

Jesus the Good Shepherd Who Will Also Bring Other Sheep (John 10:16): The Old Testament Background of a Familiar Metaphor

ANDREAS J. KÖSTENBERGER

SOUTHEASTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

John 10:16 is one of the major Johannine mission texts that sheds significant light on Jesus' messianic consciousness during his earthly ministry. Almost exclusively, however, scholarly treatments focus on the fourth evangelist's use of the Hebrew Scriptures without entertaining questions regarding the historical Jesus. Taking its point of departure from a study of the literary and historical contexts of John 10 and an investigation of its genre, the present essay seeks to uncover the fabric of OT motifs that converge in Jesus' pronouncement in John 10:16, focusing particularly on prophetic passages in Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Isaiah as well as Davidic typology. The scope of this article also includes Qumran, the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, and rabbinic literature. Jesus emerges as a faithful interpreter of the Hebrew Scriptures who understood himself as the eschatological Davidic messianic "shepherd." John the evangelist is found to uphold the lofty vision of a community—composed of both Jews and Gentiles—united by faith in the God-sent Messiah.

Key Words: Gospel of John, historical Jesus, Messiah, mission, use of OT in the NT, Good Shepherd Discourse, Ezekiel, Zechariah, Isaiah, Davidic typology

It is fairly common today to view the Gospels primarily as the expression of the theologies of the evangelists or as products of Christian communities who fashioned for themselves relevant interpretations of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ for their respective contemporary situations.¹ Consequently, few dare to shed their skepticism that

1. But see John A. T. Robinson, "The Parable of John 10:1–5," *ZNW* 46 (1955): 233–40, who remarks, "It is noteworthy that not one of the commentaries I have been able to consult even asks the question of the relation of this pericope to the teaching of the historical Jesus" (p. 234 n. 3). He concludes his study by expressing his conviction that

the words and the consciousness of the historical Jesus can be accurately gleaned from the Gospel records.² However, the data available do not support such skepticism.³ The present study will proceed with the confidence that the Gospel of John as a whole, and specifically the tenth chapter, can be searched not just for John's—or the "Johannine community's"—treatment of the OT, but for an accurate reflection of Jesus' own consciousness and teaching.⁴

This is not to deny that John selected, arranged, and presented his material with a specific purpose in mind (see 20:30–31), but it does ascribe to him a more conservative role than is often done today. John did not face the dilemma of choosing between history and theology, as if he had to embrace one and sacrifice the other.⁵ Very possibly, the evangelist drew on eyewitness recollection as well as oral and written tradition to relate the theology espoused by Jesus during his earthly ministry meaningfully to his readers. Thus it will be argued that the OT background for John 10 is not primarily evidence for John the evangelist's use of the OT but for Jesus' messianic consciousness in light of the expectations and the divine revelation found in the Scriptures.⁶

the material in John 10 is "early and authentic" and that it is "a stream of tradition of the life and teaching of Jesus which never seriously underwent . . . distortion" (p. 240).

2. Already in 1939, Leonhard Goppelt voices his skepticism concerning the accessibility of the so-called "historical Jesus" via the Gospel records when he writes, "Especially in the matter of the use of the Old Testament, it is neither possible nor meaningful to seek to distinguish carefully what can be traced directly to the historical Jesus from what has been added by the Easter faith of the church" (*Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982; orig. ed., 1939], 20). More recently, many scholars have sought to find the key to unlocking the OT in the Fourth Gospel in the interpretive activities of the so-called "Johannine community" (cf. Peder Borgen, *Logos Was the True Light and Other Essays on the Gospel of John* [Trondheim: Tapir, 1983], 81–91, esp. 86–88). See also the helpful summary in Craig A. Evans, "On the Quotation Formulas in the Fourth Gospel," *BZ* 26 (1982): 79 n. 1.

3. Cf. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: SCM, 1952), 110: "Among Christian thinkers of the first age known to us there are three of genuinely creative power: Paul, the author of Hebrews, and the Fourth Evangelist. We are precluded from proposing any one of them for the honour of having originated the process. . . . But the New Testament itself avers that it was Jesus Christ Himself who first directed the minds of His followers to certain parts of the scriptures as those in which they might find illumination upon the meaning of His mission and destiny."

4. For a detailed discussion of relevant background material to John 10, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "John," *Zondervan Illustrated Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*, Vol. 2 (ed. Clinton E. Arnold; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002).

5. Cf. Leon Morris, *Studies in the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969), 65–138; D. A. Carson, *The Gospel According to John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 35–38.

6. Cf. R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971), for a notable exception to the

I. THE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CONTEXTS OF JOHN 10:16

The questions that are of special concern for the present study are: (1) What light does the OT background shed on Jesus' statement in John 10:16? (2) How does the scriptural undergirding serve to lend authority to Jesus' statement in his historical context? (3) How, if at all, does Jesus' use of the OT in John 10 serve the evangelist's purpose in his own contemporary situation? As will be argued below, Jesus used a blend of scriptural motifs and applied them to himself in order to put present controversy in perspective.⁷ In John's day, the recalling of Jesus' use of Scripture reinforced Jesus' vision of a new messianic community that transcended ethnic boundaries at a time when Judaism and Christianity rivaled each other in claiming to be the true religion based on God's revelation in the Hebrew Scriptures.

A. Contextual Survey

The Gospel of John uses the OT in more allusive ways than the Synoptics.⁸ There are many interlocking traditions, however, that indicate

current trend of skepticism regarding the Gospels' accuracy in reflecting the teachings of the historical Jesus. See also I. H. Marshall in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 9: "There is a firm tradition that Jesus used the Old Testament to throw light on his mission, and there is no good reason to reject it." For a more positive assessment of the historicity of Jesus' teaching in parables, see further J. Arthur Baird, *Audience Criticism and the Historical Jesus* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969); and the discussion in Anthony C. Thiselton, "Reader-Response Hermeneutics, Action Models, and the Parables of Jesus," in Roger Lundin, Anthony C. Thiselton, and Clarency Walkout, *The Responsibility of Hermeneutics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1985), 90-92.

7. Contra those who argue against the historicity of the pericope. For the kinds of arguments adduced against the historical accuracy of John's Gospel, see Erich Grässer, *Der Alte Bund im Neuen: Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament* (WUNT 35; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1985), 157-58, 163-64.

8. On John's use of the OT, see esp. D. A. Carson, "John and the Johannine Epistles," in *It Is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture* (ed. D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 245-64; Edwin D. Freed, *Old Testament Quotations in the Gospel of John* (NovTSup 11; Leiden: Brill, 1965); Günter Reim, *Studien zum alttestamentlichen Hintergrund des Johannesevangeliums* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974); C. K. Barrett, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *JTS* 48 (1947): 155-69; Martin Hengel, "The Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel," *HBT* 12 (1990): 19-41; Evans, "Quotation Formulas," 79-83; Richard Morgan, "Fulfillment in the Fourth Gospel: The Old Testament Foundations," *Int* 11 (1957): 155-65; Harald Sahlin, *Zur Typologie des Johannesevangeliums* (Uppsala: Universitets Arskrift, 1950); Goppelt, *Typos*, 179-97; Grässer, *Der Alte Bund im Neuen*, 135-67; T. Francis Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel* (SBT 40; London: SCM, 1963).

