELS*, 79.

[^194]: It is used seven times; Gen 18:24, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32; 19:13.

[^195]: Lev 7:20, 21, 25, 27; 17:10; 20:3.
animals. Esther used it extensively to describe the destruction of the Jews, it is utilised heavily in 1-4 Maccabees to describe people dying from war or famine, and Tobit uses it for a child perishing (Tob 10:7). It is also prevalent in wisdom literature to describe the metaphorical nature of being destroyed.

In Jer 23:1-6 there is the sharp contrast between the failed care under the Israeliite kings and God's ideal of a shepherd. Jeremiah uses ἀπόλλυμι again in 27:6, πρόβατα ἀπολωλότα ἐγενήθη ὁ λαός μου (My people have become lost sheep) after mentioning the everlasting covenant which will not be forgotten (διαθήκη γὰρ αἰώνιος οὐκ ἐπιλησθήσεται; 27:5). This is the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:16).

God's answer to the failed leadership is to raise up David, ἀνατολὴ δικαία, a righteous dawn (Jer 23:5). Jeremiah pictures a shepherd who, from his very beginning, is covenant keeping. Righteousness is defined as being faithful to the covenant, a picture which contrasts with the kings of Israel and Judah (Jer 11:1-8). Jeremiah goes on to say David will understand (συνίη), the cognate of which is used in Kingdoms to describe David (1 Kgdms 16:18). He will shepherd the earth with judgment and righteousness (ποιήσει κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς), utilising more covenant keeping language. Of importance is the implication of the universal nature of the Davidic reign. This may suggest, as Mic 5:4 does, that the coming Davidic shepherd king will reign over more than just a reunited Judah and Israel. The Davidic shepherd king will bring salvation (σῴζω; 23:6) for Judah and Israel. As in 3:18 the Davidic shepherd king will reunite the divided kingdom. Vancil is correct when he notes that an ideal picture of kingship is often within the framework of the shepherd metaphor.

---

197. Esther 3:7, 9; 4:7, 8, 14, 16; 8:5; 9:2, 11, 12, 16 (OG).
198. For example, 1 Macc 2:37; 9:2; 12:40, 50; 13:4, 18; 49 all refer to people dying. In 2 Macc 7:20 the seven sons die, and in 8:19 185,000 die. In 3 Macc 6:14 the army is destroyed by drowning.
200. The MT has this passage placed in Jer 50:6.
201. Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 206.
2.2.4 Ezekiel

According to the text of Ezekiel, the prophet was a Jewish priest who was exiled to Babylon with King Jehoiachin in 597 B.C.E. (Ezek 1:1-3; 4 Kgdms 24:8-17). He had lived through the invasion of Babylon, the destruction of the temple and the city and was now in exile as a priest. The destruction of the temple and the exile of the Israelites were the most defining of events for an Israelite as the land was central to the covenant, and the temple signified God’s blessing and presence with his people. It is therefore not unexpected that the covenant, the temple, God’s presence, sin and exile, the removal of the kings, and restoration (because God is faithful to the covenant) are a central part of his prophetic message to an exiled nation.

The text has two key passages that refer to the Davidic shepherd king (Ezek 34:23-24; 37:15-28) and the motif of shepherd forms an inclusio around the unit of Ezek 34-37. The unit is bound together by references to the Davidic shepherd king (34:23-24; 37:24-26), the covenant of peace (34:25; 37:26) and the absence and presence of the Lord (34:5; 37:26). It is also characterised by the use of a reversal motif. In Ezek 34:1-16 the reversal paradigm

202. The authorship and dating of Ezekiel is less contentious than many prophetic writings since the material of the prophecies relate only to the events between 593 and 571 BCE and so there is historical and internal consistency, although there is acceptance of some work of redactors. Moshe Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 22; New York: Doubleday, 1983), 12; William H. Brownlee, Ezekiel 1-19 (WBC 28; Waco: Word, 1986), xxiii. However, some questions have been raised about the Babylonian locale, the poetic style of doom and the contrasting prosaic style of hope, the repetition in the text which may have come through scribal glosses, text critical concerns, evidence of priestly redactors, possible Deuteronomistic additions and grammatical concerns. For a recent survey of these claims see Paul M. Joyce, Ezekiel: A Commentary (LHBOTS 482; New York: T and T Clark, 2007), 7-16.

203. Traditionally the first twenty-four chapters are considered to be prophecies of doom while the last twenty-four chapters are largely of consolation. However, there are also themes of repentance (Ezek 14:6; 18) and restoration (16:60-62; 17:22-24) in the early section, and the restoration section most fully begins in Ezek 34. The context for the prophecies of doom centre on God’s abandonment of the temple, city and land, and the resultant exile. The focus in the restoration is on the shepherd leaders, the renewal of Israel’s heart, the reunification of the kingdom through a new David, the defeat of Gog, the messianic priestly code and visions of the future temple. The second section’s early chapters (Ezek 25-33) are sometimes considered a middle unit which ends with the fall of Jerusalem in ch. 33. For a survey see Greenberg, Ezekiel 1-20, 3-6. Chae notes the symmetrical balance in the book where it opens with the exile and departure of God’s glory from Jerusalem (Ezek 1-11) and closes with the vision of restoration from the exile, and the return of God’s presence among his people (33-48). Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 40-41.

204. Joyce recently expressed similar categories with different headings: judgment, repentance, individual responsibility, a future that does not depend on repentance (God’s grace), radical Theocentricity (holiness and expressions of ‘for his name’s sake’), and the departure of YHWH and his return (temple, land, God’s presence with the exiles). Joyce, Ezekiel, 17-32.
brings to the fore the news that the Lord will reverse the fortunes of the lost sheep. Similarly, in Ezek 36:24-32 the Lord renews the hearts and minds of his people which reverses the Israelite’s exilic fate and empowers them to live in the Davidic eschatological paradigm. The message in this unit is cumulative and the nature of the Davidic shepherd king should be understood across the unit. In the centre of this unit, the Lord as eschatological shepherd says he will take his people (ἐισάγω) from the nations,\textsuperscript{205} gather them from all lands (ἀθροίζω),\textsuperscript{206} cleanse his people (καθαρίζω) and give them a new spirit and a new heart. It also describes the salvation of his people (σῴζω; 36:29) who are described as πρόβατα ἅγια (36:38). Ezekiel's message is ultimately one of grace where salvation comes because God is faithful to his covenant with the Israelites. His promise is seen most fully in the Davidic shepherd king who will bring true leadership for the people, and through whom the covenant of peace will be established.\textsuperscript{207} As Zimmerli says 'Das Heilschaffen Jahwes mündet in 23f. in die Verheißung eines guten irdischen Hirten aus.'\textsuperscript{208}

2.2.4.1 Ezekiel 34

Ezekiel 34 is central to the wider message of Ezekiel as demonstrated in Chae’s analysis below which shows the chapter is the pivot point to the book:

(1-11) Departure of YHWH’s glory and Israel’s guilt
(12-34) Reasons for God’s judgment and oracles against the nations
(34-39) The vision of restoration
(40-48) The return of YHWH’s glory, the new temple and transformation.\textsuperscript{209}

\textsuperscript{205} ἐισάγω is used consistently to describe God’s actions in the exodus. It is used 13x in Exodus, 9x in Numbers and 15x in Deuteronomy including Exod 2:10; 3:8; 6:8; 13:5, 11; 15:7; 23:30; Lev 18:3; 20:22; 14:8, 16, 24; 15:18; 16:14; Deut 4:27, 38; 6:10, 23; 7:1; 8:7; 9:4, 28; 11:29. The next most prolific usage is in Ezekiel where the word is used 29x. The word conveys a strong exodus-wilderness image.

\textsuperscript{206} ἀθροίζω is not a common exodus word but is used in Num 20:2. The sense of God gathering his people however is an image that conveys the exodus.


\textsuperscript{208} Walther Zimmerli, \textit{Ezechiel 2} (Biblischer Kommentar; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1969), 841.

As this structure shows, Ezek 34 transitions from the theme of judgment to the theme of restoration and so plays a unique role in the text.\textsuperscript{210} This is the most highly developed shepherd chapter in all of the OT and it develops the message of Jer 23:1-6.\textsuperscript{211} It is structured to show a critique and judgment on the kings of Israel (vv. 1-10),\textsuperscript{212} the Lord as shepherd (vv. 11-16), the Davidic shepherd king (vv. 23-24) and the covenant of peace (vv. 25-31).

\subsection*{2.2.4.2. Good and Bad Shepherds (Ezek 34:1-16)}

Ezekiel's woes address the ultimate reason for the exile; that is, the policies of the shepherds of Judah which led them to become a self-serving institution that ignored the needs of the people.\textsuperscript{213} Thus, because of poor policy and practice, that for Ezekiel stemmed from their covenantal unfaithfulness, the economic and political fate of the people plummeted.\textsuperscript{214} This is consistent with the historical books that provide commentary on kings who did what was good in the sight of the Lord, and conversely, those who did evil.\textsuperscript{215} The commentary, as in Ezekiel, relates to covenant faithfulness and David's reign is often used as a measuring stick

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{210} Vancil, 'Symbolism of the Shepherd,' 228.
  \item \textsuperscript{211} Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-37, 709; Daniel I. Block, Ezekiel 25-48, (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 282; Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 61; Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 40.
  \item \textsuperscript{212} This refers to Jehoiachin and Zedekiah and probably all their advisors and officials in exile. Greenberg, Ezekiel 21-37, 694.
  \item \textsuperscript{213} Leslie C. Allen, Ezekiel 20-48 (WBC 29; Dallas: Word, 1990), 164.
  \item \textsuperscript{214} Politically the kings made poor choices and these affected the lives of the Israelites. For example, many kings chose to align themselves with foreign nations (4 Kgdms 15:19-20; 17:3-4; 20:12-13; 24:12; 25:27-30) and as a result tribute was paid and money exacted from the people of the land (4 Kgdms 15:20; 23:35). Jehoiakim taxed the people of the land, and the workers, to meet Pharaoh Neco's demands (4 Kgdms 23:35), and wars meant many died (3Kgdms 14:30; 4 Kgdms 14:11-14). Political decisions also led to sin. For example, Menahem ripped open the pregnant women when Tiphsah was not opened to him (4 Kgdms 15:16). The divided kingdom began with strife when Rehoboam did not take advice from his elders and placed a heavy yoke of service on the people and threatened discipline with scorpions (3 Kgdms 12:11). While this was to fulfil the words of the Lord to Ahijar for Jeroboam, the harshness was a result of human sin and not the Lord's will.
  \item \textsuperscript{215} The covenantal faithfulness of the king was tied to the prosperity of the nation. The historical books emphasise this by recording it before the actions of any particular king. For example, 'In the seventh year of Jehu, Jehoash began to reign; he reigned for forty years in Jerusalem. His mother's name was Zibiah of Beer-sheba. Jehoash did what was right in the sight of the Lord all his days' (4 Kgdms 12:1-2); 'In the twenty-third year of King Joash son of Ahaziah of Judah, Jehoahaz son of Jeshua began to reign over Israel in Samaria; he reigned for seventeen years. He did what was evil in the sight of the Lord' (4 Kgdms 13:1-2). When the kings followed the ways of the Lord fully, then prosperity followed. However, many kings aligned themselves with foreign gods and particularly Baal, they consulted mediums and wizards and not the Lord, and allowed the practice of male prostitution. Political and therefore economic decline was seen to follow.
\end{itemize}
for the success or not of a particular king (3 Kgdms 11:34; 15:11; 4 Kgdms 8:19; 18:3; 19:34).

In Ezekiel the woes focus on King Jehoiachin who was their leader when the exile began and who Ezekiel presents at the beginning of the book (Ezek 1:1-3). Ezekiel 34:2, however, addresses the plural shepherds of Israel and his prophecies show clearly that there was an ever growing cycle of decline in the monarchy. Ezekiel's judgment was on the institution of monarchy which failed God's flock by not living up to covenant standards.

There is a growing awareness that exodus-wilderness themes in this chapter lie behind Ezek 34-37 as a section and point to the shepherds' lack of covenant faithfulness.\(^{216}\) The theme of covenant is expressed clearly in Ezek 20 where Pentateuchal traditions lie at the heart of the chapter, and fidelity to the covenant is at the forefront.\(^{217}\) In Ezekiel 20 God is the shepherd of his people taking them by the hand to bring them out of Egypt (20:5-6). He is the shepherd driving them with his ῥάβδος (20:37), and disciplining them because they do not follow his law. In chapter 34 God is the good shepherd who is again leading his people. This resonates with our study of the Psalms (see chapter 2.1) and Isaiah 40 (see chapter 2.2.1). In chapter 20 God is angry at their infidelity and so acts for the sake of his name (Ezek 20:9, 14, 22, 39, 44), and this anger is developed again in chapter 34 toward the unfaithful shepherds. The Mosaic covenant stresses fidelity to God only, and justice for the orphan, widow and stranger by providing them with food and clothing (Deut 10:18). As Deuteronomy goes on to explain, Israel is required to care for the stranger, as they were strangers in the land of Egypt (Deut 10:19). In Ezek 20, the elders of the house of Israel come to the prophet and the prophet’s message is clear; as in the days of the exodus and the wilderness wanderings which was brought about by covenantal unfaithfulness, so again the exile stems from the unfaithfulness of Israel. In Ezek 34 the judgment falls on the shepherds who have not kept the commandments and so God has acted to remove them. God will instead establish a new kingdom where the Davidic shepherd king will bring restoration. This demonstrates that covenantal

---

217. The blessings and curses of Lev 26 show how faithfulness to the covenant is tied to the fate and destiny of the nation of Israel.
concerns discussed in Ezek 20 lie at the heart of Ezekiel's understanding of the exile and God's judgment, and also his promised restoration.218

Ezekiel's prophetic message is not simply a political reprimand, it is a vivid reminder of God who shepherded them through the desert, provided manna to eat, water to drink, a pillar of cloud by day to lead, and a pillar of fire by night for warmth and protection. These are the very attributes lacking in the shepherd of Israel.

Ezekiel 34 is a development from Jeremiah 23 and contains a detailed explanation of the practical role of a shepherd. Verse 2 begins with a question, 'Do shepherds feed themselves? Do not shepherds feed the flocks?' Ezekiel stresses the feeding (βόσκω) of sheep in eight verses (Ezek 34:2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16). The critique of the shepherds begins with a question about feeding the sheep (Ezek 34:2) and the section ends with God saying he will feed the sheep (Ezek 34:16). This demonstrates Ezekiel's emphases on the king's role in the Israelites' practical welfare. Ezekiel 34:3 centres on the greed of the shepherds who devour the flock for their own ends by using their wool and milk, and 34:4 is an itemised account of the deficiencies on the part of the shepherds. This list is then reversed almost point by point in 34:16 as demonstrated in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Comparison between 34:4 and 34:16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ ἡσθενηκός ὁὐκ ἐνισχύσατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(You did not strengthen the weakened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ κακῶς ἔχον ὁὐκ ἐσωτεροποιήσατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(You did not build up the unwell)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ συντετριμμένον ὡς κατεδήσατε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(You did not bind up the crushed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὸ πλανώμενον ὡς ἐκλείπωσις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(You did not turn about the one that had strayed)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

218. Ezekiel 20 discusses matters relating to the covenant: not worshipping and keeping idols (20:7, 28-31), keeping the sabbath (20:12, 16, 20), rejected God's ordinances and statutes which includes all the commands to care for the orphan, widow and stranger (20:16), and blasphemy (20:27).
τὸ ἀπολωλὸς οὐκ ἐζητήσατε
(You did not seek the lost)

τὸ ἰσχυρὸν φυλάξω
(I will watch the strong)

τὸ ἰσχυρὸν κατειργάσασθε μόχθῳ
(You subdued the strong with hardship)

βοσκήσω αὐτὰ καὶ τὰ κρίματος
(I will feed them with judgment)

Firstly, this table shows that God will reverse the poor care of the shepherds. Further, the words follow a repeated pattern of noun–verb which places a rhetorical stress on what the Lord will do.

However, in the final line of v. 16 the pattern changes and the verb comes first; βοσκήσω αὐτὰ μετὰ κρίματος. This reordering brings an arresting halt to the list and a focus on the Lord's judgment.

Secondly, there is the repetition of 'seeking the lost' and in 34:16 it is at the beginning of the list. This highlights the importance of the phrase.

Thirdly, the table draws attention to the physical needs of the weak and marginalised by itemising God's standard of care.220 Leviticus 25:43, 53 is clear that leaders must not abuse servants with hardship (μόχθῳ) making this final charge in 34:4 an echo of their failure to obey the Lord's commandments. As owner of the flock, the Lord did not expect his shepherds to ignore the needs of the people and especially not the weak, unwell, crushed, strayed and lost. Further, the phrase τὰ πρόβατα μου (Ezek 34:3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 11, 12, 15, 19, 22) suggests not only ownership of the flock, but endearment,221 and highlights God's compassion. This expression coheres with an early and much repeated saying that the Lord is gracious and merciful (οἰκτίρµον καὶ ἐλεήµον; Exod 34:6; 2 Chron 30:9; 2 Esdr 19:31; Pss 85:15; 102:8; 110:4; 111:4; 144:8; Sir 2:11; Joel 2:13; Jonah 4:2). It is compassion and mercy that charac-

---

219. Note the changed order here with the verb placed first.
221. Block, Ezekiel 25-48, 284.
terise the Lord's care for his people and Ezek 34 reiterates very clearly that this must also characterise his leaders.

Finally, the prophet uses ζητέω eight times in the chapter, showing that the nature of a shepherd who 'seeks out' the lost is important for Ezekiel; v. 16 is the final usage in the chapter, emphasising the Lord who 'will seek out the lost sheep.' The use of ἀπολλύμι as we saw in chapter 2.2.3.3, conveys a strong statement about something that is perishing or being lost and destroyed. Ezekiel goes on to show the result of this lack of care; the sheep are scattered (διασπείρω; 34:5, 6 [twice]) and have become food for other animals (34:8).

Duguid notes that, 'According to Ezekiel 34, the expected change in Israel's governance will be accomplished not so much through a change in the nature of the office but through a change in the nature of the occupant.\(^{222}\) That is, the picture of restored Israel will be characterised by the lost being found, the strayed being turned around, the broken being healed, the crushed being bound up, and the abandoned being strengthened. The opening statement of Ezek 34:16 which describes God's care as shepherd, τὸ ἀπολολὸς ζητήσω, summarises the thrust of the new community and, as we will, see resonates strongly with the Lukan Jesus seeking the lost.

### 2.2.4.3. The Coming Davidic Shepherd King (34:23-31; 37:15-28)

The two passages that refer to the Davidic shepherd king come at either end of the unit Ezek 34-37. In the unit the Lord as eschatological shepherd gives his 'holy sheep' (πρόβατα ἁγία; 36:38) a 'new spirit' and a 'new heart' (36:26). Further, God's grace is seen most clearly in the Davidic shepherd king.\(^{223}\) But what does Ezekiel say of this coming king? What does this add to our knowledge of the Davidic shepherd king?

καὶ ἀναστήσω ἐπ’ αὐτοὺς ποιμένα ἐτερον\(^{224}\) καὶ ποιμανῶ ἀντίτις, τὸν δοῦλόν μου Δαυὶδ, καὶ ἔσται αὐτῶν ποιμὴν, καὶ ἐγὼ κύριος ἐσομαι αὐτοῖς εἰς θεόν, καὶ Δαυὶδ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν ἄρχων,

---

223. Joyce writes, ”Grace” is absolutely characteristic of Ezekiel; though the word ἡν “grace” is not used, the concept is central. And far from being an anachronistic imposition of New Testament ideas, it is Christianity that is the borrower here.’ *Ezekiel,* 27.
224. Rahlfs uses ἕνα (one) instead of Göttingen's ἐτερον (another) in 34:23, while in 37:24 Göttingen specifies ’one’ (ἑῖς) shepherd.
And I will raise up for them another shepherd, my servant David, and he will shepherd them, and I, the Lord, will be a god for him, and David will be a ruler (נְשָׂיא) in their midst; I the Lord, have spoken. And I will make with David a covenant of peace (Ezek 34:23-25a).

καὶ ὁ δοῦλός μου Δαυίδ ἄρχων ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ ποιμὴν εἷς ἔσται πάντων, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασι μου πορεύσονται καὶ τὰ κρίματά μου φυλάζονται καὶ ποίησον αὐτά, καὶ κατακύριεσον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς αὐτῶν ... καὶ Δαυίδ ὁ δοῦλός μου ἄρχων αὐτῶν ἔσται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, καὶ διαθήσομαι αὐτοῖς διαθήκην εἰρήνης, διαθήκη αἰωνία ἔσται μετ’ αὐτῶν, καὶ θήσω τὰ ἅγια μου ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

And my servant David will be ruler (נְשָׂיא) in their midst, and they will have one shepherd, for they shall walk by my commandments and keep my judgments and do them. And they will live on their land ... and my servant David will be their ruler (נְשָׂיא) forever. And I will make a covenant of peace with them and it will be an everlasting covenant with them; I will set my holy things in their midst forever (Ezek 37:24-26).225

These passages recall the tradition of Jeremiah 23 and also features of Isaiah and Micah's prophesy where a shepherd is coming to rule and usher in peace (Isa 9:6; Mic 5:5) while showing a growth in the tradition. Ezekiel describes David as ποιμήν εἷς (Ezek 37:24), δοῦλος (34:23), ἄρχων (34:24), and the one who will be given διαθήκην εἰρήνης (34:25). These characteristics of Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd king will now be explored.

Firstly, David is one shepherd.226 This is a development from Jeremiah who speaks of plural 'shepherds' (Jer 23:4). The use of εἷς (Ezek 37:24) is an emphatic description that may be linked to a reversal of the divided northern and southern kingdoms (3 Kgdms 11-12) where there were two kings.227 The sign-act of Ezek 37:15-25 pictures two staffs which come together as one staff in the hand of Judah.

Behold I am taking the whole house of Israel from the midst of the nations...and I will give them into one nation in my land...and they shall have one ruler, and they shall no longer be two nations, nor shall they be divided into two kingdoms (Ezek 37:21-22).

---

225. The Hebrew terms נְשָׂיא and נְשָׂיא form the backdrop to later discussion on Ezekiel's translation of both as ἄρχων.
226. The Göttingen uses ἄρχων at Ezek 34:23 and not ἑνα which Rahlfs records. However, Göttingen specifies the 'one shepherd' in Ezek 37:24.
The unit of Ezek 34-37 shows that the Davidic shepherd king is the one through whom the united community will be brought together. Ezekiel stresses that there is one ruler coming and he is coming as a shepherd. Like the Lord himself, therefore, this shepherd is not primus inter pares.

Secondly, David is 'my servant.' Blenkinsopp notes this designation implies 'service rather than self-advancement or domination.' It is a term which contrasts the self-seeking shepherds of 34:1-10, although some note the term implies the subordination of David to YHWH. Block reasons that the use of 'servant' is an honorific title for those in an official relationship with Yahweh. Allen suggests that the term is similar to a 'head-of-state' who has a subordinate vassal status and points to a style of leader who will guard against further despotic rulers. Δοῦλος also points back to the Davidic covenant and this may lie behind the word (2 Kgdms 7:5, 8) as 37:25 is a further recollection of the covenant (see chapter 3.3.1).

Thirdly, Ezekiel calls David ἄρχων (Ezek 34:24; 37:22, 24, 25), rather than βασιλεύς which Jeremiah used to describe the Davidic shepherd (Jer 23:5). The Hebrew text from which the Greek text is derived, uses two words, ממלך and נשיא. The former is traditionally translated 'chief' or 'prince' and latter as 'king.' In 34:24 and 37:25 נשיא is translated ἄρχων, while 37:22, 24 translates ממלך as ἄρχων. Ezekiel favours the term נשיא which has its roots in pre-monarchical days when the tribal leader wielded both military and political power. Joyce and Allen both note that נשיא is a ‘deliberate archaizing’ word which points back to pre-monarchical leadership patterns (Num 2:3; 13:2) and presents them as a pattern for the future. Zimmerli notes that the use of נשיא 'is not so much a sign of a polemic against the title ממלך (king) as the desire to describe the dignitary in an archaically solemn fashion by

---

228. See chapter 2.2.4 for the unity of Ezek 34-37.
231. Also 2 Kgdms 7:19, 20, 21, 25-29.
233. Chae argues this, saying, 'surely it points to 2 Sam 7:12-14 in which "my servant David" is both king and shepherd "over" the people.' Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 69.
234. Duguid, Ezekiel, 15.
235. Joyce, Ezekiel, 198; Allen, Ezekiel 20-48, 163.
means of a genuine ancient Israelite title. This is consistent with Ezekiel's desire to remind Israel of God's faithfulness to them in the exodus and wilderness. Duguid further suggests the use of נְצָר may be being used as a foil to 'my servant' in the same text, showing this powerful coming Davidic king will not exercise power like the past kings of Israel, but will instead exercise power with service.

Finally, this Davidic shepherd king will usher in διαθήκη εἰρήνη (Ezek 34:25). We have come to expect this Davidic figure to bring peace (Isa 9:5-6; 11:1-9; Mic 5:5) but this is the first time it is presented as a διαθήκη. This theological language of covenant has echoes of the Davidic covenant that will be eternal (2 Kgdms 23:5; Ps 88:4, 29), although this is hinted at and is not specified. A new covenant has already been referred to in Ezek 16:60. The covenant of peace is given a concrete image in Ezek 34:25-31 when the prophet describes the restoration to the land, abundance, protection from wild animals, and deliverance from people who have enslaved the Israelites. The text uses exodus language of deliverance (ἐξαιρέω, καταδουλῶ) suggests this covenant of peace is rooted in covenant promises of old. At this time there will be no more famine and Israel will be vindicated in the sight of other nations. This chapter ends with another strong commitment by God as the shepherd of Israel, πρόβατά μου καὶ πρόβατα ποιμνίου μού έστε, καὶ ἕγῳ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν, λέγει κύριος κύριος.

In Summary: The shepherd motif is strategically used by the prophet in Ezek 34 for both judgment on the leaders of Israel and also to herald the coming restoration. Ezekiel presents both God and the Davidic αὐχον as shepherds, and unlike Jeremiah, specifies that there is only one coming shepherd. The new David will exercise power that reflects his status as the Lord’s servant and he will come in fulfilment of the Davidic covenant. The Davidic shepherd king will herald a covenant of peace which is not fully explained, yet has echoes of the Mosaic covenant. The Davidic shepherd king will be the one whom the Lord will send to restore a united Israel and lead them back into the land, out of disgrace and into peace again. With this figure will come a new heart and a new spirit for the people which will enable them to live in

---

238. ἐξαιρέω (Exod 3:8; 18:4, 8, 10; Ezek 34:10, 17); καταδουλῶ (Gen 47:21; Exod 1:14; 6:5; 7:24; Ezek 34:27).
fidelity to the covenant. The Davidic shepherd king will usher in a new dominion of the Lord's grace.

2.2.5 Zechariah

Zechariah is considered the most obscure book of the prophets with eschatological and apocalyptic language and themes. While the Bible presents the book as a unified whole, scholarship is largely agreed that it is from at least two authors covering varying time periods. The text states it was written during the reign of Darius I (522-486 B.C.E.), and this is the likely dating of chapters 1-8, while the dating of chapters 9-14 remains uncertain. Darius was an officer of the tyrant Cambyses II, who was the son of King Cyrus, who was known for his compassionate reign. Cyrus repatriated the Israelites from Babylon to Palestine after he led a bloodless campaign in 539 B.C.E., which secured the Persian position in the ANE. He allowed people to retain their cultural and religious identity and also a measure of self-governance. Isaiah refers to Cyrus as shepherd in the MT (Isa 44:28-45:1), which may be a tradition that informs Zechariah 9-14 where the central motif is a shepherd king.

From chapter 9, the Lord God is pictured as the eschatological shepherd and the coming king as the agent of his salvation. The coming of the Lord is described with exodus imagery where God delivers his flock. Zechariah 9:16 says 'On the day the Lord will save them, his people like sheep.' The king comes ἐν αἴματι διωθήκης (Zech 9:11) to release prisoners from their dungeons where there is no water and the king comes to bring σωτηρία (9:9, 16; 12:7).

240. The unity of Zechariah is not agreed upon by scholars as material in chapters 9-14 in particular appears to be written well after the second temple was completed. It is therefore suggested that ch. 9-14 are from an anonymous prophet who lived after the conquests of Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.E.) and when Greece was the dominant imperial power, replacing Persia. This makes sense of Zechariah’s reference to Greece (9:13) although others prophets also refer to Greece (Isa 66:19; Ezek 27:13; Dan 8:21; 10:20; 11:2). This position also recognises that the oracles at 9:1 and 12:1 do not refer to Zechariah and yet this is also not uncommon either (Isa 15:1; 17:1; 19:1; 21:1; 22:1; 23:1; Jer 29:1). The two sections (1-8; 9-14) seem to reflect varying themes, yet this could well be to do with occasion and purpose as much as it could reflect differing authors. For a survey of the debate see Barry Webb, The Message of Zechariah: Your Kingdom Come (BST; Leicester: IVP, 2003), 43-46.
242. Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 76.
The ἐν αἷματι διαθήκης may recall the Mosaic covenant sealed in blood (Exod 24:8) and yet it may have a wider picture in view, as the king's reign is over the nations (Zech 9:8).

Zechariah does not describe this king using the title 'messiah' but he announces a rejuvenated Davidic kingship with extensive predictions about this figure as both king and humble servant. He is described as righteous and salvific (δίκαιος καὶ σώζων; Zech 9:9) having been described earlier as the Branch (3:8; 6:12). He comes humbly riding on a donkey to destroy the weapons of war, to bring εἰρήνη and to reign (κατάρξω) over all the earth. That the king is δίκαιος καὶ σώζων reflects less what the king will do for others, and instead emphases what God has done for him. The ANE saw good leaders and rulers as 'humble,' and kings were expected to be pious and humble before their gods as they secured them victory in battle. Further, this king riding on a donkey reflects the practice of Near Eastern royalty and stands in contrast to the use of horses and chariots which are military motifs. It may have the image of Gen 49:10f behind it, where Jacob's blessing of Judah involves a donkey. Further, this common Near East image demonstrates solidarity with the people. Zechariah says of the king's reign:

There shall be abundance and peace from nations,
and he shall reign over the waters as far as the sea,
and the rivers at the exits of the earth (Zech 9:10).

For Zechariah therefore, this coming king will have dominion over all the inhabited earth. Zechariah’s image draws on Ezek 34-37 and Mic 2-5, traditions of a shepherd king who brings peace and cares for the flock, and yet it has new hues drawn from its post-exilic setting. The coming king is ushered in as the suffering shepherd king where the shepherd and the sheep face judgment. Zechariah 11:5 states καὶ οἱ ποιμένες αὐτῶν οὐκ ἔπασχον οὔδὲν

---

244. Smith, Micah-Malachi, 255.
246. Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9-14, 129.
247. Laniak, Shepherds After My Own Heart, 164.
248. Myers and Myers say that 'the global directions are implied even when specific seas are the reference points surely indicates that 'sea to sea' lends a dimension of universality in Zech 9:10 that is quite constant with its eschatological perspective.' Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9-14, 137.
249. Laniak, Shepherds After My Own Heart, 170.
ἐπ’ ἀὑτός, (the shepherds are not suffering on behalf of the people), implying suffering is an attribute of a good king. The condemnation comes in an enacted parable of two shepherds. The prophet is required to perform two symbolic actions and these can be interpreted in either of two ways: (1) There is one good shepherd and one bad shepherd;250 or (2) where both are bad shepherds,251 and in the second he plays the role of the inexperienced or worthless shepherd (11:15-17). Interpreting these apocalyptic parables is difficult, and yet as Willetts notes, whichever way you read the signs there is judgment on Israel's shepherds.252

In the first symbolic act (Zech 11:7-14), which Boda calls a 'sign-act,,'253 the διωθήκη the Lord made πρὸς πάντας τούς λαούς is disbanded or revoked (11:10, 14). Exactly which covenant 'with all the peoples' Zechariah is referring to is unclear. The sign-act is related to a staff which could lead to the logical assumption that this symbolises the Israelite people.254 Webb assumes the parable has one good shepherd and one bad shepherd and notes that in the first, Zechariah plays the role of the good shepherd and represents the Lord (Zech 11:4-14), thus Zechariah is referring to a Jewish covenant and all the tribes and people groups that constituted Israel.255 The use of the plural τούς λαούς could suggest a wider scope, although Myers and Myers point out that at times the people of Israel are referred to using a plural (Gen 27:29; 48:4; 49:10; Mic 1:2) and so this need not negate a purely Jewish covenant.256 In this case Zechariah may be referring to the covenant of peace from Ezek 34:25; 37:26 as he is drawing on shepherd king imagery of Ezek 34-37,257 or he may have a more universal scope in mind with both Jew and non-Jew. Zechariah 9:9 has hinted at such a dominion for the coming Davidic king as we have seen, and this was the intention of the Abrahamic covenant where he was blessed to be a blessing to all the tribes of the earth (Gen 12:3). Furthermore,

252. Willetts, Messianic Shepherd King, 65.
253. Boda, 'Reading Between the Lines,' 280.
the phrase 'all the peoples' is used of non-Israelite nations (3 Kgdms 5:14; Hab 2:5) leading to
the possibility that Zechariah had a broader perspective in mind, even if was not fully formed.

In the parable the prophet takes the role of the shepherd marked for slaughter (Zech 11:4).
The parable makes clear that the sheep and shepherds share responsibility for their destruction. The depiction of the three shepherds who are removed is historically difficult to locate;258 but the parable tells the reader that γὰρ αἱ ψυχαὶ αὐτῶν ἐπωρύοντο ἐπὶ ἐμὲ (for their souls were howling against me; Zech 11:5). They are clearly leaders who are actively against God. The charge is laid that the shepherds have made themselves rich, and thus exploited the poor and that they did not suffer (πάσχω) in the sheep's distress. This contrasts with the features of Zechariah's shepherd king who suffers with and for the people. This is again a feature in Zech 12:10-14 when there is mourning and grief in the houses of David, Nathan, Levi and Simeon. It is on this day that the Lord will open up (διανοίγω) every place for the house of David. This grief, brought about by a siege in Jerusalem, will bring the salvation of the Lord (Zech 12:7). The motif from suffering to glory is characteristic of the Lord himself, and of the Davidic shepherd king and is epitomised in the progression of chapters 9-14.259

The second symbolic act is seen in Zechariah playing the role of the inexperienced shepherd (Zech 11:15-17). The LXX describes the shepherd as ἄπειρος. This is used only four times in the LXX with a semantic range from inexperienced or ignorant (Num 14:23; Wis of Sol 13:18), to boundless (Jer 2:6).260 The shepherd is unable to be a good shepherd because of some form of lack which 11:16 says results in inattentive care and leads to the destruction of the flock. This culminates in the shepherd deserting the sheep, the ultimate charge of neglect. The Lord's judgment is represented by a sword striking the shepherd's arm with the result that

258. There are over forty suggestions of what τοιὸς τρεῖς πομένας may mean. These include the number which can represent completeness, so it may mean all oppressors are removed. It may reflect Amos’ ταῖς τρεῖς ἁπτεῖσις (the three transgressors; Amos 1:3); be a Maccabean scribal gloss, represent Moses, Aaron and Miriam, three kings of Israel—Zechariah, Shallum, and Menahem; three world empires—Assyrians, Babylonians, and Persians; the Persians, Greeks, and Romans; the divisions of kings, prophets, and priests; three high priests—Jason, Menlaus, and Lysimachus; or the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes. Smith, Micah-Malachi, 270; Meyers and Meyers, Zechariah 9-14, 264-265; Webb, Zechariah, 149.
260. ἄπειρος means: (1) inexperienced in Num 14:2 referring to age, in Zech 11:15 referring to the the shepherd or the warrior in 3 Kgdms 17:39; (2) boundless where there are no limits (Jer 2:6). GELS, 67.
it withers, and striking his eye which causes blindness. The judgment on the arm may represent lack of physical care for the flock, and the eye blindness to what happens to God’s flock.261

Thus, physical care and healing for the sick are characteristics of the good shepherd and are also represented in the new kingdom Zechariah perceives (Zech 10:3-12). Indeed, the first leadership critique is the consequence of poor shepherd leadership where there healing did not happen; διὰ τοῦτο ἐξήρθησαν ὡς πρόβατα καὶ ἑκακώθησαν, διότι οὐκ ἦν ἱασίς (therefore they were removed like sheep and were mistreated, for there was no healing; Zech 10:2). Chae notes that ‘the translator of the LXX equates the presence of the shepherd with the possibility of healing the oppressed and sick ones.262 This reflects Ezek 34 where the leaders were not building up the unwell and strengthening the weak (Ezek 34:4). This leads to the Lord being against the shepherds (Ezek 34:9). The physical well-being of the Lord's flock should be of concern to the good shepherd.

In Summary: Zechariah's Davidic figure is somewhat enigmatic but appears in Zech 9:9-10 as the humble and δίκαιος shepherd king, the agent of the Lord's σωτηρία and bringer of εἰρήνη. He will reign over all parts of the earth. The motif of shepherd king is most pre-eminently seen in the Lord who comes as a suffering shepherd king. He suffers with and for the people, but this suffering leads to salvation for the house of David. In the kingdom pictured there is physical care and safety.

### 2.3 The Second Temple Period

The writers of the Second Temple period continued to use the motif of the shepherd king in retelling the biblical stories and addressing life in the ancient world. The motif was one among many, yet God as shepherd and the Davidic shepherd king remained visible. We will consider PssSol 17 as this forms part of the backdrop of Luke's Benedictus, Philo who presents a positive view of shepherds, Pseudo-Philo as he rewrites the story of David's

261. Laniak suggests that this picture of the suffering shepherd and the scattered sheep is background used the Gospel writers to explain Christ’s passion. Laniak, Shepherds After My Own Heart, 170.
262. Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 77.
anointing by Samuel, Josephus as his rewritten Bible shows a first century perspective, and *I Enoch* where at the exodus and the eschaton God is the 'Lord of the Sheep.'

2.3.1 Psalms of Solomon 17

The setting for *PssSol* 17 is probably the siege of Jerusalem by Herod and Sosius (*PssSol* 17:7, 11), although the earlier invasion by Pompey is still a possibility. It is believed they were written in Hebrew and then translated into Greek and later Syriac, although there is no Hebrew Vorlage. The likely date for the redacted collection is approximately 65 to 30 B.C.E., although, in light of their historical details, they appear to have been composed over three decades. The provenance is accepted to be Jerusalem as it is the locale of most events.

---

263. Robert B. Wright, ed. *Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (JCTCR 1; London: T and T Clark, 2007), 6. Wright argues that the references to the conqueror in *PssSol* 2, 8 is Pompey, but the new use of the 'man alien to our race' (*PssSol* 17:7) and the 'lawless one' (*PssSol* 17:11) are more pejorative and describe the later event. Atkinson suggested in 2001 that the setting is Herod's invasion. Kenneth Atkinson, *An Intertextual Study of the Psalms of Solomon: Pseudepigrapha* (SBEC 49; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 2001), 362. However, Atkinson appears to change his position, as his monograph in 2004 suggests the setting is the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 B.C.E., which he says, 'is historically inaccurate since the Hasmoneans were not all removed from the earth as the author predicted (*PssSol* 17:7).'


265. Atkinson states, 'The Greek text is clearly translation Greek, and in numerous instances the translator has improperly vocalised the Hebrew text or has attempted to adhere to Hebrew syntax.' Atkinson, *I Cried To The Lord*, 4 Twelve Greek manuscripts remain in whole or part, the earliest dated from the fifth century and the remaining from the tenth to the sixteenth centuries. The earliest attestation to them is in *Codex Alexandrinus* where 'Psalms of Solomon 18' title is found, while no text remains in the Codex. *Codex Alexandrinus* is an early witness to the Psalms' acceptance being dated in the fifth century, although this does not necessarily imply canonical acceptance. The Psalms are likely to have several authors and there is evidence of a redactor. The authors are unknown and were originally thought to be Pharisees, but more latterly the Hasidim or Essenes, the Qumran community, or an unknown eschatological group in Jerusalem. For a survey see Wright, *Psalms of Solomon*, 7–8; Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*, 8.

266. The corruption of Jerusalem leadership (*PssSol* 4), looking forward to God's blessing of the Holy City (*PssSol* 11), and the Sanhedrin is mentioned and located in Jerusalem (*PssSol* 4:1).
At the time of the invasion, there was an illegitimate Hasmonean throne in Jerusalem, and thus the Lord who is their true king (*PssSol* 17:1-3) is requested to raise up a legitimate Davidic king who will bring both Jewish and Gentile oppressors to an end. Atkinson describes it as 'perhaps the most important text within the corpus...for it contains the most detailed pre-Christian description of the Davidic messiah.' 267 The Psalm certainly represents the greatest use of the Davidic shepherd king motif in post-biblical writings. 268 Geza Vermes suggests that prayer as a literary form represent the thinking of the 'man on the street,' and if this is so, this psalms' content is especially helpful for this study, as it shows the Davidic shepherd king motif still held common currency in Second Temple Jewish thought. 269

The Psalm falls into two main sections, the first describing the past and present state of the nation (*PssSol* 17:4-20) and the second the future longed-for state (17:26-44). 270 The beginning and mid sections are prayers or petitions (17:1-3, 21-25), and the end concludes with a blessing (17:45-46). The shepherd verses fall as part of the description of a future state when the legitimate king is on the Davidic throne and where there is no talk of a military king but a king who has power through his words.

---

270. Willitts, *Messianic Shepherd-King*, 80. Pomykala has the same structure as Willitts, but does not classify one a past and present state and one a future state. However, from v. 26 the text moves to using the future tense. For example; he shall gather (συνάξει; *PssSol* 17:26), he shall lead (συνάξει; *PssSol* 17:26), he shall judge (κρινεῖ; *PssSol* 17:26), he shall not allow injustice (οὐκ ἀφήσει ἀδικίαν; *PssSol* 17:27), he shall know them (γνώσεται γάρ αὐτὸν; *PssSol* 17:27), he shall distribute them (καταμερίσει αὐτοῖς; *PssSol* 17:28), he shall judge peoples (κρινεῖ λαοὺς; *PssSol* 17:29), he shall have peoples (ἐξει λαοὺς; *PssSol* 17:30), he shall glorify (δοξάσει; *PssSol* 17:30), he shall purify (καθαριεῖ, *PssSol* 17:30), for he shall not put his hope (οὐ γὰρ ἐλπίζει; *PssSol* 17:33), nor shall he multiply (οὐδὲ πληθυνεῖ; *PssSol* 17:33), nor shall he gather hopes (οὐ συνάξει ἐλπίδας; *PssSol* 17:33), he shall have pity (ἐλπίσει; *PssSol* 17:34), he shall strike (ποτάξει; *PssSol* 17:35), he shall bless (εὐλογήσει, *PssSol* 17:35), he shall not weaken (οὐκ ἀσθενήσει; *PssSol* 17:37), he shall not let any become weak (οὐκ ἀφήσει ἀσθενήσει; *PssSol* 17:40), and he shall lead (ἐξει; *PssSol* 17:41). However vv. 4-20 uses the past tense predominantly. Verse 7 is an exception where the text says God will overthrow them and will remove their offspring (κατυβάλεις αὐτῶν καὶ ἀρεῖς τὸ σπέρμα αὐτῶν). Willitts is therefore correct to present vv. 26-44 as picturing a future state.
The most well recognised shepherd reference is PssSol 17:40-41a where the Davidic king is the shepherd who acts faithfully and righteously, utilising covenantal language. The text says,

\[
\text{ἰσχυρὸς ἐν ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ κραταιὸς ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ}
\]

ποιμανόν τὸ ποίμνιον κυρίου ἐν πίστει καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ σῶκ ἀφήσῃ ἀσθενῆσαι ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ νομῇ αὐτῶν.

\[
\text{ἐν ἱσότητι πάντας αὐτοὺς ἅξει,}
\]

He shall be strong in his works and mighty in fear of God, shepherding the flock of the Lord faithfully and righteously, and he shall not let any of them become weak in their pasture. He shall lead all of them in equality\(^{271}\) (PssSol 17:40-41a).

The key ideas of the Davidic Shepherd king shown in this Second Temple psalm are: (1) he is characterised by bringing peace through the power of his words, while a picture of military might is implied in v. 7 and in the psalmist’s prayer in vv. 22-25; (2) he is anointed and chosen by the Lord; (3) he is a faithful shepherd to the flock; and (4) he brings justice and peace to the whole earth. These will now be discussed further.

Firstly, the Davidic shepherd king brings peace and joy by the power of his words which modifies the figure that shows military power shown in the first section of the psalm.\(^{272}\) The text gives much evidence for a Davidic messiah who shows extraordinary power through spoken words. It is established that PssSol 17:35 which says, πατάξει γὰρ γῆν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ εἰς αἰῶνα (for he shall strike the earth with the word of his mouth forever), stems primarily from Isa 11:4,\(^{273}\) but also Ps 2:9. Isaiah 11:4 says, 'he shall strike the earth with the word of his mouth, and with breath through his lips he shall do away with the impious.' This is set within the context of the presentation of the Spirit-empowered root of Jesse who is known by wisdom, understanding, counsel, might, knowledge and goodness.

\(^{271}\) Wright suggests 'impartiality' here. Wright, Psalms of Solomon, 199.

\(^{272}\) Scholars are divided about whether this figure is a violent military messiah or primarily a peacemaker. Collins and Atkinson picture primarily a military figure here. Collins, Scepter, 54; Atkinson, Psalms of Solomon, 368. Davenport and Crossan picture a peacemaker. Davenport, 'Anointed of the Lord,' 72; John Dominic Crossan, The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1991), 108. Pomykala lies toward the side of a peacemaking figure as he stresses he uses words and not military force, and yet does not go as far as Crossan. Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 162.

\(^{273}\) Collins, Scepter, 54; Davenport, 'Anointed of the Lord,' 72; Atkinson, Psalms of Solomon, 347.
Psalms of Solomon 17:35 says, 'he will strike the earth with the word of his mouth forever, and he shall bless the people of the Lord in wisdom and joy.' The psalmist goes on to say, 'he may rebuke rulers and remove sinners by the strength of his word' (17:36), and then states God has made him, 'wise in the counsel of understanding' (17:37). This picture is explained with the motif of shepherd (17:40-42) after which the psalmist explains, 'his words are more refined than costly gold...his words are as words of the holy in the midst of the sanctified peoples' (17:43). The king’s words are portrayed as having power to strike, to bless, are wise, valuable and holy and this suggests the Davidic king portrayed is not simply, 'the violent Davidic messiah' of Atkinson, and 'undeniably violent' as Collins suggests. Davenport also pictures a much less violent messiah saying, 'the word of his mouth indicates that the strength of which he speaks is not to be overt military force, but the power of the spoken word. Taking a similar position Crossan writes, 'this messianic leader does not use violence, neither the actual violence of normal warfare nor the transcendental violence of angelic destruction.' Crossan's picture may be overstating the case for a purely peaceful messianic figure, however, for the pictured in vv. 22-25 is powerful although it is power in words and not military force. Further, in the early part of Psalms of Solomon 17 there is a visible picture of a military king using violent language. From 17:7 the psalmist asks God to overthrow the Jewish sinners who have set up an illegitimate throne in Jerusalem. The psalmist then pleads with God to provide a Davidic king who is able to 'shatter in pieces unrighteous rulers' (17:22), and 'smash the arrogance of the sinner with an iron rod to destroy the nations by the word of his mouth' (17:24). These expressions convey a king who uses military power against his enemies, and yet by 17:24 this is expressed in terms of the power of his word and the military force is downplayed. This of course does not need to imply the words are conciliatory, and these words may even be to command an army to attack an enemy, however the accepted source from Isa 11:1-4 further suggests this is not purely a violent figure. Chae posits that the metaphor of an iron rod is modified by the new Davidic regime whereby the

274. Atkinson, I Cried to the Lord, 141; Atkinson, Psalms of Solomon, 368; Collins, Scepter, 54.
277. Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 162.
'destroying through the words of his mouth' (17:25) is a modification of Ps 2:9 where the potter's vessel was shattered. 278

It is possibly relevant that the power of words is also a defining feature of David's fight against Goliath where it was not only the stone and the sling that killed the allophyle, but the text stresses that David gained victory in the name of the Lord God (1 Kgdms 17:45). There could be a possibility that this well-known Davidic story may form another echo which the psalmist is recalling. Psalms of Solomon 17 perceives not only a new Davidic king who has military strength (PssSol 17:22-24) but also a faithful shepherd king (17:40-41). David was both the shepherd king of Israel (2 Kgdms 5:2), and he was also the warrior king. These two important qualities of David's kingship come together first in the story of David and Goliath where he defeats the Philistine with stones taken from his shepherd pouch (ἐν τῷ καδίῳ τῶν ποιμενικῶν, 1 Kgdms 17:40). It is after this story that David starts his public rise as king over all Israel (1 Kgdms 18:6-16; 2 Kgdms 5:2), the victorious Davidic king pictured in PssSol 17. This well-known tradition should therefore not be discounted as another possible source for the psalmist.

Secondly, the Davidic shepherd king is anointed by the Lord showing this as a divine appointment. Davenport notes, 'the importance of the anointment of the king lies in the authority and power God mediates through it.' 279 The king is called χριστὸς κυρίου showing his readiness for the task (17:32), and therefore, the one chosen to usher in God's kingdom. He is strong ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ and σοφὸν ἐν βουλῇ συνέσεως (17:37), further features that may recall king David (1 Kgdms 16:13, 18; 18:14), and affirm the psalmist's desire for a renewed Davidic dynasty.

Thirdly, he is a faithful shepherd king to the flock, although he is not simply a therapeutic shepherd. The images of the Davidic shepherd king leading his people (PssSol 17:26, 41), blessing the people of the Lord (17:35), and faithfully and righteously shepherding the flock

278. Ps 2:9 is considered a source for PssSol 17:22-25. Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 121; Atkinson, Psalms of Solomon, 347; Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 163.
279. Davenport, 'Anointed of the Lord,' 78.
(17:40) must be noted alongside images of a military Davidic messiah who will overthrow the Jewish and Gentile invaders.\textsuperscript{280}

Willitts goes as far as to suggest 17:26-41 form a thematic inclusio around the description of the kingdom in view.\textsuperscript{281} Verse 26 says this king will gather (συνάγω) a holy people whom he shall lead (ἡγεομαι)\textsuperscript{282} in righteousness, tasks of a shepherd who cares for the flock. This begins the description of the future longed-for-state, while it ends with the description of the shepherd. The verses describe life after the Davidic king becomes ruler which is characterised as peaceful. Chae notes the peaceful and non-militaristic character of the Davidic shepherd saying,

This future Davidic king's refusal to trust in the instruments of warfare, to amass the wealth needed to purchase mercenaries or to maintain a standing army, are seen as growing out of the king's dependence upon the strength that issues from God.\textsuperscript{283}

Crossan, Davenport and Pomykala also note the compassionate shepherd who gathers and leads the flock,\textsuperscript{284} but the shepherd is not only clearly present in the psalm, this motif ends the psalm with the shepherd king who is faithfully and righteously shepherding the flock (PssSol 17:40). This picture is not unlike that of the compassionate shepherd from Ezek 34 although it is neither that of a therapeutic shepherd or a purely military messiah suggested earlier by Atkinson and Collins. While Atkinson suggests this reign will not be peaceful as this Davidic messiah is asked to 'smash the arrogance of the sinner like a potter's vessel' (17:23),\textsuperscript{285} he fails to appreciate that the psalmist's final picture is of the reigning Davidic shepherd. The psalmist perceives that only the Lord can bring about this righteous rule, and that rule is characterised by the Davidic shepherd.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{281} Willitts, \textit{Messianic Shepherd-King}, 80. Chae also notes the beginning of the shepherd section from v 26-46 but does not refer to it as an inclusio. Chae, \textit{Davidic Shepherd}, 121.
\item \textsuperscript{282} MSS 655, 659 omit ἡγεομαι, and have ἀφηγεομαι which Rahlfs also uses. I follow Wright\'s critical edition with ἡγεομαι.
\item \textsuperscript{283} Chae, \textit{Davidic Shepherd King}, 122.
\item \textsuperscript{284} Chae, \textit{Eschatological Davidic Shepherd}, 119; Crossan, \textit{Historical Jesus}, 108; Davenport, 'Anointed of the Lord,' 83; Pomykala, \textit{Davidic Dynasty}, 162.
\item \textsuperscript{285} Atkinson, \textit{I Cried to the Lord}, 134. As noted previously, Collins also sees him as a violent warrior figure. Collins, \textit{Scepter}, 55.
\end{itemize}
Fourthly, he brings justice and peace to the whole earth and this includes hope for the Jew and also the Gentile. Justice comes first in removing both illegitimate Jewish and Gentile rule but the psalmist also foresees an eschatological future for both Jew and Gentile in a kingdom ruled by the Davidic shepherd king.

The psalm describes three groups who come under attack: (1) the Hasmoneans for their illegitimate rule; (2) Herod and his army who invaded Jerusalem and (3) the Jews who collaborated with the Gentiles.286 As a result, some Jews, perhaps priests, have had to flee from Jerusalem (17:16-18),287 so the psalmist cries to God to intervene by sending a legitimate king from the Davidic line (17:21-25).288 The first concern is the shattering of the Hasmonean rule (17:22) followed by the removal of the Gentile invaders.289

While the psalmist wants the Gentile invaders out of Jerusalem, the Jewish opponents come in for the harshest criticism as they have set up an illegitimate reign. The ἔθνη are able to flee from the king (PssSol 17:25),290 and the shattering to pieces in 17:22 is directed toward the unrighteous rulers, the Hasmoneans. Thus, an illegitimate Hasmonaean dynasty appears to be of greater concern to the psalmist than the ἔθνη.

To balance this the psalmist also pictures an eschatological future for the Gentiles where they too will be governed by the new king. Davenport says, 'the king will rule not only the reconstituted people of God, but the entire earth (17:29-35).291 He later qualifies this saying, 'Of course Gentiles also will have been sanctified on that day, but their holiness will not be the same as that of the original people of God. Even in a world where all have become holy, Israel retains a special identity before God.292 Pomykala describes this as a positive but subordinate role for Gentiles in the new configuration,293 while Chae suggests that a picture of compassion to all the nations continues in PssSol 18:3, 9 adding strength to an interpretation.

286. Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 161.
287. Pomykala suggests this may not imply flight, but instead mean the non-participation in the Second Temple’s social and cultic institution. Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 161.
288. The cry for a legitimate Davidic king recalls the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:11b-16; Ps 88:3-4, 19-37), as it has already done in v 4.
289. Atkinson, I Cried To The Lord, 137.
290. Davenport, Anointed of the Lord,’ 73; Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 163.
291. Davenport, Anointed of the Lord,’ 75.
293. Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 163.
of full Gentile inclusion. The idea has already been cast in Mic 5:2-5, and the text of PssSol 17 seems to support this position.

The text says that the Davidic shepherd king will judge both λαοί καὶ ἐθνη in the wisdom of righteousness (PssSol 17:29) and the people of the nations will be subject to him (17:30). This shepherd is able to bring both Jew and Gentile together under covenantal righteousness and will judge and lead both with equity (17:41). This shepherd is said to have mercy (ἐλεέω) on the ἐθνη (17:34b). As one free from sin (17:36), he is seen as able to usher in this covenantal idea of mercy. Finally, 17:32 says, 'and he shall be a righteous king, taught by God, over them.' The expression ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς is plural and suggests a leader who reigns over Jew and Gentile and not simply over reconstituted Israel.

Willitts does not go this far suggesting that while there is a place for 'reverent Gentiles who pledge their allegiance to the kingship of the Messiah...from the present setting...the Lord's flock includes only the subset of Israel. However, there is a considerable shift in the fate of the Gentile which appears to hinge on this Jewish deliverer who will be leader for all the nations. While the psalmist holds a special place for Israel in their identity with God, he appears to also suggest the Gentiles are included in the eschatological covenantal blessing.

In Summary: This Psalm is significant because it demonstrates that the Davidic shepherd king motif was in common currency in first-century Palestine. It confirms that, while there was longed for peace for the Jew, the Jewish worldview expressed here also expected some

295. Chae, Eschatological Davidic Shepherd, 125.
296. Contra, Atkinson who notes the Gentiles are denounced as unlawful (v. 24) and their commander is a foreigner (v. 28). The Gentiles acted in league with the man that is foreign to our race (v. 7), and anticipates they will be purged from Jerusalem along with the Jewish sinners (vv. 21-46). However, in this purging (vv. 21-46) Atkinson fails to recognise the details that surround the ἐθνη where they are judged and led with the λαοῖς. Atkinson, Psalms of Solomon, 335. Also Collins perceives only the defeat and subjugation of the Gentiles. Collins, Scepter, 56.
297. The subject of the preceding verse (v. 31) is the ἐθνη implying they are included in this statement. Isaiah 66:18-21 which is accepted as a source for the psalmist, directly refers to Gentiles who will be taken by the Lord to be priests and levites, giving some evidence for the Gentile inclusion. Davenport, 'Anointed of the Lord,' 76; Pomykala, Davidic Dynasty, 164. Contra, Willitts who suggests ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς refers to Israel. Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 86.
298. Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 89.
form of peace and justice for Gentiles. This Davidic shepherd king was to come with power in words and this modifies a picture of military might.

Davenport ends with a good question - why did this hope re-emerge at the time that it did? His answer is couched in terms of the Hasmonean invasion of Pompey (63 B.C.E.), but it is equally true if the historical setting is that of Herod's invasion (37 B.C.E). The Jewish world was in disgust at what had taken place and was looking for solutions to the oppression and occupation. The psalmist's answer was the coming of the Davidic shepherd king to bring justice and peace first for the Jew, but also for the Gentile. He was looking for deliverance from internal and external enemies through a Davidic kingdom in fulfilment of the Davidic covenant. The psalmist's prayer, perhaps this theology off the streets as Vermes argues, was the longed for Davidic shepherd king.

2.3.2 Philo

Philo was an Alexandrian Jew who was greatly influenced by the Hellenistic world. Living ca. 15 B.C.E.-45 C.E. his writing intersects Jewish and Greek thought, making his work of great interest and significance. Philo has much to say about being a 'shepherd,' and attributes them a role which is superior to a 'keeper of the sheep'. He defines a 'keeper of the sheep' as one who is 'indifferent to the flock,' while a 'good and faithful one is called a shepherd.' He says,

So full of dignity and benefit has the shepherd's task been held to be, that poets are wont to give to kings the title of 'shepherds of peoples,' a title which the lawgiver bestows on the wise (Philo, Agr. X 41).

He attributes being a shepherd positively to both Jacob (Agr. X 42) and Moses whom he calls 'all-wise' (Agr. X 43). He also attributes the role of a shepherd to kings and to God. Philo writes,

Indeed so good a thing is shepherding that it is justly ascribed not to kings only and wise men

299. Davenport, 'Anointed of the Lord,' 86.
301. This bears considerable resemblance to John's division of the hireling and the good shepherd (John 10:11-18).
and perfectly cleansed souls, but also to God the All-Sovereign. The authority for this ascription is not any ordinary one but a prophet, whom we do well to trust. This is the way in which the Psalmist speaks: 'The Lord shepherds me and nothing shall be lacking to me (Ps 23.1)' (Philo, *Agr.* XII 50).

He goes on to say,

For land and water and air and fire, and all plants and animals which are in these, whether mortal or divine...are like some flock under the hand of God its King and Shepherd (*Agr.* XII 51).

He exhorts the world,

Let therefore even the whole universe, the greatest and most perfect flock of God who IS say, 'The Lord shepherds me and nothing shall fail me.' Let each individual person too utter this same cry (*Agr.* XII 51-52).

Commenting on Genesis 43 Philo says,

Does it not seem as though they were more proud of being shepherds than is the king, than is the king who is talking to them, of all his sovereign power? They proclaim that not they only but their fathers also deliberately chose this course of life as worthy of entire and enthusiastic devotion (*Agr.* XII 60).

Philo also says,

Accordingly when the Mind, the ruler of the flock, taking the flock of the soul in hand with the law of nature as his instructor shews it the way with vigorous leadership, he renders it well worthy of praise and approval...With good reason, then, will the one take on him the name of king and be hailed as 'shepherd' (*Agr.* XIV 66).

Philo's view of a faithful shepherd is positive and in no way pejorative. This will become an important point for this study as there has been a strand of scholarly thought which has understood shepherds as sinners, thus colouring how shepherds are understood in the NT. Philo attributes the motif of shepherd to key leaders in the OT (Jacob, Moses) and finally, to God, who he sees as the one who most fully images what it is to be a faithful shepherd. Philo notes wise people are shepherds and believes shepherd leaders can govern diligently because they have the laws of nature as their teacher. He suggests their profession is a noble task in *Agr.* X 41 when he writes their role is 'full of dignity' and comments that poets attribute the title to kings. For Philo, when there are faithful shepherd rulers it can be said that a person lacks for nothing.
2.3.3 Pseudo-Philo

Pseudo-Philo\(^{302}\) retells the Hebrew Bible from Adam to Saul's death in a free manner with paraphrases and summaries of stories while he also condenses, omits and adds to the text.\(^{303}\) His *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum* (*L.A.B.*) dates from around the first century C.E. possibly predating the Jewish War (66 C.E.) and was written in Jewish Palestine. As such it is a valuable source for understanding Jewish thought of the late Second Temple period.

Pseudo-Philo LIX tells the story of David's anointing and draws on the biblical texts of 1 Kgdms 16:1-13; 17:34 and Ps 61:2. *L.A.B.* LX retells the story of David playing his harp to alleviate Saul's evil spirits, and *L.A.B.* LXI tells of David fighting Goliath. Unlike the biblical text, in Pseudo-Philo it is the Lord who says to Samuel, 'seek out the shepherd, the least of them all, and anoint him' (*L.A.B.* LIX.1). From a narrative perspective this focusses the readers' attention on God's voice who chooses and anoints a *shepherd* as king.

The narrative begins with a conversation between God and Samuel where God says to go and anoint the next king. This reflects the biblical text, while Pseudo-Philo adds the reason for the anointing saying, 'because the time in which his kingdom will come to pass has been fulfilled' (*L.A.B.* LIX.1). As Murphy says, this stresses God's control and foreknowledge of the event, and that David's kingship was inaugurated at the proper time, unlike Saul's reign which was 'before the time'.\(^{304}\) The psalm that is sung speaks of praising God, and then an analogy is drawn from the past. This analogy is from the story of Cain and Abel and reiterates the acceptability of the sacrifice of Abel's sheep. This reinforces the tradition which saw a sheep's sacrifice as superior to Cain's grain offering (see chapter 2.1). Pseudo-Philo thus drew on the story of Abel's animal sacrifice as support for David's kingship. That is, God had chosen the offering of a sheep in Gen 4, and again he chose the one who was close to the sheep.

---

The story of David and Goliath begins with a short encounter of David and the Midianites who had come to take his sheep, and so David fights them and kills fifteen thousand. This establishes David as a successful warrior immediately prior to the Goliath challenge. We note Pseudo-Philo emphasises David's faithful protection of his sheep, although the shepherd motif is then left aside. When Pseudo-Philo reinterprets the stones David takes to kill Goliath he says, 'And David went forth and took seven stones and wrote upon them the names of his fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, Moses and Aaron, and his own name, and the name of the Most Mighty' (*L.A.B.* LXI.1).

It is unfortunate that we do not have Pseudo-Philo's writings regarding David's anointing at Hebron to see how he rewrites that text and whether he highlights his shepherd nature at this point. Pseudo-Philo's *L.A.B.* stops near the end of Saul's life.

**2.3.4 Josephus, Antiquities**

Josephus was a Jewish historian who lived between 37-ca.100 C.E. Josephus records the story of Cain and Abel in which Cain is viewed as righteous, a follower of God, a shepherd, and excelling in virtue (refer chapter 2.1). Josephus also gives an explanation for why Abel's sacrifice was acceptable saying, 'God was more delighted with the latter oblation, when he was honored with what grew naturally of its own accord, than he was with what was the invention of a covetous man, and gotten by forcing the ground' (*Ant.* 1.54). In this Josephus lends support to the tradition in which a sacrifice of a lamb was virtuous, and a shepherd was an honourable and godly occupation.

Josephus discusses the story of David in full in *Antiquities*. From the retelling of the sacrifice at Mount Moriah, Josephus notes this is the place David would later erect the temple (Ant. 1.226). He also adds a comment at the end of Ruth's narrative that David was born of Jesse, 'because being desirous to show the power of God and how easy it is for Him to promote even ordinary folk to rank so illustrious as that which raised David, sprung from such ances-

---

tors' (*Ant.* 5.337). The retelling of David's anointing largely follows the LXX with David called a shepherd and brought out of the fields so that he can feast with the others. Josephus, like Pseudo-Philo does not make mention of David in the shepherd fields in the retelling of his entry into Saul's court, while he does record David using his staff and stones from his 'shepherd's wallet' to defeat Goliath (*Ant.* 6.185). He also convinces Saul to let him fight Goliath reasoning that God helped him in the past kill a lion that had stolen a lamb from his flock (*Ant.* 6.181-182). This tradition presents David as the faithful shepherd who defends the defenseless lamb.

The shepherd king motif at Hebron from 2 Kgdms 5:2 is absent in *Antiquities* with the military motif as the defining element. When Josephus rewrites the text of 2 Kgdms 7:18 cf., Josephus says,

> he (David) went to the ark and, falling on his face, began to worship God and render thanks to Him for all that He had for all that he had already done for him in raising him from the humble station of a shepherd to so great a height of power and glory (*Ant.* 7.94-95).

Begg notes that Josephus delays the information that David is a shepherd until his prayer of thanks. Josephus seems to downplay David's role as a shepherd and elevates the glory of his military kingship which is understandable for a Roman audience.

### 2.3.5 1 Enoch 85-90, the Animal Apocalypse

This *Animal Apocalypse* (*1 Enoch* 85-90) retells the story of Israel from the time of Adam to the fall of Jerusalem, drawing heavily on sheep/shepherd imagery in the writer's positive portrayal of the Maccabean revolt. It is dated to the period before the death of Judas (161 B.C.E.). Various animals portray characters from Israel's past in Enoch's second dream, and various images and ideas from Micah 2-5, Zechariah 9-11 and Ezekiel 34-37 appear to

---

306. There are five sons plus David in *Antiquities*, while the LXX records seven sons plus David, the setting is a feast following the sacrifice, and the Lord does not speak but the narrator says God looks on the heart and soul.


308. Collins notes the unusual place 1 Enoch 85-90 has in Jewish apocalyptic literature as it supports the armed rebellion of Judas Maccabee. Collins, *Scepter*, 34.

lie, at least in part, behind the prophecy. Collins notes, 'it envisages some kind of leader in the eschatological period, but the precise kind of leader is obscured because of the allegorical language.' The Animal Apocalypse has some similarities with Moses' song (Deut 32) where there is also the cycle of sin-punishment-repentance-salvation, and Tobit's recitation of Israel's future in the Apocalypse of Weeks. Nickelsburg suggests the Son of Man saying in Luke 12:8 (Matt 10:32-33) presents the Daniel 7 picture influenced by parables of Enoch, and the Enochic Son of Man tradition is present in Luke 17:22-37 (Matt 24:26-27) where the days are likened to Noah using flood and judgment typology (1 Enoch 53-57; 60-63).

From 1 Enoch 89:12 the motif of sheep is introduced as representative of Israel, and this sheep has twelve further sheep, the twelve tribes. As Nickelsburg points out the motif is a common biblical metaphor for Israel but what is interesting is that there are two nuances that define Enoch's sheep. Firstly, they are blinded and fall into apostasy (89:32-33, 41, 51-54, 74; 90:7) and secondly, the sheep are often helpless victims of the Gentiles who are symbolised by wild beasts. There are many other sheep/shepherd references including the seventy shepherds which reinterprets the seventy year prophecy of Jeremiah, and the three sheep who attempt to rebuild the temple (89:72) who are likely to be Joshua, Zerubbabel and Ezra or Nehemiah.

