

Highs & Lows

Luke 19:28-42

Pierre Cannings, Ph.D.

I. Ahead of Plan vs. 28-34

- a. Just as Planned
 - i. Sent Disciples Ahead
 - ii. Colt Tied
 - 1. The animal is described as tied up (an echo of Gn. 49:11, which has messianic associations) and not previously ridden (cf. Nu. 19:2; Dt. 21:3; 1 Sa. 6:7; 2 Sa. 6:3; cf. $\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\varsigma$, Zc. 9:9).
 - a. Animals for sacred use could not be put to ordinary use, but the same was also true for animals to be used by a royal personage
 - b. We should see this statement in light of the OT requirement that what was given to God not be something that was already secondhand, and therefore partly used up
 - 2. A second allusion is to Zech 9:9, The Greek translation of this verse speaks of a new or fresh donkey, and this is probably behind “on which no person has ever sat.”
 - a. This is part of the affirmation of Jesus’ royal dignity
 - 3. The thought here is probably to be related to the requirement that unused beasts be used for sacred purposes
 - a. Luke 23:53 that it was a previously unused tomb in which the body of Jesus was placed. It befits his royal dignity
 - iii. Anyone Ask
 - iv. Lord has need
 - 1. On the whole, it is most reasonable that Jesus was already known in the area—cf. the tradition of his contacts at Bethany—and that he was understood to be a kind of rabbi with authority to make a request of this kind. The fact that the trivial detail of obtaining the animal is told at such length (cf. 22:7–13) suggests that the Evangelists saw some importance in it, and this lay in its testimony to the authority and perhaps the prescience of Jesus
- b. Just as He Said
 - 1. Jesus demonstrates an unexplained awareness of (i) the location of the beast; (ii) its tethered state; (iii) the fact that it has never been ridden; and he has the perception to provide, as well, (iv) a pattern of words that will ensure the release of the animal by its owners (v 31).

2. which stresses the solemn nature of the mission; he states simply that the disciples found everything just as Jesus had said (cf. 22:13, 21, 34; Jn. 14:29); the phrase is brought forward from Mk. 11:6, where it indicates the disciples' obedience to Jesus' command, in order to indicate that his prophecy was fulfilled.
- ii. Asked
 1. The question may simply be about the authority of the disciples to impress or borrow the, but more probably it arises because of the odd action of the disciples in taking a foal that was not used for riding.
- iii. The Lord Has Need - **one who is in a position of authority, lord, master of transcendent beings**
 1. The term becomes important in chap. 23. Jesus is now on his way to royal rule, but only in the terms that 19:11–28 has defined this.
 2. Authority is rightly discerned, but this authority is the unique christologically determined authority of Jesus, not the culturally determined authority of a class of persons in society. Nor, despite its fit with the allusion to Gen 49:11 supported above, should the Markan text here. To Luke and to his readers "the Lord" here is the "Lord" of the full Christian affirmation (cf. at 7:13), though in Luke's story line, the terminology need mean no more than "the master" (of the disciples), whose authority, nonetheless, comes with his disciples, who speak the words that have been given to them by their master.

II. Riding on a High vs. 35-39

- a. Threw their Coats on the Colts
 - i. The use of ἐπιβιβάζω (10:34; *et al.*), may reflect the influence of Zc. 9:9 LXX, although it is admittedly the normal word for the process. The act is to be regarded as one of honour; such homage was a sign of kingship (1 Ki. 1:33).
 - ii. Despite the very limited basis of agreement, only an echo of Gen 49:11
 - iii. Likely to be as well an allusion to the honoring as king of the newly anointed Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:13.
- b. Spreading the Coats on road
 - i. The placing of garments for the animal to walk over is another expression of respect, perhaps indicating willingness to let a ruler trample on one's own property; cf. 2 Ki. 9:13;
 - ii. Luke probably thinks of two scenes in which OT figures prepare for a royal role: Solomon on David's donkey in 1 Kgs 1:33, and the newly anointed Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:13. Jesus is treated to an extravagant expression of supreme honoring.
- c. Crowd of Disciples

- i. Disciples
 - 1. Luke's phrase, 'the whole crowd of disciples' (cf. 19:37; *et al.*), is clearer than Mark's 'those who preceded and those who followed'
- ii. Praise God
 - 1. Joyfully with a loud voice
 - 2. For all the miracles they had seen
 - a. As Jerusalem is about to come into view, there is an explosion of ecstatic praise to God for all that Jesus represents. The praise focuses on the mighty works of Jesus, and, coming here, it represents a retrospective affirmation of the whole of Jesus' ministry, now drawing to a close.
 - b. But the link of the excitement to the appearance of Jerusalem suggests that these mighty works are also to be viewed as a precursor of the messianic blessedness that is expected to come out of this fateful entry.
 - c. The motif of praising God is also Lucan, but may be from a source (cf. 2:13, 20; 19:37; Acts 2:47; 3:8f.), and the language of the rest of the verse is Lucan. The δύνάμεις which the disciples have seen are simply those reported earlier in the Gospel (but cf. Mt. 21:14; Jn. 12:17)
- iii. Blessed is the King who comes
 - 1. For Luke the kingdom is not yet to appear (19:11) but the one who is to be king is at hand.
 - 2. He has the formula 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord', which is based on Ps. 118:26 (117:26), and which was used as a greeting for pilgrims. In the Ps., however, it appears to have been originally a greeting addressed to the king as he approached the temple to worship God
 - 3. Without the intrusion "the king," "blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord" is a quotation from Ps 118(117):26 (Mark's opening "hosanna" is a transliterated version of an Aramaic rendering)
- iv. Peace in Heaven
 - 1. Perhaps the phrase means that there is peace in heaven, i.e. between God and man as a result of the exaltation of Jesus as king (cf. Acts 10:36), or more probably the force of the saying is the same as in Rev. 7:10 where God is praised by the ascription of salvation to him, i.e. he is praised as the author of salvation.
 - 2. The coming of the king who brings peace (Zc. 9:9f.) is the appropriate occasion for ascribing praise to God as the author of peace.
 - 3. But it is true that what is being celebrated is oriented to heaven and not to the earth. εἰρήνη, "peace," I rather think that Luke has

in mind what is about to be achieved in heaven by means of Jesus' exaltation through death to the right hand of God: **the multitude of the angels had celebrated (2:13–14) what is achieved on the earth in the birth of Jesus; the multitude of the disciples now celebrate what is achieved in heaven by Jesus' journey through death to exaltation. In both cases "there is glory [for God] in highest heaven."**

4. In the unfolding of God's saving intervention, peace has come (or is about to) on earth and in heaven. The NT texts with the closest links are Col 1:20; Rev 12:10

d. Crowd - Matthew 21:9

i. Hosanna

1. It replaces the Marcan 'hosanna in the highest (places) i.e. in heaven', which is to be regarded as a 'summons to strike up songs of praise in the heavenly heights'
2. Hosanna – one who saves The term is simply a transliteration of the Heb imperative *hôša* ' , "save," augmented by the enclitic precativ particle - (n)nā, which adds a note of urgency, "save, now/please.

III. Lows vs. 39-42

a. Pharisees

i. Rebuke Disciples

1. **Rebuke- to express strong disapproval of someone, rebuke, reprove, censure also speak seriously, warn in order to prevent an action or bring one to an end.**
2. Or they may have felt simply that Jesus should not tolerate such extravagant and (in their eyes) unwarranted sentiments. \
3. The same motif appears in Mt. 21:14–16 where the chief priests and scribes are annoyed by the messianic acclamation of the children in the temple.
4. This will be their final appearance, and so their protest here should be taken to encapsulate all that has gone on before. They cannot see what God is doing in Jesus; they see in what he does only the fracturing of their piety and therefore the insulting of God. A Pharisee addresses Jesus as "teacher" in 7:40 (see there). Pharisaic opposition to Jesus' royal pretensions here parallels the role of the fellow citizens in 19:14.

ii. Stones will Cry Out

1. If the disciples keep silent, the stones will be forced to proclaim the mighty acts of God instead of them
2. As counterpart to the adoring praise of the disciples, we have the complaint of the Pharisees.

3. They cannot see what God is doing in Jesus. Instead, they see only the fracturing of their piety and therefore the insulting of God.
4. The respective roles of disciples and Pharisees provide parallels to those of the slaves and the fellow citizens of the preceding parable.
5. If the disciples were silenced, then lifeless stones would take up the refrain: creation must in some shape or form bear its witness to such a momentous occasion.

b. Saw Jerusalem

- i. Wept over - lamenting over the imminent destruction of Jerusalem
- ii. Jesus' lamentation is especially reminiscent of that of Jeremiah (Jer 9:1; 13:17)
- iii. Not in exact language, but as a whole description, what we find here has its closest parallels in Isa 29:3; Ezek 4:1–3. What Jesus anticipates is a replay of the experience of the Babylonian period. Since in precise detail what actually happened when Jerusalem met its doom in ad 70 does not agree with this description, we can be reasonably confident that this is no prophecy after the event. In any case this is not the only evidence that Jesus foretold the destruction of Jerusalem.
- iv. The sight of the city draws from him, as a weeping Jeremiah-like figure, a prophetic announcement of the coming destruction of the city, a fate that awaits it precisely because it has failed to see in the ministry of Jesus the visitation of God that was taking place.
- v. As Jesus sees Jerusalem spread out before him, he weeps over the destruction which will come over it unawares. The city could have learned the way of peace from his teaching, but it would fail to recognise in his coming the gracious presence of God offering a last opportunity of repentance; the attitude of the Pharisees (vs. 39f.) would prevail. There would be a different kind of visitation in due course, a judgment in which enemies would destroy the city stone by stone

c. If you had known

- i. Things for Peace
 1. Possibly there is an allusion to the Jerusalem which thought it had peace when in reality it had none (Je. 6:14).
 2. $\nu\tilde{\upsilon}\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is 'but as it is'. $\kappa\rho\acute{\upsilon}\pi\tau\omega$ (18:34; Mt. 11:25) may refer to the action of God who has given up the city that has for long rejected those who were sent to it (13:34; 11:50f.).
 3. Our starting-point is the OT word דִּלְשׁ in the sense of the salvation which comes from God, especially the eschatological salvation. Thus we read of the expected salvation in the song of Zacharias in Lk. 1:79: not to be taken as a wish, especially in its second part. The reference is not so much to peace among men or with God, but to the salvation which has come to earth. The closest parallels are Rev. 12:10:

4. Luke, however, can also use the term, *eirēnē*, to describe the more secular or mundane security involved in peace: from theft (11:21), averting war (14:32; Acts 12:20), release from persecution (Acts 9:31), reconciliation after an altercation between two people (Acts 7:26), or the end of a disagreement within the Church (Acts 15:33).
 5. An early lament over Jerusalem (Luke 13:34) bemoans Jerusalem's treatment of the prophets. Luke, and only he, depicts most poignantly Jesus' last lament over Jerusalem: "In no other place is it so movingly stated that Israel's national tragedy is a result of her refusal to live according to the covenant with God.
- ii. Hidden your Eyes
1. The multitude of the disciples had recognized the connection between Jesus and what makes for peace, but the city of Jerusalem, like the Pharisees of v 39, had not. The populace had been subjected to a blinding that is probably to be understood as satanic. Jesus laments their situation, because he sees, prophetically, the future outcome of it.
 2. The city collectively is in the same place as the Pharisees of v 39. A motif of general inability to understand has been met already at 8:10 (cf. v 12 and 13:33; Acts 28:26–27). This becomes in Luke 23:34; Acts 3:17; 13:27; 17:30 a culpable but forgivable ignorance. Luke uses language of blindness similarly in connection with disciples (9:45; 18:34; 24:16), but their blindness is only a limited blindness.