Old Testament quotations in John include: (1) Psalms: 22:18 in John 19:24; 35:19 or 69:4 in John 15:25; 41:9 in John 13:18; 69:9 in John 2:17; 78:24 in John 6:31; 82:6 in John

clearly that the same historical Jesus stands behind both traditions.⁹ This certainly is the case with Jesus' use of shepherd imagery.¹⁰ It will be argued that John 10 represents a merger of motifs found primarily in Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Isaiah.¹¹ While there is good reason to believe that John faithfully recorded the teaching of Jesus, it will be important to balance the reflection of Jesus' messianic consciousness with the express literary purpose of the evangelist to arrive at an accurate representation of the OT background of John 10, and especially John 10:16.¹²

The pericope of John 10 is intricately linked with the preceding chapter, John 9 (see 10:19–21).¹³ While the earlier part of chap. 10 is polemically directed against the Pharisees who are questioning Jesus

10:34; 118:25–26 in John 12:13; (2) Isaiah: 6:10 in John 12:40; 40:3 in John 1:23; 53:1 in John 12:38; and 54:13 in John 6:45; (3) Zechariah: 9:9 in John 12:15; 12:10 in John 19:37; (4) Exodus/Numbers: Exod 12:46 and Num 9:12 in John 19:36 (cf. Carson, "John and Johannine Epistles," 246). Allusions are too numerous to list. Especially important allusions for the present study include Jer 23:1–3 and Ezek 34:2–3 in John 10:8; Ps 23:1, Isa 40:1, and Ezek 34:15 in John 10:11; and Isa 56:8, Ezek 34:23, and 37:24 in John 10:16 (cf. Carson, *ibid.*, 253).

9. Cf. Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 49–58; Morris, *Studies*, 15–63.

10. Cf. Wilfred Tooley, "The Shepherd and Sheep Image in the Teaching of Jesus," *NovT* 7 (1964): 15–25. Concerning the metaphor of a "flock" for God's people, see Goppelt, *Typos*, 109; Jeremias, "poimēn," *TNDT* 6.499–502. For an unconvincing attempt to link John 10 directly with the Synoptic tradition, see M. Sabbe, "John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels," in *The Shepherd Discourse of John 10 and its Context* (ed. Johannes Beutler and Robert T. Fortna; SNTSMS 67; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 75–93. It is more adequate to locate the use of OT shepherding imagery in the teaching of Jesus, which renders literary mediation through the Synoptics unnecessary.

11. Cf. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 103–10, 148–50, 208–9, following Paul Lamerche, *Zacharie IX–XIV: Structure Littéraire et Messianisme* (Paris: Lecoffre, Gabalda, 1961).

12. Jeremias, "poimēn," 496, rightly comments that the shepherd discourse "reaches its climax in v. 16. Jesus' office as Shepherd is not restricted to Israel; it is universal." Some have argued that v. 16 represents a later insertion. However, Jeremias rightly objects that "[t]here is no linguistic or stylistic argument to justify our regarding v. 16 as unjohannine and hence as an addition" (*ibid.*).

13. Apart from the commentaries by Barrett, R. Brown, Bultmann, Carson, Dodd, and Schnackenburg (note esp. "Die Hirtenrede in Joh 10" in *Das Johannesevangelium IV* [HThK 4/4; Freiburg, 1984], 131–43), see the following works for detailed studies on John 10: Beutler and Fortna, *Shepherd Discourse*; Siegfried D. Goebel, *Die Reden unseres Herrn nach Johannes im Grundtext ausgelegt*, vols. 1–2 (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1906–10); Theodor Konrad Kempf, *Christus der Hirt: Ursprung und Deutung einer altchristlichen Symbolgestalt* (Rome: Officium Libri Catholici, 1942); Ferdinand Hahn, "Die Hirtenrede in Joh 10," in *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis: Fs. Dinkler* (ed. Carl Andresen and G. Klein; Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 1979), 185–200; Odo Kiefer, *Die Hirtenrede: Analyse und Deutung von Johannes 10,1–18* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967); A. J. Simons, *Die Hirtenrede im Johannes-Evangelium: Versuch einer Analyse von Johannes 10,1–18 nach Entstehung, Hintergrund und Inhalt* (AnBib 29; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1967); Pius-Ramon Tragan, *La Parole du 'Pasteur' et ses explications: Jean 10,1–18* (Studia

(see 9:41–42), Jesus' teaching is not limited to the conflict at hand.¹⁴ In John 10:16, he transcends the immediate context of the blind man's healing and the Pharisees' opposition, when he talks of "other sheep that are not of this fold" (that is, Judaism; see 10:1) whom he must lead also, "and there will be one flock, one shepherd."¹⁵ The passage is similar, though not identical, in import to John 11:52, where the evangelist points out that Jesus' death would not be for the nation of Israel only but also "in order to gather into one the scattered children of God."¹⁶ However, while John's editorial comment in 11:52 betrays hindsight and refers generally to a universal gathering of the scattered children of God (but see John 12:32), Jesus' statement in 10:16 is historically fixed in a context where the prospect was the exalted Lord's uniting of two kinds of "sheep" into one "flock."¹⁷

Moreover, the statement in John 10:16 is one of a few sayings by Jesus recorded in this Gospel that clearly refer to the future mission of the exalted Lord through his disciples (see 4:34–38; 14:12; 17:20; 20:21–23; 21:15–19).¹⁸ Thus John 10:16 is part of a web of references

Anselmiana 67; Rome: Anselmiana, 1980). For surveys of theories proposing a dislocation of one sort or another (all improbable and unnecessary), see *ibid.*, 55–175; and Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 379–80. For a defense of the integrity of the literary composition of John 10, see Ulrich Busse, "Offene Fragen zu Joh 10," *NTS* 33 (1987): 516–31 = "Open Questions on John 10," in *Shepherd Discourse*, (ed. J. Beutler and R. T. Fortna; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 6–17. A detailed discussion is found in Jeremias, "*poimēn*," 494–95. Jeremias concludes that "[i]t is thus as well to take the text as it stands without any critical manipulations" (p. 495).

14. Jesus' opponents are identified as "Pharisees" in John 9:13, 15–16, 40, and as "Jews" in 9:18, 22.

15. John 10:16 forms an integral part of the "Shepherd discourse." Cf. Kiefer, *Hirtenrede*, 24, who maintains that 10:16 is not merely a missionary-style digression, as Bultmann contends, but a concluding and supplementary statement that is of great significance for the entire discourse. Busse, "Open Questions," 7, notes that the observation that v. 16 may be a secondary insertion led some scholars to propose rearrangement theories for John 10 as a whole (see also n. 9, p. 136). As Busse points out, however, if v. 16 is removed as a later insertion of an ecclesiastical redactor, the functional resurrection statement of v. 18 is left without point of reference (p. 15). The results of the present study confirm further that both the typological substructure undergirding the "Shepherd discourse" and the literary context in the Fourth Gospel support the literary integrity of John 10:16 as it stands.

16. Cf. Simonis, *Hirtenrede*, 309–11.

17. Note that the flock is based on the Jews (cf. 4:22; 10:1); the Gentiles are not presented as a separate, second flock that needs to be merged with the Jewish flock. Rather, individual believing Gentiles ("other sheep") will be added to the flock. See the Pauline equivalent, the "grafting in" of "wild branches" (i.e., the Gentiles) into the "olive tree" (the Jews) in Rom 9–11. See also Eph 2:11–22.

18. Note that the last two passages record postresurrection commissionings by Jesus. Concerning the mission of Jesus' disciples, especially to the Gentiles, see Otfried Hofius, "Die Sammlung der Heiden zur Herde Israels (Joh 10:16, 11:51f.)," *ZNW* 58 (1967):

by Jesus during his earthly ministry to the Gentile mission.¹⁹ This is all the more remarkable because the Synoptic Gospels are very reluctant to represent Jesus as referring to this mission during his precrucifixion days.²⁰ At the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel, when the outreach to the Gentile world had already progressed to a significant extent, any such statements would naturally have been of great interest to the Christian communities. Especially in light of Jewish-Gentile tensions at the end of the first century AD, Jesus' concern for Jewish-Gentile unity in "one flock," the church, would be a powerful reminder of the Lord's vision.