God is presented as 'the Lord of the sheep' (1 Enoch 89:16) who hears Israel's cry of oppression and 'descended at the voice of the sheep from the lofty abode, and came to them and pastured them.' The Lord of the sheep is the one who leads the sheep through the water (of the Red Sea) and 'places himself between them and the wolves' (89:24) which coheres with the picture we have seen of God in the exodus, although in 1 Enoch 89:54-90:17 the figure withdraws into the heavenly place while the sheep wander in the wilderness. He remains this distant figure until the flock is in peril at the hands of the earthly shepherds and in 1 Enoch 90:18-19 he visits again to judge the shepherds and the earth. At this time the eschatological

311. Collins, Scepter, 34.
313. Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 83-84.
house is rebuilt (90:28-29) and the sheep return and are transformed into white bulls (90:37-39). Chae notes that the Lord of the sheep is not sullied by any involvement in the bloody eschatological battle, but he gives the sheep the swords for battle, and they eventually are able to lay them down (90:34). 316

Enoch's use of the motif of sheep and the Lord of the shepherd demonstrates that these images retained freight in the Second Temple period. The Enochic style of sapiential wisdom also lends itself to the ancient motif of a faithful shepherd. God continued to be shown as the one who led Israel as a shepherd out of Egypt and God remains as shepherd (Lord of the sheep) at the eschaton.

2.4 Summary:
In this chapter we first saw how the motif of shepherd came out of the ANE culture which perceived their deities, leaders and kings as shepherds. These largely agrarian peoples were themselves shepherds and farmers living off the land, and so the motif was a natural way for them to understand the authority and care of a king or deity.

In the biblical text we noted that key early leaders were shepherds; Abel, Abram, and Moses and that traditions grew up to explain why Abel's shepherd offering was more acceptable than Cain's grain offering. We also noted that Moses' ῥάβδος is an integral feature of the exodus-wilderness story, and when Moses asks God for a new leader for the Israelites he asks, ὡσεὶ πρόβατα, οἶς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμὴν.

In the Psalms we saw that the motif had become a theological tool and many hymns reflected on God as the shepherd of his flock. In Ps 2 the motif was used to speak of God’s authority and power, and in Ps 22, the motif was used in personal terms to provide care for his sheep. We also considered that there may be a sacrificial element in the psalm with the mention of a banqueting table and with the role shepherds play in preserving a sheep's life until the time it will be slaughtered. Psalm 27 showed the shepherd as the deliverer, and in Ps 77 the motif

was used as the exodus story was recalled. The psalmist describes Moses as God's shepherd in the exodus, and David as God’s coming shepherd leader.

In Isa 40:1-11 we saw that God was present as the compassionate shepherd while also pictured as the victorious warrior. We further noted that in Isa 52:13-53:12 the motif was modified so that the servant figure and the Israelites were both now portrayed as sheep. We saw how this figure dealt with the problem of ἁµαρτία, an opening concern of the prophet (Isa 1:4).

In Micah the two salvation oracles used the shepherd king motif, and the shepherd king showed immense authority in the face of the Assyrian oppressors. The promised messianic shepherd in Mic 4:14-5:4 recalls David's story and suggests that the anticipated shepherd king was from David’s line. Further, the prophet's words were that the messianic shepherd will bring peace to the ends of the earth.

In Jeremiah the prophet used the motif extensively and polemically against the shepherds of Israel, but also to speak of God's provision of faithful shepherds for Israel (Jer 3:15; δόσω ύµίν ποιµένας κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν µου). In Jer 22:28-30 we noted the prophet's words that the kingly line of Jeconiah would cease and that God would give them instead a Davidic shepherd king who would rule with justice and righteousness for all the earth. He was the bringer of salvation and he would reunite the divided kingdom.

We then saw how Ezekiel developed the prophecy of Jeremiah in Ezek 34, and that the chapter is important to the prophet's message from judgment to hope. We noted the very sharp critique of the shepherds of Israel and how God promised that he will shepherd his own flock; he will feed them, bind up the sick and crushed, turn about the strayed and seek the lost sheep. God also promised a new Davidic shepherd king who will usher in a covenant of peace. This Davidic shepherd king is the servant of the Lord and is a king of unequalled power.

In Zechariah we noticed that this Davidic king was a suffering shepherd king. He was present with the people in a way of vicarious suffering (Zech 11:5), he was humble and righteous, the bringer of salvation and peace.
The motif continued to be used in the Second Temple Period as we considered *PssSol* 17, Philo, Pseudo-Philo, Josephus and *I Enoch*. Notably, in *PssSol* 17 the Davidic shepherd king is pictured as showing great power in his words, bringing peace and justice to the whole earth, with justice for both Jew and Gentile. Philo, in particular, presented a very positive perspective of shepherds where key leaders of Israel and especially God are described as faithful shepherds. Pseudo-Philo reinterpreted David's anointing so that it was God and not Samuel who calls for the 'shepherd' to come to in from the fields, while Josephus downplayed the story of David as shepherd choosing instead to highlight the military role of David as king. Both Pseudo-Philo and Josephus however, referred to Abel's sacrifice of a sheep as superior to Cain's grain offering. Finally, Enoch's *Animal Apocalypse* showed the story of Israel retold through the lens of the shepherd where the Lord of the sheep leads the people through the Red Sea and reappears in the same role at the eschatological battle. This demonstrated that the motif continued to resonate in various ways in the Second Temple period.

In this analysis we have seen the growth of the motif from very humble beginnings in Abel, Abram and Moses' fields, to one which embodies an important aspect of God's nature and his chosen leaders. Now we turn to the story of David as told in the Kingdoms' narrative, and will see how his shepherd heritage defines his kingship.
Chapter 3

David: The Narrative in the LXX

We have seen in our survey of the LXX and Second Temple Literature in chapter two that the motif of shepherd is one that consistently threads through the story of Israel. It is attributed to leaders such as Moses and David, but it is used also of the Lord who is the faithful shepherd for the Israelites. The roots of the shepherd motif in history are divine and royal.

We turn now to the story of David as told in the book of Kingdoms, for David is the most prominent shepherd figure in the biblical narrative. In Aristotelian fashion, the beginning, the middle and the end of his story are defined by his identity as shepherd. As W. Brueggemann says, 'the entire narrative of David's rise is staged from shepherd boy (1 Kgdms 16:11) to shepherd king.' To talk of David is to talk of his story as the faithful shepherd king of Israel. Yet, this study suggests it is not only in the story of David's rise that the motif is significant, but the on-going story of David maintains the shepherd motif as a narrative thread even to the final event in David's life where he sins in counting God's people and says to the Lord, ἐγὼ εἰμি ὁ ποιμήν (2 Kgdms 24:17). The writer of Kingdoms clearly understands that from David's earliest introduction to the final curtain call in the narrative, he is a shepherd. This chapter aims to highlight this aspect of David's story using narrative methodology. This will involve examining several pericopae which are known as the 'History of David's Rise' (HDR). This narrative unit begins with David's election and anointing by Samuel (1

317. The book of Kingdoms (rather than Chronicles) gives the fullest expression of the David story, and recounts the history of David's rise from shepherd boy to shepherd king, therefore this will be the focus of this study. In ch. 4 I will defend examining the story of David from the book of Kingdoms due to the intertextual echoes heard in Luke's infancy narrative.
319. Leonhard Rost (1926) first identified David's rise to power (1 Kgdms 16 – 2 Kgdms 5) as a discrete unit in the book of Samuel, alongside the ark narrative (1 Sam 4:1b-7:1) and David's court history (2 Sam 9 – 1 Ki 2). Artur Weiser (1966) explored the thematic unity of David's rise by demonstrating the purpose of the unit as focusing on David's lawful succession to the throne of Israel. P. Kyle McCarter’s essay 'The Apology of David,' (1980) considered the central feature of the unit as an apology, a position which is still considered favourably. McCarter however, does question the inclusion of 1 Kgdms 16:1-13, suggesting it is formally linked to Saul's rejection, but Tsumura rightly notes the ending at 15:35 allows for the HDR to begin at 16:1. Leonhard Rost, Das kleine Credo und andere Studien zum Alten Testament
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Kgdms 16:1-13), David’s entry into Saul’s kingly court (16:14-23), his battle with Goliath (17), David's public rise and Saul's public decline (18:6-16), and finally, at the end of the unit, David’s anointing as shepherd king over all Israel (2 Kgdms 5:1-10). Yet, while these passages are very significant to the Kingdoms' narrative as they firmly establish David's identity as shepherd at the beginning of the narrative, the motif of shepherd continues in David's life. Therefore, we will go on to consider the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:1-17), Nathan's parable to David after his first recorded sin (2 Kgdms 12), and finally, at the end of David's life in his sin at the census (2 Kgdms 24). These pericopae will help us see that Brueggemann is correct to say 'to talk of David is to talk of his story as the faithful shepherd king of Israel.'

### 3.1 Literary Features in 'The History of David's Rise'

We first meet David as a young faithful shepherd to his father’s sheep in 1 Kgdms 16, the first story in the HDR. The unit 1 Kgdms 16-2 Kgdms 5 is marked by a recurring and cumulative interest in David as a shepherd, with both the beginning and the end highlighting David’s identity as shepherd. This creates a literary inclusio where the first identity the reader is presented with is David as a shepherd, and then this same motif is reiterated at the conclusion of the narrative, providing an intentional return of the motif. Bar-Efrat is correct when he says, 'contrary to real life no accidental and irrelevant facts are included and the incidents are connected with each other both temporally and causally.' This interest in David as a shepherd in the HDR has been clearly structured.

---


321. Tony W. Cartledge, 1 & 2 Samuel (Smyth and Helwys Bible Commentary; Macon: Smyth and Helwys, 2001), 199; Brueggemann, First and Second Samuel, 120.

322. Willitts has explored this motif where the early narrative shows David’s youth and inexperience as a shepherd and in 2 Sam 5:2 where he is a military and political shepherd ruler. His emphasis is on the political ramifications of the shepherd king motif and ultimately shows this in the context of Matthew’s Gospel. See Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 4, 54-58.

David is repeatedly introduced in the first three stories in the HDR. These repeated introductions could suggest a multiplicity of sources, yet as we consider the narrative’s final form, it is most likely that the author uses the reintroduction of David as a repetitive device whereby the reader engages with varying aspects of David's life. This leads us to the conclusion that the writer has carefully crafted the reader's first impressions of David, and we may assume events have been chosen and ordered to suit the author's purposes.

In the first story we meet David the shepherd boy (1 Kgdms 16:1-13), then David the musician (16:14-23), and finally, David the victorious warrior (17). Unity is found across the three pericopae through the motif of shepherd which is the common feature of the three stories. As Brueggemann also points out, these three stories parallel Saul's life where the reader is also introduced to him in three events. We meet Saul in his secret anointing (1 Kgdms 9:1-10:16), in his public recognition (10:17-27) and in his military victory (11:1-15). Saul and David’s stories are clearly paralleled and one helps inform the other. Saul's anointing and actions as king function as foils to David's anointing and actions as king, the cumulative effect of which points to Saul's deficiency and David’s suitability as God's elect ruler. However, the feature which unifies the opening of the HDR, as I will demonstrate, is David's repeated identity as a shepherd ruler.

The ordering of the unit is also significant as Sternberg's work on the *primacy effect* demonstrates (see chapter 1.2). The initial setting and characterisation is the hermeneutical filter the author provides for the reader to understand the wider narrative trajectory. David’s entrance onto the narrative stage as a shepherd boy therefore, is clearly an intentional choice of the author, the repetitive use of the motif demonstrates the author's interest in the motif, and the use of the *inclusio* is a clear indication that the motif has relevance to the wider narrative.

327. Brueggemann, *First and Second Samuel*, 120.
As Sternberg has shown, this motif will not be accidental but is provided for rhetorical effect. We will now turn to these individual narratives, highlighting the motif of shepherd.

3.2 David the Shepherd in the HDR (1 Kgdms 16:1-2 Kgdms 5)

3.2.1 David as Shepherd of his Father's Flock (1 Kgdms 16:1-13)
The setting for David's introduction has been prepared by the story of Samuel’s miraculous birth and his career as prophet whereby he is the one who anoints the first king of Israel Saul, and most especially, his successor and God's elect king David. We do not meet David until after Saul is rejected as king (1 Kgdms 15) when the Lord sends Samuel to anoint a new king from the house of Jesse the Bethlehemite (16:1). This is the highlight of Samuel's career, and his final and most significant prophetic task. In many respects this may also be seen as a long prelude before David is anointed king. The narrative is structured carefully so that Saul and David's anointing as king are paralleled and contrasted, with David's anointing from the shepherd fields ultimately shown as superior. I will now demonstrate this.

Firstly, we note that Saul is anointed king privately in 1 Kgdms 9-10, and David’s anointing is also in the privacy of his own family (16:13). Secondly, in 1 Kgdms 9 the Lord sends the one to be anointed to Samuel, while in 1 Kgdms 16 the Lord sends Samuel to the one to be anointed (16:1).

Thirdly, both individuals are anointed with oil while the container used in the anointings by Samuel varies. In David's story Samuel takes a horn of oil (κέρας τοῦ ἑλαίου) and in Saul's anointing he takes a container of cooking oil (φακὸν τοῦ ἑλαίου; 1 Kgdms 10:1). It has been suggested that the two containers point to David's anointing as superior and Saul's as deficient. Κέρας signifies considerable strength while φακός means either lentils or a container that is in the shape of lentils. It is, therefore, a household object of no particular in-

332. κέρας is the horn of an animal, and it often represents a symbol of might or strength. GELS, 395.
333. φακός means 'lentil' (Gen 25:34) while it can also mean a 'container looking like a lentil.' GELS,
terest. Κέρας is used repeatedly in the biblical narrative with respect to sacrificial offerings or the tabernacle (Gen 22:13; Exod 27:2; 29:12; 30:2, 3, 10; Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 34; 8:15). Conversely φακός occurs only ten times in the LXX, and in all but Jehu's anointing in 4 Kgdms 9:1 and 3 relates to objects from everyday life (Gen 25:34; 1 Kgdms 26:11, 12, 16; 2 Kgdms 17:28; 23:11; Ezek 4:9). Furthermore, while it is used of Jehu's anointing as king, Jehu is yet another example of a king who fails in his role and whose kingship is marred (4 Kgdms 9:11-31). It is therefore a possibility that the object of anointing does symbolise the nature of the king's reign. Like Saul, Jehu too will fail in his role as king, while David is positioned as a superior king who the Lord continues to bless. The use of the two words therefore does show some evidence that the writer may be accentuating the superiority of David’s anointing.

Fourthly, the details of Saul and David's physical appearance continue the narrative contrast. In 1 Kgdms 16:7 the reader hears the divine voice say that God does not look upon the human attributes of appearance and size as criteria in the election of a king. This directly corresponds with the information given about Saul's appearance at his anointing when he is described as handsome and tall (9:2; 10:23). Therefore, when Eliab is rejected by God due to his external appearance (16:6), this resonates with the story of Saul who has been rejected as king. The narrative also uses ἐξουδενόω to describe both Saul and Eliab's rejection as king (15:23, 26; 16:1, 7) which is contrasted by the ἐκλέγω of David. Saul was chosen by human criteria in the same way Samuel was quick to choose Eliab due to his appearance. However, David is chosen by God who views the heart.

This internal contrast is further accentuated in the repetitive use of ὀράω, where the reader is encouraged to see David's election through God's eyes. The first two pericopae of the HDR both use the verb ὀράω in the context of election (1 Kgdms 16:1, 6, 7, 17 [twice], 18), and the idea of sight becomes a guiding feature of the text where God is the one who truly sees a person. 1 Kgdms 16:1 opens with God sending Samuel to Jesse ὅτι ἐḋρακα ἐν τοῖς υἱοῖς...
αὐτοῦ ἔμοι βασιλέως. God has already seen the one who will become king. 1 Kingdoms 16:7 tells the reader that David’s election is based on what God sees, ὅτι ἀνθρωπος ὄψεται εἰς πρόσωπον, ὁ δὲ θεός ὄψεται εἰς καρδίαν. Again ὄραω is used in David's selection as a musician for Saul’s court when Saul says to look (ὀράω) for a suitable man, and the servant responds Ἰδοὺ ἔρακα ύιόν τῷ Ιεσσαί Βηθλεεμίτην (16:17). The linguistic use of ὄραω thus links the two texts and shows God's point of view in David's election as king and his suitability to come into Saul's court.

Fifthly, another contrast between Saul and David relates to the use of the word ποίμνιον. The reason the Lord replaces Saul as king is because he has kept some of the Amalekites' ποίμνια when the Lord asked him to kill all living things (1 Kgdms 15:9, 14, 15, 21). As these references demonstrate, the narrative repeats ποίμνιον four times in this pericope showing a linguistic emphasis. Even though Saul's intention for these sheep was to give them as a sacrifice to the Lord, this act seals his downfall and is clearly contrasted to David, who is introduced as a faithful shepherd to Jesse's ποίμνιον. It may also be of note that the verb ποιμαίνω is used to describe David but it is never used of Saul (1 Kgdms 16:11; 2 Kgdms 5:2; 7:7; 1 Chron 11:2). Thus 1 Kgdms 15 is the defining event in Saul's demise as king, and the entry point whereby the narrative introduces the new king, the faithful ποιμήν David.

These parallels and contrasts are built up over a long narrative period, and ultimately point to God's choice of David to be the king for Israel. In 1 Kgdms 16:1-13 the reader hears that God’s chosen one is Jesse's youngest son, a ποιμήν (16:11), ruddy337 with beautiful eyes and of good appearance to the Lord (16:12). The narrative describes the youth's appearance, and yet in 16:7 the Lord explicitly stated that it was not the outward appearance that mattered to God. This could suggest that God is fickle and has changed his mind, or that the author admired David so much that he included details of his good looks anyway.338 With the close


337. Esau (Gen 25:25) is also called 'ruddy.' This colour was the ANE's typical colour of men, and including this information points to David's destiny as a hero. Tsumura, Samuel, 423.

338. Scholars quickly note the irony here, but generally suggest that the author's admiration for David is such that the information was included anyway. Brueggemann, First and Second Samuel, 122; Cartledge, 1 and 2 Samuel, 202; Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 184; Klein, 1 Samuel, 161.
narrative proximity of such contradictory statements however, I suggest that there may be another explanation. It may be possible that it is the other attributes of David listed in 16:11 that indicate why he is chosen as Israel's new king, and these attributes outplay the details of his appearance. Appearance, as 16:7 says, is no indicator of the state of the heart. So what are these other attributes?

The two other attributes of David are that he is the youngest of Jesse's sons, and he is ποιμήν. The textual focus on David's shepherd background will continue to be important, and so it is quite possible that this information is significant here.339 As Firth notes, the knowledge that David was with the sheep may have created a sense of hope as ANE kings routinely style themselves as shepherds,340 and Alter writes, 'the tending of flocks will have symbolic implication for the future leader of Israel.'341 As we will come to see, when David is anointed king he will be named as shepherd king (2 Kgdms 5:2) and therefore, it may be possible that it is this knowledge that is more significant than the reference to David's physical appearance.

Furthermore, being young was not a barrier to serving God. The exodus narrative leads us to understand that Moses was protected by God as a young baby so that he would later be able to rescue the Israelite people from slavery in Egypt (Exod 1-3). Similarly, Joshua was Moses' young assistant when he was chosen to lead the Israelites across the Jordan and into Canaan (Exod 33:11). David's youth has kept him hidden in the narrative thus far,342 but now his youth is removed as a barrier to his kingship.

In 1 Kgdms 16:13 Samuel anoints David in the midst of his brothers, while his destiny as king is known only to Samuel. The reason the Lord gives for the anointing is simply that David is ἄγαθος. The Spirit springs upon him at this point as with Saul (1 Kgdms 10:6, 9), but remains with him unlike Saul, from whom the Spirit departed (1 Kgdms 16:14). It is only

339. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 184; Klein, 1 Samuel, 161. Contra, Tsumura, Samuel, 422. Tsumura believes the roles of shepherd and king are contrasted in 2 Sam 7:8 and so it is unlikely here that there is any sense of David's future role being alluded to. However, this position seems unlikely as shepherd and king are linked in 2 Kgdms 5:1-3.
340. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 184.
342. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 184-185.
after the anointing that David is named in the account. Until then he was known only as Jesse’s youngest son and the ποιμήν of his flock.

3.2.2 From the Shepherd Fields to Saul’s Court (1 Kgdms 16:14-23)
The story of David's election and anointing (1 Kgdms 16:1-13) and David at Saul's court (16:14-23) are closely related,343 and this narrative relationship strengthens the repeated information in the text that David is a shepherd. The story immediately shifts from David who has the Spirit on him, to Saul, from whom the Spirit has departed and who is now tormented by an evil spirit.344 The interplay of good and bad spirits forms a transition that links the two texts, as it is through this pivot in the narrative that Saul and David are brought together, and the sovereignty of God over all spirits is shown.

The court attendants set about solving the problem of the evil spirit tormenting Saul and one attendant proposes finding a skilful musician whose music can alleviate the king's distress. The son of Jesse is suggested and after his resume is given, David is summoned. David is so successful in Saul's court that Saul asks Jesse if he might remain with him. David then becomes Saul's trusted armour-bearer and musician.

Questions have been raised regarding how a servant of Saul knew so much about a youth from an insignificant Judean village such as Bethlehem.345 While no definitive answer can be given, this information does paint David as having the necessary attributes for a future king. The list certainly suggests he is being pictured as the ideal king, and one whom the text makes clear is Jesse’s shepherd.

This pericope both introduces new information about David and repeats details we have already heard (16:18). The servant describes David as συνετός conveying the sense of sage-

344. The concept of an evil spirit παρὰ κυρίου is a difficult one. For a full discussion see Tsumura, Samuel, 427-428.
345. Bodner, 1 Samuel, 173; Brueggemann, First and Second Samuel, 125.
like wisdom or being able to understand with discernment, as πολεμιστής, information that will be important in the following chapter, and as σοφὸς λόγῳ.

The repeated information is that he is a shepherd (1 Kgdms 16:11, 19), that the Lord is with him (16:13, 18) and he is good in appearance (16:12, 18). The phrase used in 1 Kgdms 16:18 which shows the Lord's favour is ὁ κύριος μετ' αὐτοῦ, a phrase that will become an important refrain in the narrative (16:18; 17:37; 18:14; 18; 2 Kgdms 5:10), and an attribute that marks David out as a leader divinely endowed to be king. The text notes David as having a ἀγαθὸς ὄρασι κυρίῳ (1 Kgdms 16:12), and ἀνὴρ ἅγαθος τῷ εἴδει (1 Kgdms 16:18), with ἅγαθος perhaps providing a contrast to Saul in 16:14 who was tormented by πνεῦμα πονηρός. In 1 Kgdms16:11 we have already heard that David πομαίνει ἐν τῷ πομηνίῳ and now in this pericope we hear it affirmed that David is ἐν τῷ πομηνίῳ when Saul calls for him (16:19). It is Saul who says, Απόστειλον πρός με τὸν υἱόν σου Δαυὶδ τὸν έν τῷ πομηνίῳ σου, which informs the reader that Saul knows David is a shepherd even though this is not listed in the resume of 16:18. These words function as elements of a Leitwort that keep the reader's attention on David's heritage as a shepherd. As Bar-Efrat points out repetition serves to emphasise an important aspect in the story and hints at implied meanings. As Garsiel comments, biblical narrators are very sparing of physical descriptions unless they are relevant to events. Freedman's tests for a significant motif note that the frequency and the placement of the motif at key points in a narrative strengthen its efficacy. Here both criteria are satisfied. Therefore, these first two introductory stories both describe David as a shepherd which indicates that these details are of narrative importance and are likely to have a significant meaning.

346. 'συνετός,' BDAG, 970.
347. In 1 Kings 17:37 Saul says to David, καὶ ἔσται κύριος μετὰ σοῦ, making this a verbally similar but not exact repetition.
348. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 189; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 281; Tsumura, Samuel, 430.
349. Alter, Art of Biblical Narrative, 92-97, 148; Buber, Scripture and Translation, 114-128; Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art, 136, 212; Amit, 'Leading Word,' 99-114; Freedman, 'Literary Motif,' 123-131; Rowe, Early Narrative Christology 197-199.
In Summary: the picture the reader forms of David is of a wise and prudent shepherd, full of the Spirit and who is well prepared to take his place as king.

### 3.2.3 David fights Goliath (1 Kgdms 17)

The LXX\(^8\) version of chapter 17 is forty six percent shorter than the MT and provides a series of events that show a greater sense of temporal chronology than the MT while also keeping a tight focus on details of David's words and actions in battle.\(^352\) The MT involves greater complications with vv. 55-58 revealing that Saul does not know of David even though the narrative has already shown him as a member of Saul’s court (16:14-23). However, both accounts show signs of narrative shaping, and the 'dischronologising' adds to the authorial picture of David showing that the author has chosen what events the reader will hear first.\(^353\) This will affect how the reader shapes their view of the character and will form a filter for how to interpret later events. While the narrative is cohesive, the story is linked to the previous two by recalling David's youth as a shepherd boy.

This pericope is especially important in the greater narrative unit from shepherd boy to shepherd king, as it is the turning point in David's rise as king. We know it is a turning point because it is David's entrance onto the public stage and it is from this place that popular support is given to David over Saul. There is a sharp theological focus in the narrative and David's great victory in battle is attributed to the Lord's power rather than his own strength. From this place in the HDR, David's destiny as a leader for Israel is sealed and it is only a matter of time before Saul is brought down and David anointed king.

The story of David and Goliath is a story that continues the focus on David as a shepherd and explains to the reader how this background makes him suitable to become God's chosen shepherd for all Israel. How then does this text show David's identity as shepherd?

---

352. There are several manuscripts of the LXX, among which one of the earliest manuscripts, LXX\(^8\) (Codex Vaticanus), is the most direct witness to the Old Greek. It omits 1 Kgdms 17:12-31, 41, 48b, 50, 55-58; 18:1-5, 10-11, 12b, 17-19, 21b, 30. This shorter narrative is marked by its coherence of story line and economy in style and is followed here. For a survey of the textual issues regarding which is the original text see Johan Lust, 'The Story of David and Goliath in Hebrew and Greek,' Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 59 (1983): 5-25; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 306-309; For a narrative review see Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 194.

353. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 180-181; McCarter, 1 Samuel, 306-309; Tsumura, Samuel, 434-437.
Firstly, there is repetition of direct shepherding language which draws the reader back to David's anointing story. David is ποιμανόν ἶν ὁ δοῦλος σου and ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ (17:34), and he puts his stones ἐν τῷ καφῶ τῷ ποιμενικῷ (17:40). This linguistic pastoral motif works to highlight David as a shepherd, and to link the story to the previous chapter where the same language is used.

It is not just these direct uses of ποιμνή cognates that keep the readers' focus on matters pastoral, since the author takes substantial narrative space to vividly describe the outdoor setting for the battle on the mountains and valley at Sokchoth in great detail (17:1-3). Here the reader is encouraged to imagine the pastoral battle scene εἰς Σοκχωθ τῆς Ιουδαίας (17:1), David's home territory.

Similarly, considerable narrative space is given to a detailed description of Goliath and his armoury (17:4-7), which is contrasted with David's shepherd identity. This builds suspense and creates the idea that Goliath could not be beaten in battle, as it details the immense physical preparedness of Goliath for battle. For example, the reader learns he is wearing a helmet, and he has a coat of chain mail of bronze and iron weighing five thousand shekels (57 kg). He has moulded bronze greaves to protect his legs, a bronze shield protecting his shoulders, an immense spear of iron weighing approximately 6.8 kg and he even has a man who went before him to carry his armour.

The biblical narrative does not often give such detailed descriptions of physical appearance, and therefore, when the text lingers over these details, the differences between the two main characters who are described are accentuated. Thus we have Goliath the heavily armed and physically imposing warrior, set against David the young shepherd, who is armed only with the natural objects of a shepherd. McCarter concludes it, 'emphasises further the inequality of the coming contest... (and) to divulge to the alert reader the one vulnerable spot on the giant's body, viz. his forehead. It is this undefended spot David exploits with the simple weapons of a shepherd. He takes his shepherd staff, a sling and five smooth stones, which

---

354. Klein, 1 Samuel, 179; Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 55.
355. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 196; Tsumura, Samuel, 442; Bar-Efrat, Narrative Art, 121.
356. Tsumura, Samuel, 442.
357. Tsumura, Samuel, 442-444.
358. McCarter, 1 Samuel, 292.
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Firth suggests are likely the size of tennis balls, from the wadi (17:40).\textsuperscript{359} While a sling was a homemade weapon most youths in the fields would have carried, it was also a military weapon common in the ANE. Egyptian evidence from the second millennium B.C.E. records the sling as a military weapon,\textsuperscript{360} and Judges 20:16 records seven hundred ambidextrous slingers who could all throw a stone at a hair and not miss. David clearly had confidence in his tools of shepherding, while the text is also clear that his greater confidence was in the Lord’s ability to bring victory in battle (17:37). Therefore, the detailed description of the skilled mighty warrior with all the up-to-date technology\textsuperscript{361} poses a suggestive comparison to the faith-filled shepherd armed only with a shepherd's pouch.\textsuperscript{362} As David is the clear hero of the story, Goliath's long description ultimately functions to accentuate David’s success in battle.

Secondly, the plot of the story gives details of David's earlier years as a shepherd. David claims that his ability to fight Goliath is due to his success in fighting bears and lions during his shepherding years (17:34-37). 'David’s boast' is divided into two sections. In the first part, David describes the dangerous aspects of a shepherd’s life (17:34-35), and in the second part, David appeals to the evidence of this shepherd experience as suitable preparation for fighting Goliath (17:36-37).\textsuperscript{363} This repeated information is in dialogue form which slows the narrative down, and is the first time we hear David speak. These are both important features of this text.\textsuperscript{364} In the text David suggests to Saul that his years as his father's shepherd have prepared him as an expert warrior, and that he has already met with victory over the lion and

\textsuperscript{359} Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 199.
\textsuperscript{360} Tsumura, Samuel, 460.
\textsuperscript{361} Goliath was clearly tall and imposing, but his height suggests about 6 ft. 9 in. rather than the legendary 'Giant.' His bronze helmet was not typical of Philistine amour which favoured a feather headdress and may have been from a surrounding nation. His armour of chain-mail, a coat of bronze and iron, bronze leg coverings, and bronze shield will have made an imposing sight. The five thousand shekels of bronze will have made speed difficult. Goliath’s weaponry is a spear with a heavy iron point which was supported by an armour bearer. Firth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 196; Tsumura, Samuel, 442-444.
\textsuperscript{364} Polzin, Samuel and the Deuteronomist, 169.
the bear. This information is given three times (17:34, 36, 37) making David's first speech lengthy and conveying some measure of narrative weight.

Finally, the narrative plot demonstrates that David perceives his spirituality and his shepherding as intimately connected. David explains that his success as a shepherd warrior came from the Lord’s protection, and so he shows confidence that God will protect him against Goliath (1 Kgdms 17:37). It is notable that the narrative describes David's clothing and armour as that of a shepherd, and this suggests that in fighting Goliath, his years as a shepherd have also spiritually prepared him for battle. We see this also when David says to Goliath, 'The Lord does not save by spear and sword; for the battle is the Lord and he will ultimately give you into our hand' (17:47). Thus, this section of the narrative ends with David reaching into his shepherd's pouch and taking the stone that kills Goliath. This links the power of the name of the Lord with David's identity as shepherd and recalls David's earlier ability to fight off Saul’s evil spirits (16:14-23). Both textual units maintain the connection between David as a shepherd and his faithfulness to the Lord.

In Summary: We have another textual narrative where David is highlighted as a shepherd, and where he defeats Goliath with the simple weapons of a shepherd empowered by the Spirit of the living God. After this pericope Saul quickly starts to lose power (1 Kgdms 18:7), displays ungodly attributes (18:8; 20:30), is ravaged by evil spirits and tries to kill David (18:11; 19:10) and consults a medium (1 Kgdms 28). He eventually commits suicide (31:4). David, in contrast, finds success with Michal and Jonathan (18:28; 20:42; 23:17-18), in battle (18:7, 13-16; 23:1-15; 2 Kgdms 3:1), over evil (16:23; 17:47) and finally over Saul.

3.2.4 David's Public Rise and Saul's Public Decline (1 Kgdms 18:6-16)

This new section is really a coda to the epic fight from 1 Kgdms 17. Here the reader hears of the public response to David's victory, the rise of regard for David, and Saul's suspicion and fear of David. The shepherd theme is further strengthened through an intertextual link to Num 27:17.

365. Cartledge, 1 and 2 Samuel, 218-219; Klein, 1 Samuel, 179; Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 55.
In this passage David’s victory over Goliath is met with rejoicing from the women who were dancing and singing, ἔπάταξεν Σαουλ ἐν χιλιάσιν αὐτοῦ καὶ Δαυιδ ἐν μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ (1 Kgdms 18:7). This refrain continues the contrast between Saul and David from the previous two pericopae, but whereas the contrast was private, now the contrast is public. Alter comments,

It is a fixed rule of biblical poetry that when a number occurs in the first verset, it must be increased in the parallel verset, often, as here, by one decimal place. Saul shows himself a good reader of biblical poetry: he understands perfectly well that the convention is a vehicle of meaning, and that the intensification or magnification characteristic of the second verset is used to set David’s triumphs above his own. Saul, who earlier had made the mistake of listening to the voice of the people, now is enraged by the people's words. 366

The contrast is further evident in the fear Saul exhibits of David (1 Kgdms 18:12), as opposed to David who shows no fear as he went out and in before the people (18:13, 16). It is ironic that, because of his fear, Saul sends David out to be an officer of a thousand, the number the narrative has linked to Saul’s poetic battle tally in 18:7, yet the result of this is that David gains even greater popular support. From this point in the narrative Saul's public decline begins and inversely, David's rise begins.

The use of ἐξεπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο ἐμπροσθὲν τοῦ λαοῦ suggests an intertextual link to Num 27:15-17 where Moses asks God to appoint his successor for the congregation who will,

ἐξελεύσεται πρὸ προσώπων αὐτῶν καὶ ὡς ἐστι ἡ συναγωγὴ κυρίου ὡσεὶ πρόβατα, οἷς ἐστιν ποιμήν.

go out before them and come in before them... so that the congregation of the Lord shall not be like sheep without a shepherd.

The writer of Kingdoms refers to the first part of Moses' words where David goes out and in before the people, but I suggest this clear allusion to the Moses story brings with it the met-

---

366. Alter, David Story, 113. Contra, McCarter who suggests the couplet shows equality rather than priority as in Ps 90:7, while he agrees that for David to be considered Saul’s equal was enough of a threat to create suspicion and jealousy. McCarter, 1 Samuel, 311-312; Cartledge, 1 and 2 Samuel, 230.

367. McCarter, 1 Samuel, 313; Tsumura, Samuel, 480; Willitts, Messianic Shepherd-King, 56-57; Chae, Davidic Shepherd, 27.
aleptic voice of 'the sheep without a shepherd.' There is good evidence for an intertextual link here.

Firstly, the same pattern of going out and coming in is used in Num 17:15 while Numbers uses the verbs ἐξέρχομαι and εἰσέρχομαι and Kingdoms uses ἐκπορεύω and εἰσπορεύω. The notion of 'going out and coming in' within a battle context will be used again by the writer of Kingdoms in 1 Kgdms 8:20; 29:6; 2 Kgdms 3:25; 5:2, 24. This may have been prefigured in Exod 3:8 when Moses brings them out (ἐξῆλθον) and in (εἰσῆλθον), as this expression of going out and coming in, 'is often used to describe military movements led by the shepherd' (cf. Exod 3:10, 11, 17; 6:6, 13, 26; 7:5; 12:42; 17:3; 23:23; Num 20:5; Deut 4:38; 20:1; 21:10; 28:25; Judg 4:14; 2 Kgdms 5:2, 24; 4 Kgdms 19:9). Chae therefore describes this, 'technical language for a shepherd’s role that echoes YHWH’s own redemptive leadership.'

Secondly, ἐξπορεύετο καὶ εἰσεπορεύετο ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ λαοῦ is used twice in the Kingdoms narrative (1 Kgdms 18:13, 16). This double usage strengthens the phrase’s efficacy and also encourages the reader to: (1) take careful note of what it encases; and (2) ask why it is important enough to be used twice. The material the repeated phrase encases is another comparison between David and Saul. The narrative says David was prudent and the Lord was with him (16:14), and Saul noted David acted prudently and Saul was afraid (18:15).

Thirdly, the rhetorical stress the writer places on the phrase by sandwiching it around the refrain κύριος μετ’ αὐτοῦ should not be underestimated. David’s story begins with the spirit rushing on him and staying with him (16:13) and the refrain κύριος μετ’ αὐτοῦ is used to describe him in 1 Kgdms 16:18 and 2 Kgdms 5:10. It is knowledge that the Lord was with David that confirmed to the Israelites that David was the chosen king for Israel (2 Kgdms 5:2). Furthermore, there are similarities between the textual units of Num 27:15-23 and 1 Kgdms 16-18, as Joshua is filled with the Spirit and commissioned by the priest Eleazar to lead the Israelite people (Num 27:18-23), and the Spirit is on David and he is anointed by the priest Samuel to lead the Israelite people (1 Kgdms 16:13). Joshua is an important figure in Israel’s history as he leads the Israelites into the promised land, and this parallel suggests

---

368. Tsumura, Samuel, 480.
David is being presented as another significant figure who is leading the Israelite people by the power of the God's Spirit.

Fourthly, as a considerable part of 1 Kingdoms describes David's rise as shepherd king of Israel, then it is quite conceivable that the writer might appeal to the story of Moses' request for a shepherd leader for Israel in Num 27:17 when defending the rise of David the shepherd. Hollander notes that the 'revisionary power of allusive echo generates new figuration.' Moses is the defining figure in the exodus, and his story held great significance for the nation of Israel. It is plausible therefore, that the writer used an intertextual link to strengthen a defense of David's legitimate rise to power.

Finally, there is awareness among scholars who also make this intertextual link between 1 Kgdms 18:6-16 and Num 27:15-17. Chae notes the same intertextual link in 2 Kgdms 5:2 and that 'the OT usage of shepherd imagery for human leaders finds its ideal type in the son of Jesse (2 Kgdms 5:2; 7:5-7, 12-16). Firth does not make this link while he does suggest that the women dancing and singing are reminiscent of Miriam (Exod 15:20-21) and that this shows the victory is from the Lord. This early exodus story may in fact strengthen the likelihood of the echo of Num 27:17, as both are stories of Moses and the exodus.

This makes the link viable through Hays' test for echoes (see chapter 1.2), providing good evidence that the shepherd motif continues into chapter 18. This forms the final narrative where David is foregrounded as shepherd in the beginning of the HDR. As the narrative moves to show David's military rise and his eventual succession as king, the reader is given the knowledge that David comes prepared for the role through his years as a shepherd. From the opening scene where he is shepherding his father's flock, to being brought into Saul's court from the fields, to fighting Goliath and winning dressed and armed as a shepherd, we finally have David being likened to Moses who shepherded Israel in the wilderness. In the days of Moses, the shepherd God chose was Joshua (Num 27:18) but now in this new period of Is-
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rael's history it is David who is called to shepherd God's flock. This is divinely sealed by the Spirit who is with David as he leads the people of God in and out.

3.2.5 David anointed as Shepherd King (2 Kgdms 5:1-10)

In 2 Kgdms 5:1-10 we find the conclusion of the long narrative of David's rise and this is brought to a climax with Israel's identification of him as their shepherd ruler. David had already been anointed king over Judah at Hebron (2 Kgdms 2:4) and now the northern elders recognise that all the tribes of Israel have a flesh and blood relationship and so formalise this unity with David as king. They acknowledge that even when Saul was king, it was David who had led them out and in (cf., 1 Kgdms 8:20; Num 27:17), and therefore that he was already functioning as the leader in their midst. As we have seen this appeal has an intertextual echo with the story of Moses, and it appears that in David, the elders of Israel have indeed discerned an important leader. Chae writes, 'once again we discover the language of "leading out" and "leading in" clearly associated with the shepherd image.'

In anointing David as shepherd king, the elders specify that this is the one of whom the Lord said, 'It is you who shall shepherd (ποιμανεῖς) my people Israel, and it is you who shall become a ruler over Israel' (2 Kgdms 5:2). By placing the words into the mouth of the Lord, the narrative draws attention to the significance of David's title and role. Furthermore, this recalls David's initial call in 1 Kgdms 16, and creates a narrative inclusio which began with the earlier stories of David as shepherd of his father's flock.

This central statement in 1 Kgdms 5:2 is surrounded by a repetition of information. In 5:1 we read that all the tribes of Israel came to David and then in 5:3 that all the elders of Israel came to him. Some scholars have questioned if there were two source traditions used by the MT at this point and suggest that 5:1-2 are an independent tradition which was added later to 5:3.
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However, a narrative reading shows that this repetition is more likely to be a rhetorical device which functions to draw attention to the central saying in 5:2 where David is named as the Lord's shepherd king. Alter labels this device as resumptive repetition and further notes, the move to confirm David as king of Israel, with which the episode began, after the insertion of the tribes' dialogue (vv. 1, 2) is carried forward. It is the role of the tribal rank and file to proclaim fealty, but of the elders to sign a pact and anoint David, and so 'elders' is now substituted for 'tribes' of the first verse. David is the one the Lord has chosen for Israel and as Firth astutely notes, this repetition foregrounds David's status as shepherd ruler of Israel. The language for ruler in 5:2 is ἡγούμενον (to lead, rule) while 5:3 uses βασιλεύς. Cartledge suggests the possibility that when the tribes came to David at Hebron, they may have been 'dancing around the use of the word king' with the intention to limit David's power, then in an older tradition, represented by 5:3 there are no qualms using the word. Firth suggests David served a preparatory status as 'leader' but in 5:3, is now named as king. However, ἡγούμενον will be used of David again in 2 Kgdms 6:21 so Firth's suggestion is not likely, and it appears the two terms are used interchangeably.

Therefore, in understanding the nature of David who will be known as Israel's greatest king, we must do this within the understanding of him as the Lord's shepherd king. Firstly, that is the identity that the Lord directly verbalises in 2 Kgdms 5:2. Secondly, David's shepherd identity is introduced when the reader first meets him in 1 Kgdms 16 giving the information some semantic force through the pronymacy effect. This satisfies Freedman's criterion for a Leitwort whereby its placement at significant points adds to the efficacy of the motif. Thirdly, we note that the narrative framework in the HDR uses an inclusio, whereby David is anointed king while he is a shepherd of Jesse's flock at the beginning of the unit, and he is named as shepherd king when the elders anoint him shepherd king at the end of the unit. This too ad-
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hers to Freedman's criterion, and also demonstrates a level of relevance for the motif for the narrative unit. Fourthly, the volume of repetition of this shepherd identity in the HDR suggests this motif is important for the writer and finally, the motif of shepherd is highly appropriate for God's choice of king as it suggests a leader who shows care, provision and protection. These combined literary features suggest Brueggemann is correct in saying that, 'the entire narrative of David's rise is staged from shepherd boy to shepherd king,' and furthermore, that the HDR sets the standard for David's ongoing kingship.

3.3 The Davidic Covenant and Beyond

There are three further passages where the shepherd motif is visible and all are significant to the wider story of David. The first is the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:1-17; cf. 1 Chron 17:4-14), the second is in a parable when David's first sin as king is recorded (2 Kgdms 12) and the third is David’s sin over the census (2 Kgdms 24:15-17). Each is significant and point to the on-going nature of David's reign where he is the shepherd of the people.

3.3.1 The Davidic Covenant (2 Kgdms 7:1-17)

In the Davidic 'covenant' the eternal nature of the Davidic kingdom is described with reference to David’s shepherd roots. The narrative recalls the Lord's words to David, Ἔλαβόν σε ἐκ τῆς µάνδρας τῶν προβάτων τοῦ εἶναι σε εἰς ἣγοµένου ἐπὶ τὸν λαόν µου ἐπὶ τὸν Ισραηλ (2 Kgdms 7:8). This speech is God's longest speech since he spoke to Moses and the use of divine direct speech creates a sense of immediacy and priority. These factors highlight for the reader the importance of what is being said, and also recall the HDR.

The word διαθήκη is not used in 2 Kgdms 7, but the language contained within it suggest this was understood as a formal covenant. For example, the use of τῷ δούλῳ µου (7:5, 8) is language common to suzerain-vassal treaties and has a perlocutionary effect whereby Nathan
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goes to speak to David. Firth notes this in the treaty between Mursilis and Duppi-Teshub in the second millennium B.C.E. where Mursilis requires on his death that Duppi-Teshub become vassal (or servant) to his son.\textsuperscript{389} Gerbrandt notes that it is a phrase used repeatedly of David and demonstrates his close relationship with YHWH, but also that Moses is the other figure to be described as τὸ δοῦλον μου frequently in the Deuteronomistic History and places the two figures on an equal footing.\textsuperscript{390} That is, Gerbrandt describes Moses as the founder of Israel's faith, although this may be underplaying Abraham, and David as the founder of a new era in the history of Israel. Certainly they are two primary figures in Israel's history and this connection is helpful. The repeated use of τὸ δοῦλον μου in 7:8 when there is a new stage in the discourse only confirms the importance of the servant relationship.\textsuperscript{391}

David now hears that the Lord has been with him throughout his battles with his enemies, another feature in suzerain-vassal treaties where the suzerain shows the benefits to his vassals. As Firth says, this demonstrates that the Lord has been David's suzerain through a long period of time.\textsuperscript{392}

The expression κύριος παντοκράτωρ (2 Kgdms 7:8), a title which is used repeatedly when the Lord's power and authority is described, points to the solemnity of the word to David and the authority with which it is given.\textsuperscript{393}

There are also many connections between the promise to Abraham and 2 Kgdms 7 which suggest a formal covenant is being initiated here by the Lord. The promise to David in 7:9-10b move from personal promises to those for the nation as a whole. This may allude back to Abraham's promise (Gen 15:1-15) which begins with his own progeny and then refers to the promise of land and peace for the nation. We also read of both individuals being μέγας (Gen 12:2; 2 Kgdms 7:9). One of the strongest parallels to the Abrahamic covenant is when David wants to build the Lord an οἶκος, and in reply the Lord says he will do so from
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\textsuperscript{393} The title is used in 2 Kgdms 5:10 after David's anointing as king of Israel, and later in David's prayer (2 Kgdms 7:25, 27). It is a prominent title in the writings of the prophets with Zechariah using it forty times.
his σπέρμα (Gen 15:3, 5, 13, 18; 2 Kgdms 7:12). This is also a feature of a Hittite treaty,394 though its intertextual echo to Abraham's story is most likely stronger here alongside other echoes of the promise to Abraham. The eternal nature of the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants is also paralleled (Gen 17:13; 2 Kgdms 7:13, 16, 25, 29), is the close relationship to the Lord (Gen 17:8b; 2 Kgdms 7:14). Finally, as we have already noted, David appears to understand the exchange as διαθήκη when in his last words (2 Kgdms 23:1-7) he refers to the everlasting covenant (διαθήκην γὰρ αἰώνιον έθετό μοι).

Finally, this covenant with David is recalled using διαθήκη in many other passages in Israel’s scriptures as it is a defining event in Israel’s history. This can be seen in Kingdoms (2 Kgdms 23:1-7; 3 Kgdms 2:4; 8:22-26; 9:4-5), Psalms (2:71, at the end of Book II; 77:70-72; 88, at the end of Book III; 131:1-18), and in the Prophets (Isa 8:23-9:6; 11:1-9; Amos 9:11; Mic 5:2–5; Jer 17:24–27; 23:5–6; 30:8–9; 33:14–26; Ezek 37:24-28), and frequently with reference to David's shepherd role.

The covenant names several promises from the Lord to David, his chosen shepherd ruler, and therefore promises to Israel as a nation. The Lord says he will make David's name renowned (2 Kgdms 7:9), will appoint a place for his people (7:10), give rest from his enemies (7:11), an everlasting house and kingdom (7:12, 16) and a father-son relationship (7:14). In the covenant there is deliberate play on the idea of 'house' with the parallel ideas of a physical place of a temple and David's dynastic line embedded in 'house'.395

This promise of an eternal throne for David’s house, as Chae rightly notes, coincides with YHWH entrusting David as the shepherd of Israel.396 The recollection of David's call from the sheepfolds acts as a filter through which the narrative of covenant can be viewed. The Lord makes this covenant with David and his house because leaders are called to function as faithful shepherds of the Lord's flock. Ultimately, as the narrative will reveal, David very quickly demonstrates his weakness in carrying out this shepherd duty when he sins with Bathsheba and this escalates into murder of her husband, Uriah (2 Kgdms 11). It is therefore
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appropriate that Nathan's response will cause him to recall his anointing to be a faithful shepherd king.

### 3.3.2 Nathan's Parable and David's First Sin (2 Kgdms 12:1-15)

David's sin of adultery with Bathsheba and this cycle of sin which leads to Uriah's murder results in quick judgment from the Lord via the prophet Nathan. In 2 Kgdms 12 Nathan speaks to David beginning with a parable of the rich man and the poor man. The rich man has ποίμνια καὶ βουκόλια πολλὰ σφόδρα (12:2) while the poor man ἕκτησατο (12:3). There are many points of contrast which point to a favourable view of the poor man. He owns only one female lamb as opposed to the rich man's flocks and herds, and this he has acquired for himself indicating personal effort. Furthermore, the poor man is pictured as a faithful shepherd who takes care of the lamb by preserving it (περιποιέω), rearing it (ἐκτρέφω), and treating it as one of his family. The parable says, ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου αὐτοῦ ἠσθίεν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτοῦ ἔπινεν καὶ ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ αὐτοῦ ἐκάθευδεν καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ ὡς θυγάτηρ (it used to eat from his bread and drink from his cup and sleep in his bosom, and it was like a daughter to him). This language personifies the lamb and is highly evocative and emotive leading the reader to be sympathetic to the poor man.

In contrast, the text tells the reader nothing of how the rich man acquired his flocks nor how he cared for them. This is a clear narrative indicator of how David and the reader are to respond to each character.397 Nathan takes until the end of 12:3 to set the scene for the narrative turn when the traveller enters into the story.

The traveller comes only to the rich man who, in response, does not take one of his ποίμνιον or βουκολία to prepare a meal, but takes the only lamb of the poor man (12:4). A faithful Israelite was expected to provide for the poor, or alien travellers (Lev 19:10, 33, 34), because God had provided for the Israelites when they were aliens in the land (Gen 26:3; Exod 22:21; 23:9). Hospitality is thus an attribute of God and should be also of his people and yet it is entirely missing in the rich man's response when he steals a lamb to provide for the traveller. This will become an important theme in Luke which we will see in chapters 5.3.3.3 and 6.3.
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David responds with harsh words saying this rich man is ιοις θανάτου and demands that he restore the poor man sevenfold for his misdeeds (2 Kgdms 12:6). The term ιοις θανάτου implies the man deserves death as in 1 Kgdms 26:16, and the call for a sevenfold restitution is equally extreme. Tradition says that if a sheep is stolen, a fourfold restitution must be made (Exod 22:1) or an added fifth (Lev 6:5), making the reader aware that David views this sin as very great when he demands a sevenfold restitution. There is no excuse for the rich man’s actions. He has many resources of his own, and yet he exploits the poor man and hoards his flocks for himself. Other OT texts also have a great deal to say about God's concern for the poor and conversely his judgment on those who oppress the poor or the alien (Exod 22:21; 23:9; Isa 14:30; Pss 24; 35:10; 131:15; Amos 4:1; 5:12; 8:4), and so the parable is even more shocking.

Nathan then reveals that David is the rich man in the parable because he has taken Uriah's wife when he has many wives of his own (2 Kgdms 12:7). The Lord speaks to David through Nathan with the strong introductory formula, τάδε λέγει κύριος θεὸς Ισραηλ. The text as a whole reminds David of the grace that has been afforded him. Firstly, he talks of his anointing as king over Israel implying not only God's blessing to him in his election, but his responsibility for the Israelite people (12:7). Secondly, he reminds David that it was God who rescued him from Saul (12:7), which the narrative of 1 Kingdoms 18-31 has already mentioned. Finally, David is reminded that he already has the gift of wives and the house of Israel and Judah (12:8), implying he has no right or need to take anything from anyone else. There is a repetition of the word μικροί which had described the poor man's lamb (12:3) but is now used to question whether David views the Lord's blessings to him as too μικροί (12:8). After the list of God's blessings to David, this two-fold use of μικροί is highly charged. David is also described as βασιλεύς (12:7), and as king, his first responsibility is to protect his subjects, and to act justly to all and especially the poor. Clearly David had failed to do this. Furthermore, the ANE understood βασιλεύς as a σωτήρ to the people, and this has been spelt out repeatedly by the writer of Kingdoms (2 Kgdms 5:2; 7:8). David has failed as a shepherd king because of his injustice toward the poor man.

This parable and proclamation from Nathan leads to David's repentance for Uriah's death and so to God's forgiveness (12:13). The narrative goes on to describe the consequences for David's household when his son dies (12:14-23). 400

Nathan's shepherd setting for his parable should be considered deliberate. 401 The parable is to be classified as a juridical parable which is designed to target the hearer so that they will pass judgment on themselves. 402 There are three other juridical parables which act in a similar manner (2 Kgdms 14:1-20; 3 Kgdms 20:39-40; Isa 5:1-7). 403 Each is effective because the audience identifies themselves in the parable and so can personally hear the judgment call. As the reader comes to the text with the view of the narrator, the reader also hears the gavel fall for David.

In Nathan's parable, this study suggests he appeals to David's sense not only as Israel's king as Roth and McCarter suggest, but specifically as their shepherd king who should exhibit faithfulness and justice to the flock. 404 The parable resonates with David's early years as a shepherd of Jesse's flock, but also his identity as Israel's shepherd king which is explicit at his anointing at Hebron (2 Kgdms 5:2). As a king he is wealthy and powerful, but neither wealth nor power allow for an abuse of that position. The parable reveals that it is the poor man and not David who is a faithful shepherd. While the shepherd setting of the parable should not be overplayed, it should be considered. The setting resonates with the motif of shepherd from the earlier Kingdoms narrative, and as a prophet Nathan will have made a choice in how he

400. The Babylonian Talmud Yoma 22b shows that there is a fourfold punishment when four of David's children die; the infant child of Bathsheba, Tamar, Amnon, Absalom. The fourfold punishment may be explained by the fourfold restitution required for stealing a sheep. See Alter, David Story, 258.
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402. Cartledge 1 and 2 Samuel, 514; McCarter, Il Samuel, 305. See also Wolfgang Roth, 'You Are the Man! Structural Interaction in 2 Samuel 10-12,' Semeia 8 (1977): 1-13. Roth notes that the tradition of David as Israel's military leader, though he does not specify shepherd leader; presents David as the hero of 2 Sam 10-12, and therefore his sin with Bathsheba and Uriah is the reversal of expectation for the reader. It is this expectation which the parable subverts. Roth, 'Your are the Man!’ 10-11.
403. In 2 Kgdms 14:1-20 David has banished Absalom for killing Amnon, and Joab persuades the woman of Tekoa to come and pretend she has a case for David to rule over. The woman tells the story of two sons where one accidentally kills the other. The community want death for the son who took the life of another while the mother pleads for her son to be spared. David agrees with the mother and it is pointed out to him that he is not so willing to restore Absalom.
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delivered the Lord’s message. Nathan chose a setting that exposed David's role as shepherd king as it was a direct and relevant way for David to understand the parable's meaning.

3.3.3 David's Sin at the Census (2 Kgdm 24)

2 Kingdoms 24 is the final pericope we will consider; it records David's sin in counting the people.⁴⁰⁵ It comes after the hymns of 1 Kgdm 22 and 23 which signify the end of David's story and balance with Hannah's song in 1 Kgdm 1, and so this final event in David's life stands alone as a distinct end-piece to David’s life. Coming as a *coda* to David's life, this passage makes the clearest narrative statement from David, who says, ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιήν.

It is not entirely clear why counting the people is considered a sin as elsewhere we do not see a negative reaction to a census.⁴⁰⁶ Furthermore, in 2 Kgdm 24:1 the Lord incited David to do this when he was angry with Israel. Yet David's actions in counting the people are presented as acting directly against the Lord’s wishes. Firth suggests it may be that Israel was not at war and David initiated an action that was not necessary, while McCarter, Alter and Brueggemann acknowledge that we simply are not given the reason for such wrath.⁴⁰⁷

As a result of his actions, David is called to choose a consequence for his sin from a limited range of options, and he chooses that death will come to the land for three days. However, the result is so devastating when seventy thousand people die, that David calls out to the Lord to stop, saying,

 başarılı εἰμι ἡδίκησα καὶ ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιήν ἐκκακοποίησα, καὶ οὕτοι τὰ πρόβατα τί ἐποίησαν

Behold, I am – I did wrong, and I am the shepherd – I did evil, and these are the sheep; what did they do? (2 Kgdm 24:17).

This LXX text uses an addition to the MT with the clarifying words ἐγὼ εἰμὶ ὁ ποιήν. In a narrative which has traced David's rise from shepherd boy to shepherd king and made great

---

⁴⁰⁵ This can be considered the end of David’s life even though his finals days and death come in 3 Kgdm 1, as the last words of David are recorded in 2 Kgdm 23:1-7. The census is the final event in his time as king.

⁴⁰⁶ In Exod 30:11-16 there is a census for taxation purposes and Num 1 and 26 record a census taken regarding numbers for military service.
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use of the language of shepherding, this narrative statement of David should not be underestimated.

The LXX translators have therefore recorded David's own voice declaring before God that he is the Lord’s ποιμήν, and the Israelites are the Lord’s sheep. He knows that seventy thousand Israelites have died because of his sin and that he has failed as a ποιμήν. He thus appeals to God to punish him rather than the people, for it is he as God's shepherd who has failed. It is the leader who is accountable for the sheep and not the sheep for the shepherd.

The phrase ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμήν is supported by 4QSam which says, 'It is I, the shepherd, who did evil.' The LXX reading is from LXX but is taken up by NETS in their recent translation. It is also supported by OL and Josephus, Ant. 7.328. The LXX translators clearly understood David as the shepherd king, as evidenced by this explicit statement at the end of David’s life. Further, as this is the final event in David's life, from a narrative perspective, this forms an echo and perhaps a final inclusio with David's early years as Jesse's shepherd.

We can therefore say that David's story is crafted by the author with the consistent motif of shepherd, and to view him as Israel's king is to understand him as their shepherd king. As this thesis argues, the author has deliberately used the beginning of the narrative to set the trajectory for the narrative and to provide a key to understand how to interpret the events in the narrative. It bears out the Aristotelian notion of connectedness in narrative which has a beginning, middle and an end. This ending is intricately connected to its beginning in the sheepfolds of Jesse’s household. It also bears witness to the primacy effect where key ideas are established at the beginning of a narrative and these affect the reader's perception of a character. David is the shepherd king of the Israelite people, who is called to be a faithful shepherd and puts the needs of the flock ahead of his own needs. It is this very realisation that David makes at the end of his life when he is punished after he sins at the census. This is also the thrust of Nathan's juridical parable after his first recorded sin. David had put his
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needs ahead of other people and therefore was not faithful to his high calling as God's shepherd.

This pericope finishes with David making a costly offering to the Lord of an altar from the threshing floor of Araunah, the Jebusite (2 Kgdms 24:18-25). Here David worships the Lord and prays for his mercy, and the Lord answers by averting the plague. The narrative leaves the reader acknowledging that it is the Lord who ultimately protects the Israelites, and saves the flock. It is God's actions that save the flock, it is God who is ultimately the faithful shepherd who saves the flock.

3.4 Summary

While the story of David could be summarised with several different ideas, the narrative consistently highlights his identity as shepherd. This shepherd identity functions as a Leitwort, which is used repeatedly at key places in the narrative, and draws the reader into its significance for David's role as king of Israel. We must agree with Buber that repetition is not accidental and is one of the strongest techniques for making meaning.

David is anointed king while he is a faithful shepherd (1 Kgdms 16:1-13), and he enters Saul’s court named as a shepherd (14-23). He fights Goliath as a shepherd, dressed as a shepherd, with weapons of a shepherd, and is prepared to be a successful warrior through his youth as a shepherd (1 Kgdms 17). He enters the public stage as a shepherd, as is emphasised by the intertextual reference to Num 27:17 (1 Kgdms 18), and he is eventually anointed as king of all Israel, and named as the Lord's shepherd king with further reference to Num 27:17 (2 Kgdms 5:2).

Thus, David's kingdom is built upon the foundation of a call to shepherd God's flock. The Davidic covenant establishes that this call to be a shepherd king is eternal (2 Kgdms 7), and it is the shepherd yardstick with which he was judged as king of Israel. His first recorded sin is dealt with by Nathan when the Lord sends him to confront David – and he does so with a
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shepherd parable (2 Kgdm 12:1-4), and at the end of David's days, he acknowledges that he has sinned because, as a shepherd, he has failed God's flock (24:17). He specifically makes the identification of himself as ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ποιήσας (24:17).

The book of Kingdoms tells the story of David firmly rooted in this important Leitwort, and it is this motif in my view that Luke will pick up in his Gospel. To talk of David is to talk of him as a shepherd king. David was known as Israel's greatest king,412 and yet his reign was not perfect. He failed God's flock, but still the Davidic kingdom is said to last forever. This study will now demonstrate that the Third Gospel presents Jesus as sitting on the everlasting throne of David (Luke 1:32-33), and it is Jesus who is the faithful Davidic shepherd king who features in the Lukan narrative.

Chapter 4

The Birth of the Davidic Shepherd King

You will conceive in your womb and bear a son, and you will name him Jesus. He will be great, and will be called the son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David. He will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there will be no end (Luke 1:31-33).

As we have seen in chapter three, to talk of David must include an understanding of him as shepherd king of Israel. While Luke's richly allusive writing bears echoes of the whole of Israel’s story, this study aims to highlight the story of David which brings with it a shepherd kingdom setting that Lukan scholarship has largely overlooked.

In this chapter we first consider how scholars have understood the Davidic theme in Luke-Acts. This review will show that there has been no study undertaken which has explored the nature of David as a shepherd king. We will then examine Luke's infancy narrative for evidence of David's story and argue that Luke 1-2 introduces Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, the Saviour and Lord, which should be read against the backdrop of David as shepherd king.

We will establish the crucial role David plays in the Lukan infancy narrative by exploring the direct and indirect references to David in the text. The story has six direct references to David (1:27, 32, 69; 2:4 [twice], 11) and many implicit references making this Leitwort prominent. These Davidic references, coupled with the implicit language from the David story (Mary’s song, Bethlehem, shepherd, Davidic covenant language especially of sonship), form a strong causal chain which function as a transumed echo of the Davidic shepherd king of the LXX. Luke establishes at the beginning of his narrative that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah, forming a thematic trajectory, ensuring that in his ministry years one way Jesus is to be viewed is as the shepherd king who seeks out and saves the lost sheep.

In recent years there has been considerable interest in the figure of David in Luke's writing. The monograph of Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, has become an important work establishing Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, while also a prophet like Moses and the suffering servant. His work on the Davidic Messiah focuses on references to David in the infancy narrative, the main body of the Gospel and the speeches in Acts, making it the most comprehensive study of its type and the first study to demonstrate how the Davidic theme is extended into the main body of the Gospel. He primarily establishes Luke's genealogical interest in David, and demonstrates how central echoes of David are crucial in understanding the infancy narrative. He also notes the importance of the birth narrative in the structure and theology of Luke-Acts, and how key christological passages are Davidic in character. Strauss goes on to say however, that how Jesus will fulfil the Davidic promise is 'barely suggested' in the infancy narrative, and that the reader must wait for Acts to see Jesus enthroned in heaven at the right hand of God. This study aims to show that while agreeing broadly with Strauss' argument, this statement is not correct for the reader is given indications of how Jesus will fulfil this promise in the infancy narrative; he comes as the messianic shepherd.

Bock's *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern* explores Luke's use of the OT in presenting a christological view of Jesus. He establishes Luke's initial foundational christological position where Jesus is the promised Davidic Messiah in Luke 1-2 (1:32-53, 68-71, 79; 2:4, 11), which he says is modified by the motif of Jesus as the victorious Servant (2:29-32, 34-35). He notes that Luke paints this picture through images, ideas and allusions and not citations. Bock argues, however, that ultimately these titles give way to Luke's primary christological characterisation, ὁ κύριος, which is confirmed in Acts (2:21, 34-36; 10:36), while having its roots in 2:11. As Rowe points out, his thesis is flawed when he fails to

---

recognise the hermeneutical importance of κύριος in the infancy narrative. I would add that the thrust of Bock's thesis is a justification for viewing Jesus as Lord, and therefore his lens for understanding the Davidic heritage of Jesus is diminished when he fails to explain satisfactorily the father-son relationship Luke presents (2:41-52; 10:21-22). His reasoning takes insufficient account of 2:50 where Luke says Jesus grew in wisdom and in years and as a result, Bock explains away a close relationship between a father and a son. Bock states that 'we distinguish between Luke's presentation of Jesus' self-understanding at an early age and Luke's portrayal of the revelation of Jesus' person in his ministry.' He explains that 'Jesus' deep self-understanding ultimately becomes comprehensible to men through his teaching about himself as that teaching is reflected in what Jesus is doing and in what the Scriptures show.' This interpretive lens undervalues the role of the infancy narratives as a part of Luke's theological schema and the elevation of 'Jesus' teaching' as the preeminent way Luke reveals truths about Jesus, seems rather overplayed. This father-son relationship which is established in the infancy narrative is an essential part of the Lukan Jesus as we will come to see in chapters 4.3.2, 4.3.6 and 5.1.1.

N. T. Wright draws a clear typological relationship between Luke's narrative of Jesus and the narrative of David's story in 1 Samuel in a brief analysis of the form of Luke's Gospel in The New Testament and the People of God. While he acknowledges the book of 1 Samuel is not Luke's only parallel, he demonstrates that Luke uses this account to explain how Jesus is the climax of the Jewish story and how Jesus is the 'true David.'

Wright notes that the story of Elizabeth and Zechariah (1:5-25, 39-45, 57-80) parallels that of Hannah and Elkanah (1 Kgdms 1:1-2:11) and that Hannah and Mary's songs function as tri-
umphant conclusions of both stories (1:46-55; 1 Kgdms 2:1-10). He finds ongoing parallels between Samuel's and John the Baptist's judgments (3:7-9; 1 Kgdms 3:1-18), and David's and Jesus' message of judgment to the people in temporal power. He comments that both stories look toward messages of salvation, Jesus' baptism parallels David's anointing (1 Kgdms 16:13; Luke 3:21-22) and Jesus' battle with Satan is similar to David's battle with Goliath (1 Kgdms 17:1-52; Luke 4:1-13). He aligns the beginning of Jesus' Galilean ministry where there is acceptance and then rejection with David's return from the battle with Goliath (1 Kgdms 18:6-8; Luke 4:14-44). He also suggests that the Lukan travel narrative is similar to David's wandering with his followers (1 Kgdms 19-30; Luke 9:51-19:28). Wright goes on to briefly establish an ongoing relationship between the story of David and Jesus in the passion, resurrection, exaltation and establishment of a true Davidic kingdom.

While not everything Wright sees is certain, the vision cast is insightful and accords with Luke’s emphasis on Jesus as the true Davidic king and also, his attention to the stories of Israel. Our aim in this chapter is to highlight and explore Wright's connection between 1 Samuel and Luke and ask how echoes from Kingdoms help the reader understand the shepherd setting of the birth narrative.

In support of this Davidic thread in Luke's Gospel, Scott Hahn has clearly but briefly traced the Davidic strand in Luke-Acts from both explicit and indirect references to David, showing how Davidic christology is an important category for Luke. While he omits any reference to 19:10 as a Davidic king reference, his analysis of Luke’s interest in the Davidic kingdom is persuasive. Hahn goes on to summarise the nature of OT Davidic monarchy to eight categories: (1) the Davidic monarchy was founded upon a divine covenant; (2) the Davidic monarch was the Son of God; (3) he was the Christ, that is the Messiah or Anointed One; (4) the monarchy was linked to Jerusalem, particularly Mount Zion; (5) it was bound to the temple; (6) the monarch ruled over the twelve tribes; (7) the monarch ruled over an international empire; and (8) the monarchy was everlasting. As Hahn does not identify the Davidic monarchy as involved in a shepherding task however, he overlooks 19:1-10 and its Davidic shep-
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herd king allusion. Therefore, while this summary is excellent, it does not provide a fully comprehensive picture of the Davidic Jesus in Luke.

