

Receiving Jesus as Messiah King: A Synoptic Study on the Way to Luke's Triumphal Entry Account

Douglas S. Huffman

INTRODUCTION: OUR METHOD FOR EXAMINING LUKE'S EMPHASES

If you were to travel to Jerusalem, among the many standard places to visit on such a pilgrimage is the Mount of Olives. The Mount of Olives is where Jesus regularly went (Luke 22:39, "as was his custom") with the apostles when they were in Jerusalem, commemorated now toward the bottom of this hill at the Garden of Gethsemane.¹ Toward

the top of this hill is the place where Jesus ascended into heaven at the end of his earthly ministry (Acts 1:9-11). And the trail going over the hill is the pathway Jesus would take as he traveled into Jerusalem. What makes the Mount of Olives a significant place for Christians to visit? Jesus.

Jesus' entry into Jerusalem is our focus here. At the beginning of the Passion Week—the week leading up to Jesus'

death on the cross—Jesus traveled over the Mount of Olives and entered the City.² All four of the canonical Gospels record this event (Matt 21:1-9; Mark 11:1-10; Luke 19:28-44; John 12:12-19), and churches everywhere annually celebrate this journey the week before Easter on what is commonly called Palm Sunday.³

In comparing the four Gospel accounts of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem, I utilize an approach sometimes called "redaction criticism." Some scholars using this method place too much emphasis on "redaction" (i.e., "editing") to the point that they claim Luke invented new stories and twisted the facts to fit his purposes. In making such suggestions, these scholars fall into a "criticism" of Scripture that is not really intended by the methodological label. Guided by presuppositions of unbelief, redaction criticism can naturally have devastating results. This is no surprise, for *any* approach to the Bible that is guided by presuppositions of unbelief can lead to a disparagement of Scripture. But this is not descriptive of my approach nor is it the intention for my use of

DOUGLAS S. HUFFMAN is Professor and Associate Dean of Biblical and Theological Studies at Talbot School of Theology of Biola University.

Dr. Huffman earned the Ph.D. from Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, and prior to his role at Talbot he served on the faculty at Northwestern College from 1994-2010. The author of numerous essays and articles, he is also the author of the forthcoming *Verbal Aspect Theory and the Prohibitions in the Greek New Testament* (Lang) and *The Handy Guide for New Testament Greek: Grammar, Syntax, and Diagramming* (Kregel).

redaction criticism observations.

Other evangelicals have done a fine job of defending a reasoned and principled utilization of redaction criticism in New Testament studies.⁴ I want to use this method of comparing and contrasting the Gospel accounts of the triumphal entry not to disparage any of them but to understand them better, particularly Luke's account. It's impossible for historians to write down absolutely everything that happens everywhere; they must be selective about what they choose to record. They must pick an angle, choose some theme(s) to trace, critically weigh the available evidence for the meaning-bearing parts and (re)construct a representative narrative of the events they are examining.⁵ This is what Luke did when writing his account of the triumphal entry, and he covers this event in just seventeen verses (Luke 19:28-44). What is it that Luke wanted to stress in this short coverage?⁶

A comparison of the Gospel accounts of Jesus' triumphal entry is not necessary for an accurate reading of any one of them on its own. But one of the benefits of such redaction-critical comparisons is a faster identification of their separate points of emphasis. And I am not using this method in isolation from the rest of Luke's writing: I am trying to inform my reading of the triumphal entry account with the rest of the Gospel of Luke and Acts as well.⁷ I have selected to discuss here four background themes to Luke's emphases, the three pericopes leading up to the triumphal entry as they emphasize those themes, and the connections Luke makes as he brings those four themes to bear in his recounting of the triumphal entry.

BACKGROUND: FOUR BASIC THEMES IN LUKE'S EMPHASES

Scholars of Luke's work identify various lists of thematic interests that come to the fore.⁸ Looking over the whole of Luke's contribution to the New Testament, we can see several of his regular interests in Luke-Acts coming together in his account of Jesus' entrance into Jerusalem. I want

to describe four such basic Lukan themes in general before addressing them in the context of the triumphal entry.

JERUSALEM CENTRAL

The popularity of Jerusalem as a destination city for Christians today (and in other eras) is certainly connected to its centrality in the work of God as recorded in both the Old and New Testaments.⁹ Nevertheless, in his narrative Luke feels the need to emphasize repeatedly the centrality of Jerusalem for the reader. The name of the city is repeated often in Luke-Acts.¹⁰ Luke begins his Gospel narrative in Jerusalem (1:5-25), orders the three temptations of Jesus to emphasize the one that occurs in Jerusalem (4:1-13), and of course, highlights the Jesus story as the climax with the death-resurrection-ascension account in Jerusalem (23-24). In the middle of the book, Luke even gives a blunt explanation of the City's importance to the story on the lips of Jesus himself as he is traveling there: "Nevertheless, I must go on my way ... for it cannot be that a prophet should die away from Jerusalem" (Luke 13:33). Jerusalem is the city of destiny for Jesus' salvific mission in the Gospel of Luke. Then in Acts Jerusalem is the city from which the salvific mission is launched to reach the world. So Luke-Acts has a storyline movement toward Jerusalem in Luke and out from Jerusalem in Acts.¹¹ As Luke Timothy Johnson puts it, "In spatial terms, therefore, Jerusalem is the *center* of Luke's narrative."¹² The movement toward Jerusalem in the Gospel of Luke makes a stark beginning in Luke 9:51.¹³ Jesus is intentionally headed to Jerusalem (literally, Jesus "set his face to go to Jerusalem"). Then throughout the Gospel's rather unique central section—often called "The Travel Narrative"—Luke frequently reminds his readers of the Jerusalem destination (see 9:51, 53; 13:22, 31-35; 17:11; 18:31; 19:28, 41). Thus, Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem is for the reader of Luke's Gospel a long-anticipated event.