B. The Genre of John 10

Carson helpfully surveys the contributions of Derrett, Robinson, Tragan, and others, who propose various reconstructions of the original parable(s) underlying John's account in chap. 10.²¹ These proposals are too speculative to prove convincing.²² Also, they are based on a fundamental misunderstanding regarding the genre of John 10:1ff. As Carson points out, John preserves no Synoptic-style narrative parables. Rather, the distinctly Johannine term used in John 10:6 to describe Jesus' use of a "figure of speech" is *paroimia* (see John 16:25, 29). Thus, far from being a parable, John 10:1ff. is actually a symbol-laden discourse employed by Jesus to communicate a cer-

289–91; Ferdinand Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament* (SBT 47; London: SCM, 1965); Joachim Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (SBT 24; London: SCM, 1965); James McPolin, "Mission in the Fourth Gospel," *ITQ* 36 (1969): 113–22; Josef Kuhl, *Die Sendung Jesu und der Kirche nach dem Johannes-Evangelium* (St. Augustin: Steyler, 1967), 141–49; Max Meinertz, "Zum Ursprung der Heidenmission," *Bib* 40 (1959): 762–77; and chap. 4 in Andreas J. Köstenberger, *The Missions of Jesus and the Disciples According to the Fourth Gospel* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998). See now also Andreas J. Köstenberger and Peter T. O'Brien, *Salvation to the Ends of the Earth: A Biblical Theology of Mission* (NSBT; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001).

19. For alternative views regarding the identity of the "other sheep" referred to by Jesus in John 10:16, however unlikely, see Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 390; cf. Kuhl, *Sendung Jesu*, 226–29. See Kiefer, *Hirtenrede*, 72 n. 113, for the broad scholarly consensus that John 10:16 refers to the Gentile mission.

20. Cf. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*, 11–39.

21. Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 380. Cf. J. Duncan M. Derrett, "The Good Shepherd: St. John's Use of Jewish Halakah and Haggadah," *ST* 27 (1973): 25–50; Robinson, "Parable of John 10:1–5," 232–40; Tragan, *Parabole du 'Pasteur'*.

22. Any reconstruction merely on the literary level fails to appreciate the salvation-historical reference point in John 10. Jesus very consciously employs a familiar complex of metaphors to communicate salvation-historical revelation from God. Note also the proposals of scholars such as William L. Schutter, "Homiletic Midrash in John 10:1–16 and 15:1–17" (paper presented at the SBL annual meeting in Kansas City, 1991), who see in John 10 a homiletic midrash.

tain message: “it is the message that controls the sheep-farming symbols, not vice versa.”²³

This is not to follow J. L. Martyn and R. E. Brown, however, who employ what may be termed an “allegorical” approach to the interpretation of John 10.²⁴ In keeping with Martyn’s overall device of a “two level reading” of the Johannine narrative, every protagonist in John 10—wolf, thieves, robbers, stranger (Jewish authorities scattering the community), the hireling (secretly believing rulers who at the critical moment abandon the Johannine community), and so on—is given significance in light of the alleged situation of the “Johannine community.” Apart from the problems with this approach on a more general hermeneutical level, this reading of John 10 unduly subverts the original message delivered by Jesus by submerging it entirely in a conjectural late first-century AD setting.²⁵

In fact, there is a world of difference between identifying the genre of John 10 as “symbolic discourse”—originally employed by Jesus—and identifying it as allegory—played out on the level of the “Johannine community.” If one regards John’s Gospel “as above all a reflection of conditions in the ‘Johannine community,’” as Ridderbos rightly contends, “the Fourth Gospel becomes one great cryptogram.”²⁶ Contrary to such interpretations, however, Jesus’ message is bound up with salvation-historical realities effected and brought into sharper focus by his incarnation, death, and exaltation. It is of a universal scope. In no way can—or must—John 10 be confined to the life of a hypothetical “Johannine community” on the fringes of end-of-first-century life.

23. Ibid. Concerning metaphorical language, see Janet Martin Soskice, *Metaphor and Religious Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987). Busse, “Open Questions,” provides a helpful discussion of the form of 10:1–18. He cites allegory, similitude, parable, concept, or simply image as possible genres. Busse comments that the difficulties in defining the genre of John 10:1–18 point to the singular character of symbolic discourse. With Klaus Berger, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments* (Heidelberg: Quelle & Meyer, 1984), 39, he opts for a description of the literary procedure as *Bildfeld* (“image field”) that approaches its subject from various angles, “playing” with the whole material available for metaphorical expression. This description accounts well for the apparent “shift” of perspective between 10:1–5 and 10:6ff.

24. J. Louis Martyn, “Glimpses into the History of the Johannine Community,” in *L’Évangile de Jean: Sources, Rédaction, Théologie* (BETL 44; ed. Marinus de Jonge; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1977), 149–75, esp. 170–74; idem, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* (2d ed.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1979); Raymond E. Brown, “‘Other Sheep Not of This Fold’: The Johannine Perspective on Christian Diversity in the Late First Century,” *JBL* 97 (1978): 5–22; idem, *Community of the Beloved Disciple* (New York: Paulist Press, 1979), esp. 90, where Brown (following Martyn) argues that the “other sheep” are Christians, not Gentiles still to be converted.

25. See esp. the refutation of Martyn and Brown by Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel of John* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 364–65.

26. Ibid., *Gospel of John*, 364.

Demonstrably, the fourth evangelist's purpose is to tell the story of Jesus in a way relevant to his contemporary audience, not to tell the story of the "Johannine community" in terms of the life of the earthly Jesus.²⁷

Arguably, then, Jesus' intention is not to tell either a parable or an allegory but to apply a conglomerate of scriptural motifs to *his* present-day context.²⁸ Nevertheless, it is possible that certain effects achieved by parables proper are akin to Jesus' purpose in John 10. Thiselton speaks of "a sense of shock, disclosure, revelation, or reorientation."²⁹ Using Nathan's parable to David in 2 Samuel 12 as an example, Thiselton notes that, "Caught off guard by his involvement in the narrative world, David finds that the story is really about him before he has had the chance even to consider putting up moral defenses."³⁰ As we will seek to show below, at the heart of Jesus' message in John 10:16 is a "paradigm shift" with regard to "the Jews'" place in God's plan: considering themselves to be safely "inside the fold," they all of a sudden find themselves "out in the cold," outside of God's redemptive sphere, replaced by select "other sheep" (that is, Gentiles).

P. S. Hawkins's statement regarding parables also seems to have relevance for John 10: "[Parables] are the *utterance but not the unveiling* of what has been hidden, a proclamation of mystery rather than an explanation of it" (see John 12:36b–43).³¹ The impending reality of the inclusion of the Gentiles into the new messianic community together with believing Jews, a fact too painful for many Jews of Jesus' day to face, is presented by Jesus not explicitly but in slightly veiled form. The reader with hindsight has little difficulty understanding Jesus' statement concerning his "other sheep" as a reference to the Gentiles. Yet Jesus stops short of explicating his saying further. Leaving the statement of John 10:16 in its "image field," Jesus is able to relate familiar scriptural imagery to his own prophetic utterance, which is

27. See also the background, description, and critique of a "two level reading" by proponents of a form of the "Johannine community hypothesis" by Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 360–61, 369–72; and idem, "Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel: After Dodd, What?" in *Gospel Perspectives II* (ed. R. T. France and David Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981), 108–12.

28. It is worth noting that some dispute that there is any real difference between a parable and the Johannine term *paroimia*. Cf. Robinson, "Parable of John 10:1–5," 233 n. 2: "It is generally agreed among modern commentators that *paroimia* and *parabolē* are simply variant translations of *mashal* and that there is no difference in their meaning." Yet the Scripture index in Craig Blomberg, *Interpreting the Parables* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990), does not include a single reference to the Fourth Gospel.