More recently, Yuzuru Miura has provided a full examination of David in his monograph *David in Luke-Acts.*\(^{429}\) He explores David in the OT, the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, in the Qumran MSS, the writings of Philo and Josephus, early rabbinic writings and early Jewish thought. His interest lies in whether there is a typological and genealogical aspect to Davidic Messianism which he shows to be the case. This develops the work of Strauss who establishes Luke's interest in David to be primarily genealogical,\(^{430}\) and of Wright who looks at the typological relationship. He thus supports Wright's typological proposal that Luke relates the story of Jesus in light of David's story in Samuel.\(^{431}\) We shall confirm the relationship Miura finds between the story of David from the book of Kingdoms and Luke's portrayal of Jesus in the Gospel and support Miura's thought that 'in Luke 19, Jesus' earthly ministry is summarised with Davidic shepherd imagery.'\(^{432}\) However, Miura's analysis of David in the OT does not identify David's role as a shepherd king to support his own statement. The categories of David for Miura are (1) an ideal king; (2) a religious authority; (3) a Moses parallel; (4) a Solomon parallel; (5) a sinner; (6) a psalmist; (7) a model for the Jews; (8) a prophet and; (9) an indicator of the Messiah.\(^{433}\) Because Miura takes this analysis into Luke-Acts, he then fails to identify any role for Jesus as a Davidic shepherd. Although he upholds Marshall's view of the importance of 19:10,\(^{434}\) and specifically identifies the *summative* nature of Jesus’ earthly ministry as a *Davidic shepherd* in Luke 19, his analysis fails to show how his statement is supported in the Lukan narrative. I suggest Luke built his understanding of Jesus' ministry in a cumulative way which is summarised in 19:10. This study agrees that the Davidic shepherd summarises Jesus' earthly ministry and aims to add to Miura's apparent lacuna with respect to this feature of David.

---

4.2 The Beginning of the Lukan narrative

While Conzelmann largely ignored the infancy narrative in his significant work Die Mitte der Zeit, the role his work plays in introducing key Lukan themes has been well noted since and accepted by scholars. These themes include salvation, joy, temple, Jerusalem, prayer, the role of the Spirit, Gentile salvation and the early signs of Jewish rejection, the eschatological reversal paradigm, Jesus’ role as Saviour and the long-awaited Davidic king who will reign with justice and righteousness. These themes, which are introduced in the infancy narrative can be traced throughout Luke-Acts, the evidence of the primacy effect in action.

So how does Luke tell the beginning of his story? It is clearly different from Mark's Gospel where a quote from Mal 3:1 and Isa 40:3 introduces John the Baptist who has come to prepare the way for Jesus. Matthew opens his Gospel with the genealogy of Jesus which links Jesus to key events and people from Israel's history, providing credentials for him as Messiah. Luke's beginning is very different. After his methodological prologue, Luke steps the reader back into the Septuagintal world with echoes of Israel's story. Rowe describes this as 'atmospheric resonance' where 'characters and events of the Old Testament are everywhere present and nowhere mentioned.' Luke uses only two direct OT quotes in Luke 1-2 with the introductory ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου (2:23, 24), yet the Lukán διήγησις as a whole is richly allusive, drawing the reader back into OT characters and story such as Abraham and Sarah, Moses and the exodus, David and kingdom, and prophets such as Isaiah, Micah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Zephaniah, Zechariah, Habakkuk and Malachi. Maxwell notes the privileged position these literary allusions to the Jewish scriptures have in the text, and how these bolster the authority with which the author and his Jesus speaks and acts.
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Luke's focus on the continuing story of Israel has led some to see Luke's Gospel as the continuation of the biblical story, yet as Talbert concludes, 'Luke and Acts tell the continuing story of salvation history...[but] Let us remember, however, that salvation history narrows at the point of Jesus to the story of one individual. At that point, the history of salvation is best told by the literary genre biography, and it is within this genre that Luke tells the story of Israel with Jesus as its pinnacle or culmination (24:27, 44-45). For Luke, Jesus is the culmination of Israel's story, and Luke has created an 'echo chamber' where he interacts with the many stories of Israel. Green and Litwak correctly note that Luke shows his interest in Abraham in 1:55, 73, and they then go on to stress the points of congruence between Gen 11-21 and Luke 1:5-2:52, but many of these also have possible parallels in the story of Kingdoms.

I agree with Wright who suggests Luke's beginning enters the reader into the book of Kingdoms with the story of Hannah and Samuel rather than entering the reader into Genesis and the story of Abraham which Green and Litwak suggest. Wright states, 'the story of Elizabeth and Zechariah in Luke 1:5-25, 39-45, 57-80 is without a doubt meant to take the reader's mind back to the story of Hannah and Elkanah in 1 Samuel 1:1-2:11... [and] the highest moment in the story of Samuel is...his anointing of the young David.' While Luke presents Jesus at various times with a particular lens highlighted, he appears to use the story of Kingdoms in Luke 1-2 as one way he deliberately sets the stage for Jesus' ministry as the Davidic
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shepherd king who seeks out and saves the lost sheep (19:10). This interest is first evident by the use of six explicit references to 'David' suggesting a *Leitwort* (1:27, 32, 69: 2:4 [twice], 11). Luke's on-going interest in echoes from 1 Kingdoms and David's story in particular, is a second way this interest is seen. This is demonstrated in the following table.

Table 2: Points of convergence between the book of Kingdoms and Luke’s Gospel:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The story of Kingdoms</th>
<th>The Lukan infancy narrative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hannah was barren (1:2).</td>
<td>Elizabeth was barren (1:6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set in Shiloh, the centre of worship (1:3).</td>
<td>Set in Jerusalem, the centre of worship (1:8).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkanah sacrificing to the Lord (1:3).</td>
<td>Zechariah, entered the sanctuary to offer incense (1:9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah and Elkanah shown as faithful (1:4-7).</td>
<td>Elizabeth and Zechariah are faithful and righteous (1:6).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah says her son will be devoted, will not drink wine and no razor will touch his head (1:11).</td>
<td>John will not drink wine and will prepare the way for the Lord (1:15-17).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The priest Eli speaks words of blessing to Hannah’s prayer for a son (1:17).</td>
<td>The angel speaks of the blessing of a son to Zechariah (1:13-19).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bore a son and called him Samuel (1:20).</td>
<td>Bore a son and called him John (1:13); bear a son and call him Jesus (1:31).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah sings a song of individual praise (2:1-10).</td>
<td>Mary sings a song of individual praise (1:46-55).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Linguistic themes in Hannah's song⁴⁴⁷ - horn of salvation (2:1, 10), joy (2:1), holiness of God (2:2, 10), and the theme of reversal (2:4-8). | Linguistic themes of Mary's song- salvation (1:46), joy (1:46), holiness (1:49), and the theme of reversal (51-53).
| Linguistic themes of Zechariah’s song- salvation (1:68, 71, 77), David (1:69, 76, 79), joy (1:68), faithfulness of God (72-73), and peace (1:79). |

⁴⁴⁷ This will be explored in detail in chapter 4.3.3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On a literary level, Hannah's song is balanced by David’s songs (2 Kgdms 22, 23).</th>
<th>On a literary level, Mary's song is balanced by Zechariah’s song (1:68-79).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Samuel kept going and became great and was in favour both with the Lord and people (2:26).</td>
<td>John grew and became strong in spirit (1:80). Jesus increased in wisdom and in years, in divine and human favour (2:52).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David is from Bethlehem (16:1).</td>
<td>Jesus is born in Bethlehem, πόλις Δαυίδ (2:4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David is a shepherd (16:11).</td>
<td>Jesus is presented as the messianic shepherd recalling Mic 5:2-5 (2:1-20); his birth is announced first to faithful shepherds (2:8); he calls his disciples 'little flock' implying he is the shepherd (12:32); he is the faithful shepherd from the parable (15:3-7); and Jesus is pictured as the Davidic shepherd king (19:10).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David is anointed and the spirit sprang upon him from that day and onward (16:13); from the Davidic covenant, 'I will be a father to him and he shall be a son to me' (2 Kgdms 7:14).</td>
<td>The Holy Spirit descends on Jesus at his baptism and words echoing the Davidic covenant are heard, ‘You are my son, my beloved, with you I am well pleased’ (3:22).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David is welcomed by the people (18:6-7), and then rejected by Saul (18:8).</td>
<td>Jesus is welcomed in Nazareth and then rejected by the people (4:16-30).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David travels with his followers as a fugitive from Saul (1 Kgdms 19-30).</td>
<td>Jesus travels with his followers (9:51-19:28).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David is anointed shepherd king over all Israel (2 Kgdms 5:2).</td>
<td>Jesus is hailed as ‘king’ by ‘multitudes of disciples’ (19:37); Jesus is Saviour, Messiah and Lord of all (2:11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The book of Kingdoms while containing stories of Hannah, Samuel, Saul and David, tells the story of how Israel came to have a king (1 Kgdms 8) and gives an account of the first two kings. 1 Kings 1-2 describe how God provides a baby Samuel for Hannah who is barren, and how Samuel is a faithful prophet (1 Kgdms 3-16) who will anoint Saul (1 Kgdms 10) and later David (1 Kgdms 16), God's chosen king. As we saw in chapter 3.2.1, Saul and David are contrasted in the narrative, with David being seen as superior on every occasion. The sto-
ry of Kingdoms, therefore, can be said to move toward a climax at 1 Kgdms 16 where God's appointed king, the shepherd boy David, is anointed and his rise to power begins. Luke's interest in the story of Kingdoms in his wider narrative with its focus on king and kingdom, is therefore a good first indicator of his thematic interest in Jesus as the Davidic king. As we will come to see in chapter 4.3.2, the annunciation stresses that he is the Davidic king (1:31-33). Then in chapter 4.3.5, we will see that his kingship is suggested to be as Davidic shepherd king (2:1-20). While Luke does create a beginning which has a Septuagintal atmosphere where various passages of the OT come into view, he makes particularly clear that Jesus is the promised Davidic shepherd king. To demonstrate this I will consider Luke's explicit and implicit references to David, showing how in Luke 1 the platform is prepared for the birth narrative in Luke 2, where Jesus is introduced as the Messianic Davidic shepherd king.

4.3 Luke's Davidic References:

4.3.1 Jesus' Davidic Lineage (1:27) and Echoes of David in Isaiah

The first direct reference to David is in 1:27 where Jesus' legal lineage to the house of David is recorded. Luke 1:27 says πρός παρθένον ἐμνηστευμένην ἄνδρι ὁ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ ἐξ οἴκου Δαυΐδ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παρθένου Μαριάμ. This lineage will be affirmed with further references in 2:4 and 3:31 establishing Luke's desire to make clear Jesus' connection to the Davidic line. At this time in the narrative, Luke draws the readers' attention not only to Jesus' lineage, but also to Mary as παρθένος. Mary is called παρθένος twice in v. 27, repetition that signals its narrative importance. Mary's status as a virgin is recognised as a point of literary parallel in the contrasts between the stories of John and Jesus. That is, Elizabeth's barrenness is a barrier to her conceiving in the story of John, while Mary's virginity is a greater barrier in the story of Jesus, as it requires a more miraculous intervention to overcome.

448. Luke also confirms Mary's virgin status in 1:34 when Mary says to Gabriel, πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γνώσκοι; Luke uses παρθένος again to describe Philip's daughters (Acts 21:9) and it is used often in the NT to specify a woman who has not had sexual intercourse (Matt 1:23; 25:1, 7, 11; 1 Cor 7:25, 28, 34; 2 Cor 11:2). 'παρθένος,' BDAG, 777.


451. In the Jewish world there was no expectation of a virgin birth from the Messiah. Brown, Birth, 299; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 338; Nolland, Luke, 47.


453. Bock, Proclamation, 55.

454. Brown, Birth, 299-301.

455. Brown, Birth, 300.


458. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 66.
strates that the Isaianic passage was interpreted christologically in the Jewish Christian world, and Luke may well have known this tradition.

There is considerable shared language between the two pericopae supporting the test for volume as demonstrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Isaiah 7:10-17</th>
<th>Luke 1:26-38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οἶκος, Δαυίδ</td>
<td>7:13</td>
<td>1:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὁ κύριος</td>
<td>7:10</td>
<td>1:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρθένος</td>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>1:27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐν γαστρί</td>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>1:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τίκτω υἱόν</td>
<td>7:14</td>
<td>1:31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| καλέσεις τὸ οἴ
μα αὐτοῦ     | 7:14           | 1:31         |
| ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον | 7:17           | 1:33         |

While the test for volume has some strong support in this explicit repetition of words, Luke does not allude to Isa 7:14 elsewhere in the Gospel and so the test for recurrence is not met. Yet we read that the shepherds are given a σημεῖον about the baby in the birth narrative (2:12) and a σημεῖον is given about the baby in Isa 7:11, 14. This primarily reflects Luke's Septuagintial style, as signs are common occurrences at significant narrative events in the LXX. Yet, there is a possibility that the sign of the baby (2:12) may refer back to Isa 7:14, linking the annunciation to Mary with the sign given to the shepherds. Furthermore, Luke also uses a preceding Isaianic passage (Isa 6:9-10) in 8:10 in the parable of the sower and also at the end of Acts (Acts 28:26-27) showing his knowledge and interest in this early part of Isaiah and its relevance to the story of Jesus. Both Tannehill and Talbert have demonstrat-
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ed the narrative links between the Gospel and Acts, therefore, at the very least we can assume with some confidence that Luke had the text of Isa 7:14 available to him.

Mallen has shown the importance of Isaiah in Luke-Acts, noting that Luke includes more extended quotes from Isaiah than any other book, that is, nine explicit quotations and more than one hundred allusions. Further, Luke most likely alludes to Isa 9:1 in Zechariah's Benedictus (1:78-79), and Isa 49:6 and 42:6 in Simeon's Nunc Dimittis (2:32), demonstrating that Isaiah plays an important role in the infancy narrative. Therefore, the volume of linguistic repetition between Isa 7:14 and the infancy narrative, coupled with Luke’s prominent use of Isaiah’s writing, means that the test of volume is met.

An echo also fits well within the thematic coherence of Luke’s argument in which he is establishing deliberate links to the David tradition. Strauss and Bock both note that Davidic messiahship is the controlling christology in Luke 1-2, and Strauss, that this opening thematic

---

465. Verse 79 has echoes of Isa 9:2; 42:7; 49:6; Ps 106:10 while no one passage is cited. As the table below shows, 1:79 shows great linguistic similarity to Ps 106:10, while the Psalm does not develop the idea of light breaking into the darkness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 1:79</th>
<th>ἐπιφάναι τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένους</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ps 106:10</td>
<td>καθημένους ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instead, Isa 9:2 and 42:7 use images of light breaking into the darkness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isa 9:2</th>
<th>ὃ λαὸς ὁ πορευόμενος ἐν σκότει, ἰδέτε φῶς μέγα, ὁ̃ι κατοικούντες ἐν χώρᾳ καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου, φῶς λάμψει ἐφ᾽ ὑμᾶς</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The people who walked in darkness, behold a great light, the ones who dwell in the territory of death, on them a light has shined.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isa 42:7</th>
<th>ἔξαγαγεν ἐκ δεσμῶν δεδεμένους καὶ ἔξ ὀσκοῦ φυλακῆς καθημένονς ἐν σκότει</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To bring prisoners out from the prisons and from the prison, those who walk in darkness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notably, Isa 9:2 bears great linguistic resemblance to the first part of 1:79, while Isa 42:7 shows the leading of those in the darkness. However, the context of ἀνατολή (1:78) provides a royal-messianic context which is supported by Isa 9:2 where the coming of the Davidic king brings light. Furthermore, this passage talks of the coming Davidic king who will bring not only light to those in darkness but peace (Isa 9:6-7), which supports Luke 1:79 and the birth story to follow where shepherds will be brought a brilliant light and news of peace that is tantamount to salvation (Luke 2:8-14).

467. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 123-125; Bock, Proclamation, 55-90. Bock further notes Jesus is also introduced as victorious Servant (2:29-32, 34-35).
concern is balanced by a return to this theme in the speeches in Acts where Jesus' Davidic enthronement is explicit (Acts 2:14-40; 13:16-41, 46-47; 15:13-21).  

It is possible Luke's readers could have understood this echo with its repeated use of παρθένος within a Davidic context, as Matt 1:23 demonstrates that early Jewish tradition had made the connection between Isa 7:14 and Mary's virgin birth. Therefore, it is historically plausible that Luke is drawing on Isa 7:14 in his narrative.

Furthermore, there is some precedent to accept the echo as we consider the history of interpretation. Bovon notes Matthew demonstrates a Jewish precedent for interpreting Isa 7 christologically, and concludes Luke has used the Immanuel prophecy.  

Finally, Green concludes

the conjunction of so many points of correspondence between the Gabriel-Mary encounter and Isa 7:10-17 cannot help but produce an echo effect...these reverberations establish an interpretive link emphasising how God is again intervening in history to bring his purpose to fruition.

Green is correct that this Isaianic echo helps to illuminate the surrounding text by bringing together the Davidic lineage of Jesus with Mary the virgin, the two key features of 1:27.

In Summary: In Luke 1:27 there is a likely echo of the prophecy of Isa 7:14 where it is said a virgin from the house of David will conceive and bear a son. Luke appears to be suggesting this as a backdrop to the annunciation to Mary, and that Jesus' birth can be interpreted in relationship to this prophecy.

4.3.2 The Annunciation (1:28-38) and Echoes of the Davidic Covenant
καὶ ἴδον συλλήμμην ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ νῦν καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν.

---
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In 1:31-33 Gabriel announces to Mary that she is to have a baby. The angel says that her son who is to be called Jesus will be great and he will be called Son of the Most High. God will give him the throne of his ancestor David and his reign and this kingdom will be eternal. This is the second direct reference to David.

This passage confirms not only the Davidic descent of Jesus, but shows the father-son relationship between Jesus and God and that Jesus' birth stands in the Davidic covenant tradition (2 Kgdms 7:14; Pss 2:7; 88:27-28; 4QFlor frag 10-13). Bovon notes the clear basis for this when he says 'Grundlage dieser Tradition ist 2Sam (LXX 2Kön) 7. The angel uses a high level of Davidic covenantal language (2 Kgdms 7) providing a strong intertextual link (see chapter 3.3.1). The linguistic links are Jesus' description as ιύς υψίστου (1:32; 2 Kgdms 7:14), the use of μέγας (1:32; 2 Kgdms 7:9), the reference to the θρόνος (1:32; 2 Kgdms 7:16), οἶκος (1:33; 2 Kgdms 7:13), βασιλεία (1:33; 2 Kgdms 7:12) and finally Mary is the Lord's δοῦλος (1:38) in the same way David is the Lord's δοῦλος (2 Kgdms 7:4, 8). Mary will go on to reiterate the promise to Abraham and his descendants in her song of praise (1:55), and this will be later recalled in Peter and Stephen's speeches (Acts 3:25; 7:5, 6).

The relationship between πατήρ and ιύς is especially significant in the covenant and it is given preeminence in the annunciation. In 1:32 ιύς υψίστου precedes the verb in the sentence giving it an emphatic position where Jesus as son is prominent. Further, Marshall notes that this father-son relationship is given prior to the Davidic genealogical relationship

473. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas I, 75.
474. David is a 'son' of the Lord Almighty.
suggesting that Luke is showing something more than an adoptive relationship, and that the
former interprets the latter.\textsuperscript{477} 2 Kgdms 7:14 stresses this relationship saying, ἐγὼ ἐσομαι
অντός εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτός ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν. Klein notes the uniqueness of the child and
the implication of his birth saying, 'Der Sohn wird kein gewöhnliches Kind sein, sondern
wird "groβ" sein, d.h. bedeutend für die Glaubenden, mehr noch, er soll "Sohn des Höchsten"
genannt werden.'\textsuperscript{478}

The uses of ὁ υἱός to describe God (1:32) is a common expression for God in the LXX
(Gen 14:18-22; Num 24:16; Deut 32:8; 1 Esdras 2:3; 6:30; 8:19; Pss 7:18; 12:6; 17:14; 90:1;
Sir 4:10; 2 Kgdms 22:14),\textsuperscript{479} and the 'Son of the Most High' is synonymous with 'Son of
God.'\textsuperscript{480} This sonship expresses both the father's care of the son but also the responsibility of
the son to the father. This is an on-going feature of the Lukan Jesus' relationship with God
where Jesus shows his dependence upon his father (1:35; 2:49; 3:22; 9:35; 10:21-22; 11:2,

Green argues that the emphasis of this father-son relationship in 1:31-33 demonstrates Luke
is moving toward an understanding of Jesus' ontology whereby he is set apart for God's re-
demptive work from his conception.\textsuperscript{481} Unlike Mark's Gospel which opens with John's min-
istry and Jesus' baptism (Mark 1:2-11), Luke shows that from conception Jesus is God's son
who is a part of God's salvific plan. This plan of salvation is, however, thoroughly Davidic
and is enacted by God in the divine conception (1:35). The repeated knowledge that Mary is
παρθένος (1:27), which we noted Luke foregrounds (see chapter 4.3.1), further suggests it is
only God's actions which bring this plan about.\textsuperscript{482}

\textsuperscript{477} Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 68.
\textsuperscript{478} Hans Klein, Das Lukasevangelium (KEK; Göttingen; Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2006), 98.
\textsuperscript{479} This list is not exhaustive as the expression is common from Genesis through to apocryphal
writings with a particular concentration in the Psalms.
\textsuperscript{480} Green, Gospel of Luke, 89. Marshall suggests Luke may have chosen to use υἱός ὑψίστου so that
there was no confusion with a similar pagan expression, and it also contrasts with the description of John
\textsuperscript{481} Green notes that 'though Luke is not working with Johannine or later trinitarian categories, he is
nonetheless moving toward a more ontological (and not only functional) understanding of Jesus' sonship.'
\textsuperscript{482} Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 90-91.
The father-son relationship in the annunciation is established early in the infancy narrative (1:31-33) but it also forms the centre of the final pericope in the infancy narrative when Jesus is at the Jerusalem temple (2:49). As a result, there is a narrative link between the use of υἱὸς ὑψίστου (1:32), and Jesus as a boy in the temple when he says, οὐκ ἦδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι με; (2:49). This suggests the importance of the father-son relationship for the infancy narrative, and raises the possibility that the Davidic covenant is of particular importance for Luke as he establishes his key themes for the Gospel. This will be considered further in chapter 4.3.6 when we assess the possibility of a further echo of the Davidic covenant in 2:41-52.

In reviewing the Davidic covenant in chapter 3.3.1, we noted that David is the shepherd leader of Israel when the covenant is established (2 Kgdms 5:2; 7:7-8), and the language of 'shepherd' is used twice to describe David as God's chosen shepherd ruler in 2 Kgdms 7:7. As this forms such a prominent introduction to the Davidic covenant, there is the possibility that this shepherd king identity may also lie in the background of Luke's echo. While this point is yet unspoken by Luke, the transumed echo of David's story brings with it a causal chain whereby one thought is linked to another for the reader. Hollander describes this causal chain in Henry Peacham's The Garden of Eloquence, where 'in speaking of darcknesse, we understand closenesse, by closenesse, blacknesse, by blacknesse, deepnesse.' As Luke will go on in the birth narrative to use a shepherd setting for Jesus' birth in the city of David, Bethlehem, there is the possibility that the reader will engage in the literary task of protention and retention to create new meaning (see chapter 1.2). I suggest that the Davidic echo in 1:31-33, lays part of the platform for the birth of the Davidic shepherd king in 2:1-20.

In Summary: Jesus is established as the fulfilment of the Davidic promise in the annunciation pericope. With this covenant story comes the background story of David whom God called from the sheepfolds of his father to shepherd the people of God (2 Kgdms 7:7, 8), and in which we find the close father-son relationship.

484. This pericope will be addressed in section 4.3.6.
485. Hollander, Figure of Echo, 133-149.
486. Hollander, Figure of Echo, 141.
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4.3.3 Mary's Song (1:46-55) and Echoes of Hannah's Song

The song of Hannah and the song of Mary have many similar narrative features and Hannah's song should be seen as the predominant model for the Magnificat. As Bovon says, 'Zweifellos kennt der Verfasser das Lied Hannas nach der Geburt Samuels (1Sam [LXX 1Kön] 2:1-10).'

While this is a story of Hannah and not David, the story of Hannah's conception and the birth of Samuel is inextricably tied to the author's story of Israel's first two kings. We must remember that Samuel will go on to anoint David, which Campbell argues is the greatest purpose for Samuel in the narrative. The inauguration of the monarchy and rejection of Saul are steps along the way to the major task of anointing David as shepherd king. As Brueggemann says, 'the first fifteen chapters are a preparation for him [David].' Perhaps this is an overstatement, and yet the story of Hannah is inextricably tied up to the wider story of David's kingship and evaluating it now adds another valuable link to Luke's use of Kingdoms.

The two songs come in a similar place in their respective books after an introduction to the characters and setting through narration and dialogue. They both function to provide a theological commentary on what is taking place providing a narrative pause through their hymn-like genre. Both songs are strophic and are personal songs of praise, lacking a communal call to praise reflected in the Psalms (Pss 32, 46, 112, 116, 134, 135).

---

487. There is dispute about the source of Mary's song, and yet scholars agree it is rich with allusions to the LXX. It can be seen to echo other parts of scripture especially hymns of praise from the Psalms (Pss 32, 46, 112, 116, and especially 135) where there is an introductory call to praise God followed by the reasons for praise, concluding with an element of repetition. As Bovon notes however, Mary's song lacks a call to congregational praise. Mary's song has been compared with Qumran psalms but its content lacks the Qumran focus on God as creator, death, destruction and messianic expectation. Mirua suggests in addition to reflecting Hannah's song, Mary's song shares thematic links to PssSol 17 and 2 Kgdms 22. Nevertheless, Fitzmyer, Bock and Sanders note the strongest parallel comes from the song of Hannah and Bovon concludes that Luke clearly makes use of the song. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 81-82; Miura, David in Luke-Acts, 204; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 359; Bock, Luke, 148; James A. Sanders, 'Isaiah in Luke,' in Luke and Scripture: The Function of the Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts, ed. by Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 17.

488. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 82.

489. Campbell, 1 Samuel, 2.

490. Brueggemann, First and Second Samuel, 2.
The theme of praise in Hannah's song comes out of a setting of prayer and worship (1 Kgdms 1:7-28) and the location is Shiloh (1 Kgdms 1:3) where the Israelites went to worship before the Jerusalem temple was built by Solomon (Josh 18:1-10). Luke begins his narrative in the temple where Zechariah is offering incense, a symbol of prayer (1:8-10), and he maintains a narrative focus on Jerusalem with its first reference coming in the infancy narrative (2:22).

Both women describe themselves as God's δούλη. Hannah uses this term frequently in her prayer to God (1 Kgdms 1:11, 16, 18) and Mary in her encounter with Gabriel and in her song (1:38, 48).

The content of the two songs shows points of similarity. For example, Hannah's song centres on her thankfulness to God for the child she has prayed for in the opening chapter (1 Kgdms 2:1-2), and similarly, Mary's song focuses on her thankfulness to God and is a response to Elizabeth’s words, 'Blessed is she who believed that there would be a fulfilment of what was spoken to her by the Lord' (1:45).

Both songs begin with praise of God and to God. Hannah praises the Lord with reference to her heart (καρδία), her horn (κέρας) and her mouth (στόµα), while Mary’s does so with reference to her soul (ψυχή) and her spirit (πνεῦµα). A horn is a symbol of power or strength, and the raising of the horn is symbolic of the vertical patterns of elevation and descent in the narrative as a whole where the Lord’s power reverses people's fortunes. Hannah has been bowed down because she has been barren. So in the birth of her baby, God has saved her from her disgrace and lifted her up, thus bringing her salvation.

Hannah's song ends with a similar reference, ὑψώσει κέρας χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ (he will exalt the horn of his anointed; 1 Kgdms 2:10); the horn functioning as an inclusio in the song. This horn is related to the βασιλεύς that is to come (1 Kgdms 2:10) and points to the monarchy. Hannah's words set the trajectory for the Davidic kingdom and the narrative will confirm this when David will say at the end of his life that God is the 'horn of my salvation' (2 Kgdms 22:3). Her song therefore introduces the theme of monarchy for the book of Kingdoms,

491. Firth, Samuel, 60; Werner Foerster, 'κέρας,' TDNT 3:669.
492. Alter, David's Story, 9.
493. Tsumura, Samuel, 149.
thereby giving the song an elevated role in the narrative even though it will be two generations until this will be accomplished.494

Mary's first statement of praise is to God her Saviour (1:47) begins a Lukan emphasis on salvation, a theme that will be further established in the infancy narrative and is important for the Lukan Gospel (1:69, 71, 77; 2:11).495 Hannah's words speak prophetically of the monarchy which points to David, Mary's words speak of the Saviour which points to Jesus, the new Davidic king (1:32-33; 2:11).

The structures of the songs have similar features. Hannah's song has an introduction of praise for the Lord's sovereignty (1 Kgdms 2:1b-3), a focus on the reversal of human fortune beginning with her own reversal (1 Kgdms 2:4-5), a return to the Lord's sovereignty (1 Kgdms 2:6-10a) and finally a look ahead to the theme of kingship (1 Kgdms 2:10b). Mary's song has an introduction of praise (1:46-47), a focus on the reversal of human fortune beginning with her own (1:48-49), an expression of God's sovereignty (1:50-53) and ends looking back to the promise to Abraham (1:54-55).

Both songs have a focus on God's holiness and of joy associated with the salvific events. Hannah talks of the holiness of the Lord (1 Kgdms 2:2, 10), and of the Lord's salvation which has brought her joy (1 Kgdms 2:1). Mary declares the name of the Lord is holy (1:49) and Elizabeth's baby leaps for joy in the womb (1:44), a passage which functions to introduce Mary's song. This linking of joy and salvation will come again in 2:10-11 when the angel announces Jesus' birth.

The central body of each hymn (1 Kgdms 2:4-8; Luke 1:51-53) focuses on the reversal of the fortunes of the weak and begins with the reversal of their own fortune coming from the power of God. Both songs portray women who have seen God act powerfully in them not only to show God's favour to them, but also to bring about the salvation of God for others.

Mary is told she is favoured (1:28, 30) and carrying the Davidic king, and so she is elevated from her lowly peasant status. She finds favour with God and with people (1:42-45; 2:34)

---

494. Alter, David Story, 9.
and Jesus is increasingly portrayed as the one through whom salvation will come. While Mary praises God as Saviour in 1:47, Zechariah and the angels will give praise to God for Mary’s baby who is the Davidic saviour (1:69; 2:11). It is through Jesus that Luke says all people will find salvation.

In Summary: The reader can view Mary's song as closely related to Hannah's song given this level of interweaving of thematic material and similar structure. It is therefore likely that Luke intended an intertextual echo, making this another recollection of David's greater story.

4.3.4 The Benedictus (1:68-79) and echoes of David
Zechariah's Benedictus begins with a focus on what God is doing for Israel in Jesus as Davidic saviour (1:69-71), shifts to a focus on the Abrahamic covenant (1:72-75) and then returns to more Davidic imagery (1:76-79). David's house is again specifically recalled in the Benedictus (1:69) showing Luke's ongoing interest in Jesus' lineage and the story of David.

In the Benedictus Zechariah praises God for raising up a redeemer to be a 'horn of salvation' or 'mighty saviour' for Israel ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ παιδός αὐτοῦ. However, it is not only that Jesus is specified as being ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυὶδ (1:69) which shows Luke's interest in David at this point, it is the on-going use of Davidic allusions in the hymn. David may be mentioned only once, but his presence is evident in various echoes.

Miura has recently found the language of the Benedictus as a whole reflects much of the language in 1 Kgdms 2 (Hannah's song), 2 Kgdms 22, 23 (David's songs), and PssSol 17, a late Davidic shepherd/warrior Psalm. David or the covenant are central in each of these songs.

The language of κέρας σωτηρίας (1:69) is Septuagintal language used sometimes to recall David (Ps 17:3; 2 Kgdms 22:3), and κέρας is also used in reference to David in the Psalms (Ps 88:25; 131:17) and in Hannah's song in reference to God (1 Kgdms 2:1, 10).

Κέρας σωτηρία literally means 'a horn of salvation,' and in 1:69 refers to Jesus and not John, as there is nothing to suggest John is from the house of David. A horn represents a strong fighting animal such as a bull or ox (Deut 33:17; Dan 7:7; 1 Enoch 90:9), and this expression fits with the Jewish expectation of a victorious Davidic messianic king. The symbolism suggests Jesus is a powerful Davidic saviour who is able to save Israel from their enemies (1:71).

It is interesting that Luke qualifies κέρας σωτηρίας with ἐγείρω rather than ἐπαιρω (Ps 74:6; Zech 2:4) or ἐξανατελλω (Ps 131:17) which are more common in the LXX. This verb ἐγείρω is more commonly used of raising up priests, kings and judges, and as Luke uses this in an early Christian hymn, Brown suggests the κέρας σωτηρίας 'has already been personified in Jesus the Saviour whom God had raised up (Luke 7:16; Acts 4:10, 12).'

Hannah refers to κέρας at the beginning and end of her song (1 Kgdms 2:1, 10) as does David in his (2 Kgdms 22:3). For both Luke and the writer of Kingdoms this horn is within the context of σωτηρία (Luke 1:69; 1 Kgdms 2:1; 2 Kgdms 22:3, 36, 47, 51; 23:5), and the κέρας σωτηρία in 1:69 is clearly Davidic.

There is language used in the Benedictus that is also found in the Davidic covenant and Pss-Sol 17. The language of παῖς in 1:69 is used in 2 Kgdms 7:7 and PssSol 17:21. There is also shared language with αἰών (Luke 1:70; 2 Kgdms 7:13, 16; PssSol 17:1, 3, 4, 35, 46) and οἶκος (Luke 1:69; 2 Kgdms 7:11, 13; PssSol 17:42).

---

498. This is attributed to David in the superscription in Psalm 17:1.
502. Ibid, Italics original.
503. It is also found in David’s prayer after the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:25) and in David's hymn (2 Kgdms 22:51).
The thematic links to *PssSol* 17 are especially relevant to this study as the psalm ends with a picture of the Davidic shepherd king as the coming messianic figure. While there is no direct shepherd language in the *Benedictus*, Luke will move directly into his birth narrative after the *Benedictus* where there is a remarkably clear shepherd setting. We saw in chapter 2.3.1 that one way the psalmist's Davidic messianic figure is presented is as a shepherd king who brings righteousness through words rather than military might (*PssSol* 17:23-37). This figure is the one who will restore justice to the people (*PssSol* 17:32). This is similar to the *Benedictus* where the Davidic saviour brings salvation from enemies (1:71) and peace (1:79). The shared language with the Davidic covenant could also suggest a shepherd setting is not too far away from the *Benedictus* either.\textsuperscript{504}

In Summary: Luke focuses on David in this hymn by recalling his lineage to the house of David, and uses language from the Davidic covenant and *PssSol* 17, a shepherd-warrior Psalm.

**4.3.5 The Birth Narrative (2:1-20)**

There are three further explicit references to David in the birth narrative, two occur in 2:4 in the context of the census and one in the message to the shepherds in 2:11. Mary and Joseph go up to Bethlehem, the πόλις Δαυίδ, and they do this because Joseph is ἐξ οἴκου καὶ πατριᾶς Δαυίδ (2:4). This information of the πόλις Δαυίδ (2:4) is repeated in 2:11 in the context of the angel's message to the shepherds. So, near the beginning of this new pericope the lineage of Jesus to David is again established, narrative information that has become familiar to us throughout Luke 1.

Firstly, we will discuss the shepherds who are foregrounded in 2:8-20 and who play a key narrative role in the pericope. As we have seen in chapter three, David's role as a shepherd is woven throughout his story in Kingdoms and so their narrative role in the Luke's writing deserves to be evaluated. Why did the angels go to the shepherds? What narrative role do they play?

\textsuperscript{504} This is the use of οἶκος (2 Kgdms 7:11, 13), παῖς (2 Kgdms 7:7), αἰών (2 Kgdms 7:13).
Secondly, another striking feature of the pericope is Augustus' census which is given prominence in the pericope. Luke takes five verses to describe the census (2:1-5) which contrasts the two verses given to the birth itself (2:6-7). We will examine the role the census plays in informing the reader's interpretation.

Thirdly, we will consider to the narrative role of the 'city of David, Bethlehem' (2:4, 11). This phrase would have awakened the curiosity of first-century readers, as the city of David was historically known as Jerusalem not Bethlehem. Our study suggests that this is a deliberate gap or blank in the narrative which is left for the reader to fill.

These three features in the narrative all have strong Davidic shepherd king implications, and we will turn to these in order.

**4.3.5.1 Why are there shepherds in the birth narrative?**

Manson is correct in saying the shepherds form the centre-piece of the birth narrative. While the setting is marked by Augustus' decree and the subsequent movement that this demanded (2:1-5), it is the shepherds who take the centre stage in 2:8 and they maintain a prominent position until the end of the pericope at 2:20.

The reason for the inclusion of the shepherds therefore appears to be a question the text asks of the reader. Why did the angels go to the shepherds? Various answers have been given for this and these will be reviewed and evaluated.

This question has been answered in six main ways:

1. They are regarded as sinners whom Jesus has come to save.
2. They have been introduced in the style of Hellenistic Bucolic poetry.
3. They are 'as angels.  
4. They are examples of the lowly that Jesus has come to lift up (1:52).
5. They support the Davidic tradition.
6. They point to the birth of the messianic shepherd.

---

506. Coleridge describes the shepherds 'as angels.' *Coleridge, Birth*, 147.
These views will now be evaluated.

4.3.5.1.1 The Shepherds are Sinners

Godet in 1875 suggested that shepherds were regarded with 'contempt' and as 'heathen,' and entitled this section in his commentary 'The gospel is preached to the poor.' He rests his case on the b. Sanhedrin and m. Aboda Zara but gives no references to either. A legacy of regarding shepherds as 'sinners' has since had an ongoing place in scholarly debate.

This position has been supported by Jeremias, especially in his book, Jerusalem in the Times of Jesus. This position will be examined in detail here, even though Jeremias' own understanding of the shepherds in the birth narrative is primarily to support a 'stall tradition.' This stall tradition explains why the shepherds knew where to find the baby whom the angels had announced was born in Bethlehem (2:12), for this tradition says they were the owners of the stall. This is Jeremias' primary explanation for Luke's inclusion of the shepherds in 2:8-20, rather than that they were sinners, which he also supports.

However, it is important to assess this view as his underlying belief in shepherds as sinners as expressed in Jerusalem in the Times of Jesus and also The Parables of Jesus, has been used by other scholars. This has impacted scholars' views not only of the birth narrative's inclusion of shepherds, but has influenced interpretation in the parable of the lost sheep and the story of Zacchaeus where shepherd imagery is found and sinners are mentioned. Since this

511. Jeremias does note that while shepherds are never judged adversely in the New Testament, this stands in contrast to the contempt of the Rabbis and so 'one is forced to conclude that it mirrors the actuality of the life of Jesus, who had fellowship with the despised and with sinners, and who shared sympathetically in their life.' Jeremias, 'ποιμήν,' TDNT 6:490.
belief that shepherds were sinners in first-century Palestine forms the backbone of many other scholars' interpretation, it will be dealt with in this discussion.

**Jeremias' view of shepherds as sinners**

Jeremias equates first-century shepherds as ἁμαρτωλοί 'because they are suspected of driving their flocks into foreign fields, and of embezzling the produce of their flocks.' He notes that being a herdsman is one of the long list of trades which were socially despised including shopkeepers, physicians, butchers, sailors, tax collectors, publicans and even dealers in produce of the sabbatical year (*m. Kidd. iv.14; b. Sanh. 25b*). However, the *Babylonian Sanhedrin* 25b actually refers only to those shepherds with their own cattle as they might be tempted to graze their cattle on another's land for gain, and it further limits this to herdsmen only in Palestine. This considerably qualifies Jeremias' list, and lessens his findings. The text says of herdsmen,

'Herdsman': At first they thought that it was a question of mere chance; but when it was observed that they drove them there intentionally, they made the decree against them...Raba said: The 'herdsmen' whom they [the Rabbis] refer to, include the herdsmen of both large and small cattle, [i.e., both cowherds and shepherds]. But did Raba actually say so? Did he not say: Shepherds are disqualified only in Palestine, but elsewhere they are eligible...Because they allowed cattle to graze on other people's lands. This law applies only to graziers of their own cattle, but not to hired herdsmen, for it is taken for granted that a man does not trespass unless material benefit accrues to him (*b. Sanh. 25b*).

While the Babylonian Talmud is considered the single most important document of rabbinic literature, it was not completed until 600 C.E. and so it cannot be fully relied upon to provide a definitive understanding of the attitudes of first-century Jews. Marshall and Bock also note this late dating means this is not evidence that should determine how the shepherds are viewed in Luke's text.

---

Jeremias however also gives evidence from the earlier *m. Kidd.* iv.14 to substantiate the claim that shepherding was a despised trade. This Mishnah passage records a conversation between Jewish fathers about suitable occupations for their sons. It says,

> Abba Gurion of Sidon said, in name of Abba Gurya, 'A man should not teach his son to be an ass driver, a camel-driver, nor a barber, a sailor, a herdsman, or a shopkeeper. For their trade is the trade of thieves.' Rabbi Judah says in his name, 'Most ass drivers are evil; most camel drivers are decent, most sailors are saintly, the best physician is going to Gehenna, and the best of butchers is a partner of Amalek.' Rabbi Nehorai says, 'I should lay aside every trade in the world, and teach my son only Torah. For a man eats its fruit in this world, and the principal remains for the world to come. But other trades are not that way. When a man gets sick or old or has pains and cannot do his job, lo, he dies of starvation. But with Torah it is not that way. But it keeps him from all evil when he is young, and it gives him a future and a hope when he is old' (*m. Kidd.* iv.14).

The Mishnah was compiled by 200 C.E., so with an earlier dating than the Babylonian Talmud it may provide evidence closer to first-century Palestinian thought. It is unclear, however, whether this passage represents a normative historical prejudice against shepherds. We see in the text that the advice of Abba Gurion about camel-drivers and sailors is immediately refuted by Rabbi Judah. This passage is a conversation where speakers make assertions and then another refutes them or adds their perspective on what has been said. While Rabbi Judah says no more about shepherds, clearly there are a variety of views about what professions are wise for sons to enter into. Ultimately, the conversation builds to Rabbi Nehorai who states what they would have all agreed on, and where I suggest the conversation was always designed to head, that all trades are less than simply teaching your son the Torah. Indeed, as the Rabbi goes on to argue, the Torah is what keeps you whether you are young or old, and whether life is beginning in youth or nearing its end. This is surely the point of this passage rather than any real form of trade critique. To take this text and suggest it shows a sense of universal Jewish prejudice against shepherds as Jeremias has done, is to misread the text.

It is also quite possible that there is a rhetorical element to the list of occupations. Abba Gurion of Sidon says of ass drivers, camel-drivers, barbers, sailors, herdsmen and shopkeepers that they are trade of *thieves.* Could it be that these occupations are thieves of time? That is,

---

518. Italics are my emphasis.
they are all occupations that steals time away from the study of Torah, the true occupation for a Jewish male. Furthermore, Rabbi Judah suggests his list of occupations will end up in Gehenna, the place of destruction for the wicked. This was originally known as the Valley of Hinnom (2 Chron 28:3; 33:6; Jer 7:31; 19:2-6; 2 Esdr 2:29; 7:36 [Latin only]) where apostate Israelites worshipped false gods and sacrificed their children in the fire. It was the place where the wicked suffered and atoned for their sins. In the Second Temple period, when an understanding of the afterlife developed, the Valley of Hinnom came to represent the place of eschatological judgment by the Jews (1 Enoch 26–27; 54:1–6; 56:1–4; 90:24–27).520 In this Mishnah passage therefore, the reference to Gehenna may be a pictorial way to suggest these occupations too will ultimately end and be laid waste.

The same argument may hold for the reference to Amalek who are known as God's antagonists and should be viewed pejoratively. Amalek fought with Israel at Raphidin (Exod 17:8) after they had been delivered through the Red Sea and in the story of Saul and David, they are again viewed pejoratively (1 Kgdms 15). This is further evident when Samuel says to Saul,

> Because you did not hear the voice of the Lord and did not carry out his fierce wrath on Amalek, therefore the Lord did this thing to you today. And the Lord will hand over Israel along with you into the hands of the allophyles, and tomorrow you and your sons shall fall (1 Kgdms 28:18-19a).

The reference to Amalek then, like the reference to Gehenna, appears to be strategically used to show God’s displeasure. Overall, this passage from *m. Kidd. iv.14* simply reinforces that the true occupation for a Jewish male is the study of Torah. Against this occupation, being a shepherd, a butcher, a shopkeeper, a physician or any other occupation, cannot compare.

The Tosefta, as companion to the Mishnah and dated about 300 C.E., has one further text regarding judicial procedures where shepherds are unreliable witnesses.521 Jeremias does not cite this text. It reads,

> Among persons disqualified to act as judges or witnesses are also to be included robbers, herdsmen and extortioners, and all suspects concerning property. Their evidence is always invalid (*T. Sanh. II.2.5a*).


The Tosefta is not, however, a free standing document necessarily representing a 'primary view,' but it is 'secondary, derivative and dependent,' and it does not sustain any commentary on the shepherds. Hence, a simple repetition without any amplification of the theme suggests that it should not be overemphasised.

Talbert similarly references b. Sanh. 25b to support a pejorative view of shepherds by Luke in the birth narrative. He says that Luke's inclusion of the shepherds,

> can only be regarded as a foreshadowing of the subsequent theme of God's grace shown to sinners that runs throughout Luke. The messianic Lord is the friend of sinners (e.g., 5:29-32; 7:36-50; 10:30-37; 15:1-2; 17:11-19; 19:1-10). It is to sinners Jesus promises good news (e.g., 18:9-14; 15:11-32).

This view however, assumes Jeremias' conclusions about shepherds are correct, and as we have seen it is unlikely that is the case, although his identification of Luke's gospel as emphasising the forgiveness of sin is correct. It is unlikely that Luke intends his readers to regard them as sinners while at the same time he draws attention to the story of David (2:4, 11) when David is so widely understood as God's faithful shepherd king.

Further, the m. Bekhorot 5.4 which discusses first-born animals as 'holy things' refers to 'Israelite shepherds' and 'priestly shepherds.' The texts says,

> [If] a firstling was running after him, and he kicked it and made a blemish in it - lo, this is slaughtered on that account. Any blemishes which are likely to happen at the hands of man - Israelite shepherds are believed [to testify that the blemishes came about unintentionally]. But priestly shepherds are not believed. Rabban Simeon b. Gamaliel says, 'He [a priest] is believed concerning another's [firstling] but not concerning his own.'

Shepherding later became a proscribed trade for Pharisees, as this passage from the Mishnah suggests. This is consistent with Josh 14:4 which says, 'For the people of Joseph were two tribes, Manassah and Ephraim; and no portion was given to the Levites in the land, but only towns to live in with their pastures lands for their flocks and herds.'

We cannot be sure when 'priestly shepherds' became so designated and if there were Pharisees who were known as this in the first-century Palestine, but it is unlikely that any reli-

524. We will consider this in detail in section 4.3.5.3.2.
igious leaders would become shepherds if they were known as ἁμαρτωλοί. As a result, this lends further weight to the argument that Luke is not suggesting shepherds are sinners. Further, we have found that Philo spoke well of shepherds in the first-century (see chapters 2.1 and 2.3.2), which suggests at the very least, that there was not a normative Jewish position which believed shepherds were all sinners. We have also noted that Josephus records the tradition of Abel's superior sacrifice where it is suggested shepherding is a Godly occupation (see chapter 2.1; 2.3.5), and similarly Pseudo-Philo draws on story of the superior sheep sacrifice (see chapter 2.3.4). These traditions appear to have been overlooked in the above view. On the balance of evidence, these scholars make too much of a generalisation of the status of first-century shepherds from a Jewish perspective as a result of the late text of b. Sanh. 25b. Furthermore, for Jeremias to take m. Kidd. iv. 14 as a text that has valuable Jewish thinking on shepherds, is to overwork and misread the text. The T. Sanh. II.2.5a, which scholars do not even refer to, is simply too little evidence for Jeremias, Bailey, Hendriksen and Talbert to suggest there is a 'Jewish' position that shepherds are sinners. The suggestion that Luke’s understanding of shepherds was that they were sinners is therefore not to be considered likely.526

4.3.5.1.2 Shepherds Represent Graeco-Roman Bucolic Poetry

Bultmann suggested Luke introduced the shepherds into the narrative as the most suitable representatives of a new humanity where the Saviour's goal is to restore a state of Paradise.527 He perceives a shepherd's life constitutes this ideal image, as found in Bucolic Poetry of the Graeco-Roman world. Creed also notes how shepherds are found associated in legends with the birth and childhood of Romulus, Remus, and Mithras, although he does not develop the idea.528

The main problem with this view is that Luke's narrative is firmly centred in the stories of the history of Israel rather than Graeco-Roman allusions, so these former texts are most likely to


be his interpretive field. Luke states his aim in the Gospel prologue (1:1-4) and says he wants Theophilus to be certain about the things in which he has been instructed (1:4). This most likely refers to some form of Christian instruction, though probably not the later structured Christian catechesis of the early church.\textsuperscript{529} We can be confident anyway that the instruction would have been centred on locating Jesus in the Jewish scriptures, as Luke records Jesus explaining his story on the Emmaus road and for the disciples from the law, the prophets and the psalms (24:27, 44-45). We also note that Luke's writing is septuagintal in style and language after his initial prologue and his writing uses a high level of scriptural echoes. All this is evidence that Luke's primary interest is to locate Jesus in the story of Israel. Furthermore, there is no other evidence for Hellenistic Bucolic ideas in Luke’s birth narrative.\textsuperscript{530} A Hellenistic interpretive basis therefore should not be considered likely.

4.3.5.1.3 The Shepherds ‘as Angels’

Coleridge paints a vivid picture of the birth narrative where the shepherds are human players in a divine narrative, but he primarily suggests they are humans who become 'as angels' in delivering heaven's interpretation of the birth.\textsuperscript{531} The beginning of the narrative suggests it is Caesar who is the prime mover in the plot, but the advent of the angels coming to the shepherds shows he is not the centre of the story, God is. Thus, the shepherds are strategic in the narrative by bringing together the realm of Caesar who brought the parents to Bethlehem, and the realm of God who revealed the message to the shepherds.

Coleridge also suggests the shepherds resonate with those sitting in darkness and the shadow of death (1:79) suggesting an echo of Isaiah 9:1.\textsuperscript{532} While Isa 9:1-6 uses a military image, he concludes that Luke has abandoned the soldiers and military motif of Isaiah, in favour of shepherds. It is interesting that Coleridge does not develop or defend this echo, as this prophecy from Isaiah shows broader thematic features of Jesus from the infancy narrative. For example, we read in Isaiah that the child to be born will bring not only light to those in

\textsuperscript{529} Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 43.
\textsuperscript{531} Coleridge, Birth, 147.
\textsuperscript{532} Coleridge, Birth, 153.
darkness (Isa 9:1; Luke 1:79), but joy (Isa 9:2; Luke 2:10), the release of oppression (Isa 9:3-4; Luke 1:51-55, 71-75), peace (Isa 9:5-6; Luke 1:79; 2:14), and will herald the Davidic kingdom which is characterised by judgment and righteousness (Isa 9:6; Luke 1:75). Coleridge remains content to simply imply that the shepherds are examples of ones who are sitting in darkness and who see a great light, as in Isa 9:1, and note that Luke exchanged shepherds for soldiers. It is possible Luke may be reversing the military motif of Isa 9 as when Luke quotes Isa 61:1-2 in Luke 4:18-19 he stops before the Isaianic reference to the vengeance of God, ending instead with a declaration of Jubilee, a picture of hope. This aligns well with the view presented here that Jesus comes as the Davidic shepherd king who binds up the injured and heals the sick (Ezek 34:16) reversing the fortunes of the marginalised and oppressed. Thus a shepherd picture reverses the Jewish expectation of a military messiah and resonates with the Lukan Jesus who heals the sick, even the soldier who has his ear cut off (22:5-51); and a messiah who suffers (9:22; 18:31-33; 24:26, 46) and is silent before his oppressors (23:9).

Coleridge further describes the shepherds as examples of the marginalised who demonstrate belief, unlike the priest Zechariah, who does not believe the angel's message.\(^{533}\) This, Coleridge explains, is shown when they become as angels by believing the message and delivering it to Mary and Joseph (v. 17) and all who heard it (v. 18). The story of Jesus' birth is reported briefly, while the narrative freight lies in the meaning of the birth. This knowledge is given to the shepherds, as it is they who put the facts and interpretation together for the parents and all who were present in the κατάλωμα.\(^{534}\)

Coleridge notes the reaction of people to the shepherd's message (v. 18) which he suggests is astonishment to the point of incomprehension.\(^{535}\) He includes Mary in this reaction, so that in 2:19 when Luke says 'Mary treasured all the words and stored them up in her heart,' he suggests she is also puzzled by the words she has heard.\(^{536}\) He explains that the reason why she

---
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535. The Gospel says all the people are amazed (θαυμάζω). BDAG defines θαυμάζω as wondering, marvelling or being astonished, and suggests it is used with the same understanding as 1:63 when Zechariah writes John's name, and the people are amazed. θαυμάζω, BDAG, 444.
536. Coleridge, Birth, 148.
is puzzled is because of the unusual messengers and the circumstances of the birth, rather than the angel's message, as Mary has already heard the angel tell her who this child will be (1:26-38). From a literary point of view, Coleridge describes the inclusion of ὑπὸ τῶν ποιμένων and πρὸς αὐτοὺς (v. 18) as literary redundancy. That is, it is text that is not necessarily needed but focuses on 'the extraordinary fact of such a message brought by such messengers who themselves have been visited by angels.

The message is that the baby born in the city of David, is the Saviour, the Messiah and the Lord (2:11) and he is good news of great joy for all people (2:10). Coleridge stops short of making further narrative connections regarding the messengers themselves, however, could it be that the literary redundancy with regard to the shepherd messengers, is an aid for the reader to reveal something embodied in their message of the Davidic Saviour, Messiah and Lord born in the city of David?

The text goes on to narrate Mary's reaction, keeping the spotlight on her. Perhaps the reader is being led toward considering her perspective? Luke has already recounted Mary's encounter with Gabriel where we learn that the baby is the Son of the Most High and will be given the everlasting throne of David (1:31-33). She has already heard that her son will be the one to fulfil the Davidic covenant and so it is possible Mary might have made the link between the faithful shepherds in front of her with her baby's identity as Israel's new Davidic shepherd king. Luke has described Mary as a faithful servant of God when she responds to Gabriel (1:38) and Mary and Joseph are described as faithful Jews making pilgrimage to Jerusalem and the temple (2:22-24; 39, 41). Her song of praise from chapter one echoes much of Hannah's song from Kingdoms, and so, Luke presents her as knowledgeable of the stories of David and of scripture as a whole. It may be possible that Luke is suggesting that Mary pieces together something significant in the coming of the shepherds with the message of the Davidic saviour. Perhaps through the literary redundancy, Luke is highlighting the shepherds again as they are a part of the divine message. Could they be faithful shepherds coming to the Davidic shepherd?

537. Coleridge, Birth, 149.
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When Coleridge's analysis is broken down, the shepherds' role as angels is really one of faithful human delivery of the message, rather than a more elevated role that 'angels' may suggest. He fails to suggest there is anything embodied in that message aside from the fact that they are marginalised people.

Coleridge however, makes some valid points about the narrative which do show the limitations on Augustus' power to control the young couple's life. While Augustus is the one to issue the decree that all must be registered, the text shows that this decree simply gets Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem for the birth. The narrative shows that God is ultimately the one in control of Caesar’s imperial power, as his seemingly sovereign actions play into God's already predetermined plan that the messiah must be born in Bethlehem (Mic 5:2).

Coleridge's analysis also highlights the role of the cosmic realm in Luke's worldview, a position which grows throughout the Gospel. The important role of angels is established in the infancy narrative. It begins with the visitation of the angel to Zechariah (1:11) who announces that Elizabeth’s barren state will be overcome by God’s power so that she will give birth to one who will have the spirit and power of Elijah (1:17). This emphasis on the miraculous realm continues when Zechariah is struck dumb by the angel when he questions God’s word (1:20), and then is miraculously restored after John is named (1:59-66). The angel Gabriel is also a key character in the annunciation story. The text tells the reader he is sent by God to Mary (1:26), and then tells of an even more miraculous birth where the Holy Spirit will overshadow Mary so that she falls pregnant (1:31-35).

In emphasising the role of the angels and the divine in the narrative however, Coleridge underplays the role of the shepherds. For example, commenting on 2:8 Coleridge says, 'From a narrative point of view, the prime question is not why God might choose the shepherds to receive the revelation, but why the narrator makes the sudden switch away from the birth scene when he might easily and more naturally have turned to the reaction of Mary and Joseph.'539 This suggestion that the reader is not called to ask why God chose the shepherds as the recipients of the angel's message seems to overlook an important narrative feature. Why should the

539. Coleridge, Birth, 137.
reader not ask this question? And why should we not ask why Luke chose to make the shepherd setting so prominent in the birth narrative?

These are questions this study seeks to examine, and are short-falls of Coleridge's reading of the birth narrative. It appears that he has made a false choice by excluding an examination of the shepherds' involvement.

4.3.5.1.4 The Shepherds as Examples of the Lowly

The prevailing view of the shepherds in the birth narrative is that they are examples of people from a lowly status and so ideal recipients of God’s grace. Creed says, 'the idea that revelation is made to the simple is thoroughly in harmony with the spirit of the Gospels in general, and with Luke in particular.' ⁵⁴⁰ He further notes that this is consistent with the pagan world where gods visited simple country folk rather than sophisticated city dwellers. Marshall states the motif of God announcing the birth to ordinary lowly people is 'undoubtedly present,' ⁵⁴¹ while Johnson argues that they are seen as 'low-esteemed labourers.' ⁵⁴² He comments that Mary and Joseph 'are transients, equivalent to the homeless of contemporary street people.' ⁵⁴³

Fitzmyer also holds to the position that Luke includes the shepherds as examples of lowly members of society recalling 1:38, 52, while he also recognises the tradition that associates the birth of the messiah with Bethlehem and David. ⁵⁴⁴ He affirms that they are not sinners but also, contra Johnson, that they are not poor, since they are the implied owners of the flock. ⁵⁴⁵ Fitzmyer’s reference to Mary’s song at 1:52, where God brings down the powerful from their thrones and instead lifts up the lowly is a reversal motif that is consistent with Luke’s Gospel, while Fitzmyer's inclusion of 1:38 is confusing. In this verse Mary says to Gabriel, 'Here I am the servant of the Lord; let it be with me according to your word.' This does not necessarily imply she is a lowly member of society, rather that she is humble before

---

⁵⁴³. Ibid.
God. Fitzmyer may be suggesting she is poor because she is a woman, although the focus here is on her words of submission to God and not her gender.

Bock also sides with this view that shepherds represent the lowly and humble who respond to God's message. He cites Mary's humility at 1:38, the Magnificat at 1:52 and then appeals to the Nazareth manifesto at 4:16-18. These verses highlight the eschatological reversal where the lowly are lifted up and the poor have good news brought to them. This view stresses the work of God in bringing salvation to the poor, while it includes no recognition of a Jewish view of the divine shepherd from the OT. This is intriguing because Bock argues the view that shepherds are not sinners, based on the late dating of rabbinic evidence, and the positive view of shepherds from the OT and the NT. He notes in particular that church leaders come to be known as shepherds and, 'in the OT, Abraham, Moses and David were all shepherds at some point in their lives,' while he does not identify God as a shepherd. He appears to have overlooked that God says he will be a shepherd for his people (Ezek 34:11-16) and that David clearly knows God as shepherd (Ps 22).

Green also sides with this predominant view of shepherds as lowly but he refers to the shepherds as 'outsiders.' He views 'outsiders' in two ways. Firstly, they are outsiders to the birth family showing not only how significant this birth is, but that it prefigures Luke's redefinition of 'family' in the Gospel. Secondly, they are outsiders because they are 'persons of low regard.' He acknowledges that they play a pivotal role in the narrative, and that they have been anticipated implicitly by the continued mention of David and the lowly in Luke 1. He makes nothing further, however, of this connection between Luke's use of 'David' in the narrative and the shepherds.

547. The Nazareth sermon finishes at 4:19.
548. Bock wrongly positions Brown with this view of shepherds as sinners. Bock, Luke, 213. Talking of the view that shepherds are sinners from b. Sahn 25b, Brown states, 'This has led to the suggestion that for Luke they represented sinners whom Jesus came to save (see 5:32; 7:34; 15:1; 19:7); yet there is no hint of that in 2:8-20.' Brown, Birth, 420.
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Green does comment however, that the economic situation of shepherds set them toward the bottom of the scale of power and privilege. Bailey's research shows that

- the average family may have five to fifteen animals. A number of families get together and hire a shepherd. The shepherd may own some of the animals and be from one of the families. Thus, in the case of a small herd of about forty animals, the shepherd leading them may be their sole owner. In the case of a hundred sheep the shepherd is probably not their sole owner.

Undoubtedly being a shepherd for someone else's sheep or even being the owner of some of the sheep, suggests a low socio-economic status. Furthermore, the crippling taxation system would have meant that life was difficult economically. There is no doubt that shepherds can be identified as poor in first-century Palestine and Luke presents an eschatological reversal of the lowly in the Gospel. But I would question whether this is the primary function of the shepherds in the birth narrative and whether their historical economic situation is why Luke has given them such a central role in the birth narrative.

Green describes Luke 1-2 as an 'echo chamber' where many stories of Israel are heard. Yet here, he and other scholars appear to underplay the role for the shepherds by only interpreting them in their literal setting, making no connection between them and the strong Davidic setting Luke has given in this narrative and the wider infancy narrative. While first-century Palestinian shepherds were economically poor, in Luke's narrative world where Israel's stories abound, shepherds had a divine and noble heritage. It is therefore unlikely that their natural status as poor or marginalised is the only image they suggest.

4.3.5.1.5 The Shepherds Support the Davidic Tradition

Fitzmyer, Nolland and Brown see varying degrees of resonance between the shepherds and the Davidic tradition, while the argument is only developed by Brown. Other scholars see an

---

553. Green references Lenski who addresses the 'peasant class' over a broad geographical and historical domain from sixteenth-century Japan, modern Chinese peasants, Sukodhya Thailand, Hammurabi's Babylon, Christian Europe in the middle ages to thirteenth-century England. He does not directly address the economic situation of first-century Palestinian shepherds, although his analysis does provide a broad background for assessing the peasant class. See Green, Gospel of Luke, 130; Gerhard Lenski, Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification (New York: McGraw Hill, 1966), 266-278.
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allusion to the Davidic tradition from Mic 5:2, but they make this connection because of the mention of Bethlehem and not the shepherds.\textsuperscript{556}

Fitzmyer's key rationale for the role of the shepherds is because they are examples of lowly members of society. He also attributes the introduction of the shepherds into the birth narrative to support the tradition which expects the Messiah to be born in Bethlehem, the hometown of David the shepherd. While Fitzmyer suggests that Mic 5:2 lies in the background of Jesus' birth in Bethlehem, he is not willing to make the connection between the shepherds and the Davidic tradition.\textsuperscript{557}

Nolland also briefly suggests the shepherds suit the pastoral roots of David who was also from Bethlehem (1 Kgdms 16:11; 17:15; Ps 77:70), although he fails to perceive any royal figure behind the shepherds in the Lukan drama.\textsuperscript{558} Marshall does not find a connection between 'David' and the 'shepherds' in the birth narrative since 'an allusion to the task of David as a shepherd…is unlikely, since it should be the child who is a shepherd, not the witnesses of his birth.\textsuperscript{559} However, as Luke's readers are also presented with a strong Bethlehem setting (2:4, 15), and David's name occurs three times in the narrative, it might be wrong to assume Luke's readers would not make some level of connection here.

Nolland also considers the possibilities of a link between the shepherds and Migdal Eder, the 'Tower of the Flock' (Mic 4:8), but with the key word 'tower' and 'dominion' missing in Luke's narrative, he side with caution.\textsuperscript{560} While it appears therefore that he may see possibilities within the David tradition, he does not make any connection between the shepherds in the birth narrative and David as the shepherd ruler of Israel.

Brown, on the other hand, sees great symbolism in the shepherds, their point of origin from Bethlehem and the role of Mic 4:8.\textsuperscript{561} He uses the word 'symbolism' frequently with regard to the shepherds, suggesting that there is something in them that implies something greater for the narrative. Brown proposes that there is a 'midrashic reflection' underlying Luke's narra-

\textsuperscript{556} This will be discussed in section 4.3.5.3.
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\textsuperscript{561} Brown, \textit{Birth}, 420-424.
tive which is a key to the symbolism of the shepherds that attaches them to the Bethlehem area.\(^562\) In this, he first states that it is likely there is a Jewish background to Luke's symbolism which is sound, as Luke draws so heavily on the stories of Israel in his Gospel.

He then notes that Jewish expectation was that the Messiah would come from Bethlehem. John 7:42 supports this when it says, 'has not the scripture said that the Messiah is descended from Bethlehem, the village where David lived?' This 'scripture' John refers to is most likely Mic 5:2, a text Matthew cites (Matt 2:5-6).\(^563\) While I do not suggest Luke knew Matthew or John's Gospel, their Gospels do indicate that first-century Judaism did expect the Messiah to come from Bethlehem, and we can expect that Luke also knew this tradition. This tradition is found in the prophet Micah's words.

In considering Mic 5:2, Brown looks to the broader historical picture of Mic 4-5. When the prophet was writing the Northern Kingdom had fallen to Tiglath-pileser III and the Assyrian army (722 B.C.E.) and Micah prophesies the fall of the Davidic monarchy and the Southern Kingdom. However, Micah says the Lord will rescue Jerusalem from her enemies through a ruler who will come from the small city where David was born, Bethlehem. Firstly, he notes that Migdal Eder is called the 'tower of the flock' (Mic 4:8) and Brown suggests that it is this that connects the shepherds and their flocks to the Bethlehem area.\(^564\) He notes that both Gen 35:21 and Mic 4:8 connect Migdal Eder with the Bethlehem area (Gen 35:19; Mic 5:1). He goes on to suggest that because the future victory for Jerusalem/Zion will come from Bethlehem's new ruler, Migdal Eder and Jerusalem are being identified together.\(^565\)

Secondly, Brown notes that Luke describes Joseph going up to Bethlehem (\(ἀναβαίνω\); 2:4) with the verb traditionally used for going up to Jerusalem, and also that Luke refers to the 'city of David' for Bethlehem and not Jerusalem.\(^566\) He then suggests that for Luke, 'Micah's reference to the "mountain of the house of the Lord" [Mic 4:8] has been shifted from

\(^{562}\) Brown, Birth, 421.
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\(^{564}\) Brown, Birth, 421.
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Jerusalem/Zion to Bethlehem, since it is there that one must go to see the Lord ([Luke] 2:11-12). This he suggests is possible if Luke, or a midrashic tradition available to him, read Mic 4:8 and 5:2 in parallel as he demonstrates:

> And you, O dusty tower of the flock,
> daughter Zion,
> to you it shall come, and the former dominion,
> a kingdom out of Babylon, shall enter daughter Jerusalem (Mic 4:8).

> And you, O Bethlehem, house of Ephratha,
> Are very few in number to be among the thousands of Judah;
> From you shall come forth for me to become a ruler in Israel,
> And his goings forth are from of old, from days of yore (Mic 5:2).

Brown concludes that 'Luke's reference to shepherds pasturing their flock in the region of Bethlehem (2:8) may reflect his understanding that Migdal Eder, the Tower of the Flock of Mic 4:8, is in the environs of Bethlehem rather than at Jerusalem.' However, Brown's midrash may be taking these parallels too far by equating one place (Migdal Eder/Jerusalem) with another (Bethlehem) and this seems an unlikely background for Luke's use of the city of David, Bethlehem.

The strength of Brown's analysis is the significance he places on the symbolism of the shepherds in Luke's narrative and identifying an echo of Micah's prophecy. This echo and the role of Bethlehem will be assessed later in the chapter, however we should note that Brown does not develop any tangible link between the messianic shepherd king of Mic 5:4 and the newborn Davidic baby. His focus is limited to narratively and geographically linking Mic 4:8 with Mic 5:2. It seems he may have limited his analysis of the shepherds in Luke too tightly by limiting his links to confirming the geographical setting and missing the fact that Mic 5:2 is attached to a wider pericope of 5:2-5 where the shepherd ruler is described.

Nolland and Fitzmyer's reading of the shepherds in Luke 2 as drawing in some respects on the early story of David when he was in Bethlehem is sound and should be considered possi-
Luke makes a considerable emphasis on the 'Davidic' setting of the birth and specifically the 'city of David' which is Bethlehem for him, and not Jerusalem. As we have seen earlier in this chapter, he has also made considerable use of the David story to introduce Jesus. These, coupled with Luke's remarkable shepherd setting and David's shepherd identity are links that lie comfortably in Luke's overall interest in the Davidic theme in the infancy narrative.