JOYOUS PRAISE

A second background theme in Luke-Acts has to do with Luke's pervasive interest in rejoicing and praise to God. I. Howard Marshall observes, "One of the most conspicuous Lucan features of the Gospel is the way in which the various scenes often culminate in an expression of praise or glory to God on the part of the people involved and the spectators."¹⁴ So prevalent is this theme that the Gospel of Luke is sometimes dubbed "the Gospel of joy."¹⁵ Certainly Luke's interest in joy and praise is noticeable in the abundance of passages using joy-related vocabulary, not only in the Third Gospel but Acts as well.¹⁶ The rejoicing expressed at the triumphal entry fits nicely with this Lukan theme.

JUDGMENT REVERSAL

The third theme I want to note as background for Luke's version of the triumphal entry is judgment reversal. The most commonly recognized expression of reversal theology—common enough to attain the status of proverbial cliché in even modern secular society—is found in Luke 13:30, "And behold, some who are last will be first and some who are first will be last" (cf. Matt 19:30 and Mark 10:31). Paul Borgman points out that Luke's version of the first-and-last saying is quite literally central to Luke as it appears at the midpoint of the Travel Narrative and at the midpoint of the Gospel of Luke.¹⁷ But Luke's interest in this turnabout of expectations has many other, and some more subtle, expressions.¹⁸ For example, Luke (and only Luke) twice includes, "Everyone who exalts himself will be humbled, and he who humbles himself will be exalted" (Luke 14:11; 18:14). Just as the reader is repeatedly reminded of Jerusalem during the Travel Narrative of Luke's Gospel, the Evangelist's interest in reversal theology is particularly concentrated in that central section of Luke.¹⁹ This thematic interest of Luke becomes important for our reading of his triumphal entry account because Luke, like no other Gospel writer, records some blunt statements that reverse common expectations.

JESUS' IDENTITY

Most would agree that all four Gospels and Acts have a major concern with the identity of Jesus. The significance of this theme in Luke is that he uses the question of Jesus' identity as a tool for structuring his Gospel.²⁰ In the first half of Luke various characters specifically ask about Jesus' identity:

- Luke 5:21—scribes and Pharisees: "Who is this man ... Who can forgive sins?"
- Luke 7:19-20—John the Baptist: "Are you the one who is coming?"
- Luke 7:49—a Pharisee's guests: "Who is this who even forgives sin?"
- Luke 8:25—apostles: "Who is this [commanding the wind and waves]?"
- Luke 9:9—Herod Antipas: "Who is this I hear such things about?"
- Luke 9:18—Jesus: "Who do the crowds say I am?"
- Luke 9:20—Jesus: "Who do you say I am?"

That Luke does not write with a mystery novel practice is evident in that, along the way, he provides some identifications of Jesus—e.g., "the Son of the Most High" (Luke 1:31-32); "He is Christ the Lord" (Luke 2:11); "You are my Son, whom I love; with you I am well pleased" (Luke 3:22); and "the Christ of God" (Luke 9:20). But God himself gives the capstone announcement of Jesus' identity at the transfiguration: "This is my Son, whom I have chosen; listen to him" (Luke 9:35). It is as if Luke wants us, his readers, to be asking the question about Jesus' identity as we read his Gospel so that by the time we come to the turning point of Luke 9:51, we will have the definitive answer. Just a little further on, in his account of the triumphal entry, Luke builds upon this theme.

PRELUDE: THE THREE PERICOPES LEADING UP TO THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY

These four broad Lukan themes—Jerusalem, joy, judgment, and Jesus—play roles in the

three pericopes (paragraphs or sections in the Gospels) that lead up to Luke's triumphal entry account. Mark Strauss suggests that the whole of Luke 18:31-19:48 "marks a transition from Jesus' journeying to the period of conflict and crucifixion in Jerusalem. Every pericope in this section contains a geographical reference oriented toward Jerusalem and each carries special christological significance for Luke."²¹ Indeed, in each of the three episodes between Jesus' last passion prediction (18:31-34) and the triumphal entry (19:28-44), at least three of these four themes is touched upon.

HEALING THE BLIND MAN NEAR JERICHO (LUKE 18:35-43)

Each of the Synoptic Gospels includes an account of Jesus healing a blind man near Jericho. Of the four motifs in our study, all but the Jerusalem theme are mentioned in Luke's account, but Jerusalem had just been mentioned in Luke 18:31. Furthermore, the mention of Jericho at the beginning of the passage (18:35) may be enough for, as Strauss notes, "the reader knows from the parable of the good Samaritan (Luke 10:25-37) that Jericho is on the road to Jerusalem. Jesus is on his final approach to the city."²² When the blind man asks about the crowd's commotion, he is told "Jesus of Nazareth" is passing by (Luke 18:37). The blind man, however, shouts out a more messianic identification: "Jesus, Son of David!" (Luke 18:38), and he persists in it despite rebukes from the crowd (Luke 18:39). "The use of this title by a blind man begging for mercy makes it clear that Jesus does not enter Jerusalem as a firebrand. The title applies to one who hears the cries of the oppressed, shows mercy, brings healing, and evokes praise to God. The blind man does not cry out for deliverance from foreign domination but deliverance from his blindness."²³ Contrary to the expectations of the crowd, Jesus is interested in the blind man and stops to grant his request for healing.

The Synoptics all tell much the same story up to this point with typical differences in detail.²⁴ But Luke alone closes the story with explicit mention of rejoicing: "and followed him" (Matt 20:34); "and followed him on the way" (Mark 10:52); "and followed him, glorifying God; and seeing it, all the people gave praise to God" (Luke 18:43). "Being healed by Jesus brought about a restoration not only of physical well-being but honor as well and called forth thanksgiving and discipleship. The healing episodes reflect the reversal of present conditions brought about by Jesus as the instrument of God's beneficence as Jesus ushers in the New Age."²⁵ The work of Jesus the Messiah to reverse humanity's current situation calls forth rejoicing and praise.