29. "Reader-Response Hermeneutics," 85.

30. *Ibid.*

31. P. S. Hawkins, "Parables as Metaphor," *Christian Scholar's Review* 12 (1983): 226; compare with the discussion in Thiselton, "Reader-Response Hermeneutics," 89–90.

pregnant with theological implications for his audience, both on a national and on a personal level.

Thus Jesus shows both spiritual discernment and a thorough knowledge and understanding of applicable biblical tradition. He is able to relate relevant scriptural motifs both to himself and to his opponents at that decisive time in the history of God's people. In this way Jesus becomes the decisive bridge between OT and NT traditions in his own person, work, and teaching. His consciousness of his impending violent cross-death and its substitutionary significance (John 10:11, 15, 17–18; compare with 15:13) allows him to anticipate the consequences of this pivotal salvation-historical event. On the one hand, Jesus contrasts the Jewish leaders' irresponsibility with his own faithful "shepherding." On the other hand, he links the Jewish leaders' irresponsibility with the prospect of the Gentile mission, clearly a message of judgment (see Rom 9–11).

II. THE OLD TESTAMENT BACKGROUND OF JOHN 10:16³²

The "iceberg" of shepherd typology, first applied to God, later to his Davidic messenger, initially lingered beneath the surface of conscious use by the biblical writers (Pentateuch, 1–2 Samuel). But already in the Psalms, typological awareness regarding the "shepherd motif" emerges. Even more decisively, the Prophets (especially exilic and postexilic) apply shepherd imagery to a personality partly human in the Davidic line, partly divine, and representing God himself. The motifs of the shepherd-king and the suffering servant undergo a certain amount of fusion. The climax of these developments is reached when the historical Jesus applies this imagery to himself. Finally, the early church took over these images and incorporated them into its theology of the church as God's flock and Jesus as the chief shepherd. The following discussion will focus on the period in which shepherd imagery was first applied explicitly to the expectation articulated by Jesus according to John 10, as found in Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Isaiah.³³

32. Note the helpful survey by J. G. S. Thomson, "The Shepherd-Ruler Concept in the Old Testament and Its Application in the New Testament," *SJT* 8 (1955): 406–18; and the brief treatment of shepherd imagery in John by Kirsten Nielsen, "Old Testament Imagery in John," in *New Readings in John: Literary and Theological Perspectives* (ed. Johannes Nissen and Sigfred Pedersen; JSNTSS 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 76–80, with reference to idem, "Shepherd, Lamb, and Blood: Imagery in the Old Testament—Use and Reuse," *Studia theologica* 46 (1992): 121–32, and Robert Kysar, "Johannine Metaphor—Meaning and Function: A Literary Case Study of John 10:1–18," in *The Fourth Gospel from a Literary Perspective* (ed. R. Alan Culpepper and Fernando F. Segovia; Semeia 53; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 81–111.

33. For a treatment of the shepherd motif in light of Christ/Moses typology, see Glasson, *Moses in the Fourth Gospel*, 95–96. Similarly, Sahlin, *Typologie des Johannesevangeliums*, esp. pp. 36–38, 71, 74–78. Sahlin locates the primary background for John 10 in

A. Ezekiel³⁴

Doubtless the most important OT passages for an understanding of Jesus' teaching in John 10, where Davidic typology and shepherd imagery intersect, are Ezekiel 34 (esp. vv. 23–24) and 37 (esp. vv. 24–25).³⁵ In Ezek 34:1–10, Ezekiel charges Israel's "shepherds" (that is, its religious leaders) with complete irresponsibility in failing to care for God's people, his "flock." God promises to come himself to search for his "sheep" and to seek them out, to deliver them and to care for them, to gather them from the places where they had been scattered, to feed them in a good pasture, and to give them rest (vv. 11–16). But the irresponsible shepherds God will "feed with judgment" (vv. 16–22). "Then I will set over them one shepherd (LXX: *poimena hena*), my servant David, and he will feed them; he will feed them himself and be their shepherd" (v. 23).³⁶

Num 27:16–17 (Moses' commissioning of Joshua), thus casting Jesus as the "new Joshua." However, the wording (*probata ois ouk estin poimēn*) is closer to Matt 9:36 par. than John 10. Moreover, Sahlin neglects to trace the typological developments throughout the OT. For a linking of Joshua and David in Israel's history, see Acts 7:45 and Heb 4:7–8. See also Siegfried Mittmann, "Aufbau und Einheit des Danklieds Psalm 23," *ZTK* 77 (1980): 23 n. 57, who contends that the OT use of shepherding imagery is not by itself adequate warrant for reading this tradition into Ps 23—or, it might be added, John 10. See *ibid.*, 20–21 n. 55, for further bibliography.

34. Cf. Bruce Vawter, "Ezekiel and John," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 450–58. Vawter notes that Johannine imagery is indebted to Ezekiel with regard to the vine, the shepherd, and others. Another significant treatment is B. Willmes, *Die sogenannte Hirtenallegorie Ez 34: Studien zum Bild des Hirten im Alten Testament* (BBET 19; Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang, 1984); see also Siegfried Herrmann, *Die prophetischen Heilserwartungen im Alten Testament: Ursprung und Gestaltwandel* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1965), 266–75; and Mary Katharine Deeley, "Ezekiel's Shepherd and John's Jesus: A Case Study in the Appropriation of Biblical Texts," in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders; JSNTSS 148; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 252–64, who detects in John 8–11 "a liberal use of both the images and the narrative shape of Ezekiel 33–37."

35. Cf. Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 381–82. Reim, *Studien*, 183–86, draws the scope of his investigation so narrowly that he ends up concluding that John almost certainly did not use Ezekiel. He conjectures that John might have interpreted a tradition composed of the expectation of one shepherd (Ezekiel) and of one flock (Mic 2:12?) with the aid of Isaianic texts (Isa 49:5–6; 53:6, 12?). With this suggestion, he is not far from France and Lamarche. However, Reim never asks if Jesus himself used a tradition of a messianic shepherd based on Ezekiel. See also C. H. Dodd, *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953), 358–61; and Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 146 n. 3.

36. See the discussion of the targumic traditions of Ezekiel 34 and their messianic application by Frédéric Manns, "Traditions targumiques en Jean 10, 1–30," *RevScRel* 60 (1986): 135–57; and the discussion of "Ezekiel 34 and the Narrative Strategy of the Shepherd and Sheep Metaphor in Matthew" by John Paul Heil in *CBQ* 55 (1993): 698–708.

In Ezek 37, the seer has the vision of the restoration and unification of Israel from two nations into one (v. 22). "And my servant David will be king over them, and they will all have one shepherd" (LXX: *poimēn heis*; v. 23). Both passages are concluded with a reference to the (new) covenant that God will make with his people (34:25: "covenant of peace"; 37:26: "covenant of peace," "everlasting covenant").

The type itself, of course, is found in David's own life, when he was called from shepherding his flock to be king over God's people Israel (1 Sam 16:11–13; compare with 17:34–37). Yet David himself acknowledged, "The LORD is my shepherd" (Ps 23). Jesus could have made a point similar to the one he made with reference to Ps 110:1: "How can David, who is Israel's shepherd, call the Lord *his* shepherd?"³⁷ By calling himself "the good shepherd," Jesus is clearly placing himself in the context of the messianic tradition of Ezekiel as well as evidencing a consciousness of Davidic typology.³⁸

As Goppelt points out, one aspect of typology is a "typological heightening," an escalation from type to antitype.³⁹ Clearly this is the relationship between David and Christ: what David prefigures, Christ fulfills. While Ezekiel at one point states that God *himself* will come and lead his sheep (34:11), he predicts soon thereafter that God will send his servant David (34:23). Jesus brings together in himself both of these personages and their shepherding ministries and appropriates Ezekiel 34 fairly directly.⁴⁰

While Ezekiel 34, however, refers to the unification of Israel and Judah (v. 22), Jesus extends the scope of the passage to include both

37. Cf. Matt 22:45 = Mark 12:37 = Luke 20:44.

38. Cf. W. S. LaSor, D. A. Hubbard, and F. W. Bush, *Das Alte Testament: Entstehung—Geschichte—Botschaft* (ed. Helmut Egelkraut; Giessen: Brunnen, 1990), 558, who suggest that Isaiah indicated that the Davidic Messiah is to be identified with Yahweh himself (with reference to John 10:1–18 and Isa 37:24).

39. Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, x, 17–18; but see D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible* (Leicester: InterVarsity, 1976), 262, who argues that escalation is not a necessary part of typology. Both authors agree that typology sets in relation historical persons, events, or institutions, in the present case David and the Lord Jesus Christ (Goppelt, *Typos*, 179–95; Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 266–67). See also Marshall's helpful definition of typology in Carson and Williamson, *It Is Written*, 16: "Typology may be defined as the study which traces parallels or correspondences between incidents recorded in the Old Testament and their counterparts in the New Testament such that the latter can be seen to resemble the former in notable respects and yet to go beyond them." Marshall adds, "Certainly the type is used to throw light on the New Testament incident by providing a frame of reference or a metaphorical expression which helps to illuminate the New Testament incident." Carson notes that typology is based on "a perception of patterns of continuity across the sweep of salvation history" (*ibid.*, 249).

40. Cf. Carson and Williamson, *It Is Written*, 255. Cf. also Goppelt's reference to J. Hofmann, 189–204, in *Typos*, 12, regarding the typology of Jesus in the NT as continuing the work of Yahweh in the OT.

Jews and Gentiles in the new messianic community, the church.⁴¹ As Dodd argues, there is “a certain shift, nearly always an expansion, of the original scope of the passage.”⁴² Dodd also claims that the OT passages are normally interpreted in a christological sense.⁴³ Carson notes that in John 10 the “replacement motif” coalesces with typology:

Thus when Jesus proclaims himself the good shepherd (John 10), the reader cannot forget that in the OT Yahweh (Ezek. 34:11) or the messiah (Ezek. 34:23) is the shepherd who cares for his flock: Jesus identifies his ministry with theirs. . . . But the entailment, for the church, is that it is the new messianic community that “fulfils” Israel’s role in the Ezekiel passage; and that connexion is unavoidably typological, and bound up with replacement of the type.⁴⁴

Moreover, as will be seen below, another OT passage can be shown to extend God’s “shepherding” activity beyond the confines of Israel.

B. Zechariah

The other significant OT background for John is the book of Zechariah.⁴⁵ Bullock draws attention to the fact that, while Zechariah made numerous appeals to the preexilic prophets, his greatest patron was Ezekiel, with whom he shared his theological and eschatological plan.⁴⁶ R. T. France, in his *Jesus and the Old Testament*, argues that the four figures from Zech 9–14 were merged into one coherent picture of the coming Messiah in OT tradition: (1) the king riding on a donkey (Zech 9:9); (2) the good shepherd (11:4–14); (3) the martyr (“the one whom they have pierced,” Zech 12:12); and (4) the smitten shepherd (13:7).⁴⁷ He cites Lamarche, who argues that these four

41. Jesus’ application of an OT reference originally referring to Israel and Judah to the new messianic community may have served as the model for the interpretation of the early church. See, for example, the use of Jer 31:31–34 in Heb 8:8–12 and 10:16–17. Concerning the theological problem of the relationship of Israel to the church, see George E. Ladd, “Israel and the Church,” *EvQ* 36 (1964): 206–13.

42. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 130, quoted by Marshall in Carson and Williamson, *It Is Written*, 7.

43. *Ibid.*

44. In Carson and Williamson, *It Is Written*, 255. On the church as “spiritual Israel,” see also Goppelt, *Typos*, 140–51.

45. On Zech 9:9, see the study by Werner H. Schmidt, “Hoffnung auf einen armen König: Sach 9,9f. als letzte messianische Weissagung des Alten Testaments,” in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums* (ed. Christof Landmesser et al.; BZNW 86; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1997), 689–709 (including further bibliographic references).

46. Cf. Hubert Cunliffe-Jones, *A Word for Our Time? Zechariah 9–14, the New Testament and Today* (London: Athlone, 1973), and the works cited in the following notes.

47. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 103–10. For a similar treatment, see Goppelt, *Typos*, 88–89. See also Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 174–78.

passages are seen as four aspects of a single messianic conception, "the shepherd-king," presenting successive phases of his coming and the reaction of the people. Lamarche further sees a relationship between Zech 9–14 and the Servant Songs in Isaiah.⁴⁸ He takes the figure of the shepherd-king as built up through reflection on the figure of the servant of Yahweh in Isaiah, therefore concentrating on the problem of the rejection, suffering, and death of the Messiah.⁴⁹

The four aspects of the messianic figure in Zech 9–14 can be traced in detail as follows. First, Zech 9:9 portrays the Messiah as a humble and gentle king, victorious only because God has vindicated and delivered him, bringing peace and prosperity.⁵⁰ Second and third, Zech 12:12 indicates the Messiah's expectation of a violent death and the people's resulting mournful repentance. The "piercing" of the Messiah would be due to the rejection of the good shepherd by the people (see 11:4–14) as well as of his smiting by the sword of God (13:7). Fourth, Zech 13:7 portrays the messianic shepherd's suffering, which is necessary for the salvation he will provide. France insists that Jesus saw in these passages predictions of his own status and work:

48. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 109–10, citing Lamarche, *Zacharie*, 138–39. France also refers to the important article by F. F. Bruce, "The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative," *BJRL* 43 (1960–61): 336–53, esp. 342–49, where Bruce traces the figure of Zech 9–14 in Jesus' thought during the closing phases of his ministry. See also Bullock, *Introduction*, 322, who concurs, "The image of the shepherd-king had already been set forth by Ezekiel (34:23–31; 37:24), and Zechariah mixes the hues of that imagery with those of the Suffering Servant to paint the portrait of the Messiah on his apocalyptic canvass. The gospel writers knew those precious phrases from Zechariah, and in them they heard the traumatic events of the passion of Christ expressed." See further F. F. Bruce, *The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968), 100–114. Along different lines, André Feuillet, "Deux références évangéliques cachées au Serviteur martyrisé (Is 52,13–53,12): Quelques aspects importants du mystère rédempteur," *NRT* 106 (1984): 549–65, sees Isaianic language reflected in Jesus' expression "give my life for," found four times in 10:11–18 (pp. 556–61). Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 39 n. 99.

49. Cf. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 104, citing Lamarche, *Zacharie*, 118–23. Since the focus of the present study is John 10:16, where Jesus' "giving his life for the sheep" is not the center of attention, the connection between Isa 53 and John 10 is not the primary subject of the present study. However, see the discussion of Isaiah below and the references to Craig Evans's work. Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 77 n. 3, wisely expresses caution about seeing the Isaianic servant songs as informing theology for Zechariah. Note also Moo's extensive treatment of Isaiah's servant songs (pp. 79–122) and Zech 9–14 (pp. 173–224).

50. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 106 n. 82, where France cites favorably the suggestion by D. R. Jones (*VT* 12 [1962]: 256–58) that this passage may be modeled after David's humble and peaceful return to Jerusalem after his son Absalom's rebellion (cf. 2 Sam 15:30; 16:1–2). If Jesus indeed consciously reenacted this Davidic scene, this would be significant testimony to Jesus' Davidic consciousness, enhancing the likelihood of Davidic typology at various points.