Word Studies

Lord - **one who is in a position of authority, lord, master¹ of transcendent beings**

Rebuke- to express strong disapproval of someone, *rebuke, reprove, censure* also *speak seriously, warn* in order to prevent an action or bring one to an end.²

Wept - (on weeping and lamenting over the imminent destruction of Jerusalem³

Peace - harmony in personal relationships *peace, harmony* w⁴. ὁμόνοια⁵

Luke, however, can also use the term, *eirēnē*, to describe the more secular or mundane security involved in peace: from theft (11:21), averting war (14:32; Acts 12:20), release from persecution (Acts 9:31), reconciliation after an altercation between two people (Acts 7:26), or the end of a disagreement within the Church (Acts 15:33).⁶ An early lament over Jerusalem (Luke 13:34) bemoans Jerusalem's treatment of the prophets. Luke, and only he, depicts most poignantly Jesus' last lament over Jerusalem: "Seeing the city he wept over her saying: 'If only you had known on this day that which brings peace; but now it is hidden from your eyes' " (Luke 19:42). In no other place is it so movingly stated that Israel's national tragedy is a result of her refusal to live according to the covenant with God. Even the desire to make Jesus a good Stoic who would not weep yields here to the historical reality. Similar statements are found in Josephus twenty years after the event.⁷

a. Our starting-point is the O⁸T word מִלְּשָׁח in the sense of the salvation which comes from God, especially the eschatological salvation. Thus we read of the expected salvation in the song of Zacharias in Lk. 1:79: προπορεύσῃ γὰρ ἐνώπιον V 2, p 413 κυρίου. ... τοῦ κατευθῆναι τοῦς

¹ William Arndt et al., [*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 577.

² William Arndt et al., [*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 384.

³ William Arndt et al., [*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 545.

⁴w. w. = with

⁵ William Arndt et al., [*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 287.

⁶ William Klassen, "[Peace: New Testament.](#)" in *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 209.

⁷ William Klassen, "[Peace: New Testament.](#)" in *The Anchor Yale Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 209.

⁸OT Old Testament.

πόδας ἡμῶν εἰς ὁδὸν εἰρήνης.⁶⁹⁹ The song of the angels in Lk. 2:14: δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας,⁷¹⁰⁰ is not to be taken as a wish, especially in its second part.⁷¹¹¹ The reference is not so much to peace among men or with God, but to the salvation which has come to earth. The same is true of Lk. 19:42: εἰ ἔγνωσ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην,⁷¹²² i.e., to thy salvation. The remarkable saying in Lk. 19:38b: ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, must be taken in the same sense. The closest parallels are Rev. 12:10: ἄρτι ἐγένετο ἡ σωτηρία ... τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, and Rev. 19:1: ἡ σωτηρία καὶ ἡ δόξα καὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, and the meaning is that εἰρήνη (the same as σωτηρία in Rev.) is present and is fashioned in heaven.⁷¹³³¹⁴

⁹⁶⁹ A. Plummer, *St. Luke*⁴ (ICC., ad loc.) relates this to the peace between God and His people, and Dausch Synpt., *ad loc.* to true felicity, but we are really to construe it with B. Weiss, *Die Ev. des Marcus u. Lucas* (1901) and Kl. Lk., *ad loc.* as Messianic salvation.

¹⁰⁷⁰ It is now generally recognised that the true reading is εὐδοκίας, cf. J. Jeremias, *ZNW*, 28 (1929), 13 ff.

¹¹⁷¹ Cf. also Rev. 12:10 and 19:1f.: That σωτηρία and δόξα become God's is an event.

¹²⁷² This is the true reading, without σου.

¹³⁷³ Cf. Zn. Lk. and Schl. Lk., *ad loc.*

¹⁴ Werner Foerster, "[Εἰρήνη. Εἰρηνεύω. Εἰρηνικός. Εἰρηνοποιός. Εἰρηνοποιέω.](#)" in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, ed. Gerhard Kittel, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, and Gerhard Friedrich (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1964—), 412–413.

Commentary Studies

(28) The opening verse is a Lucan link with the preceding section; the phrase εἰπὼν ταῦτα is meant to emphasise that Jesus has removed any basis for misunderstanding of the present incident, and the reformulation of the story itself is perhaps meant to smooth out any grounds for misunderstanding in Mk. ἔμπροσθεν means that Jesus went in front of his followers (cf. Mk. 10:32 for the motif). For ἀναβαίνω cf. 2:42; 18:31. εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα is drawn from Mk. 11:1. Although Jesus is not actually said to enter Jerusalem until the last supper, Conzelmann's view (68) that for Luke Jesus does not enter Jerusalem but only the temple is implausible (Marshall, 155 n. 1); the present verse surely implies that Jerusalem is his intended goal.

(29) The καὶ ἐγένετο ... construction is again regarded by Schramm, 145f., as pre-Lucan; he suggests that the opening of this verse belonged, with vs. 37f., to Luke's special source. This is possible, but the linguistic basis is not strong. ἤγγισεν is singular, diff. Mk. plural, thereby emphasising the leading position of Jesus (cf. v. 28). βηθφαγή, i.e. *bēṭ paggē*, 'house of unripe figs' (Mk. 11:1; Mt. 21:1), was a hamlet between Jerusalem and Bethany. βηθανίαν (so (UB¹⁵S)), but κ^* ¹⁶B D* have βηθανία, an indeclinable form, B¹⁷D 56²; cf. 24:50; Mk. 11:11f.; 14:3), i.e. *bēṭ 'anniyāh*, 'house of dates', is to be identified with El Azariyeh, two miles SE of Jerusalem and on the E of the Mount of Olives; for the topography see Finegan, 88–92. The places are named in a surprising order, since Bethany was further away from Jerusalem than Bethphage; it is possible that Bethany, the better-known place, was added to elucidate the situation of Bethphage. It is also notable that Bethphage appears to have marked the outer limit of the area which ritually belonged to Jerusalem itself. πρὸς means that Jesus came towards the Mount of Olives: ἔλαιων is genitive plural (cf. 19:37), but E. Nestle, followed by A¹⁸G, preferred the nominative form ἔλαιων ('olive yard', Acts 1:12) here and in 21:37; see the discussion in B¹⁹D 143; M²⁰H I, 235; W. Foerster, TDN²¹T V, 484 n. 100); surely, however, an accusative form would have been needed here. In view of Zc. 14:4 (cf. Ezk. 11:23) the hill came to have eschatological associations (S²²B I,

¹⁵UBS *The Greek New Testament* (3rd edition), United Bible Societies, London, 1976)

¹⁶B Baptist source

¹⁷BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

¹⁸AG W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, 1957

¹⁹BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

²⁰MH J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard and N. Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh, I, 1906; II, 1929; III, 1963; IV, 1976

²¹TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

²²SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

840–842), but these are not developed in the NT, and it figures solely as the place of the ascension in Acts; whether Luke expected the parousia to take place at the same location is not clear.

(30) The village opposite (κατέναντι^{23*}) to which Jesus sent the two disciples is no doubt Bethphage. Mark's paratactic style (καὶ εὐθύς ...) is improved by the use of ἐν ᾧ. According to W. Bauer^{24*} (summarised in A²⁵G s.v.), πῶλος means a 'young animal' when another animal is named in the context, but a 'horse' (not a 'colt') when it stands alone; he therefore adopts the meaning 'horse' here and in Mk. 11:2. The linguistic basis for this conclusion is inadequate (H.-W. Kuhn^{26*}, O. Michel, TDN²⁷T VI, 959–961); Mark follows the meaning of the word in the LXX (cf. Gn. 49:11; Zc. 9:9), and this is confirmed by Matthew's interpretation; the young of the ass is meant. This interpretation is also demanded by the circumstances of the story; it is more likely that an ass would be found in a village than the much rarer horse which was used more by the upper class. J. D. M. Derrett^{28*}, 244, states that animals would be kept for the benefit of travellers who might borrow or hire them to aid them on their journeys (cf. similar arrangements for stage coaches in later history). The animal is described as tied up (an echo of Gn. 49:11, which has messianic associations) and not previously ridden (cf. Nu. 19:2; Dt. 21:3; 1 Sa. 6:7; 2 Sa. 6:3; cf. νέος, Zc. 9:9). Animals for sacred use could not be put to ordinary use, but the same was also true for animals to be used by a royal personage (J. D. M. Derrett^{29*}, 248f.). We are probably to think of a young, unridden animal tethered alongside its mother, who would naturally accompany the young animal (cf. A. Frenz^{30*}, who thinks, however, that Jesus rode the mother). πῶποτε, 'ever' (Jn., 4x; 1 Jn. 4:12^{31*}), replaces Mk. οὕτω (Lk. 23:53): does Luke try to avoid the possible deduction from Mk. that a mere *man* was now about to ride it? ἄγω, par³². Mt., is preferable to Mk. φέρω in the case of leading an animal (cf. v. 35; 9:41).

(31) Jesus' instructions take care of the possibility that somebody will ask (ἐρωτάω, diff. Mk. λέγω) the disciples why (διὰ τί, diff. Mk. τί) they are untying the animal (diff. Mk. 'doing this'). If

^{23*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

^{24*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

²⁵AG W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, 1957

^{26*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

²⁷TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

^{28*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{29*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{30*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{31**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

³²par. is parallel to

they are asked, they will answer: because the master needs it. ἐρεῖτε is a polite imperative, par³³. Mt., diff. Mk. (cf. 22:11). αὐτῷ is added by A W Γ Δ Θ f³⁴1 f1³⁵3 pm; T³⁶R; *Diglo*³⁷t; the omission in κ³⁸B D L R pc could be due to assimilation to Mt. and Mk. ὅτι is here causal (in Mt. it may introduce indirect speech). The word κύριος is ambiguous. It is unlikely to refer to God; it is more likely that it refers to the animal's owner (αὐτοῦ should perhaps be taken with κύριος rather than χρεῖαν, at least in Mk.; cf. J. D. M. Derrett^{39*}, 246 n. 2), but in Lk. there is a reference to οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ in v. 33 which indicates that this is not the meaning here. Accordingly ὁ κύριος must mean 'its (real) owner' (J. D. M. Derrett^{40*}, 246f.) or 'the Master' (123), as a term used to refer to Jesus. On the first view, Jesus is the 'real owner', in contrast to 'its owners' below. Readers of the Gospels probably accepted the second of these two possibilities. It is not clear how much significance was originally present in the phrase. Luke omits the remainder of Mk. 11:3 which probably seemed unnecessary to him.

(32) Luke introduces the subject οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι (cf. 13:34) which stresses the solemn nature of the mission; he states simply that the disciples found everything just as Jesus had said (cf. 22:13, 21, 34; Jn. 14:29); the phrase is brought forward from Mk. 11:6, where it indicates the disciples' obedience to Jesus' command, in order to indicate that his prophecy was fulfilled. The story does not make it clear whether what happened took place in view of a prior arrangement made by Jesus or was a matter of supernatural prescience. A prior arrangement is certainly possible. If animals were kept for the purpose of hiring or lending out to travellers, no such arrangement need have been made, nor is prescience necessary, except if Jesus knows that the animal will be an unriden foal. The story thus gives the impression of prescience, but may originally have referred to a normal human arrangement.

(33) The rest of the story unfolds as Jesus foretold. While the disciples were untying the animal to take possession of it (genitive absolute, diff. Mk.), the persons responsible for it (cf. Acts 16:16, diff. Mk., 'some of the bystanders') asked them what they were up to. The question may simply be about the authority of the disciples to impress or borrow the animal, but more probably it arises because of the odd action of the disciples in taking a foal that was not used for riding.