4.3.5.1.6 Shepherds signify Jesus as the Messianic Shepherd

Bovon says that the overriding portrayal of shepherds in biblical literature is primarily positive, and as a nation of shepherds, they used this image for God, for their king and their expected messiah.570 We have found this to be true from our analysis in chapter two. However, Bovon also notes that Ezekiel 34 shows the Jewish people were expecting an eschatological Davidic shepherd, and from Micah 5 that this messianic shepherd was going to be born in Bethlehem.

In his brief interpretation of the birth narrative, Bovon perceives Jesus as the 'messianic shepherd,' and the role of the shepherds in the narrative as drawing the readers' attention to that fact. 'Was von Betlehem seit Mi 5 erwartet wurde, war freilich nicht eine messianische Geburt des mitten unter den Hirten, sondern die Geburt des messianischen Hirten.'571 In this Bovon makes an interpretive link that combines resonant features of Davidic prophecy with the baby born to Mary.

He cites not only the messianic shepherd from Micah 5 but also the Davidic shepherd king from Ezekiel 34. In Ezek 34 Bovon notes the criticism of the bad shepherds of Israel (vv. 1-10), the drawing together of Israel under God as shepherd (vv. 11-16), God’s judgment of the people and leaders (vv. 16-22), the prophecy of the eschatological Davidic shepherd (vv. 23-24), and a description of the messianic age (vv. 25-31). In this echo, Bovon takes seriously the interplay of God as Israel's shepherd (vv. 11-16) and also the coming Davidic shepherd, his servant (vv. 23-31). This he develops no further.

570. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 122.
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The strength of Bovon's reading of the shepherds is that he assesses them in the context of the wider story of scripture. It appears from our analysis of the shepherds in Luke's narrative that there is a tendency for scholars to consider them as isolated characters in the narrative, and this limits how they are understood. Bovon, instead, reads them as a part of a wider connection to David, Bethlehem, and to God. This approach resonates with Luke's narrative writing style which assumes the narrative is a cohesive whole and one part of a narrative or one character works to complement the story as a unity. This is the view I will go on to develop.

We will first consider the role of the census and the rule of Augustus in 4.3.5.2 which will establish that Luke is contrasting two 'shepherd kings' with two understandings of 'kingdom.' Then in 4.3.5.3 we will demonstrate how Luke is using his expression the 'city of David, Bethlehem' to further support the baby's shepherd king identity through an echo of Mic 5:2-5. In 5.3.5.3.2 and 5.3.5.3.3 we will address the juxtaposition of the 'city of David' and 'Bethlehem' with reference to Luke's genealogy which does not trace the kingly line through Solomon but though a lesser known son, Nathan. Here we will affirm that Luke is drawing on Jer 22:30 in accord with other scholars, but go on to show that Jeremiah's ongoing argument declares that God is replacing Israelite leadership by his appointed Davidic shepherd (Jer 23:1-6), and that this is an association Luke intends his readers to recognise. It is these combined features that support Bovon's reading of the messianic shepherd in the birth narrative. As this thesis progresses we will then demonstrate in chapters 5 and 6 that Jesus as the Davidic shepherd king is an ongoing interest in Luke's narrative and this epitomises the nature of his ministry as he seeks out and saves the lost sheep.

In Summary: The shepherds should not be taken as examples of sinners or as characters from Hellenistic poetry, and neither should they be limited to mere examples of the humble, poor and marginalized. Shepherds have an overwhelmingly positive characterisation in the scriptures, and are often used metaphorically for his servant David. While they may have had a humble status in first-century Palestine, their Jewish heritage is royal and divine. As Luke's writing style favours echoes of Israel's story to convey meaning, their prominent role in the birth narrative should be seen as narratively significant, with the key echo here being drawn from the LXX. The suggestion that the shepherds support the Davidic tradition seems resonant with Luke's emphasis on David in Luke 1-2. Further, Brown and Bovon's suggestion
that Luke is echoing Micah 5 deserves to be evaluated as it may bring together Luke's shepherd setting and his emphasis on the story of David.

4.3.5.2 The Role of the Census

This section will examine the narrative role of the census with respect to Augustus and the Graeco-Roman background. Luke begins this pericope with news of Augustus’ decree that all the world must be registered in their own towns. Augustus' ἀπογραφή dominates the first five verses by being recalled four times (2:1, 2, 3, 5). It therefore takes central stage in the setting of the birth narrative and it is against this backdrop that the reader learns of Mary and Joseph's movement to Bethlehem. As the census is located historically by Luke, first we will consider how mention of Augustus would have been perceived in the ancient world, and then what this may mean to the reader’s interpretation.

Caesar Augustus, born Gaius Octavius Thurinus, was triumvir of Rome (43 B.C.E. – 31 B.C.E.) in a shared military rule with Mark Antony and Marcus Lepidus known as the Second Triumvirate. Octavian then held various autocratic positions of power over the Roman Senate until he came to rule the Roman world in supreme position from 27 B.C.E. to 14 C.E. when he was given the title Augustus. His new name, Augustus, had semi-religious connotations and made claims of superior personal prestige and authority. Augustus was the first

572 There is considerable debate about the census in Luke 2:1-5. D. F. Strauss noticed in 1835 that Luke had appeared to make an historical error with his record of the census. How can the reader reconcile the fact that there is no external evidence to support a world-wide census at the time of Herod, who died in 4 B.C.E., and when Quirinius was governor of Syria, whose rule did not commence until 6 C.E? Scholars have found, and continue to find potential explanations for these tensions, and their solutions fall largely into five groups. (1) Luke has made a mistake in his historical information. (2) There was a scribal error that caused the tension. Luke’s intention was to be historically accurate. (3) There are grammatical solutions and possibilities that may mean we have mistranslated Luke’s text. (4) There is missing historical information to resolve the issue of the census and Quirinius’ governorship. (5) Luke’s purpose is purely theological rather than historical, therefore eliminating the need for historical reliability. For surveys of these debates see Bock, Luke, 903-909; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 399-405; Nolland, Luke, 99-103.


574 H. H. Scullard, From the Gracchi to Nero: A History of Rome from 133BC to AD68 (London: Methuen, 1979), 219.
Roman emperor to achieve 'worldwide' rule, so while other emperors before him had widened Roman rule, Octavius annexed Egypt in 30 B.C.E. and achieved Pax Augusta. In a civil war that finally eliminated all his rivals, he declared: *per consensum universorum potius rerum omnium*, proclaiming his 'unchallenged and universal sovereignty.' Further, the Mediterranean world believed imperial rule was underpinned by a god-like autocracy that was both religious and political. The poet Horace summed up Roman thinking when he said; 'Because you show due reverence to the gods, you rule on earth.' Virgil declared of Augustus:

This is the man, this is the one whom you have long been promised,
Augustus Caesar, offspring of a god, founder of the golden age.

By bringing temporal peace Augustus was viewed as the earthly prince of peace, and was looked upon in god-like terms. Dio Cassius records the occasion when the Romans formally conferred the title of 'Father' on Augustus, when he was honoured as 'saviour of the citizens,' was given the title of Augustus signifying that he was more than human, and his power was described as that of a monarch. Paulus Fabius Maximus, the proconsul of Asia decreed that 'in view of the distinctiveness of Augustus' birthdate as the beginning of a new era for humanity, it would be appropriate to adopt the natal day of Augustus as the beginning of the official year in the province.'

Whereas Providence…has…adorned our lives with the highest good: Augustus…and has in her beneficence granted us and those who will come after us [a Savior] who has made war to cease and who shall put everything [in peaceful] order…with the result that the birthday of our God signalled the beginning of Good News for the world because of him…

---

579. Dio writes, "The Romans also formally conferred the title of father upon the Emperor: until then he had only been so addressed, without the title having been established by decree." Dio Cassius, Book 55.10.
580. Dio Cassius, Book 53.16.
581. Dio Cassius, Book 53.16.
582. Dio Cassius, Book 53.17.
Inscriptions talked about Augustus as 'the most divine Caesar,' that he was 'the beginning of the breath of life for them,' and in his birth was 'the beginning of all things.' Many coins had images of his head in a temple and one of a sacrifice before the imperial temple. The cult of the ruler as founder, saviour and benefactor was well established in the Graeco-Roman world, and it served in the first instance as an 'ecumenical unifying force' for the empire, even though the 'divinity' of the emperor was constructed one way in the Latin West and another in the Greek East. The seeds of the ruler's divinity were evident. Crook says,

Some seminal elements can already be traced, for example, in the oak-leaf crowns and laurel wreaths, and the symbolism of victory-on-the-orb on the coinage and elsewhere; and Augustus was accorded the right to wear at any time the triumphal costume, which was the dress of Jupiter himself, and included a sceptre.

The language and images of saviour, god, father, good news and lord echo in the biblical text, and particularly in the infancy narrative where a new Davidic king was about to be born. In 2:1 Augustus issues a decree to πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουµένην, literally the 'whole inhabited earth,' and therefore Joseph and the heavily pregnant Mary go to Bethlehem. This powerful Roman figure, however, makes no further appearance on the Lukan stage. In the narrative he has fulfilled his function by bringing Mary and Joseph to the place where God needed them to be. The text tells us this is the city of David called Bethlehem.

The inclusion of Augustus and news of his census serves the narrative in three ways. Firstly, it confirms Luke's interest in the historical world and his desire to connect his readers with their own culture and history. The Gospel could not simply be read by Theophilus and other first-century readers without their senses being alerted to this leading political figure. We have seen that Augustus' influence was pervasive in the Graeco-Roman world and this study suggests any Christian writer who names him would have been doing so deliberately.

---

585. These are (translated) words from an ancient Roman statue where the Roman governor, who proposed starting the New Year on Augustus' birthday, expresses the crucial importance of the birth of Augustus. See Price, Rituals and Power, 55.
588. Crook, Augustus: Power, Authority and Achievement,' 136.
589. There is no scholarly consensus regarding the role Augustus plays in the Lukan narrative. Marshall notes he functions to place Luke's account in the context of world history. Nolland, Fitzmyer, Brown, Bovon, Horsley and Green suggest that he is a deliberate contrast to the rule of Christ. Green
mention of Augustus who is known to be *Saviour, Lord, the bringer of peace* and *good news* in contrast to the angels who declare the baby has these roles, signals something of Luke's intention. As Bovon says,

> Mit einem allen, Juden und Griechen, verständlichen Titel verkündet der Engel die Geburt des ιησου. Dieser Titel spielte damals, besonders in der hellenistischen Herrschaftsideologie, eine große Rolle.\(^{590}\)

While Luke is therefore positioning Jesus as fulfilling the promises to Israel, he is also showing how Jesus as Saviour and Lord impacts Theophilus' immediate context, the Graeco-Roman world.

Secondly, the text demonstrates that God's power is greater than that of Augustus. Augustus issues the decree and all people must obey, and yet his actions lead to the fulfilment of ancient prophecy as Micah has prophesied the messianic shepherd will be born in Bethlehem (Mic 5:2). Caesar enters the narrative, fulfils his function to move Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem, and then exits. This suggests even Augustus, the Roman Emperor, is ultimately on God's timetable as God is the prime mover in the narrative. Augustus issues his decree when Herod is King in Judea (1:5), but God has issued his decree in the late eighth century B.C.E. when Micah was prophet in the land of Judea. For Luke, real power resides in God and not in earthly rulers and their kingdoms.\(^{591}\)

\(^{590}\) Bovon, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1*, 125.

\(^{591}\) This is an ongoing feature of Luke’s narrative. For example, the Herods are mentioned often by Luke: 1:5 refers to Herod the Great; 3:1, 19; 8:3; 9:7, 9; 13:31; 23:7, 8, 11, 12, 15; Acts 4:27 refer to Herod Antipas; Acts 12:1, 6, 11, 19, 20, 21; 13:1; 23:35 refer to Herod Agrippa I, and Acts 25:13-26:32 refers to Agrippa 1's son, Agrippa). They play an important narrative role. When Herod Agrippa 1 put Peter in prison, it is God's angel who unshackles Peter and shows him an escape route while many guards on watch remain unaware of his absence (Acts 12:1-11). The text shows it is God who brings light to the cell (Acts 12:7) and holds the prison keys not the governing authorities. In Acts 12:20-23 Herod Agrippa puts on his royal robes and takes his seat to deliver a public address when he is struck down by an angel of the Lord and eaten by worms because he does not give glory to God. God acts with supreme power to show both this royally robed Herod and the people of Judea that Herod is not king, God is. Herod's power is thus shown to be inadequate and his life is on God’s timetable. *Contra*, Paul W. Walaskay, *And So We Came to Rome: The Political Perspective of St Luke* (SNTSMS 49; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
Finally, Luke suggests an inherent contrast between the baby who is born in the 'city of (King) David' and Augustus. Both are rulers and so both are shepherds, but it is with respect to the type of rule they exercise that Luke draws a contrast. Augustus rules by political maneuvering and imperial organisation characterised by the census decree, while the baby's power comes from the divine throne characterised by the army (στρατιά) of angels who announce God's peace. It is God's power attributed to the baby which brings divine peace and therefore godly power to all the earth.

From this we can conclude that the mention of Augustus has a narrative role in the birth story which contrasts the power of imperial and divine worlds. For Luke, God is the one with true power as his decree was announced centuries before Augustus' reign, and this power now resides in the baby whose birth was announced by an army of angels.

4.3.5.3 Bethlehem, the City of David

Luke's statement that Mary and Joseph go up to the πόλις Δαυίδ ἃτις καλεῖται Βηθλεὲμ provides a possible echo of Mic 5:2-5, and also unexpected information that is important in understanding Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as Davidic shepherd king. These ideas will be explored now.

4.3.5.3.1 The City of David

Luke’s focus on the πόλις Δαυίδ as Bethlehem is a signal of Luke's narrative interest. Bethlehem reminds the reader of the story of David as we first meet David at Bethlehem where he was anointed king by Samuel (1 Kgdms 16:1-13), and where he was a faithful shepherd for his father’s flock. It is here he is said to have fought and prevailed against lions and bears to protect the flock (1 Kgdms 17:34), and it is where he gained the necessary skills and attributes so that he was seen as suitable to be brought into Saul's kingly court (1 Kgdms 16:14-23).

Bethlehem is the place where Micah had said the messianic shepherd would be born (Mic 5:2-5), and so we will evaluate this echo using Hays' tests. Bock is not confident about attributing an echo to Micah as Luke does not directly quote the passage, as Matthew does

---

592 Refer to chapter 3.2.

There are obvious parallels of vocabulary with references to Βηθλέεμ (Mic 5:2; Luke 2:4, 15), ποιμήν and cognates (Mic 5:4; Luke 2:8, 15, 18, 20) and talk of εἰρήνη (Mic 5:5; Luke 2:14). There is also the allusion to one giving birth in Micah (Mic 5:2) with Mary giving birth (2:7). The emphasis on one who is to rule is also shared between the texts while using different language; Micah talks of one to rule (ἄρχων; Mic 5:2) while the wider text of Micah 4:5 uses βασιλεία (4:8) which is consistent with Luke’s emphasis on Jesus being given the Davidic throne (1:32). There is also the possibility that the σήμερον in Luke 2:11, should be ‘heard’ as the fulfilment of the woman in labour in Micah (Mic 5:2). This shows there is some evidence of volume through the repetition of language between the two passages.

On a thematic level we should not underestimate the use of some of this language. Peace (εἰρήνη) is an aspect of salvation in Luke and is used in a common blessing (7:50; 8:48). Εἰρήνη has already been spoken by Zechariah in the context of salvation coming to Israel (1:79), it is in Simeon’s hymn of praise (2:29) and is an echo of Isa 49:6 where salvation comes also to the Gentiles (2:32). It is mentioned in the context of the mission of the seventy (10:5, 6) and Jesus will bless the disciples with peace after the resurrection (24:36). It is sung

---

595. The UBSGNT (Rev 4th Ed.) has a list of quotes and allusions. The NA only lists quotes. See UBSGNT (Rev 4th Ed.), 900.
596. Brown also suggests Micah 4:10’s birth pangs may resonate here. Brown, Birth, 422.
597. Brown does give specific references here. Brown, Birth, 422. I note Micah’s use of ξοδος for the bringing forth in labour (Mic 5:1). Notably this is the word used in Exod 19:1 of the Israelites’ deliverance from Egypt, and Micah uses it to talk of the exodus in Mic 7:15. This is also used within the context of the shepherd motif of 7:14 which says, ‘Shepherd your people with your rod, the sheep of your possession...they shall feed in Basanitis and Galaditis as the days of old.’ Luke also uses ξοδος in his transfiguration account (Luke 9:31), and this is significant for his journey motif. There could be the possibility that Luke may be suggesting a veiled exodus motif here, although he does not make it clear. 598. Jesus says to both the sinful woman (7:50) and the haemorrhaging woman (8:48), ἡ πίστις σου σέσωκέν σε τον πορευόμενον εἰς εἰρήνην.
of in the angels' hymn of praise before the shepherds in 2:14, where peace is tantamount to salvation. This is later recalled in a parallel hymn in 19:38 when multitudes of disciples sing of peace in heaven.

The use of μεγάλόνω (Mic 5:4) in the context of the Bethlehemite ruler may also recall μέγας used in Luke 1:32 which, as we have seen, echoes the Davidic covenant (2 Kgdms 7:9). The description of Bethlehem being ὀλιγοστός (few in number; Mic 5:2) also reflects the general thrust of Mary's song where it is the ones who are poor and lowly who are lifted up. There is an interesting use of ἐξοδος in Mic 5:2 which Luke uses uniquely in the transfiguration (9:31). This is understood as integral to Luke's exodus journey motif and so there may be wider Lukan cohesion here. Finally, the description of being made great 'to the ends of the earth' (Mic 5:4), has a Lukan flavour of the gospel going to the ends of the earth (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8), while the language used is different.

In Summary: The thematic coherence of Micah 5:2-5 resonates very highly with identified Lukan themes. It comes with a strong base of scholarly support showing that many scholars using a range of methodological approaches have found an echo here, and it most certainly provides a satisfactory reading. In fact, combining the prominent shepherds in the Lukan narrative with this echo, we do find support for Bovon's suggestion regarding the messianic shepherd; namely, the Davidic shepherd king.

Strauss rightly notes 'whereas Matthew emphasises Jesus' Bethlehem birth because it fulfils the prophecy of Mic 5:2, Luke wishes to stress the Davidic link.' Matthew's concern is to show how Jesus fulfilled prophecy, while Luke's emphasis is to link Jesus' birthplace with his Davidic shepherd king identity. Therefore, Luke's unexpected reference to the city of David as Bethlehem, functions to recall the prophecy of Mic 5:2-5 of the Davidic shepherd ruler.

4.3.5.3.2 The Juxtaposition of the City of David and Bethlehem

In the birth narrative, the reader’s ears are alerted to the juxtaposition of πόλις Δαυίδ with Βηθλέεμ. The Jewish world knew the city of David was Jerusalem (2 Kgdms 5:7, 9; 6:10,

599. This will be discussed more fully in chapter five.
600. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 111.
12, 16; 3 Kgdms 9:24; 14:31; 15:8) rather than Bethlehem. 2 Kingdoms 5:7-9 (cf. 1 Chron 11:5-7) describes the taking of the Jebusite city and renaming it 'the city of David,' otherwise known as 'Jebusite' Jerusalem, the holy city, or Zion. The city of David was the place where the ark resided (2 Kgdms 6:12, 16; 1 Chron 15:29) and where Solomon built his temple (3 Kgdms 3:1; 8:1; 2 Chron 5:2) making it the key place of religious and divine power. It is also the place where the kings lived and were buried when they died, suggesting a political interest. Luke's narrative interest in Jerusalem is well accepted, and yet, at this point in the infancy narrative, it is Bethlehem and not Jerusalem to which Luke directs his readers. The question must be asked why Luke does this.

I propose that Luke's use of Bethlehem in contrast to Jerusalem suggests king and kingdom are being redefined in Luke's Gospel. In the same way that Augustus, the leading Graeco-Roman political figure, is sidelined in Luke's narrative, so too is the lineage of a Jewish political kingdom in Jerusalem. This suggests a kingdom that will have a different nuance to kings who conquered with armies and displays of power.

This proposal may be confirmed by Luke's genealogy (3:23-38). Luke has some clear differences to Matthew's record; notably, Luke shows David's son as Nathan (3:31) while Matthew has him as Solomon (Matt 1:6). Johnson notes that 'the most surprising aspect of Luke's genealogy is its rejection of the royal line of Judah.' The kingly lineage in Matthew is from Solomon to Jechoniah (Matt 1:6-12) while Luke's lineage is from Nathan to Neri in Luke

---

601. 'Jebusite' Jerusalem distinguishes the ancient site from what we know as Jerusalem. The ancient site is estimated to be only ten to fifteen acres and is a relatively small part of what is now known as Jerusalem. Philip J. King, 'Jerusalem,' ABD 3:751.


603. David (3 Kgdms 2:10), Solomon (3 Kgdms 11:43; 2 Chr 9:31), Rehoboam (3 Kgdms 14:31; 2 Chr 12:16), Abijam (3 Kgdms 15:8; 2 Chr 13:23), Asa (3 Kgdms 15:24; 2 Chr 16:14), Jehoshaphat (3 Kgdms 22:51; 2 Chr 21:1), Jehoram (4 Kgdms 8:24; 2 Chr 21:20), Joash (4 Kgdms 12:22; 2 Chr 24:25), and Jotham (4 Kgdms 15:38; 2 Chr 27:9).


Scholars have come to various positions regarding why Luke has done this. These views from least likely to most accepted are:

1. Luke shows a tradition that traces Nathan the son of David to Nathan, the prophet. The Tg Zech 12:12 links the family of the house of Nathan the prophet, to the Son of David, as does Africanus’ Letter to Aristides, Eusebius, and the Apocalypse of Zerubbabel. This position was suggested by Johnson in his earlier monograph where he argues this minority view was the tradition that Luke drew on.

2. Luke avoids the kingly line because of scandals associated with the kingly Davidic line.

3. The most widely accepted view is that Luke avoids the kingly line of Solomon to Jechoniah because he is aware of Jeremiah’s prophecy to Jehoiakim that his son Jechoniah would not sit on the throne of David (Jer 36:30), and that the line from Jechoniah would cease (Jer 22:24-30). Jeremiah says,

   O land, land
   Hear the word of the Lord:
   Record this man as a banished person,
   Because none of his offspring shall grow up
   To sit on the throne of David,
   As ruler again in Judah (Jer 22:30).

This position also acknowledges that Zech 12:10-14, and in particular vv. 12-14, describe the separate houses of David, Nathan, Levi, and Shimeites, which are all a part of Luke's distinctive genealogy from Nathan to Neri. The text says,

   The land shall mourn, tribes by tribes; the tribe of the house of David by itself, and their wives by themselves; the tribe of the house of Nathan by itself, and their wives by themselves; the tribe of the house of Levi by itself, and their wives by themselves; the tribe of Simeon by itself, and their wives by themselves; and all the tribes that are left, each by itself, and their wives by themselves (Zech 12:12-14).

In this passage Zechariah makes no statement about the relationship of David and Nathan, but the four houses are each recorded in the pre-exilic section of Luke's genealogy (Luke 3:30-31) making it very likely that Luke knew this tradition and was drawing upon it.
Miura in David in Luke-Acts, states that the reasons for Nathan’s inclusion and the apparent rejection of the kingly line remains uncertain. It is here this study wishes to add to the discussion.

4.3.5.3.3 The End of the Kingly line and the Rise of the Davidic Shepherd King of Jeremiah

Jeremiah's prophecy in Jer 22:30 does not stop at v. 30 when he announces the cessation of the Jewish kingly line, but the prophet’s argument continues with the announcement of a Davidic shepherd king. Jeremiah 23 follows immediately with a woe to the shepherds of Israel that they have not been caring for the flock and a declaration that the Lord will end their reign by replacing them with faithful shepherds (vv. 1-4). Then Jeremiah says God will raise up a Davidic shepherd king (vv. 5-6). Jeremiah first prophesies:

καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτοῖς αὐτοῦς ποιμένας, οἱ ποιμανόσιν αὐτοῦς
I will raise up shepherds for them who will shepherd them (Jer 23:4).

Then he prophesies a shepherd who will: (1) come from the house of David (Jer 23:5); (2) come as an ἀνατολή δίκαιων (Jer 23:5); (3) be βασιλεύς (Jer 23:5); and (4) will bring Judah salvation (Jer 23:6).

These four points are all reflected in Luke's infancy narrative.

Firstly, Jeremiah's prophecy reflects Luke's interest that has already been established in Jesus' lineage through the house of David (1:27, 32, 69; 2:4, 11).

Secondly, the use of ἀνατολή δίκαιων recalls ἀνατολή ἐξ ὕψους (1:78), where Jesus is the ἀνατολή, 'rising light,' and which Strauss has shown has a Davidic basis stemming from Jer 23:5; Zech 3:8; 6:12 (see chapter 2.4.3.).

Luke also repeats δίκαιος in his narrative particularly to describe the covenant-keeping faithful (1:6; 2:25; 23:50) who he shows are model respondents to God. However, most significant of all is Jesus, who is shown to be innocent in his trial by both Pilate and Herod, and then declared δίκαιος by the centurion (23:47).

---

614. See chapter 2.4.3.
615. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 103-107.
616. Luke has many unique passages in the trial which highlight Jesus' innocence. Pilate states to the Chief Priests and the multitudes that οὐδὲν εὐρίσκω αὕτων ἐν τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τούτῳ, 'I find no guilt in this man' (23:4), and Jesus is brought before Herod to be questioned but Herod also exonerates him from the
This use here of ἀνατολή δίκαιων in Jeremiah therefore coheres with the Lukan Jesus who is both the Davidic 'rising light' and δίκαιος.

Thirdly, the status of Jesus as βασιλεύς and the resultant nature of that kingdom are of central interest to Luke. While Jesus’ role as king is often implied in the narrative, the presentation of Jesus as βασιλεύς will be brought to the fore in 19:38 when Jesus enters Jerusalem. While Mark records, 'Blessed is the one who comes in the name of the Lord' (Mark 11:9), Luke sharpens his focus to explicitly name Jesus as βασιλεύς. Furthermore, at his trial, Jesus is charged with forbidding people to give tribute to Caesar and saying ἐκατόν χριστόν βασιλέα εἶναι (23:2). The initial setting for Jesus as βασιλεύς comes from the infancy narrative where Jesus is given тὸν θρώνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ (1:32), making clear for Luke that Jesus is king and specifically the Davidic king. However, as Luke’s genealogy suggests, he has a particular type of king in view and this is not through Solomon's kingly line which Matthew records (Matt 1:6). Jeremiah 23 suggests that it is a king who will shepherd the people. The critique of the kings is specifically that they scattered the sheep, have driven them away and have not visited them (Jer 23:2). The shepherd king will instead receive sheep from every land and restore them to pasture where they can increase and multiply (Jer 23:3). The Davidic shepherd king will be characterised by righteousness and salvation (Jer 23:5-6). Ezekiel 34 will develop this further (see chapter 2.2.4).

Finally, Jer 23 uses the language of σωτήρ, and salvation is a significant theme for Luke. Luke’s use of σωτήρ and its cognates as a key indicator of Luke’s interest cannot be overemphasised. The nature of salvation and who is the Saviour is the means by which Luke both sets and develops the boundaries of Jesus’ mission to seek and save the lost in the Gospel, and where the Third Gospel stands in considerable contrast to Mark and Matthew. The use of the terms σωτὴρ, σωτήριος, and σωτηρία is almost uniquely Lukan among the Synoptics. Matthew does not use these words at all in his Gospel, and in Mark σωτηρία is

---

charges (23:14-15). Pilate states, ἰδοὺ οὖν δέξου θεωρήτου ἐστίν παραγιμένον αὐτῷ, 'Behold, nothing deserving death has been done by him' (23:15).

only found once in 16:9 as part of the shorter ending, which is universally agreed not to be authentic.

Luke, in contrast uses 'salvation' as a noun eight times in the Gospel (and seven times in Acts). God is clearly the Saviour who has sent John the Baptist to announce God's salvation has come (3:6) and Mary worships God, her Saviour (1:47). Zechariah declares God has raised up a Saviour (1:69) who will deliver them from their enemies (1:71) and that John will be the prophet of the Most High God and give 'knowledge of salvation' (1:77). The shepherds also hear that the baby born in the city of David is the Saviour (2:11), drawing the readers' attention to his role not only as Saviour but as Davidic Saviour. With six of these nouns occurring in the infancy narrative, it is likely that this establishes a primacy effect (see chapter 1.2), whereby the nature of Jesus as Saviour and his role in bringing salvation functions programmatically throughout the remaining narrative.618

What we find therefore is that Luke's thematic interests cohere not only with Jer 22:30 which has already been identified by many scholars and is evident in his genealogy, but also with the immediately following verses in Jeremiah where the Jewish kingly line centred in Jerusalem is replaced by the Davidic shepherd king. The volume and recurrence of words and themes strongly suggest that Luke perceives God is instituting a kingdom that does not follow the failed Jewish kingly line which was centred in Jerusalem, but is a kingdom where the faithful Davidic shepherd king reigns. Micah tells us he is from Bethlehem.

Luke's interest in tracing Jesus' lineage through Neri to Nathan is likely to be because: (1) he is intentionally presenting a kingdom which does not belong to the standard political line; and (2) he is pointing the reader to the Davidic shepherd king whose rule is characterised by righteousness and salvation.

In Summary: The announcement in 2:4 of the πόλιν Δαυιδ ήτις καλεῖται Βηθλέεμ is an unexpected turn in the narrative which functions like a gap or blank. It suggests the reader is to recall the city of David’s youth where, as a shepherd, he is anointed king by Samuel, and also the prophecy of Micah of the messianic shepherd. This suggests that Luke is presenting a

618. Minear, using historical-grammatical method has also identified the role the infancy narrative plays programmatically for the rest of Luke. Minear, 'Use of the Birth Stories,' 111-130.
specific picture of Jesus as king of Israel and also of the kingdom that he will reign over. While the readers expect to hear of the city of David called Jerusalem, they hear Bethlehem instead. Jerusalem's role as a Jewish political city has been subverted by Luke for the small city of Bethlehem where David the shepherd was born, and this is based on Micah's prophecy of the messianic shepherd ruler from Bethlehem. Through this reference the reader is expected to make an interpretive judgment in which lies an inherent critique of Jerusalem. This line of thinking is supported by the genealogy which shows Luke's interest does not lie in the Jewish kingly line, but the Davidic shepherd king of Jeremiah 23.

4.3.5.4 Summary: The Birth Narrative

We have found in this section first, that Luke emphasises the shepherds in the birth narrative, as is indicated by their prominent role. While they are examples of the lowly or economically poor in first-century Palestine, Luke's propensity to echo Israel's stories and his repeated use of Davidic references suggest they embody the Davidic motif. Secondly, Luke uses the Augustus' census to bring Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem, fulfilling Micah’s prophecy of the messianic shepherd who would come from Bethlehem and bring peace to all the earth. Augustus, the key political figure in the Mediterranean world, stands in contrast to the new baby, whom Luke presents as the Saviour and Lord of all. Finally, the city of David, called Bethlehem, provides a narrative gap which confirms Micah's prophecy of the new shepherd king. In resonance with Luke's genealogy, it suggests Jesus' identity is the Davidic shepherd king of Jer 23. Maxwell's attention to gaps and blanks as an ancient rhetorical tool gives weight to the likelihood of Luke's deliberately laconic writing here, and Iser's explanation of protension and retension does indeed engage the reader in finding new meaning.619

The birth narrative is the centrepiece of the infancy narrative, and provides the key to understanding Luke’s emphasis on the Davidic baby which we have seen is firmly established in Luke 1. For a child who is declared from heaven to be the Saviour, Messiah and Lord of all, the interpretive key is given to none other than the shepherds, in whom is embodied part of the message itself.

---

619. Refer to the discussion of gaps and blanks in chapter 1.2.
4.3.6 Jesus is in his Father's House (2:41-52)

The final pericope we will consider in the infancy narrative is the single boyhood story of Jesus which comes at the very end of the unit (2:41-52), and where there is an echo of the Davidic covenant. The centre and climax of the story is 2:49 when Jesus says to his earthly parents, ὅτι ἐξήτειτέ με; οὐκ ἤδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου ὑπάρχει με; In these words the reader can hear an implicit echo of the Davidic covenant where the Lord is David's father and he is his son (2 Kgdms 7:14).

Many scholars have identified the significance of Jesus' reply to his mother at 2:49 as the centre of the pericope. Bock calls it the high point of Luke 1-2 because Jesus speaks for the first time and reveals how he sees his own task. Fitzmyer and Marshall conclude that the point of the passage is to show Jesus' unique relationship with his Father. Green notes Jesus' reply to his mother is the 'dramatic nucleus' of the narrative. He argues that Jesus' credentials (2:40, 52) present him as having the hallmarks of someone with an extraordinary destiny in the Graeco-Roman world. Marshall and Green identify that v. 49 confirms 1:32, 35. Coleridge describes Jesus' words as the 'what' of christology in Luke, where Luke's Jesus becomes prime interpreter of himself and where he shows he is the Son of God. Bovon says the verse 'Freilich geht der Text in Richtung einer höheren Christologie,' while stopping short of a Davidic covenant echo. There is therefore considerable acceptance of the importance of v. 49 as the centre of the pericope, and so we should expect this centre to be significant in interpreting the pericope.

---

620. As there is no specific mention of David when Jesus is presented at the temple (2:22-38), this study does not address the pericope.
627. Coleridge, Birth, 199-203.
628. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 159.
Strauss however, building on the analysis of Henk de Jonge, posits that the climax is vv. 46b-47 as a result of the 'concentric symmetry' in the text. As this centre ultimately produces a different Davidic echo, I will examine it in detail here. De Jonge's analysis shows:

A  Mary, Joseph and Jesus go to Jerusalem (ἀναβαινότων, 41-2)
B  Jesus stays in Jerusalem, which is not noticed (43)
C  His parents seek to find him (44-46a)
D  Jesus among the doctors (46b-47)
C¹ his parents, annoyed, reproach him (48)
B¹ Jesus' reaction which is not understood (49-50)
A¹ Jesus, Mary and Joseph return to Nazareth (κατέβη, 51a)

In accepting de Jonge's analysis, Strauss then identifies the primary Davidic echo as stemming from Isa 11:1-3. Here he finds a Davidic wisdom passage which resonates with de Jonge's centre point D, while he also identifies a secondary echo coming from the father-son relationship. Strauss' analysis from Isaiah 11:1-3 shows the following parallels to Luke 2:40:

Καὶ ἐξελεύσεται ῥάβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης Ιεσσαι, καὶ ἄνθος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης ἀναβήσεται.
καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπὶ αὐτῶν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως, πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἰσχύος, πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας, ἐμπλήσει αὐτῶν πνεῦμα φόβου θεοῦ.

Strauss concludes that Luke is trying to show the Davidic Messiah who is endowed by God with wisdom and understanding (σοφία, v. 40; σύνεσις, v. 47). However, I note that the same Greek is used of David in 1 Kgdms 16:18 to show he is qualified to enter Saul's kingly

---

629. Strauss notes the wisdom tradition in jub 11:16 where Abraham as a fourteen year old decides to forsake idols, and that in PssSol 17:37; 4Qlsa’a-fr. C 10-11; 1QSb 5:25 the coming Davidic Messiah would exhibit wisdom. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 121-22. Bultmann accepts both the wisdom focus and the revealing of Jesus' identity. In terms of wisdom he notices the similarities with stories where children display precocious wisdom in Philo and Josephus about Moses, in Herodotus about Cyrus, Plutarch about Alexander, Philostratus about Apollonius of Tyana. Bultmann, Synoptic Tradition, 301.

630. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 120.

631. The emphasis is Strauss' and shows how Isa 11:1-3 has similar language to Luke 2:40. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 123.
court, and may also echo David's early shepherd boy years. Furthermore it is used in Pss-Sol 17:37 of the Davidic shepherd warrior king.

There are problems with this analysis of 2:41-51a by de Jonge. Firstly, his analysis ends at 51a where the text says 'and he obeyed them,' which excludes 51b where Mary 'treasured all these things in her heart' and v. 52, a summary statement that clearly balances 2:40. He argues that vv. 51b-52 are the summary ending for not only this pericope, but the whole childhood narrative. His evidence comes partly from the Infancy Gospel of Thomas (in its first Greek Form), which he says ends with vv. 51b-52 as the last paragraph of the whole book. This may be flawed logic as the Infancy Gospel adds dialogue after v. 49 where the scribes and the Pharisees discuss Jesus' great wisdom with Mary, and then goes on to a version of vv. 51b and 52. Greek texts however did not include paragraphs and punctuation, and so this may build a case on modern logic as we cannot be sure where the original writer intended paragraphs to be. It is therefore an hypothesis that cannot be supported. Furthermore, the addition of the wisdom narration by the religious leaders in the Infancy Gospel of Thomas, may support de Jonge’s case for Luke's text having the central focus on Jesus' childhood wisdom, but it is likely to be a later conflation of the text, and the later dating rules it out as supporting Luke’s pericope.

Secondly, it does not accept the rhetorical stress of the narrative when Jesus speaks for the first time in v. 49. In fact, de Jonge's analysis shows no recognition of the dialogue between Mary and Jesus, or of the way the reader is influenced by the main character's first words. Osborne notes that, 'dialogue often carries much of the emphasis in characterization and theology.' Alter similarly says, 'Everything in the world of biblical narrative ultimately gravitates toward dialogue – perhaps... by exercising the capacity of speech man demonstrated,

---

632. καὶ ἀπεκρίθη εἰς τῶν παιδαρίων αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν Ἰδού ἔόρακα υἱὸν τῷ ἱερατείᾳ βηθλεεμίτῃ καὶ αὐτὸν εἰδότα ψαλμόν, καὶ ὁ ἀνήρ συνετός, καὶ ὁ ἀνήρ πολεμιστής καὶ σωφὸς λόγῳ καὶ ἀνήρ ἄγαθος τῷ εἴδει, καὶ κύριος μετ' αὐτοῦ (1 Kgs 16:18)
633. ὁ θεός κατεργάσατο αὐτὸν δυνατόν ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ καὶ σωφόν ἐν βούλῃ συνέσεως μετὰ ἵσχος καὶ δίκαιοται (Pss-Sol 17:37).
634. He does not actually define what 'the childhood narrative' is. It may mean from 1:5, 2:1 or 2:22. De Jonge, 'Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy,' 338.
635. The Second Greek form of the text does not even include the story but ends instead when Jesus is eight and miraculously lengthens wood to help Joseph.
however imperfectly, that he was made in the image of God. He further acknowledges that when a narrative event is considered to be important, this will come through dialogue rather than narration.

The reader listens for the interchange of characters knowing that important material is being overheard. Thus, we find in vv. 48-49 and the interchange between mother and son, that Luke has balanced the conversation with each character asking a question and through the repetition of ἔστω. Mary and Joseph have been looking (ἔστω) for Jesus, and he replies, 'Why have you been looking (ἔστω) for me?' The stress then falls on Jesus' own answer, οὐκ ἠδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς πατρός μου ἐστι, εἶναι με; As Osborne suggests, it is here we find something of Luke's theology, and as Alter notes, here in speech we find the material Luke has deemed to be essential. Using a narrative critical methodology therefore, we see that de Jonge's analysis falls short of giving adequate attention to the dialogue.

Thirdly, points B and B1 do not appear to be well balanced. Point B shows simple narrative detail that sets up the story for later development, while B1 contains key themes that will be developed in the wider narrative. These themes of redefining family and the father-son relationship make v. 49 of much greater narrative weight, out-weighing de Jonge’s point B. While there may be natural symmetry in any narrative we should not assume too quickly that a chiastic structure is present.

Fourthly, 2:49 contains Luke's first use of language of divine necessity (δεῖ), and as this is a significant Lukan motif of salvation-history, de Jonge's analysis fails to reflect this. His point B1 simply says, 'Jesus' reaction, which is not understood (vv. 49-50),' and this does not

---

637. Alter, Art of Biblical Narrative, 182.
638. Ibid.
639. Jesus redefines family most clearly when he says his mother, brothers and sisters are those who hear the word of God and do it (8:19-21).
640. Luke uses this motif: within the context of the good news being proclaimed (4:43); his suffering and death (9:22); criticism of the Pharisees who neglect the justice of God (11:42); the Holy Spirit’s guidance; in the context of a saving encounter (13:14, 16); in predicting his death (13:33); in summarising the need to celebrate the lost being found (15:32); in predicting his suffering and rejection (17:25); in a saving encounter with Zacchaeus (19:5); in an apocalyptic warning (21:9); with regards to the passover celebration which may hint at a salvific context and not only the actions of a faithful Jewish practice (22:7); when Isa 53:12 is said to be fulfilled (22:37); referring to Jesus' suffering and death (24:7, 22) and in the context of scripture being fulfilled (24:44). This usage is widely recognised by scholars. Bock, Luke, 28; Green, Gospel of Luke, 22;
give any recognition to Luke's opening use of δεῖ. This is interesting as de Jonge acknowledges the important role δεῖ plays in Luke's Gospel and how Luke uses it to describe divine laws being fulfilled,641 and so this leads me to expect it would form a strategic part in a narrative structure. Under de Jonge’s analysis it does not, and this is puzzling.

Finally, de Jonge makes too much of the wisdom motif which is only mentioned in Luke's secondary conclusion (2:52), and in vv. 46b-47, so is unlikely to be the main point of the episode.642 He appears to rely too much on the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* which is secondary to Luke's account and in which, as I have noted, there is an explicit wisdom motif. The *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* contains a conflated dialogue and should not be relied upon as evidence for Luke’s own emphasis. The wisdom material does not constitute any part of the verbal exchange between Mary and Jesus, the only dialogue Luke records, and as we have seen, dialogue carries important theological weight. It certainly should be seen as more important than the narration of Jesus questioning the teachers (vv. 46-47).

As a result, de Jonge's analysis is flawed and Strauss' Davidic echo is unlikely to be the correct one, since in placing the interpretive stress within the wisdom tradition, he is searching for Davidic wisdom echoes only. In doing this, Strauss misses the force of Jesus' words at v. 49 which talk about the father-son relationship. Therefore, we will now consider the alternative view where v. 49 is at the heart of the message of the pericope and in which lies an echo of the Davidic covenant.

*Did you not know I must be in my Father’s house?*

We note first, that when Jesus speaks he is in the temple at Jerusalem (2:46), the place where Zechariah first heard the angel's message of John's coming (1:8). This forms an inclusio in the infancy narrative around the beginning and ending of the unit as both are in the temple.643 Luke’s ongoing interest in the temple and in Jerusalem suggests that this pericope has been carefully chosen and placed in the Gospel. In this we find another internal parallel that

strengthens the literary unity of Luke 1-2 and shows the boyhood story is a part of a wider unit and is not merely a transition story.644

The words that Jesus speaks when he identifies himself as God's son, by saying 'did you not know I must be in my Father's house?' form a literary inclusio.645 I suggest these words recall the annunciation story near the beginning of the infancy narrative where Gabriel says Jesus will be called the son of the Most High, and has been given the throne of David to reign over an everlasting kingdom (1:31-33), and which we have discussed in chapter 4.3.2. Alter notes that 'the reading of any literary text requires us to perform all sorts of operations of linkage, both small and large, and at the same time to make constant discriminations among related but different words.'646 This is one such occasion, when the reader should link the father-son relationship in 1:32 with Jesus' reference to his father (2:49) when he is in the Jerusalem temple. In one sense this is not a difficult link to make as Green and Marshall indicate,647 and it is made easier to do so as Luke has foregrounded the words by using dialogue at this point. But it also requires the reader to recall the wider story of Israel and draw on echoes of scripture. In v. 49 we have Jesus speaking of his relationship with his father, calling the temple his father's house, and saying there is a divine necessity in his being there. These are all key ideas to the Lukan narrative, but also recall 2 Kgdms 7 where the Davidic covenant is established.

In 2 Kgdms 7 David wants to build a house (οἶκος) for the Lord (2 Kgdms 7:13, 16), but he is told instead the Lord will build him a house.648 Thus, the nature of a house being inherently about a dynasty where a Davidite will sit on the throne and represent God is shown. The covenant goes on to establish the very close father-son relationship David and his descend-
heard by the reader, although Luke does not use ὁικός in 2:49. The two similar features are that Jesus is God's son and God is his father (2:49; 2 Kgdms 7:14), and there is the possibility that even at this early stage of the Gospel, the house of God is being redefined around the person of Jesus, a descendant of David, rather than the temple building (see chapters 3.3.1; 4.3.2).

In evaluating a Davidic covenant echo in 2:49, in terms of volume it is the language of πατήρ coupled with the setting in God’s house (ἰερόν; v. 46) that leads the reader back to both 1:31-33, 35 and 2 Kingdoms 7. Because Luke foregrounds this echo in 1:31-33, 35, we see some movement toward the test for recurrence. Gabriel says the Davidic role is the central identity for Jesus in his declaration, and in his narration in 1:27 Luke stresses the lineage of Joseph to qualify him as the successor of the covenant promise. We have seen an ongoing recollection of David and the book of Kingdoms in Luke 1 and the birth narrative also has many Davidic statements and echoes as we have seen. Here in the final event in the infancy narrative, Luke takes the reader back to the earliest stage of the infancy narrative by recalling the father-son relationship spoken of by Gabriel. This provides substantial evidence for the test of thematic coherence where the story of Jesus is told repeatedly in terms of David’s story.

While there is not a history of seeing the Davidic covenant here, there are scholars who have identified the link to 1:31-33. I would suggest that, in light of the Davidic material we have seen, particularly in recovering the role of the shepherds and the recollection of an echo to Mic 5:2-5 in the birth narrative, the logical step is to view 2:49 as not only recalling the announcement, but also the Davidic covenant. This echo gives a high level of satisfaction in reading the surrounding discourse as it forms an inclusio in which Jesus is firmly established as the Davidic Saviour, the Davidic Shepherd and the Davidic king.

4.4 In Summary

As we come to the end of this chapter's analysis of the beginning of the Lukan Gospel, it is helpful to recall Sternberg and Perry’s work on the primacy effect. We know this is a carefully used rhetorical device in literature, and functions to set parameters for interpretation and to show the author’s interests. Therefore we must agree with Coleridge that ‘there is never any-
thing inevitable about the way a narrative begins: a narrator may start anywhere, and where to begin is therefore a matter of choice. Luke has clearly chosen to highlight Jesus as being given the throne of David and thereby fulfilling the Davidic promise, and we can anticipate that this will have an ongoing resonance in Luke-Acts. From Luke's opening in 1:5 the reader hears echoes of the LXX, and we have noted the many echoes of David's story. As a result we hear not only of Jesus' genealogical relationship with David, but in support of Chae and Wright (see chapter 4.1), we are presented with a typological portrayal where we find the Davidic covenant fulfilled in Jesus.

Further to this, given the way we have heard and reheard of David both explicitly and implicitly, we should consider the role of David as a Leitwort that reveals Luke's interest in Jesus in the light of David's story. The sheer volume of repetitions of David's name and features from his life demonstrate this is a key primary lens for the Lukan Jesus. He is not only Saviour, he is the Davidic Saviour. He is not only Messiah, he is the Davidic Messiah. Jesus is consistently clothed in shades of David's story that point the reader to ways he fulfils these roles. He is the Davidic Messiah who will bring God's salvific peace to earth. Unlike Strauss who says that 'how Jesus will fulfill the Davidic promise is barely suggested,'650 the birth narrative suggests that Jesus is the Davidic shepherd king coming from the city of David.

The Davidic covenant is the opening motif which interprets Jesus' birth (1:31-33), and yet we find the same echo, perhaps a little fainter, in the final story of the unit (2:49). As a result we have the Davidic covenant forming an inclusio around the infancy narrative giving light to what is in its midst.

At the very core is the birth narrative where we have found Jesus stands in contrast to Augustus, and in the same way that Jesus is superior to John, Jesus is superior to Augustus. This is evident through the use of Hellenistic claims of saviour, lord, bringer of peace and good news which Luke attributes to Jesus while the ancient world attributed them to Caesar (2:1-20). We also see a contrast between God's power and Augustus' power. For Luke, Augustus moves on God's timetable when his census brings Mary and Joseph to Bethlehem to fulfil Micah's prophecy. What is at stake here is the nature of leadership and power, and while Au-

649. Coleridge, Birth, 28.
650. Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 124.
gustus' might is found in decrees and Imperial rule, an important aspect of Jesus' identity is found in him as the shepherd king. The shepherd king is Davidic, he is righteous, and he brings peace. Furthermore, for Luke, the prominent shepherds in the narrative are not to be viewed as sinners or even necessarily as only humble and lowly, they are indicators of the messianic shepherd.

Luke appears to have made very clear that the primary motif for interpreting Jesus' birth is as the promised Davidic king (1:31-33) and in light of his birth narrative, we see that an important aspect of this is that he is the long-awaited Davidic shepherd king. The shepherd nature of this promised king is a feature of the Davidic covenant from 2 Kingdoms 7, but is also suggested in the transumed echo of David which cannot be separated from his narrative role as Israel's chosen shepherd king. I consider that Luke's choice to echo the Davidic covenant in the annunciation should be considered deliberate and a key area of interest for Lukan theology. To find this same echo, although more faintly in the final story of the unit supports seeing this as a guiding paradigm in the story of the Lukan Jesus. This gives some light to Miura's undeveloped thought, and that we signalled in the outset in chapter one, that the motif of Davidic shepherd does have a role to play in summing up Jesus' earthly ministry.
Chapter 5
The Faithful Shepherd

In chapter four we saw how Luke uses the motif of the David and the Davidic shepherd king to highlight an important aspect of the nature of Jesus and his identity. He is the fulfilment of the promise of a Davidic shepherd king as he will sit on the throne of David, and bring peace to all the earth as prophesied by Micah (Mic 5:4). We noted that in the infancy narrative, king and kingdom are redefined and that Luke does not show an interest in the political line from David through Solomon, but presents Jesus as the Davidic shepherd king from Jeremiah 23. This king will bring salvation, righteousness and peace.

Now we turn to the ministry years of Jesus and will consider how this motif is used in three pericopae. Firstly, we will consider the shepherd saying in the household mission where Jesus is implicitly the shepherd who sends the disciples into households with salvific peace (10:3). Secondly, we will look at Luke 12:32 where the motif is used by Jesus when he is addressing his disciples regarding what they will eat and wear (12:22-32). Thirdly, we will consider the parable of the lost sheep in Luke 15:1-7. Then we will turn to Acts and note the return of the motif in the Miletus Speech (Acts 20:28-29). In these four pericopae we will see that Ezekiel 34 is a text which Luke drew upon when talking of the role of the shepherd. It is significant that the motif, while not prominent, does not disappear from the narrative and is relevant for early church leaders. This chapter will end with a consideration of Luke's shepherd omissions (Mark 6:34; 14:27).

5.1 Jesus, the Shepherd in the Mission Mandate (10:3)

ὑπάγετε· ἰδοὺ ἀποστέλλω ὑµᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν µέσῳ λύκων.
Go, I am sending you like lambs in the midst of wolves.

651. In chapter six we will discuss Luke 19:1-10 which has a well-recognised echo of Ezek 34.
In the mission mandate near the beginning of the travel narrative, Jesus sends out seventy disciples into households to cure the sick and to say that the kingdom of God has come near (10:9). As he does so, Luke implicitly pictures Jesus as the shepherd who sends the lambs out into the midst of wolves (10:3). This pericope is strategic in the Lukan narrative coming near the beginning of the travel narrative, prefiguring the Gentile mission, and sending a wider group of disciples into mission. We will consider the saying at 10:3 and then discuss what this adds to our knowledge of the shepherd motif in the Lukan narrative.

5.1.1 The Shepherd Saying (10:3)
The shepherd saying falls within the household mission mandate (10:1-24). The pericope is unique to Luke, while the shepherd saying shares some aspects of the Matthean command when Jesus sends out the twelve (Matt 10:7-8). The uniqueness, placement and the sheer size of the pericope reveal its narrative importance, as do the Gentile territories that are recalled in 10:13-14 for this is another way Luke's universal mission grows in visibility. Simeon has foretold the universal mission (2:32) and Jesus and the disciples have already

---

652. Scholars are divided between the textual variant in 10:1 and whether the text reads seventy or seventy-two which are sent out although I support reading seventy. The external evidence is evenly divided between the two readings. Major witnesses which support seventy include א C I L W Δ Ξ Ψ f f3. Marcin, ed. to Tertullian, Irenaeus, 1st Clement, Origen, 1st Eusebius, Basili Cyril, Theodoret; Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerome. Metzger notes the factors for internal evidence are elusive. However, the tradition for seventy from the LXX is clear. There are seventy elders, sons and priests in the house of Jacob, and seventy years is a prominent figure. Specifically the nations in Gen 10:2-3:1 are seventy-two in the LXX, while seventy in the MT, which does not support this reading. However, seventy-two only appears once when in Num 31:38 seventy-two cattle are set aside for sacrifice. Metzger, Textual Commentary, 151; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 845-846.

653. Because this is a second sending account, is unique to Luke and has some similarities with Matthew's sending of the twelve, there is discussion about whether these are two separate events, if two accounts have been shaped out of one Q source, or if this is a Lukan creation. Bock says that 22:35 which is special Lukan material may indicate two accounts and Fitzmyer suggests this is a 'doublet' coming from Q, but Marshall notes that Luke does not normally use doublets. Johnson believes this is a unique account as it resembles 9:1-6 and the Synoptics, but contains many distinctions that suggest it is a separate event. For a summary see Bock, Luke, 986-991. See also Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 412-413; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 842; Johnson, Gospel of Luke, 169-171.


journeyed into Samaritan territory as the travel narrative begins (9:52). Matson, whose study is the most comprehensive analysis of the role of household narratives in both Luke and Acts, notes that 'household evangelism becomes the modus operandi of the growing church (in Acts)'. Matson, *Household Conversion Narratives*, 27.

Further, as it is placed so close to the beginning of the travel narrative, there is a level of priority being afforded it by Luke under the primary effect. The degree and importance of household mission grows as Jesus ventures into Zacchaeus' house at the end of the travel narrative, and the household becomes central to the Gentile mission in Acts. This, therefore, suggests the motif is setting a trajectory for narrative units that comes after it, and it is being used strategically by Luke to prefigure Gentile mission. It makes the inclusion of the shepherd saying at 10:3 of heightened interest to this study.

The key thrust of the mission is that peace is spoken to the household (εἰρήνη τῷ οἶκῳ τοῦτῳ; 10:5), and this peace is more than an ancient greeting. For Luke, it is a metaphor for salvation, and is a feature of the Davidic shepherd king in Micah and Ezekiel (Mic 5:4; Ezek 34:25). Peace is used many times by Luke to convey salvation (1:79; 2:14, 29; 7:50; 8:48; 19:38, 42; 24:36). The greeting of peace is either received or rejected (10:7-11), and it is this acceptance or rejection which signifies the reception of the message. The salvific mission is framed by the command to stay in one house eating and drinking whatever is given, suggesting the ritual purity code was no longer the determining factor for where the message could be proclaimed. This is consistent with Jesus' prior actions in eating and drinking with sinners (5:29-39; 7:33, 36-50), many of whom had already found salvation. We will go on to see that this resonates with the 'lost' parables (see chapter 5.3.3) and the story of Zacchaeus (see chapter 6.3), and further, it will form the heart of the Gentile mission in Acts and will be finally settled in the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15). This characteristic 'eating and drinking'

---

658. The Zacchaeus pericope will be considered in detail in chapter six.
660. Refer to chapters 2.2.2 and 2.2.4.
661. Refer to chapter 4.3.5.3.1.
could also resonate with the Davidic shepherd king from Ezekiel who seems particularly concerned with the flock being fed (see chapter 2.2.4). 662

This mission to possibly unclean households is of considerable relevance for the wider vision Luke casts. Inclusive table-fellowship inaugurates a new opportunity for a 'sacred space,' 663 a space centred on fellowship, a feature of the early church (Acts 2:42-47). This may go as far as to point beyond the temple as the primary 'sacred space,' as salvation is now found in the ὀἶκος. We will note this again in chapter 6.3 when Jesus brings salvation to Zacchaeus in his house.

The disciples are sent ahead of Jesus (9:52; 10:1) with 10:1 stating they were heading to places Jesus intended to go. We do not know why the Lukan Jesus sent them ahead, but in doing so he places great confidence in their ability to carry out the task. Luke 10:2 describes that the harvest is plentiful and so the call is made for labourers to be sent out (ἐκβάλλω) into the harvest. The use of ἐκβάλλω suggests the seventy are sent out with some level of force (Matt 9:38; Acts 16:37), 664 and the reference to wolves in 10:3 confirms the strength of this idea. As Bovon says, 'Trotz der Angst, der mangelnden Vorbereitung und den beschränkten Mitteln sollen sie jetzt gehen.' 665 The mission task is one that involves risk and danger, and so in v. 3 Jesus forewarns the disciples of the dangers, demonstrating that he knows ahead of time what perils his followers will encounter. This knowledge appears to be of divine origin, but it may also suggest that Jesus is offering some protection in this forewarning. 666 This protection also falls within the role of a faithful shepherd who is to protect the sheep (Isa 40:11; Ezek 34:4-6, 16). 667

Jesus says to the seventy, ὑπάγετε· ἵδον ἀποστέλλω ὑμᾶς ὡς ἄρνας ἐν μέσῳ λύκων (10:3). This shepherd motif is not used in Luke's sending of the twelve (9:1-6). Bock describes the significance of the motif where the 'Great Shepherd, [is] God himself.' 668 This is supported

---

662. Ezekiel repeatedly calls for the flocks to be fed (Ezek 34:2, 3, 5, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16).
664. 'ἐκβάλλω,' BDAG, 299.
668. Ibid.
by *b. Toledot* 32b where God is the Great Shepherd.\textsuperscript{669} Hendriksen notes that in this pericope Jesus, 'is no one less than their Shepherd.'\textsuperscript{670} Bock in particular believes Ezek 34 is behind the usage, giving some level of recognition and strength under Hays' test for the history of interpretation.\textsuperscript{671}

With Jesus cast as a shepherd in 10:3 and the seventy sent to carry out his mission, this suggests that even though he sends them as 'lambs', he is also sending them as shepherds like himself to bring salvific peace to the scattered flock. Perhaps when Jesus sends them 'as lambs' he is addressing their vulnerability in the task, but it appears that the mission they carry out is that of the shepherd who seeks his lost sheep. There is evidence for this in the text. Luke has a double use of ἀποστέλλω where Jesus sends the disciples (10:3) and God sends Jesus (10:16).\textsuperscript{672} Fitzmyer notes with regard to 10:16,

The saying lends authority to the preaching of the disciples. The principle implied in it is that of representation...The one sent is to be regarded as the sender himself. The disciples, therefore, speak and act in the name of Jesus, just as he speaks and acts in the name of the one who sent him.\textsuperscript{673}

As representatives of God, who is known to the Israelites as their shepherd (see chapter 2), and Jesus, who is implied in this passage as a shepherd, we have the disciples: (1) going as representative of Jesus who is a shepherd; and (2) carrying out his mission to households where eating and salvific peace are preeminent. These are characteristics of Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd king (Ezek 34:13, 14, 15, 25; see also chapter 2.2.4), features that may have led Bock to identify Ezek 34 behind this passage.

Thus, the seventy are sent out as Jesus' representatives to speak and act in his name. Their mission is a shepherding task, and they come into households to share the kingdom proclamation as faithful shepherds who are seeking the lost sheep. It is of interest that this 'shepherd

\textsuperscript{669} b. Toledot 32b., the sixth weekly Torah portion in the annual Jewish cycle of Torah reading, says, 'There is something great about the sheep (Israel) that can persist among the seventy wolves (the nations). He replied, 'Great is the Shepherd who delivers it and watches over it and destroys them (the wolves) before them (Israel).'


\textsuperscript{672} *BDAG* notes that ἀποστέλλω is used when Jesus sends the disciples (Matt 10:5; Mark 3:14; 6:7; Luke 9:2), but it also describes God's sending forth of Jesus in his divine mission (Matt 15:24; Mark 9:37; Luke 10:16; 9:48). ἀποστέλλω, *BDAG*, 121.

mission' is for the wider group rather than the twelve (9:1-6) since this suggests that the 'shepherd mission' is a task that will characterise more than a few individuals. This resonates with the Miletus speech where the church leaders are named as shepherds (Acts 20:28) and which we will consider in chapter 5.4, but the roots of the shepherd motif for leaders seem to lie in 10:1-24. The Acts passage also makes clear that feeding the sheep relates to teaching (Acts 20:28-30). It is also possible that when the shepherds from the birth narrative return to their workplace and community glorifying and praising God for all they have seen and heard (2:20), they also take on the role of early proclaimers of the message of salvific peace, which was what the angels declare (2:14).

The disciples are called 'lambs' which are characteristically vulnerable animals especially amongst wolves. Matthew refers to πρόβατον in his sending narrative (10:16) rather than Luke's ἄρην, with Luke's designation stressing the precariousness of the task.674 Bock and Hendriksen suggest Luke may be drawing on Isa 40:11 where God is the shepherd who cares for the ποιμήν, ἄρνος, and the γαστήρ,675 and this is quite possible. As we have seen in chapter 2.2.1, Isa 40 shows God as a victorious warrior shepherd, classifications that suit this Lukan passage where the mission task is reflected on in the context of a cosmic battle (10:17-20). Both Isa 40 and Luke 10:1-24 convey the double use of battle and shepherd, and both come at the beginning of a new narrative section. Isaiah 40, although read within the whole book of Isaiah at the time of Luke, does convey a new historical period, while Luke's narrative setting is equally new with Jesus' journey to Jerusalem having just begun (9:51). Therefore under Hays' tests for echoes, there is some resonance shown by the tests for volume, thematic recurrence, history of interpretation and certainly satisfaction, making this a possible backdrop to Luke's use of ἄρην.

The reference to the ἄρην in 10:3 may also resonate with the Jewish use of the lamb representing God's people. Psalms of Solomon 8:23 says, ἐδικαιώθη ὁ θεὸς ἐν τοῖς κρίμασιν αὐτῶν ἐν τοῖς ἐθνεσιν τῆς γῆς, καὶ οἱ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἄρνια ἐν ἀκακίᾳ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν (God was proved right in his condemnation of the nations of the earth, and the devout of God are

---

674. ἄρην is a NT hapax legomenon.
like righteous lambs among them).\textsuperscript{676} Again in *PssSol* 8:30, μὴ ὑπερίδῃς ἡμᾶς, ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ καταψίωσιν ἡμᾶς ὡς μὴ ὄντος λυτρωμένου (Do not neglect us, our God, so that the Gentiles will not devour us as if there is no redeemer). The use of καταπίνω\textsuperscript{677} again suggests the motif of the vulnerable lambs.

It is also found in *1 Enoch* 89:14, 18-20 where we find the image of vulnerable sheep and the wolves, and also shows how the *Lord of the Sheep* protects his flock (*1 Enoch* 89:16).\textsuperscript{678} Wolter notes that the use of wolf and lamb in *1 Enoch* recalls, 'lebten die Israeliten in Ägypten als Schafe unter Wölfen.'\textsuperscript{679} Enoch says,

I saw the wolves, and how they oppressed the sheep exceedingly with all their power; and the sheep cried aloud. And the Lord came to the sheep and they began to smite those wolves: and the wolves began to make lamentation; but the sheep became quiet and forthwith ceased to cry out (*1 Enoch* 89:19-20).

Evans notes it is hard to identify who the wolves are in Luke 10:3, although in Acts 20:29 the wolves are false teachers,\textsuperscript{680} which is not the idea behind the Gospel passage.

Luke's household mission pericope comes immediately after three discipleship sayings where the pattern for following Jesus is one of considerable cost (9:57-62), and so this picture of vulnerable lambs is consistent with the Lukans Jesus' journey. Jesus has recently predicted his passion (9:21-22), and called for the disciples to deny themselves and take up their cross daily and follow (9:23-27). This saying coheres with the Lukans Jesus' own journey, so that 'the vulnerability of those sent is a mirror of Jesus' own vulnerability.'\textsuperscript{681} The combined image of the lambs and wolves suggests this vulnerability, as Wolter says, 'Das Bildwort wird demnach von kulturellem Alltagswissen gespeit, den jeder kann sich vorstellen, wie es Lämmer ergeht, die in ein Wolfsrudel geraten.'\textsuperscript{682} Furthermore, this verse is followed by the call to take no
purse, bag or sandals and to greet no one on the road (10:4), leaving the disciples exposed and unprotected.\textsuperscript{683}

In Ezek 34, God is the faithful shepherd of his flock unlike the shepherd rulers of Israel who have neglected the sheep and instead pursued their own comfort. The result of this neglect is that sheep are scattered on the mountains and hills and have become food for animals of the plain (Ezek 34:6-8). While Ezekiel does not use the word λόκος in chapter 34, he does at Ezek 22:27 where he explains, οἱ ἀρχοντες αὐτῆς ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῆς ὡς λόκοι ἀρπάζοντες ἄρπάγματα τοῦ ἐκχέαι αἵμα, ὡς πλεονεξίᾳ πλεονεκτῶσιν (Its rulers in its midst were like wolves catching prey to shed blood so that they gain through greed). This is the situation we find in Luke's Gospel where the religious leaders have neglected people who they considered ritually impure, and this has hindered God's salvific plan (5:29-32; 7:36-50;\textsuperscript{684} 15:1-32; 19:1-10). Luke shows Jesus instead going to the borders of society and seeking out the sinner (5:32) and the lost sheep (19:10), demonstrating he is God's faithful shepherd. In doing this he places the needs of the flock ahead of his own, even at great personal cost. Jesus is criticised for eating with toll collectors and sinners (5:30; 15:2; 19:7), and he lays himself open for criticism when he touches and heals the leper (5:12-16). This seems evident when the religious leaders come down from Jerusalem to hear him speak in the following story (5:17). His ministry causes him to pray all night (6:12) and he always attends to the needs of the crowd (4:42; 5:17; 6:18-19; 7:17; 8:4, 19). Ultimately, Jesus' mission will cost him his life, a motif Luke will pick up in Acts 8:32-33 where Jesus is said to be like a sheep led to slaughter (Acts 8:2).\textsuperscript{685}

\textsuperscript{683} This vulnerability is expressed in 2 Clement 5:2-4 which records a conversation between Jesus and Peter and begins with the Lukan shepherd saying, 'For the Lord said to Peter, 'You will be like a lamb (ἀρήν) in the midst of wolves.' But Peter replied to him, 'What if the wolves rip apart the lamb (ἀρήν)?' Jesus said to Peter, 'After they are dead, the sheep should fear the wolves no longer. So too you, do not fear those who kill you and then can do nothing more to you, but fear the one who, after you die, has the power to cast your body and soul into the hell of fire.'

\textsuperscript{684} In the story of the sinful woman Simon the Pharisee is scathing when Jesus allows the woman to bathe his feet with her tears. This shows he does not understand that Jesus has forgiven the woman her sins.

\textsuperscript{685} This sheep, rather than shepherd, motif deserves further consideration, but is not directly within the parameters of this study. Its significance is signalled as a text for further work in the conclusion.
In 10:3, Jesus is the faithful shepherd who sends the disciples to carry out a shepherding task, and this will be costly for them. They are vulnerable like lambs in the midst of wolves (10:3) for some will reject their message (10:10-11, 16) and they will contend with demons (10:17). Yet this is a significant sending of a large group of disciples who enact his mission and start to count the cost of following the shepherd to the margins of society. This mission, it should be noted, also brings joy (10:17-21), a Lukan signal of a salvific mission which will be discussed further in chapter 5.3.4.

5.1.2 What does this add to our knowledge of the shepherd motif?
Firstly, Luke shows Jesus as the disciples' shepherd as they go out into a mission to households. The mission is placed near the beginning of the travel narrative giving it some preeminence under the primacy effect and it takes the disciples into territory which indicates Luke's interest in universal salvation. In this mission Jesus as a shepherd is not concerned for matters of ritual purity while his concern is that any household can be brought the message of salvific peace. We also have noted the double use of ἀποστέλλω where God sends Jesus (10:16) and then Jesus sends the disciples (10:3). As God is known as their shepherd and as Luke presents Jesus as the messianic shepherd king, there is the suggestion that the disciples become like faithful shepherds themselves as they engage in God's mission. It is therefore of particular note that this motif is used with the wider discipleship group and shepherds are not limited to the smaller group of the twelve.