They present a unified picture, of the lowly king, rejected and killed by the people to whom he comes, whose martyrdom is the cause of their repentance and salvation. The correspondence of this figure with the actual mission of Jesus is striking, and it is clear that he expected it to be so. In alluding to these passages of Zechariah he made clear both to his disciples and to the crowds the sort of Messianic work he envisaged himself as accomplishing. It was not to be one of triumphant and majestic sovereignty, bringing political deliverance for the Jews, but one of lowliness, suffering and death. If he was their king, it was in the character of the lowly and rejected Shepherd-King.⁵¹

C. Isaiah

The question has been raised above whether the “missing link” between Ezekiel’s and Zechariah’s references to Israel and Judah and Jesus’ reference to the new messianic community in John 10 can be supplied from the OT or whether Jesus expanded those prophecies originally addressed to Israel in a typological fashion. Arguably, Isa 56:6–8 supplies this important connection.⁵² Verse 8 reads, “The Lord God, who gathers the dispersed of Israel, declares, ‘Yet others I will gather to them, to those already gathered.’” Thus there is the notion of “others” apart from the “dispersed of Israel” that God pledges to gather as well. It is crucial to read v. 8 in the context of vv. 3–7, which emphatically affirm the inclusion of “foreigners” in God’s covenant:

Let not the foreigner who has joined himself to the LORD say, “The LORD will surely separate me from his people.” . . . I will give them an everlasting name which will not be cut off. Also the foreigners who join themselves to the LORD, to minister to him, and to love the name of the LORD, to be his servants, every one who keeps from profaning the sabbath, and holds fast my covenant, even those I will bring to my holy mountain, and make them joyful in my house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be acceptable on my altar; for my house will be called a house of prayer *for all the peoples*.⁵³

It is those previously excluded from God’s covenant with Israel that God will gather. The basis for being joined to the Lord will no longer

51. *Ibid.*, 109.

52. Cf. Hofius, “Sammlung der Heiden,” 289–91. Hofius holds that Isa 56:8 is post-exilic (p. 290). Note also Isa 46:6 (cf. Jesus of himself in John 8:12, to his disciples in Matt 5:14; cf. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 345).

53. The Synoptic tradition preserves a saying of Jesus uttered at the occasion of his cleansing of the temple involving a quote from Isa 56:7 (Mark 11:17 = Matt 21:13 = Luke 19:46).

be ethnic heritage but loving service to God and holding fast to his covenant. This passage, then, links the “divine shepherd motif” with the inclusion of non-Jews (“foreigners”) in the orbit of God’s covenant. As Jeremias points out, the universal expansion of the shepherd motif belongs to the conception of the eschatological pilgrimage of the nations to God’s mountain.⁵⁴ In light of Johannine “inaugurated eschatology,” Jesus indicates that in his coming the hour of the eschatological ingathering of God’s flock has indeed dawned.

While the Pharisees, who held to particularistic views, were closed to the notion of a united “flock” under Jesus that included Jews and Gentiles alike, such a prospect is not only not foreign to the OT but positively predicted in passages such as 56:3–8. This willful closing of their eyes in the face of God’s revelation renders the Jewish religious leaders morally culpable. The evangelist explicitly links the Jews’ response to Jesus’ ministry with the prophet Isaiah’s experience: “Lord, who has believed our report?” (John 12:38; compare with Isa 53:1; see also Rom 10:16). The implied answer: “No one” (or at least very few). Yet, as John is quick to point out, this massive unbelief on part of the Jews is the result of sovereign divine hardening (John 12:40; compare with Isa 6:10): “He has blinded their eyes, and he hardened their heart, lest they see with their eyes, and perceive with their heart, and be converted, and I heal them.”⁵⁵ In contrast to the Jewish religious leaders, Jesus represented the universalistic view that had already found expression in Isa 56:3–8.⁵⁶ The book of Isaiah thus constitutes a crucial substructure both of Jesus’ self-understanding and teaching and of John’s theology.

*D. Davidic Typology*⁵⁷

Lastly, it seems that Davidic typology constitutes the thread connecting early divine promises with later biblical revelation and their

54. Joachim Jeremias, *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1956), 55; cf. Hofius, “Sammlung der Heiden,” 289, 291.

55. Cf. Craig A. Evans, “Obduracy and the Lord’s Servant: Some Observations on the Use of the Old Testament in the Fourth Gospel,” in *Early Jewish and Christian Exegesis: Studies in Memory of William Hugh Brownlee* (ed. Craig A. Evans and William F. Stinespring; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 221–36.

56. This great paradigm shift from particularism to universalism is realized at Pentecost (Acts 2) and confirmed at the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15). As the Fourth Gospel indicates, the historical Jesus clearly anticipated these developments.

57. Note the discussion of Davidic typology under §II A. Ezekiel above. See also Walter Wifall, “David: Prototype of Israel’s Future?” *BTB* 4 (1974): 94–107, who notes that the “David story” of Samuel and Kings functions as the prototype for the description of Israel’s prehistory, while the same story is later used by the prophets for their descriptions of Israel’s future. Wifall traces the development from Ezekiel to Zechariah to the

manifestation in Jesus' "Davidic consciousness."⁵⁸ This thread begins in Gen 49:8–12 and Num 24:17–19. It is continued in 1 Sam 16–17 and 2 Sam 7:7–8. The "royal" and "messianic" psalms consciously reflect upon and develop this tradition (for example, Pss 2, 72, and 110). Many of the prophets see David as typical of the king, who is to come in the future (Isa 7:13–17; 9:1–7; 11:1–9; 55:3–4; Hos 3:5; Mic 5:1–5; Jer 23:5; Ezek 34:23–24; 37:24–25; Amos 9:1; and others).⁵⁹ The intertestamental *Pss. Sol.* 17 and 18 (first century BC) give prominence to the house of David and make it the basis of messianic hope.⁶⁰

There are also numerous instances where the NT quotes Davidic psalms in a way that suggests that Jesus' life—and death—were typologically related to David's.⁶¹ Jesus publicly acknowledged his role as the Son of David when healing a blind man toward the end of his ministry (see Mark 10:47–48 = Matt 20:30–31 = Luke 18:38–39). John 7:41b–42 witnesses to the Jewish expectation of a Davidic Messiah from Bethlehem. In the matrix of messianic scriptural tradition, Jesus sees himself as the Davidic shepherd-king sent by God. This consciousness is, among other instances and passages, expressed in John 9 and 10.⁶²

NT's portrayal of Jesus as the "new David." While dissenting from Wifall's historical-critical presuppositions (late dating of Pentateuch, Deutero-Zechariah), I arrived at similar conclusions regarding the "David story." See also Herrmann, *Heilservartungen*, 92–103; and most recently Margaret Daly-Denton, *David in the Fourth Gospel: The Johannine Reception of the Psalms* (AGJU 47; Leiden: Brill, 2000).

58. Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 14, 36–39 (esp. n. 99), 82–90, and 122, for an extensive treatment of Davidic typology. See also France, *Jesus and the Old Testament*, 46–47, referring to Mark 2:25–26; Matt 12:3–4; and Luke 6:2–4.

59. Cf. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible*, 243. Note especially Mic 5:1–5, where a "ruler" with eternal beginnings from Bethlehem of Judah is promised, who will effect the return of the "remaining brethren" to the sons of Israel.

60. Cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 36. See also the excursus below.

61. See, for example, Jesus' own use of Ps 110:1 in Mark 12:35–37 par. See C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), 64; Goppelt, *Typos*, 83, esp. n. 100. It is true that the name of David occurs in John only in 7:42, as a reference to the popular expectation that the Messiah would come from Bethlehem of Judah (cf. Mic 5:2). But Davidic typology manifests itself in more subtle and indirect ways in the Fourth Gospel, as is characteristic of this writer's style.