(34) The disciples answer with the words provided by Jesus, and these suffice to satisfy the questioners. *It is unlikely that ὁ κύριος here means the actual owner of the animal, and the implication is that a higher authority is recognised who has the right to impress the animal. On*

³³par. is parallel to

³⁴f1 Family 1 (Lake)

³⁵f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

³⁶TR *Theologische Rundschau*

³⁷*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

³⁸B Baptist source

^{39*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{40*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

the whole, it is most reasonable that Jesus was already known in the area—cf. the tradition of his contacts at Bethany—and that he was understood to be a kind of rabbi with authority to make a request of this kind. The fact that the trivial detail of obtaining the animal is told at such length (cf. 22:7–13) suggests that the Evangelists saw some importance in it, and this lay in its testimony to the authority and perhaps the prescience of Jesus.

(35) When the animal had been brought to Jesus (ἄγω, as in v. 30), the disciples threw garments upon it, and seated Jesus on it. ἐπιρίπτω (1 Pet. 5:12^{*41*}) is ‘to throw upon’, diff. Mk. ἐπιβάλλω (Mt. ἐπιτίθημι); the clothes are apparently meant to do duty for a saddle, and would be needed if the foal was not normally intended to be ridden. Luke alone draws attention to the action of the disciples in mounting Jesus on the animal (diff. Mk. ἐκάθισεν), and the use of ἐπιβιβάζω (10:34; *et al.*), may reflect the influence of Zc. 9:9 LXX, although it is admittedly the normal word for the process. The act is to be regarded as one of honour; such homage was a sign of kingship (1 Ki. 1:33).

(36) Luke has dropped the vague subject in Mk. (πολλοί), so that it is apparently the disciples who continue to act here (diff. Mt., ‘the crowd’), and he inserts a genitive absolute phrase to bring out the fact that Jesus actually proceeded on the foal. While he did so, the disciples strewed their garments on the way. ὑποστρώννυμι^{*42*} is ‘to spread something out beneath’ (cf. Jos. Ant. 9:111; 18:204), diff. Mk. στρώννυμι; αὐτῶν (κ D f⁴³1 f1⁴⁴3 pm; T⁴⁵R; UB⁴⁶S; *Diglot*⁴⁷) is perhaps more likely than ἐαυτῶν (A⁴⁸B W Θ *al.*; *Synopsis*⁴⁹s) in view of the usage in v. 35. The placing of garments for the animal to walk over is another expression of respect, perhaps indicating willingness to let a ruler trample on one’s own property; cf. 2 Ki. 9:13; Jos. Ant. 9:111; S⁵⁰B I, 844f.; Plutarch, Cato Mi. 7; Acts of Pilate 2 (NTA⁵¹I, 451). Luke makes no mention of the use of palm branches; was their use not regarded as part of the kingly symbolism?

(37) Luke’s account here differs considerably from Mark’s, and raises the question whether another source is being used. The use of ἐγγίζω (repeated from v. 29) and the genitive absolute indicates a Lucan connection with what precedes, but the combination with πρὸς (instead of

^{41**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{42**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

⁴³f1 Family 1 (Lake)

⁴⁴f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

⁴⁵TR *Theologische Rundschau*

⁴⁶UBS *The Greek New Testament* (3rd edition), United Bible Societies, London, 1976)

⁴⁷*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

⁴⁸B Baptist source

⁴⁹*Synopsis* K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, Stuttgart, 1964 (cited as giving the text of E. Nestle-K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1963²⁵)

⁵⁰SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

⁵¹NTA I E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* (translated by R. M. Wilson, *et al.*), London, 1963, 1965

the simple dative) is surprising (Schramm, 147); πρὸς with dative is rare (Mk. 5:11; Jn. 18:16; 20:11f.; Rev. 1:13^{*52*}). κατάβασις^{*53*} is 'descent, road leading down', and the description indicates that the procession has reached the summit of the Mount of Olives and is now beginning the descent, with Jerusalem spread out before it. The use of the phrase τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν is not Lucan (cf. 19:29, diff. Mk.; Schramm, 147). ἤρξαντο is plural with a collective noun as subject (Mt. 21:8; Acts 6:7; 25:24; Jn. 7:49; Rev. 8:9; 9:18; B⁵⁴D 134^{1c}); the construction is Lucan (Acts 25:24 is a close parallel). Luke's phrase, 'the whole crowd of disciples' (cf. 19:37; *et al.*), is clearer than Mark's 'those who preceded and those who followed', and could be regarded as an improvement of it. The motif of praising God is also Lucan, but may be from a source (cf. 2:13, 20; 19:37; Acts 2:47; 3:8f.), and the language of the rest of the verse is Lucan. The δύνάμεις which the disciples have seen are simply those reported earlier in the Gospel (but cf. Mt. 21:14; Jn. 12:17 for a similar motif). Hence there is no need to adopt the variant γινομένων (D r¹; Creed, 241). The verse is reminiscent of the praise which greeted Jesus on his entry into the world at Bethlehem in Galilee from the angels and the shepherds (2:13, 20); his entry to Jerusalem is hailed in the same way by those who have seen what has already happened.

(38) What now follows is to be understood in its Lucan context as the wording of the praise expressed to God for the mighty acts done by Jesus, although the saying itself does not at first sight have this character. Luke has omitted the Hebrew word ὠσαννά at both the beginning and the end of the saying; it would not have been intelligible to gentile readers. He has the formula 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord', which is based on Ps. 118:26 (117:26), and which was used as a greeting for pilgrims. In the Ps., however, it appears to have been originally a greeting addressed to the king as he approached the temple to worship God (G. W. Anderson, P⁵⁵C, 439). This original force reappears in Lk. with the addition of ὁ βασιλεὺς (the text is confused: ὁ ἐρχόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς is read by B; UB⁵⁶S; *Synopsi*⁵⁷s; *Diglo*⁵⁸t; ὁ ἐρχόμενος, D W pc it; ὁ βασιλεὺς, κ^{*} pc Origen; ὁ ἐρχόμενος βασιλεὺς, κ^c A L Γ Δ Θ f⁵⁹1 f1⁶⁰3 pm; T⁶¹R. Metzger, 169f., regards the reading of ⁶²B as the most difficult; the others can be explained as assimilation to the LXX and the parallels. The presence of βασιλεὺς in the text is unquestionable; D adds it in a separate phrase). Several motifs may be involved here. Luke may

^{52**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{53**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

⁵⁴BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁵⁵PC M. Black (ed.), *Peake's Commentary*, Edinburgh, 1962

⁵⁶UBS *The Greek New Testament* (3rd edition), United Bible Societies, London, 1976)

⁵⁷*Synopsis* K. Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, Stuttgart, 1964 (cited as giving the text of E. Nestle-K. Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart, 1963²⁵)

⁵⁸*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

⁵⁹f1 Family 1 (Lake)

⁶⁰f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

⁶¹TR *Theologische Rundschau*

⁶²B Baptist source

be following a tradition also attested in Jn. 12:13, which alludes to Zc. 9:9 (cf. Lindars, 114f.). He has replaced a reference to the coming kingdom of David with a reference to the coming of the king (Burger, 112–114). For Luke the kingdom is not yet to appear (19:11) but the one who is to be king is at hand. The wording (without ὁ βασιλεύς) also appears earlier in 13:35, but we argued that this verse was probably not prophetic of the present occasion, since here it is the disciples from Galilee who utter the greeting and not the people of Jerusalem; the significance of the present scene is that the prophecy in 13:35 is *not* fulfilled at this point, as the next verse makes clear. The greeting closes with an enigmatic couplet, peculiar to Lk. and reminiscent of, but significantly different from 2:14. It replaces the Marcan ‘hosanna in the highest (places) i.e. in heaven’, which is to be regarded as a ‘summons to strike up songs of praise in the heavenly heights’ (E. Lohse, TDN⁶³T IX, 683). Hence δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις is to be understood as an ascription of praise in view of the coming of the king. The praise is regarded as addressed to Jesus by J. H. Davies, ‘The Acclamation in Luke 19:38’ (unpublished paper), who notes that to ascribe glory to Jesus is especially Lucan (9:26; 24:26), but this seems less probable than the view that glory is ascribed to God, since this is what is meant in Mk., and it is demanded by v. 37. The preceding phrase is difficult (ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη, κ ⁶⁴B L; inverted by *rell*; T⁶⁵R; *Diglot*⁶⁶t, but the chiasmic form is surely original). To speak of peace in heaven is unusual; contrast 2:14 where the effect of the Messiah’s birth is peace on earth among men, i.e. salvation. W. Foerster, TDN⁶⁷T II, 413, takes the view that salvation is present and fashioned in heaven (cf. Rev. 12:10; 19:1); it is not yet present in Jerusalem (cf. 19:39–44; Klostermann, 189; Ellis, 225). H. Traub’s explanation of the relation to 2:14 (TDN⁶⁸T V, 519 n. 169) is not perspicacious. J. H. Davies suggests that peace is given to Jesus in order that he may give it to men (cf. the Spirit, Acts 2:33), but this does not explain why this happens in heaven. Perhaps the phrase means that there is peace in heaven, i.e. between God and man as a result of the exaltation of Jesus as king (cf. Acts 10:36), or more probably the force of the saying is the same as in Rev. 7:10 where God is praised by the ascription of salvation to him, i.e. he is praised as the author of salvation. The same liturgical use is present here, so that ἐν οὐρανῷ is virtually a periphrasis for the name of God. The coming of the king who brings peace (Zc. 9:9f.) is the appropriate occasion for ascribing praise to God as the author of peace.

(39) Although the actors so far have been the disciples of Jesus, there is an audience, among which are to be found some Pharisees (for ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου cf. 9:38). It is possible that they are to be regarded as friendly to Jesus, as elsewhere in Lk. (7:36; 11:37; 14:1; possibly 13:31–33),

⁶³TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁶⁴B Baptist source

⁶⁵TR *Theologische Rundschau*

⁶⁶*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

⁶⁷TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁶⁸TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

but their advice is unacceptable. They think that Jesus should restrain the fervour of his disciples. They may possibly have feared for Jesus' safety (and their own skins) if such outbursts led to a messianic demonstration. Or they may have felt simply that Jesus should not tolerate such extravagant and (in their eyes) unwarranted sentiments. The same motif appears in Mt. 21:14–16 where the chief priests and scribes are annoyed by the messianic acclamation of the children in the temple. A common tradition may lie behind the two Gospels here, especially as a similar motif occurs yet again in Jn. 12:18f. Cf. Bultmann, 34, who holds that an 'ideal scene' is being described.

(40) Jesus' reply is peculiar to Lk. After λέγω ὑμῖν the conjunction ὅτι is added in κ A D Γ Δ ϵ^{69} 1 pm ; T⁷⁰R; *Diglo*⁷¹t. The use of ἔάν with the future indicative is rare (1 Thes. 3:8; 1 Jn. 5:15; M⁷²H I, 168, 187; B⁷³D 372^{1a} 373²). For σιωπάω cf. 1:20; Acts 18:9; Mk. 10:48; *et al.*; see also 18:39 note. The force of the saying as a whole is uncertain: 1. It is no more possible for the disciples to keep silent than it is for stones to speak. 2. If the disciples keep silent, the stones will be forced to proclaim the mighty acts of God instead of them (cf. Grundmann, 367f.). 3. Hab. 2:11 was taken up in the Targum and rabbinic writings to indicate that the stones could cry out against those who do evil (S⁷⁴B II, 253). This may be taken to refer to the stones crying out against the disciples who would sin by keeping silent (J. Jeremias, TDN⁷⁵T IV, 270; cf. Gn. 4:10; Job. 31:38, or, 4. to the stones crying out against the people who rejected Jesus and silenced the disciples (cf. Schlatter, 409f. who thinks that the reference is not to the stones speaking, but to the testimony of their being overthrown in AD 70). The portents in Jos. Bel. 6:288–300 are of a different kind. In any case, the saying serves to underline the truth of the messianic acclamation in v. 38. Its authenticity was strongly defended by J. Weiss, 501. The Jewish terminology is a sign that it is not a Lucan creation, and a traditional origin is likely; it may well be authentic.

c. The Fate of Jerusalem (19:41–48)

This brief section bridges the gap between Jesus' approach to Jerusalem and his teaching ministry in the temple, and falls into two parts. In the first, Jesus is still outside Jerusalem and weeps over the prospect that lies before the city which, he knows, will reject his message. Nevertheless, Jerusalem is given its chance to hear the message, and in the second scene Jesus

⁶⁹f1 Family 1 (Lake)

⁷⁰TR *Theologische Rundschau*

⁷¹*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

⁷²MH J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard and N. Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh, I, 1906; II, 1929; III, 1963; IV, 1976

⁷³BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁷⁴SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

⁷⁵TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

enters the temple and cleanses it of avaricious practices so that it may be a place of prayer to God and teaching for the people.