ZACCHAEUS (LUKE 19:1-10)

Only Luke mentions the Jericho encounter with Zacchaeus. Again, there is no explicit mention of Jerusalem here, but there is of Jericho (19:1). The motif of Jesus' identity is explicit as Zacchaeus "sought to see who Jesus was" (19:3), and the pericope closes with what many consider a theme statement for Jesus' whole ministry: "For the Son of Man came to seek and to save the lost" (19:10).²⁶ People were shocked that Jesus would spend time with a sinful, rich tax collector like Zacchaeus (19:7), for tax collectors could be viewed as collaborators with Rome and thus as enemies of Israel.²⁷ John York suggests, "The shameless status of Zacchaeus in the community is further emphasized by his inability to get through the crowds to see Jesus."²⁸ But Jesus makes a declaration that reverses such stigma, "Today salvation has come to this house, since he also is a son of Abraham" (19:9), which is not meant to be a mere indication of Zacchaeus's Jewishness but as a sign of his value and belongingness.²⁹ The motif of joy is touched on in reporting Zacchaeus's response (19:5-6), and the repentant tax collector serves as an ideal respondent and an exemplar of the joy that comes at the time of properly receiving Jesus.

PARABLE OF THE POUNDS (LUKE 19:11-27)

The idea of proper responsiveness is a key issue also in the parable of the pounds. Only Luke recounts Jesus telling his parable at Jericho, which is similar to the parable of the talents utilized later in Matthew (Matt 25:14-30; cf. Mark 13:33-37).³⁰ Luke introduces the parable with a reference to Jerusalem (Luke 19:11), and the parable itself is understood as analogous to Jesus' rule. Most scholars understand the parable as picturing Jesus' kingship, the acceptance of his identity and authority, and his final act of judgment delayed until the Second Coming. The nobleman already had authority but went away to receive the kingdom; when he returned he was ready to act with full kingship. So also Jesus was the king-in-waiting during his earthly ministry but went away at the ascension to receive his kingship; we now await his return as the exalted king when he will act with full kingship.³¹ The reversal theology present in the blind man story and enhanced in the Zacchaeus story now reaches new heights in the parable of the pounds. "Those who abhor the nobleman and reject his claim to the throne—are they rebels or patriots? The slave who blew the whistle on the character and practices of the nobleman—is his action noteworthy (though tragic) or blameworthy?"³² But the ambiguity is short lived in the reading of the parable: the nobleman may not appear to be powerful at first, but he returns as authoritative ruler and calls his servants to give account for their work while he was away.

Luke curiously closes his account of the parable with the returned ruler making a final statement of judgment (a statement missing from Matthew's similar parable of the talents): "But as for these enemies of mine, who did not want me to reign over them, bring them here and slay them before me" (19:27). It is with reference to "this" statement of judgment that Luke begins his triumphal entry account, "And when he had said this" (19:28). And so the triumphal entry begins with ominous expectations of judgment and of separating out—

perhaps surprisingly—who is in the kingdom and who is not.³³

CONNECTIONS: THE FOUR THEMES IN LUKE'S ACCOUNT OF THE TRIUMPHAL ENTRY

Luke's triumphal entry account begins with a reference to the parable immediately prior: "And when he had said this, he went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem" (Luke 19:28). Why is Luke verbally tying these episodes together? I suggest that it is more than mere deictic indicators of the order of events; rather, Luke wants us to connect the thematic dots that we have been tracing here. In his account of the joyous triumphal entry, Luke emphasizes the judgment reversal upon Jerusalem for its lack of recognizing Jesus' true identity.³⁴

ARRIVAL AT JERUSALEM CENTRAL

The name of Jerusalem is used only once in each Gospel's account of the triumphal entry. But like no other Evangelist, within his report Luke assures and reassures the reader that Jesus "draws near" to this city central to his salvific mission (19:28-29, 37, 41; cf. 18:35, 40). The role of Jerusalem in the OT faith would have naturally unfolded into the Christian faith.³⁵ We already mentioned above that, because of the theological significance of Jerusalem, there was an eschatological anticipation for Jesus' entrance about which Luke offered a narrative corrective and explanatory parable (Luke 19:11-27).³⁶ It turns out, however, that Luke's focus on the *city* of Jerusalem is really a focus on the *citizens* of Jerusalem. In relatively short space, Marshall gives a convincing explanation of the solidarity of Jerusalem, temple, and people in Luke's theological perspective.

The temple symbolizes Jerusalem in its religious aspect. Luke does not separate the temple from Jerusalem itself because he is not primarily interested in the theology of topography. On the contrary Luke's interest is primarily in people. Thus the teaching of Jesus in the temple is given to the people of Jerusalem. The significance of Jeru-

salem as the place of the crucifixion is that there the rulers of the Jews are to be found. The guilt of Jerusalem is the guilt of its people who refused to respond to the message. Jerusalem did not recognize the time of its visitation, and this visitation was precisely the presence of Jesus in the temple (Luke 19:44).³⁷

In summary, “For Luke, city and Temple stand as symbols of the people of Israel.”³⁸ This focus on the people becomes clear in Luke’s unique record of Jesus weeping over Jerusalem on the way into the city (Luke 19:41-44).

ANNOUNCEMENT WITH JOYOUS PRAISE

But before Jesus weeps over Jerusalem, Luke focuses on the disciples rejoicing that Jesus comes as king to Jerusalem. The widespread Lukan theme of rejoicing is stressed in this episode beyond the other Gospels. The other Gospels introduce the Psalm 118 citation by reporting that the crowds “cried out” (Matthew and Mark use κράζω; John uses κραυγάζω), but this is not enough for the celebratory Luke who expands this, “the whole crowd of disciples began to praise God rejoicing with a loud voice over all the mighty works they had seen” (Luke 19:37). Luke’s emphasis on praise and rejoicing with his unique note about “peace in heaven” (Luke 19:38) contains echoes of Psalms 122 and 132, which are among the songs of ascent (see Psalms 120-134) sung by pilgrims on their way to Jerusalem in celebration of annual festivals (see Exod 23:14-17; Deut 16:16). In these the psalmist gives expression to his joy over Jerusalem, where “the house of the LORD” (122:1, 9) or his “dwelling/resting place” (132:4, 7-8, 13-14) is located, where “the thrones of the house of David stand” (122:5), and where God promised David, “one of your own descendants I will place on your throne” (132:11). In these the psalmist gives his prayer that “the saints will sing for joy” (132:9 and 16) and that “there be peace within your walls” (122:7; cf. vv. 6-9). If Jerusalem as the “city of the Great King” (cf. Ps 48:2) symbolically represents

on earth the joy-filled rule of God from heaven, Luke writes with messianic reflection about Jesus the king ascending to Jerusalem the royal city and “the whole multitude of disciples” receiving him with joyous praise to God.