62. See also Mark 6:34 = Matt 9:36 (editorial), Mark 14:27 = Matt 26:31 (quoting Zech 13:7); Matt 7:15; 10:6/15:24 (both focusing on Jesus' call to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel"); 25:31–32 (parable); Matt 10:16 = Luke 10:3; Matt 18:12–14 = Luke 15:3–7 (parable); Luke 12:32; 19:10; John 21:16–17; and, of course, John 10. Jesus' employment of shepherding metaphors is thus attested in all strands of Gospel tradition (Marcan, Matthean/Lucan ["Q"], Matthean, Lucan, and Johannine). References are found in editorial sections, with reference to the OT, and in explicit statements by Jesus, both in form of parables and of commissions given to his disciples. John 10, however, is the only extended treatment relating Jesus typologically to the OT figure of the Davidic shepherd. Note further later theological developments of Jesus' employment

III. INTERTESTAMENTAL LITERATURE

A. *Qumran*

F. F. Bruce, after tracing the early church's use of the OT in light of the advent and ministry of Jesus, refers to the Christian church's view of itself as a new Israel (Gal 6:16; compare with 4:21ff.) and states categorically, "Such an application of Old Testament scripture, extending to Gentiles equal privileges within the Abrahmic covenant, would have been unacceptable to the Qumran sect."⁶³ Concerning Davidic typology, he writes that most of the Qumran "testimonies" relating to the Davidic Messiah are applied to Jesus in the NT or early Christian literature.⁶⁴ The books of Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Isaiah were important for the messianic expectations of the Qumran sect.⁶⁵

Moreover, the apocalyptic portions of Ezekiel, Zechariah, and Isaiah provided fertile ground for the community's eschatological speculations. However, as Bruce notes, one of the major differences between Christian interpretation and Qumran is the concentration of all messianic passages in Christian interpretation on Jesus, while Qumran expected two or more messianic figures.⁶⁶ An interesting statement using shepherd imagery is found in CD 13:9, where the priest of the sect "shall love them as a father loves his children, and shall carry them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep."⁶⁷ The concept of the Messiah as a shepherd-king, however, is not found in the Qumran literature.

B. *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*⁶⁸

In Sir 18:13, a Jewish apocryphal book composed around 180 BC, there is a reference to the Lord as a shepherd: "The compassion of man is

of shepherd imagery to describe his mission in Heb 13:20; 1 Pet 2:25; 5:1-5; and Rev 7:17. The themes of the new covenant, the Isaianic suffering servant, and the Davidic shepherd motif are represented in these passages, providing further evidence of the trajectory of scriptural traditions blending references found especially in Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah, and the Psalms.

63. F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (London: Tyndale, 1959), 79.

64. *Ibid.*, 84.

65. Beutler, "Alttestamentlich-jüdischer Hintergrund," 29-30, refers to a passage in the *Damascus Document* that seems to be dependent on Ezek 34 (CD 7:13ff.).

66. *Ibid.*, 84-86. See also Moule, *Birth of the New Testament*, 67-70, who notes as distinctive of early Christian interpretation of the OT its historical interpretation of the Scriptures (p. 68) and "the convergence of all these [messianic] figures upon Jesus" (p. 69).

67. Cf. Moo, *Gospel Passion Narratives*, 177, who also refers to CD 19:5-9.

68. Cf. Beutler, "Alttestamentlich-jüdischer Hintergrund," 27. See also Jeremias, "poimēn," 500.

for his neighbor, but the compassion of the Lord is for all living beings. He rebukes and trains and teaches them, and turns them back, as a shepherd his flock" (*hōs poimēn to poimnion autou*). The recognition that God's mercy extends to "all living beings" is noteworthy.

Another apocryphal book, 2 Esdras, has relevance to John 10:16 as well. In 2 Esdr 2:33–34 we read: "I, Ezra, received a command from the Lord on Mount Horeb to go to Israel. When I came to them they rejected me and refused the Lord's commandment. Therefore I say to you, O nations that hear and understand, 'Await your shepherd; he will give you everlasting rest, because he who will come at the end of the age is close at hand.'" This passage is apocalyptic in nature. It is part of a portion of the book (chaps. 1–2) that was probably added to the central section (chaps. 3–14) around the middle of the second century AD by a Christian editor in Greek. Thus it technically is not part of intertestamental literature. Still, it is interesting that shepherd imagery is used even at this stage in connection with the inclusion of the "nations that hear and understand" in God's redemptive plan.

In 2 Esdr 5:18, which is dated to around the time of the composition of the Fourth Gospel, Phaltiel, the prince of the people, is quoted as saying to Ezra, "Do not let us down, like a shepherd who abandons his flock to bad wolves."⁶⁹ This reference provides some evidence that political or religious leaders were at times likened to faithless shepherds in the intertestamental period.

In 1 En. 83–90, the seer traces salvation history since Noah and the history of Israel since the patriarchs. The twelve sons of Jacob and their offspring are presented as sheep (89:11ff.). Egypt is portrayed as a wolf (89:13–27). The foreign rulers after the destruction of Jerusalem are likened to 70 shepherds who neglect their flock and expose it to wild animals (89:59–70). The same image is used to describe the 35 rulers between the return from the Babylonian exile and the time of the Maccabees (89:74–76). God announces the future judgment over these shepherds (90:22–25). However, the dating of this part of 1 Enoch is uncertain.⁷⁰ If pre-Christian, 1 Enoch would provide independent evidence for the use of shepherding imagery in the intertestamental period. The "shepherd discourse" in John 10, however, is presented as part of a different genre (symbolic discourse rather than apocalyptic). In the ultimate analysis, both 1 En. 83–90 and John 10 seem to stand firmly in OT tradition.

The fifth fragment of the *Apocryphon of Ezekiel* is quoted by Clement of Alexandria in approximately AD 95 and dates from around

69. Cf. *ibid.*, 28.

70. M. Black dates this part of 1 Enoch to about 175–165 BC (*Enoch*, n. 39, pp. 19–20); referred to by Beutler, "Alttestamentlich-jüdischer Hintergrund," 27.

50 BC to AD 50. In a passage apparently dependent on Ezek 34:14–16, the *Apocryphon* reads: “Therefore he says by Ezekiel . . . , ‘And the lame I will bind up, and that which is troubled I will heal, and that which is led astray I will return, and I will feed them on my holy mountain . . . and I will,’ he says, ‘be their shepherd and I will be near to them as the garment to their skin.’”⁷¹

A similar expectation is expressed in the second-century AD work 2 *Baruch*, in which the (purported) exiles are called to recommit themselves to obey the Law, which is said to fulfill the function of shepherd, lamp, and fountain—all applied to Jesus in John’s Gospel—in the life of God’s people: “For the shepherds of Israel have perished, and the lamps which gave light are extinguished, and the foundations from which we used to drink have withheld their streams,” laments the seer. “Now we have been left in the darkness and in the thick forest and in the aridness of the desert.” Yet, there is hope: “Shepherds and lamps and fountains came from the Law and when we go away, the Law will abide. If you, therefore, look upon the Law and are intent upon wisdom, then the lamp will not be wanting and the shepherd will not give way and the fountain will not dry up” (2 *Bar* 77:13–17).

Psalms of Solomon 17 expresses the expectation of a Davidic figure (v. 21), who will “gather a holy people whom he will lead in righteousness” (v. 26). “He will have Gentile nations serving him under his yoke” (v. 30). Notably, the writer asserts that “he will be compassionate to all the nations who reverently stand before him” (v. 34). “Faithfully and righteously shepherding the Lord’s flock (*poimnion kyriou*), he will not let any of them stumble in their pasture” (v. 40). Wright notes that the *Psalms of Solomon* emerge from the tradition of a Jewish community in the last century before the turn of the era.⁷² They are almost certainly to be dated to before AD 70, and thus they provide important evidence for intertestamental Jewish messianic expectations.