Secondly, we have also seen that both Isa 40:11 and Ezek 34 lie behind the motif and that eating seems to have an important function in Jesus' mission, the household mission, the Gentile mission in Acts and the early church (2:42).

Finally, we note that this motif is resonant with Jesus' wider mission where he is constantly seeking out the lost on the margins of society even though this draws criticism and signals a costly journey.
This verse is a shepherd saying that is attached to a Q passage (Luke 12:22-32, Matt 6:25-34), and is located in the travel narrative which has begun at 9:51 when Jesus sets his face to Jerusalem. The context of the pericope (12:22-32) is Jesus teaching the disciples that God will care for their material needs, for God is a generous provider. The unit comments on the immediately preceding parable of the rich fool (12:13-21) where the overarching focus is on being ready for coming judgment by the good use of earthly wealth. On first reading, the expression τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον could be considered simply a term of endearment by Jesus, and yet there are indicators that this is not the case and the expression may carry theological weight for Luke.

The verse has no parallel in Matthew and is unique to Luke. It is also shepherd imagery that is very familiar in the OT where Israel is the Lord's flock. With Luke's writing demonstrating a high level of allusion and echo, it is very possible that the term has its roots in Israel’s history where the Lord is shepherd of his people. The phrase τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον is spoken by Jesus to his disciples, and while Jesus only calls the disciples little flock once, the metaphor does recur in Acts 20:28 in the context of Paul speaking to the Ephesian elders.

In considering the saying, firstly, we will consider the content of Jesus' teaching to the disciples in 12:22-32, as we would expect that this teaching would relate to the shepherd saying at the end of the pericope. Secondly, scholars have suggested a variety of shepherd allusions and echoes for this saying, and we will consider these. Finally, we will consider what this adds to our knowledge of the shepherd motif in Luke.


687. The parable is an L passage, and falls in the wider unit of 12:1-13:9 where the focus is on being ready for God's judgment. Nolland, Luke, 684.
5.2.1 The teaching of 12:22-32

This pericope is located in the wider section of 12:1-13:9 where the focus is on being ready for the coming judgment of God. The preceding parable of the rich fool (12:13-21), turns the eschatological focus to the theme of material wealth. In the teaching of 12:22-32 Jesus explains to his disciples that God is the provider for their daily needs, adding commentary to the preceding parable’s discussion on wealth. That is, the disciples do not need to have bigger barns to store their wealth, not only because this stored wealth will not make them rich toward God, but because they can rely on God as their daily provider.688

Marshall suggests the teaching can be seen in a similar way to wisdom literature, with an emphasis on encouraging the disciples to 'sit lightly to material possessions and help the poor.'689 Fitzmyer notes the key idea is of the priority of values for the disciples.690 Bock takes a simple reading of the text which expects the disciples to trust God for their provision, noting how, 'a kingdom focus prevents excessive anxiety about one's earthly possessions.'691

The unit opens with Jesus speaking to his disciples (12:22). The text says, Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ. There is a textual variant with a few significant manuscripts omitting the αὐτοῦ,692 but there is strong support from witnesses for its inclusion.693 Luke uses the expression μαθητής αὐτοῦ nine times, which is more frequent than Mark and Matthew, so it is quite possible that it is authentic here.694 Luke also uses it at the beginning of this wider section (12:1-13:9) when Jesus speaks to μαθητής αὐτοῦ (12:1). He also uses it at 5:30; 6:13; 9:14, 43; 12:1; 17:1 in redaction from Markan material and at 6:20; 11:1 and at 12:22 in

688. Matthew's parallel teaching is included in his Sermon on the Mount (Matt 6:25-34) and comes at the end of his teaching on almsgiving, prayer and fasting which focuses on the devotional life of the believer. He has a distinct use of ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος (Matt 6:26, 32) and δικαιοσύνη (Matt 6:33) which reflect his redactional interests. The final verse of Matthew's pericope is a call not to be anxious about tomorrow and instead to focus on the needs of the day. Matthew's ending contrasts Luke's shepherd saying, and is their greatest point of difference.


692. These are P73 B 1241 itc. e

693. These are A B C D L W Δ Θ Ψ 070 0233 f 113 1 itc. d e h syr. s h cop arm.

comparison to Q. This constitutes strong internal evidence that Luke favoured this expression, while conversely Luke uses ὁ μαθητὴς without αὐτός significantly less than Matthew, who favours the expression.

Finally, in agreement with Metzger's commentary who gives this a {C} rating, the familiarity of the expression in Luke’s writing and the significant witnesses with the reading suggest the expression μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ can be considered a likely reading. Therefore, the text reads, 'He (Jesus) said to his disciples.'

The pericope emphasises that God will provide food and clothing for the disciples. It encourages them not to worry, as to do so characterises those who do not know God, and instead to prioritise seeking the kingdom of God. In doing this, Jesus states God will provide for the disciples’ daily needs and the kingdom will be given to them. There are two statements made about the kingdom; the disciples are to seek the kingdom and the kingdom is given to them.

The rationale for trusting God is centred in two metaphors. Firstly, God is their father and he will care for his children (12:30, 32). Secondly, God is a shepherd who feeds and cares for his sheep (12:32) and so as a vulnerable little flock, they can rely on a faithful shepherd. This resonates with what we have seen in 5.1 where Jesus is the faithful shepherd who warns his lambs of the danger of wolves (10:3).

Jesus uses two examples from nature in his teaching. In the first, he describes how ravens neither sow nor reap, nor build storehouses or barns (12:24) and yet God feeds them. The disciples are worth more than birds, and so they are encouraged to trust that God will also care for them.

The second example is that of the lilies of the field which neither toil nor spin and yet are clothed more beautifully than Solomon (12:27). This presupposes the hearers know the sto-


696. Luke shows the relationship of God as Jesus' father on many occasions. We see this at the temple (2:49) and notably in parallel with Joseph in 2:48 after which he disappears from the narrative; in Jesus’ ethical teaching (6:36); in an eschatological passage Luke describes the glory of the Father (9:26); Jesus prays to his father when he is in need and when he rejoices (10:21; 11:2; 22:49; 23:34, 46); God the Father is the provider (12:30, 32); the Father is known by the Son, and knows the Son (10:21, 22); confers on the disciples a kingdom (22:29) and gives the disciples the Spirit (24:49).
ries of Solomon and his grandeur (3 Kgdms 10), and it also suggests they know that Solomon's financial blessings are directly related to his request for a wise mind to govern well rather than a request for long life and riches (3 Kgdms 3:5-14). When Solomon chooses to ask for non-material blessings, God grants him material riches so that no other king compares with him (3 Kgdms 3:13). This shows that God is not only the ultimate provider for daily needs in life, but also his provision is generous.

Luke may be using the Solomon echo as encouragement for his disciples to also request good things from God, while he also notes that Solomon's grandeur is surpassed by the simple lilies (12:27). Jesus reasons that the lilies themselves are passing away, here one day and gone the next, and he chastises the disciples for having little trust in God's care for them (12:28).

As Jesus draws the teaching to a close he calls his disciples not to be like the nations of the world who worry about what they will eat and drink, for God already knows they need these things. The call is to seek the kingdom, and God will give both the kingdom to the disciples and the practical things they need.

5.2.2 Possible Shepherd Echoes

We will consider the possible reasons Luke may have called his disciples, τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον. 'Little flock' could be a simple term of endearment, and yet the internal evidence from the Gospel, Acts and the LXX suggests that there may be more in this simple saying. There are many reasons why the term may carry significance in this saying and these will be discussed below: (1) we have already seen how the infancy narrative has used the reference to shepherds to reveal an aspect of Jesus' identity as the Davidic shepherd king, and how Jesus is the shepherd in 10:3; (2) the shepherd saying in 10:3 positions Jesus as the disciples' shepherd; (3) the same word recurs again in Acts 20:28; (4) the parable of the lost sheep speaks of Jesus as shepherd; (5) 19:10 has a well recognised allusion to Ezek 34 which is a noted shepherd passage; (6) it is a well known OT description for God's people, and; (7) the

698. Green notes that 'in spite of their seeming diminutive presence ("little flock"), the disciples are nonetheless the recipients of God's dominion.' Green, Gospel of Luke, 495.
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thrust of the unit's message is on practical provision and especially on the disciples being fed by God. This theme echoes Ezek 34's emphasis on βόσκω and Green suggests that there may be an allusion to this here. 699

Points (3) and (4) above will be addressed later in this chapter, and (5) will form the focus of chapter six and so will not be addressed in detail here. Their presence in this argument however is important. This is not an isolated use of the term ποίμνιον, as it will recur in the Miletus speech, and so it is more likely that it carries some special interest here. Notably, in Acts, the church is called ποίμνιον and elders are called 'to act as shepherds' (ποιμάνω). Furthermore, in Acts it is the Holy Spirit who has chosen them for this task, and the role of the Spirit is well known in Luke's writing. 700 It seems unlikely that Luke would use τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον simply as a term of endearment if he uses it so strategically in another part of his writing. Similarly, the parable of the lost sheep which is yet to be told in the Lukan narrative, suggests Jesus is positioned as a faithful shepherd (15:4-7), which strengthens the possibility that the term here means Jesus is likening himself to the disciples' shepherd. Further, Luke 19:10 is a well-established allusion to Ezek 34 making it a passage we know that Luke drew upon and a metaphor he identifies with Jesus. These passages in Luke's writing suggest the term should not be overlooked here, but is rather a recollection and development of the shepherd motif.

We have seen in chapter two that 'God's flock' is an ongoing metaphor in the LXX. 701 At this point in the narrative Jesus' disciples are all Israelites (6:13-16), and so we can suppose they might have perceived some OT resonance in this phrase. Furthermore there is agreement among scholars that there is an OT source for this expression. Nolland notes this is a stock image for Israel and Judah, and refers to Jer 13:17; Ezek 34 and Zech 10:3 as examples. 702 Bock also notes various shepherd or flock passages as support (Pss 22:1; 27:9; 73:1; 76:21; 699. Ibid.


701. This is clearly seen in Ps 77:52; Mic 2:12; 5:3; Zech 10:3; Isa 40:11; 65:10; Jer 13:17, 20; 38:10; Bar 4:26; Ezek 34:12, 31.

Isa 40:11; Jer 13:17; Zech 11:11; 13:7. Bock and Nolland do not develop these ideas, but their interest in an OT parallel to τὸ μικρὸν ποιμνίαν suggests they perceive a motif behind the expression.

Fitzmyer and Marshall point to other shepherd allusions, making this almost certainly a significant shepherd expression. Fitzmyer suggests that Isa 41:14 may reflect the τὸ μικρὸν ποιμνίαν as the LXX says, Ἰακωβ, ὀλιγοστός Ἰσραηλ, ἐγὼ ἐβοήθησά σοι (O Jacob, O small Israel, I have helped you). This allusion is possible as we have seen Isa 40 begins with shepherd imagery and the notion of Israel as God's flock is a well established metaphor. However, this seems less likely as Isaiah seems to have less emphasis on God feeding his flock and rather on God's protection from Babylon in the time of exile (Isa 41:12).

Marshall suggests Zech 13:7 and the scattering of the sheep may be behind the saying. Nolland and Bock also refer to this verse, although they do not produce an argument for this allusion. The possibility of a Zechariah echo is worthy of consideration as we have seen that it is likely that Luke draws on Zech 12:12-14 in his genealogy, therefore making another echo from Zechariah more likely here.

Zech 13:7 says

'Ῥομψαία, ἐξεγέρθητι ἐπὶ τούς ποιμένας μου καὶ ἐπὶ ἄνδρα πολίτην μου, λέγει κύριος παντοκράτωρ, πατάξατε τούς ποιμένας καὶ ἐκσπάσατε τὰ πρόβατα, καὶ ἐπάξω τὴν χεῖρά μου ἐπὶ τούς ποιμένας.

Awake, O sword against my shepherds, and against my fellow citizen, says the Lord Almighty. Smite the shepherds and remove the sheep; and I will bring my hand against the shepherds.

This verse stresses that bad shepherds will be judged by the Lord if they do not care for the vulnerable sheep which takes up Luke’s idea of τὸ μικρὸν ποιμνίων. However, the LXX does not contain the notion of little sheep, and alters the MT which uses צער which means 'small.' In the wider context of Zechariah 9-14 the predominant metaphor is that of an eschatological shepherd, and while Luke's wider unit (12:1-13:9) relates to coming judgment,

704. Marshall also suggests Dan 7:27 may be behind the combined use of βασιλεία and πατήρ.
705. Smith, Micah-Malachi, 282.
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the focus in this unit is on God as provider. While earlier in Zechariah the prophet does recall God's care for the physical needs of the flock (Zech 10:1-12), the focus in Zech 13 is on eschatological judgment where idols, unclean spirits and unfaithful shepherds will be removed. As we have seen, Luke's focus is on the practical provision for the disciples by God, albeit within a broader eschatological picture of wealth, which is at variance with Zechariah's focus. An allusion to Zechariah in Luke 12:32 is unlikely therefore for this particular unit, as the main foci of Luke and Zechariah vary too greatly to make this a strong link. What is of interest to this study is that scholars agree there is a scriptural echo of some description in the phrase τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον.

I suggest the particular echo Luke would be drawing on is most likely to centre not only in shepherd imagery of God's flock, but it would occur in the context of God as provider of material needs, as this is Luke's narrative context. It is more likely that Luke has chosen this shepherd saying as his unique ending because it is most informative or resonant with Jesus' teaching to the disciples which began at v. 22.

This leads me to consider Green and Johnson's suggestion that Ezekiel 34 is behind this shepherd saying. Luke's emphasis on material provision in the unit and especially on what the disciples will eat, coupled with the shepherd metaphor, echoes Ezek 34's marked emphasis on God's desire that his sheep are fed. Green goes so far as to suggest that τὸ μικρὸν ποίμνιον is present in v. 32 to remind the disciples of Ezek 34 where God is the shepherd of the flock, and suggests that this is the primary echo here. Johnson similarly gives this as the sole allusion in this unit, while Nolland suggests it as one possible echo. This provides a significant history of interpretation.

As we have seen in chapter 2.2.4.2, Ezek 34 repeatedly stresses the need for shepherds to feed the flock, therefore, the reader hears God say, 'I will feed them upon the mountains' needs, so that they will not need to wander far to find food. They will be fed with justice and righteousness. I suggest the shepherd imagery of this verse is the echo Luke is drawing on.

706 This includes rain for vegetation, healing for sickness, and the protection of a warrior shepherd king (Zech 10:1-12).
709 Ezek 34:2 [2x], 3, 8 [2x], 10, 13, 14 [2x], 15, 16.
(Ezek 34:13), 'I will feed them in good pasture' (Ezek 34:14) and 'It is I who will feed my sheep' (Ezek 34:15).

This emphasis is reflected in this Lukan passage which devotes considerable space to the practical needs of the disciples (12:22-26). Furthermore, the previous parable on which this unit comments, expresses a revised picture of material wealth with an emphasis on what is eaten. In this parable, Jesus' followers are warned not to focus on the needs of this world to the exclusion of being rich toward God. God is ultimately the one who determines the length of our days (12:20), and so lives that are focused on gathering material wealth do not reflect kingdom values. Both units (12:16-21; 22-32) therefore stress God as the provider of matters for daily life, making this thematically coherent with Ezek 34.

It is historically plausible that Luke used τὸ µικρὸν ποίµνιον as an allusion to Ezek 34 and did indeed see the correlation between God as a shepherd feeding the sheep, as this not only reflects Ezekiel's shepherd theme, but it is also how Israel had understood God from the time of the wilderness (Exod 16:4-21).

We know Ezek 34 was available to Luke as it recurs as an established echo in 19:10 and we will see in chapter 5.3 and 5.4 that Luke makes further use of the passage.710 Both passages show an emphasis on God’s concern for his people's practical provision which suggests thematic coherence. Three scholars suggest this is the likely echo, and two exclusively so, which lends support to the test for the history of interpretation. As Hays says, this is the least reliable of the guides, but on the level of satisfaction this echo scores highly. This is the most logical of the echoes as it illuminates the surrounding discourse with clear resonance to the thematic focus of 12:16-21, 22-32 of God as provider of material needs and especially food. Hence, we find valuable evidence that Ezekiel 34 is the text behind Luke’s shepherd saying in 12:32.

710. This will be fully explored in chapter 6.
5.2.3 What this adds to our Knowledge of the Shepherd Motif

Firstly, we find the shepherd motif in a kingdom teaching pericope during Jesus' ministry years. Luke shows us that God cares for the material needs of the disciples as a father and as a shepherd. So firstly, we see God pictured as a shepherd.

Secondly, the motif is also applied to Jesus who calls the disciples his flock, making him their shepherd also. We have noted this is a unique shepherd saying although it is attached to a Q passage suggesting a special interest or emphasis for Luke. This resonates with the opening picture we have of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd.

Finally, this shepherd saying is most likely to be an echo of Ezekiel 34 where God is pictured as the one who feeds the flock, and Jesus is God's Davidic shepherd. We find the expression little flock is more than just a term of endearment and is a narrative reminder that Jesus' ministry is as a faithful shepherd who looks after God's sheep. On a narrative level, we find a repetition of the motif of Jesus as a shepherd which suggests Luke sees an on-going role for the motif. Jesus as a shepherd who is talking of the faithful care of God, is very relevant to the picture of the Lukan Jesus to this point who is gathering in the lost sheep (5:29; 7:1-10, 36-50; 8:26-39) and healing the sick (5:12-16, 17-26; 6:6-11, 18).

5.3 The Parable of the Faithful Shepherd (Luke 15:1-7)

The significance of Luke's three 'lost parables' in chapter 15 have been consistently noted by scholars. Ramaroson describes these parables as 'le coeur du Troisième Évangile.' Bovon suggests they are at the midpoint of the Gospel and they foreground God's magnanimity to the lost, and Manson that they are Luke's 'Gospel for the outcast.' All agree on the para-
bles' significance and that there is something of Luke's essential theology tied up in them. To understand Luke's gospel, scholars agree one must grapple with their message.

In attempting to understand parables, scholars have journeyed from rejecting allegory to accepting there is some allegory inherent in a parable. While the extent of allegory is not settled, as we consider Luke 15:1-7, we will seek to recover echoes in the text which will help support a sound interpretation. As we have seen, Luke appears to have a particular interest in David and the motif of shepherd established in the infancy narratives, in 10:3 in the mission mandate and in the echo of Ezek 34 in 12:32. Now, at approximately the half way point of the Gospel narrative we find three 'lost parables,' the first of which is the 'lost sheep.' This is of great interest to this study due to its shepherd content.

Firstly, we will explore the nature of the initial parable and its source to establish if this is from Luke's unique material or from a shared source with Matthew or the Gospel of Thomas. Secondly, we will note the parable’s relationship within the unit of three parables. Thirdly, we will look in depth at the setting which provides an interpretive key for the parables. Fourthly, we will examine the parable's text, and fifthly, we will establish the LXX echoes within the text. Finally, we will review what we have learnt about the shepherd in the parable. Because of the significance of these 'lost' parables to the Gospel's central thrust, we will examine the parable of the lost sheep in some depth.

### 5.3.1 Luke 15:4-7, Matthew 18:12-14 and Gospel of Thomas §107


715. There is also a saying with some similarity in the *Gospel of Truth* §32.

> He is the shepherd who left behind the 99 sheep that were not lost, in order to go searching for this one which had strayed. And he rejoiced when he found it. For 99 is a number that is counted on the left hand, which tallies it. But when 1 is added, the entire sum passes to the right hand. So it is with him who lacks the One, which is the entire right hand—he takes from the left what is deficient in order to transfer it to the right, and thus the number becomes 100. Now, the significance within these words is the Father.

This is generally considered a Gnostic Gospel, written originally in Greek between 140 and 180 C.E. and translated into Coptic. It is considered likely that the parable stands in the Valentinus tradition whose writings Irenaeus declared as heresy (*Haer. 3.11.9*). The Coptic version was found at Nag Hammadi. It is best understood as a homily which describes the person and ministry of Jesus. S. Kent Brown, 'Gospel of Truth,' *ABD* 6:668.
The question of source is of interest to this study since each shepherd motif passage we have looked at to this point is unique to Luke. If this pattern continues this may show Luke has a particular interest in the motif and sees it cohering with Jesus' identity and ministry. Luke 15:4-7 bears resemblance to Matt 18:12-14 and scholars are divided over whether its source is Q or L.716 This parable is also found in the Coptic version of the Gospel of Thomas.717 It says,

§107 Jesus said, 'The kingdom is like a shepherd who had a hundred sheep. One of them, the largest, strayed. He left the ninety-nine. He sought that one until he found it. After he had laboured, he said to the sheep, 'I love you more than the ninety-nine.'"718

The significance of the Thomas sayings is related most fully to the dating of the document and its relationship to the Synoptics. If the Gospel of Thomas has a second century dating as was first believed, then the sayings may be dependent on the Synoptics and of interest in comparison, but secondary to the canonical texts.719 However, if the sayings have an early dating then it leaves open the possibility that they predated Luke and Matthew's parable, and may take higher priority.720 More latterly an earlier dating has been favoured. Riley, Pagels

717. The three Greek Oxyrhynchus fragments do not contain this logion. The fragments are: P Oxy654 sayings 26-30, 77, 30-31; P Oxy’s sayings 1-7; P Oxy655 sayings 36-40. Some scholars suggest the original document was an Aramaic or Syriac document, although most believe the original form was in Greek. See Marvin Meyer, The Gospel of Thomas: The Hidden Sayings of Jesus (New York: HarperSanFrancisco, 1992), 9. Contra, Perrin who posits an original Syriac document which was quickly translated into Greek. Nicholas Perrin, Thomas, the Other Gospel (London; SPCK, 2007), 80.
719. Grenfell and Hunt who found the Greek papyri first suggested a date soon after 200 C.E. for the oldest fragment P Oxy 1. Perrin notes the three fragments are from three different scribes at different times and are separate documents. Perrin, Thomas, 79. Scholars who support a later dating are Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 1074; Donald A. Hagner, Matthew 14-28 (WBC 33B; Dallas: Word, 1995), 526; Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 600; Nolland, Luke, 769; Perrin, Thomas, vii.
720. This was first suggested in James A. Robinson’s essay, 'ΑΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: On the Gattung of Q,’ in Trajectories through Early Christianity, ed. by J. M. Robinson and H. Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 71-113. This was originally printed in German in 'ΑΟΓΟΙ ΣΟΦΩΝ: Zur Gattung der Spruchquelle,’ in Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann, ed. by E. Dinkler (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1964). Robinson suggests there is a genre of saying, logoi sophon, which Q and Thomas drew upon. This was supported and developed by Helmut Koester who said because the collections of saying predate narrative elements of Matthew, Mark and Luke which he says were later introduced, then Thomas is the earliest and most authentic Jesus tradition. Helmut Koester, 'ΓΝΟΜΑΙ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΑ: The Origins of Diversification in the History of Early Christianity,’ in Trajectories through Early Christianity, ed. by J. M. Robinson and H. Koester (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971), 114-157. Originally printed in HTR 58 (1965): 279-318.
and Patterson have suggested that there was a Thomasine School that ran as another school of early Christian thought. DeConick suggests that the Gospel has a 'kernel' or early version predating the Synoptics that was developed at a later date. With these possibilities in mind, we will turn to GTh §107.

Thomas' version is presented as a saying in a collection of one hundred and fourteen sayings and so saying §107 does not have a discernible narrative context in the same way that the synoptic narratives of Jesus have a general chronological framework. Furthermore, the parable does not begin with a question as in Matthew and Luke, but it is a kingdom saying of Jesus. While it is harder to directly compare language as we have no copy of the Greek text for this saying, there are elements of shared language with both canonical versions. These however, are few, and in reality amount to only the '100 sheep' and the '99 sheep.' DeConick notes that, 'elements of the parable probably evoke memories of Ezekiel 34:11-16, the eschatological ingathering of the scattered sheep, the tribes of Israel.' This is an echo which we have already seen that Luke is familiar with.

There are similar features in GTh 107 that resonate with either Matthew or Luke's own redactive interests. With Matthew, the GTh 107 also talks of the sheep that goes astray and speaks directly of 'the shepherd,' and with Luke, he looks for the sheep until he finds it. However, this may suggest the writer of the Gospel of Thomas knew both Matthew and Luke's versions of the parables. If so, this would support a later dating for this saying of Thomas. Patterson does concede that GTh 107 is extremely close to the parallel form found in the canonical Gospels.

---

Many scholars now hold to an earlier dating including Crossan, Historical Jesus, 427.
722. DeConick, Gospel of Thomas, 18.
723. The Gospel of Thomas is only found in completed form in a Coptic translation found at Nag Hammadi in 1945. The Coptic translation has close correlation with the three Greek papyri found at Oxyrhynchus, Egypt in 1897 and 1903 which suggests the translation is a reliable text. However, there is no copy of saying §107 in the Greek papyri.
724. DeConick, Gospel of Thomas, 286.
726. Patterson, Gospel of Thomas, 18-71.
There are many features however in \textit{GTh} §107 which are in contrast to both canonical versions. Firstly, the shepherd speaks directly to the sheep saying, 'I love you more than the ninety-nine.' There is no direct speech in the comparable canonical parables. Secondly, the writer says the shepherd toils, implying this is very hard work. In comparison Matthew and Luke talk of rejoicing, and, particularly Luke emphasises the joy of the shepherd. Thirdly, there is no talk of repentance which is so pivotal in Luke's parable and no further comment on the saying as we find in Luke 15:7. Fourthly, there is no language of the 'lost' or the 'righteous' which is a feature for Luke, while absent from Matthew. Finally and most significantly, the sheep in the \textit{GTh} is large and the shepherd loves the lost sheep because of his large size. This is unlike both the Lukan and Matthean parables. Matthew talks of the 'little ones' in the context of the Matthean community, but this is a term of endearment and does not relate to the size of the sheep or the value of the people. Luke makes no mention of any specific characteristic of the lost sheep, and as we will come to see in section 5.3.3, his primary interest is in this parable as a critique of the religious leaders and in demonstration of how a good leader acts. His interest is also in an egalitarian salvation where everyone regardless of gender, ethnicity and social status is valued. With \textit{GTh}'s reference to loving one sheep more than another because of its size, we therefore have not only different language being used, but an entirely different 'type' of shepherd pictured and one which accords with the wider themes of Gnostic theology. The distinctive features of the \textit{GTh} 107 led France to conclude that Thomas’ writer has reversed the point of Matthew’s parable,\footnote{France writes, the ‘	extit{Gospel of Thomas} 107 misses, and indeed reverses, the point of the parable; its version of the sheep which have gone astray is not a little one but “the biggest,” and when the shepherd has recovered it says, “I love you more than the ninety-nine!”’ R. T. France, \textit{The Gospel of Matthew} (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 688. See also Hagner, \textit{Matthew 14-28}, 526.} and Fitzmyer, that there is a later dating for this saying in the \textit{Gospel of Thomas}.\footnote{Fitzmyer, \textit{According to Luke}, 1074.}

Perrin has noted the correspondences between \textit{GTh} and the \textit{Diatessaron}\footnote{Tatian’s \textit{Diatessaron} was written about 170 C.E., although no Greek textual witnesses remain and the actual text has had to be reconstructed from translations, commentaries and quotations. It is widely attested, and in Syria it was the primary Gospel until the fifth century. William L. Petersen, ‘Diatessaron,’ \textit{ABD} 2:189.} and has raised the possibility that that they drew on a common Syriac source, quite distinct from the Synoptic
traditions. He notes the many similar sayings and catchwords that linked the sayings together, and the common ascetic thread in both documents, and suggests the GTh must have therefore been written sometime after 173 C.E. when he dates the Diatessaron. He also notes places where GTh appears to draw on Matthew, that GTh §13 breaks firmly with the Synoptics in its description of who Jesus is, where it appears to follow Philonic logic and where it pictures a later persecuted church. He further notes the creation theme in the GTh that reflects later Gnostic writings such as the Dialogue of the Saviour; and the Gospel of Philip. These features further support a later dating for the GTh.

Therefore, because of the marked language differences, the different 'type' of shepherd who loves one sheep more than another, the resonance the Gospel shows with the later Diatessaron and the ideas coming from both Matthew and Luke, it is most likely that the canonical parables were the source for the GTh §107. This makes a later dating more likely and further comparison unnecessary for this study, therefore we will turn to a comparison between Matthew and Luke's parables.

---

730. Perrin, Thomas, 83.
731. Perrin, Thomas, 97.
733. Perrin, Thomas, 112-119.
734. Perrin, Thomas, 122-123.
The table below outlines key features of Matthew's and Luke's parables which will help us see how they are similar and how they are different.

Table 4: Comparison between Matthew 18:12-14 and Luke 15:4-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Matthew 18:12-14</th>
<th>Luke 15:4-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context of the parable:</strong></td>
<td>The parable comes in the fourth block of teaching which focuses on the community. The parable is introduced by v. 10 where the attention on pastoral care for the μικροί and thus the care for the one sheep that has strayed is proportionate to 'the little ones' in a community. 735</td>
<td>The parables is part of a discrete block of three parables which have the unifying themes of ἀπόλλυμι, εὐρίσκω, χαίρω (συνχαίρω, χαρά), and μετάνοια. The setting is amongst tax collectors and sinners who are drawing near to listen to Jesus while the Pharisees and scribes grumble and complain about Jesus sharing table fellowship with ones known as sinners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening:</strong></td>
<td>Begins with a question Τί υἱῶν δοκεῖ;</td>
<td>Begins with a question τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑμῶν;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared language:</strong></td>
<td>100 sheep, 99 sheep, ἄνθρωπος (18:12), πορευόμαι (18:12), ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι (18:13), χαίρω (18:13), ἀπόλλυμι (18:14)</td>
<td>100 sheep, 99 sheep, ἄνθρωπος (15:4), πορευόμαι (15:4), λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι (15:7), χαίρω (15:5), ἀπόλλυμι (15:4 [twice],6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

735. Verse 11 is omitted by NA27 and UBSGNT 4ED. Metzger’s commentary rates this omission [B] noting that the earliest witnesses do not have this verse. The verse ἠλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου [ζητήσας καὶ] σώσαι τὸ ἀπολλός is found in Luke 19:10 and it is believed this interpolation was to connect v. 10 with the parable. The brackets note that some witnesses omit ζητήσας καὶ. Metzger, Textual Commentary, 36. France says, ‘It looks more like a well intentioned addition reflecting the message of the parable of the sheep.’ France, Gospel of Matthew, 684.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theological emphasis:</th>
<th>The emphasis is on the sheep that has strayed and needs to be sought out so it is no longer lost.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The primary emphasis is on the shepherd, his joy at finding the sheep (15:6) and that of shared joy in the community and the angels in heaven (15:6, 7). A second emphasis is on being lost and found, and repentance. ἀπόλλυμι (15:4 [twice], 6); εὑρίσκω (15:4, 5, 6); μετάνοια (15:7).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Unique language: | The sheep have strayed (πλανάω; 18:12 [2x], 13), are on the mountain (18:12), ζητέω (18:12), ἀφίημι (18:12), θέλημα (18:14), τοῦ πατρὸς ὦμόν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς (18:14), μικρός (18:14). |
|                   | The sheep are lost (ἀπόλλυμι), ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (15:4), εὑρίσκω (15:4 [2x], 5, 6), μετάνοια (15:7 [twice]), δικαίος (15:7), οἶκος (15:6), 15:5 is all unique to Luke plus the shepherd carrying the sheep on his shoulders, and the gathering of friends and neighbours to rejoice with him (15:6). |

| Ending of the parable: | After the parable’s focus on the sheep who went astray, there follows another example of someone straying through sin and how to restore him. |
|                       | After the focus on God who finds the lost sheep, an intensified and slightly truncated version of the parable follows in the parable of the lost coin, and then an expanded and developed version in the parable of the lost son. |

As this table shows there are some similarities in the language of the parables, particularly the key ideas of sheep, rejoicing and the lost. These are strong linguistic similarities. We also find each parable opens with a question, and yet here the opening questions are quite different both in who Jesus is talking to and what he says. Matthew has Jesus asking the disciples (Matt 18:1), 'What do you think?', while Luke has Jesus saying to the Pharisees and scribes, 'Which one of you having a hundred sheep...?'

---

However, there are considerable differences between the two parables. The context at the beginning and ending of each parable is markedly different, as are the theological emphases, and the unique language each parable features. Each of these differences build up a picture that suggests the two versions may come from separate occasions, and are not merely redactions of the same parable.  

Snodgrass recently noted,

> Matthew and Luke have relatively little in common...[and] of the sixty-five words in Matthew 18:12-14 and eighty-nine in Luke 15:4-7 only fourteen are identical in both accounts, with four more words shared but with different grammatical forms...[finally saying] that there is so little verbal agreement between the two accounts suggests we are dealing with two independent and equally valid traditions.

The level of linguistic difference is considerable and should not be overlooked as an indicator of two separate parables, but possibly more significant is the entirely different theological thrust of the two parables. France, a Matthean scholar notes that the difference in theological emphasis is more than an idiomatic variation as the two contexts of the parables suggest a different focus for the writer. Luke's context is the religious leaders, and the focus is evangelistic bringing outsiders into the fold, while Matthew's concern is pastoral and emphasises disciples caring for one another.  

Hagner, on the other hand plays this down commenting that Matthew has freely adapted the parable to suit his own purpose of bringing strayed community members back into the fold. While Hagner, Schnackenburg and France ultimately propose the Matthean parable is a reduced version of Luke, thus favouring a Q source, they call attention to the great differences between the parables. Lukan scholars however are less convinced that Luke is using Q because Matthew and Luke's parables contain so many differences, and Luke's parable of the lost sheep is so closely aligned to the parable of the lost coin, and the lost son. It is also helpful to remember the radical nature of the parable of the

742. Bailey notes the first two parables may be viewed as a double parable and Bock that 'the parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin are so similar that they are best treated together.' Bailey, *Poet and Peasant*, 156; Bock, *Luke*, 1295.
lost coin. In this parable rather surprisingly, God is pictured as a woman. It is very unlikely that Luke would have written *ex nihilo* considering that the subject matter subverted the patriarchal ancient world.

The greatest point of difference however, is the Lukan collection of three parables which add to the discussion of source. We will now consider the unity of the three parables.

### 5.3.2 Unity of the Three Parables

The parable of the lost sheep is part of three parables which are popularly known as the *lost* parables as the central theme of salvation of the lost forms the core of each parable. They are primarily theologically motivated and speak of what God does as the one who seeks the lost rather than focusing on the lost themselves. That which is lost is of concern in the parables, and yet this is not the primary message. The sheep who is lost is, for Luke, the setting within which the agent (the shepherd) comes and finds the sheep and joyfully restores it to the fold. The narrative deals foremost with the actions of the shepherd. Léonard Ramaroson expresses it well when he says,

> Au reste, le centre d’intérêt, dans les trois paraboles, n’est point l’object perdu ni l’object retrouvé, mais le propriétaire de l’object, ou, plus précisément, le propriétaire heureux de retrouver son bien momentanément perdu.

Similarly, the complementary parable is less about the coin than it is about the woman who diligently searches for it and then rejoices with her neighbours. In the final parable we do have greater narrative space given to the son who becomes lost to his father, and yet the thrust of the parable is on his need to be restored into his father's house where he can be fed, and find shelter and community again. Hence, we again have a focus on the one who restores the lost.

---


744. Ramaroson, 'Le Coeur,' 349.
Due to this theological focus, the parables could more accurately be renamed 'the faithful shepherd,' 'the faithful woman,' and 'the gracious father,' to reflect their core. Bailey notices that church tradition has failed to make this connection in identifying Jesus as the faithful shepherd, because in doing so it requires the identification of God as the good woman also. The father in the prodigal parable is commonly understood to represent God, and yet the two earlier parables are paralleled thematically. Therefore, this study will now refer to the parables using the suggested titles to reflect their theocentric focus.

The three parables are bound together by shared themes, language, a numeric progression, and the use of an inclusio which links the three pericopae into a unit. There is also a well-established shared literary structure and thematic symmetry and development in the first two parables where the second parable mirrors the first almost flawlessly. Bailey suggests this is most likely because they share a common source.

The shared themes are: (1) God's mission to find the lost (15:4, 8, 24, 32); (2) the burden of restoration (15:5, 8, 22-23) and; (3) joy and a community feast when a sinner repents (15:7, 10, 24, 32). These themes are evidenced by the linguistic use of Leitwörter, which in these parables are μετάνοια, χαίρω, ἀπόλλυμι, and εὐρίσκω. As Buber demonstrates, leading words draw the reader to the author's thematic interests, and are used skillfully to create meaning. This is what Luke has done by these four 'leading words' which I will now demonstrate.

The linguistic repetition of μετάνοια is explicit in the first two parables (15:7 [2x], 10), but it also infuses the story of the prodigal son who 'came to himself' and got up and went back to his father (15:17-18). Repentance as a theme is significant for the Lukan gospel of salvation and points back to chapter three where John is proclaiming a baptism for the repentance of sins (3:8). We see it again at Levi's banquet when the religious leaders are also grumbling, and Jesus says, 'I have come to call not the righteous but sinners to μετάνοια' (5:32). It will continue to play a significant role in Jesus' mission to seek out and save the lost and this will

746. Barton, 'Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness,' 201.
747. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 142.
748. Buber, Scripture and Translation, 114-115.
be reiterated in Jesus' commission to the disciples after the resurrection when he says, καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (24:47).\(^{749}\)

Luke however also speaks of repentance without the specific language of μετάνοια as is the case in this final parable.\(^{750}\) Strack and Billerbeck suggest the expression εἰς ἡματόν ἔλθειν, is a Semitic phrase which means 'to repent,'\(^{751}\) and so consider the younger son's actions to be equated with repentance. Johnson explains the expression as showing, 'the repentance from sin which was the moral attached to the first two parables is now thematic.'\(^{752}\) Similarly Chilton notes the implicit nature of repentance in Jesus' parables when he says, 'Repentance, a turning back to what alone has value, is a necessary and inescapable aspect of entering the kingdom; it is implicit within much of Jesus’ discourse, and need not be named to be operative.'\(^{753}\)

The repetition of μετάνοια therefore, whether explicitly or not, can be considered a linguistic device used to draw the reader’s attention to its importance for the narrative as a unit.

Χαίρω notably comes when a sinner repents and is characteristic not only of the one who finds the lost (15:5, 20), but is shared by the community (15:6, 9, 22-24), and even by the angels in heaven (15:7, 10). The theme of rejoicing in each parable is linked to a festive gathering. Eating together was a central dimension of life in a middle-eastern community and this is visible in the nature of the rejoicing. In the first two parables neighbours are gathered for a celebration, and in the final parable a banquet is held to celebrate the return of the lost son. Indirectly therefore, people are always fed in the parables.

The repetitive use of ἄπολλομι (15:4 [twice], 6, 8, 9, 17, 24, 32) and εὐρίσκω (15:4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 24, 32), form strong linguistic and thematic ties that bind the three parables together. The nature of what it is to be lost and to be found has clearly been the guiding thematic link in the

---

749. This theme follows through into Acts where a gospel of repentance is preached to both Jew and Gentile (Acts 5:31; 11:18; 13:24; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20).
750. Other examples are Peter at Jesus' feet (5:8); Zacchaeus coming down from the tree (19:6); the thief on the cross (23:41-42).
751. Str-B II. 215.
history of interpretation where, as we have noted, the parables are commonly known as 'the lost parables.' These words' use at the beginning of the first parable, their occurrence in all three parables and their final use in the ultimate phrase (15:32), point to the strength of these as leading words for Luke.

There is also an ongoing use of ἁρτωλός (15:1, 2, 7, 10) in both the setting and the parables themselves, and there is also reference to its antonym, δικαίος (19:7). Again the nature of sin and righteousness play a narrative role in the final parable where the younger son blantly sins when he asks for his inheritance and uses it on a foolish lifestyle. However, similar consideration must be given to the elder brother who also silently takes his own inheritance (15:12) and then later complains and does not enter into the festivities when his brother returns to the father’s house. Bailey notes that when the elder son hears the younger son's request, he should first respond in protest to the request, and then he should act as reconciler. This custom of reconciler is a Middle Eastern role for someone close to both parties, and as the elder son it would most certainly fall to him. The elder son's silence is therefore tantamount to a refusal to mend the broken relationship, and suggest his actions depict him also as ἁρτωλός.

There is a strong numeric progression in the three parables. There is one sheep lost out of one hundred, one coin lost out of ten, and one son out of two sons. This shows clear thought to the ordering and cumulative nature of the parables, and suggests they form a carefully worked literary unit. The progression also functions thematically as it accentuates God’s grace for the lost, which is the central message of the chapter. One in a hundred and the shepherd would seek the lost sheep, one in ten and God as the faithful woman will find that which is lost, and one out of two and God as the gracious father would still seek one's return. Bovon says the theme of God's magnanimity to the lost stands in the foreground in Luke's Gospel. He suggests that Luke 13:22-17:10 is the mid-section of the Gospel and 'Das Gleichnis vom verlorenen Sohn etwa steht genau in der Mitte des Evangeliums.' As such it functions as a literary synopsis and a hermeneutical key to the narrative where God’s concern for

754. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 168.
755. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 15-16. Bovon further suggests the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) functions in the same way in Acts and brings the inclusion of the Gentiles to the fore.
the lost is demonstrated. This coheres with many scholars' views, and especially Manson who said of the parable of the lost sheep,

The L material in chapters 15-19 might be called in a special sense the Gospel of the Outcast. There is in this section a great concentration of teaching, chiefly in the form of parables, whose purpose is primarily to demonstrate God’s care for those whom men despise and condemn.

It is of great interest therefore that the first of these parables, which carries possibly the greatest critique of the parables' hearers, is a parable of a shepherd.

The final literary feature that shows these three parables form a unit, is the use of inclusio. The most accepted inclusio is between the beginning setting with the grumbling scribes and Pharisees (15:1-3) and the elder brother's response which is characterised by complaining (15:28-30). There is also an inclusio between the joyful burden of restoration shown by the shepherd and the father’s joyful and festive reconciliation with his son in the lost son parable. Both uses demonstrate the author’s deliberate literary planning. Further to this, Luke introduces the three parables with the singular παραβολή which shows that he perceives them as a single unit.

These literary features bind the three parables together into a unity, and suggest the parable of the faithful shepherd is inextricably tied to the other parables. This, together with the repeated language, material and themes in the good shepherd parable itself, suggest it is most likely that the parable is unique to Luke.

5.3.3 The setting (15:1-3)

Luke provides the setting for the three parables in his introduction in vv. 1-3, and scholars suggest the setting is the interpretive key for the three parables. As a result establishing

757. Manson, Sayings, 282.
758. Green, Gospel of Luke, 586; Johnson, Luke, 242; Nolland, Luke, 769; Barton, 'Parables of God's Love and Forgiveness,' 201. This will be explored in more detail in the following section.
759. The burden of restoration has been explored most fully in the work of Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 148-154.
760. Bailey, Jacob and the Prodigal, 60.
what Luke is saying in the setting and how this informs the parables is essential for the reader to understand the parable of the faithful shepherd.

Verse 3 informs the reader to whom the parables are spoken when it says, Ἐἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοῖς τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην λέγων. Here the text's use of αὐτοί refers to the Pharisees and scribes who are the named audience, although 14:25 notes the large crowds that are travelling with Jesus. Noting this is of primary importance for reading the parables. Jesus tells the parables for the benefit of the Pharisees and scribes, who as we know are shepherds of God’s flock. This is of particular importance as the first parable is about faithful shepherds, and the narrative suggests it would almost certainly have been heard by them as a critique of their leadership. Neale notes this is two-fold as the parables justify Jesus' action in eating with the sinners, but he also critiques the religious leaders whose behaviour is not welcoming. But it is Bailey, Green, Klein and Blomberg who see most clearly the link between the leaders as shepherds and the faithful shepherd of the first parable. Bailey shows this clearly when he says,

The original audience of the Pharisees and scribes is pressed to make something of the following decision/response: We, the shepherds of Israel, have 'lost our sheep' and Jesus, acting in God’s place, at great cost has found them. Rather than attack him we should rejoice at the restoration of these lost even if Jesus in the process radically redefines repentance.

Green states,

By analogy, cast by Luke as leaders of the people, the legal experts and Pharisees who complain against Jesus’ practices at the table find themselves under indictment for their failure to act in a way that befit faithful shepherds.

Klein notes this is confirmed in v. 4 when he says,

---

Mit 'Wer ist unter euch…?' werden die Hörer konkret angesprochen. Sie sollen sich mit dem Hirten, von dem sofort die Rede ist, identifizieren und daraus ihre Schlüsse ziehen.\textsuperscript{767}

Wolter further notes that this setting shows a clear comparison to the story of Levi when he says, 'An das Streitgespräch Lk 5:27-32 erinnert… das Gegenüber der Sammelbezeichnungen "Zollner und Sünder" auf der einen Seite und "Pharisäer und Schriftgelehrte" auf der anderen (5:30 diff. Mk 2:16).\textsuperscript{768}

However, not every scholar believes the shepherd character in this parable is directly referring to the religious leaders. Nolland finds it unusual that the parable would suggest a first century Pharisee or scribe would own any sheep, let alone one hundred of them, and so does not make the connection between religious leaders and shepherds.\textsuperscript{769} He takes the use of the hundred and the ninety-nine sheep as a literary device to show the disproportionate investment in time and effort to find one sheep, and suggests it has its roots in the Jewish text of \textit{m. Peah} 4.1, 2 that says,

\begin{quote}
Even if ninety-nine [poor people] say that [the householder should] distribute [the produce] and [only] one [poor person] says that [the poor should] take [the produce by themselves, leaving the householder out of the distribution process completely], they listen to the latter...[In the case of the trellis or the palm tree], even if ninety-nine [poor people] say that [the poor should] take [the produce by themselves], and [only] one [poor person] says that [the householder should] distribute [the produce among the poor], they listen to the latter...
\end{quote}

This position however only views the shepherds in the text as literal first century shepherds, and does not take into account the way scripture repeatedly refers to leaders as shepherds of God’s people. The Pharisees and scribes were so highly trained in the scriptures it is to be expected that they would have made connections to passages like Jeremiah 23 and Ezekiel 34 where the shepherds were also criticised for not seeking out the lost sheep.

Jeremias equates first century shepherds as ἀμαρτωλοί, 'because they are suspected of driving their flocks into foreign fields, and of embezzling the produce of their flocks.'\textsuperscript{770} As we have seen however in chapter four, Luke does not appear to be portraying shepherds as sinners,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{767} Klein, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, 523.
  \item \textsuperscript{768} Wolter, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, 523.
  \item \textsuperscript{769} Nolland, \textit{Luke}, 771.
  \item \textsuperscript{770} Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 133.
\end{itemize}
and the rabbinic texts Jeremias suggests as evidence for viewing first-century shepherds as sinners are a little thin. Furthermore, we also saw that although there are a few rabbinic texts that portray shepherds unfavourably, this is the opposite of Philo's perspective which views shepherds as respectable, noble and for whom God is the preeminent example of a shepherd (see chapter 2.3.2).

It appears that the Lukan setting (vv. 1-3) suggests that these three parables are directed specifically for the purpose of challenging the religious leaders as to their non-acceptance and welcome of toll collectors and sinners. The use of αὐτοί in 15:3 implies Luke’s intention to challenge their attitudes and behaviour toward sinners. As the content of the very first of the three parables centres on a faithful shepherd, this appears to confirm the parables’ challenge is directed toward the immediate hearers who know their task is to shepherd God’s people. However, the parable itself may have further evidence of this, and so this will be considered further when we look at the text in section 5.3.4.

There are three additional ideas in the setting which may shed further light on this proposal that Luke’s setting is directing its challenge to the religious leaders. Firstly there is the description of the Pharisees and scribes grumbling (διαγογγύζω), secondly their charge that the toll collectors and sinners are ἁµαρτωλοί and what this may imply, then finally the issue of Jesus welcoming (προσδέχοµαι) and eating with (συνεσθίω) sinners. We will explore these three key ideas before looking at the parable in detail.

5.3.3.1 What does the ‘grumbling’ imply?

The introductory verses state that πάντες the toll collectors and sinners are drawing near to listen to Jesus while the Pharisees and scribes are grumbling (διαγογγύζω) and that Jesus is both welcoming and eating with sinners. The use of πάντες is hyperbole for the sake of emphasis,⁷⁷¹ and functions to highlight the positive portrayal of the toll collectors and sinners. Luke’s use of ἄκοῦω in 15:1 recalls 14:35 where the conclusion of the parable of salt says, ὁ ἔχων οὖτα ἄκουειν ἄκουέτω. Immediately, in 15:1 we see that it is the toll collectors and sinners who have been positioned in the narrative to be the model responders to Jesus by them lis-

⁷⁷¹ Neale, None but the Sinners, 155.
tening (ἀκούω) to Jesus. Johnson suggests 'hearing' is a sign of conversion, although he may be overstating the point. Nolland notes, 'It is too much to say that drawing near to Jesus implies the repentance of vv. 7 and 10, but it is certainly a move in the direction of that possibility.' The narrative supports this view through the use of ἀκούω.

The Pharisees and scribes however are set up to be viewed pejoratively. Luke never uses διαγγέλλω (15:2; 19:7) or its simple form γογγύζω (5:30) in a positive light. In all three of these pericopae those who are grumbling are characterised negatively, and all use the imperfect tense giving the sense of the ongoing nature of their attitude. Both points lead the reader to conclude that those grumbling are the antagonists in the narratives.

Gowler notes in 15:2 the Pharisees are indirectly attacking Jesus' honour in their murmuring, and this would have been perceived as offensive. It has been suggested that the grumbling of the scribes and the Pharisees echoes the Israelites who were grumbling at Aaron and Moses in the wilderness (Exod 15:24; 16:2, 7, 8, 9, 12; Num 11:1; 14:2, 27, 36). Evans originally proposed that the travel narrative modelled the exodus journey, and this view has gained general support with varying emphases in the works of Moessner, Green, O'Toole, Strauss, Scobie, and Turner, with Pao exploring this in Acts. As scholars have analysed Luke’s travel narrative they have noticed that the transfiguration sets the scene for a transformation of attitude.

---

774. 19:7 will be discussed in detail in chapter 6.3.
779. O'Toole, Parallels Between Jesus and Moses, 22-29.
for the journey by its unique shaping of Jesus' mission as an exodus. There is considerable
evidence for this.

Luke uniquely uses the word ἐξοδος in the transfiguration narrative (9:31), he uses νεφέλη
three times (9:34 [twice], 35) which may recall the pillar of cloud that led the Israelites (Exod
13:21, 22; 14:19, 24; 33:9, 10; Num 12:5; 14:14; Deut 31:15),\(^{784}\) and uniquely speaks of the
δόξα (9:31, 32)\(^{785}\) which may recall the glory mentioned in Exod 24:16-17 and Deut 5:24.
Other exodus indicators are given when Luke presents Jesus in a prophet-like-Moses role
fulfilling Deut 18:15. For example Luke's use of the Shema in 10:27 (Deut 6:5), and the
sending out of the seventy (10:1; refer 5.1) which may look back to the 70 elders who assist-
ed Moses (Num 11:16-17, 24-25).\(^{786}\) The focus in Luke on the Spirit's presence in Jesus (4:1,
14; 5:17) may also be equated with the presence of God who led the Israelites (Exod 33:14),
and Moessner suggests the teaching from 10:1-18:14 largely parallels Deut 1-26.\(^{787}\) Watts ex-
plored the idea of the Isaianic new exodus in Mark, and Strauss has tested this motif in
Luke’s writing finding the ἐξοδος motif is not limited to the travel narrative, but begins with
John the Baptist in the wilderness.\(^{788}\)

The high level of scholarly support for the Lukan Jesus travelling on an exodus journey, does
suggest the grumbling of the religious leaders in 15:2 may well also recall the exodus. This
in turn points the reader towards a pejorative view of the grumbling, and may even go so far
as to indicate the religious leaders' unfaithfulness to God and God's mission to bring salvation
to sinners (1:77; 2:11, 30; 5:32). However, as Hollander points out, an echo brings with it a
causal chain that links an idea to the wider picture.\(^{789}\) That is, one significant word or idea
suggests something greater. With the Lukan Jesus on his exodus journey therefore, this men-
tion of grumbling leaders may bring into view a picture of the exodus where the reader can
perceive the grumbling Israelites who are God’s flock and God who is their shepherd (Pss

\(^{784}\) The other synoptics only use this twice each (Mark 9:7 [2x]; Matt 17:5 [2x]).
\(^{785}\) This also recalls Luke 9:26-27.
\(^{786}\) Scobie, 'A Canonical Approach,' 337-338.
\(^{787}\) Moessner, Lord of the Banquet, 45-79. Moessner suggests a four-fold exodus typology as a
\(^{788}\) Rikki E. Watts, Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark (Biblical Studies Library; Grand Rapids: Baker Books,
2000); Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 261-336.
\(^{789}\) Hollander, Figure of Echo, 131-149.
This is made more likely as the first parable in the unit of three is that of the good shepherd. As this study agrees with scholars such as Bailey, Neale, Johnson, and Curkpatrick that this Lukan setting of 15:1-3 is the interpretive key of the chapter, then this echo of the exodus is particularly informative for the reader.

5.3.3.2 The use of ἁμαρτωλός and what it may imply
Luke describes the Pharisees and scribes grumbling that Jesus is dining with and welcoming sinners. This notion of ἁμαρτωλός is significant in this text and is of great importance in the wider narrative as we will soon see, but first it is helpful to consider the historical use of the word.

The word was not common in the Hellenistic world, but when it was used the Hellenistic background contained the basic idea of failure. Homer used ἁμαρτωλός for a spear which missed its target, and the classical world used it to show when something was missing mentally or spiritually, including a deficiency or failure to achieve in education. It contained a basic derogatory meaning but it was not accusatory. It was used only occasionally to mean something other than 'failure,' an example being on grave inscriptions where it came as a warning against anyone who might disturb the tomb. One inscription reads, ἁμαρτωλός ἔστω θεοῖς καταχθονίοις (Let him be 'a sinner' to the underworld gods; CIG III, 4307). It was also used of leaders or gods who did not fulfil their annual sacrifices. OGIS 55:30 records this inscription, 'If the rulers and leaders do not fulfil their annual sacrifices, let them be ἁμαρτωλοί.' Thus we have alongside the basic idea of failure, also one of error where someone fails morally or ethically.

---

792. Homer, Iliad, 5.287.
793. Rengstorf, ἁμαρτωλός, TDNT 1:317.
794. Rengstorf says no one would describe themselves as ἁμαρτωλός, while this use on gravestones functions as if the dead person is speaking a curse on anyone who would disturb their rest. Rengstorf, ἁμαρτωλός, TDNT 1:320; Adams, Sinner in Luke, 22.
Unlike Hellenistic writing, the word was very common in the LXX and the Pseudepigrapha, particularly in the Greek Psalter, and so it is within the Jewish writings that we can gain a primary understanding of what it may have meant for Luke.

ἁμαρτωλός comes from the Hebrew רָשָׁע or דָּוִד. The key term רָשָׁע contains the notion of guilt in contrast to the primary antonym דָּוִד. This is legal language and God is said to be the judge of sinners. Sinners are a category or a type of person, and the measurement was the standard of the law. This term was not restricted only to Israelites to whom the law was given. Enemies of Israel (Ps 9:16; Isa 13:9; 14:5), those whose behaviour was wicked (Gen 13:13), or Gentiles are also named as sinners (Gen 13:13; Exod 34:15-16; Lev 18:24; Deut 32:32; Isa 1:10; Ezek 16:46-58). Gentiles were considered sinners by virtue of their non-adherence to the Torah and therefore the resulting impurity before God.

As with the LXX, for Luke, the term ἁμαρτωλός also has its primary antonym in δίκαιος. The word is of prime importance in the Lukan narrative as Luke’s gospel message is preeminently about the forgiveness of sins (1:77; 3:3; 4:18; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:31;

796. דָּוִד is translated ἁμαρτωλός seventy-three times, and sixty-two of these appear in the Psalter. It is also translated ἁσβής (120x), δίκαιος (5x) and διονος (32x). Neale, None But the Sinners, 76; Adams, Sinner in Luke, 29.
797. Adams, Sinner in Luke, 23; Neale, None but the Sinners, 75-82.
798. The Pentateuch uses the term ἁμαρτωλός only for ἡμᾶς where its primary antonym is πονηρό (Gen 13:13; Num 16:38: 17:3). For a full discussion see Adams, Sinner in Luke, 23-41.
800. Superscriptions often help define the Sitz im Leben of Psalms. Adams, Sinner in Luke, 33. Neale only sees the ideological type of ‘sinner’ which exists primarily to contrast the ‘righteous.’ Neale, None But the Sinners, 78-80.
801. Rengstorf notes in the Psalms a sinner (1) is opposite of the pious and godly (Ps 1:1, 5); (2) boasts in the law and the covenant but does not regard the Law as binding (Ps 50:16ff); (3) persistently breaks the commandments (Ps 10:7); (4) shows no sign of repentance and even boasts in wickedness (Ps 49:13); (5) trusts in his own wealth and power instead of God (Ps 49:6); (6) ignores God in his life (Pss 10:4; 36:1); and (7) is lax toward the law (Ps 119:53). Rengstorf, ἁμαρτωλός, TDNT 1:325.
802. Sodom became the archetypal example of Gentile ‘sinner’ known for their wickedness, but Gentile nations were also portrayed as associating with idolatry and sexual immorality. The impurity of Gentiles is addressed in M. Pesahim 8:8; M. Shekalim 8:1; T. Yom ha-Kippurim 4.20. See S. Safari and M. Stern in cooperation with D. Flusser and W.C. van Unnik, ed. The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions, 2 Vol. (Compendia Rerum Judaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974-76), 2:829.
803. ἁμαρτωλός, BDAG, 51; Rengstorf, ἁμαρτωλός, TDNT 1:324.
26:18), and Jesus’ claim that he can forgive sins on earth now (5:17-26) identifies him as an agent of God.

It is natural therefore that this is a word used repeatedly by Luke. Luke uses the term eighteen times in comparison with Mark, who uses it only six times, and Matthew, five times.\(^{805}\) However, this volume of recurrence is heightened by Luke’s unique use of the word which suggests this is a significant concept for Lukan theology. Luke uses the term four times where there are synoptic parallel passages (Luke 5:30, Mark 2:15, Matt 9:10; Luke 5:32, Mark 2:16, Matt 9:13; Luke 7:34, Matt 11:9; Luke 24:7, Mark 14:14, Matt 26:45).\(^{806}\) Yet he also uses ἀμαρτωλός in fourteen passages which are unique to Luke. These are in the Sermon on the Plain (6:32, 33, 34 [twice]), and six pericopae where the focus is on Jesus' relationship with ἀμαρτωλοί (5:8; 7:37, 39; 13:2; 15:1, 2, 7, 10; 18:13; 19:7). Furthermore, key mission statements in the Gospel (5:32; 19:10) are in 'sinner' pericopae,\(^{807}\) and the Nazareth Manifesto which is programmatic for the Gospel describes Jesus' mission to bring the ἅφεσις to the captives (4:18). Therefore, the combined force of the frequency with which Luke uses 'sinner' material, its use in these key narratives, and the Lukan Gospel which is about the forgiveness of sins means this is a concept we will consider in some detail.

Firstly, of fundamental importance is the idea that the term helps to define the universal scope of the Lukan Jesus’ mission which is for all people. This may be why 'sinner' material is found in the Evangelists' mission statements. The emphasis is less on condemning people for their sinful actions and more on the mission of God to reach all people. We know from the infancy narrative that Jesus' coming will bring joy to all people (2:10), salvation for all people (2:32), and that the disciples are called to preach repentance and forgiveness of sins to 'all the nations' (24:47).

The scope of this universal salvation is offset by Luke's understanding that all people are sinners and in need of repentance. This is most clearly seen in the stories of the Galileans

---

805. The word is notably absent in Acts. Adams has most recently suggested Luke 24:7 provides a 'conceptual bridge into Acts in which the rejection of Jesus or opposition to the preaching about Jesus is described as opposing God and placing one under his wrath.' See Adams, Sinner in Luke, 196.

806. Luke 24:7 is in Luke's resurrection narrative, while Mark 14:14 and Matt 26:45 are in Gethsemane.

who died at Pilate's hand and those who died when the tower of Siloam fell and killed eighteen (13:1-5). The pericope is significant in the Gospel as it focuses on the need for all people to repent as all are ἁμαρτωλοί, and yet it also shows that none are worse sinners than any other. Adams writes of this passage, 'In Luke 13:1-9, the term "sinner" broadens out to include the entire listening audience of Jesus, and by implication, all Israel and even the reader.' 808 In the context of this study this passage provides the framework for understanding that the religious leaders in Luke 15 are sinners in need of repentance.

Luke 13:1-5 is found before the parables of the fig tree, the fig tree being a known metaphor for Israel (21:29). Jesus has also recently quoted from Micah 7:6 in Luke 12:53, where the prophet mourns over Israel who is an unproductive fig tree (Mic 7:1), and then following our sinner pericope (13:1-6) is the parable of the fig tree where Israel is warned that God will soon cut down the fig tree if it does not bear fruit (Luke 13:6-9). 809

The evangelist uses two words to convey 'sin' in Luke 13:1-5. In Jesus' first rhetorical charge about the Galileans' suffering he refers to them as ἁμαρτωλός (13:2) and in his second charge regarding those killed in the tower of Siloam, he uses the word ὀφειλέτης (13:4b). The word ὀφειλέτης is an archaic expression, while it still conveys the same idea of ἁμαρτωλός used in v. 2. 810 This is the only time Luke uses the word. 811 It is helpful to realise Matthew uses ὀφείλημα in the Lord's Prayer (Matt 6:12), while Luke's Prayer for Daily Bread has ἁμαρτία (Luke 11:3), 812 yet functionally they convey the same idea. 813 For Luke, these two words ap-


809. The prophet attributes Israel's invasion by Assyria in Mic 7:9 to her ἁμαρτάνω, and his hope and promise is that the Lord will be their σωτήρ (Mic 7:7), will ποιμαίνω the flock (Mic 7:14) and cast their ἁμαρτία into the depths of the sea (Mic 7:19). Micah also says there is hope for Judah as the Lord is sending a shepherd ruler from Bethlehem to bring peace to the ends of the earth (Mic 5:5). This echo of Micah in the Gospel should be read as a part of the call for all people to acknowledge their sin by repenting and turning back to God as was specified in the eighth century prophet's call.

810. ὀφειλέτης, BDAG, 742.

811. The word is relatively rare in the NT with Matthew only using it once more conveying the idea of debt (Matt 18:24) and Paul using it four times also conveying the legal sense of debt (Rom 1:14; 8:12; 15:27; Gal 5:3).

812. Hagner suggests Luke's predominantly Gentile audience would have understood the notion of ἁμαρτία more easily than the older expression ὀφείλημα. Hagner, Gospel of Matthew, 150.

813. Hagner, Gospel of Matthew, 150.
pear to express the same idea as BDAG has suggested,\textsuperscript{814} and his variation here may be for literary variety.

Therefore we have a double call for sinners to repent. While the immediate call is first to the Galileans and then the Jerusalemites, Adams is right that the implication here is wider than for Israel, it is to all people including the reader, to repent and turn to God. With respect to 15:1-2, the implication is that the scribes and Pharisees who have been grumbling, a negative attribute, are sinners in need of repentance.

Secondly, we will consider Luke's first use of ἀμαρτωλός which is found in Simon Peter's call narrative who declares, ὅτι ἁμαρτωλός εἰμι (5:8). This suggests Simon's unworthiness and separation before God in the same way Isaiah perceived his sinfulness in his own call narrative (Isa 6:5).\textsuperscript{815} In the prophet's narrative the seraph says to Isaiah,

\begin{quote}
Τὸ ἱπατο τοῦτο τῶν χειλέων σου καὶ ἁφέλει τὰς ἁνομίας σου καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου περικαθαριεῖ.

Behold, this has touched your lips, and will take away your lawlessness and purify your sins (Isa 6:7b).
\end{quote}

Here ἁνομία and ἁμαρτία are used sequentially to express Isaiah's understanding of the great problem of sin.\textsuperscript{816} Isaiah's response is because of his awareness of God's holiness (Isa 6:3) and Luke may suggest this in Simon's response as Jesus has recently been called the 'Holy One of God' (4:34). What the reader is aware of is Simon’s humility toward Jesus in falling at his knees and his declaration of himself as a sinner (5:8). This becomes the primary framework for how the reader can understand Luke’s view of ἀμαρτωλός, and establishes an appropriate response to Jesus. It is also the beginning of a linear schema where there is something christological tied up in peoples' actions.\textsuperscript{817} Against this pericope, the religious leaders in

\textsuperscript{814} ὁρειλέτης,' BDAG, 742.

\textsuperscript{815} A similar encounter is found in Testament of Abraham 9, where Abraham has a comparable response to seeing the archangel Michael. Adams parallels the two, although if this pseudepigraphal work is dated to the first to second century, it is unlikely to be of concern to Luke. Adams, Sinner in Luke, 111.

\textsuperscript{816} Isa 1:4 uses both ἁμαρτία and ἀμαρτωλός, a verbal repetition which points to the key problem of Israel's sin which Isaiah has identified.

\textsuperscript{817} Luke shows the sinful woman anoint Jesus' feet (7:36-50), the demoniac falls down before Jesus (8:28), the leper will return and fall at Jesus' feet (17:16), and Zacchaeus will come down the tree when Jesus calls him (19:5-6).
15:1-2 are seen to fail as it is the toll collectors and sinners who draw near to Jesus while the religious leaders stay their distance showing no humility in what they say or do.

Thirdly, we will consider Jesus' mission to call sinners to repentance at Levi's banquet (5:32), as this statement is a Lukán addition to a triple tradition passage and expresses Luke's theme of sin and repentance together in a statement that is tantamount to a mission statement. In the context of a large crowd of toll collectors and sinners (5:29) and the Pharisees and scribes who were complaining to Jesus' disciples about his table fellowship, Luke again places an emphasis on the ἄµαρτωλοι who repent (µετάνοια; 5:32). In the same way Simon Peter's confession showed a turning back to God, Jesus' statement shows those sinners who repent are received by God. Neither Mark nor Matthew use µετάνοια in their parallel passages (Mk 2:17; Matt 9:13), whereas Luke makes it a feature of this pericope, and throughout Luke-Acts (3:3, 8; 5:32; 15:7; 24:47; Acts 5:31; 11:18; 13:24; 19:4; 20:21; 26:20). Thus sin and repentance are clearly linked in Luke's thought here, and appear linked together again in 13:1-5 and in 15:1-32.

Finally, as δίκαιος is the primary antonym for ἄµαρτωλός, it is also helpful to consider how Luke shows the flip-side of the coin as this should confirm the first. We note that Luke addresses the δίκαιος in 15:7 demonstrating that Luke perceives the two words as closely linked.

For Luke, being truly δίκαιος is about being humble before God and is not reflected necessarily in religious practices even as they relate to the Torah (18:9-14). In the Gospel Luke shows examples of δίκαιος who invite the poor, the lame, the crippled, and the blind to a meal instead of those who can repay them (14:12-14). Luke also portrays the δίκαιος as those who acknowledge their need of God's forgiveness and so repent (5:29-32; 15:3-7), and as people following the Lord and the Torah (Elizabeth and Zechariah 1:6; John the Baptist 1:17; Simeon 2:25; Joseph of Arimathea 23:50; Cornelius Acts 10:22). For Luke, Jesus exemplifies what it is to be δίκαιος, a truth Luke uniquely stresses after Jesus dies (23:47), and in Acts, 'Righteous One' (δίκαιος) will become a formal title for him (Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14). This picture of what it is to be righteous, therefore, stresses the nature of a covenantal relationship which shows humility before God and practical concern for God's people. As the Righteous One, Jesus is the perfect representation of one who is in relationship with God and whose ac-
tions show God’s covenantal concern for the poor. Luke explains the heart of the Torah which brings eternal life as two-fold; loving God and loving people (10:27-28). He will go on to express the same idea in the story of the rich ruler which I will discuss in chapter 6.3. Again we see within the context of 15:1-3 the religious leaders fail in their words and actions as they condemn the toll collectors and sinners and do not eat with them. Their actions reveal they are not δίκαιοι.