ANTICIPATION OF JUDGMENT REVERSAL

But Luke’s extra emphasis on the praise and rejoicing during the triumphal entry sets up the reader for another ironic reversal. Even as the blind man is the one who truly sees who Jesus is (Luke 18:35-43), even as the sinful tax collector Zacchaeus in declared a son of Abraham (Luke 19:1-10), and conversely, even as the presumptuous citizens in the parable of the pounds are punished for not receiving their king (Luke 19:11-27), so now here at the triumphal entry there is a reversal of kingdom expectations. And like the others, this reversal hinges on the proper identification of Jesus. On the one side are those who rightly recognize Jesus as he has quietly and humbly, but no less intentionally, declared himself to be king. These are the rejoicing ones. On the other side are those who refuse to admit to Jesus’ royal identity. Who are these? Immediately after the report of the rejoicing believers and the citation of the psalter’s praise for the king (vv. 37-38), Luke points them out in the uniquely Lukan addition of a conflict between Jesus and some Pharisees (vv. 39-40).³⁹

The reversal climaxes in Luke 19:41-44, where Jesus weeps and offers a lament for the unreceptive citizens of Jerusalem. Even in contrast to Luke’s joyous praise theme, this is not the first or the last of the uniquely Lukan expressions of Jesus’ sorrow over those refusing to believe (see Luke 13:34-35 and 23:28-31; cf. 17:20-37; 21:20-28). Early in the Gospel, Simeon announces that Jesus would bring division to Israel (Luke 2:34-35), and the rejection that has been taking place in Jesus’ ministry since the Nazareth sermon (Luke 4:14-30) and foretold along the way (cf. 9:22, 44; 17:25; 18:31-33) reaches a new low here.⁴⁰

ANXIETY OVER JESUS' IDENTITY

The juxtaposition of joyous praise and judgment reversal is poignant here as it focuses on the proper response and reception of Jesus' true identity. With a bit more length, there are three things to note here.

First, all four Gospels present Jesus as king in the triumphal entry. It is largely uncontested that Jesus selects his mode of transportation (a previously unriden donkey) as a conscious allusion to the peacetime entrance of OT kings.⁴¹ All the Gospels report that the people in the crowd recognized this kingly entrance with the words of Psalm 118:26, "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord!"⁴² While some may question how much *messianic* flavor this entrance was intended by Jesus to have, the *royal* flavor is clear.⁴³ But it is something of a false dichotomy to separate messianic and royal imagery, as the Son of David was a significant royal *and* messianic idea in Second Temple Judaism. While messianic expectation at the time of Jesus was not a monolithic set of ideals for all branches of Judaism, John J. Collins comments on their similarities and notes, "This concept of the Davidic messiah as the warrior king who would destroy the enemies of Israel and institute an era of unending peace constitutes the common core of Jewish messianism around the turn of the era."⁴⁴

Second, while Luke is clear on the kingship of Jesus, he seems to downplay some kingdom aspects. For example, in his paraphrase of Psalm 118:26 (Luke 19:38), Luke inserts the title "King" but avoids both "kingdom" (cf. Mark 11:10) and "King of Israel" (cf. John 12:13).⁴⁵ And Luke closes the citation not with "Hosanna" ("Save us!" as do Matthew and Mark) but with "Peace in heaven and glory in the highest!" The purpose of Luke's editorial paraphrasing may be to avoid overly literal political connotations while still stressing a messianic kingship. Luke does not avoid calling Jesus king, and even elsewhere ascribes to him a kingdom (e.g., Luke 1:32-33; 22:29-30; Acts 1:6-7). It is simply that Jesus' kingdom is not a geopo-

litical one set to begin upon his arrival in the regal city of Jerusalem.⁴⁶ King Jesus is not attempting to establish a peace that rivals the *Pax Romana*, but "peace in heaven."⁴⁷ The "mighty works" of Jesus that are joyously celebrated by his followers are not political or military deeds, but acts that confirm his messianic identity.⁴⁸ Jesus is a man of peace and not a political threat to first-century Roman control of Palestine.⁴⁹ Thus, Jesus comes not as a military king of a mere earthly reign, but as Messiah King.

Third, in his triumphal entry account Luke alone reports a specific confrontation about Jesus' identity (Luke 19:39-40). Some Pharisees insist that Jesus rebuke the disciples in their royal praise of him, but Jesus refuses—and thus supports their identification of him as messianic king—but uses a strange saying regarding the stones speaking out should the people be silent. "No unanimity of interpretation exists concerning this seemingly enigmatic response."⁵⁰ The saying shows a verbal parallel with Habakkuk 2:11 and has been suggested as serving as "a threat uttered against a nation which plunders people and acquires gain by violence."⁵¹ Lloyd Gaston has suggested that it is not a backward looking statement of judgment (per Hab 2:11) but a forward-looking one wherein "the tumbled stones of a destroyed city will cry out to the survivors that Jerusalem should have repented" (cf. Luke 19:44).⁵² But the immediate setting here is about praise and not judgment.⁵³ In keeping with a praise view, James A. Sanders notes the liturgical role of the priests in reciting Psalm 118 at festivals and suggests Jesus meant that the stones of the temple steps would fulfill the role if the priests would not.⁵⁴ More recently Arthur Just suggests the possibility that praise from Gentiles is intended, as Gentiles were sometimes considered to be insentient stones regarding spiritual matters.⁵⁵ Whatever the intended details, there is a returned rebuke here in that Jesus tells the Pharisees that the royal treatment aimed at him is correct and to say otherwise is to be in denial. Perhaps Jesus' rebuke of the Pharisaic naysayers is

tantamount to saying that, even if they had rocks in their heads, they should be able to see the obvious. “The point of the saying here is that Jesus is king, and no silencing of the disciples can deflect that fact.”⁵⁶