In order to accommodate the first scene, Luke has removed Mark's story of the cursing of the fig tree, whose two parts bracketed the story of the cleansing of the temple (Mk. 11:12–14, 20–25). He has already related a parable which might be considered an equivalent to this dramatic parable (13:6–9), and the new material expresses the same theme. At the same time, the cleansing of the temple appears more clearly as a prelude to Jesus' teaching there.

i. Jesus Weeps over Jerusalem 19:41–44

As Jesus sees Jerusalem spread out before him, he weeps over the destruction which will come over it unawares. The city could have learned the way of peace from his teaching, but it would fail to recognise in his coming the gracious presence of God offering a last opportunity of repentance; the attitude of the Pharisees (vs. 39f.) would prevail. There would be a different kind of visitation in due course, a judgment in which enemies would destroy the city stone by stone.

The section is peculiar to Lk., but is unlikely to be a Lucan composition. The language shows at least one Aramaic feature (v. 44), and the theme is found elsewhere in Luke's special material (cf. 13:34f.; 23:28–31, and possibly 21:5f., 20–22). The material may have formed part of an apocalyptic discourse, traces of which can be seen in 21. The thought is dependent on Je. 6:6–21 (Hastings, 116–120) and Is. 29:1–4, and it is therefore unnecessary to hold (with Bultmann, 130; Wilson, 71) that it was composed after AD 70: 'To describe these verses as a Christian composition after the event is the kind of extravagance that brings sober criticism into disrepute' (Manson, *Sayings*, 320). This comment may itself be exaggerated; but, although the passage may have been edited in the light of AD 70 (J. Weiss, 501), there is no reason to doubt that the Christian interpretation of the fall of Jerusalem as the outcome of failure to accept the message of Jesus goes back to Jesus himself (Ellis, 226).^{76*}

(41) The connecting verse is probably Lucan (ὥς, ἐγγίζω, κλαίω (6:21; *et al.*) with ἐπί, 23:28). Only here and in Jn. 11:35 is Jesus said to weep.

(42) The sorrow of Jesus over the impending fate of Jerusalem (cf. 23:28f.) is matched by that of Jeremiah (Je. 8:18ff.; 15:5; cf. 2 Ki. 8:11f.). ὅτι is *recitativum*. It is followed by the protasis of a present, unfulfilled condition, with the apodosis suppressed (B⁷⁷D 482; cf. Nu. 22:29; Jos. 9:7; Is. 48:18; Jn. 6:62; Acts 23:9). The force is: 'If only you knew now ..., the future would hold something better for you, *or* it would be pleasing to me'. For ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ καὶ σὺ (κ⁷⁸B L 579 *pc*) there are the variants καὶ σὺ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ (Θ *pc*); καὶ σὺ καὶ γε ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ((A D f⁷⁹1 *al*) W f1⁸⁰3 *pm lat*; T⁸¹R): Metzger, 170, argues that καὶ γε (Acts 2:18; Acts

^{76*} See Manson, *Sayings*, 319–322.

⁷⁷BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁷⁸B Baptist source

⁷⁹f1 Family 1 (Lake)

⁸⁰f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

⁸¹TR *Theologische Rundschau*

17:27) is a secondary addition. With the meaning ‘at least’ (B⁸²D 439²), it would stress that this was Jerusalem’s last opportunity after she had rejected many previously. The force of καὶ σὺ, ‘even you’, may possibly be to draw attention to the significance of ‘Jerusalem’ as the city of peace (Heb. 7:1f.; cf. Je. 15:5; Pss. 122:6; 147:12–14), but since the city is not named in the context this allusion must remain doubtful.

τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην (14:33) here signifies ‘the things that make for your peace’ (σου is added by A W Γ Δ f⁸³1 pm; T⁸⁴R; *Diglo*⁸⁵t; and σοι by D f1⁸⁶3 157 pc lat; cf. Metzger, 170), i.e. for salvation (W. Foerster, TDN⁸⁷T II, 413). Possibly there is an allusion to the Jerusalem which thought it had peace when in reality it had none (Je. 6:14). νῦν δέ is ‘but as it is’. κρύπτω (18:34; Mt. 11:25) may refer to the action of God who has given up the city that has for long rejected those who were sent to it (13:34; 11:50f.).

(43) The ὅτι ... clause is to be taken with εἰ ἔγνων ...: ‘if only you knew ... for the consequences of your ignorance are fearful’. For ἡμέραι cf. 5:35; 17:22; 21:6; 23:29; and for ἥκω cf. 13:35. The addition of ἐπὶ σέ is unusual and indicates the menacing character of the future period. καί is equivalent to ‘when’ (B⁸⁸D 442⁴; cf. Mk. 15:25; Lk. 23:44; Mt. 26:45; Heb. 8:8). παρεμβάλλω^{*89*}, ‘to throw up against’, is a military term, and χάραξ^{*90*}, is ‘stake, palisade’ (cf. Is. 29:3 LXX; Je. 6:6 MT); for the adoption of this manoeuvre by the Romans cf. Jos. Bel. 5:262ff., 491ff.: when the palisade erected by the Romans was burned down by the Jews, it was replaced by a stone siege-dyke. This latter may be referred to by περικυκλώω^{*91*}, ‘to surround, encircle’ (Jos. 6:13; 2 Ki. 6:14; cf. Lk. 21:20; Is. 29:3), but this verb may simply stress that the siege-works extend all round the city. συνέχω (4:38; *et al.*) here means ‘to press hard upon’ (2 Mac. 9:2); πάντοθεν is ‘from all sides’ (Mk. 1:45; Heb. 9:4^{*92*}).

(44) ἐδαφίζω^{*93*} (here with an Attic future) can mean ‘to dash something to the ground’ (Ps. 137 (136):9; Ho. 10:14) or ‘to raze something to the ground’ (Is. 3:26). Here the two

⁸²BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁸³f1 Family 1 (Lake)

⁸⁴TR *Theologische Rundschau*

⁸⁵*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

⁸⁶f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

⁸⁷TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁸⁸BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

^{89**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{90**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{91**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{92**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{93**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

meanings may be combined (A⁹⁴G), in which case τὰ τέκνα is a second object, or the second meaning is intended, and καὶ τὰ τέκνα ... is to be taken as a circumstantial clause: ‘while your children are in you’ (Manson, *Sayings*, 320). The τέκνα are the inhabitants of the city (1 Mac. 1:38; *et al.*; A. Oepke, TDN⁹⁵T V, 639), but the destruction of children is a traditional feature of descriptions of siege (Ho. 13:16; Na. 3:10) and this idea is possibly present here. Not a stone will be left in position; cf. 2 Sa. 17:13, and Lk. 21:6 par⁹⁶. Mk. 13:2. The active form ἀφήσουσιν, diff. 21:6 passive, may be due to assimilation to the preceding verb forms, but in any case it is probably a sign of use of a source: Luke had no need to conflate with Mk. 13:2 here. For λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον ἐν σοί (κ⁹⁷B L 33 *pc*), *Diglo*⁹⁸ has ἐν σοὶ λίθον ἐπὶ λίθον, possibly a misprint for ἐν σοὶ λίθον ἐπὶ λίθῳ (A C W (Γ) Δ f1⁹⁹3 *pl*; T¹⁰⁰R). For ἀνθ’ ὧν cf. 1:20; *et al.* γινώσκω is here ‘to recognise’, and for καιρός cf. 12:56. ἐπισκοπή is ‘visitation’, the coming of God whether for good (Gn. 50:24f.; Ex. 3:16; Wis. 2:20; 3:7; Job 10:12; 29:4; *et al.*) or for judgment (Je. 6:15; 10:15; Is. 29:6; cf. 1QS 3:14, 18; 4:6, 11, 19, 26; Braun, *Qumran* I, 92; H. W. Beyer, TDN¹⁰¹T II, 606–608); cf. 1:78; 7:16; 1 Pet. 2:12. Here the visitation is intended to be the occasion of salvation as proclaimed by Jesus; unrecognised as such, the same visitation becomes the basis for a judgment yet to follow.¹⁰²

⁹⁴AG W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, Cambridge, 1957

⁹⁵TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁹⁶par. is parallel to

⁹⁷B Baptist source

⁹⁸*Diglot* Luke: A Greek-English Diglot for the Use of Translators (British and Foreign Bible Society, London, 1962; this work incorporates the projected 3rd edition of the BFBS text of the Greek New Testament prepared by G. D. Kilpatrick)

⁹⁹f13 Family 13 (Ferrar)

¹⁰⁰TR *Theologische Rundschau*

¹⁰¹TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

¹⁰²I. Howard Marshall, [*The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*](#), New International Greek Testament Commentary (Exeter: Paternoster Press, 1978), 711–719.

Making a Royal Approach to Jerusalem (19:29–40)

Comment

A rich vein of biblical allusion here celebrates the royal identity of Jesus and the sense that something decisive in relation to this identity is about to transpire in Jerusalem. At the same time, the story stresses the distance between this royal figure and other competitors for royal dignity and power. The text looks back on the cumulative achievement of Jesus' ministry and forward to his translation into the heavenly sphere.

29 Luke has already used Mark's εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, "to Jerusalem," in v 28. For Mark's ὅτε, "when," with the present verb, Luke substitutes ἐγένετο ὡς, "it happened when/as," with the aorist (ἐγένετο ὡς is not infrequent in the LX¹⁰³X, and it may be considered here as Lukan imitation of Septuagintal style; since, however, the only other uses of this construction in the NT [1:23, 41; 2:15] may reflect a Semitic source, the use here has been appealed to as reflecting a second Lukan source). Luke makes it clear that Ἐλαιῶν, "Of Olives," is a name and not a description by adding τὸ καλούμενον, "called" (cf. 6:15; 7:11; 9:10; etc). Mark's historic present for "sent" (lit¹⁰⁴. "sends") also becomes for Luke an aorist.

ἤγγισεν, "he drew near," involves a Greek root that Luke uses throughout this section (18:35; 19:11, 37, 41) to highlight the thread of geographical procession. The location of Bethphage is uncertain, though it must have been close enough to Bethany for the villages to be naturally paired. Its name is normally taken as a transliteration of an Aramaic phrase meaning "house of unripe figs," which is then explained in terms of a species of fig that though edible never seems to ripen properly. Bethany is to be located about two miles east of Jerusalem, on the eastern slopes of the Mount of Olives. The name is again Aramaic, but an etymological sense "house of dates" (Marshall, 712) is likely to be based on the Gospel pairing of the two names; "House of (H)ananiah" is more likely (cf. Fitzmyer, 1248). The Mount of Olives is the central of three main summits of a range rising from the Kidron valley, east of the city and running north-south. Jesus is still on the opposite side of the mountain from Jerusalem. While it is not impossible that the Mount of Olives at this point in Mark has a symbolic significance (in 13:3 it does seem to have a symbolic significance, where Ezek 11:23 appears to be echoed), there is no basis for reading Luke in this way (see Nolland, "Luke's Readers," 129–30). "Two disciples" of the Baptist are involved at 7:19 (and see 22:8; cf. Mark 14:13; Luke 10:1). Given the

¹⁰³LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

¹⁰⁴lit. literally

mysterious complexity of the arrangements for finding and fetching the donkey, the number may be related to the theme of legal adequacy for witness (cf. at 7:18).