Furthermore, in the Gospel neither being δίκαιος nor ἀμαρτωλός is tied to gender, race or class. Ethnicity is not a defining feature for Luke as we see when we read John's cry in the wilderness that having Abraham as your ancestor does not bring automatic forgiveness of sins (3:3-14). The defining feature is instead a life humbled before God and living out this righteousness in the community. Simon shows humility when he declares he is ἀμαρτωλός (5:8) and falls down at Jesus' knees. As he does this the reader understands that he becomes δίκαιος. This action is repeated by the γυνὴ ἀμαρτωλός (7:36-50) who is saved by her faith and demonstrates her gratefulness for the forgiveness Jesus has offered her by bending down to kiss and anoint his feet. A repentant and grateful heart, a sign of forgiveness (7:47), now makes the woman δίκαιος rather than Simon the Pharisee. Thus, the reader finds the model respondent is not only a woman, but she is favourably contrasted to a man of status in the community. Similarly, in the parable of the Pharisee and the toll collector it is the toll collector who names himself as the sinner and in doing so, the reader learns he is 'justified'

---

818. Elizabeth is described as δίκαιος (1:6), so are Zechariah (1:6), Simeon (2:25) and Joseph of Arimathea (23:50).
819. Gentiles such as Cornelius (Acts 10:22) are δίκαιοι, while the Jewish rulers are called ἁμαρτωλοί (Luke 24:7).
820. Elizabeth as δίκαιος would have been considered poor, while Cornelius would have been comparatively wealthy.
821. John says to the crowds they should share their food and clothes with those in need (3:11); to the toll collectors to collect only the prescribed tax (3:13); and to the soldiers to not extort money by false threats and to be content with their wages (3:14). All three are examples of righteous living within the community as their actions affect others.
Again the reader finds the protagonist is the one least expected, as Luke subverts the roles society has given.

These two groups are again clearly shown in the parable of the good shepherd as Luke positions two groups who are listening to the parables; the Jewish religious elite who believe they are δίκαιοι, and those they claim are ἁμαρτωλοί. This setting which is the interpretive key for understanding the parable, highlights the focus Luke is placing on who is a sinner.

In Summary: Luke’s use of ἁμαρτωλός works together with its primary antonym δίκαιος to show the nature of Jesus’ mission to call sinners to repentance. That is, his mission is centred in restoring people into a right relationship with God, and this is reflected in their relationship with others. Luke shows all people regardless of race, class or gender to be in need of the forgiveness of sins which is shown through μετάνοια. This repentance is seen in both words and actions. In the context of 15:2, the Pharisees and scribes have set themselves against Jesus and his listeners by implying they themselves are not sinners while others are. As 13:1-5 has set the Lukan understanding that all are sinners and in need of repentance, this narrative setting in 15:1-3 shows them as the antagonists who call others sinners and imply that they are not. In contrast to Simon Peter and the sinful woman, they fail the test of humility in acknowledging their own sinfulness, and need of repentance. As at Levi’s banquet, they appear to still believe they have no need of a physician for they are not sick. Yet Luke's characterisation of them here as antagonists to Jesus and his mission to the lost, shows they are in need of his message and mission. This implication that they are not righteous but sinners adds to the interpretive framework which will help us interpret the parable.

---

822. 18:13 says, ἱλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ (have mercy on me the sinner). Many translations do not reflect the definite article here, however the presence of the article implies the toll collector is identifying himself in the narrative as the sinner who does not carry out the religious practices of the Pharisee. The parable is told ‘to some who trusted in themselves as righteous and regarded others in contempt’ (18:9). The end of the parable shows that it is the toll collector who finds forgiveness from sin, and goes home justified (18:14). This will be discussed further in chapter 6.1.1.3.
5.3.3.3 The Significance of Jesus Eating with and Welcoming Sinners

In 15:2 we find Jesus welcoming and eating with toll collectors and sinners. Luke makes a particular feature of Jesus at meals with various people in his Gospel, uses many parables that centre on eating and drinking (10:30-37; 11:5-8; 12:16-21; 14:7-11, 15-24; 15:11-32; 16:19-31), and also shows Jesus teaching at meals (5:29-39; 7:36-50; 10:38-42; 11:37-52; 14:1-24; 22:14-38). This Lukan interest in eating reflects the ancient near eastern custom of hospitality where eating with others was an essential part of the fabric of daily life.

Jesus' ministry is characterised by dining with people whom the religious leaders classify as ἀμαρτωλοί (7:34, 39; 15:1-2, 19:7), and the matter of ritual impurity will be at the heart of their concern. Purity of the meal table was an important concern among many of the Pharisees of Jesus' time as it set them apart as faithful Jews. Borg notes that it also pointed to

824. Luke's interest in the theme of hospitality and table fellowship is well recognised. Jesus' ministry years are often characterised (and often uniquely to Luke) by Jesus' dining with others or he teaches on practical details about eating and drinking. Food is also often a feature of Luke's parables or pericopae. For example in the Nazareth Sermon an illustration given is of the widow of Zarephath who is fed in the famine (4:25-26). When Simon's mother-in-law is healed she waits on Jesus (4:39) and in Simon-Peter's call narrative there is a unique miraculous catch of fish. Luke uniquely notes the δοκή μέγας which Levi gives in honour of Jesus (5:29), Jesus eats grain with his disciples on the Sabbath (6:1-5) and one of his blessings and woes focus on the hungry (6:21, 25). The Son of Man is found eating and drinking (7:34), the sinful woman pericope notes Jesus' uniquely eating at Simon's house (7:36-50), and Jairus' daughter is encouraged to eat after she is healed (8:55) another unique feature of Luke's retelling of this pericope. In the mission of the seventy (unique to Luke) the disciples are to remain eating and drinking in the houses (10:7) and Martha's conversation with Jesus centres on hospitality (10:38-42). Luke's Lord's prayer is often known as the Prayer for Daily Bread because of his focus on food and daily needs (11:3), and 12:22-32 as we have seen is Jesus' practical teaching about God who provides food and clothing for the disciples. In chapter fourteen there are many Lukan parables centering on eating, manners and hospitality and in chapter fifteen eating and hospitality characterise God's relationship with sinners who repent (15:6, 9, 23, 25-32). Luke has the unique parable of the rich man and Lazarus which centre on the poor not being fed (16:19-31), and in the Zacchaeus pericope we see Jesus having table fellowship with Zacchaeus (19:5-6). This pattern of unique and repeated material continues in the Jerusalem section (notably the twelve disciples will eat and drink at Jesus table at the eschaton [22:30], Jesus dines with the Cleopas' on the road to Emmaus [24:28-35], and Jesus eats fish with his disciples in a post-resurrection appearance [24:42-43]), and then the theme is also a key feature in Acts. Cadbury noticed Luke's particular interest in this literary theme in 1927, and many have developed Luke's use of the motif. Henry J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (London: SPCK, 1958), 251-253. Originally published in 1927 by Macmillan and Co, London.
826. Neusner goes so far as to describe them as a 'table fellowship sect' and Borg that table fellowship was their 'survival symbol.' See Jacob Neusner, From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism.
their destiny as an eschatological kingdom of priests which would be inaugurated at a banquet.\footnote{827} Certainly the dominance of table fellowship halakhic practices is a central defining feature of their sect in later rabbinic literature.\footnote{828} Josephus describes the Pharisees as the party of ἀκρίβεια, a term which describes those Jews who apply the laws for daily life with strictness and precision.\footnote{829} This development stemmed from the Jews’ post-exilic past where holiness was defined through separation, and thus this was not a matter of etiquette but a visible act where loyalty to Yahweh was enacted.\footnote{830}

The relationship between pre-70 C.E. Pharisees and later rabbinic texts is of course not certain, and we cannot assume a first century practice from later rabbinic texts. Yet, the strictness around matters of table fellowship suggested by rabbinic texts is similar to the separation between the religious leaders and the ritually impure in Luke-Acts, and it is a central concern for Luke’s ‘gospel to the ends of the earth’ where the issue of table fellowship would ultimately need to be resolved in the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15).

It is not however simply that table fellowship separated people; eating together was an act of intimacy that demonstrated one’s acceptance of another, and conversely to not share table fellowship expressed disapproval and rejection. Bailey notes ‘in the East today, a nobleman may feed any number of lesser needy persons as a sign of his generosity, but he does not eat


\footnote{827} Borg describes this as both praxis and telos.\footnote{828} Marcus J. Borg, Conflict, Holiness and Politics, 96.

\footnote{829} There are three hundred and seventy one rabbinical laws regarding individuals or houses, and sixty seven percent deal with dietary law. Jacob Neusner, The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70, 3 vol. (Leiden: Brill, 1971), 3:303-304. Tithing and purity are central issues in these texts. For example, The Seder Ṭohoroth is dedicated to matters of ritual purity. B. Niddah deals with purity around the menstruant; b. Kelim with the uncleanness of vessels; b. Oholoth laws concerning dead bodies or ‘vessels’; b. Nega’im rules for dealing with leprosy; b. Parah matters concerning the red Heifer and the use of its ashes for purification; b. Ṭohoroth matters regarding uncleanness of food-stuffs and liquids; b. Mikwa’oth requirements for wells and reservoirs for the pools of immersion; b. Makshirin foodstuffs which may have become unclean; b. Zabim treats the uncleanness of men and women who suffer flux; b. Yadayim the uncleanness of unwashed hands; b. Ṣebul Yom deals with times of the day and how these relate to uncleanness; b. Ῥχζν contains laws around the stalks of plants or fruits and they convey uncleanness.\footnote{829} The Talmud: Babylonian Talmud, Seder Ṭohoroth (London: Soncino, 1948), xiv-xv. See also Neale, None But the Sinners, 40-67; Borg, Conflict, Holiness and Politics, 93-134.\footnote{829} Josephus, War 1.110; 2.126; Ant. 17.41; Life 191. For a discussion see Dunn, ‘Pharisees, Sinners and Jesus,’ 266-268.\footnote{829} Borg, Conflict, Holiness and Politics, 96.
with them.\textsuperscript{831} When Jesus had table fellowship with ritually impure people, he not only defied social barriers which kept the Pharisees separate, he expressed a welcome that showed ultimate acceptance and forgiveness to them. Luke 15:1-3 draws the reader's attention to both of these concerns, for Jesus is eating with (συνεσθίω) and welcoming (προσδέχομαι) toll collectors and sinners. While there are, therefore, strong thematic and linguistic ties with the setting of 15:1-2 to 5:30 where the Pharisees and scribes are also grumbling (γογγύζω) that Jesus is eating and drinking with sinners, the charge appears to be heightened when it says ὅτι ὁ ἄριστος ἀμαρτωλός προσδέχεται καὶ συνεσθίει αὐτοῖς. Jesus is \textit{welcoming} and \textit{eating with} sinners, opening up the possibility that he is hosting them and not simply dining as a guest.\textsuperscript{832} This should be understood as a deliberate symbolic act where Jesus is fighting the prevailing norms.\textsuperscript{833}

The nature of Jesus' dining with others is often raised as a question by characters in the Gospel. In 5:30 he is criticised for eating with the ritually impure, and the Pharisees' question at 5:33 shows that the nature of Jesus' disciples' eating and drinking was misunderstood as it differed from John's disciples who were characterised by fasting and prayer. Similarly, when Jesus walks through the cornfield and his disciples pluck heads of grain, Jesus is criticised (6:1-5). It is especially significant that in Acts 11:3 the circumcision group in Jerusalem charged Peter with eating with (συνεσθίω) the uncircumcised.

The use of προσδέχομαι should also not be overlooked since it is an important salvific term. δέχομαι and προσδέχομαι are synonyms in Luke's writing\textsuperscript{834} and they are often tied to waiting for and welcoming the kingdom.\textsuperscript{835} Many model respondents such as Simeon (2:28), Anna

\textsuperscript{831} Bailey, \textit{Poet and Peasant}, 143. Emphasis original.
\textsuperscript{832} Ibid. \textit{Contra}, Craig L. Blomberg \textit{Contagious Holiness: Jesus' Meals with Sinners} (NSBT 19; Downers Grove: IVP/Leicester: Apollos, 2005), 150.
\textsuperscript{833} Borg, \textit{Conflict, Holiness and Politics}, 97.
\textsuperscript{834} Bailey, \textit{Poet and Peasant}, 143.
\textsuperscript{835} Simeon welcomed Jesus into his arms (2:28), he looked for the consolation of Israel (2:25) as did Anna who looked for the redemption of Jerusalem (2:38). Joseph of Arimathea is described in a similar way (23:51). The parable of the sower describes receiving the word (8:13). The mission mandates are couched in the language of welcome (9:5; 10:8, 10). Jesus speaks of welcoming children into the kingdom (9:48 [4x], 18:17), and of the Samaritans as not welcoming him when his face was set to Jerusalem (9:53). The parable of the dishonest manager is laced with the language of welcome (16:4, 6, 7, 9) and 16:9 explains it in terms of welcoming into an eternal home. Acts picks up the notion of accepting or receiving the word (Samaritans in 8:14; Judeans in 11:1; people of Beroea in 17:11).
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(2:38), the children (18:17), Zacchaeus (19:6) and Joseph of Arimathea (23:51) are shown as welcoming Jesus and/or the message. Furthermore, the parable of the sower talks of μετὰ χαρᾶς δέχονται τὸν λόγον (8:13), an image that will become established in Acts (Acts 8:14; 11:1; 17:11). Therefore, when Jesus welcomes and eats with the sinners, the narrative suggests there is an implied salvific element to the meal.

In Summary: The setting of 15:1-3 where Jesus eats with and welcomes sinners is the interpretive key in this narrative unit, and the reason Jesus tells the parable to the Pharisees and scribes. That is, Jesus tells them the parable as a result of their negative charge that he is hosting the ritually impure and so behaving contrary to Jewish practice.

5.3.4 The Parable of the Good Shepherd (15:4-7)
As we have found from the setting, v. 3 informs the reader that Jesus is speaking the parable primarily to the Pharisees and scribes whose negative words and actions suggest they are sinners and in need of repentance. This is evident through the combined use of αὐτοί, Luke's pejorative shading of διαγογγύζω, and the issue of Jesus dining with the ἁµαρτωλοί.

The parable itself begins with a protracted question (vv. 4-6) where the listeners are encouraged to identify themselves as shepherds. Verse 4 begins τίς ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ὑµῶν (which one of you...?) providing further evidence that the parable is a direct question to the religious leaders. The first parable which describes a faithful shepherd, further suggests this question is rhetorical to leaders who historically were known as shepherds. Matthew's parable describes a sheep who goes astray (πλανάω; Matt 18:12 [twice], 13), which is a very marked difference between the two texts. Luke's emphasises the role of leaders (shepherds) to look after their people (the flock).

The parable itself is simple. A shepherd has lost one of his one hundred sheep, and so leaves them in the wilderness to look for the lost sheep. He searches for it until he finds it. When he finds it, he lays the sheep on his shoulders and carries it home rejoicing. This costs the

836. The use of παραβολή is singular, but the three parables are implied.
838. Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 523.
shepherd considerably to carry the sheep back to the community, but this 'burden of restoration'\textsuperscript{839} is presented as the task of a faithful shepherd. The parable ends with a comment that there is more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than ninety-nine who do not need repentance.

The protracted question which begins, 'which one of you having a hundred sheep...?' is rhetorical and the response is that of course a shepherd would look for a lost sheep. Sheep were valuable commodities and the response of the shepherd is taken for granted.\textsuperscript{840} As Klein notes, 'Denn er weiß, daß das Schaf nicht allein zur Herde findet. Darum macht er sich auf den Weg, dem Verlorenen nach.'\textsuperscript{841}

Jeremias comments that 'when a sheep has strayed from the flock, it usually lies down helplessly, and will not move, stand up or run.'\textsuperscript{842} With the weight of an average sheep estimated to be about 32 kilograms,\textsuperscript{843} and rural countryside likely to be undulating if not rocky, carrying the sheep home to the community would be a costly task. In the parable Luke talks of the ἐρημὸς where the shepherd leaves the other sheep, suggesting harsh conditions.

The shepherd's rejoicing is of interest. Rejoicing is a favoured response in Lukan stories, and in this parable it is the response of the shepherd (χαίρω; 15:5), the friends and neighbours (συγχαίρω; 15:6), and also the angels in heaven (χαίρω; 15:7). This repetition functions as a literary highlighting tool which, if combined with the idea of joyful restoration, forms part of the centre piece of the parable.

Luke often uses χαίρω or χαίρω when in salvation stories and it is an attribute of a model respondent in the Gospel (1:14; 2:10; 8:13; 10:17, 20; 13:17; 15:5, 7, 10, 32; 19:6, 37; 24:52; Acts 5:41; 8:39; 11:23; 13:48, 52). Four of these examples are from Luke 15, giving some weight to Ramaroson's view that it is the owners' joy at finding the lost object which is the central focus in the parables.\textsuperscript{844} Indeed, this is \textit{le coeur du Troisième Évangile}. This joy is found, as Luke 15:7 shows, when a sinner repents. This central interest in the joy of the

\textsuperscript{839} Bailey, \textit{Poet and Peasant}, 148.
\textsuperscript{841} Klein, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, 523.
\textsuperscript{842} Jeremias, \textit{Parables}, 134; also Snodgrass, \textit{Stories With Intent}, 102.
\textsuperscript{843} Imperial measurement is 70 pounds. Bailey, \textit{Finding the Lost}, 74.
\textsuperscript{844} Ramaroson, 'Le Coeur;' 349.
shepherd is also visible in Bailey's analysis of the parable through his points C and C1 shown below:

1 Which man of you (a direct address to the audience)
   2 one
   3 ninety-nine
   A the lost
   B find
   C joy
   D restoration
   C' joy
   B' find
   A' the lost
   1' I say to you (a direct address to the audience)
   2' one
   3' ninety-nine

We see that for Bailey the central point (D) in his analysis is the calling of friends and neighbours together in his house (καὶ ἐλθὼν εἰς τὸν οἶκον συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς γείτονας). His theological analysis of the parable, therefore, focusses on the 'joy at the restoration.' He says,

This brings us to a consideration of the centre stanza...we have a long, somewhat unnatural statement which is clearly constructed to provide the inversion of the ideas that will fill out the parallelistic form and climax on 'joy at the restoration' in the centre of the parable.  

Here Bailey links his points C and D, the joy and the restoration. He also works extensively with the idea of the 'burden of restoration' which describes the shepherd's actions in carrying home the sheep and their christological implications. I agree that the burden of restoration is a key idea in the parable as it charges the religious leaders with the costly task of seeking out the lost sheep, but I note that it also contains two ideas; the burden of carrying the sheep and the restoration to the community. Bailey therefore seems to have overworked his analysis by dividing up points C and D which for him theologically are the heart of the parable. I suggest the centre is the joyfully enacted burden where the shepherd at great personal cost carries the sheep home to the community. To divide it more than this is to over-analyse the parable.

845. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 144-145.
846. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 146.
Bovon optimistically notes, 'All die Anstrengungen erschöpfen die Energie des Hirten nicht und lassen seine Freude nicht versiegen.' However, the personal cost for the shepherd in the parable to achieve this restoration should not be overlooked. Some commentators believe that the picture of the shepherd with a sheep on his shoulders is like Isa 40:11 and presents an idyllic pastoral picture. Isaiah 40:11, as we have seen in chapter 2.2.1 however, is linked to the image of the warrior in v. 10 who comes with strength and authority bringing all flesh σωτήριον (Isa 40:5). Historically he came as Cyrus who brought Israel deliverance (σωτήριον) from Babylon in 539 B.C.E., while Luke says God is now bringing his σωτήριον through Jesus the Saviour, Messiah and Lord (2:11) to all people. In Luke's parable, the picture in 15:5 is not primarily of an idyllic pastoral scene, but a picture of a joyfully enacted burden. Bailey's picture resonates as the more accurate record of the shepherd who takes upon himself the weight of a sheep.

Furthermore, the narrative location of these parables should be noted. Jesus has turned his face to Jerusalem in 9:51 having made clear that he will suffer and die (9:21-22). This is reiterated in 13:33 and again in 17:25 and 18:31-33. Jesus is clearly on the journey to his suffering and death as he travels to Jerusalem.

Bailey develops the idea and makes a soteriological interpretation of the parable where the faithful shepherd carrying the sheep back to the community on his shoulders describes Jesus' work on the cross, and posits that the doctrine of the atonement originates in the parables. Snodgrass notes that this was a medieval understanding of the parable, although he and other major commentators doubt there is any vicarious dimension at work in this parable. Bock suggests it shows the care of the shepherd (Isa 40:11; 49:11), Johnson's view is similar while adding it reflects Hellenistic pastoral tradition, Nolland maintains that the sheep is most quickly returned to the flock in this manner, Green fails to make any comment, and Marshall says that it shows the care of the shepherd (Isa 40:11) and perhaps a 'triumphant air.'

847. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 3, 27.
849. Bailey, Finding the Lost, 75-80; Bailey, Jacob and the Prodigal, 78.
Fitzmyer is the only commentator who gives anything other than an idyllic picture of the shepherd carrying the sheep. He notes that the figure is consistent with statues in the catacombs, but he makes no suggestion as to what this might mean. 852

There is no doubt that Bailey's idea of the burden of restoration resonates with the Lukan journey, and the early church used the picture, but is Luke suggesting a proleptic picture of the atonement? We will consider this question as it is important to consider this view before we assess the echo of Ezekiel 34 in section 5.3.5.

Firstly, Luke shows that this restoration is costly to the shepherd. While the picture may be on one level poetic, the reality of carrying a sheep from the wilderness back to the community would have been a very difficult and possibly long task. This difficult task resonates with the Lukan Jesus who talks repeatedly of his suffering as he journeys to Jerusalem. It is also supported in the narrative context where the religious leaders criticize Jesus for embracing and befriending sinners. Jesus' actions are thus condemned by his own fellow Jews. This too is a costly task.

In this picture of the joyful restoration of the sheep we should note that the sheep is helpless. As we have noted, the sheep in its fright becomes unable to move. This costly restoration is a matter of survival for the sheep and the cost is expected to be borne by the shepherd.

Secondly, we have noted that Luke's parable is firstly theological and talks of what God does as the shepherd who searches for the lost sheep. Every sheep is valuable and should not be lost, and if even one goes missing a faithful shepherd will search for it until he finds it. However, through Jesus' action in welcoming the toll collectors and sinners, Jesus enacts the parable, taking on the role of the faithful shepherd making a christological reading appropriate. Green tentatively asks, 'Is it possible to understand the parable not only theologically but also christologically? If so, Jesus would be portrayed as fulfilling the role of Yahweh in caring for the lost sheep.' 853 Snodgrass agrees saying,

If Jesus defends his eating with sinners by pointing to God's character and saying God is like a shepherd searching for the lost, then he implicitly claims he is doing God's work. At least

---

with respect to Luke, the analogy of the shepherd refers to both the character of God and the activity of Jesus.854

Jesus is doing the work of God here, but whether this is an atonement picture needs to be tested out. Certainly the parable comes in the travel narrative where Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem to suffer and die, but how much Luke intended the reader to understand this as a picture of the cross is uncertain. As with 12:32, one way the verse's interpretation may be tested is by the LXX echo behind the text. This we will do, but first we will examine the last key idea in the parable.

The reference to the ninety-nine who need no repentance in 15:7 is another important feature in the parable. Some have taken this literally to mean that Jesus is saying some have no need of repentance as they are already righteous. Neale, even though he believes Luke's attributes a negative stance toward the religious leaders' grumbling, holds this position. He says, 'In this parable Jesus clearly thinks some indeed are "righteous" in the sense of being in the fold and this includes, by analogy, the Pharisees.'855 Similarly Johnson notes the religious leaders, like the elder son, have stayed within the covenant but that 'Luke's compositional frame makes it unmistakable: he told these stories to the righteous ones who complained about the prophet accepting sinners (15:1-2).856

Others query how Jesus could refer to the religious leaders as righteous when the setting suggests he is criticising them. Bailey posits Luke could be using irony and he is really meaning the self-righteous,857 yet as Blomberg points out Luke uses δίκαιος positively elsewhere in the Gospel and Bailey's reading downplays the thrust of the verse which elevates those who do repent.858 Blomberg suggests that as in the parable of the gracious father, Luke appears to be using a carrot rather than a stick in encouraging the religious leaders to turn to God again.859

We have previously noted that Luke’s setting is crucial for interpretation and it presents the religious elite pejoratively. The protracted question of vv. 4-6 asks a rhetorical question with

855. Neale, None But the Sinners, 163.
857. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 155.
858. Blomberg, Parables, 182.
an implied answer where the reader knows the shepherd would search for the lost sheep. Our study suggests that the righteous and the sinners in v. 7 structurally balances the two groups of the toll collectors and sinners on the one hand, with the Pharisees and scribes on the other hand from v. 1. As a result Luke paints the δίκαιον as the toll collector and 'sinners' as they are acting humbly to Jesus, while the ἀμαρτωλός is the unlikely (or perhaps likely) group of the Pharisees and the scribes. The shepherds of Israel who should have known better in this Lukan passage do not, and their words and actions show they are in need of repentance. 860

We will now examine the primary echo behind the parable which Green, Johnson, Adams, DeConick, Barton and Bailey suggest is Ezek 34. 861 This will enable us to evaluate Bailey's suggestion that there is an atonement image in the parable.

5.3.5 Ezekiel 34 in Luke 15:4-7

There are many linguistic and thematic ties between Ezekiel’s shepherd chapter and Luke’s parable of the faithful shepherd. Firstly, Ezekiel begins with a warning to the shepherds that they are not fulfilling their role as shepherds of God's flock. They have become preoccupied instead with their own needs and have neglected their responsibility to the sheep, and so the sheep have become scattered across every mountain and hill (Ezek 34:1-10; refer 2.2.4). The critique upon them is sustained and judgment follows. In Luke's parable setting in vv. 1-3 we see the named religious leaders (some of the current shepherds) in a negative light, and the question of the parable is interpreted primarily through this setting. That is, the sustained rhetorical question in vv. 4-6 is directed toward them as they have not been seeking out the lost sheep of Israel, and so fulfilling their role as shepherds of God's flock.


861 Green, Gospel of Luke, 574; Johnson, Gospel of Luke, 240; Adams, Sinner in Luke, 159; Bailey, Jacob and the Prodigal, 68-85; DeConick, Gospel of Thomas, 286; Barton, 'Parables on God's Love and Forgiveness,' 204. Bailey suggests Ps 23, Jer 23:1-8, and Ezek 34 are behind the parable. Bailey includes Jer 23:7-8 which do not appear in the LXX, Luke's accepted scriptural base. In Finding the Lost Bailey makes a more developed case for Ps 23 as the echo in the parable. Snodgrass says the connections to Ps 23 are 'imaginative and none too convincing' (106), when Bailey creates too much out of the idea of 'bringing back' to mean repentance in Ps 23:3. Bailey, Finding the Lost, 68-92; Jacob and the Prodigal, 66-72; Snodgrass, Stories With Intent, 106.
Secondly, the idea of sinners needing to repent is present in both passages. Ezekiel 34 is preceded by Ezek 33:8, 19 where the prophet uses the notion of ἁµαρτωλός, and particularly of sinners who need to turn back to the Lord. This thinking then underpins the prophet's woe in chapter 34.862 In Ezek 33 the reader finds the Lord showing the repentant sinner forgiveness, in the same way as the repentant sinner finds forgiveness in Luke's parable (15:7).

Thirdly, feeding is at the centre of both pericopae. Luke shows Jesus in the midst of toll collectors and sinners and sharing food with them. The idea that συνεσθίω (15:2) suggests Jesus is hosting sinners is entirely consistent with the picture in Ezek 34 where the Lord will feed his sheep. Ezek 34 makes much of feeding the sheep with the word βόσκω used repeatedly in the chapter (Ezek 34:2, 3, 8 [twice], 10 [twice], 13, 14 [twice], 15, 16). The practical action of the Lord's people being fed seems to resonate in Luke 15 with Jesus eating with sinners, but also in the wider narrative where Jesus is often eating and drinking with sinners and Luke also presents many pericopae with an emphasis on food and dining as we have seen.

Fourthly, it should be noted that Ezekiel refers to sheep being safe in the wilderness (Ezek 34:25), as this is Luke's setting (15:4).863 In Luke's parable the sheep are safe in the wilderness because the shepherd is with them, and even when one sheep is lost the faithful shepherd will look for it most likely leaving another shepherd with the ninety-nine.864 This suggests a picture of safety for the sheep. In Ezekiel's prophecy it is after the Lord has made a covenant of peace with his shepherd David, that the sheep are safe in the wilderness. With so many other linguistic echoes of Ezek 34 in Luke 15, this reference to the wilderness, though not a strong link, should not be discounted.

Fifthly, both passages have a theological focus on God as shepherd, and also Ezekiel has a clear role for the Davidic shepherd king who will be the Lord's servant (Ezek 34:23-24). While the Lord is ultimately the shepherd for the prophet, his hands and feet in the task of shepherding are his servant David.

863. Ezekiel 34:6 notes the sheep are scattered on the mountain and also they find safety around my mountain (Ezek 34:26).
864. Bailey says, 'I am told by Palestinian shepherds that no man can care for a hundred sheep permanently by himself' and notes the likelihood of a second shepherd. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 149, nt. 34.
This appears to be the role that Luke shows Jesus to be fulfilling in the parable.\(^{865}\) Jesus is very much the faithful shepherd of the parable who is seeking out the lost sheep such as the toll collectors and sinners who have drawn near to listen to him. While the religious leaders deride his welcome and fellowship with these sinners, Jesus' welcome of them is the message of the parable in action. This also resonates with Jesus' Davidic shepherd identity that Luke has painted in the infancy narrative and in the genealogy, where leadership is characterised by a faithful shepherd leading them. The link with Ezek 34 is also quite possible since Luke has already used Ezek 34 in 12:32 showing his knowledge and use of the passage.

Furthermore, Jesus' ministry is characterised by ministry to the sick, poor and marginalised in pericope after pericope. Luke shows Jesus helping the weak, healing the sick and searching for the lost. Indeed, the programmatic statement where Jesus is identified as the anointed one who brings good news and freedom to the poor, captive, blind and oppressed resonates with the Davidic shepherd who faithfully shepherds God's flock. Luke 15:1-7 can thus be read as not only a reflection of God’s care for the lost, but Jesus' care as the faithful shepherd. Ezekiel shows both are shepherds, and it appears so too does Luke.

What Ezekiel 34 does not support is any sense of a vicarious suffering of the shepherd. The shepherd goes to great lengths to seek out and gather in the sheep. He is charged with feeding, binding up the injured and providing places of rest for the sheep. He is also required to guard the strong, but there is no picture of him carrying or suffering on behalf of the sheep. While the tasks described would be strenuous and time consuming, Ezekiel does not develop this or even allude to a burden for the shepherd. Rather he simply expects that a faithful leader will simply carry out these tasks as they are responsibilities of the faithful shepherd.

The many linguistic ties, the setting of each passage and the theological thrust all suggest that an echo of Ezek 34 is the echo behind Luke's parable. The volume and recurrence cohere, as do the thematic concerns. Furthermore there is a growing body of scholars who find this echo most likely.\(^{866}\) I would suggest this history of interpretation makes this the most satisfactory reading of the parable. The Pharisees and scribes had a duty of care for God's flock,

---

and yet the parabolic unit situates them pejoratively, suggesting they are shepherds who are not caring for God's flock. Jesus is the example of the faithful shepherd by enacting the message of the parable, but this does not press toward Bailey's proleptic picture of the cross.

5.3.6 The Faithful Shepherd

What do we learn of the faithful shepherd from the parable?

Firstly, the faithful shepherd is the one who looks for the lost sheep. The shepherd does not leave a sheep lost on a hillside or in the wilderness as pictured in Ezekiel or the parable, he goes out and looks for the sheep. Verse 7 which comments on the parable suggests the lost sheep represents the sinner who needs to repent. The Lukan Jesus has been consistently seen searching out the lost sheep who are marginalised or lost from society. He engages with lepers (5:12-16), the sick (5:17-26; 6:18-19; 8:43-55; 13:10-17; 14:1-6), toll collectors (5:27-32), Gentiles (7:1-10; 8:26-39), widows (7:11-17), sinners (7:36-50), and women (7:11-17, 36-50; 8:1-3, 43-55; 10:38-42; 13:10-17), while he still engages with the religious leaders (7:36-50; 11:37-53; 14:1-24).

Jesus' action in welcoming and eating with toll collectors and sinners shows he is a faithful shepherd. This stands in contrast to the scribes and the Pharisees who are pictured pejoratively in the setting by the use of διαγογγύζω (15:2) recalling the grumbling in the wilderness, and the use of ἀκούω (14:35; 15:1). The religious leaders do not appear to 'have ears to listen' to Jesus' message, while the toll collectors and sinners do have ears to hear. Hence, we find when Luke comments on the ninety-nine 'righteous' persons in v. 7, there is also an implied charge to the religious leaders who classify themselves as righteous. The parable shows however they are in need of repentance as they have not been seeking the lost sheep.

Secondly, the shepherd searches for the sheep until he finds it (ἔως ἐὕρῃ αὐτό; 15:4). This is a task the shepherd does not give up on in contrast to the Matthean parable where it says 'if'

---

867. *Contra*, Neale, *None but the Sinners*, 162-164. Neale suggests the ninety-nine are there for comparative purposes to explain there is more joy over one sinner who repents, and that the use of δίκαιος implies the Pharisees are included in this term. Nolland and Marshall also suggest the figures are used for comparison and that God is pleased with the righteous. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 602; Nolland, *Luke*, 771.
he finds it (καὶ ἔαν γένηται εὐρεῖν αὐτό; Matt 18:13). Luke draws on the picture of Ezekiel where there appears to be no question of the sheep not being found when the shepherd seeks them out. Matthew’s picture is considerably different.

Thirdly, the shepherd takes on the joyful burden of restoration for the sheep by carrying it home. The echo of Ezek 34 stresses the need for the shepherds to seek out the lost sheep and to gather the scattered sheep from the mountains and the hills. This is a costly task for the shepherd as this implies leaving the comfort of safe pasture to find the one who is lost. Ezekiel’s critique that the shepherds had fed themselves first and used the fat and the wool for their own needs is heavily criticised by the prophet as he expected shepherds would put the sheep’s needs ahead of their own. Sheep are by nature dependent on their shepherd. We have seen Ezekiel’s emphasis on this expectation through his prolonged critique of the shepherds in vv. 1-10 and his beginning words, Τάδε λέγει κύριος (Ezek 34:2), showing this is God’s expectation. Ezekiel’s picture of joy in enacting this shepherd-task is expressed through an abundant pastoral picture where the shepherd who is God, delights to provide ὑετὸν εὐλογίας (34:26), καρπὸν (34:27), ἐλπίς εἰρήνην (34:27), and when the prophet says καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτοῖς φυτὸν εἰρήνης (34:29).

Fourthly, the faithful shepherd shows joy in finding the sheep (15:5) as do the angels in heaven who rejoice when a sinner repents (15:7). As we have seen, this joy at the restoration of the lost sheep is the climax of the parable, and with its three-fold repetition where the reader also sees the community’s call to rejoice (15:6), we see joy in the foreground of the parable. This is consistent with Luke’s use of χαῖρω and χαρά in salvific encounters.

Fifthly, the faithful shepherd eats with his friends and neighbours in a festive atmosphere when he finds the lost sheep. The setting of the parables suggests that Jesus is hosting a meal for the toll collectors and sinners (15:2), and now another meal is pictured in v. 6 and again in v. 9. A banquet is also in the foreground of the younger son’s return to his father’s house (15:23-32). Luke has an emphasis on the Saviour who eats with people, and for whom people being fed is a feature (9:12-17; 12:22-32). This will be reflected in the household conver-

868. Bailey, Poet and Peasant, 144-145.
sion narratives of Acts which have their roots in the mission to households (9:1-6; 10:1-12; 19:1-10), and also the Jerusalem Council where the issue of table fellowship is finally dealt with so that the gospel can go to both Jew and Gentile (Acts 15). As we have seen the matter of ritual purity was foremost in the religious leaders' response to Jesus, and this is why he responds so directly about his hosting of sinners. It ultimately was the issue that had to be addressed for Gentile inclusion and why the council was called in Jerusalem. It is interesting therefore that Luke has these parables at the midpoint of the Gospel and the council at the midpoint of Acts. Perhaps, in this way the parables lay the platform for what is to come in Acts.

Sixthly, all sheep are valued and not one should be lost. This must have been a challenge to the religious leaders as they listened to a parable directed specifically to them. Their own pejorative use of 'sinner' (15:2) and their obvious frustration at Jesus hosting sinners, suggests Jesus believes they have lost many sheep. It should be noted here that it is most likely that when the shepherd went to find the lost sheep, he left the ninety-nine sheep in the care of another shepherd rather than simply left them alone. This theme of salvation for all has been firmly established in the infancy narrative where the angel announces Jesus has come as Saviour, Messiah and Lord for all people (2:10). Simeon's Nunc Dimittis speaks of Jesus as a revelation for the Gentiles (2:32), also establishing the seeds of the Gentile mission. Furthermore, it is well recognised that Jesus' ministry is characterised by care for the marginalised of society.

Seventhly, through an echo of Ezek 34, we find Jesus presented in the parable as the Davidic shepherd. The Davidic shepherd is God's shepherd who brings care for every sheep so that the sheep can live in safety and peace. This picture of the good shepherd in the parable provides helpful insight with regard to how Luke presents Jesus' Davidic role in the Gospel. That is, he comes as the Davidic shepherd who seeks out and saves the lost sheep.

Eighthly, the faithful shepherd is the one who enables restoration and repentance. In v. 7 Jesus comments on the parable saying, 'there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than ninety-nine righteous people who need no repentance.' The Lukan Gospel shows that all need repentance (13:1-5), and the rhetorical nature of this parable toward the Pharisees and scribes, suggests they are in need of repentance also. It is a precarious thing to be in a position of power in Luke's Gospel, and this is yet another example of how the model respondents are not those who know the scriptures well, but those who respond to Jesus and draw near to listen to him.

Finally, it is unlikely that there is an atonement image in the parable as there is no picture of the shepherd in Ezekiel suffering vicariously for the sheep. Luke does show the great cost with which the sheep is carried home, but he uses this image to: (1) challenge the religious leaders' behaviour in neglecting to care for people on the margins of society such as the toll collectors and sinners and, (2) it characterises Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. It is unlikely that this picture is making a statement about the cross.

In Summary: In the text of Luke 15:1-7 we find a picture of Jesus who is challenging the Pharisees and scribes to enter the kingdom through repentance like the toll collectors and sinners have already done, and also to shepherd God’s flock with diligence and grace as Jesus is doing. Jesus has welcomed and is eating with the toll collectors and sinners showing his acceptance and forgiveness of them, while the religious elite grumble about what they see. The parable challenges the religious leaders to do as Jesus does, for God and the angels of heaven rejoice when one sinner repents. This picture reflects the prophet Ezekiel's warning to the shepherds that they are not seeking the lost sheep and binding up the injured (Ezek 34). In Ezekiel we see God as a faithful shepherd to his own flock after the Jewish leaders have repeatedly failed to lead well, and we see the Davidic shepherd who he raises up to do this. This is reflected in Luke's parable where there is a theological and christological dimension. That is, seeking and saving the lost are characteristic of how God acts as demonstrated in Ezek 34, but it is also reflected in what Jesus is doing in their midst. His action of carrying the sheep home, the burden of restoration as Bailey describes it, proleptically pictures his actions as he heads to Jerusalem to die, but is not likely to be a view of the atonement. It
almost certainly pictures the great lengths Jesus goes to as the faithful shepherd to seek out and save the lost sheep.

5.4 The Faithful Shepherds in Ephesus (Acts 20:28-29)

In the Miletus speech in Acts 20:17-38 the motif of shepherd and flock reappears. The motif comes in a unique passage where Paul speaks to Christian leaders, and which Walton describes as 'an island in the sea of Acts.873 The return of shepherd and flock language at such a significant and distinctive speech in Acts makes it of particular relevance to this study as this may demonstrate that as the church progressed this motif held currency for Luke.

We will first examine the significant and distinctive nature of the Miletus speech, and then consider the shepherd motif including whether it is Lukan or Pauline. Finally we will consider what the Miletus speech adds to our knowledge of the shepherd motif in Luke's writing.

5.4.1 The significant and distinctive nature of the Miletus Speech

Paul addresses the leaders of the church of Ephesus at Miletus on his way to Jerusalem where, according to Luke, he was hurrying to be for Pentecost (Acts 20:16). Miletus is a short distance of about 48 km from Ephesus and there are conflicting suggestions about why he did not simply go to Ephesus to speak to the church leaders.874 Notably, it is the only speech we have of Paul where his audience is exclusively Christian,875 and in the speech he calls for the leaders to look to God for their future well-being.876 I accept the 'we' passages are most likely suggesting that the author is present and functioning as an eyewitness to the

874. For a detailed list of the possibilities see Paul Trebilco, The Early Christians in Ephesus from Paul to Ignatius (WUNT 166; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 172-176.
875. This is the fourth of Paul's speeches in Acts. The first is to Jews in Pisidian Antioch (Acts 13:6-41), the second is to the people at Lystra (Acts 14:15-18), the third is to Greeks in the Areopagus at Athens (Acts 17:22-31) and this is the fourth speech which is to Christians. Paul's later speeches are to the civil authorities (Acts 22, 24, 26).
speech. While there is considerable suggestion that the 'we' passages are a literary device or are from someone else's diary, I agree with a large body of scholars who note that the literary style and perspective cohere with the larger narrative and suggest Luke is not heavily reliant on another source here, and is not trying to assert an authority in the use of 'we' to gain the confidence of the reader. Therefore, when Acts 20:15 says that 'we' came to Miletus, I assume the author is present for Paul's speech in Miletus as he goes on to use 'we' when the leaders depart from Miletus (Acts 21:1). The speech itself uses the third person which is appropriate as Paul is the one giving the speech. This ensures that the narrative maintains a clear focus on Paul rather than the body of travelling companions.

The passage falls into two basic sections with the first centering on introductory remarks (vv. 18-27) including an announcement of his departure and future suffering (vv. 22-25), while the second section contains exhortations and farewell material (vv. 28-35). Verse 28 opens the second half of the speech where Paul calls the leaders to faithfulness, diligence and wisdom. He starts this call with the central motif of the leader as shepherd of the flock, the church of God.

The speech is considered to be Paul's Abschiedsrede and it shows similarities to Jacob's farewell speech in Genesis 49, Joshua's in Joshua 23-24 and, as Witherington notes, especially that of Samuel in 1 Samuel 12. There are also some shared parallels with Jesus' speech to his disciples in Luke 22:14-38 which give some credence to the Gospel-Acts parallels

---


878. It has been suggested that the 'we' passages can be viewed as a literary device that does not mean to suggest the writer was present, and may be the author's creation. Parsons proposes the 'we' passages are likely to be composed by the author but create a sense of authority to the stories, but Luke's attention to historical information, while not perfect, does not lead to the conclusion he is deliberately trying to mislead the reader. E. Haenchen, The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary, trans. by B. Noble et. al (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1971), 85; Richard I. Pervo, Acts: A Commentary (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 5-7; Mikeal C. Parsons, Acts (IIAΔEIA; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 238-240; Hemer, Book of Acts, 319; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 98-103.
Tannehill and Talbert have found. Most farewell speeches come close to one’s death, and yet Paul is still far from death at this point. As Trebilco points out, in 1 Sam 12, Samuel's speech is not close to his death either, making a classification of farewell speech still the most likely.

The speech is addressed to the Christian community and is more epistle-like than apologetic or evangelistic. While the speech is to the Ephesian church leaders, it is widely believed that the content is of a universal nature for the church and is not localised by Luke's immediate context. Witherington suggests the speech is a Lukan summary of the Pauline message to Christians, and Trebilco that, 'the Ephesian elders are almost certainly representatives of the whole church and in particular of its leaders. In agreement with Walton and more latterly Holmás, we note that here Paul passes on the model of Christian discipleship and leadership taught and loved by Jesus.

5.4.2 The language of shepherd: Lukan or Pauline?

While this Abschiedsrede is accepted to be predominantly Lukan in language and style, Luke's text uses many words and phrases of Paul's teaching as recorded in his epistles. Our concern here is with the shepherd language and its source. In these verses the church is called ποιμνίον (vv. 28, 29), and the ἐπίσκοποι are called to shepherd (ποιμαίνειν) the church or gathering of God (v. 28). Paul continues by warning the ἐπίσκοποις of savage wolves,
probably false teachers who will try and hurt the flock from within (v. 29). As he concludes the speech, Paul specifies that the leaders should use him as an example and support the weak (v. 35). This is not direct shepherd language, but in the context of the speech describes the responsibility of the shepherd to the most vulnerable of the community, the weak. Therefore the motif is not restricted to vv. 28-29 but extends to v. 35 and therefore underpins Paul’s final words to the church leaders.

Furthermore, Luke seems to be using the image carefully and with some theological weight in v. 28 as he draws attention to the Holy Spirit who has given these individuals their leadership role, and also that in some way Jesus' blood has purchased or obtained the church.886 The role of the Holy Spirit in birthing the church in Acts is pervasive beginning in Acts 1:8 and on the day of Pentecost (Acts 2), and this speech presents another role of the Spirit in appointing leaders.887 The use of περιποιέω (preserve, obtain, acquire)888 carries with it an echo of Israel as the elect people from 2 Kg 12:3, Isa 43:12 and Mal 3:17, and so gives an elevated theological sense to Paul's words.889 Barrett describes the verse as, 'both the practical and theological centre of the speech.'890 It is noteworthy that this statement also reflects the three members of the Godhead,891 and while not yet a formula, we find the efficacy of the cross (the Son), the work of the Holy Spirit and the church of God. Therefore within a single statement where the speech moves from Paul's suffering and ministry into a hortatory plea by

---


886. Luke’s reference to the τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἱδίου is of great interest in discussion on Lukan language due to the scarcity of verses where the work of the cross is mentioned. We will signal Luke's theology of cross as a possible area for further study in chapter 12:3 with respect to the shepherd king motif, but here we merely note its inclusion in the Miletus speech. This is the only place in Acts where 'the blood' is mentioned and so Conzelmann and Pervo do not think it is being used in a soteriological sense. Pervo suggests Luke knew the phrase from Ephesians 1:7. Conzelmann, Theology of St. Luke, 201; Pervo, Acts, 524. Parsons conversely says of this debate, 'It is hardly acceptable by redaction-critical criteria, much less more recent literary models, to dismiss the passage as an errant tradition that slipped past Luke and does not represent his point of view.' Parsons, Acts, 300.

887. This should not be understood as invalidating Paul and Barnabas who selected leaders in Acts 14:23 through prayer and fasting, and so were drawing on the guidance of the Spirit.

888. περιποιέω, BDAG, 804.


891. The language of Trinity would not have been used by Luke or Paul.
Paul to the leaders, Luke provides a vignette of the Godhead at work. The shepherd motif in this verse is therefore all of the more relevance and significance. But whose language are we hearing? Luke is recording all of a speech of Paul's, and as a probable eyewitness to this event, we need to consider if this is simply Pauline language or if this is a Lukan redaction.

This shepherding language has not been a major focus of any particular study in this speech, and it is generally considered that the shepherd language in the Miletus speech is neither Pauline nor Lukan. However, Lambrecht's analysis of this text finds forty-six words or phrases reflecting Luke's hand and includes ποίμνιον (vv. 28, 29), and Walton also notes ποίμνιον as one of the Lukan linguistic features which point to 'substantial parallels in Luke 12, 21 and especially 22.'

Luke uses ποίμνιον in Luke 12:32, and has made considerable use of the shepherd motif in an echo of Ezek 34. Paul on the other hand, does not use ποίμνιον or cognates except in 1 Cor 9:7 and Eph 4:11. The passage in 1 Corinthians is a simple visual metaphor and not theological, while the writer of Ephesians does express the role of pastor (ποιμήν) in a list of ministries in the body of Christ showing his acceptance of the term in the church. The word is also used in 1 Pet 5:2, 3, and these verses reflect 1 Peter closely. It is also used by Clement in 1 Clement 16:1; 57:2 where he appeals at length to Isa 53 where there is a pastoral metaphor, as justification for his plea for unity. While the motif therefore was relevant by Paul, he did not use it often and others used it more.

892. Trebilco, Early Christians in Ephesus, 189.
894. Walton, Leadership and Lifestyle, 126, 135.
895. 'Who at anytime pays the expenses for doing military service? Who plants a vineyard and does not eat of its fruit? Or who tends a flock and does not get any of its milk?' (1 Cor 9:7).
898. Ταπεινοφρονοῦντον γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ Χριστός, οὐκ ἐπαιρομένων ἐπὶ τὸ ποίμνιον αὐτοῦ (For Christ belongs to those who are humbled, not to those who vaunt themselves over his flock; 1 Clem 16:1); μάθετε ὑποτάσσεσθαι, ὑποθέμενοι τὴν ἀλαζόνα καὶ ὑπερήφανον τῆς γλώσσης ὠμόν αὐθάδειαν· ὃς εἰς αὐτὸν γὰρ ἔστιν ὑμῖν, ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μικρός καὶ ἐλλογίσμους εὑρέθηναι, ἢ καθ’ ὑπεροχήν δοκοῦντας ἐκρήγην ἐκ τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ (Learn to be submissive; lay aside the arrogant and haughty insolence of your tongue. For it is better for you to be considered insignificant but reputable in the flock of Christ than to appear prominent while surbed from his hope; 1 Clem 57:2).
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It is further likely that ποίμνιον should be considered an emphasis of Luke, as there are parallels between Luke 12:1-53 and the Miletus speech that extend well beyond this pastoral motif. In Walton’s examination he notes the shared themes of leadership, suffering, and money and also other verbal parallels including the use of ποίμνιον.\textsuperscript{899} He concludes that while one or two parallels could be considered coincidental, the 'several clear-cut verbal parallels clustered together lead us to take seriously the likelihood of conceptual parallels.\textsuperscript{900}

Scholars have pointed out the deliberate parallels between Jesus and Paul in the Gospel and Acts respectively, and these appear to be evident in the Miletus speech. In the speech, we find Paul is the suffering servant who is heading to Jerusalem (Acts 20:24), and whom the Holy Spirit says will be imprisoned and persecuted. The link is often made between the ministry of Jesus in the Gospel and Paul in Acts, and therefore this Abschiedsrede is compared to Luke 22:14-38 when Jesus farewells and warns his disciples before his death.\textsuperscript{901} Both Jesus and Paul's journeys are to Jerusalem, their speeches talk of coming suffering/death (Luke 22:15-16, 21-22; Acts 20:22-25, 38), contain warnings of coming temptations (Luke 22:31-34; Acts 20:29-30), exhortation to lead well (Luke 22:26-30, 32; Acts 20:28, 35), talk of the kingdom (Luke 22:29-30; Acts 20:25), and note the compassionate care shown by Jesus and Paul to their community (Luke 22:19, 27, 32; Acts 20:35).\textsuperscript{902} These Jesus-Paul parallels further suggest that the shepherding language in the Miletus speech may be an emphasis of Luke.

Furthermore, in Jesus' Abschiedsrede Luke quotes Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 when he says, 'For this scripture must be fulfilled in me' (καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη). In quoting this suffering servant passage, Luke demonstrates his belief that this scripture informs Jesus' death. The wider passage of Isa 53 uses a pastoral motif (Isa 53:6-8) and if this wider passage is in some

\textsuperscript{899} The other verbal parallels he notes are γρηγορέω (Luke 12:37; Acts 20:31), τελέω (Luke 12:50; Acts 20:24), ὑποδείκνυμι (Luke 12:5; Acts 20:35), and there are a number of uses of γινώσκω and οἶδα. Walton, Leadership and Lifestyle, 118-127.

\textsuperscript{900} Walton, Leadership and Lifestyle, 127.

\textsuperscript{901} Witherington, Acts, 612; Walton, Leadership and Lifestyle, 134; Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:253; Talbert, Literary Patterns, 15-23.

way in view, then we have a link, albeit a not very close one, where both Acts 20:28 and the farewell speech use a similar motif.

These factors therefore add to a body of evidence that suggests the use of the shepherd motif can be considered Lukan; and in the Miletus speech Luke, as an eyewitness, is translating what Paul actually said with pastoral language. Luke has used the shepherd motif for Jesus and now for the leaders of the church who seek to proclaim him. While this is the only use of the motif in Acts, it is also the only time we have a formal address to the church leaders. Thus its use should not be overlooked or diminished.

5.4.3 What does this add to our knowledge of the shepherd motif?
We can assume that Luke uses the motif of shepherd because he sees its relevance for the church and its leaders. With our understanding of Luke's significant use of allusions and echoes of scripture this should come as no surprise as we know how pervasive the motif is in the OT for leaders of Israel. In particular we know the value Luke places on Jesus as the Davidic shepherd king from the infancy narrative, and we are coming to see how Luke works this motif into his presentation of Jesus' life as the seeking and saving shepherd of the lost sheep.

There seems to be a particular level of resonance with Ezekiel 34's call to the leaders of Israel to shepherd the flock of God. In this chapter the prophet shows the faithful shepherd to be the one who provides not only for the needs of the sheep, but also protects them from wild animals (Ezek 34:6, 8, 22, 25, 28, 29). This echoes the warning of the Lukan Paul regarding the savage wolves who will come in among the flock (Acts 20:29), and that some from even their own group will distort the truth (Acts 20:30). While Luke 10:3 has implied wolves come from outside the disciples' group (see chapter 5.1), Acts 20:29 is clear that people from among them will threaten the safety of the flock. In the Pastoral Epistles and Revelation we learn that such problems did take hold in the church at Ephesus (1 Tim 1:19-20; 4:1-3; 2 Tim 2:17-18; 3:1-9; Rev 2:4), although in Ignatius' letter to the church a short time later the
church was doing well. The ongoing relevance of this shepherd motif for the church is evident in other writers including Peter, and Clement, bishop of Rome.

As this motif is found in a theologically weighty verse, and because of its strategic place at the beginning of Paul's hortatory remarks to the church leaders, we can agree with Barrett that the verse forms the practical and theological centre of the speech. This suggests the motif is not viewed as only useful by Luke, but highly appropriate for the church as he emphasises it by giving it primary place in Paul's speech. Furthermore, as this speech is the only one which records the Lukan Paul's words to the church it may well be of particular importance for Luke.

We know one of the important ways Luke presents his christology is through the lens of the story of David, and this story is inherently tied into his role as the faithful shepherd of God's people, the flock. We have seen this motif recur in the Gospel as a helpful indicator of the type of leader Jesus is, that is, he is the one who cares for the marginalised like the sinner and toll collector. Now we learn that Luke presents this as a motif for church leaders to model. Paul says in the speech that he is an example for the leaders to follow and in particular calls them to support the weak (Acts 20:35). Walton has demonstrated that Luke presents Paul as embodying and personifying the model of Christian leadership that has been taught and lived by Jesus, to which we add being a faithful shepherd as described in Ezek 34:16. We have seen Jesus in this role, so too we find Paul imitating Jesus. There is considerable evidence for this.


(2) He shows Paul gathering the scattered sheep through Paul's mission to the Gentiles (Acts 13:46), his encounter with Lydia at Philippi (16:14-15), the Philippian jailer (16:25-34), and with the Athenian idol worshippers (17:16-34). In this we see that there is now clearly a

gospel for all people and it has broadened out from the Gospel narrative. While we noted in section 5.1.1 that the household mission and the story of Zacchaeus prefigured Gentile mission, in Acts the mission is plainly universal to Jew and to Gentile.

(3) Paul binds up the crushed when he heals the crippled man at Lystra (Acts 14:8-10), the sick in Ephesus and Malta (19:11-12; 28:7-9), and brings Eutychus back to life (20:8-10).

(4) Paul supports the weak when he has Timothy circumcised because of the Jews (Acts 16:3), he responds to the Macedonian call (16:9), undergoes the rite of purification in Jerusalem (21:24-26), and speaks Hebrew to the Jews (22:2).

(5) Luke shows Paul watching the strong when he encounters the magician Elymas (Acts 13:8-12), engages with the council at Jerusalem (15:1-5), the slave girl (16:16-18) and the seven sons of Sceva (19:11-20).

(6) We see Paul going to the Jews even after he turns to the Gentiles (Acts 14:1; 16:13; 17:1; 18:4; 19:8; 21:15-26) so that at the end of the narrative Paul is still engaging with the Jews (28:17), trying to gather in the scattered sheep.

Therefore, Paul can say with confidence to the Ephesian elders that he has been an example to them in the ministry he has faithfully carried out. This faithfulness is best described as a faithful shepherd of the flock. The call to the elders is then endorsed by a quote of Jesus, adding an authoritative stamp to Paul's plea (Acts 20:35) when Paul says, 'it is more blessed to give than to receive.' Having established the church his desire is for it to be strengthened and kept safe from wolves that would come among the flock and scatter it.

In Summary: Luke returns to the motif of the shepherd in the Miletus speech where we find Paul’s only speech to church leaders. While it is Paul speaking, the shepherd motif appears to be Lukan language which resonates not only with his propensity for Septuagint themes and echoes, but where we also find an echo of Ezekiel 34. The motif is at the beginning of Paul's plea to the leaders, and is seen as especially relevant by its repeated use in vv. 28-29, and its echo in v. 35. Luke presents Paul in the role as faithful shepherd, in the same way Jesus has been presented in that way in the Gospel. Thus he exhorts the Ephesian leaders to imitate his
example and especially to keep the flock safe and to support the weak. This is affirmed as important by the reference to the Holy Spirit, the church of God and the blood of Christ.

5.5 Luke's Omissions
Mark uses two shepherd sayings which Luke omits (Mark 6:34; 14:27). If the shepherd motif is so important to Luke, why has he done this?

**Mark 6:34**
Mark 6:34 says that Jesus, seeing a great crowd, 'had compassion for them, because they were like sheep without a shepherd,' and so he began to teach them. The context for this saying is the feeding of the five thousand and the teaching Jesus refers to is the object lesson in the five loaves and two fish. This immediately precedes Luke's 'great omission' of 6:45-8:27.

Luke also records Jesus feeding the five thousand while his setting says, 'he welcomed them, and spoke to them about the kingdom of God, and healed those who needed to be cured' (Luke 9:11). Thus Luke's account draws attention to his well-known interests of welcome and hospitality, the kingdom of God and healing, while it does not use the 'sheep without a shepherd' reference which draws on Num 27:17; 1 Ki 22:17 and possibly Ezek 34:5. Why did Luke not use this shepherd reference?

Firstly, it is intriguing that with access to Mark's Gospel and an interest in the shepherd motif, Luke has not chosen to make use of this saying. Undoubtedly it would have been helpful to this study if he had done so, however, I will go on to argue that the shepherd motif is not far from the surface of Luke's text, that this omission does not downplay his later use of the motif in the travel narrative (10:3, 12:32; 15:1-7, 19:10), and this saying which expresses concern over the lack of a shepherd, was not relevant for Luke as Jesus functions as the faithful shepherd by carrying out shepherding tasks. What this also confirms is that as we suggested at the outset of the argument, Luke presents a range of Christologies rather than a single
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Christology (refer ch.1), and it appears that in the Lukan Jesus' Galilean ministry, it is not a motif Luke specifically used.

It is also helpful to note that the relationship between Mark and Luke in these passages 'is complicated,' and there is the possibility that Mark and Luke had access to different sources, while we acknowledge that even if this is a Lukan redaction, Luke has made choices which reflect his own special interests. This is true of Mark as well as Luke. Stein concludes that Mark's reference to teaching (6:30) and its use to introduce a miracle story (6:34) show his redactional work as illustrated in Mark 1:21-22, while Bovon notes that Luke replaces the shepherd allusion with the introduction of healings.

The content of Luke's feeding story is set within the context of welcome (ἀποδέχομαι), healing and the kingdom of God, which are actions of the Davidic shepherd. For example, we have seen in 5.3.3.3 that Jesus' welcome is often salvific and in the context of this feeding story (9:10-17), it is helpful to remember that Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd had a distinct call to feed the sheep (see chapters 2.2.4.1). We have seen that Ezek 34 lies behind Luke 12:32 and 15:1-7, which are also both feeding stories, and this will be reinforced with Zacchaeus dining with Jesus in 19:1-10. Therefore, while Luke does not use Mark 6:34 in his feeding story, he does cast Jesus as the Davidic shepherd who compassionately feeds people.

Further, it is quite possible that the reference to Jesus healing in Luke 9:11 indirectly points to the Davidic shepherd whose charge is to heal the sick sheep (Ezek 34:4, 16). As Bovon has suggested, Luke replaces the shepherd motif of Mark with the motif of Jesus healing, perhaps because by his actions in healing the people, he perceives Jesus as the faithful shepherd who is diligently caring for the needs of the sheep. Thus Mark's sentiment that the crowd are without a shepherd, is not true for Luke. The people had a leader in Jesus and were not like sheep without anyone to lead them.

910. Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 1, 467.
911. Ibid.
Similarly Luke's setting tells us that Jesus is speaking about the kingdom of God. The kingdom is of primary importance for Luke with the first reference to it coming in relation to the Davidic throne (1:33) and with the ongoing knowledge that it is not a kingdom of this world (4:5) but a Davidic kingdom of peace and salvation (2:8-14). The term η βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is used repeatedly by Luke; it is the purpose of Jesus' ministry (4:43) and in the forty days between Jesus' resurrection and ascension, it is singled out as the topic of Jesus' teaching (Acts 1:3). Our study in chapter 4 has shown us that Luke presents a particular perspective on the nature of the kingdom through Luke 1 and 2 in general, and the birth narrative and his genealogy in particular. The kingdom which the Davidic baby represents is heralded by an army of heavenly beings rather than the military might of Rome, and is marked by its repetitive use of the language of shepherd and points to a kingdom of divine peace supported by a Micah echo. Therefore, any discussion of kingdom, even in Luke's feeding story, is coloured by this Davidic shading.

Finally, the question of omission must be balanced with the acknowledgement that while Luke has not employed the shepherd motif in the Galilean ministry, he uses it repeatedly and at key places in the travel narrative where we find the bulk of Luke's own material. From its establishment in the birth narrative, he returns to this theme at the beginning of the travel narrative in the household mission (10:3), in Jesus' teaching of the disciples (12:32) and most especially, at the mid-point of the Gospel in the parable (15:1-7) and in the final encounter of the travel narrative (19:1-10). This leads us to consider that Luke viewed this motif as more helpful in his journey section where Jesus the Shepherd, like Moses the shepherd, led God's people in the exodus.

**Mark 14:27**

In 14:27 Mark quotes Zech 13:7 in which Jesus warns his disciples that they will desert him saying, 'I will strike the shepherd, and the sheep will be scattered.' This is another direct shepherd saying which Luke omits to use. We know that Luke favours echoes and allusions over quotes, and so including a quote is less likely (refer 1.2, 4.2), yet on the occasion of his
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I suggest that instead of using Zech 13:7 Luke has chosen to form part of his passion story around the servant passage in Isaiah, a prophet he turns to at significant narrative junctures. For example, John the Baptist's ministry is qualified through Isaiah 40:3-5 (Luke 3:3-6), Jesus' ministry is described in Isaianic terms (Luke 4:18-19; Isa 61:1-2), and one way Jesus' death is interpreted is through Isaiah 53's suffering servant figure (Luke 22:37; Acts 8:32-33). There are three quotations in Acts, with Luke quoting Isaiah's own call narrative (Isa 6:9-10) at the conclusion of Acts (Acts 28:26-27). Mallen has recently demonstrated the pervasive force of Isaiah in Luke-Acts and especially in Jesus’ ministry, and it is likely that Luke has turned to Isaiah rather than Jeremiah in his passion account.

In Isaiah 53 we also find pastoral language as we do in Zechariah. We find the sheep that is led to slaughter and the lamb which is silent before his shearers (Isa 53:7; Acts 8:7). This resonates with Luke's travel narrative where Jesus, on God's mission, journeys (or is led) to Jerusalem, and it certainly typifies Jesus who is silent before Herod (Luke 23:9). In chapter seven I signal this as an area for further study since the pastoral language in this servant song is related to this shepherd study, while outside its parameters. Isaiah 53 pictures the servant through the motif of a sheep who becomes a sinless offering on behalf of the sinful (see 2.2.1.1). This thematic link correlates with Luke's gospel which is about the forgiveness of sins (Luke 1:77; 3:3; 5:17-26, 32; 7:36-50; 11:4; 24:47) and with Jesus who is declared δίκαιος at his death (23:47). Therefore, there is a considerable likelihood that this servant figure may lie behind some ideas in Luke's passion narrative.

At the heart of my proposal is the realisation that ἀνόμος in Luke 22:37 which is usually translated 'transgressor,' is used in parallelism with ἀμαρτωλός which is translated 'sinner' in the OT (Ps 31:5; Isa 6:7). If we read that Jesus is counted among the ἀνόμου (sinful) yet dies as δίκαιον (righteous) does this present an atoning picture? Further in 22:7 when it was nec-
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915. In the passion narrative Jesus is also repeatedly found not-guilty of his charges (23:4, 14-15, 22).
essary for the passover lamb to be slain, is there more at stake than simply the actions of a faithful Jew who carried out the festival requirements. In some way does Luke perceive a role for Jesus as the passover lamb, and is his death necessary in some way for the gospel of forgiveness? Is the Lukan Jesus God's pastoral offering who is counted among the sinful and carries the sin of many (Isa 52:12)?

If so, this complements our motif and strengthens the reason why he chose not to use the quote from Zechariah from Mark.

5.6 Summary
In this chapter we have seen four repetitions of the Davidic shepherd king motif. Firstly, we saw how Jesus sent the seventy disciples out like lambs in the midst of wolves as a shepherd in the household mission. We noted how prominent this passage was due to its placement near the beginning of the travel narrative and its mission which prefigures the Acts household conversion narratives into Gentile territory. While God sends Jesus (10:16), Jesus also sends the disciples (10:3), and as both are shepherds this prefigures a future role for them as shepherds of the flock. This as we found in chapter 5.4 is a motif Luke uses in the Miletus speech. We also noted that Isa 40:11 and Ezek 34 were behind the motif, and the shepherd from Ezekiel especially with the focus on eating.

Secondly, in Luke 12:32 we have a unique shepherd saying attached to a Q passage. Thus we find the motif being used in Jesus’ ministry years when he is teaching his disciples that it is God’s nature to care and provide for his people. Jesus also describes his disciples as a 'little flock' which situates him as the shepherd in the text. The passage is drawing on an echo to Ezekiel 34 where there is also a focus on the flock being fed, and where the Lord's Davidic Shepherd is given the role of leading the flock.

Thirdly, we saw how the parable of the lost sheep focuses on the role of the faithful shepherd who seeks out the lost sheep, and so we renamed it 'the parable of the faithful shepherd.’ We found it is most likely to be from Luke's own source due to its internal features and particularly its unity with the following two parables.
The parable’s setting helps the reader understand that the parable critiques the religious leaders who are grumbling at Jesus’ table fellowship with toll collectors and sinners. The response of Pharisees and scribes causes Jesus to tell them the parable of the faithful shepherd which is particularly appropriate to religious leaders whose scriptures identify them as shepherds. This setting and parable together again suggest an echo of Ezekiel 34 where there is a strong critique of the shepherds of Israel who have looked after themselves and not the Lord’s flock.

In the parable there is a vivid description of the faithful shepherd. The shepherd looks for the lost sheep, is faithful in searching until he finds it, and carries the animal even at great personal cost. This appears to resonate with the Lukan Jesus who suffers on the road to Jerusalem (9:22; 18:31-33). The shepherd is characterised by his own joy at finding the lost sheep and then the shared joy when he returns to the community. It is also reflected in heaven when the parable concludes with reference to joy over one sinner who repents. This shows not only the value of each individual to God, but the specific theme of sin and repentance. This points back to the religious leaders who are not characterised by joy but rather grumbling at Jesus' dinner guests, and suggests it is they who need to repent. The motif of eating is prominent in the parable and in Luke's setting, and this resonates with Ezek 34 also where God is particularly concerned that his flock are fed.

In the parable we have both a theological emphasis where we learn of God's care for his flock, and a christological emphasis where Jesus is the Lord's Davidic Shepherd. Jesus can be seen as the faithful shepherd in the parable through his actions towards toll collectors and sinners. The parable/s directed toward the religious leaders shows not only their need of God’s forgiveness, but it demonstrates that God’s desire is restoration and repentance.

The placement of this parable at the midpoint of the Gospel and that it expresses le coeur du Troisième Évangile, certainly satisfies Freedman's criterion for a high efficacy for the motif. It also does seem to suggest that Luke has carefully wrapped text around this central point which makes the parable/s stand out as a call for the shepherds of Israel to seek out the lost sheep.
Finally we saw the motif used in the Miletus speech in Acts 20 when Paul addresses the Ephesian church leaders. We noted that this speech is the only one recorded to Christians and it is likely that it was recorded by Luke for the benefit of all church leaders. The motif extended to the church of God as the 'flock' and the leaders as 'shepherds.' They are warned and encouraged to be faithful as Paul was faithful, and to be on their guard against false teachers who are described as wolves who will come among them to harm the flock.