In one action here, Jesus stresses his identity as Messiah King and calls people to deal with it one way or another. “Jesus intended to enter Jerusalem as its king and so provoke its people either to embrace or deny him and his message.”⁵⁷ Throughout Jesus’ ministry in the Gospel of Luke, Jesus has been received by some and rejected by others. This same divided reception is his as he enters Jerusalem, and it will continue to be so divided in the book of Acts.⁵⁸

CONCLUSION

While Luke has a thematic focus on Jesus’ identity, Jesus himself for a time lived out a theme of concealment, especially in the first half of the Gospel where he regularly instructs those he heals to remain silent about his identity (e.g., Luke 4:33-35, 40-41; 5:12-16; 8:51-56; 9:21). Apparently Jesus felt the need to overcome inaccurate Jewish messianic expectations before being overtly announced as the Messiah.⁵⁹ As the time drew near for him to complete his mission, as he drew near to Jerusalem, the secrecy fades and his identity as Messiah King becomes clearer.

The three stories leading up to the entry—the blind man crying out “Son of David” (Luke 18:35-43), Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10); and the parable of the pounds (Luke 19:11-27)—follow immediately after one of Jesus’ key passion predictions (Luke 18:31-34) and connect directly to the triumphal entry story (Luke 19:28-44). Strauss’s overview of this introduction to the triumphal entry is worth repeating here.

In summary, Luke like Mark uses the son of David cry of the blind man outside Jericho to prepare the reader for Jesus’ royal entrance into Jerusalem and his passion and death as king of the Jews. But, in contrast with Mark, Luke introduces

two pericopes between these events which serve to clarify Jesus’ messianic role and ministry. In the Zacchaeus story, Jesus’ messianic role is seen not as the conquering son of David of contemporary Judaism (*Pss. Sol.* 17; *Ezra* 13; 4QpIsa^a; 1QSb 5.24-26) dealing with retribution to Israel’s enemies but rather as the compassionate Son of man seeking and saving the lost (i.e. the role of the messiah as set out in Luke 4:18-19, 7:20-23). Then, in the parable of the pounds, the nature of Jesus’ kingly authority and reign is presented not as the immediate establishment of an earthly kingdom on earth but rather as a departure to receive kingly authority, followed by a still future return in judgment.⁶⁰

As for the triumphal entry itself, these same themes are confirmed by the manner in which Luke recounts the event. Recalling the blind man healed in Jericho, people at the triumphal entry recognize Jesus as royalty and praise God “for all the mighty works that they had seen.” Recalling the Zacchaeus story and Jesus’ openness to receiving all who believe and respond, Luke alone describes the people at the triumphal entry as “the whole multitude of the disciples.”⁶¹ Recalling the parable of the pounds and the separation of those devoted to the king and those opposed to him, Luke alone reports the Pharisaic anxiety at the triumphal entry about Jesus’ identity. The time for ultimate judgment does not come when Jesus reaches Jerusalem (nor even after the resurrection when he is in Jerusalem; see Acts 1:6). But judgment day is coming. This is the emphasis of how Luke closes the triumphal entry episode with a uniquely Lukan account of Jesus’ sorrow over Jerusalem. It was not merely over the bricks of the walls and buildings that Jesus mourned, for it was not merely over those things that he is Messiah King.

If you travel to Jerusalem, don’t miss visiting the Mount of Olives. And if you are able, take the short walk down the (now paved) trail just below the level of the tourist plaza to the small chapel called *Dominus Flevit*. This much quieter garden

venue with a view of the Old City bears a Latin name commemorating a triumphal entry detail that only Luke records: “our Lord wept.” There, as you look over Jerusalem, remember that Jesus the obvious Messiah King reversed things there. But the experience of Jesus’ kingship is not a geopolitical reign in the physical city of Jerusalem (at least not yet!). More important right now is his reigning in the hearts of people through the promised Holy Spirit so as to move out from Jerusalem and reach the world with the joyous good news of salvation through him.⁶² The division of the people at the triumphal entry over the identity of Jesus still exist today. The one who came to seek and to save the lost (Luke 19:10) still seeks blind and repentant sinners for whom he can reverse things. And what it still takes is for them to receive him as the Messiah King. Garland observes that for both the blind man and Zacchaeus, the crowd presents an obstacle to seeing Jesus.⁶³ We must encourage people to break from the crowd, to identify Jesus as the one who reverses judgment into peace, and joyfully to receive him as Messiah King.⁶⁴

ENDNOTES

¹The name “Gethsemane” is used only twice in the NT: Matt 26:36 and Mark 14:32. These are the parallels to Luke’s reference to the Mount of Olives in Luke 22:39 and to John’s reference to a garden across the Kidron valley in John 18:1. The name “Gethsemane” means “oil press,” which is an unsurprising name on a mount with olive trees. See Joel B. Green, “Gethsemane,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 265-68; Kim Paffenroth, “Gethsemane,” and “Olives, Mount of,” in *Eerdmans Dictionary of the Bible* (ed. David Noel Freedman et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 499 and 985-86.

²On the historicity of the triumphal entry, see Brent Kinman, “Jesus’ Royal Entry into Jerusalem,” in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence* (ed. Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb; WUNT 247; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 383-427. This is an expansion of Brent Kinman, “Jesus’ Royal Entry into Jerusalem,” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 15 (2005): 223-60. See the easily accessible defense of the authenticity of this event in Mark L. Strauss, *Four Portraits, One Jesus: A Survey of Jesus and the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2007), 479-80.

³“Palm Sunday” derives its name from John’s Gospel. The Synoptics all mention people spreading garments on the road before Jesus (Matt 21:8; Mark 11:8; Luke 19:36), and both Matthew and Mark also mention the branches of trees (cf. Ps 118:27). Luke does not mention (nor deny) tree branches, but only John specifies branches of palm trees (John 12:13). Of the palm branches, Robert H. Stein comments, “Their presence gave a royal and messianic quality to the event, for they were a sign of Jewish nationalism, especially Maccabean nationalism, and they appear on the coins minted during the Bar Kokhba revolt in A.D. 132-35”; Robert H. Stein, *Jesus the Messiah: A Survey of the Life of Christ* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1996), 180-81; cf. Kinman, “Jesus’ Royal Entry into Jerusalem,” 406. Since Luke (the Rome conscious writer of Luke-Acts) does not mention branches at all, is he down playing the political side of things here?