30 Luke makes a series of minor editorial adjustments to the Markan text here, of which the most notable are the replacement of several of the verbs with participles; the omission of one of Mark's uses of "immediately"; the better choice of ἀγάγετε, "bring/lead," over Mark's φέρετε, "carry/bring," for the leading of an animal; and the touch of elegance gained by Luke's ἐν ᾧ (lit¹⁰⁵. "in which") for a Markan paratactic καί, "and" (Luke in this way creates a kind of parallelism with the coming ἐφ' ᾧ, "upon which"). One minor piece of artistry worth noting is the chiasmic parallelism created in the Lukan ordering of εὗρήσετε πῶλον δεδεμένον, "you will find a donkey tethered," and λύσαντες αὐτὸν ἀγάγετε, untie and bring it.' The Markan text leaves unclear which of the two villages is intended, and Luke does not clarify (Matthew solves the problem by only mentioning Bethphage in this episode).

πῶλον is capable of a range of meanings, but despite Bauer (*JB*¹⁰⁶ L 72 [1953] 220–29), it will mean "donkey" here (as in LX¹⁰⁷X) and not "horse" (as would be more natural in secular Greek of the period; cf. Michel, *NT*¹⁰⁸S 6 [1959–60] 81–82; id¹⁰⁹., *TDN*¹¹⁰T 6:959–61; Kuhn, *ZN*¹¹¹W 50 [1959] 82–91). Jesus demonstrates an unexplained awareness of (i) the location of the beast; (ii) its tethered state; (iii) the fact that it has never been ridden; and he has the perception to provide, as well, (iv) a pattern of words that will ensure the release of the animal by its owners (v 31). While this is of a piece with the Lukan portrayal of Jesus' uncanny awareness of what goes on in other people's minds (see at 4:23; for Mark, prior arrangement could be the preferred explanation [cf. 14:13–15, which Luke reproduces in 22:10–12], but this seems less likely for Luke, and is not certain for Mark), more is surely involved here, especially when the anticipated events are substantiated in vv 32–35. Why the extended treatment? Despite the very limited basis of agreement, only an echo of Gen 49:11 can, to my mind, account for the generosity of this narrative investment. This likelihood is strengthened if (i) as maintained by a range of scholars, Zech 9:9 (see discussion at v 35 of the present episode's links with that verse) already involves allusion to Gen 49:11 (or if an exegetical tradition linking the two already existed in the first century); and if (ii) "upon which no person has ever sat" is to be traced back to the Septuagintal νέον, "new/young/fresh," used to describe the donkey of Zech 9:9. If there is such a link with Gen 49:11, what significance will it have? There is a dramatic contrast between the royal figure of Gen 49:11–12, who in the best traditions of royal excess and self-indulgence, tethers his own beast to the vine in order to satiate himself on the richness of wine and milk, and the figure (no less royal) in Luke of one who must borrow a donkey in order to stage his royal entry into Jerusalem (Luke will drop the Markan assurance that the donkey will be returned at once), and who does so with full anticipation of rejection and execution. If this

¹⁰⁵lit. literally

¹⁰⁶*JBL Journal of Biblical Literature*

¹⁰⁷LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

¹⁰⁸*NTS New Testament Studies*

¹⁰⁹id. *idem*, the same

¹¹⁰*TDNT* G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., tr. G. W. Bromiley *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)

¹¹¹*ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

contrast is intended, then the humility motif of Zech 9:9, which lacks explicit expression in either the Lukan or the Markan form, is nonetheless likely to be in view (at least in Mark, and probably also in Luke who would have been likely to abbreviate heavily if he had not seen the point). That the donkey had not been used as a mount is of a piece with the use of garments in lieu of trappings in v 36 (cf. Catchpole, “The ‘triumphal’ entry,” 324). The thought here is probably to be related to the requirement that unused beasts be used for sacred purposes (that is beasts whose potential has not been already partly used up; Num 19:2; Deut 21:3; 1 Sam 6:7), and then in turn to the point made in 23:53 that it was a previously unused tomb in which the body of Jesus was placed. It befits his royal dignity that he should not have to share with previous users (the thought actually fits a little awkwardly with the fact that the donkey is only a temporarily borrowed one!). Are we to think of an unbroken mount over which Jesus exercises royal mastery, or should we be less literal and think of a beast trained to be a mount, but not yet put to use, or does the framing of such questions already take us outside the intent of the narrative?

31 Luke makes a series of stylistic alterations to Mark’s wording here and drops the Markan clause about the prompt return of the donkey. Though found persuasive by several, we should probably not follow Derrett (*Nov¹¹²T* 13 [1971] 241–58) in appealing here to a (royal) right of impressment for which this statement of need would constitute sufficient justification. Authority is rightly discerned, but this authority is the unique christologically determined authority of Jesus, not the culturally determined authority of a class of persons in society. Nor, despite its fit with the allusion to Gen 49:11 supported above, should the Markan text here (and still less the Lukan text) be read as “his lord/master has need of it.” To Luke and to his readers “the Lord” here is the “Lord” of the full Christian affirmation (cf. at 7:13), though in Luke’s story line, the terminology need mean no more than “the master” (of the disciples), whose authority, nonetheless, comes with his disciples, who speak the words that have been given to them by their master.

32 Both Matthew and Luke feel the need to specify the subject here. Luke’s οἱ ἀπεσταλμένοι, “the ones sent,” may be chosen because it is cognate with “apostle,” and here these disciples will act as Jesus’ authorized delegates (see at 6:12–16). Luke brings “just as he had said” forward from its position in Mark 11:6 and applies it, not to the repetition of Jesus’ words, but to finding things just as Jesus had forecast (cf. 22:13 par¹¹³. Mark 14:16). This places additional emphasis on the foreknowledge of Jesus.

33 Luke continues his pattern of purely stylistic improvement here, but also makes one significant change: Mark’s “bystanders” become οἱ κύριοι αὐτοῦ, (lit¹¹⁴. “his masters/lords”). Luke could intend the phrase to mean those who had charge of the beast, but he probably thinks of owners (Buth [*JB¹¹⁵L* 104 (1985) 680–85] offers no adequate justification for reading the phrase in terms of a Hebrew idiom, and therefore as singular). The shared ownership of a donkey has attracted comment as an unlikely state of affairs. The question is asked, just as anticipated, and (in v 34) the answer will be given exactly as coached.

¹¹²*NovT* Novum Testamentum

¹¹³par. parallel or paragraph

¹¹⁴lit. literally

¹¹⁵*JBL* Journal of Biblical Literature

34 Having used the “just as” method of reporting in v 32, Luke here spells out with repetition of Jesus’ own words. The authority of these words is so decisive that he feels no need to include Mark’s “and they let them [take the animal].”

35 Luke changes all Mark’s verbs here (the first as in v 30; the second and third use more elegant language, though Luke may, for the third, be influenced by the Septuagintal language of 1 Kgs 1:33 [but Luke uses the verb also at 10:34 and Acts 23:24; the idiom involving the second verb is found in 2 Sam 20:12; 1 Kgs 19:19 (with the singular “garment” rather than Luke’s “garments”), but there is no real reason for linking these texts]). Thus far the initiative has been with Jesus, but now it passes to the disciples (Luke’s third verb change may be motivated in part by a desire to make this move more clear cut than the Markan text does). The garments on the donkey may well be in lieu of the missing standard trappings, but there is likely to be as well an allusion to the honoring as king of the newly anointed Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:13.

36 Luke uses a genitive absolute to provide a transitional expression: “as he went along” (Mark’s “many” is lost in compensation, which leaves the Lukan text vague about who is engaged in these actions); with a change of tense he makes a continuous process out of the strewing of garments; and he deletes mention of the cutting of leafy branches for the same purpose. An extravagant expression of supreme honoring is clearly intended, but no close parallel has been cited.

37 The content of this verse is not paralleled in the Markan account (nor in Matthew or John). Does the verse betray Luke’s access to a second source here? The distinctive use of ἐγγίζειν, “to draw near,” with πρὸς, “to,” + dative is the strongest element in the case for such a source. But since we have already noted Luke’s use of this verb to mark progress throughout this section of the Gospel, it may be possible to treat this usage as a hybrid influenced by the source use with πρὸς + acc¹¹⁶ in v 29, but taking on the dative that Luke normally uses after this verb. Θυνάμεις for “mighty works” is also unusual for Luke (only a source use in 10:13). The clear links with the language of 2:14 in v 38 stand in support of the language here being a deliberate echo of that in 2:13, 20 (see further below).

The explosion of praise comes as Jesus approaches the crest of the mount, beyond which Jerusalem will come into view. Luke wants to depict a crowd action as in Mark, but for him only disciples are in a position to discern the significance of this entry to anything like the level of perception that would warrant the ecstatic praise and affirmation that he here reports. Besides, a general crowd response here would create confusion about the referent of 13:35b, by making it possible to think that what was anticipated there had now already arrived (cf. v 38 below). At this point of anticipation of the fateful arrival in Jerusalem, the praise concerning “the mighty works” represents a retrospective affirmation of the whole of Jesus’ ministry, now drawing to a close (the “multitude” of the disciples will also represent symbolically the whole fruit of Jesus’ disciple-making activity), but the praise may also reasonably be taken as indicating the view that these mighty works are a precursor of the messianic blessedness to come out of this fateful entry.

38 Luke dispenses with Mark’s opening “hosanna” (he frequently dispenses with transliterated Semitic forms); he incorporates his own understanding of Mark’s second “blessed” clause into the first with an added appositional, “the king” (John also uses “the king,”

¹¹⁶acc according (to) or accusative

but the differences are striking and both text forms are natural developments of the Markan form); and for Mark's ὡσαννὰ ἐν τοῖς ὑψίστοις, "hosanna in the highest," Luke has ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, "in heaven peace, and glory in [the] highest."

Without the intruded "the king," "blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord" is a quotation from Ps 118(117):26 (Mark's opening "hosanna" is a transliterated version of an Aramaic rendering [cf. Fitzmyer, 1250–51] of part of the previous verse). This section of the psalm is clearly a ritualized welcome for pilgrims arriving in Jerusalem to worship at the temple. It is known to have been used in the great pilgrim feasts (Passover, Tabernacles, and perhaps even Pentecost and Dedication). As "the coming one" Jesus is much more than another pilgrim (cf. at 7:19), and Luke makes this quite explicit with his intrusion of "the king." Despite the word order, it will be the coming that is in the name of the Lord. Luke has not previously used "king" of Jesus, though in this section Jesus is consistently a royal figure. The term becomes important in chap. 23. Jesus is now on his way to royal rule, but only in the terms that 19:11–28 has defined this.

Luke's ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰρήνη καὶ δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις, "in heaven peace, and glory in [the] highest," has an evident relationship to 2:14: δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ..., "glory in [the] highest to God, and on earth peace ..." Baarlink (ZN¹¹⁷W 76 [1985] 170–86) has emphasized this link and understood it in terms of the removal to heaven, and so from availability to the Jewish leaders in their hostility to Jesus, of the peace that came to the earth with Jesus. But, despite the protest of the Pharisees in vv 39–40, this is hardly a natural reading of the text in its immediate context: the tone is celebratory, not threatening. But it is true that what is being celebrated is oriented to heaven and not to the earth. Though my suggestion does not involve the most natural of meanings for εἰρήνη, "peace," I rather think that Luke has in mind what is about to be achieved in heaven by means of Jesus' exaltation through death to the right hand of God: the multitude of the angels had celebrated (2:13–14) what is achieved on the earth in the birth of Jesus; the multitude of the disciples now celebrate what is achieved in heaven by Jesus' journey through death to exaltation. In both cases "there is glory [for God] in highest heaven." In the unfolding of God's saving intervention, peace has come (or is about to) on earth and in heaven. The NT texts with the closest links are Col 1:20; Rev 12:10. The alternative is to take "peace in heaven" as analogous to "treasure in heaven," but this does no real justice to the parallel with 2:14.