The motif is emphasised by the exposition of the Godhead of Acts 20:28. We read that it is the Holy Spirit who has appointed the leaders as shepherds of God's flock, and that church has in some way been acquired through the blood of Jesus. This mention of the blood of Jesus resonates with the passion narrative where Luke quotes from Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 and in Acts 8:32-33 where he quotes Isa 53:7-8.\footnote{916}

The shepherd motif in Paul's speech recalls Ezekiel 34 where the shepherds are to care for the weak and injured sheep (Ezek 34:16) and also protect them from wild animals (Ezek 34:6, 8, 22, 35, 28, 29). This is reflected in Paul's words when he says to watch out for devouring wolves (Acts 20:29-30) and to support the weak (20:35). Furthermore, the shepherd language is an emphasis of Luke as it resonates with his use of the shepherd motif in the Gospel and the predominance of his echoes of Ezekiel 34.

We have found four passages or sayings which are all unique to Luke and use the shepherd motif and which point to Jesus’ role as the faithful Davidic Shepherd of Ezek 34, and to Paul and the leaders who are appointed by the Holy Spirit to be faithful shepherds in the early church, also drawing on Ezek 34. This suggests that the motif was considered relevant and appropriate for church leaders, and that the motif of the flock was helpful for the church. We also considered briefly why Luke omitted to use Mark 6:34 and 14:27. While the four shepherd passages do not suggest this is Luke's predominant motif, these passages are significant and appear to show a particular feature of the Lukan Jesus' earthly ministry.

\footnote{916}{Isaiah 53:6-8 also uses the motif of the flock and the sheep.}
Chapter 6

Jesus, the Seeking and Saving Davidic Shepherd

We have seen in chapter five that the motif of the shepherd has continued in the Lukan narrative beyond the infancy narrative. We examined four passages where the Davidic shepherd king from Ezek 34 was in the background (10:3; 12:32; 15:1-7; Acts 20:26-35), and we noted that this resonates with one of Luke's emphases - the practical care of individuals. We also saw that the motif was used to describe a good leader. In 12:32 and Acts 20:35 the shepherd motif described a leader who cared for the physical needs of his flock, although it was not limited to only this. In 15:1-7 it was the leader who welcomed the people on the margins of society such as the toll collectors and sinners.

In 10:16 we noted that God sends Jesus, and in 10:3 that Jesus sends the seventy into household mission as a shepherd. We suggested therefore, that as the seventy carry out God's mission, they do so as shepherds who proclaim the kingdom of God to lost sheep. This is an implied status as shepherds, while in Acts 20:28 the leaders in Ephesus are explicitly called shepherds. Further, we saw in the parable that this shepherd leader carried a costly burden on behalf of the sheep. Jesus demonstrated this in his journey to Jerusalem where he was going to suffer and die (9:22; 18:31-33).

Now we turn to the supreme example, the story of Zacchaeus where Jesus is the Son of Man who has come to seek out and save that which is lost (19:10). This saying is a well accepted echo of the shepherd of Ezekiel 34, and as we have already seen, the Davidic shepherd king motif is depicted using a Leitwort that reinforces its theological weight. Marshall suggests this saying sums up the central message of the Gospel and Miura specifies that Davidic Shepherd imagery sums up the earthly ministry of Jesus in Luke 19.917 Marshall's statement in
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particular implies that 19:10 expresses the *telos* or *fulfilment* of Jesus' ministry years and holds a semantic key for the Gospel.

We will firstly discuss the summative nature of 19:10 and how this pericope, to which the saying is attached, is so resonant with the wider Lukan narrative. We will note the placement of the narrative and its content and demonstrate that it is the *telos* of Jesus' *Reisebericht*.

Secondly, we will review what has been called the 'vindication' argument which suggests that Zacchaeus customarily gives away half his income and restores four-fold anyone from whom he has extorted money. This is an important debate as it casts a very different picture of Jesus as the Davidic shepherd king. If Jesus is showing that Zacchaeus is already a member of the kingdom community, then he does not need a saviour and Jesus' role as reaching to the margins for the sheep is significantly changed.

Thirdly, we will give a detailed exegesis of 19:1-10 showing how this pericope is a salvation story, where Jesus as a Davidic shepherd king seeks out and saves Zacchaeus. We will note that salvation begins in Zacchaeus' house, is multi-layered and affects many areas of his life. We will also see how salvation is shown to be fully universal in this pericope; it is open to both genders, and to all races and social classes.

Fourthly, we will consider what this adds to our knowledge of the Davidic shepherd king motif; and finally, we will consider what the summative nature of 19:10 means with regard to 4:18-19, the programmatic saying of the Gospel. We will suggest that Luke has two programmatic sayings, one at the beginning of his ministry years (4:18-19) and one at the end (19:10).

### 6.1 The Summative Nature of 19:10

This study accepts that 19:10 has a summative role for the Gospel. Firstly, I will show the importance of 19:1-10 as the final narrative in Jesus' ministry years, since this is the pericope where the Davidic shepherd king saying has been placed by Luke. Then, I will demonstrate
how the Zacchaeus pericope is connected to the wider Gospel by an analysis of the linguistic features of several texts.\textsuperscript{918}

### 6.1.1 The Cumulative and Cohesive Nature of the Narrative

Firstly, a narrative is cumulative and works toward a \textit{telos} or goal in a storyline (see chapter 1.2). While we acknowledge that stories have more than one climax and certainly Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension is paramount, other key places in the text are also important in reading the text. The story of Zacchaeus is Jesus' last encounter in his ministry years and I suggest is one of those places.\textsuperscript{919} Mark's final pericope is the healing of the blind beggar (Mark 10:46), but as Luke inserts the story of Zacchaeus after this healing story, his ending and narrative emphasis are quite unique. Luke's emphasis is now on the Davidic shepherd king who seeks out and saves the lost sheep.

Jesus' ministry begins formally when he is in the synagogue in Nazareth (4:14-30) and this is where the accepted programmatic saying of the Gospel is located (4:18-19). The saying encapsulates the ministry of Jesus; that is, it tells the reader what the Lukan Jesus' ministry is. It is a mission to the poor, the captive, the blind and the oppressed. It is a message in which the year of Jubilee is declared to bring hope to the poor.

As the ministry of Lukan Jesus proceeds, there is encounter after encounter where Jesus enacts this mission statement (4:18-19). For example, we find many pericopae which deal with the poor and related topics such as wealth, women and widows (4:25; 6:20-25; 7:11-16; 7:36-50; 12:13-34; 18:18-30). We see captives to sickness being released (5:12-16, 17-26; 8:26-39; 13:10-17), the blind seeing again (7:21-22; 18:35-43) and the oppressed going free...

\textsuperscript{918} This section focuses on my analysis of the texts, and in 6.3, the exegetical reading of 19:1-10, I will build support from secondary literature.

(7:36-50). All of these categories overlap and express Luke's central theme of universal salvation. Salvation is available to all people regardless of gender, ethnicity or social status. Ultimately we find these three key paradigms of universal salvation are all outworked in the story of Zacchaeus.

Luke has placed the Zacchaeus story in its immediate context carefully to parallel and contrast especially with the rich ruler (18:18-30), the healing of the blind man (18:35-43) and the parable of the Pharisee and the toll collector (18:9-14). It also has strong links with the earlier 'lost' parables (refer chapter 5.3), the healing of the crippled woman (13:10-17), the sending of the seventy (refer chapter 5.1), the sinful woman (7:36-50), the calling of Levi (5:27-32) and the birth narrative (refer chapter 4.3.5). While many Lukan stories could be said to have some parallels, the Zacchaeus story has so many linguistic and thematic resonances with other stories that this suggests the Zacchaeus story has a summative role for the Lukan narrative. Further, Luke seems to use these parallel stories to build a cumulative intra-textual platform which helps the reader to be able to interpret the Zacchaeus pericope. I will demonstrate this now.

6.1.1.1 The Rich Ruler (18:18-30) and Zacchaeus

There are many parallel features between the Zacchaeus pericope and the story of the rich ruler. Both men are wealthy (18:23; 19:2), exercise rulership (18:18; 19:2) and seek Jesus out (18:18; 19:3). The rich ruler asks Jesus a question (18:18) and Zacchaeus is seeking to see Jesus (19:3). Both are shown to have good intentions in approaching Jesus. The text notes that the rich ruler becomes περίλυπος when Jesus replies that as well as keeping the commandments he should sell his possessions and give the money to the poor (18:23), showing that his desire had been to follow Jesus' advice. Zacchaeus goes to great lengths to see Jesus by running ahead and climbing a tree, even though he may face further ridicule from the community in this act. Thus, he is able to overcome the obstacles of the crowd and his height\(^\text{920}\) to gain a glimpse of Jesus as he passes by, and shows his good intentions in ap-
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proaching Jesus. The stories therefore, bear much in common that link them together and this suggests they are related.

The rich ruler story is primarily about entering the kingdom (ἐἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ εἰσπορεύονται; 18:24) and the reader with the crowd wonders whether the rich can enter the kingdom of God when they hear Jesus' riddle (18:25) when the question is asked, 'Who then can be saved?' (18:26). No reply is given, only Jesus' words, 'What is impossible for mortals is possible for God' (18:27). The question is yet to be fully answered. Can a rich person enter the kingdom? The rich ruler seems unable to relinquish his possessions in keeping with the general tenor of Luke's presentation of the tyranny of wealth (6:24; 12:16-21, 34; 14:7-11, 15-24; 15:25-32; 16:19-31).

Maxwell notes that in 18:18-30, Luke has created a narrative gap for the reader to fill (chapter 1.2). This gap creates a space where the audience must consider the plight of the rich and whether they can indeed be saved (18:26). This question is left hanging until Zacchaeus, a man who is πλούσιος relinquishes his wealth (19:8). This is a literary twist, an unexpected event and gives the wider narrative a sense of closure. Aside from the women who support Jesus (8:1-3) who are given little narrative space, no rich person has managed to enter the kingdom. When Zacchaeus welcomes Jesus with joy this implies he has entered the kingdom, echoing in the reverse sense the story of the rich man.

As the two stories are tied together narratively, the first laying a platform for the second, we have evidence from the wider narrative that the Zacchaeus pericope is a salvation story. It is about Zacchaeus entering the kingdom.

6.1.1.2 The Blind Man (18:35-43) and Zacchaeus

The healing of the blind man also bears many parallels with the Zacchaeus pericope, and we note the first immediately precedes the second. The narrative links are the location in Jericho (18:35; 19:1), Jesus is passing by (18:37; 19:1), and the crowd forming a barrier to each individual (18:39; 19:3). Both men have a salvific encounter (18:41-2, 19:9), both show deter-
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921. Maxwell, Hearing Between the Lines, 145.
922. The blind man asks to receive his sight (18:41) and this fulfils 4:18. This is the only pericope
mination in reaching Jesus (18:39; 19:4) and demonstrate a good response to him (18:43; 19:6, 8). There are linguistic parallels in the use of Ἰστήμη (18:40; 19:8) and κύριος (18:41; 19:8). Both pericopae echo the Nazareth Manifesto; Jesus is named as Jesus of 'Nazareth' (18:37), and in 19:10 the content of the manifesto is recalled (see section 6.5). There is a Davidic connection with the blind man calling out τις Δαυὶδ twice (18:38, 39) while in 19:10 there is a clear echo of the Davidic shepherd king who seeks out and saves the lost (Ezek 34). There are also narrative contrasts which further suggest the two stories are linked. The central character in one is a beggar, while the other is rich (18:35; 19:2) and there is a spatial contrast where one is sitting down while one has climbed a tree and has an elevated position (18:35; 19:4). The result of each man's salvific encounter also illustrates different aspects of salvation; the blind man receives his sight and Zacchaeus finds acceptance and salvation and responds with economic reform.

The story of the blind man marks a return to the Davidic theme from the infancy narratives (refer 4.4). The blind man calls τίς Δαυὶδ twice, signalling a return to the infancy narrative's Davidic theme. The primacy effect has made readers sensitive to the Davidic motif. The Davidic shepherd king motif is recalled again in the story of Zacchaeus (19:10). This causal chain shows a clear ordering of the Lukan narrative and the Davidic motif as a Leit-
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924. Luke uses σωτήριον here (18:42)

925. 19:9 uses σωτήριον. This is the only instance of the noun for salvation outside of the infancy narrative and in the John the Baptist pericope (3:6). With the theme of salvation being so prominent, this makes this a significant echo of the narrative beginnings where Jesus is the Saviour (2:11).

926. In Luke 1-2 we have seen that the angel announces that Mary's baby will be the Son of the Most High and will sit on the throne of David where he will reign eternally (1:32-33). Zechariah prophecies he is the mighty saviour in the house of David (1:69), and the birth narrative itself shows the fulfillment of these prophecies (2:1-20). Nolland marks a new section from 18:35 and notes Jesus makes his way into Jerusalem as a royal figure. Nolland, *Luke*, 897.

927. We will see in section 6.3 that this Davidic causal chain continues in the parable of the minas (19:11-27) and the entry into Jerusalem.
This chain begins with the healing of the blind man and this sets the stage for Zacchaeus, the lost sheep (19:10), who will meet with the Davidic shepherd king.

6.1.1.3 The Parable (18:9-14) and Zacchaeus

The Zacchaeus pericope is set in parallel to the parable of the Pharisee and the toll collector (18:9-14). Both pericopae have central characters who are τελῶναι (18:10; 19:2) and discuss money and possessions. In 18:12 the Pharisee states he gives a tithe of his income which is an assertion of his religious superiority, and Zacchaeus is πλούσιος in 19:2 and speaks of his ὑπαρχόντων in 19:8. Both toll collectors demonstrate a Lukan ideal of true humility (18:13-14; 19:4, 6, 8). We see this in the parable when the toll collector distances himself in the temple and does not draw attention to himself but speaks to God. It is further evident in his actions when he does not look up to heaven, but beats his breast and declares he is 'the sinner' (τῷ ἁµαρτωλῷ). Humility is seen in Zacchaeus when he risks ridicule in running to secure a place to see Jesus when he passes by, and also when Jesus speaks to him he responds with obedience, joy and haste. Further, Zacchaeus shows humility when he does not respond to the crowds' charge in 19:7 but instead calls Jesus κύριος and gives half of his possessions away to the poor. Both characters are presented as people who are model respondents.

The parable makes clear that a right relationship with God is not centred only in what we do with our money, but in our humility to God. In the parable we have a positive and negative example. The Pharisee practices tithing and fasting which are good religious practices, but are seen to be inadequate in themselves as right responses to God. The toll collector, conversely, is a model respondent as he humbles himself before God, acknowledging that he is a sinner and in need of God's mercy (18:13). This clear picture of a repentant sinner will help the reader interpret Zacchaeus' response as one of humility and repentance before Jesus to whom he responds (19:6) and acknowledges as κύριος (19:8).

929. Other examples of model respondents are Mary when she responds to the angel (2:38), the shepherds who hurry to the baby (2:15), the sinful women who anoints Jesus' feet (7:38) and the leper who praises God and falls at Jesus' feet (17:15-16).
The parable articulates how toll collectors are viewed by society; that is, they are viewed in the same way as thieves, the unrighteous and adulterers. This setting will help the reader interpret why the crowd forms a barrier against Zacchaeus (19:3) and why they call him a sinner (19:7). The Pharisee will pejoratively judge the toll collector (18:11) and in the same way the crowd will judge Zacchaeus (19:7). The linguistic use of ἁµαρτωλός further ties the passages together (18:13; 19:7).

This parable makes clear a Lukan perspective relating to δίκαιος and ἁµαρτωλός which is crucial for the Lukan narrative as a whole and the Zacchaeus pericope in particular. The parable is told to those who think they are δίκαιοι (18:9), and the Pharisee will call the toll collector ἁδίκος (18:11). The toll collector however will call himself ἁµαρτωλός using the definite article (18:13), and is declared δίκαιος (18:14).930 The implication in the parable is that the one who thinks he is δίκαιος may be ἁδίκος, but the one who acknowledges he is ἁµαρτωλός is justified and put right with God. This is the only Lukan pericope where someone calls themselves ἁµαρτωλός using the definite article and this is significant.931 Thus, we have a toll collector acknowledging the full weight of his sin by calling himself ‘the sinner’ and as a result the reader finds him justified.932 This supports Jesus’ explanation of his mission at 5:32 that he has not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. The Pharisee sees himself as righteous, while the toll collector sees himself as the sinner, and thus, in his repentant plea to God, finds justification and the forgiveness of sins. This information will help the reader understand that Zacchaeus, the chief toll collector, also finds justification and the forgiveness of sins.

930. Wallace suggests that Luke’s context points to the article functioning as par excellence rather than simple identification and the man ‘is declaring that he is the worst of all sinners...This seems to fit well with the spirit of his prayer, for only the Pharisee explicitly makes a comparison with the other person present.’ If it was simple identification then the tax collector is recognising the presence of the Pharisee and making a distinction between the two of them. Daniel B. Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 223.

931. Simon Peter will call himself ἁµαρτωλός (5:8) without the definite article.

932. This parable illustrates 16:14-15 where Jesus says to the Pharisees that they are those who justify (δικαιῶ) themselves in the sight of others, but that God knows their hearts. As lovers of money they are indirectly revealed as an abomination in the sight of God.
6.1.1.4 The Crippled Woman (13:10-17) and Zacchaeus

The story of the healing of the crippled woman (13:10-17) also parallels the Zacchaeus story primarily because both stories contain specific classifications as a daughter or son of Abraham.933 Aside from the genealogy which recalls Jesus' lineage and where we hear who is the son of whom (3:23-38), Luke only uses the phrase to describe Zacchaeus (υἱός Ἀβραάμ, 19:9). What Luke does do however, is refer to the crippled woman in 13:16 as θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ. The phrase θυγατέρα Αβραάμ is unique to all Jewish literature up until the time of Luke,934 though a similar phrase appears in 4 Maccabees 14:20; 15:28; 17:6; 18:20.935 There are other interesting parallels between the two Lukan stories while they contain many differences.

Both stories are unique to Luke, centre on one person, use the Greek ἔδει/ἐδεί (13:16; 19:5) and κόρις (13:15; 19:8) which convey a soteriological centre to each story. Both stories have a physiognomic aspect that plays a strategic role in the plot. The woman is bent and according to physiognomic tradition, her condition would have been understood as moral.936 Similarly, Zacchaeus' height could have been interpreted as reflecting a 'small spirit' or divine judgment.937 Both stories involve plots where Jesus seeks out the person. In 13:12 Jesus approaches the woman, and Luke’s use of ἀπολύω in the perfect, passive, indicative (ἀπολέλυσα) shows the reader that the agent of her healing is God. In 19:10 it is Jesus who seeks out Zacchaeus. Both stories also include a negative response to Jesus’ encounter; in

933. Acts 13:26 talks about being a descendant of Abraham.
935. In the Maccabean story a mother watches her seven sons die and then accepts martyrdom rather than violate food laws, and as she does she recalls the strength of Abraham. 4 Macc 15:28 calls her the 'daughter of Abraham's strength.' This tradition was well known and Parsons suggests the Jews in the synagogue would have heard this echo when Jesus called this bent woman θυγατέρα Αβραάμ. Parsons, Body and Character; 88.
936. Parsons, Body and Character; 86. Polemon the Platonic philosopher writes that 'if you see that the back is broad, it is an indication of mighty and strong men, and it indicates great anger. If it is the opposite of that, it indicates weakness and the contrary of what the broad and strong back indicated.' Richard Foerster, ed. Scriptores Physiognomonicorum Graecorum et Latinarum (Leipzig: Teubner, 1983), 2:208.
937. Parsons, Body and Character; 99, 101. Pseudo-Aristotle said, 'These are the marks of a small-minded person. He is small limbed, small and round, dry, with small eyes and a small face, like a Corinthian or Leucadian' (808a30).
13:14 the leader of the synagogue reacts to Jesus, and in 19:7, the crowd react to Jesus. Finally, both stories contain an allusion to the LXX; 13:17 is a clear parallel to Isa 45:16\(^{938}\) and 19:10 to Ezek 34. These stories follow the Lukan pattern where there are parallel stories of a man and a woman,\(^{939}\) and the two stories demonstrate that salvation is universal for both genders. Both characters are on the margins of society and respond well to Jesus. Jesus is shown to be the one who releases the captive woman from the power of Satan echoing Isa 61:1-2 and Luke 4:18. Zacchaeus' salvation releases him from his estrangement from the community, while the use of σωτηρία (19:9) and σώζω (19:10) also suggests a salvation that is transcendent.\(^{940}\)

6.1.1.5 The Sinful Woman (7:36-50) and Zacchaeus

The story of Zacchaeus and the sinful woman (7:36-50) have clear parallels. They are both set in the context of hospitality (7:36; 19:5). Simon accuses the woman of being άμαρτωλός (7:39) and the crowd do likewise to Zacchaeus (19:7). The implication is the woman is άμαρτωλός through her occupation (7:37) and so too, Zacchaeus, who is άρχιτελώνης and πλούσιος (19:2). The use of συκοφαντέω which means to harass, squeeze, shake down, or extort through intimidation (19:8) points to Zacchaeus' sinful business practice.\(^{941}\) Jesus reveals Simon's attitude to the woman is wrong (7:40-47) and similarly, Jesus does this for the crowd who have ostracised Zacchaeus. Further, Simon's murmuring (7:39) and the crowds' murmuring about Jesus (19:7) are wrong. The woman anoints Jesus' feet with her tears and μυρόν, a very costly perfume (7:37-38) from an alabaster jar and Zacchaeus makes a very costly resolve with his money (19:8). When the woman enters the Pharisees' house and responds to Jesus with tears and anoints his feet, the woman faces public ridicule. Similarly,

---

939. Examples of this are: Mary's song and Zechariah's song (1:46-55; 67-79); Simeon and Anna (2:25-25, 36-39); the men disciples and the women disciples (6:13-16; 8:1-3); and the first two parables in chapter 15 (the faithful shepherd, the good woman). Luke 13:10-17 also has similarity to Sabbath healing of the man with dropsy (14:1-6) which is another male-female parallel. Nolland, Luke, 722. Bultmann suggests 13:10-17 is a variant of the later Sabbath healing (14:1-16) and is composed on the basis of verse 15. Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, 12.
940. σώζω, BDAG, 982.
941. συκοφαντέω, BDAG, 955.
when Zacchaeus climbs the tree and responds to Jesus publicly he lays himself open to public humiliation. There is also linguistic parallels in the salvific language of σῴζω/σωτηρία (7:50; 19:9, 10). We again have a story of a man and a woman although this is not the focus of the parallel as in section 6.1.1.4.

Both narratives reveal that the characters have been forgiven a great debt. The parable of the two debtors describes the scale of the woman's debt (7:41-42), and the use of the ὅτι (7:47) shows the link between her debt and her love. As Jesus says to Simon, 'Therefore, I tell you, her sins, which were many, have been forgiven; for (ὅτι) she has shown great love' (7:47). Zacchaeus' debt is shown in his costly resolve (19:8). The parable in the sinful woman story lays the platform to interpret Zacchaeus' resolve with his money as one who has been forgiven a great debt and so generously gives half of his money away. In both stories therefore we see Jesus in the role of saviour of sinners. Zacchaeus' level of generosity causes the reader to hear the echo of this story and Jesus' words that 'her sins are forgiven' (7:48).

6.1.1.6 Levi (5:27-32) and Zacchaeus

The calling of Levi and the following banquet (5:27-32) also parallels the Zacchaeus story. Both characters in the narratives, Levi and Zacchaeus, are toll collectors. Jesus calls Levi to follow him and he does so immediately (5:27-28) and Jesus calls Zacchaeus to come down and he does so immediately (19:5-6). The narratives involve table-fellowship and both have crowds listening to the proceedings (5:29; 19:3, 7). The Pharisees and scribes grumble (γογγύζω, 5:30) and so do the crowds (διαγογγύζω, 19:7). The setting for Levi's banquet implies rejoicing (5:29) and Zacchaeus rejoices (19:6). Repentance (μετάνοια) in the Levi story suggests a reorienting of his life around God's purposes, while 5:28 implies that he does not give up all his possessions. In the same way Zacchaeus' welcome of Jesus does not mean he gives up all of his possessions, though he does give up a sizeable portion that suggests he

---

943. Luke 5:28 states Levi left everything, but then in 5:29 he gives a banquet for Jesus. This tension in the text is resolved by understanding that it does not simply mean giving away all his possessions, but a fundamental reorienting of purpose around Jesus and his mission as physician to the sinner.
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reorients his life to reflect God's care for the poor (19:8). Most importantly, each pericope ends with significant mission statements from Jesus' lips and 19:10 recalls the earlier 5:32.⁹⁴⁴ There is a narrative contrast as Levi leaves his job as toll collector while Zacchaeus does not. Further, Luke uses the language of μετάνοια in the story of Levi, but only implies it though the gaps in the Zacchaeus story. A gap, as we have seen in chapter 1.2 and in the story of the rich man (section 6.1.1.1), is an opportunity for the reader to fill the lacuna. We noted that gaps must be 'logically constrained to the text'⁹⁴⁵ and so cohesive with the narrative itself, and these criteria are supported in the parallels and contrasts in 5:27-32 and 19:1-10. This suggests a supportable gap in which the author engages the reader in making meaning. These links coupled with the language of μετάνοια in 5:32 helps the reader interpret Zacchaeus' response to Jesus as one of repentance.

### 6.1.1.7 Summary:

Luke 19:1-10 works in parallel with many other Lukan Gospel stories. Its language, style and content resonate with many other pericopae making it a pivotal story in the wider narrative. It completes the sense of universal salvation through the story of the rich ruler (the rich can be saved), the story of the crippled women (both genders can be saved) and the story of the sending of the seventy (all ethnicities can be saved; see chapter 5.1). The stories lay an interpretive base with which we can fully understand the story of Zacchaeus. Jesus is the one who has come to call sinners to repentance (5:29-32), he forgives the repentant sinner (7:36-50), he brings transcendent salvation to households (10:1-24), and salvation is universal and comes to both men and women (13:10-17). Further, Jesus exalts the sinner who humbles himself (18:9-14), he shows us that salvation is not just about what we do with our wealth but about our relationship with God (18:18-25), and as the Son of David he brings salvific sight (18:35-43). Jesus is the Davidic shepherd king (18:38, 39; 19:10) and a faithful shepherd who seeks out the lost sheep. To understand the message of Zacchaeus, it must be read within the context of the character and mission of Jesus throughout his ministry. Luke has painted a cohesive picture where one story illuminates another, and culminates in 19:1-10 as a signif-

---

⁹⁴⁵ Eagleton, Literary Theory, 73.
icant *telos*. It is an ordered narrative where beginnings and progression build to a significant climax. It is a story with gaps and blanks to engage the reader and a story which ends with an important mission statement (19:10): the Son of Man has come to seek and save the lost.

The placement of the Zacchaeus pericope at the end of the travel narrative suggests its narrative's importance, and further, by inserting this pericope into the Markan outline, Luke gives the reader a unique end to Jesus' journey to Jerusalem. Jesus enters Jerusalem as the Davidic shepherd king who brings salvation to all, and especially to those on the margins of society.

### 6.2 A Vindication Reading of Zacchaeus

The nature of the Zacchaeus pericope has given rise to various form critical classifications, and here we will examine the debate which surrounds the classification of 19:1-10 as a vindication story.

The centre of the controversy stems from verse 8 where the question is asked how to best interpret δίδωμι and ἰπποδιδωμι. These verbs are written in the present active indicative and have traditionally been read as futuristic presents; however the verbs can equally be read as simple present iterative verbs showing Zacchaeus' customary action. This debate is important because it affects a Lukan theology of salvation which in turn, affects a reading of the Davidic shepherd king in the narrative. A vindication reading pushes towards a works-based theology with an emphasis on what we do to achieve salvation and where the human sinful

---

condition is underplayed. In so doing, it does not recognise the need of a cosmic Saviour and we find Jesus in the role of what could be called a life coach. A salvation reading, on the other hand, places an emphasis on the actions of God to initiate salvation and on human actions as a result of salvation. In this reading the Davidic shepherd really does have a seeking and saving role for the people of God.

6.2.1 Zacchaeus - the Saint (A Vindication Reading)
Godet challenged the traditional view in the latter part of the nineteenth century when he saw the interpretive problem of translating ἀποικίασμα as a futuristic present. While he could understand δίδωμι to mean 'as of now I give away,' he queried what sense it would make to understand ἀποικίασμα in the same way. If this was a salvation story then how do we understand a repentant sinner already making plans for what he would do to restore those he would defraud or extort money from? The tension he sees is real as there is an interpretive problem. In support of this view, Godet also suggests that Luke's use of σταθείς (19:8) denotes a firm and dignified attitude, which he proposes 'suits a man whose honour has been attacked.' Furthermore, the use of ἵσσοι (19:8) heralds the unexpected revelation for the crowd rather than an expression of resolve. Godet's concerns have been reiterated and expanded as the following analysis demonstrates.

Fitzmyer, for example, also queried the traditional view. Firstly, Zacchaeus does not beg for mercy (17:13; 18:38) or express sorrow (15:21; 18:13) as one might expect in a salvation story. Secondly, Jesus makes no reference to Zacchaeus' faith (7:50; 8:48), repentance or conversion (15:7, 10), or discipleship. Fitzmyer, therefore, reads Jesus' pronouncement of salvation as unrelated to the forgiveness of sins, but argues Jesus' pronouncement is given to make sure the crowd understands that as a Jew, a son of Abraham, he has as much claim to salvation as any other Israelite. He refutes that Zacchaeus has become a child of Abraham in a Pauline sense (Gal 3:7, 29; Rom 4:16-17) and yet reads v. 10 as summing up this episode as

950. Fitzmyer says, 'This does not mean that Zacchaeus has become a child of Abraham in some spiritual sense (as in Pauline usage. Gal 3:7, 29; Rom 4:16-17).’ Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 1221.
the 'soteriological message of the entire travel account and the Lucan Gospel. In the light of these features, and coupled with the present tense verbs of verse 8, he takes the thrust of this pericope to be Jesus’ vindication for Zacchaeus' customary actions.

White also believes this pericope does not contain the necessary elements to make it a salvation story and that Luke is interested in vindicating Zacchaeus from a false stereotype that toll collectors are all corrupt. He notes that firstly, there is no clear indication that Zacchaeus is a sinner and there is no mention of sin. Secondly, Zacchaeus' speech and behaviour are not contrite and self-effacing such as in 8:40, where Jairus falls at Jesus' feet; 15:21 where the prodigal son says he is no longer worthy to be called a son; or 18:13 where the toll collector beats his breast and acknowledges himself a sinner. Thirdly, the story does not show deference to the power of Jesus nor a petition for his mercy (9:37; 17:13). Fourthly, the story does not contain a forgiveness pronouncement of Jesus that notes his faith (5:20; 7:47). Finally, White notes the observers do not react, either positively (5:26) or negatively (7:49) to the power of Jesus to effect change which is a typically Lukan response.

Mitchell believes Luke is trying to explode a false stereotype and to show 'how salvation came to a loyal Jew...without necessarily implying that Jesus saw him as a sinner. At the heart of Mitchell's critique of a 'salvation reading' is a belief that salvation (σωτηρία) is not only about the forgiveness of sins, but also that salvation refers to the Davidic Messiah who rescues us from our enemies (1:69, 71), which he claims has nothing to do with sin and repentance. He goes on to note that the Zacchaeus story lacks any reference to sin and repentance, and the programmatic verses (4:18-19) lack any reference to the forgiveness of sins.

---

953. I assume White means 8:41 where Jairus falls at Jesus' feet.
955. For example he argues that there are false stereotypes uncovered in the stories of the call of Levi (toll collectors can leave everything and follow Jesus), dinner at Simon's house (the sinful woman is the one who understands forgiveness more fully than the Pharisee), and the Good Samaritan (the Samaritan and not the religious leaders is the one who helps the injured man). Mitchell, 'Zacchaeus Revisited,' 153-176 (153).
Furthermore, he suggests that Luke records the pericope to answer the question of how we can have material possessions and still be saved and also as an apologetic to explain how the Jews are included in universal salvation.\textsuperscript{959} That is, it shows us how the promises of the OT are still valid for Jews.

Mitchell’s argument makes much of the reference to Zacchaeus as son of Abraham (19:9), claiming that this provides the necessary interpretive link to the Genesis account where Abraham is justified by works through his hospitality.\textsuperscript{960} He suggests Luke ties salvation to good works in 3:1-20 by linking the quote from Isaiah (Luke 3:4-6) which ends with all flesh seeing the salvation of God (v. 6), through the word οὖν at the beginning of v. 7 and again in v. 10. According to Mitchell, the word οὖν functions as a link word which shows how this salvation is fulfilled. That is, it is fulfilled by our actions which are fruits worthy of repentance. He proposes that Luke drew on traditions not only of Abraham, but also of Rahab\textsuperscript{961} as models of hospitality,\textsuperscript{962} to show justification by works, and showing how the promises of the old covenant are still in effect and coming to fruition for Jews in Christianity.\textsuperscript{963} Mitchell quotes James 2:21 where Abraham is justified by good works and believes that this is a tradition Luke is likely to have drawn on.

For Ravens, a combination of factors leads him to argue strongly against a future sense for the two verbs.\textsuperscript{964} He notes this story is at a climax in the narrative because this is the last story before Jesus enters Jerusalem and because Zacchaeus is the ἀρχιτελῶνης (19:2). He correctly notes that Luke always portrays τελῶναι responding well to Jesus,\textsuperscript{965} but takes this to imply a customary action from v. 8, rather than a future response or a response relating to

\textsuperscript{959} Mitchell, ‘Zacchaeus Revisited,’ 163.
\textsuperscript{960} Mitchell, ‘Zacchaeus Revisited,’ 169-172.
\textsuperscript{962} Here he uses Jas 2:18-25 as evidence of the tradition.
\textsuperscript{963} Mitchell, ‘Zacchaeus Revisited,’ 167.
\textsuperscript{964} Ravens, ‘Zacchaeus,’ 19-32, (28).
\textsuperscript{965} Ravens correctly notes the τελῶναι are one of three groups the Baptist addresses when they come to him to be baptised (3:10-14), are at Levi’s banquet (5:29), and at 7:29, in a narrative comment, the reader finds out that the τελῶναi went home justified. He fails to note another positive example in the parable of the toll collector and the Pharisee (19:9-14) where it is the toll collector who is a model respondent. Raven, ‘Zacchaeus,’ 22.
Zacchaeus' actions in v. 6. He also notes the absence of the language of repentance suggesting its absence means he has no sins to repent from.

Ravens examines the Zacchaeus pericope in light of the anointing story (7:36-50) and the story of the rich man and Lazarus (16:19-31), which he suggests together function as a triptych. This he admits is 'involved and circumstantial' and centres on the meaning of the names of principal characters in each passage. In 7:36-50 Simon's name in the Hebrew form means 'hearing,' echoing Simon's need to hear what Jesus has to say (7:40), and in 16:19-31 Lazarus finds help ultimately from God echoing his name's Hebrew root, 'El'azar' (God has helped). Therefore, he suggests, Zacchaeus' name, which means innocent, gives Luke's view of his character in the text making it a vindication story.

Ravens also looks to evidence external to the pericope, noting that Luke has interrupted the Markan narrative's order so that 19:1-10 follows the healing of the blind man, which follows mention of the disciples' lack of understanding (18:31-34). This he suggests functions as a prelude to the Zacchaeus story where Jesus opens the eyes of the crowd to Zacchaeus' true status.

To support his position Ravens further notes that Luke uses πάντες διεγόγγυζον (19:7) pejoratively of the crowds' response, and that being a toll collector does not mean being a sinner in Luke. To support this he interprets σταθεῖς to mean standing firm in belief, and Zacchaeus calling Jesus 'Lord' as Luke paints Zacchaeus in a favourable light. The crowd seem to assume that all τελώναι are ἁµαρτωλοί and therefore outside the covenant, but Luke subverts that.

Green positions Zacchaeus as a model of one on the margins who has already understood the values of Jesus' mission and for whom salvation means restoration to the community of God. He suggests that Zacchaeus has understood the message of John (3:10-14) and also of Jesus' economic justice and almsgiving. He also notes the lack of conversion lan-

---

969. Ravens, 'Zacchaeus,' 22-23.
guage, \(^{972}\) and interprets his response of joy and immediate and exact obedience (19:5) as showing, 'he is one who embraces the values and claims of the kingdom of God.' \(^{973}\)

Lieu agrees with the vindication position and further notes that repentance is not discussed and that Jesus brings salvation often to those whom society traditionally despises by restoring them and giving them recognition. \(^{974}\)

In summary: 19:1-10 as a vindication story:

\[\text{Δίδω \ μι} \text{ and } \text{ἀποδίδω \ μι} \text{ are present tense verbs that could present Zacchaeus as customarily giving half his possessions to the poor and if he finds he has defrauded anyone of anything, restoring them fourfold. On this reading, the crowd claim he is a sinner but Jesus shows this to be false by declaring him to be a son of Abraham as evidenced by his good deeds. Jesus is interested in unearthing false stereotypes particularly concerning people on the margins.}\]

In support of this, the claim is made that this pericope does not contain all the language or components of a salvation story revealing that it is indeed a vindication story of a righteous man. The specific critiques centre on: (1) the omission of the language of sin and repentance; (2) Jesus does not declare Zacchaeus' sins forgiven, implying there are none to forgive; (3) Zacchaeus' speech and behaviour are not contrite or self-effacing as one would expect in a salvation story; (4) Zacchaeus does not declare his faith; and (5) there is no crowd response to his actions or Jesus' statement.

However, there is considerable evidence that this position is not the best reading of the pericope and that the Zacchaeus story is indeed a salvation story with \(\text{δίδω \ μι} \text{ and } \text{ἀποδίδω \ μι}\)

---

\(^{972}\) Green notes that Luke does not mention Zacchaeus' need for repentance, an act of repentance or faith, or Jesus calling him to repentance and therefore that this is not a story of conversion. He does state that if v. 8 had a futuristic sense then 'verse 8 would refer to his repentance, while vv. 9-10 would refer to his being saved.' Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 671-672.


showing a new sense of resolve. We will now turn to the evidence from the text to support this claim.

### 6.3 Zacchaeus - the Sinner (A Salvation Reading)

The Zacchaeus pericope, as we have seen in section 6.1, comes at the end of the travel narrative and contains many of the Lukan themes of salvation, the lost and Jesus' mission. It does not contain all the language of salvation, but it uses many of the ideas and concepts of sin, repentance and salvation which clearly place it within the domain of a salvation story. Further, as we have seen in section 6.1 the Zacchaeus story resonates with many other pericopae which lay an interpretive base with which the reader can interpret gaps and blanks in the story. In chapter 1.2 we noted that narrative works as a whole to create meaning, and therefore repetition, arrangement and echoes are significant in Luke's διήγησις, where Luke himself has stated his writing is ἄνωθεν (from the beginning of something), καθεξῆς (in orderly sequence) and ἀκριβῶς (carefully or accurately). No story in a narrative stands alone, as narrative is cumulative and cohesive and is ordered so meaning becomes clear. We particularly noted how the primacy effect sets the trajectory of the narrative (refer chapter 1.2) and how Jesus' role as the Davidic shepherd king was foreshadowed in chapter 4 of this thesis. We will now look at details in the text which support a salvation reading where

---


976. ἄνωθεν, BDAG, 92.

977. καθεξῆς, BDAG, 490.

978. ἀκριβῶς, BDAG, 39.
Zacchaeus is to be seen as a sinner who is sought out and saved by Jesus the Davidic shepherd king.

In 19:1, we find Jesus is on his journey to Jerusalem (9:51-52) and is passing through Jericho (19:1). Jericho is about 20 km from Jerusalem, at the border between Perea, under Herod Antipas' control, and the province of Judea. The city was known as an agricultural centre, a winter playground for Jerusalem aristocracy, and, as a relatively wealthy crossroad city near to Jerusalem, it was a likely place for a toll collection point. There is generally considered to be no intrinsic link with Jericho in the Zacchaeus story other than recording the actual historical location, but rather it brings Jesus nearer his narrative travel destination, Jerusalem.

The introductory remarks about Zacchaeus in v. 2 set him up to be of high interest in the Lukan narrative. Zacchaeus is a ἀρχιτελώνης and he is πλούσιος. Zacchaeus is not simply any τελώνης, but a ruler of others. Those in places of power and status walk a precarious road in Luke's perspective regarding the kingdom of God, and this is not any man of status, he is a Jewish man working as a ruler of the toll collectors for the Romans. Furthermore as one who is πλούσιος and as the cheif toll collector (ἀρχιτελώνης), he is clearly a successful toll collector as he collects the indirect taxes on agricultural produce and other goods coming from Judea to Perea. The use of πλούσιος recalls 18:23 and the rich ruler who is seeking salvation (18:18, 26; refer section 6.1.1).

'Zacchaeus' is the Greek form of the Jewish name Zakkai or Zacchi (Neh 7:14; Ezra 2:9; 2 Macc 10:19; Josephus, Life 1.239) and may be an abbreviated form of Zechariah. Zacchaeus' name in Hebrew means 'clean, innocent' and is often used in Hebrew parallelism with צדיק, 'righteous, upright.' Although Zacchaeus' name means clean or innocent it is not gen-

979. Safrai and Stern, Jewish People, 1:333.
980. Ehud Netzer, 'Jericho,' ABD 3:739.
984. TWOT, 240; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 1223.
erally considered significant to the pericope.\textsuperscript{965} There are many interesting possibilities in Luke's inclusion of his name.

Firstly, Bauckham argues that as a named account, it is possible that Zacchaeus was either known to the author or was the source for the story.\textsuperscript{966} This is quite possible. It is not often that Luke provides the reader with an individual's name.\textsuperscript{967}

Secondly, we know that Zacchaeus is a Jew and this makes sense of Jesus declaring that he is a son of Abraham (19:9).\textsuperscript{968} It is significant however, that in the parallel statement in 13:16 where Luke describes the crippled woman as a daughter of Abraham, Luke does not name her suggesting that the inclusion of his name is not only to confirm ethnicity.

Thirdly, his name is also coupled with the knowledge that he is ἀρχιτελώνης, and this sets the reader up with the inevitable conflict that would arise from a Jewish man working for the Romans. As we have noted, Zacchaeus is not simply any τελώνης, but a ruler of others, and his status as πλούσιος, demonstrates to the reader that he is a man of some status in the community. The combination of information (ἀρχιτελώνης and πλούσιος) implies this community status is infamous.

Fourthly, as a thoroughly Jewish name, there is an element of irony or conflict with his occupation for the Roman oppressors.\textsuperscript{969} This helps the reader to make sense of 19:3 where the crowd have formed a barrier and so he cannot see Jesus.

\textsuperscript{967} For example we are not given the name of the man with the unclean demon (4:31-37), or Simon's mother-in-law (4:38-39), the leper (5:12-16), the crippled man (5:17-26), the centurion (7:1-10), the widow of Nain (7:11-17), the sinful woman (7:36-50), the Gerasene demoniac (8:26-39), the hemorrhaging woman (43-48), the daughter of Jairus (8:40-42, 49-56), the lawyer (10:25-37), the Pharisee who dines with Jesus (11:37-41), the crippled woman (13:11-17), the man with dropsy (14:1-6), the rich ruler (18:18-30), the blind man (18:35-43), the widow at the temple (21:1-4), the man carrying the jar of water (22:10-13), or the two criminals on the cross (23:32-43). In fact, there are very few people named in the narrative aside from the infancy narrative (Zechariah, Elizabeth, Mary, Joseph, Simeon, and Anna), Simon the Pharisee (7:36-50), Lazarus in the parable (16:19-31), Simon of Cyrene (23:26), and Joseph of Arimathea (50:50-56). Even Cleopa's partner is not named in the long narrative on the road to Emmaus (24:13-35).
\textsuperscript{969} O'Hanlon suggests this is ironical because of his role with the Romans and Lieu because his name means 'righteous.' John O'Hanlon, 'Zacchaeus,' 12; Lieu, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 147.
Finally, the inclusion of his name also adds interest when in 19:5 Jesus mysteriously knows his name.

Zacchaeus' name is also introduced by a Septuagintal expression ὄνοματι καλούμενος. Luke uses ὄνοματι and καλούμενος frequently, but it is less common that he combines the two words. This 'pleonastic' expression (ὁνόματι καλούμενος) while being stylistically Septuagintal, also provides a deliberate pause in the narrative. This sharpens the reader's focus for 19:5 when Jesus will miraculously call Zacchaeus by his name. Jesus' miraculous knowledge of Zacchaeus' name is consistent with his ministry in the power of the Holy Spirit (4:1, 14, 18; 5:17) where he finds divine empowerment. This empowerment relates not only to miraculous deeds (19:37), but to divine knowledge. For example, the Lukan Jesus demonstrates miraculous foreknowledge of Simon's catch of fish (5:4), and further, in the story of the rich ruler Jesus shows remarkable insight into the man's struggle to understand the law (18:19-22). Luke also describes Jesus praying all night before choosing the disciples (6:12) which suggests Jesus is seeking divine knowledge, and he also encourages the disciples to allow the Holy Spirit to give them divine knowledge if they are in court (12:12). In 19:5 therefore, when Jesus knows Zacchaeus' name, it is consistent with the Lukan Jesus who is exercising divine knowledge.

Roman taxes were collected in two forms in Palestine at this time; direct taxes (land and head taxes) collected by the Jewish councils and indirect taxes (tolls, customs and duties) collected by private contractors. Zacchaeus is a private contractor, and as such would have added his own charge onto the state toll charge, to which an individual had no recourse to disagree.

---

990. The words ὄνομα and καλέω are sometimes contained in close proximity in the LXX, so this suggests an example of Luke's use of Septuagintal language (Exod 33:19; 34:5; Judg 18:29).
993. Luke uses a combination of these two words also in 1:31, 61; 2:21.
994. Nolland describes this combination of words as 'pleonastic.' Nolland, Luke, 904.
995. John also knows of this tradition (John 1:48).
996. Michel, 'εκλόνης,' TDNT 8:97. Stern notes that when Archelaus' reign as ethnarch ceased and he was exiled in 6 C.E., the Roman tax system was revised which required a census to be called. We do not know what changes were made to the tax system at this point, and it is possible they did not increase taxes. See Safran and Stern, Jewish People, 1:330-334.
This lay the system open to abuses and Luke's description that he was πλούσιος implies his wealth was made through fraudulent means, adding intensity to his characterisation. O'Hanlon therefore rightly notes that, 'the function of ἄρχατελώνης in the narrative is to emphasise the richness of the tax collector and the magnitude of his sinfulness.' Jesus' mission to call sinners to repentance is clear in 5:32 and this parallel story creates an echo here (refer 6.1.1.5).

Luke's emphasis on Zacchaeus' Jewish name, his social status as ἄρχατελώνης and his wealth sets Zacchaeus up in the narrative to be an arch-sinner. This point is overlooked or underplayed by White, Mitchell, Ravens, Green and Lieu. Thus, we find that the information that Zacchaeus is πλούσιος and ἄρχατελώνης is significant for interpreting Zacchaeus' characterisation as a sinner. This makes Zacchaeus an ideal candidate for the seeking and saving Davidic shepherd king who, as we saw in chapter 2.5, seeks the lost and scattered sheep (Ezek 34:12).

In v. 3 we find Zacchaeus is seeking (ζητέω) to see (εἴδον) Jesus, but he is unable to do so because there are two barriers – the crowd that has gathered to see Jesus are blocking his vision and Zacchaeus is short in stature and so cannot look over the crowd. This quest how-

---

999. Luke uses the verb ζητέω 25 times and in the Lukan narrative there is definitely a sense of a 'quest.' There are an equal number of examples where people are seeking something both in a positive and a negative way. Positive examples are 1:48, 49; 5:18; 6:19; 11:9, 10; 12:31; 15:8; 19:3, 10; 24:5, while negative examples are 9:9; 11:16, 24, 51; 12:29; 17:33; 22:2, 6. There are also four examples which express warning or caution (12:48; 13:6, 7; 13:24). The usage is spread throughout the Gospel starting in the infancy narrative (2:48, 49) peppered throughout the early response and discipleship sections (5:18, 6:19) but there is a definite increase in usage when sections on conflict (11:16, 24, 29) and coming judgment (12:31, 48; 13:6, 7, 24) are described. Furthermore, as tension mounts in the Jerusalem build up to the passion of Jesus, Luke uses the term freely (19:47; 20:19; 22:2, 6). Implicit in 'seeking' is the quest to find something. In a religious sense it is God who seeks (12:48; 13:6, 7; 19:10) and God pre-eminently seeks and saves the lost, but humans (9:9; 15:8; 19:3, 10, 47; 20:19; 22:2; 22:6) and evil spirits (11:24) are also on a quest. Ultimately the quest is cosmic as God, Father, Son and Spirit battle with Satan and win. God's mission is clear, Jesus, the Son of Man has come to seek out and save the lost. Luke has five meanings for ζητέω. (1) To seek or look to find something or someone that has been lost where both God and humans can be the subject: God seeking (12:48; 16:6, 7; 19:10); Humans looking/seeking (2:48, 49; 15:8; 24:5). (2) To seek God in prayer (11:9, 10). (3) To inquire, investigate or consider (12:29). (4) To ask or demand (11:16, 29; 12:48). (5) To seek out, strive for or try to do something (5:18; 6:19; 9:9; 11:24; 12:31; 13:24; 17:33; 19:3, 47; 20:19; 22:2, 6).
1000. Another possible avenue explored is the ancient world of physiognomy where Parsons has suggested Zacchaeus' short stature may be perceived by the ancient world as indicating that he was a
ever, is positive and suggests 'a christological backbone' to the pericope.\textsuperscript{1001} Earlier in the narrative Herod had been seeking (ζητέω) to see who Jesus was (9:9) but 23:8 shows us that he was hoping to see him perform a sign. Luke shows this motivation as negative. In 11:16 people are also demanding (ζητέω) a sign from heaven to test Jesus, and in 11:29 Jesus calls the generation evil as it is asking (ζητέω) for a sign. In contrast, Zacchaeus' motivation to see Jesus is not sparked by a negative motivation such as Herod's in 9:9, 23:8 or the people in 11:16, 19, and his place in the tree makes him unobtrusive. This positive characterisation coupled with his marginalisation from the crowd, further strengthens his candidature for a saving encounter with the Davidic shepherd king.

The notion of 'sight' is significant in the Gospel, which we signaled in section 6.1.1.2, and 'seeing' as a metaphor for spiritual sight was common in religious literature of the ancient world.\textsuperscript{1002} In 4:18-19 in Luke's programmatic saying, Jesus announces that through him as God's anointed, the blind will see again and, under Hamm's chiastic analysis of 4:16-20, τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν forms the centre of the chiasm.\textsuperscript{1003} This is demonstrated below:

A and he stood up to read
B and there was given to him the book of the prophet Isaiah
C he opened the book and found the place where it is written
D 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me
E to proclaim good news to the poor
F he has sent me to proclaim release to captives
G and recovering of sight to the blind
F\textsuperscript{1} to set at liberty those who are oppressed

'sinner.' He notes congenital defects were associated with sinfulness in both Jewish and Greek writings (2 Kgdms 12:15b-23; Ruth Rab. 6.4; John 9:2; Hesiod, Op. 1.235; Herodotus, Hist. 1.105; 4:67), and in this Jewish context it is possible that Zacchaeus may have been prohibited from temple worship if his short stature was perceived as a physical deformity. Lev 21:17, 20 states, 'No one of your offspring throughout their generations who has a blemish may approach to offer the food of his God. For no one who is blind or...a hunchback, or a dwarf, or a man with a blemish in his eyes or an itching disease or crushed testicles.' Parsons notes that Codex Alexandrinus translates the Hebrew daq (thin) with the unambiguous ύψος (dwarf) providing some possible evidence for his position (Body and Character, 104). Parsons has also shown the possibility that Zacchaeus' height coupled with his almost comic hurrying may have been interpreted pejoratively. He therefore concludes, 'Luke's authorial audience may have naturally heard a double entendre in the crowd's pronunciation of Zacchaeus' sinfulness: he was born a sinner, as evidenced by his physical size, and he lived as a sinner, as evidenced by his cheating fellow country-folk out of their money.' Parsons, 'Short in Stature,’ 50-57 (55); Parsons, Body and Character, 97-108.

\textsuperscript{1001} O’Hanlon, ‘Zacchaeus,’ 13.
\textsuperscript{1003} Hamm acknowledges the earlier work of Meynet (1982) and Lund (1942). Hamm, ‘Sight to the Blind,’ 458-459.
Furthermore, in 7:21 Luke records an important summary healing statement which specifies the blind receiving their sight and then in 7:22, various healings are named using LXX allusions to Isa 29:18; 35:5; 61:1. The blind receiving their sight is the only healing that is common to both verses, and its double linguistic use is intriguing as Luke writes of the blind receiving their sight last in v. 21 and first in v. 22, suggesting a Lukan emphasis where Jesus' soteriological mission and sight are connected. This is demonstrated below:

\[ \text{ἐν ἑκείνῃ τῇ ὑστερήσει πολλοίς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ νεκρῶν καὶ} \]
\[ \text{τυφλοίς πολλοίς ἐγρήγορσα χείλες.} \]

(καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ἔτειν αὐτοῖς: προσευχήτερ παραγινώσκει Ἱούδιν ἀ εἴδετε καὶ ἰκουσατε:) \[
\text{τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χελοὶ περιπτέουσιν,}
\]
\[ \text{λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται και κοφοὶ ἀκούοντες;}
\]
\[ \text{νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγέλζονται. (7:21-22).} \]

This statement is important because it confirms Jesus as the Messiah and its likely echo of Isa 61, the source for the programmatic saying, lends weight to its significant content. That salvific sight is central to both passages, makes a double statement of its importance for the narrative.

Further, as we saw in section 6.1.1.2, in the pericope immediately prior to Zacchaeus, the blind man asks to receive his sight (ἀναβλέπει; 18:41) and has an uncanny ability to perceive Jesus as the 'Son of David.' The blind man seems able to 'see' something of Jesus' nature, a revelation that his disciples do not appear to have received (18:34). When the blind man re-

1004. The italics are Hamm's and the bold centre is mine. Green's analysis notes the quote from Isaiah is at the centre, and at the centre of that are two sayings of release (to proclaim for the captives release; and to send forth the oppressed in release). However, I note that even under his analysis the blind receiving their sight is between these two sayings and lies at the centre of the verse. Green, Gospel of Luke, 210. Bock follows Tiede’s analysis, which shows the centre as the same as Hamm’s. Bock, Luke, 399.

1005. Isa 35:5 is within the context of σωξίω (Isa 35:4).

1006. In 2:30 Simeon says his ‘eyes have seen your salvation’ and 2:32 talks of Jesus being a ‘light’ to the Gentiles. Both examples link seeing and salvation language.

1007. Fitzmyer regards Jesus’ reply as nonmessianic, although his words are so closely reflective of the works expected of the Messiah that there seems to be a messianic claim being made either directly or as an allusion. Bock, Luke, 668; Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 292; Nolland, Luke, 330; Fitzmyer, According to Luke, 667.
ceives his sight the Nazareth manifesto is fulfilled (4:18-19), at least in part, and while 7:21-22 has claimed Jesus has already done so, Luke has not opened this window clearly for the reader until the end of Jesus’ ministry. That is, it is not until 18:35-43 that the reader 'sees' Jesus heal the blind. This accelerates the ending of the travel narrative as Jesus' ministry is shown to be nearly complete. While blind Bartimaeus ends the Markan journey (Mark 10:46-52), for Luke, Jesus' ministry still has one more important dimension which will be added with Zacchaeus who is seeking to see Jesus.

In light of Luke’s use of salvific sight as a metaphor, and the positive characterisation of Zacchaeus when he is seeking 'to see who Jesus is,' this action can be seen as 'the first step in Zacchaeus' own repenting.'

The parable of the toll collector and sinner (18:9-14) also bears many parallels to the Zacchaeus pericope as we have seen, and its close proximity has already created an ideologically sympathetic attribute to a toll collector who shows humility and repentance (refer section 6.1.1.3). This parable, I suggest, provides the reader with a Lukan lens with which to read the character of Zacchaeus who is on a quest to encounter Jesus, albeit at a distance at this stage.

In v. 4, Luke also shows Zacchaeus is eager to see Jesus with the pleonastic expression which highlights Zacchaeus’ actions of 'running on ahead' (προτρέψας), followed by 'in the front' (εἰς τὸ ἐμπροσθεν). This further confirms Zacchaeus' honest desire to see Jesus which will also be shown when he climbs a sycamore tree which could have led to the possibility of public ridicule. The ancient world found the movements of dwarfs comical and they were sought after as party entertainment; thus, the image of height-challenged Zacchaeus running ahead, Parsons suggests a 'cruel and ribald mockery.' Although he is a man of considerable social status and wealth through his infamous role as ἀρχιτελώνης, it is a positive attribute that Zacchaeus is willing to face public humiliation to gain access to Jesus. As we have seen in section 6.1.1.5, the sinful woman parallel has also shown a woman who risked public ridicule in approaching Jesus. This story's many close links further place the Zacchaeus story within a

1010. Parsons, Body and Character, 103.
salvific domain. Certainly, Zacchaeus' actions negate White's belief that Zacchaeus' behaviour is not contrite or self-effacing, and confirms Zacchaeus' intention as more than a sight-seeing tourist. His desire is shown as honourable by Luke.

The language and Lukan theme of salvation is firmly established in vv. 5-6. As Klein rightly says, 'Mit Jesu Kommen kehrt sich die Sache um. Nicht Zachäus sieht Jesus, sondern Jesus schaut auf und erblickt ihn.' The significance of Jesus seeking Zacchaeus out and the salvific language is under-played in a vindication reading, a key weakness in this theory. It is here in Zacchaeus' house that I suggest the salvific event occurs. That is, salvation occurs in Zacchaeus' house which I will now demonstrate.

In v. 5 Jesus speaks to Zacchaeus with an imperative, σπεύσας κατάβηθι. Luke uses σπεύδω in the context of divine command in Acts 20:16; 22:18, 21. In Acts 20:16 Paul is hastening to arrive in Jerusalem for Pentecost in line with the divine plan for his mission (Acts 20:22-24), while in Luke 2:16 σπεύδω recalls the shepherds as model respondents, hurrying to Mary and Joseph and the baby lying in the manger. In Luke 19:5 there is this sense of divine command, especially with the salvific language that follows. Indeed, 'Jesus kennt die Namen der Menschen kraft übermenschlichen Wissens,' leading the reader to expect a salvific encounter on a divine timetable.

The use of καταβάνω is interesting as it may suggest functional repentance. It is a sign of Zacchaeus' acknowledgment of this divine command that he responds quickly and comes down from the tree. In v. 8 he will go on to address Jesus as κύριε, which may be another sign of repentance. Luke favours showing people responding to Jesus by a physical action of falling down before him. For example, Simon falls down and acknowledges his sin before Jesus (5:8), the Gerasene demoniac falls down before him (8:28) and the leper who is healed prostrates himself in front of Jesus (17:16). Luke also has the sinful woman anoint-

1011. Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 601.
1012. Klein, Das Lukasevangelium, 601; also Bovon, Das Evangelium nach Lukas 3, 274.
1013. This pericope is primarily Lukan. The response is unique.
1014. This physical response of falling down before Jesus (προσπίπτω) is Lukan. Mark uses προσκυνέω, to worship.
1015. This pericope is Lukan. He uses the physical picture of the man ἐπεσεν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ.
ing Jesus' feet (7:38) rather than his head in the Markan anointing story (Mark 14:3).\footnote{1016} When Zacchaeus therefore comes down from the tree, Luke paints him as responding appropriately to Jesus.\footnote{1017}

Luke's use of σήμερον could be viewed as temporal and non-theological, but its context makes this option unlikely as σήμερον will be repeated and linked with σωτηρία in 19:9.\footnote{1018} As Wolter further notes, Erstmals seit 4:21, seinem ersten eigenen Wort in der Öffentlichkeit, spricht Jesus wieder von σήμερον...Dass es auch hier heilsgeschichtliche Bedeutung hat, steht außer Frage.\footnote{1019} Luke uses σήμερον extensively in a theological sense,\footnote{1020} and in 19:5 Jesus calls for a response from Zacchaeus. Further, 19:5 and 19:9 are parallel statements with σήμερον at the beginning of each verse and with σωτηρία coming between σήμερον and οἶκος. This points to this encounter in Zacchaeus' house as salvific. The parallels are demonstrated below:

(19:5) σήμερον γὰρ ἐν τῷ οίκῳ σου δεῖ με μεῖναι
(19:9) σήμερον σωτηρία τοῦ οίκου τούτου ἐγένετο

Furthermore, the concept of salvation is clearly evident in Luke's use of δεῖ when Jesus says he must stay in Zacchaeus' house.\footnote{1021} This word, which expresses divine necessity, is critical to the narrative and it is loaded with cultural overtones. It has a Hellenistic background where the thought is of a neutral deity who is in control of the course of the world.\footnote{1022} Luke

\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{1016} These are not directly parallel stories but bear strikingly similar features. They are both in the house of a man named Simon when a woman comes to anoint Jesus, people react at the costly act which could have instead helped the poor, but Jesus defends her actions.
  \item \footnote{1017} This may suggest a Christological framework.
  \item \footnote{1018} Fitzmyer, \textit{According to Luke}, 1224; O'Hanlon, 'Zacchaeus,' 15; Marshall with some reserve, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 697. Green says the term is highly suggestive as in other places it has been linked to salvation. Green, \textit{Gospel of Luke}, 670.
  \item \footnote{1019} Wolter, \textit{Das Lukasevangelium}, 612.
  \item \footnote{1020} Examples of this are when the angels announce to the shepherds in 2:11 that today a Saviour has been born for all people in the city of David; in the synagogue in Nazareth and in the context of the scripture being fulfilled (4:21); when Jesus heals the paralytic man, the crowd will respond that they have seen strange things today as Jesus can forgive sins here on earth rather than the Jewish eschatological belief (5:26); today and tomorrow Jesus is performing cures, but on the third day his work is finished (13:31); Jesus reiterates this saying with the context of the prophet being killed in Jerusalem (13:33); and when Jesus speaks to the criminal on the cross that today he will be in Paradise with him (23:43).
  \item \footnote{1022} Grundmann, δεῖ, δέον ἐστί; \textit{TDNT} 2:21.
\end{itemize}
has taken this term and given the deity a name and embedded the understanding of God who is not neutral, but is actively pursuing his plan of salvation for the world in his son Jesus who is Saviour (2:11).

When Luke uses δεῖ, the soteriological interpretive framework has been set. The additional use of σήμερον confirms this. This verse shows the reader that Jesus is in control of this encounter with Zacchaeus. While Zacchaeus was seeking to see Jesus, Jesus is displaying his greater desire to meet with him. Méndez-Moratalla suggests the use of δεῖ points to repentance. He says,

Luke's emphasis on divine initiative displayed in the ministry of Jesus and expressed in terms of 'necessity'...aims at repentance. That is the expected response to the divine salvific initiative articulated as 'the call of sinners to repentance' (5:32), 'the seeking of the lost' (19:10), which is toward those despised by members of the socio-religious strata, namely, to the sinners, the toll collector, the lost. ¹⁰²³

Furthermore, Jesus’ words ἐν τῷ οἶκῳ σου δεῖ με εἶναι cannot be underestimated. This is a clear reference to Middle Eastern hospitality, that is, table fellowship,¹⁰²⁴ and the salvific nature of Jesus' request is paramount. Luke's narrative has consistently foregrounded Jesus' table fellowship and the role eating and drinking has in the purposes of God (refer 5.2.3.3). The Zacchaeus pericope is another example of Jesus eating with a sinner and showing his acceptance of them as a result. Luke favours the use of μένω (and ἐπιμένω). Unlike Matthew and Mark who only use it once each respectively for hospitality in a house (Matt 10:11; Mk 6:10), Luke uses it seven times in the Gospel (1:56; 8:27; 9:4; 10:7; 19:5; 24:29 [twice]) and thirteen times in Acts (Acts 5:4 [twice]; 9:43; 16:15; 18:3, 20; 20:5, 23; 21:7-8; 27:31; 28:12, 14).¹⁰²⁵

Adams, following Marshall, describes Jesus' offer of fellowship to Zacchaeus as extending an offer of forgiveness.¹⁰²⁶ For there to be forgiveness, the implication is that there is sin to be

¹⁰²⁵. He also uses ἐπιμένω in Acts 10:48; 15:34; 21:4, 10; 28:12, 14.
forgiven. While in the Western world this may not seem explicitly related to the forgiveness of sins, the Middle Eastern world knew all that it implied.

In Moessner’s description of the Lukan journey he explores the motifs of 'food' and 'meal' as metaphors for proper relationship with Jesus. Meal imagery he suggests is, paradigmatic of the disciples' relationship of submission and total dependence upon their Lord. For not only were the disciples dependent upon their identification with Jesus to receive hospitality from their hosts but also the home meal became the fullest expression of the relationship of blessing and salvation to the presence of the Lord in their midst.1027

N. T. Wright goes so far as to suggest that in the encounter in Zacchaeus' house, Jesus is implicitly claiming to be and do what the temple was and did.1028 That is, in this act of hospitality, Jesus was offering forgiveness of sins and restoration, roles of the Jerusalem temple, thereby offering Zacchaeus a 'bypass.'

If one was with Jesus, one did not need the restoration into the covenant membership which was normally attained by going to Jerusalem and offering sacrifices in the temple: 'Today salvation has come to this house; this man too is a son of Abraham!' (Luke 19:9).1029

This is consistent with the household mission in Luke 10:1-24 which we found to have a foundational role in the household Gentile mission in Acts and where entering the house and offering peace was tantamount to salvation (see chapter 5.1). In 19:5-6, Luke again presents the reader with a picture of Jesus entering a house and bringing salvation. In a very real way, Jesus being present was enough for salvation, and supports Wright's suggestion that the Lukan Jesus does supersede the role of the temple by being a new 'sacred space.' Forgiveness for Zacchaeus was enabled by Jesus' invitation and was entered into by his response and not by a visit to the temple.1030 In this act of invitation therefore, and surrounded by language of necessity (δεῖ, σήμερον, and μένω in v. 5, and with the backdrop of Zacchaeus seeking to see

1027. Moessner, Lord of the Banquet, 151.
1030. Luke's Gospel begins and ends in the temple (1:8; 24:53), giving the temple a special narrative place in the Gospel. He also shows a unique interest in what happens in the temple when Jesus dies, as he brings the tearing of the temple curtain forward to before Jesus dies (23:45) Mark and Matthew both place it after the death (Mark 15:38; Matt 27:51). While scholars are uncertain what this means, it does show that Luke does see the temple and Jesus as being connected.
Jesus (ζητόει, εἰδον), Luke has drawn heavily on salvation language. The absence of some salvation language is given as primary evidence for a vindication reading of the pericope (see section 6.2), and yet Luke's language is clearly salvific, while not containing every possible Lukan salvific word.

It is of note that after this unit (19:1-27), Jesus will enter Jerusalem and go straight to the temple and cleanse it (19:45-46). Perhaps another reason Luke has inserted the Zacchaeus pericope into the Markan journey (see section 6.1), is that Wright is correct that the Lukan Jesus was redefining the role of Jerusalem and the temple. Luke 13:35 has suggested that, for the Lukan Jesus, the temple has become a place where God no longer dwelt when he says ἴδον ἀφίεται ύμῖν ὁ οἶκος ύμῶν, and this will be affirmed in Stephen's words (Acts 7:48-49).

While Luke continues to refer to the temple in his Gospel narrative and in Acts,\(^\text{1031}\) it is possible that Luke views the temple and the forgiveness of sins in a new way and the house is a new salvific space. Certainly Jerusalem, which is inextricably tied to the temple, becomes a narrative marker for the progression of the gospel rather than the preeminent place where the temple was located. Locations in the travel narrative help to show Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, and thereafter they become linked to the spread of the gospel (24:47; Acts 1:8).