⁴See esp. Stephen S. Smalley, “Redaction Criticism,” in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (ed. I. Howard Marshall; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 181-95; Grant R. Osborne, “The Evangelical and Redaction Criticism: Critique and Methodology,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 22 (1979): 305-22; idem, “Redaction Criticism,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 662-69; idem, “Redaction Criticism,” in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. Kevin Vanhoozer; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 663-66; D. A. Carson, “Redaction Criticism: On the Legitimacy and Illegitimacy of a Literary Tool” in *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 119-42; reprinted now as chapter 4 in D. A. Carson, *Collected Writings on Scripture* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 151-78; and Scot McKnight,

“Redaction Criticism,” in *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods* (ed. I. Howard Marshall; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1977), 181-95; Grant R. Osborne, “The Evangelical and Redaction Criticism: Critique and Methodology,” *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 22 (1979): 305-22; idem, “Redaction Criticism,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 662-69; idem, “Redaction Criticism,” in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. Kevin Vanhoozer; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 663-66; D. A. Carson, “Redaction Criticism: On the Legitimacy and Illegitimacy of a Literary Tool” in *Scripture and Truth* (ed. D. A. Carson and John D. Woodbridge; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 119-42; reprinted now as chapter 4 in D. A. Carson, *Collected Writings on Scripture* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2010), 151-78; and Scot McKnight,

Interpreting the Synoptic Gospels (Guides to New Testament Exegesis; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 83-95.

⁵This clumsy statement is a woefully inadequate description of historiography. Much fuller and more elegant treatments of this important topic and its relationship to historical Jesus studies are available in such works as Scot McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005), 3-46; Robert L. Webb, "The Historical Enterprise and Historical Jesus Research," in *Key Events in the Life of the Historical Jesus: A Collaborative Exploration of Context and Coherence* (ed. Darrell L. Bock and Robert L. Webb; WUNT 247; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2009; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 7-93.

⁶It is patently obvious to the reader that this short article on the triumphal entry in Luke's Gospel will not be absolutely exhaustive of everything we can learn from this passage. After all, I too must be selective of things to focus upon.

⁷If redaction criticism is thought of in its narrowest terms (i.e., focused only on the editorial differences of one Gospel compared to the others), some have used the label "composition criticism" to describe a more holistic approach that is concerned with how an Evangelist weaves together both the editorial differences and similarities into one narrative.

⁸Darrell Bock devotes seventeen chapters of his new book on Lukan theology to major theological themes; Darrell L. Bock, *A Theology of Luke and Acts: God's Promised Program, Realized for All Nations* (Biblical Theology of the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 99-427.

⁹Peter Walker writes, "Jerusalem plays a central role within the story of the NT, and this is no accident. If Jerusalem at the dawn of the NT period was associated with the presence of the divine Name, the throne of the true King, the place of true sacrifice, the centre of Israel's life and the focus of its eschatological hope, then it was inevitable that the mission of Israel's Messiah would be integrally connected with this unique city"; Peter W. L. Walker, "Jerusalem," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner et al.; Downers Grove, IL:

InterVarsity, 2000), 590; cf. idem, *Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament Perspectives on Jerusalem* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), esp. 102-106 on Luke-Acts.

¹⁰Luke-Acts comprises approximately 25 percent of the NT but has almost 65 percent (90 times) of the NT's 139 occurrences of "Jerusalem." There are two different spellings of "Jerusalem" in the Greek NT: of the 62 times Ἱεροσόλυμα is used in the NT, it occurs 4 times in Luke and 22 times in Acts; of the 77 times Ἱερουσαλήμ is used in the NT, it occurs 27 times in Luke and 37 times in Acts.

¹¹See Mikeal C. Parsons, "The Place of Jerusalem on the Lukan Landscape: An Exercise in Symbolic Cartography," in *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. Richard P. Thompson and Thomas E. Phillips; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998), 155-71.

¹²Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1991), 15. Johnson continues, "The middle twelve chapters of the two-volume work narrate events exclusively in that place." Joseph Fitzmyer says with more color, "Though Luke never uses the expression, Jerusalem functions for him as 'the navel of the earth.'" Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke* (2 vols.; The Anchor Bible 28-28A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981, 1985), 1:168.

¹³I cannot think of a single scholar, living or dead, who does not consider Luke 9:51 to be a major turning point—if not *the* turning point—of the Gospel of Luke.

¹⁴I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1989), 203. See Robert F. O'Toole, "Joy, Wonder, Blessing and Praise," *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts* (Good News Studies 9; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1984), 225-60.

¹⁵E.g., William G. Morrice, *Joy in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 91.

¹⁶Luke 1:14, 58; 2:20; 4:15; 5:25-26; 6:23; 7:16; 8:13; 10:17-20, 21; 13:13; 15:5-7, 9-10; 17:15-18; 18:43; 23:47; 24:41, 52-53; Acts 2:25-28, 47; 3:8-10; 4:21; 5:41; 8:8, 39; 10:46; 11:18; 12:14, 23; 13:52; 14:17; 15:3; 16:34; 21:20). The rejoicing theme is also evi-

dent in his unique “infancy hymns” (Luke 1:41-45, 46-55, 68-79; 2:10-14, 28-32), and perhaps even in the wealth of his dinner party references, many of them uniquely Lukan (e.g., Luke 5:29-30, 33-35; 7:33-35, 36-37; 9:10-17; 11:37-42; 12:35-40; 13:29; 14:1-14, 15-24; 15:1-2, 22-32; 16:21; 17:7-10, 27-28; 22:7-22, 29-30; Acts 1:4; 2:46; 27:33-38).