39 That Luke has a source for vv 39–40 is made likely by the evident link with Matt 21:14–16, but given the total failure of shared language and the very limited extent of shared content, the Evangelists will hardly have used a shared source here. It remains unclear what of the verses is traditional and what redactional. Pharisees have been regular antagonists for Jesus in Luke, but they have not been mentioned as present since 17:20 (but see 18:9; cf. v 10). This will be their final appearance, and so their protest here should be taken to encapsulate all that has gone on before. They cannot see what God is doing in Jesus; they see in what he does only the fracturing of their piety and therefore the insulting of God. A Pharisee addresses Jesus as "teacher" in 7:40 (see there). Pharisaic opposition to Jesus' royal pretensions here parallels the role of the fellow citizens in 19:14.

¹¹⁷ZNW Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

40 In the biblical tradition there is a strong sense that nature participates in the witness and celebration of what God is doing (the verbally closest parallel is actually Hab 2:11 where the stones of the walls of the house and its beams cry out in witness against the wickedness that has been perpetrated, but that is hardly what is happening here). The disciples are marking a moment of high destiny; if *their* marking of it were to be silenced, then the stony terrain around them would need to take their place.

Explanation

The present episode needs to be read closely with 19:11–28: Luke has gone to some pains to present them in parallel. The present royal arrival in Jerusalem is no bid for immediate enthronement there. The narrative here is built upon a basis of biblical allusion and quotation that point to the royal dignity of this arriving figure, but also to the gulf that separates him from the normal understanding of the exercise of the prerogatives of royal power.

The action begins about two miles from Jerusalem, when the pilgrim band was still out of sight of Jerusalem on the eastern slopes of the Mount of Olives. It will reach its climax as Jesus approaches the crest and the city comes into view.

It is unclear which of the villages Luke understands the disciples to have been sent to. Jesus' prior knowledge of what would be found there is clearly of great importance in the account. This is part of his mysterious otherness. It may be that the mention of the *two* disciples is precisely to indicate that the truth of this instance of Jesus' prescience can be legally assured, according to the OT requirements for legally valid witness.

What the disciples are told they will find (and do find) is a tethered donkey that has never been used as a mount. Several biblical allusions are involved here. The first is to Gen 49:11–12. But here more contrast than equation is involved. There is a dramatic contrast between the royal figure of Gen 49:11–12, who in the best traditions of royal excess and self-indulgence, tethers his own beast to the vine in order to satiate himself on the richness of wine and milk, and the figure (no less royal) in Luke of one who must borrow a donkey in order to stage his royal entry into Jerusalem, and who makes his entry with clear awareness of coming rejection and execution.

A second allusion is to Zech 9:9, an allusion pervasive in the narrative. The Greek translation of this verse speaks of a new or fresh donkey, and this is probably behind "on which no person has ever sat." We should see this statement in light of the OT requirement that what was given to God not be something that was already secondhand, and therefore partly used up (see Num 19:2; Deut 21:3; 1 Sam 6:7). A similar point will come in Luke 23:53. This is part of the affirmation of Jesus' royal dignity.

As the disciples carry out their task all goes as Jesus has said it would. Of particular note is the way in which his words, which have been shown again and again in the Gospel to be authoritative, are here shown to be no less so when they are spoken by those who have been sent as authorized delegates by Jesus. We have here something similar to the message of the mission charges (Luke 9:1–6; 10:1–16; and note esp. 10:17).

For the strewing of the garments and the putting of Jesus on the donkey, Luke probably thinks of two scenes in which OT figures prepare for a royal role: Solomon on David's donkey in

1 Kgs 1:33, and the newly anointed Jehu in 2 Kgs 9:13. Jesus is treated to an extravagant expression of supreme honoring.

As Jerusalem is about to come into view, there is an explosion of ecstatic praise to God for all that Jesus represents. The praise focuses on the mighty works of Jesus, and, coming here, it represents a retrospective affirmation of the whole of Jesus' ministry, now drawing to a close. But the link of the excitement to the appearance of Jerusalem suggests that these mighty works are also to be viewed as a precursor of the messianic blessedness that is expected to come out of this fateful entry.

v 38 uses some of the wording of Ps 118:26. The quotation is from what is clearly a ritualized welcome for pilgrims arriving in Jerusalem to worship at the temple. It is known to have been used in the great pilgrim feasts, but as "the coming one" of the psalm, Jesus is much more than another pilgrim (cf. at 7:19), and Luke makes this quite explicit with his intrusion of "the king" (which has no place in the wording of the psalm).

Beyond the quotation from Ps 118:26, the language of vv 37–38 involves allusion, not now to further biblical text, but to an earlier part of Luke's own text: chap. 2:13–14, 20. The intention of this link is disputed, but I think it is best understood as recognition of what is about to be achieved in heaven by means of Jesus' exaltation through death to the right hand of God: the multitude of the angels had celebrated (2:13–14) what is achieved on the earth in the birth of Jesus; the multitude of the disciples now celebrate what is to be achieved in heaven by Jesus' journey through death to exaltation.

As counterpart to the adoring praise of the disciples, we have the complaint of the Pharisees. They cannot see what God is doing in Jesus. Instead, they see only the fracturing of their piety and therefore the insulting of God. The respective roles of disciples and Pharisees provide parallels to those of the slaves and the fellow citizens of the preceding parable. To the Pharisees' complaint, Jesus replies that in such a high moment of destiny, if the disciples were silenced, then lifeless stones would take up the refrain: creation must in some shape or form bear its witness to such a momentous occasion.

Lamenting the Coming Fate of Jerusalem (19:41–44)

Comment

The coming of the city into sight draws from Jesus, as a weeping Jeremiah, an announcement of its pending doom as a city that has failed to recognize in the ministry of Jesus the visitation of God.

41 This verse may be entirely a Lukan contribution (for ὥς ἤγγισεν, "as he drew near," cf. v 29; for ἔκλαυσεν ἐπ' "he wept over," cf. 23:28 [the only other place in the NT where this idiom occurs; but there it is traditional, which could suggest that the idiom here is traditional as well]; Luke is responsible for ἰδὼν, "seeing," at least in 5:12; 18:43). Jesus' progress to the city takes yet another step. Jesus' lamentation is especially reminiscent of that of Jeremiah (Jer 9:1; 13:17; 14:17), but Tiede ("Weeping for Jerusalem," 78) catches well the wider canvas: "It is finally the sympathy of the suffering prophet, of Deuteronomy's Moses, of Jeremiah, Isaiah, and Hosea,

caught up in the rage, anguish, frustration, and sorrow of God for Israel that constitutes the pathos of the story.”

42 Luke may still be formulating here his setting for the verses to come (the failure to recognize recurs in v 44; τὰ πρὸς εἰρήνην, “what concerns peace,” may be taken up from v 38; this possibility finds support from the καὶ σὺ, “also you,” if this is read in connection with the perceptiveness in vv 37–38, by contrast, of the “multitude of the disciples”; this in turn suggests that “in this day” is a reference to the day in which the “multitude of the disciples” make their acclamation and/ or the day of Jesus’ royal approach to Jerusalem; νῦν, “now,” is one of Luke’s preferred words; ἐκρύβη ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου, “they are hidden from your eyes,” echoes language elements of 18:34 and 24:16). The city collectively is in the same place as the Pharisees of v 39. A motif of general inability to understand has been met already at 8:10 (cf. v 12 and 13:33; Acts 28:26–27). This becomes in Luke 23:34; Acts 3:17; 13:27; 17:30 a culpable but forgivable ignorance. Luke uses language of blindness similarly in connection with disciples (9:45; 18:34; 24:16), but their blindness is only a limited blindness. In both cases it may be best in the Lukan frame to attribute this blindness to Satan (see at 9:45). If the reference to peace is Lukan, and not traditional, then it is hardly likely that there is a play here on the name Jerusalem (as, e.g., Fitzmyer, 1256–57).

43 Now, except for the use of συνέχειν, “to press,” the language takes on a non-Lukan cast (the paratactic construction is un-Lukan; ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι is not Luke’s idiom for “days will come” [see 5:35; 23:29; cf. Acts 2:20]; periods of time do not come *upon* people elsewhere in Luke-Acts; Luke’s natural language for the Romans would not be “your enemies”; four of the key words are not found elsewhere in Luke-Acts [three not elsewhere in the NT]). παρεμβάλλειν means literally “to put in between” and so “to insert or interpose.” It is used in the LX¹¹⁸X in connection with attacks on cities (e.g., 2 Kgdms 12:28). χάραξ should mean a stake or a palisade, but may come to mean an earthen rampart set with palisades (as the Latin *vallum*). In the LX¹¹⁹X the word is used to translate הללס, sōlēlâ, which, because of the verb always associated with it, which literally means “to pour out,” must refer to a mound of earth (the same term is used to translate מצב, muṣṣāb; though this is clearly a military term, its precise sense is unknown). The mound is part of the equipment used in laying siege to a city. The four Roman earthwork embankments set against the walls of Jerusalem by Titus’ army (see Josephus, *War* 5.466) could correspond to this, but do not really fit the use of παρεμβαλοῦσιν, and are not likely to be quite what is in view in the OT language reflected here. περικυκλοῦν is used in connection with the military encirclement of a city (this verb is found in 4 Kgdms 6:14). This could be for siege purposes or to cut off avenues of escape. Titus’ army built an encircling wall around Jerusalem (Josephus, *War* 5.508). Only συνέχειν, “to press,” is not used in the LX¹²⁰X in connection with the siege of a city (it is found in 1 Kgdms 23:8 in connection with the besieging of David by Saul), and this is the one clearly Lukan term in the description. Not in precise language, but as a whole description, what we find here has its closest parallels in Isa 29:3; Ezek 4:1–3.

¹¹⁸LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

¹¹⁹LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

¹²⁰LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

44 The non-Lukan cast of the language continues here, except perhaps for the final clause. ἐδαφίζειν is used in the LX¹²¹X normally of the throwing down to the ground of women and children (thought of as destroying them) in the context of the sacking of a city. It is used in Ezek 31:12 (in connection with the imagery of the cutting down of a tree) of the bringing down of a city, and in Isa 3:26 of the bringing down of Zion. The shared fate of city and children comes closest to being reflected by Nah 3:10; Hos 14:1 (E¹²²T 13:16). The cumulative effect of the evocation in vv 43–44 of the OT descriptions of military conquest is to call to mind strongly the role of these conquests as judgments of God upon the sin of his people (and/or on the sin of their oppressors, but here the former). The striking imagery of no stone upon another is clearly a development of the idea of the throwing down of a city. It is not found in the OT (the imagery in 2 Sam 17:13 is closest, but there the imagery is of the *dispersal* of the stones of a city; Hag 2:15 uses the imagery of stone upon stone in connection with building). Dupont (*Bi*¹²³*b* 52 [1971] 310–20) has argued (to my mind convincingly) that the use of this imagery in Mark 13:2 (par¹²⁴. Luke 21:6) is based on a use of the same dominical tradition as reflected here in Luke. Many centuries earlier Micah had anticipated a similar degree of destruction for Jerusalem (3:12), which did not in fact transpire (Jer 26:18–19). In the Jewish war of A.D. 70, while the walls of Jerusalem were for the most part leveled, some of the towers and at least one section of the wall were left standing (Josephus, *War* 7.1–4).