When Jesus enters Zacchaeus' house the belief of the crowd in 19:7 is that he enters a ritually unclean house. \textit{M. Tohorot} 7.6 which discusses purity says, 'The tax collector who entered the house - the house is unclean.' Jewish tradition likened toll collectors to Gentiles who were ritually unclean.\(^\text{1032}\) \textit{M. Ohol.} 18.7 notes the 'dwelling places of gentiles [in the land of Israel] are unclean' and \textit{Jub.} 22.16 says,

\(^{1031}\) The Gospel notably ends with the disciples worshipping God in the temple (24:53), while the reader's first narrative scene is Zechariah in the temple (1:9). In Acts the disciples continue to go to the temple (Acts 3:1; 5:25).

\(^{1032}\) John R. Donahue, 'Tax Collectors,' \textit{ABD}, 337. Some examples from the \textit{m. Aboda Zarah} which deal with festivals and fairs; 1.1 says, 'Before the festivals of Gentiles for three days it is forbidden to do business with them.' 4.4 (a Gentile's idol is prohibited), 4.8 (a Gentile's winepress is prohibited), 4.9 (an Israelite and a Gentile cannot tread a winepress together), 4.10 (if a Gentile stands beside a cistern of wine and has lain on the vat it is prohibited), 4.11 (in a town where all of the residents are Gentiles, the wine is prohibited), 5.1 (restrictions around Israelites and Gentiles working together where some are permitted and some are not), and 5.12 where utensils purchased from a Gentile must be treated by immersing, scalding, placing in fire or cleaning. While there are times the \textit{m. Aboda Zarah} suggests a Gentile and an Israelite can eat together at a fair (\textit{m. Ab. Zar.} 5.5), there are also many restrictions around this occasion. For example, if an Israelite leaves the meal and later comes back, the food is now unclean and can no longer be consumed.
Separate thyself from the nations, and eat not with them:
And do not according to their works,
And become not their associate;
For their works are unclean,
And all their ways are a pollution and an abomination and uncleanness.

For the Jewish person remaining separate was essential as God could not mix the holy with the profane. This is evident in the Prayer of Benediction, Havdalah, which says,

Blessed are you, Lord our God, king of the world, who divides holy and profane, between light and darkness, between Israel and the peoples, between the seventh day and the sixth day of work. Blessed are you Lord, who divides between sacred and profane.

The mission to households has established a radically inclusive attitude to mission where there is a breaking down of concern over table fellowship, and the Zacchaeus pericope is a further example of this mission strategy in action. In fact, because it is the final pericope in the travel narrative and so culminates themes of the Gospel, this may be not only another recollection of the household mission, it may highlight this theme as of special interest to the Lukan Jesus. As Matson says, 'Jesus' declaration to Zacchaeus (in v. 9) highlights the sphere of the house as the place for the restoration and cleansing of "sinners."

Zacchaeus responds with joy and haste to Jesus’ command in v. 6 and Luke reiterates σπεύσας κατέβη. Zacchaeus also welcomes (ὑποδέχομαι) Jesus, another clear reference to hospitality. The notion of δέχομαι and its cognates often means to welcome or receive a guest (2:28; 9:5, 11, 53; 10:8, 10, 38; 19:6; Acts 7:59) and yet, clearly these references are set within mission mandates where the focus is on receiving not only the guest, but the message of the kingdom. The word-group is also used explicitly with regard to receiving the kingdom message (8:13; 16:9; 18:17; Acts 8:14; 11:1; 17:11). In 19:1-10, Fitzmyer notes that there is no mention of faith, as evidence for a vindication reading. Yet, the context for Zacchaeus

1035. Matson, Household Conversion, 74.
1036. Green, Gospel of Luke, 670. Green says both 'stay at your house' (v. 5) and ὑποδέχομαι (v. 6) represent hospitality.
welcoming Jesus suggests he is welcoming the kingdom and points to this encounter as salvific.

Zacchaeus' response to Jesus is not only to welcome him with haste, but with joy (χαίρω). His response with χαίρω, especially within the salvific context of v. 5, points the reader to his conversion.1038 We have noted the role of joy in the parable of the faithful shepherd (see chapter 5.3.4) and here we have another example where salvation and joy are linked.

Verse 7 forms a pivot in the narrative as the opinions of the crowd are revealed and they are πάντες (all) found grumbling (διαγογγύζω). We have seen in chapter 5.3.3.1 and section 6.1.5, that Luke uses this word pejoratively (5:29; 15:2) and that there is likely to be an exodus echo behind the word (Exod 15:24; 16:2, 7, 8, 9, 12; Num 11:1; 14:2, 27, 36). The crowd seem unable and unwilling to embrace Jesus' compassionate welcome of Zacchaeus and the crowd charge Zacchaeus as ἁµαρτωλός. Bovon highlights that 'Lukas hat seine Leserinnen und Leser an eifersüchtige Proteste im Kontext von Szenen der Vergebung, Versöhnung, Heilung oder Erlösung gewöhnt.'1039

Luke points to the crowd's charge as deficient through his use of διαγογγύζω, and scholars holding the vindication position have made the assumption that Zacchaeus must therefore be righteous. However, this does not necessarily have to follow. From a narrative perspective, the grumbling may imply that the crowd, and here Luke uses πάντες, do not understand who Jesus is and what his mission entails. It does not have to imply that Zacchaeus is δίκαιος.

The crowd's reaction is undoubtedly a result of their misunderstanding of the salvific nature of Jesus' encounter and invitation in vv. 5-6. They do not yet appear to understand that Jesus offers forgiveness of sins. Furthermore, the crowd's reaction may be a deliberate parallel to the disciples' lack of understanding at 18:34. The result is that at the end of Jesus' ministry outside Jerusalem, Luke makes it clear that neither the disciples nor the crowd understand his mission.

---

The negative reaction of the crowd parallels the reaction of the elder brother in the prodigal parable (15:25-32), and so looking to the wider Lukan narrative is again helpful. The older brother cannot accept his father's welcome of the younger son whose sin was so blatantly visible to the community. He cannot understand how their father has put the younger son's immense sin fully behind him when he simply returns home. This parallel story may be Luke's key to help the reader perceive that it is not that Zacchaeus has not sinned, but that forgiveness is complete through a turning to God.

There are other echoes between the two units that encourage the reader to view the pericope as a salvation story. The lost parables talk of being found within the context of repentance and joy. These explicit references in the parables find further expression in Zacchaeus who is one of the lost sheep of Israel that Jesus finds (19:9-10), the one who shows repentance through his action in responding to Jesus (19:5-8) and then joyfully responds to Jesus (19:6). There are also the linguistic parallels with the use of ζητέω (15:8; 19:3, 10), δεί (15:32; 19:5), χαίρω/χαρά (15:5, 7, 10, 32; 19:6), ἁμαρτωλός (15:2; 19:7) and ἀπόλλυ (15:4, 6, 8, 9, 17, 24, 32; 19:10). Thus, the Zacchaeus pericope resonates with the parable and it is likely that interpreting the latter narratively speaking (19:1-10), with respect to the former (18:9-14) is a natural response to a cohesive text. The parallels with the story of Levi further suggest that Zacchaeus is a sinner in need of repentance and this is a story of a sinner who finds salvation (see section 6.1.1.6).

More latterly, Rowe has noticed that 'Luke uses ἁμαρτ- cognates thirty-seven times in Luke-Acts, and in every case "sin" and "sinner" is a moral-theological category related to the need of repentance, forgiveness and salvation.' While the crowd has an incorrect understanding of the Lukan Jesus' view of ἁμαρτωλός (and δικαιός), Rowe is correct that the term is used by Luke to confirm this as a salvation story. Luke's biographical detail in 19:2 has already provided the reader with the parameters to establish that Zacchaeus is a sinner, and in view of the pejorative way Luke portrays the crowd, it may in fact point also to their sin in excluding Zacchaeus and grumbling at Jesus' action.

1040. Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 87. Italics mine.
In v. 8 Zacchaeus issues a statement of resolve that he will give half of his money to the poor and give back in four-fold restitution to anyone he has defrauded. At the first level, this resolve is a result of the saving action in vv. 5-6 rather than it being the moment that initiates his salvation. Yet, for Luke, knowing God is inextricably tied to ethical action as Zacchaeus demonstrates, and this ethical action is one important dimension in a multi-layered salvation. Zacchaeus' saving encounter with Jesus in his house therefore, results in an ethical response, for one who is saved is enabled to live a life that reflect God's character and nature. It is God's nature to care for the poor (Exod 22:21-24; Deut 10:17-19) and so in being forgiven (and saved), Zacchaeus is transformed ethically. Mitchell's argument therefore that Zacchaeus is justified by his good works is incorrect.  

The earlier interchange between Jesus and the lawyer (10:27), which draw on the Shema and Lev 19:18, demonstrate that loving God and loving people are tied together for Luke. Again, in the exchange between the rich ruler and Jesus, we see the same dynamic where loving God is tied to how we live. When Jesus quotes part of the decalogue in 18:20, he includes honouring parents which I suggest is from the first table of the law, the part which refers to loving God. Some scholars have wrongly noted that Luke only quotes the 'second table' of the Decalogue which relate to one's behaviour, yet in Jewish tradition, honouring parents is considered a part of the first table. There is considerable evidence for this. Philo Dec. 106 says,

After dealing with the seventh day, he gives the fifth commandment on the honour due the parents. This commandment he placed on the borderline between two sets of five; it is the last of the first set in which the most sacred injunctions are given and it adjoins the second set which contains the duties man to man.

---

1043. This understanding of the decalogue comes from the work of Diane Hakala, University of Cambridge, Oxbridge Seminar May 2011.
1044. See also Philo, Dec. 50-51. 'We find that he divided the ten into two sets of five which he engraved on two tablets, and the first five obtained the first place, while the other was awarded the second. Both are excellent and profitable for life...The superior set of five treats the following matters: the monarchical principle by which the world is governed: idols of stone and wood and images in general made by human hands: the sin of taking the name of God in vain: the reverent observance of the sacred seventh day as befits holiness: the duty of honouring parents, each separately and both in common. Thus one set of enactments begins with God the Father and Maker of all, and ends with parents who copy His nature by begetting particular persons. The other set of five contains all the prohibitions, namely adultery, murder,
Pseudo-Philo also seems to suggest that honouring parents is linked to the first tablet when he says, *Propter quod dixi eis ut diligerent patrem et matrem me honorificaverunt creatorum suum* (Whereas I told them to honour father and mother, they have dishonoured me their creator, *L.A.B. 44.7*). Similarly Pseudo-Phocylides says, 'First of all honour God, and thereafter your parents' (Pseudo-Phocylides 8).1045 Wilson agrees that Pseudo-Phocylides is including honouring parents in the first table when he says, 'Indeed, the combination may have been generally understood as a summary of the first table of the Decalogue.'1046

Furthermore, Josephus numbers the commandments in *Ant. 3.90* with the fifth being honoring parents, and then in *Ant. 3.101* says, 'he showed the two tablets on which were graven the ten words, five on either of them and the writing thereon was from the hand of God.' He thereafter says, 'honouring parents is second only to honouring God' (Josephus, *C. Ap. 2.206* cf. 217).

These examples show there was a strong tradition which suggests honouring parents was included on the first table of the law and when Jesus talks with the rich ruler he is not simply referring to ethical or moral commands, and which are in the second table, he is referring to the whole decalogue. Thus Jesus' challenge to the rich ruler to give up his possessions is inherently tied to the first table and what it means to love God. The two actions are not separated in the rich ruler story and neither can they be separated in 19:1-10.

Zacchaeus' saving encounter with Jesus in his house results in his ethical action, for, giving to the poor characterises God's identity. This resonates with Ezek 34's emphasis on the practical needs of the sheep being met; God wants his sheep found, fed, healed, and restored. Salvation is therefore about being found by the shepherd and then fed by the shepherd. This then, enables Zacchaeus to be a faithful shepherd for the poor by sharing in God's action in the world. Thus, in Zacchaeus' resolve, he takes on an aspect of God's mission, being his 'faithful shepherd' who gives half of his money to the poor and so cares for God's flock. This is the same cycle we saw in chapter 5.1 in the household mission when Jesus, the shepherd, sends the seventy to replicate his mission. As people become disciples in the Lukan narrative,

---

1046. Wilson, *Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides*, 82.
God's mission becomes their mission. Perhaps this is why the motif of shepherd is so appropriate in the Miletus speech; Jesus has been presented as the faithful shepherd in the Gospel and so this is who the early church leaders become, faithful shepherds of God's flock.

Mitchell's use of Luke 3:8 to validate actions as the basis for repentance and salvation is therefore flawed. John the Baptist says to 'bear fruits worthy of repentance' (3:8) and goes on to list many examples. Luke uses καρπός in a physical and spiritual sense, but here Luke uses it to convey the idea that our actions are an appropriate and visible response by the people of God. Luke does not suggest they are the component on our part that brings us into salvation, but that they are the natural consequences of good fruit coming from a good tree (6:43-45).

Godet and Ravens' reading of σταθείς in v. 8 as standing firm in self-belief, can equally be understood in its literal meaning as in 18:11; Acts 2:14; 17:22; 27:21, or as prefacing a significant statement as Marshall suggests. It does not need to support a vindication reading.

The ethical response of Zacchaeus is generous and exceeds the requirements of the law. With respect to extortion Lev 6:1-5 says you must return the principal amount plus one fifth of that sum, while 2 Kgdms 12:6 and Exod 22:1 require the amount plus a threefold penalty to be demanded of rustlers. In Antiquities Josephus writes similarly that the thief shall restore fourfold. The Talmud required twenty percent to be given to the poor rather than Zacchaeus' generous fifty percent, and also twenty percent for extortion rather than Zacchaeus' fourfold.

The idea that these present tense verbs show Zacchaeus' customary behaviour runs contrary to the narrative which presents him as lost to the community and therefore as excluded. If this extreme generosity was his norm, the crowd would not have called him a sinner and formed a physical barrier that he could not penetrate. Similarly, if this was his customary beh-

1048. 'He shall restore the lamb fourfold, because he did this thing, and because he had no pity.'
1049. 'When someone steals an ox or a sheep, and slaughters it or sells it, the thief shall pay five oxen for an ox, and four sheep for a sheep.'
1050. Josephus, Ant. 16.3.
haviour then Zacchaeus is more likely to have been called πτωχός and not πλούσιος. Money can only be given away this quickly a couple of times before you have little left.

There are two uses of κύριος in the verse; one by the author and one by Zacchaeus to Jesus. Zacchaeus' use of κύριος within the context of his statement of resolve most likely signals the reception of the 'Lord' of the house.¹⁰⁵² Rowe has convincingly argued that Luke shows Jesus to be ὁ κύριος from the womb,¹⁰⁵³ and that 19:8 expresses Lukan christology.¹⁰⁵⁴ It is consistent with the narrative's thrust to interpret Zacchaeus' words here to indicate his prior reception of Jesus as κύριος.

Verses 9 and 10 give the pericope the final stamp as a salvation story. Jesus declares that today salvation has come to Zacchaeus' house, for the Son of Man came to seek out and to save that which is lost (ἦλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ζητῆσαι καὶ σῶσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός; 19:10). Like the lost sheep in 15:3-7 Zacchaeus is now a person who is found, as is his house. As a Jew he is brought back into fellowship through Jesus' welcome of him, and as one cut off from his community he is now restored. The linguistic parallels of v. 5 and v. 9 make clear that it is in his house that salvation has occurred, and Jesus' statement simply echoes this reality. Just notes of vv. 9-10, 'Although "forgiveness" (ἄφεσις) is not pronounced in Luke 19:1-10, the declaration of salvation "today" implies the forgiveness of sins within the table fellowship of Jesus.'¹⁰⁵⁵ O'Hanlon rightly suggests that the searching out of the lost along his journey to Jerusalem is the whole point of Jesus' journey.¹⁰⁵⁶ To be lost, 19:10 clearly shows us, is to be in need of salvation.

As Mitchell has highlighted, Luke records Zacchaeus as υἱὸς Αβραὰµ and through this reference the reader is encouraged to recall Abraham's story. Mitchell however makes a great deal out of Abraham’s hospitality at the oaks of Mamre (Gen 18:8), and that Josephus and Philo

---

¹⁰⁵² Matson, Household Conversion, 73; Moessner, Lord of the Banquet, 169.
¹⁰⁵³ Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 27.
¹⁰⁵⁴ Rowe, Early Narrative Christology, 147.
¹⁰⁵⁵ Just, Ongoing Feast, 192.
¹⁰⁵⁶ O'Hanlon, 'Zacchaeus,' 15.
record the same encounter. He argues Luke has built the Zacchaeus pericope using Genesis 18 as his source and provides the following parallels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis 18</th>
<th>Luke 19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Lord appears to Abraham at the oak of Mamre (Gen 18:1)</td>
<td>Zacchaeus meets Jesus at the sycamore tree (19:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He entertains his guests under a tree (Gen 18:8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham looks up (ἀναβλέπω, ἔδον) and sees his visitors (Gen 18:2)</td>
<td>Jesus looks up at Zacchaeus (ἀναβλέπο) (19:5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When he saw them he ran (προστρέχω) to meet them (Gen 18:2)</td>
<td>Zacchaeus seeks to see (ἐδον) who Jesus is (19:3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He wishes they would not pass by him (Gen 18:3)</td>
<td>(no parallel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He runs to the herd (Gen 18:7)</td>
<td>(no parallel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham addresses his visitor as κύριε (Gen 18:3)</td>
<td>Zacchaeus addresses Jesus as κύριε (19:8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abraham hastens to the tent (Gen 18:6)</td>
<td>Zacchaeus hurries down the tree (19:6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There appears to be no doubt that there are linguistic parallels between the two stories, and that Abraham is an important figure for Luke (1:55, 73; 3:3, 34; 13:16, 28; 16:22-30; 19:9; 20:37). Mitchell therefore assumes that Abraham's act of hospitality is the point of the parallel, rather than the gracious action of God (Gen 18:10). This overemphasis on Abraham's good works in providing hospitality means Mitchell fails to recognise the narrative thrust of the Abraham-Sarah story which was the fulfillment of the promise of Gen 12:1-3, 15:1-6 that God would make them a great nation with many descendants, and not on Abraham's actions.

---

1057. Josephus, Ant. 1.196 'When God had pronounced this doom upon the Sodomites, Abraham, while sitting beside the oak of Mambre before the door of the courtyard, espied three angels, and taking them for strangers, arose and saluted them and invited them to lodge with him and partake of his hospitality;' Philo Abr. 107-114 retells the story of Gen 18 while in Abr. 114 Philo reflects on this event saying, 'We have described Abraham's hospitality which was but a by-product of a greater virtue. That virtue is piety, of which we have spoken before, and is quite clearly seen in this story, even if we think of the strangers as men.' Here we note that his primary virtue was piety toward God and this is evidenced in his hospitality. The hospitality he showed his guests is thus secondary.

The key barrier to the promise was of course Sarah's barrenness and Gen 18 functions to show the progression of events whereby she falls pregnant with a son (Gen 18:10). Mitchell is correct that the story of Abraham in Genesis 18 and the story of Zacchaeus have strong linguistic parallels, but to suggest these imply 'justification by works'\textsuperscript{1059} is to misread both stories.

The primary action in the story of Zacchaeus is Jesus who seeks out the man in the tree and invites himself to his home. It is Jesus' actions that are the reason Zacchaeus is transformed and is able to support the poor financially. Similarly, in Genesis 18 it is the Lord's actions in coming to Abraham through the three visitors that allow the promise to be fulfilled when Sarah falls pregnant with Isaac. While both Abraham and Zacchaeus offer hospitality, this is not the key event in either narrative, the key event is in the 'Lord' of each story coming to each and doing the impossible (Gen 18:14; Luke 18:27).\textsuperscript{1060} In Genesis it is providing a son to a couple who are old (Gen 18:11), and in Luke it is in a Jewish toll collector who works for the Romans, finding salvation. The parallel with the story of the rich man brings the idea that nothing is impossible for God, to the fore (see section 6.1.1.1).

This study suggests that Luke's mention of Zacchaeus as a υἱὸς Ἄβραάμ works in three ways. Firstly, it affirms that Zacchaeus is Jewish, as the reader has surmised from his name (19:2). We know this is significant to the story because it sets up the tension between his occupation as ἀρχιτελώνης and his fellow Jews.\textsuperscript{1061}

Secondly, it does help us recall the wider story of Abraham. As a son of Abraham we would expect Zacchaeus to be entitled to the blessings of Abraham, and yet the Lukan story has showed us this now comes through a response to Jesus rather than a right due to one's ethnicity.\textsuperscript{1062} Luke has already shown the reader that belonging to the Jewish race is not an automatic reason for blessing. John the Baptist says,

---

Bear fruits worthy of repentance. Do not begin to say to yourself, 'We have Abraham as our ancestor'; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. Even now the axe is lying at the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire (3:8-9).

This is also reflected in Jewish tradition seen in m. 'Abot. 5:19 which says,

Anyone in whom are these three traits is one of the disciples of Abraham, our father; But [if he bears] three other traits, he is one of the disciples of Balaam, the wicked: (1) a generous spirit, (2) a modest mien, and (3) a humble soul – he is one of the disciples of Abraham, our father. (1) A grudging spirit, (2) an arrogant mien, and (3) a proud soul – he is one of the disciples of Balaam, the wicked.

Thirdly, it recalls the story of the crippled woman who is θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ (13:16; see section 6.1.1.4). Describing someone as a daughter or son of Abraham only occurs twice in the Gospel, giving these two stories a narrative link. Mitchell's argument that Luke is pre-eminently highlighting Zacchaeus' action of hospitality authenticating him as a child of Abraham, is further unseated here.1063 If his argument was true it should also be true for the crippled woman who is θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ (13:16). Yet, the crippled woman pericope (13:11-17) does not justify her healing by any actions she performs on behalf of the poor. When Jesus approaches the crippled woman on the sabbath Jesus is the one who initiates the encounter, as with Zacchaeus. Jesus says to her, γυναι, ἀπολέλυσαι τῆς ἀσθενείας σου (13:12). She is set free by Jesus and not in any way through her own actions, as shown by the passive form of ἀπολύω. The perfect tense further indicates the ongoing nature of this healing. Jesus' action is an act that releases her from the power of Satan (13:16), and so Jesus reasons it is very appropriate that she is set free on the sabbath day. However nowhere is this status as θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ justified by her ability to help the poor; quite the reverse, she is the poor person who is in need of help. Although Mitchell makes much of interpreting Zacchaeus' narrative in light of the reference to υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ, the same methodology does not hold for the parallel passage where the woman is θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ.

The two stories noticeably show Luke's special interest in paired stories of women and men. I suggest that the use of the expression υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ, which inevitably recalls the θυγατέρα Ἀβραάμ, in this final pericope in the travel narrative shows another aspect of universal salva-

tion; salvation for both genders. We have seen through a parallel with the rich ruler that salvation is available for both rich and poor and here we have salvation for both men and women. The Davidic shepherd king seeks out and saves the lost on every mountain (Ezek 34:6; see chapter 2.2.4) and he seeks for the lost sheep until he finds it (Luke 15:4; see chapter 5.3).

Further, in Luke's uses the expression that σήμερον σωτηρία τῷ οίκῳ τούτῳ ἐγένετο, the reader sees that salvation is brought to the house rather than simply an individual. This is a fulfillment of the household mission (9:1-6; 10:1-12) but also a prefiguring of the Acts Gentile household conversion narratives (see chapter 5.1).\textsuperscript{1064} The house is the place where meals are shared and throughout the ministry of Jesus, a place where religious and social barriers are levelled.\textsuperscript{1065} When Jesus dines with Zacchaeus, the barrier of his uncleanness is broken, and the reader sees a further dimension to the radically inclusive Lukan salvation; salvation of both clean and unclean, and ultimately both Jew and Gentile. Matson goes so far as to suggest that 'Jesus converts a household by entering and staying in the house of a proto-Gentile.'\textsuperscript{1066} In many respects Zacchaeus is considered so unclean that he is like a 'proto-Gentile.' Jesus' encounter with Zacchaeus certainly gives a hint that mission is extended to both Jew and Gentile and that Lukan salvation is for all ethnicities. This resonates with the Davidic shepherd king who did not leave any sheep on the hillside, but sought out and found all the sheep (Ezek 34:11-16), and the inclusive salvation of the Davidic shepherd king in Micah, Jeremiah, Zechariah and \textit{Psalms of Solomon} 17 (see sections 2.2.2; 2.2.3; 2.2.5; 2.3.1). It also coheres with Luke 15:1-7 and the lost parables in general, when Jesus criticises the religious leaders who are not seeking the lost sheep (see chapter 5.3). Faithful shepherds do not leave one sheep lost in the wilderness, but leave the ninety-nine and search until they find it.

It is true there is no crowd response in this salvation story, but coming at the end of the travel narrative, this pericope ends instead with a summary statement of Jesus' mission as the Da-

\textsuperscript{1064} This forms the central thesis of Matson's monograph, \textit{Household Conversion Narratives in Acts: Pattern and Interpretation}.


\textsuperscript{1066} Matson, \textit{Household Conversion Narratives}, 75.
vidic shepherd king. The shepherd's mission is complete outside of Jerusalem, salvation is available to all socio-economic groups, both genders and it points to all ethnicities. Therefore suggest that Luke does not end with a crowd response because he instead transitions the story line into the Jerusalem narrative, where Jesus will enter Jerusalem to battle Satan for the lost. Furthermore, not all salvation stories end with a crowd response. The healing of Simon's mother-in-law (4:38-39), the hemorrhaging woman (8:43-48) and the ten lepers (17:11-19) also do not end with a crowd response and yet each are clearly salvific encounters with Jesus.

Luke ends with ἡλθεν γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐξητήσας καὶ σώσαι τὸ ἀπολωλός (19:10). This Son of Man saying is well accepted as a reference to Ezek 34 and it is generally agreed that the primary image here is of the Davidic Shepherd who is faithful to the Lord who shepherds his people. A faithful shepherd looks for the lost (τὸ ἀπολωλός) until he finds it (Ezek 34:4, 16; Luke 15:4; 19:10), and then saves the sheep (Ezek 34:22; Luke 19:9-10). While the self-designation ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου raises questions as to whether Jesus actually spoke these words, in this pericope there is a clearly defined royal Davidic context where Jesus speaks with authority, and the historical question is outside the parameters of this study.

We have noted earlier that the Zacchaeus encounter is preceded by the blind man calling twice, Ἰησοῦ υἱὲ Δαυὶ (18:38, 39), a feature which marks an explicit return to the Davidic theme, and a royal thread in general. Now in 19:11-27 we find a parable which is full of the language of royal power, followed by Jesus entering Jerusalem as ὁ βασιλεύς

1067. The context of Jesus healing many people (4:40), a demon declaring Jesus is the 'Son of God' (4:41) and Jesus rebuking the fever of Simon's mother-in-law (4:39) suggest this is a salvific story. Healing stories often represent Lukian salvation as salvation is multi-layered in Luke. Examples where salvation and healing are linked are seen clearly in both of the sending narratives (9:1-2; 10:1-12). Further BDAG notes healing as a salvific category, 'σώζω,' BDAG, 982.


1071. In the parable, the nobleman went to get βασιλεία (royal power) for himself (19:12), and so he summons ten δοῦλοι to whom he gives a mina with which to trade (19:13). A mina equates to one hundred drachmas, approximately four months wages (Bock, Luke, 1533). The narrator shows that the men did not want anyone βασιλεύσαι ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς (19:14), however the nobleman did receive βασιλεία and he ordered the servants to explain the results of their trading (19:15). The first two servants had made a considerable amount of money (19:16-19) and were rewarded for their work, while the third slave had buried his money and was only able to return it to his master. In v. 27 we hear again that the people did
This shows a special interest of Luke which we signalled in chapter 4.3.5.3.3. The Markan account says, ὡσαννά· εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου (Mark 11:9) while Luke writes, εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ὁ βασιλεύς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου. This redaction shows a Lukan interest in Jesus as king. It also suggests an echo of Zechariah 9:9-10 is likely, and that Jesus enters Jerusalem as a righteous and salvific king who brings peace (see chapter 2.6). Zechariah 9:9-10 says, 

Χαίρε σφόδρα, θύγατερ Σιων...ιδοὺ ὁ βασιλεύς σου ἐρχεται σοι, δίκαιος καὶ σώζων αὐτός...καὶ ἐξολεθρεύσει ἅρµατα ἐξ ἔφραιμ καὶ ἵππον ἐξ ἱερουσαλήμ...καὶ ἐπλήθης καὶ εἰρήνη ἐξ ἔθνων καὶ πλῆθος καὶ εἰρήνη ἐξ ἐθνῶν, καὶ κατάρξει ὑδάτων ἕως θαλάσσης καὶ ποταµῶν διεκβολὰς γῆς.

Rejoice exceedingly daughter Zion...Behold your king comes to you, righteous and salvific is he...and he will utterly destroy chariots from Ephraim and cavalry from Jerusalem...and there shall be abundance and peace from nations.

This passage from Zechariah resonates with the Lukan Jesus on several levels. We know that Luke presents Jesus as the one who is δίκαιος (23:47; Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14), that he is Saviour (1:69; 2:11; Acts 5:31; 13:23), and that he is the one who brings εἰρήνη (1:79; 2:14; 7:50; 8:48; 10:5; 24:36; Acts 10:36), features of this king in Zechariah. Both figures also ride on a πῶλος which has never been ridden (Zech 9:9; Luke 19:30), and bring salvation to all the earth (Zech 9:10; Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8). These parallels suggest Zechariah 9 is behind this entry into Jerusalem and that Luke is highlighting Jesus the king who is righteous and salvific entering Jerusalem. However, as Jesus is to enter Jerusalem to suffer and die (9:22; 18:31-33) this also coheres with Zechariah's picture of the suffering shepherd. As we saw in 2.6, the shepherd suffers for and with the people (Zech 11:4-5) and his suffering leads to salvation for the house of David (Zech 13:1).
Furthermore, there is a narrative link back to the infancy narrative where the Davidic motif is explicit and where angels sing of God's salvific peace. The two texts say:

δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ
cαὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας (2:14).

eὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου·
ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις (19:38).

The two verses can be considered as parallel through their similar hymn-like structure, the repeated use of δόξα, ὑψίστος and εἰρήνη in both hymns and the deliberately contrasted reference to γῆ in the birth narrative and οὐρανός in the triumphal entry. These linguistic and structural features suggest their messages are complementary.

The reader finds a deliberate return to the Davidic strand of the infancy narrative where Jesus has been indirectly introduced as the Davidic shepherd king. At the end of Jesus' ministry years and the beginning of the Jerusalem section, it is clear to the reader that Jesus enters Jerusalem as a particular type of king, a Davidic shepherd king who is still seeking the lost sheep on his journey.

In Summary: We have found that the vindication reading of 19:1-10 is an inadequate reading of the text. Salvation in this pericope comes from God in the form of the Davidic Shepherd-king who seeks out the lost Zacchaeus, welcomes him, forgives him and saves him. Salvation is not achieved by Zacchaeus simply giving his possessions away, but by responding to Jesus, the Saviour, with immediacy and joy. The ethical reform that follows is a result of a saving encounter with the Davidic shepherd king. This seems to be a faithful reading of the Zacchaeus pericope which takes the nature of διήγησις seriously where a text is interpreted only within the context of the text as a whole. Zacchaeus is ἄµαρτολός and in need of a Saviour, but his humility in action to ὁ κύριος sends him home justified like the toll collector of chapter 18. He is now saved in response to the crowd's question (18:26), he is given sight like the blind man (18:42), he is forgiven much like the sinful woman (7:50), he is a sinner who has come to repentance fulfilling Jesus' mission in Levi's house (5:32) and he is a son of

Abraham even as the crippled woman is a daughter of Abraham (13:16). Indeed, salvation has come to Zacchaeus' house.

6.4 What does this tell us of Jesus as the Davidic Shepherd King?

Firstly, the Davidic shepherd seeks (ζητέω) the lost sheep (19:10). While the narrative says that Zacchaeus is seeking (ζητέω) to see Jesus (19:3), and so Zacchaeus climbs a tree so that he may see him as he passes by, the narrative ultimately shows that it is Jesus who is seeking out Zacchaeus in his journey to Jerusalem. Yet Jesus does not only want to seek out Zacchaeus, he wants to stay with him. This, as we have seen, is tantamount to an act of forgiveness and a sign of salvation. The reader therefore finds that the Davidic shepherd Luke portrays is one who seeks (ζητέω) the lost sheep, a quality of Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd (Ezek 34:16).

Secondly, he saves (σώζω) the lost sheep (19:10). In this pericope we see Zacchaeus is saved on several levels as salvation is multilayered in Luke's Gospel and affects various areas of life (see section 6.3). He is saved from the shame of exclusion in the community, as the narrative suggests his new ethical actions will result in the community accepting him. He is also saved eschatologically through his encounter with Jesus. It is interesting that Luke has two tree stories; Zacchaeus who climbs a sycamore tree and the criminal on the cross (23:32-43). Acts 5:30; 10:39 and 13:29 describe the cross as the tree (ξύλον). Jesus' words of promise to the criminal on the tree who acknowledged Jesus was an innocent victim say, ἥμην σοι λέγω σήμερον μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ (23:43). While this does not tell us in linear time when he is with Jesus in Paradise, it does confirm eschatological salvation.

These parallels support an eschatological salvation in 19:9-10 for Zacchaeus. Salvation is a key theme in Luke and forms a central core to the identity of Jesus the Saviour. Luke 19:10 adds additional colour to that theme by making explicit that he is the Davidic shepherd who saves, and he demonstrates the care of a faithful shepherd. The faithful

---

1076. 'σώξω', BDAG, 982.
1077. BDAG notes this when it classifies the use of σώξω in 19:10 as, 'to save or preserve from transcendent danger or destruction; save/preserve from eternal death.' BDAG, 'σώξω', 982.
shepherd as we have seen is the one who is attentive to the needs of the sheep and is not self-seeking. By contrast, the shepherds in Ezekiel were unfaithful and fed themselves rather than the sheep.

Thirdly, the Davidic shepherd knows Zacchaeus, the lost sheep. In 19:5 the dialogue shows the reader that Jesus knows Zacchaeus' name and even where to find him. The reader should consider this significant information as Luke does not often name people in his narrative, and this suggests Luke is drawing the readers' attention to this narrative feature.

Fourthly, the shepherd is an inclusive shepherd whose focus is on the people lost on the margins of society. Jesus accepts Zacchaeus as a Jewish Son of Abraham (19:9) but also as one who is marginalised by his unclean status, and therefore to the community he is unclean like a Gentile. For the Davidic shepherd, salvation is universal and open to all both clean and unclean, Jew and Gentile, and shades of both are seen in the story of Zacchaeus. Furthermore, it is notable that the Zacchaeus pericope demonstrates that the rich can also be saved, a question the reader has had after the encounter with the rich man (18:18-30). The Gospel has made much of the salvation of the poor grounded in Jesus' declaration in the synagogue at Nazareth (4:18) and Jesus is constantly seen going to the poor person on the margins. This includes widows, the sick, the Gentiles, and the ritually impure. Furthermore, Jesus is presented in the infancy narrative as a poor person himself, evidenced by his parents' offer-

---

1079. The infancy narrative is the exception in Luke's narrative, and many characters are named (Zechariah, Elizabeth, Mary, Joseph, Simeon and Hanna), while most encounters in Jesus' ministry years have unnamed characters. Examples from Jesus' early ministry years are, the man with the unclean spirit (4:33), Simon's mother-in-law is not named (4:38), the leper (5:12), the paralysed man (5:18), man with the withered hand (6:6), the centurion (7:2), the widow from Nain (7:12), and the sinful woman (7:37). This pattern continues throughout the narrative with only a few characters actually named. These characters are Levi (5:27), Simon the Pharisee (7:40), Mary and Martha (10:38-39), Lazarus (16:20), Barabbas (23:18), and Joseph of Arimathea (23:50).

1080. There are five widow stories in the Gospel; Hanna in the temple (2:37), the widow of Zarephath (4:25), the widow of Nain (7:11), the persistent widow (18:5) and the poor widow (21:2). This feature is noted in many studies. For a survey and analysis see Robert M. Price, The Widow Traditions in Luke-Acts: A Feminist-Critical Scrutiny (SBLDS 155; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997).

1081. For example Luke shows Jesus helping the centurion (7:1-10), the Gerasene demoniac (8:26-39), and Jesus stops the disciples cursing the Samaritan village (9:52). He also tells a parable of the good Samaritan where the Samaritan and not the religious leaders demonstrate the appropriate response to the injured man (10:30-37).

1082. He heals the bleeding woman (8:43-48), the lepers (5:12-16; 17:11-17), and the blind man (18:35-43).
In the Zacchaeus pericope therefore, we finally have a salvific encounter of a wealthy person. This is a highly unexpected literary twist, and one that signals an end to the travel narrative as there is a sense of completeness to Jesus' mission where all can be saved. Finally, we see the designation 'son of Abraham' (19:9) recalling the 'daughter of Abraham' (13:16), revealing a Davidic shepherd king who welcomes both genders.

Jesus is therefore the Davidic shepherd of the rich and the poor, the Jew and the Gentile, and men and women. Luke paints this Davidic Shepherd as accepting anyone who comes to him. The inclusive nature of the Lukan Gospel is another well recognised feature of the narrative. From Simeon's oracle (2:32), the reader knows that salvation is for the Gentiles, and the Nazareth Manifesto has also made clear that Jesus, like Elijah and Elisha before him, has come to bring relief to Gentiles. In the Zacchaeus pericope we see it broaden out even further beyond ethnicity and to include both rich and poor.

Fifthly, Luke presents the Davidic shepherd as a royal and kingly figure who brings peace.

Sixthly, the Davidic Shepherd endorses the actions of Zacchaeus when he gives money to the poor out of his abundance. Jesus' action in calling to Zacchaeus and saving him are generous and so Zacchaeus responds generously by giving half of everything he owns to the poor with the use of ὑπῆρχον suggesting literally half of his possessions. In this ethical action, Za-

1083. We know they are poor in the narrative when Mary and Joseph offer a pair of turtle doves or two young pigeons, the sin offering designated in Lev 12:8 for ones who cannot afford the lamb without blemish (Lev 12:6).
1084. The widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian are not Jews (4:25-27).
1086. ὑπάρχω, BDAG, 1029.
cchaeus takes on the mission of Jesus, the faithful shepherd, by caring for the physical needs of the poor.

This is a clear outworking of Ezek 34:16 where God says he will guard the strong sheep so that the weaker or more vulnerable sheep are protected. As we know Zacchaeus is a man of influence in the Roman world and the text implies he has made much of his great wealth through extortion (συκοφαντέω; 19:8). Yet in the development of the story, Zacchaeus is transformed by his saving encounter with Jesus and makes significant changes to what he does with his wealth. In this we see that Jesus has indeed looked after not only Zacchaeus' interests, but those of the poor with whom he works as toll collector. Here Luke shows that the Davidic shepherd has been watching or guarding the strong.

Seventhly, the Davidic shepherd desires a response of haste and joy. Jesus requested that Zacchaeus σπεύσας κατάβηθι in v. 5, and in v. 6 we read of Zacchaeus' response with σπεύσας κατέβη. As the narrative uses a repetition of Jesus' command, coupled with the use of χαίρω, we find a model response to Jesus. We noted also that Zacchaeus welcomes (ὑποδέχομαι) Jesus, favoured Lukan language for welcoming the kingdom, further suggesting Zacchaeus' response as enabling salvation.

Finally, we should acknowledge that the narrative itself stresses that Jesus' identity as a Davidic shepherd is a significant one in the Gospel, for it comes in the final encounter in the travel narrative. This must be considered a deliberate location and choice by the author. The heart of the seeking and saving Davidic shepherd king is to bring salvation to the lost. This is the action of bringing good news to the poor, proclaiming ἄφεσίν (forgiveness of sins/release) to the captives, recovery of sight to the spiritually and physically blind and helping the oppressed go free. The ministry of Jesus is characterised by these things and the way in which they are carried out is as the faithful shepherd who always seeks out and saves the lost. The Gospel shows that no one is outside the bounds of the saving shepherd, neither Jew nor Gentile, rich nor poor, male nor female. This conclusion is only reached finally through the story of Zacchaeus. This makes Marshall's comments accurate, that 19:10 sums up the central
message of the Gospel and further, Miura's comment that in 'Luke 19, Jesus' earthly ministry is summarised with Davidic shepherd imagery,' holds true.\textsuperscript{1087}


The logical step after recognising the truth of Marshall and Miura's statements regarding Luke 19:10 and hearing the echoes of the Davidic shepherd king in the Gospel, is to recognise its resonance with the programmatic saying of the Gospel (4:18-19) and then consider what this might mean for reading Luke.

We know Luke brings the Nazareth sermon forward in his Gospel and develops the content considerably from Mark. It holds a unique place in the Lukan narrative. We also know that the Lukan Jesus' care for the poor and marginalised is very prominent in the text. After the Isaianic quote in 4:18-19, which is at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, we see Jesus demonstrating this mission in pericope after pericope in the narrative. Jesus is constantly stopping his journey for those in need, and this shows how he fulfils the programmatic saying.

As Jesus stops for each person however, I also hear the echo of the Davidic shepherd of Ezek 34 whose job is to reach to sheep who are lost on the hills and mountains, so that all are brought salvation. I further note that 19:10 ends Jesus' ministry years outside Jerusalem, and wonder about the placement of this saying at the telos of Jesus' journey, and the vision at 4:18-19 which begins his ministry. This leads me to propose that Luke has a second programmatic passage, and that 19:10 functions as a programmatic inclusio which echoes and defines the first saying. The Spirit of the Lord has anointed Jesus, Luke says in 4:18-19, so that he will bring good news to the poor, to proclaim release to the captives, recovery of sight to the blind, to let the oppressed go free and to proclaim the year of the Lord's favour. I suggest that this ministry is carried out as a faithful shepherd. In many ways the two sayings make the same point, while the second defines how that ministry is carried out. It is carried out as God's faithful shepherd.

The impact of 19:10 as a *summative* statement of what has gone before ultimately paves the way for a recollection of 4:18-19, and allows us, perhaps even demands, that we hear as Miura heard, Luke summarise Jesus' earthly ministry as that of the *Davidic Shepherd*. It is the blank in the narrative where the author 'does not set the whole picture before the reader,'* but asks them to draw the inference for themselves. It is also an example of Buber's *estrangement* where two remote texts are related and the texts attract the reader to what is unique or exceptional (see chapter 1.2). As Buber notes, this allows for significant meaning to emerge as the directing tool draws the reader to a conclusion. Here, Jesus' ministry to the poor is enacted in his role as the Davidic shepherd king.

It is not just the placement of the two passages and that they echo each other thematically that lends support to this proposal; I think there are other signs that this may be a possible reading for Luke. Firstly, we have already noted that the programmatic saying has a chiastic focus on the recovery of sight to the blind and that this idea of 'seeing' is used in a salvific sense for Luke. We have seen this confirmed in 7:21-22 and made visible when Jesus heals the blind man in 18:35-43. This is the pericope immediately prior to the Zacchaeus story when Jesus' ministry outside Jerusalem has its culmination or goal. While the healing of the blind man is a triple tradition passage, we have seen that Luke has inserted the Zacchaeus story immediately afterwards, suggesting that there is a cumulative sense of *telos*, whereby Luke has linked two passages together that bring a fulfillment to the programmatic saying. That is, we read Jesus fulfilling the heart of the Isaianic passage (Isa 61:1-2) in the healing of the blind man, and then restating its message clothed in the language of Ezekiel's shepherd. This shows a significant narrative connection between the beginning and end of Jesus' ministry.

Secondly, the gospel for Luke is about the forgiveness of sins (5:17-26, 29-32; 7:36-50; 11:4; 15; 19:1-10; 23:39-43; 24:7, 47) and Luke has many pericopae revisioning the notion of ἀμαρτολός, but it is as the Davidic shepherd that Jesus shows the way ahead. In particular, the Davidic shepherd gathers in the sheep and feeds them. While Jesus' ministry is characterised by moving from one meal to another, so too Ezekiel 34 has a key focus on the sheep being fed, so much so that we have seen the prophet use βόσκω eleven times in the one chap-

---
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ter. The prophet is convinced God is concerned that his people are fed. At the time of the Gospel's writing the religious elite had so many *halakhic* practices that they had become defined by their exclusion of people at meals (see chapters 5.3.3.3, 6.3). Jesus instead, went to the heart of the matter by dealing with sin and welcoming and eating with all who would dine with him. Further, he then sent the seventy as lambs in the household mission into Gentile territory, a prefigurement of the Acts household mission into Gentile territory. This Gentile mission is hinted at in the Nazareth sermon by the references to the widow of Zarephath and Naaman the Syrian (4:25-28), and is seen in the Zacchaeus pericope also with Zacchaeus' household mission as 'a proto-Gentile' mission. He is the final example in the ministry years where we see one who is materially rich to whom the good news of salvation is brought, and who finds forgiveness of sins (갃; 4:18) and gives half of his possessions for the benefit of the poor.

These two sayings do seem to balance one another and both seek to describe Jesus' mission to the lost. Luke describes people as poor at the beginning of his ministry (4:18) and lost at the end of his ministry (19:10), and both summarise the vision of Jesus' earthly ministry. Their structural placement at either end of Jesus' ministry is an indicator of a theological feature for Luke. He has the Lukan Jesus going to the poor lost sheep, and with the care of a faithful shepherd, he gathers them in to the flock. As Luke understands salvation, not one is to be left out.

### 6.6 Summary

As we have examined Jesus' final encounter in the travel narrative we have seen that the Zacchaeus story is a salvation story and not a vindication story. Although the present tense is used for the verbs δίδωμι and ἀποδίδωμι in 19:8, the thrust of the pericope is overwhelmingly that of a salvation story. Luke returns to language and themes of both the infancy narrative and the ministry years and ultimately shows that salvation is available for all people, clean and unclean, Jew and Gentile, rich and poor, and men and women. The salvific act is centered in Zacchaeus' house, an example of household mission from the mission of the seventy and a prefigurement to the Gentile household mission of Acts. The ethical reform of the ἀρχιτελώνης is directly related to the salvific act of vv. 5-6 as salvation is multi-layered in
Luke. Zacchaeus is saved to the community, from exclusion and gains eternal life as he responds to Jesus with haste and with joy. At such a pivotal narrative juncture therefore, there is a completeness to Jesus' ministry outside Jerusalem. While the Gospel has laid particular emphasis on God's concern for the poor and his great demands on the rich, finally we see a rich person enter the kingdom. The crowd has recently called out, 'who then can be saved?' (18:26) after Jesus has asked the rich ruler to sell his possessions and give them to the poor, and in Zacchaeus an answer is finally given.

We then considered how 19:10 adds to our knowledge of the shepherd motif. We found the shepherd seeks out the lost sheep that they might be saved. He knows the sheep by name and is inclusive of ethnicity, status and gender. He is a shepherd who brings peace to the community and supports ethical action on behalf of the poor. The Davidic shepherd king desires a response of haste and joy when he calls to the one who is lost.

We finally made clear that Luke's narrative makes rhetorical use of the Davidic shepherd king motif by placing this saying, which echoes the programmatic saying of 4:18-19, as the final encounter of the ministry outside Jerusalem of the Lukan Jesus. The Zacchaeus pericope is an insertion into the Markan narrative and allows for the reader to see Jesus as he turns to his work in Jerusalem, with the clothes of a Davidic shepherd who cares for each individual sheep. Miura's statement that the Davidic shepherd sums up the earthly ministry of Jesus holds true.

We then suggested that the programmatic saying which comes at the beginning of the Galilean ministry does not function alone, but is echoed by 19:10 and the two sayings work together to form a *programmatic inclusio*. The first saying describes the scope of Jesus' mission and the second saying describes how the mission is enacted. That is, Jesus' mission to the poor is as the faithful Davidic shepherd king, who is constantly seeking out and saving the lost.
Chapter 7
The Davidic Shepherd King in the Lukan Narrative

In this investigation we have seen that Luke has crafted the narrative of Jesus so that the reader learns not only about his salvific mission to the poor and the lost, but we also learn how he carries out his mission. That is, he does so as God's faithful shepherd constantly reaching to the margins of society for the lost sheep whom he saves and restores to the community. His ministry is characterised by dining and journeying with toll collectors and sinners from whom the Pharisees and scribes distanced themselves, and as he does so he enacts a radical inclusiveness, a gospel for all people.

As we noted in chapter one, Luke uses a variety of Christological terms in his narrative and the Davidic title stands alongside titles such as Lord, Messiah, and Saviour which clearly take a central role.

The main result of our thesis is to give a more complete understanding of the character and task of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts who fulfils the role of faithful shepherd by his care of all people regardless of their ritual purity status or the cost of the task. He is the one in whom peace is brought to earth in the form of salvation and he is the one who exhibits the Godly traits of a leader. The Christological contribution this study offers is one of nuancing the already recognised Davidic Messiah in Luke, so that the shades of the shepherd who protects, feeds, guards and cares for all God's flock, is recognised. It does not seek to over-turn any other Christology, but shows that the role of Luke's Davidic Messiah reaches to the ends of the earth (24:47; Acts 1:8) because God's salvific peace is for all people and it is God's desire that not even one sheep should be lost. The theme of universal salvation which permeates Acts is thus the outworking of a Shepherd who saves both Jew and Gentile.

In chapter one we established the rationale for a narrative methodology that draws on a solid exegetical base, noting that Luke has stated he is writing a διήγησις (1:1). We noted especially that narrative is cumulative and works toward its telos, and also how narrative is cohesive.

and the Lukan narrative is a whole which can interpret itself. We saw that the ordering of narrative is an important semantic tool, and especially that the beginnings of narratives are important as they set the parameters for the on-going story. Further, we considered how gaps and blanks in a narrative are deliberate and create opportunities for the reader to engage in the meanings of texts, and how repetition has a clear role in creating a Leitwort which reveals and clarifies an author's meaning. This repetition can involve an individual word or a semantic cluster of words and can happen with great effect over a distance in a text and also a motif's efficacy is strengthened when it occurs at strategic places in the narrative. In identifying gaps and blanks and Leitwortstil, the reader is logically restrained by the thrust of the text, and thus we considered criteria that strengthen the likelihood of a motif and its efficacy.

We noted the value of examining echoes in the Lukan narrative as Luke's writing style is more likely to allude to a passage rather than use a direct quote. We adopted Hays' seven tests for echoes and have used this tool repeatedly as we examined various passages.

In chapter two we found that the motif of shepherd is used from the very earliest stages of the story of Israel conveying God's care and protection of his people. The story of the exodus is often recalled in the psalms where God is the shepherd and Israel is the flock. We also saw that David is seen as God's new shepherd for Israel. The Davidic shepherd king is a consistent thread in the times of the prophets who used the motif to convey both judgment on Israel's leaders and the hope of a new Davidic shepherd king who would rule all the earth with justice and peace. We noted that in the Second Temple period the motif still had currency to describe God's care and protection of Israel and how in 1 Enoch this expressed an eschatological perspective. We also found that in the writings of Philo, Pseudo-Philo and Josephus shepherds were understood positively.

In chapter three we found that the shepherd motif is tied very closely to the story of David. From a narrative perspective the shepherd motif kept recurring during David's early years in Jesse's household to his anointing as the shepherd of Israel. It was in the background of the Davidic covenant, Nathan's parable and the sin of the census which is at the coda of David's life. We found therefore, that when we talk of David and his kingship, his identity as a shepherd is an inseparable element.
With this in mind, in chapter four we considered the Davidic theme at the beginning of the Gospel narrative (Luke 1-2). We examined each of the direct references to David, the related language of sonship, Bethlehem and shepherd and echoes of David's story, arguing that these associated cluster of ideas formed a strong Leitwort which were deliberately chosen by the author to underpin the on-going narrative. This led us to conclude that Luke 1-2 is crafted to highlight the Davidic story, but that this is coloured by the motif of the shepherd king. We found that the question of why the angels went to the shepherds in the birth narrative is best explained with reference to the messianic shepherd of Micah 5. Luke's reference to the πόλιν Δαυίδ ἡτὶς καλεῖται Βηθλέεμ, functions as a directing tool toward a new type of king and kingdom under the care of a Davidic shepherd. This is supported by Luke's genealogy which does not follow Matthew's line through Solomon, but instead, points to Jeremiah's prophecy (Jer 22:28-30) where the kingly line would be superseded by the Davidic shepherd king from Jer 23. This king's rule is characterised by justice, righteousness and salvation which resonates with the Lukan Jesus.

Further, Luke points to Jesus' kingship as distinct from that of Augustus. Luke views the Davidic shepherd king as superior and vastly more powerful than the Imperial world. He suggests that Jesus' kingship is characterised by righteousness and peace, features of Micah's messianic shepherd.

In chapter five we considered the shepherd saying in 10:3 in the household mission mandate where Jesus sends the seventy out as a shepherd, and how in enacting his mission, the disciples act as faithful shepherds who eat with anyone and bring God's salvific peace. We noted the use of τὸ μικρὸν ποἶμνον in 12:32 in the context of Jesus' teaching on God's care and provision where we found an echo of Ezek 34 and how this placed Jesus in the role of Ezekiel's Davidic shepherd king. Further, in the parable of the faithful shepherd which conveys the heart of Luke's gospel, a faithful leader is like the shepherd who seeks out every lost sheep until it is found. While the parable is theocentric and speaks of what God does, Jesus is shown to be enacting the parable by hosting and welcoming the toll collectors and sinners, a burden of restoration he was willing to carry. This implicit polemic against the religious leaders of the day will have resonated in them, since they knew they were shepherds of God's
flock and Jesus was implying they were in error. This pericope also echoed Ezek 34 with both its critique of the current leaders and its description of Godly leadership.

We then turned to Paul's *Abschiedsrede* and noted that the motif recurred when he exhorted the Ephesian elders as he journeyed to Jerusalem. We observed how Paul and Jesus' lives are paralleled in the narrative, and in the same way Jesus strengthened the weak and cared for the flock in the Gospel in line with Ezek 34, so too did Paul in his ministry. We conceded that this motif was not prominent in Acts, yet it was found to be relevant and applicable for the early church in this, the only speech to Christians.

In chapter six we found that the qualities of the Davidic shepherd king, particularly of Ezek 34, bore considerable resonance with the programmatic saying of Luke 4:18-19 and the Lukan Jesus' mission to the poor and marginalised. In using Hamm's analysis of the saying we found that the recovery of sight to the blind fell at the centre of the chiasm and yet Luke did not make this visible in the text until near the end of the travel narrative in the story of the blind man (18:35-43) which precedes the story of Zacchaeus. In the story of the blind man we noted that Luke made a clear return to the royal Davidic motif in the infancy narrative, and how 19:1-10 gave this a shepherd hue. Luke therefore describes Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as a *shepherd* king who had been constantly stopping on his journey for the lost sheep.

We especially considered the final encounter in the Lukan Jesus' journey to Jerusalem where Zacchaeus and his house are saved. Zacchaeus, a rich proto-Gentile, is saved in the encounter and demonstrates that for Luke, salvation is universal as now we have a rich person entering the kingdom. We also found that Zacchaeus a son of Abraham, is a narrative foil to the daughter of Abraham (13:10-17). This points to universal salvation as regards gender. Luke's gospel really is good news for all people. This lent support to Marshall's comment that 19:10 sums up the message of the Gospel, and Miura's statement that Jesus' earthly ministry is characterised by his ministry as *Davidic shepherd*, for the Gospel shows the Lukan Jesus reaching constantly to the margins and saving the lost sheep.

Finally, this led to the conclusion that Luke has a *programmatic inclusio* where the mission statement at 4:18-19 is echoed in 19:10. They are similar sayings and are placed at either end
of the ministry of the Lukan Jesus. The first saying explains Jesus' mission to the poor and the second comments on how this mission is fulfilled. For Luke, Jesus' mission to the poor is enacted as God's faithful Davidic shepherd king. Jesus seeks out the lost sheep, he heals the sick, and he binds up the broken hearted, and he saves each one. He searches for a lost sheep until he finds it; not one sheep is to be lost, for salvation is multi-layered and it is universally available for all people.

Our study has shown that Ezekiel 34 is a scripture Luke drew on repeatedly, and it is a passage that is clearly significant for the Gospel. While the Davidic covenant and Micah's messianic shepherd are relevant for the narratives' beginning, Ezek 34 becomes a key text for Luke as he describe Jesus' ministry.

As I finish this thesis the world and the church are struggling with leadership in this radically globalised and interconnected earth. From what I have seen in the Lukan narrative world, they struggled too. The Graeco-Roman world was dominated by the Imperial superpower, but Luke saw an inadequacy and impotence in their sphere of power. While Caesar issued a decree that all the world must be registered, Luke showed all that happened was Mary and Joseph arrived at the place God had already said through the prophet Micah in the eighth century, that the messianic shepherd was to be born. Who really held real power here? For Luke it was God.

Similarly, the leadership shown by the religious leaders was negative for Luke. Their rules regarding ritual purity caused them to separate themselves from unclean people around the meal table. As I have read Luke, I think Luke shows us another style of leadership, that of the Davidic shepherd king who feeds and even eats with the sheep, gathers them in, searches for one that is lost, and welcomes and saves the sheep. This radical inclusion is for all; women and men, Gentile and Jew and for those at both ends of the social spectrum. It is this salvation which Jesus enacts and the disciples are called to follow, which Luke suggests can enable the gospel to go to the ends of the earth. Forgiveness of sins is paramount as social, ethic and gender barriers are broken down. This is good news for our current world, and the theological and practical implications of this thesis deserve some further study.
I have also suggested that Luke's household mission, where a new 'sacred space' is created, deserves further consideration. I have long considered that in Luke's writing there are the seeds of Jesus superseding the temple. I am aware that the temple is still very visible in Acts, but narratively it holds a unique place for Luke. In an apocalyptic Gospel passage, Jesus says, ἰδοὺ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν (Luke 13:35) and Stephen states, οὐχ ὁ υἱός τος ἐν χαροποιήτος κατοικεῖ (Acts 7:48). In the mission mandate salvation is brought to households, but salvation for Luke is intrinsically tied to the forgiveness of sins (Luke 1:77; 3:3; 4:18; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:31; 26:18). Luke seems to be suggesting a new locus for the forgiveness of sins which is tied to Jesus and his presence. I also note that Luke moves the story of the tearing of the temple curtain to before Jesus dies (23:45) which has not been satisfactorily explained. I wonder if Luke's passion takes the emphasis off the temple, for οὐχ ὁ υἱός τος ἐν χαροποιήτος κατοικεῖ. A fresh reading of the temple in the Lukan narrative would also be valuable.

Furthermore, as Jesus the shepherd comes into view in the narrative, it would be valuable to re-read Luke's use of Isaiah 53 with its sheep motif. Luke quotes Isaiah 53 twice in Luke-Acts (Luke 22:37 – Isa 53:12; Acts 8:32-33 – Isa 53:7-8). The most extensive quote is in Acts 8:32-33 where the image of a sheep and a lamb are used by Luke to explain the good news of Jesus. It is interesting that here we may have the functional opposite of the motif of shepherd, the motif of sheep for whom the shepherd cares.

It would be worth exploring whether there is a reversal of the motif of shepherd in Acts 8:32-33, and considering if within this, there may lie the embryonic seeds of an 'incarnational' understanding of Jesus. That is, is Luke presenting Jesus as becoming one like us, his flock, in his life and in his death? Scholars often comment that Luke’s narrative lacks a strong work of the cross. The Miletus speech is one of only two direct references to the vicarious work of the cross (Luke 22:20; Acts 20:28). Yet, if Luke uses Isa 53 in the encounter of Philip

---


1092. The inclusion of Luke 22:20 is ranked (B) by Metzger, although this was a difficult decision. The verse is found in Ῥ Β Σ Λ Φ Ω Κ Λ Τ Χ Δ Θ Π Ψ ΣΥ 063 (1) and the minuscules א b c d vg syr Sah. cop. However it is not found in D it כ ה ו. Metzger notes that in favour of the longer 'Majority text' reading, the
with the Ethiopian Eunuch in such a way that Jesus is identified as the sheep led to slaughter, then we may have another way Luke is explaining the work of Jesus' death on the flock's behalf. The other quote in Luke 22:37 also contains some strong possibilities for a re-reading of the quote with a vicarious dimension. The essence of this idea comes from this thesis, but it was not within the scope of the thesis to explore.

Finally, it would be valuable to consider the relevance of this thesis to the study of the historical Jesus. The shepherd motif has already been recognised in the Gospel of Matthew, Mark and John, while our study has demonstrated this motif was also used by Luke. This raises the possibility that this was not simply a Lukan nuance, but one that has been influenced by the Jesus tradition or even Jesus himself. Our methodology has been primarily narrative, but now it would be valuable to move from the history within the narrative to a consideration of the picture of Jesus within his historical-cultural world. What was Jesus' self-understanding of his role and is there a historical basis for this motif?

---

external evidence favours including v. 20, it is more likely that the sequence of cup-bread-cup was included and the cup (v. 20) was edited out later even though this left the sequence at variance with Paul's order, and the theory of disciplina arcana may have meant in order to protect the eucharist the sacramental formula was largely omitted in order to protect it from non-Christian readers. While the shorter reading is generally preferred, the weight of the external evidence and the principle of lectio difficilior meant it was retained. Metzger, Textual Commentary, 148-150.
Appendix 1

This table demonstrates that, while the Abraham story can be heard as an intertextual echo as Green has demonstrated in twenty possible points of convergence,\textsuperscript{1093} there are also fifteen possible points of convergence to the story from Kingdoms.

*Columns 1 and 2 are from Green’s analysis of the parallels between Genesis and Luke. Column 3 shows where Kingdoms has possible parallels of the same points.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genesis</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Kingdoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarai was barren, she had no child (11:30).</td>
<td>Elizabeth was barren (1:7).</td>
<td>Hannah had no child (1 Kgdms 1:2).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord said to Abram, 'I will make of you a great nation, and I will...make your name great (12:2).</td>
<td>The angel to Zechariah about John, 'will be great in the sight of the Lord' (1:15). Gabriel to Mary, 'He will be great' (1:32).</td>
<td>The Lord says to David via Nathan, 'I made you renowned like the name of the great ones on the earth' (2 Kgdms 7:9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord to Abram, 'To your offspring (σπέρμα) I will give this land' (12:7; 13:4-14-17 cf. 17:7; 18:18; 22:17).</td>
<td>Mary's song, 'according to the promise he made to Abraham and his offspring forever' (1:55).</td>
<td>Hannah to the Lord, 'remember me and give to your slave an offspring' (1 Kgdms 1:11); Davidic covenant, 'I will raise up your offspring after you and I will establish his kingdom,' (2 Kgdms 7:12); Davidic hymn 'he shows steadfast love to his anointed, to David, and his descendants (σπέρμα) forever' (2 Kgdms 22:51).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Melchizedek to Abram, blessed be the God Most High, who has delivered your enemies into your hands' (14:20; cf. 15:13-14; 22:17). | Gabriel to Mary, 'Jesus will be called son of the Most High...and the power of the Most High will overshadow you' (1:32, 35); Zechariah about John, 'And you, child, will be called prophet of the Most High' (1:76); Zechariah: God has granted 'that we, being rescued from our enemies, might serve...' (1:74). | David song, 'the Most High uttered his voice' (2 Kgdms 22:14). Hannah's song, 'my mouth was made wide against my enemies; I was glad in your deliverance' (1 Kgdms 2:1). |
| [Abram] believed the Lord and it was credited to him as righteousness (15:6; 18:19; 26:5). | Both of them [Elizabeth and Zechariah] were righteous before God (1:6). | Hannah's song, 'There is none righteous like our God' (1 Kgdms 2:2); Hannah speaking of herself, [God] 'has blessed the years of the righteous... execute justice and righteousness' (1 Kgdms 2:9-10). |
| 'Now Sarai, Abram's wife bore him no children' (16:11). | 'But they had no children, because Elizabeth was barren' (1:7). | 'Hannah had no child' (1 Kgdms 1:2, 6). |
| To Hagar, 'You shall conceive in your womb and shall bear a son and you shall call him Ishmael' (16:11). | To Mary, 'Now you shall conceive in your womb and bear a son and you will name him Jesus' (1:31). | Prophecy from the house of David, 'The virgin shall be with child and bear a son and shall name him Immanuel' (Isa 7:13-14).1094 |
| 'When Abram was ninety-nine years old the Lord appeared to Abram' (17:1). | '[Elizabeth and Zechariah] were getting on in years...then there appeared to him an angel of the Lord' (1:7, 11). | [Hannah], 'year by year when she would go up to the house of the Lord' (1 Kgdms 1:7). This suggests Hannah is old. |

1094. This reference is not from Kingdoms, while it may reflect the wider David tradition. See chapter 4.4.1.
| God to Abram, 'I am God Almighty; walk before me and be blameless' (17:1) | 'Both of them [Zechariah and Elizabeth] were righteous before God, walking blamelessly' (1:6). | Hannah is described as 'year after year going up to the house of the Lord'; and so is depicted as faithfully walking in the ways of God (1 Kgdms 1:7). |
| 'And when he had finished talking with him, God (ἀναβαίνω) went up from Abraham' (17:22). | 'Then the angel (ἀπέρχοµαι) departed from [Mary]' (1:38). | [Hannah and Elkanah] left him there before the Lord and departed (ἀπέρχοµαι)' (1 Kgdms 2:11). |
| Abraham presents himself as a servant (18:3-5). | Mary presents herself as a servant (1:38, 48). | Hannah presents herself as a servant (1 Kgdms 1:11, 16, 18); David is presented as a servant (2 Kgdms 7:8). |
| Abraham is a prophet (20:7). 'Sarah conceived and bore Abraham a son' (21:2). | Zechariah 'prophesied' (1:67). 'Elizabeth conceived and bore a son' (1:24, 57). | 'Samuel was faithful to the Lord as a prophet' (1 Kgdms 3:20). Hannah conceived and bore a son (1 Kgdms 1:20). |
| God brought laughter to Sarah (21:6). | | Hannah ate and drank with Elkanah and her 'countenance was sad no longer' (1 Kgdms 1:18). |
| Of Isaac, 'The child grew and was weaned' (21:8); of Hagar's son, 'God was with the boy and he grew up; he lived in the wilderness' (21:20). | Of John, 'The child grew and became strong in spirit, and he was in the wilderness' (1:80); of Jesus, 'The child grew and became strong...and the favour of God was on him' (2:40; cf. 2:52). | Of Samuel, 'The boy Samuel kept going and became great and was in favour with both the Lord and people' (1 Kgdms 2:26); Notably of Jesus in Luke 2:52 'Jesus increased in wisdom and in years, in divine and human favour.' |

1095. The LXX uses the expression, εὐαρέστει ἐναντίον ἐµοῦ 'be well pleasing before me' (NETS). The verb is εὐαρεστέω, (I am well pleasing).  
1096. The Greek says πορεύοµενοι ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐντολαῖς (travelling in all the commands of God). The verb is πορεύομαι, (to journey, travel, proceed).  
1097. Zechariah is not the one who prophesied the birth of John and shows dissimilarity to Abraham at this point.  
1098. Samuel was born a prophet much as Zechariah prophesied that regarding John.
### General Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Anchor Bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABRL</td>
<td>The Anchor Bible Reference Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTC</td>
<td>Abingdon New Testament Commentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Biblical Archaeologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBR</td>
<td>Bulletin for Biblical Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BETL</td>
<td>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bib</td>
<td>Biblica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BibInt</td>
<td>Biblical Interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSac</td>
<td>Biblioteca Sacra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BST</td>
<td>The Bible Speaks Today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTB</td>
<td>Biblical Theology Bulletin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBQ</td>
<td>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JSOT Journal for the Study of the Old Testament

JSOTSS Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series

LCL Loeb Classical Library

LHBOTS Library of Hebrew Bible, Old Testament Studies

LNTS Library of New Testament Studies

LXX Septuagint

MT Masoretic Text


NCBC The New Century Bible Commentary

NETS A New English Translation of the Septuagint; And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under that Title. Edited by Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

NICNT New International Commentary on the New Testament

NICOT New International Commentary on the Old Testament

NIGNTC New International Greek New Testament Commentary

NovTSup Supplements to Novum Testamentum

NT New Testament

NTS New Testament Studies


OT Old Testament

PBM Paternoster Biblical Monographs

SBEC Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity

SBL Society of Biblical Literature

SBLDS Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL  Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLSCS  Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP  Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers
SBT  Studies in Biblical Theology
SJSJ  Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SNTSMS  Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP  Sacra Pagina
SSEJC  Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
SVTP  Studia Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha
Them  Themelios
TTZ  Trierer theologische Zeitschrift
TynBul  Tyndale Bulletin
VT  Vetus Testamentum
VTSup  Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WBCOM  Westminster Bible Companion
WBC  Word Biblical Commentary
WTJ  Westminster Theological Journal
WUNT  Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament
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