¹⁷Paul Borgman, *The Way According to Luke: Hearing the Whole Story of Luke-Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 228; cf. 78 and 203.

¹⁸See John O. York, *The Last Shall Be First: The Rhetoric of Reversal in Luke* (46; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1991).

¹⁹Mikeal Parsons suggests, “The reversal contrast is embedded in the very structure of the parable collection [of the Travel Narrative] which, in the paired parables, alternates in its narrative audience,” i.e. between outsiders and insiders. He concludes that “this collection of parables was carefully organized to emphasize their rhetoric of reversal”; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2007), 118-19.

²⁰I touch on this in “What Did Luke Really Care About? The Gospel of Luke” in *What the New Testament Authors Really Cared About: A Survey of Their Writings* (ed. Kenneth Berding and Matt Williams; Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2008), 61.

²¹Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995), 305. The pericopes of Luke’s Gospel encompassed by Strauss’s comment are typically identified as follows: the last of Jesus’ predictions of his passion (18:31-34), the healing of the blind man near Jericho (18:35-43), Zacchaeus (19:1-10); the parable of the pounds (19:11-27), the triumphal entry (19:28-40), Jesus weeping over Jerusalem (19:41-44), and the cleansing of the temple (19:45-48). We are including the uniquely Lukan report of Jesus’ weeping over Jerusalem as part of the triumphal entry account.

²²Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 306.

²³David E. Garland, *Luke* (Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids:

Zondervan, 2011), 738.

²⁴Mark is wordier and alone gives us the man’s name (“Bartimaeus son of Timaeus”; Mark 10:46); Matthew alone mentions a second blind man (Matt 20:30).

²⁵York, *The Last Shall Be First*, 170. Joel Green observes, “As is typical in Lukan accounts of healing, people attribute restorative power to God, even while recognizing Jesus as the one through whom that power is manifest. Jesus is thus identified as the authorized agent of God—in the language of this pericope, ‘Son of David.’” Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, (New International Commentary on the New Testament: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 665.

²⁶See for example, I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (New International Greek Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 694; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:1221-22; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPI New Testament Commentaries; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1990), 664; Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 310; and York, *The Last Shall Be First*, 160. Robert Tannehill makes a convincing case for this by calling on vocabulary connections with “must” (dei) and “lost” and comparing Luke 19:10 with 5:32; Robert C. Tannehill, “The Story of Zacchaeus as Rhetoric,” *The Shape of Luke’s Story: Essays on Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2005), 77-78.

²⁷Of course, in contrast to the citizens of Jericho in the Zacchaeus story, the careful reader of Luke is not as shocked by Jesus’ connection with a tax collector; see Luke 3:12-13; 5:27-32; 7:29-30; 15:1-2; 18:9-14. On the other hand, Zacchaeus is described as “rich” (19:2), and Luke does not always portray the rich favorably; see Luke 1:53; 6:24; 12:13-21; 14:12-14; 16:19-31; 18:18-30; cf. 5:11, 28; 9:57-62; 14:25-33; 20:45-21:4. See Tannehill, “The Story of Zacchaeus as Rhetoric,” 74-75.

²⁸York, *The Last Shall Be First*, 158.

²⁹Ibid., 160, n. 1; cf. Tannehill, “The Story of Zacchaeus as Rhetoric,” 79-83; Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 138-39.

³⁰The similarity of parable of the pounds in Luke to the

later parable of the talents in Matthew need not mean that one of the Evangelists has the story in the wrong place. Jesus could certainly use similar illustrations on separate occasions; cf. Earle E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (rev. ed.; New Century Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 221-22; and Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 701. In support of this idea, Strauss observes, “In this case the common source would be Jesus himself whose idiosyncratic language would account for the verbal parallels. It seems to me this possibility is too quickly dismissed by modern critics. What teacher would never repeat himself in two different forms?”; Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 307-308, n. 3.

³¹Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 90; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:1233. Johnson sees the parable as reflecting Jesus’ authority, but makes the application completely to Jesus’ earthly experience, conquering at the resurrection with no implications for the Second Coming; Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 292-94. Garland suggests that the parable is not meant to picture a ruler analogous to Jesus but one in contrast to him: “The vengeful king contrasts with the rule of King Jesus, the Messiah, who comes into the world to bring peace and goes to Jerusalem to give his life for others, not to destroy them”; Garland, *Luke*, 756; cf. 754-64. But Johnson’s view reduces (down to a mere ten days) Luke’s stated rationale for the parable and Garland’s view severely revises—or virtually removes—it (cf. Luke 19:11).

³²Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 677.

³³This reversal of who is and who is not in the kingdom is laid out in Luke’s passion week account in such a way that it is of little surprise that he does not include a pericope on the separation of the sheep and goats, a pericope that only Matthew has in Matt 25:31-46, immediately after his parable of the talents (Matt 25:14-30).

³⁴“In this way, the point for Luke’s audience is not on the delay but on the nature of the kingly authority which Jesus received (and the need for stewardship during his absence). Luke is dispelling the Jewish expectation, shared by the disciples during Jesus’ life, that the messiah’s reign and the consummation of the kingdom of

God would occur when he entered Jerusalem”; Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 309.

³⁵In discussing Luke’s connection of Jerusalem (and the temple) with Christian eschatology, J. Bradley Chance concludes that “the Jewish view of the significance of Jerusalem and the temple in the eschatological age of salvation had thoroughly saturated Jewish thought” and that “the early Christians were aware of this significance, an awareness that would have sprung from the Jewish roots of the earliest followers of Jesus themselves” J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), 146; cf. 5-33. On the symbolism of Jerusalem, see J. Barton Payne, “Jerusalem,” in *The Zondervan Encyclopedia of the Bible* (rev. ed.; ed. Merrill C Tenney and Moisés Silva; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 3:528-64, esp. 562-64; and D. A. Carson, “Jerusalem,” in *Evangelical Dictionary of Theology* (ed. Walter A. Elwell; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1984), 579-81.