In the final clause of the verse, ἀνθ' ὧν is likely to be Lukan (cf. at 12:3). The Lukan concern with the ignorance motif has been explored at v 42 above. ἐπισκοπή is used in the NT with the sense “visitation” only here and in 1 Pet 2:12, but Luke has the cognate verb for seven of its ten occurrences in the NT (in one of Luke’s uses the sense is different). The time of visitation by God is not the entry to Jerusalem as such, but the whole of the ministry of Jesus, now coming to its end. τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, “the time of your visitation,” may reflect the language of Jer 6:15 (LX¹²⁵X): ἐν καιρῷ ἐπισκοπῆς αὐτῶν, “in the time of their visitation,” which anticipates the same prospect of destruction for the city, but, by contrast with Luke, sees the visitation of God as itself destructive. See further at chap. 21 for how Luke understands this coming judgment upon Jerusalem.

Explanation

Jesus continues to get closer to Jerusalem. The sight of the city draws from him, as a weeping Jeremiah-like figure, a prophetic announcement of the coming destruction of the city, a fate that awaits it precisely because it has failed to see in the ministry of Jesus the visitation of God that was taking place.

The multitude of the disciples had recognized the connection between Jesus and what makes for peace, but the city of Jerusalem, like the Pharisees of v 39, had not. The populace had

¹²¹LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

¹²²ET English translation

¹²³*Bib Biblica*

¹²⁴par. parallel or paragraph

¹²⁵LXX The Septuagint, Greek translation of the OT

been subjected to a blinding that is probably to be understood as satanic. Jesus laments their situation, because he sees, prophetically, the future outcome of it.

The description of what awaits the city is a pastiche of OT texts that describe the taking in siege of cities, and especially of Jerusalem. Not in exact language, but as a whole description, what we find here has its closest parallels in Isa 29:3; Ezek 4:1–3. What Jesus anticipates is a replay of the experience of the Babylonian period. Since in precise detail what actually happened when Jerusalem met its doom in ad 70 does not agree with this description, we can be reasonably confident that this is no prophecy after the event. In any case this is not the only evidence that Jesus foretold the destruction of Jerusalem.

The judgment comes because the city had not recognized and responded to the visitation of God occurring in and through the ministry of Jesus. But of course this is no more a writing off of the Jews than the Babylonian exile had been centuries before. Though in individual cases judgment may leave no place for restoration, it is, throughout the OT, primarily a matter of chastisement and purgation for the historic People of God.¹²⁶

19:28 After Jesus had said this. By his introduction Luke linked the triumphal entry closely with the preceding parable dealing with Jesus' kingship (cf. 19:12, 14–15).

He went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem. For Luke a divine necessity lay behind this. See Introduction 8 (1).

19:29 He approached Bethphage and Bethany. The exact location of Bethphage, even whether it lies east or west of Bethany, is uncertain. Luke most probably referred to it because it

¹²⁶ John Nolland, [Luke 18:35–24:53](#), vol. 35C, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, Incorporated, 1993), 917–933.

was found in his Markan source. Bethany lies on the eastern slope of the Mount of Olives two to three miles from Jerusalem. It is referred to again in 24:50.

At the hill called the Mount of Olives. The Mount of Olives lies directly east of Jerusalem 2,660 feet above sea level. To reach Jerusalem one would proceed west down the Mount of Olives, through the Kidron Valley, and into the temple area through the eastern gate, later called the Golden Gate.

He sent two of his disciples. The disciples are unnamed in all three Synoptic Gospels.

19:30 Go to the village ahead of you. The village possibly was Bethphage.

As you enter it, you will find. This can be interpreted as an example of Jesus' prescience or as due to his prearrangement. If Jesus prearranged this, then the messianic character of the triumphal entry is heightened, for this means that Jesus intentionally sought to fulfill Zech 9:9 by riding into Jerusalem on a colt that never had been ridden. This would explain from a historical perspective why the owners of the colt permitted the disciples to take it. Yet it is quite possible that Luke and his readers might not have interpreted this text in so historical a manner. They might have thought that Jesus, the Lord (Luke 19:34), knew that a colt would be there because of his supernatural knowledge.¹²⁷³

A colt. Matthew 21:2 assumes that this was the colt of a donkey. The term (*pōlon*) simply means *colt* and can refer to a young horse or a young donkey. Luke's readers may very well have known this tradition, and if Matt 21:5 reflects a common association of this event to Zech 9:9, they would have assumed that the "colt" referred to a young donkey.

Which no one has ever ridden. Compare Luke 23:53. Such an animal was qualified to perform a sacred task (cf. Num 19:2; Deut 21:3; 1 Sam 6:7). This may also allude to the "young colt" of Zech 9:9.

19:31 If anyone asks. Jesus prepared the disciples for the future encounter with the owners.

The Lord needs it. "Lord" (*kyrios*) would be interpreted by Luke's readers as the Lord Jesus, not the owners (literally *lords* [*kyrioi*]) of the colt (19:33). This is evident because the owners/lords were told "the Lord needs it." Historically there is no reason why Jesus could not have arranged beforehand to have a colt ready. Only if we deny Jesus a messianic consciousness can we deny this possibility. The likelihood of the owners' accepting the commandeering or requisitioning of their animal by a stranger is quite low, as is the availability of a donkey that had never been ridden.

19:32 Those who were sent ahead. Compare 13:34.

Found it just as he had told them. Compare 19:30; 22:13.

19:33–34 Compare 19:31. The strongest argument favoring a prearrangement is the total compliance of the owners. Why would they permit the disciples to do this? To say "the Lord needs it" requires either a prearrangement or that the owners were believers who would do whatever Jesus asked.

19:35 Threw their cloaks on the colt. The disciples used their garments to serve as a kind of saddle.

Put Jesus on it. Luke changed his sources, "he [Jesus] sat on it" (Mark 11:7), and thus paralleled more closely Solomon's coronation (1 Kgs 1:33).

¹²⁷³ Cf. Luke 22:13; cf. also 5:22; 6:8; 7:39–40; 22:21, 34.

The space devoted to the colt (Luke 19:30–35) suggests its important role in the story. As a result Zech 9:9, even though not quoted, is a key to what is taking place. Luke therefore understood Jesus' entry into Jerusalem as a parabolic action.¹²⁸⁴

19:36 People spread their cloaks on the road. Spreading cloaks on the road is an act of homage as in 2 Kgs 9:13 (cf. also Josephus, *Antiquities* 9.6.2. [9.111]). Luke made no mention of the spreading of branches, perhaps due to the nationalistic overtones of such an act.¹²⁹⁵

19:37 Where the road goes down the Mount of Olives. What takes place, occurs as Jerusalem comes into sight.

The whole crowd of disciples. The following response of praise came from the disciples, not from Jerusalem. Jerusalem's response is found in Luke 19:39–40, even though this occurs before Jesus enters the city. For the existence of a large group of disciples, see comments on 6:13.

Began joyfully. Luke may have added this in order to tie this episode more closely to Zech 9:9, which begins "Rejoice."

To praise God in loud voices. For praising (*aineō*) God, see comments on 2:13 (for a similar term [*doxazō*], see comments on 5:25). The praise of the angels and shepherds (Luke 2:13, 20) at the birth of the Son of David now resumes as he enters Jerusalem. "In loud voices" echoes a favorite Lukan expression.¹³⁰⁶

For all the miracles they had seen. Compare 10:13; Acts 2:22; 8:13; 19:11. Luke wanted his readers to know that the four miracles listed in the travel narrative (Luke 13:10–17; 14:1–6; 17:11–19; 18:35–43) are only samples of Jesus' works.¹³¹⁷

19:38 Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord! This, minus the words "the king," comes from Ps 118:26. This psalm was used to greet pilgrims entering Jerusalem. At first glance this verse appears to be the fulfillment of Luke 13:35, but on closer examination it is evident that the prophecy of 13:35 was not fulfilled. Jerusalem was not yet forsaken (13:35a), and it was not Jerusalem that uttered this benediction but Jesus' disciples. As 13:32–33 foretold, Jerusalem's response would be quite different. Matthew's placement of this saying (Matt 23:39) after the events of Palm Sunday indicates that he did not think the events surrounding the triumphal entry fulfilled this prophecy. It is best to interpret Luke similarly. See comments on 13:35. Luke omitted from his source "Hosanna" and "Blessed is the coming kingdom of our father David" (cf. Mark 11:9–10). The first omission corresponds to his tendency to omit Aramaic terms (see comments on 8:54). The second may be due to what Luke said about the coming of the kingdom in 19:11.

The king. This is a clear Lukan addition to the tradition, as a comparison with Matt 21:9; Mark 11:10 reveals. Jesus' kingship has been alluded to in Luke 1:32 and in 18:38–39 (cf. also 23:3, 37–38; Acts 17:7). In the preceding parable his kingship is seen as bestowed at his resurrection/ascension and exercised at his parousia. Thus the beatitude here is a proleptic

¹²⁸⁴ For other parabolic actions of Jesus, see R. H. Stein, *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978), 25–27.

¹²⁹⁵ Cf. Mark 11:8; Matt 21:8. This is especially true of palm branches (John 12:13; cf. 1 Macc 13:51; 2 Macc 10:7; Rev 7:9), which appear in the coinage of Judas Maccabeus.

¹³⁰⁶ Cf. Luke 4:33; 8:28; 23:46; Acts 7:57, 60; 8:7; 14:10; 16:28; 26:24; cf. also Luke 17:15; 23:23.

¹³¹⁷ As Luke 4:14, 36; 5:17; 6:17–19; 8:46; 9:1; 10:13, 19 reveal.

announcement of Jesus' kingship, which like God's kingdom is already a present reality in Jesus' ministry but whose ultimate consummation awaits the parousia.

Who comes. See comments on 7:19.

Peace in heaven. This is a strange statement, whereas "peace on earth" (Luke 2:14) would be perfectly understandable. Luke may have changed the wording of 2:14 to "peace in heaven" because the peace Jesus sought to bring (10:5–6) does not find fulfillment in Jerusalem. On the contrary, as the next pericope reveals, Jerusalem would not experience peace (19:42) but war and destruction (19:43–44). Nevertheless peace reigns in heaven, for God's divine plan is being fulfilled. Only when the Son of Man returns will peace finally come to Jerusalem (13:35).

Glory in the highest! Literally the two expressions are *in heaven* (A) *peace* (B) and *glory* (b) *in the highest* (a) and form a chiasmus. Compare 2:14.

19:39 Luke ended his account of the triumphal entry with a brief conversation between Jesus and the Pharisees found only in Luke. He added this to show the reality portrayed in the picture part of the preceding parable (cf. 19:14).

Some of the Pharisees in the crowd. This is the last reference to the Pharisees in Luke. It was for Luke a demonstration of the parabolic picture in 19:14 and in 20:9–18. Whereas in some instances the Pharisees are viewed positively, or at least neutrally (see comments on 13:31; cf. Acts 5:34–39; 15:5; 23:6–9), here, as in most instances, they are portrayed negatively. Luke's readers would not have interpreted this as a Pharisaic attempt to save Jesus from the consequences of this messianic excitement. They would have interpreted this as an attempt to squelch the disciples' praise of God (cf. Matt 21:14–16).

19:40 If they keep quiet, the stones will cry out. The Greek construction (*ean* with the future indicative) is rare, and the verse is capable of several interpretations. The most likely is, "If the disciples would stop their praising of God and his Son, then the stones would take their place and cry out praise in their stead." Nothing can detract from this day. There may be an allusion here to Hab 2:11. Whereas earlier Jesus had given a command to silence (see comments on 9:21), this day there was no silencing the welcoming of the Son of David, Israel's King.

The Lukan Message

Luke incorporated the tradition of the triumphal entry into the overall purpose and scheme of his "orderly account." Jesus' entry into Jerusalem brings the travel narrative (cf. Luke 9:51) to its consummation. Christologically, Jesus' Davidic sonship, his kingship, and his role as the Coming One are not only supported by this incident but reach a climax. His prearrangement or prescience (see comments on 19:30) also supports this Christological teaching as does the title "Lord" (19:31). Luke anticipated that his readers would see in this account a confirmation of much of the Christology of which they had been taught (1:4). Jesus is the promised Messiah. Born of Davidic lineage (1:27, 32; 3:31), he entered Jerusalem as Israel's true King. He would die as King of the Jews (23:2–3, 11, 38, 42), but he would also be raised and return as their King (Acts 2:33–36; 13:21–23, 30–39). Luke in recounting this story wanted his readers to know that Jesus is indeed the fulfillment of all the OT promises. This Jesus, in whom they believed, is truly the Son of God.

Yet there is a dark cloud hanging over this whole incident, and Luke taught his readers once again that what had happened to Israel was the result of their rejection of the Christ. See Introduction 7 (2). The Pharisaic response (Luke 19:39) reveals that Israel had not received their King (cf. 19:14). The “triumphal” entry from a human perspective was not “triumphal.” What had been true from the very beginning continues even now. The Son of God is rejected. This theme, the rejection of Jesus and the resulting judgment, will be brought to the forefront by Luke in 19:41–44, which is the climax of 19:28–40. Here the cry of 13:34–35 will be repeated. Judgment will come. Tragedy would soon strike, for Israel had headed down a road that did not lead to peace (19:42) but, on the contrary, to destruction. Judgment would come upon the nation in the events of A.D. 70 but even more frightfully in its exclusion from the kingdom (cf. Acts 13:46–47; 18:6; 28:25–28). Finally, such characteristics as obedience, rejoicing, and praising God are also emphasized in the account.

2. Lament Over Jerusalem and the Cleansing of the Temple (19:41–48)

⁴¹ As he approached Jerusalem and saw the city, he wept over it ⁴² and said, “If you, even you, had only known on this day what would bring you peace—but now it is hidden from your eyes. ⁴³ The days will come upon you when your enemies will build an embankment against you and encircle you and hem you in on every side. ⁴⁴ They will dash you to the ground, you and the children within your walls. They will not leave one stone on another, because you did not recognize the time of God’s coming to you.”

⁴⁵ Then he entered the temple area and began driving out those who were selling. ⁴⁶ “It is written,” he said to them, “‘My house will be a house of prayer’; but you have made it ‘a den of robbers.’ ”

⁴⁷ Every day he was teaching at the temple. But the chief priests, the teachers of the law and the leaders among the people were trying to kill him. ⁴⁸ Yet they could not find any way to do it, because all the people hung on his words.

Context

Luke concluded Jesus’ entrance into Jerusalem with three different and unrelated accounts. The first involves Jesus’ lament over the city (Luke 19:41–44); the second is an abbreviated account of his cleansing of the temple (19:45–46); and the third is a summary of Jesus’ teaching ministry in the temple and the plot by the religious leaders to kill him (19:47–48). The account of Jesus’ weeping over Jerusalem is unique to Luke. Having entered Jerusalem as Israel’s King (19:38), Jesus as its Prophet announced for the second time its judgment (cf. 13:34–35). He would do this a third time on the way to the cross (23:26–31). There is a parallel between Jesus’ lament and the Benedictus (1:68–80). In both there is reference to “enemies” (cf. 19:43 and 1:71, 74), “knowing” (cf. 19:42 “known” and 19:44 “recognize,” the same Greek word as in 1:77), “coming” (cf. 19:44 and 1:68, 78), and peace (cf. 19:42 and 1:79). Tannehill notes, “These links make it highly likely that the narrator intends to connect the arrival in Jerusalem with the birth narrative in order to highlight the tragic turn which the narrative is now taking.”¹³²⁸

¹³²⁸ R. C. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 160.

Luke drastically abbreviated the account of the cleansing of the temple.¹³³⁹ In so doing he (1) omitted the cursing of the fig tree (Mark 11:12–14), due perhaps to his inclusion of similar material in Luke 13:6–9; (2) sharply curtailed Jesus’ actions in the temple and omitted any description of Jesus’ violent action (cf. Mark 11:15; John 2:15–17); (3) eliminated Jesus’ prohibition of using the temple as a shortcut (Mark 11:16); (4) eliminated the reference to Jesus’ teaching (Mark 11:17), due to his referring to this later in Luke 19:47; and (5) eliminated “for all nations” (Mark 11:17) in the Isa 56:7 quotation, due perhaps to the temple’s having been destroyed and being unable to fulfill that function.

The final account is a Lukan summary that focuses on Jesus’ teaching and the plot to kill him (Luke 19:47–48). One of the results of Luke’s abbreviation of the cleansing narrative is that whereas in Mark the plot to kill Jesus is associated with the cleansing of the temple (cf. Mark 11:18 with what has preceded), in Luke the plot (19:47b–48) is more closely associated with his teaching (19:48a).

The historicity of the lament and the cleansing of the temple has been questioned. The historicity of the former presents less of a difficulty than the latter, for we find similar prophetic material throughout the Gospels.¹³⁴⁰ Any astute observer might well have been able to see that Jewish nationalism would one day lead to a confrontation that could only end in disaster. (Cf. how in 1QpHa¹³⁵ b 9:6f.; Hab 2:7–8 is interpreted as a prophecy of Jerusalem’s future defeat by the Romans.) There is no reason to deny that Jesus spoke of Jerusalem’s future destruction.¹³⁶¹ Such a depiction can be found in the OT descriptions of Jerusalem’s destruction in 587 B.C.¹³⁷²

As for the temple cleansing, the classic question is whether there was one cleansing (as in the Synoptic Gospels and in John) or two (as reconstructed from the Synoptic Gospel with John). And if there was one, which dating and account is more authentic, the Synoptic Gospels’ or John’s? The question has also been raised whether any cleansing could have been possible in light of the presence of Roman soldiers in Jerusalem and the apparent messianic nature of such a cleansing. For the purpose of this commentary such questions while important cannot be dealt with. See Introduction 9. This tradition, however, already existed when Luke wrote his Gospel, and we will concentrate attention on what Luke sought to teach his readers through his reporting of this tradition.¹³⁸³

Comments

¹³³⁹ This is apparent as one compares the material: Matt 21:10–17; Mark 11:11, 15–17; John 2:13–17; Luke 19:45–46.

¹³⁴¹⁰ Cf. John 2:19–22; Mark 13:2 (Matt 24:2; Luke 21:6); Mark 14:58 (Matt 26:61).

¹³⁵ 1QpHab *Pesher on Habakkuk* from Qumran Cave 1

¹³⁶¹¹ See E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985), 61–76.

¹³⁷¹² Cf. Jer 6:6, 8, 14–15; 8:18; 9:1; Isa 29:3; Hos 10:14; Nah 3:10, 14; Ps 137:9. See C. H. Dodd, “The Fall of Jerusalem and the ‘Abomination of Desolation,’ ” *JRS* 37 (1947): 47–54, and J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976), 26–30.

¹³⁸¹³ See J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke*, AB (Garden City: Doubleday, 1985), 1260–67, for a helpful discussion of the historical issues.

19:41 He wept. Compare Luke 13:34, where Jesus experiences a similar sorrow but there is no mention of weeping. Only here and in John 11:35 do we read of Jesus' weeping in the Gospels. Jesus wept, however, not for himself and his fate but rather for the fate of Jerusalem and the people of Israel (Luke 23:28–31). Compare the weeping of the OT prophets: 2 Kgs 8:11; Jer 8:18–21; 9:1; 14:17. The experience of Ps 137 after the destruction of Jerusalem in 587 B.C. will soon be relived.

19:42 If you, even you. The NIV in its translation reveals that the “you” is emphatic. The form of the sentence is that of a contrary-to-fact condition (second class condition), but it is never completed as the dash in the NIV text indicates, i.e., there is no apodosis. This breaking off of the sentence in the middle (called “aposiopesis”) reveals the strong emotions present at the time. Compare Acts 23:9; John 6:62.

This day. This refers to “the time of God’s coming to you” (Luke 19:44), which refers broadly to the coming of God’s kingdom but more narrowly to the coming of Israel’s King in 19:28–40.

Peace. The city, within whose name is the word “peace” (*salem*), rejected the messianic peace offered it and instead would experience war. Compare Pss 122:6–9; 147:14.

Is hidden. This could be a divine passive, i.e., *God has hidden*.¹¹³⁹⁴ What the blind beggar saw (Luke 18:35–43) was not seen by the leaders of Jerusalem.

19:43 The days will come. Compare 23:29; see comments on 5:35.

Upon you. This refers primarily to Jerusalem’s destruction in A.D. 70, but it also involves the gospel going to the Gentiles.¹¹⁴⁰⁵ The forthcoming judgment can be seen as due to either (1) Israel’s rejection of God’s Anointed and a resultant divine judgment or (2) an attitude of heart that rejected God’s Anointed and would lead Israel to revolt against Rome and experience the catastrophe of A.D. 70. The latter, however, is a “historical” explanation that would have been foreign to Luke’s way of thinking. For him the events of A.D. 70 are God’s judgment upon Israel because of the rejection of their King. This judgment is described as follows:

Enemies will build an embankment against you. Compare Isa 29:3; 37:33; Jer 6:6–21; Ezek 4:1–3. The Romans were not specifically mentioned, but the reference is to the palisade they built around Jerusalem.

And encircle you. This refers to the wall later built to surround the city to keep people within the city from escaping. Compare Luke 21:20; 2 Kgs 6:14; Isa 29:3.¹¹⁴¹⁶

And hem you in on every side. This refers to the continual pressure of attacks against the city. Compare Ezek 4:2; 21:22; Jer 52:5; 2 Macc 9:2.

19:44 They will dash you to the ground, you and the children within your walls. This is a traditional feature in the description of sieges.¹¹⁴²⁷ It describes the slaughter in war that often befell the defeated in a most literal way and to which Luke 23:28–31 refers.

They will not leave one stone on another. Compare 21:6. This is the fifth and final description of the coming judgment. Compare 2 Sam 17:13; Mic 3:12; Ps 137:7. This describes

¹³⁹¹⁴ J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Scribner’s, 1971), 12.

¹⁴⁰¹⁵ Acts 13:46–51; 18:6; 28:25–28; cf. also Rom 11:13–32.

¹⁴¹¹⁶ I. H. Marshall (*The Gospel of Luke*, TNIGTC [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978], 718) suggests that this palisade was burned down by the Jews and then replaced by a “stone siege-dyke” Luke may have been alluding to by the next expression “and encircle you.”

¹⁴²¹⁷ Cf. Ps 137:9; Hos 10:14; 13:16; Nah 3:10; 2 Kgs 8:12.

Titus's attempt to raze the entire city. For a detailed description of what happened, see Josephus, *Wars* 7.1.1. (7.1–4) and 7.8.7 (7.375–77). The use of hyperbole in this instance is easily excused by anyone familiar with Jerusalem's destruction in A.D. 70.

Because. The reason is now given for this judgment. This favors the first view given in Luke 19:43. By their rejection of God's Son, the day of visitation that was meant to fulfill Israel's hopes and expectations (1:54–55, 68–79) would instead bring God's judgment.¹¹⁴³⁸¹⁴⁴

¹⁴³¹⁸ Cf. Exod 32:34; Isa 29:6; Jer 6:15; 10:15; Wis 14:11; Sir 16:18; 18:20; 23:24; 1 Pet 2:12. Cf. also 1QS 3:14, 18; 4:11–14, 18–19, 26.

¹⁴⁴ Robert H. Stein, [Luke](#), vol. 24, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992), 478–485.