³⁶Marshall cautions against pushing expectation of the Second Coming so far into the future that it no longer affects the believer’s current lifestyle. “We should not attach any significance in this connexion to Luke 19:11, since the point of this editorial comment is that the disciples were wrong in expecting the kingdom of God to come when Jesus entered Jerusalem; it is not concerned with the expectations held by Luke’s readers at a later date.” Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*, 131-32.

³⁷*Ibid.*, 154-55.

³⁸Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 15.

³⁹Matt 21:14-17 records a similar but later confrontation about Jesus’ identity happening in the temple district between Jesus and the chief priests and scribes. Luke records several such confrontations in Jerusalem in Luke 20-23.

⁴⁰Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 681.

⁴¹For example, people rejoiced as Solomon, the son of David, was brought into the city on a mule to become king over his father’s kingdom (1 Kgs 1:32-40; cf. 2 Sam 18:9; 19:26), people spread their garments out for Jehu to walk upon when he became king (2 Kgs 9:13), and palm branches, praise, and singing were

all part of Simon Maccabeus's entrance into Jerusalem (1 Macc 13:51). "In analogous scenes, the person who enters the city does not do so in order to claim kingship; rather, entry presupposes an already achieved victory. This is important because it suggests that Jesus is not about to assert his royal status." Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 683. For longer lists of such accounts in ancient literature, see David R. Catchpole, "The 'Triumphal' Entry," in *Jesus and the Politics of His Day* (ed. Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984), 319-21; and Brent Kinman, "Parousia, Jesus' 'A-Triumphal' Entry, and the Fate of Jerusalem (Luke 19:28-44)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 280-84. On the theological significance of donkeys in Scripture, see now Kenneth C. Way, *Donkeys in the Biblical World: Ceremony and Symbol* (History, Archaeology, and Culture of the Levant 2; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2011).

⁴²Darrell Bock notes that, as one of the Hallel Psalms (Pss 113-118), Psalm 118 was used liturgically at festivals and to greet pilgrims at the Feast of Tabernacles, but its use by Passover pilgrims entering Jerusalem is unusual; Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 12; Sheffield: JSOT, 1987), 122-23. The point is that, even if not fully understood by all members in the crowd, they are treating Jesus in an intentional and messianic way and are not merely being caught up into a usual Passover practice.

⁴³Kinman, "Jesus' Royal Entry into Jerusalem," 405; cf. esp. 409 and 411.

⁴⁴John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (2nd ed.; Anchor Bible Reference; New York: Doubleday, 2010), 78.

⁴⁵In recounting Jesus' hearing before Pilate, all four Gospels report Pilate's question, "Are you the King of the Jews?" But only John makes explicit Jesus' claim, "My kingship is not of this world" (John 18:36). Rather than report this conversation, Luke has narrated the nonpolitical nature of Jesus' kingship.

⁴⁶"Though Jesus is rightly proclaimed to be the king, he is not now to establish a kingdom in Jerusalem";

Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 309; cf. 315.

⁴⁷Lynn A. Losie, "Triumphal Entry," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 857.

⁴⁸Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 313; cf. 316. See Luke 4:18-19; 7:18-23; Acts 2:22; 10:38.

⁴⁹"The realm of Jesus' kingship in Luke, accordingly, is beyond the sphere of earthly kingdoms (cf. Acts 1:6-8), and hence is not a political threat to the reigning powers (cf. Lk 23:3-4, 47; cf. Acts 25:8, 25)." Lynn A. Losie, "Triumphal Entry," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, 857; cf. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:1245.

⁵⁰Brent Rogers Kinman, "'The stones will cry out' (Luke 19:40): Joy or Judgment?" *Biblica* 75 (1994): 232.

⁵¹Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, 2:1252.

⁵²Lloyd Gaston, *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* (Supplements to Novum Testamentum 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970), 359; cf. Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 314.

⁵³Here Kinman's grammatical argument against the judgment view is convincing. That is, the judgment view must take the if-then statement both ways: "if they don't praise, judgment will come" and conversely, "if they do praise, judgment will not come." But the disciples do praise and Jesus says in Luke 19:41-44 that judgment is coming anyway, so the judgment view fails; see Kinman, "The stones will cry out," 234-35. In support of a praise view, Kinman (p. 235) notes the similarity to Cicero's description of his arrival in Rome (*In Pisonem*, 52): "That single day of my restoration to my country was to me a day of immortality, when I saw the senate and the entire people of Rome gathered outside the city and Rome herself seemed to dislodge herself from her fixed abode and go forth to embrace her saviour. And her reception of me was such that not only all men and women of all classes, ages, and ranks of society, of every circumstance and ever position, but even the very walls, buildings, and temples of the city seemed to show their joy."

⁵⁴James A. Sanders, "A Hermeneutic Fabric: Psalm 118

in Luke's Entrance Narrative," chapter 10 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 150. "It is as though Jesus responded, 'I'm sorry, friends, this event is happening, and the roles indicated have to be filled.'"

⁵⁵Arthur A. Just Jr., *Luke* (2 vols.; Concordia Commentary; St. Louis: Concordia, 1997), 2:748; cf. 1:152.

⁵⁶Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 298. Johnson notes that Luke uses a number of stone related sayings: Luke 3:8; 19:40, 44; 20:17, 18; 21:5-6; 24:2; cf. Acts 4:11.

⁵⁷Kinman, "Jesus' Royal Entry into Jerusalem," 421; cf. Strauss, *Four Portraits, One Jesus*, 480.

⁵⁸See Just, *Luke*, 2:748.

⁵⁹This is supported by the fact that Jesus gives the former demoniac in the Gentile Decapolis region the instructions to declare what was done rather than keep it quiet (Luke 8:26-39).

⁶⁰Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 311.

⁶¹In Luke's use of the term, a "disciple" is any follower of Jesus and not merely a member of the Twelve; it was this way from the beginning (see Luke 6:13 and 17).

⁶²See Jesus' response to the apostles' question about "kingdom of Israel" rule in Acts 1:6-8.

⁶³Garland, *Luke*, 744.

⁶⁴For more on the nature of Jesus' kingship and what it means for being his followers, see now Jonathan Lunde, *Following Jesus, the Servant King: A Biblical Theology of Covenantal Discipleship* (Biblical Theology for Life; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010).