C. Rabbinic Literature

Around AD 90, the rabbis discussed the question whether or not non-Jews had a share in the world to come.⁷³ Rabbi Eliezer contended that

71. Cf. James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, Vol. 1 (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983), 488, 495; see also Beutler, “Alttestamentlich-jüdischer Hintergrund,” 27.

72. Cf. Charlesworth, *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2.641.

73. Cf. Hermann L. Strack and Paul Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. 1 (Munich: Beck, 1924), 360–61. Concerning the tension between universalism and particularism in Jewish tradition, note their discussion in Vol. 2, pp. 538–39.

the *goyim* had no share in the future life, appealing to Ps 9:17, which says: "The wicked will return to Sheol, even all the nations who forget God." But R. Yehoshua replied that, if the verse ended after "all the nations," he would agree. But because it continued to specify, "who forget God," he argued that there were righteous people among the Gentiles who will have a share in the world to come.

This rabbinic dispute that seems to have taken place roughly at the time the Fourth Gospel was written illustrates well the variety of opinions among Jewish scholars with regard to the relationship between Jews and Gentiles in the messianic age. Certainly Jesus' statement in John 10:16 passes the critical test of "dissimilarity" in relation to much of rabbinic teaching of his time. The very reluctance to admit Gentiles into the community of God's people on part of Jewish rabbis stands in marked contrast to both Jesus' teaching and the subsequent missionary activity of the early church (see Acts).

With regard to general shepherding imagery, there is evidence that Moses and David were considered to be the good shepherds of God's flock Israel by the Jews (see already Isa 63:11 [Moses]; Ps 78:20, 72 [David]; Isa 44:28 [Cyrus]). Thyen maintains that John 10 is rooted in Mishnaic thought (*m. Šeb.* 8; *m. B. Mešī'a* 7; see also *Mek.* 13b.14a). However, it is doubtful whether these traditions predate Jesus' "shepherd discourse." Beutler sees few traces in rabbinic writings that may serve as a background for John 10:1–18.⁷⁴ He contends that there is virtually no evidence for a messianic sense of the "good shepherd" in rabbinic sources. Among other matters, shepherds were held in fairly low esteem in Israel in NT times, so that the image could hardly have been used as a picture for majesty. Moreover, the early use of the image of the shepherd by Jesus would have kept rabbis from developing corresponding OT and early Jewish traditions any further.

After illumining some of the major strands of OT theology converging in Jesus' "good shepherd" discourse in John 10, I will now return to the passage itself in order to trace its literary and theological developments as well as its development of certain OT motifs. This will help to limit and define Jesus' scriptural allusions in John 10:16. The article will conclude with some tentative answers concerning the relevance of John 10:16 for John's readership and summarize the major argument of the present essay.

74. "Alttestamentlich-jüdischer Hintergrund," 23. See also Jeremias, "*poimēn*," 485–502. Beutler has reservations regarding Derrett's attempt to derive John 10:1–18 from Jewish *halakha*.

IV. THE MESSAGE OF JOHN 10:16 IN ITS ORIGINAL AND CONTEMPORARY CONTEXTS

A. *Literary Development in John's Gospel*

Jesus' healing of the blind man in John 9 had led to the man's excommunication from the local synagogue.⁷⁵ This act by the Jewish religious leaders issued in Jesus' response. He saw in their excommunication of this formerly blind man an arrogant assertion of usurped authority. This he used as an occasion for recalling God's promise of judgment on the irresponsible religious leaders of Israel (9:39–41; compare with Ezek 34). While "the Jews" were trying to guard their religious system—including the temple that was soon to be destroyed (see John 2:19–20), the law of Moses (see 1:17; 5:16; 7:19; 9:28–29), and their national autonomy (11:49–50; 19:15)—their day of reckoning was near. Jesus' sharp polemic calls "Israel's shepherds" to account for their failure to follow the Davidic-prophetic tradition: "All who came before me are thieves and robbers, but the sheep did not hear them" (John 10:8). This prophetic word of judgment is firmly placed in John's "eschatology of decision." It is decision time for Israel's religious leaders. "And this is judgment, that the light has come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their deeds were evil. For everyone who does evil hates the light, and does not come to the light, lest his evil deeds should be exposed" (3:19–20).

B. *Theological Development*

The Jews' rejection of Jesus the Messiah occurs at the "midpoint of time" (*Mitte der Zeit*), a crucial intersection in salvation history (see Luke–Acts). Their rejection is presented in the Fourth Gospel as a paradigm of the world's rejection of its Savior.⁷⁶ Jesus is the one who faithfully preserves and fulfills God's law, while "the Jews" fail to recognize their Messiah in Jesus and in the Scriptures (see the *double entendre* in John 1:11; and 5:39). The formerly blind man, not only physically healed but also spiritually "illuminated" (9:35–38), is one of the "scattered children of God" in Jesus' eyes. Ultimately, physical descent from Abraham avails nothing, if not accompanied by faith (see John 8).

75. There is no good reason why excommunication from the local synagogue may not have been practiced as early as during the later stages of Jesus' ministry as a local, isolated phenomenon, foreshadowing what was to come (cf. John 16:2). It is therefore not necessary to follow J. Louis Martyn and others who see John 9 as a later projection by the "Johannine community" onto the time of the historical Jesus (cf. Martyn, *History and Theology in the Fourth Gospel* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1979], 24ff.). See the critique of Martyn's hypothesis in Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 35–38, 360–61, and esp. 369–72.

76. Cf. Grässer, *Alte Bund im Neuen*, 151, 163; Kuhl, *Sendung Jesu*, 171–74.

On the other hand, Jesus knows of “other sheep” that are scattered but “his” as well: “I must bring them also, and they will hear my voice, and there will be one flock, one shepherd” (10:16).⁷⁷ As the fulfillment of God’s promise to Abraham is dawning—“in you *all the families of the earth* shall be blessed” (Gen 12:3c)—those who presume to hold the keys of the synagogue will suddenly find themselves outside the door of salvation (see Rev 3:7, 9). Jesus’ word in John 10:16, while good news for the Gentiles, is a word of judgment for “the Jews” (see also Rom 9–11).

For Jesus’ disciples, Jesus’ word announces the task at hand, which will commence as soon as Jesus’ own redemptive work is completed: the task of shepherding a church made up of believing Jews and Gentiles joined together in unity and love.⁷⁸ Moreover, the shepherd motif sheds interesting light on another element of the Fourth Gospel, the presentation of the Apostle Peter.⁷⁹ Even this chosen first leader of the new messianic community is shown to be initially scattered, chastened, and only subsequently forgiven and reinstated by Jesus. Only a forgiven sinner—a Jew notwithstanding—is fit to assume the representative leadership of God’s people.

C. Development of the Old Testament⁸⁰

In light of passages such as Isa 56:3–8, a subtle but nonetheless very significant paradigm shift becomes apparent. While the “other sheep”

77. See John F. O’Grady, “The Good Shepherd and the Vine and the Branches,” *BTB* 8 (1978): 86–89, who contends that the stress in John 10:1–18 and 15:1–8 is on the individual’s relationship to Jesus and not on the collective aspect. This is to erect a dichotomy that does not seem to exist in Jesus’ mind, which moves freely from individual to corporate aspects in those discourses.

78. Cf. John 13:34–35; 15:12; 17:20–26; 21:15–19; see also Acts 20:28–29; Eph 2:11–22; 4:3–6; 1 Pet 5:1–5. Note, however, that the shepherd title and metaphor are not used of Christ in the Pauline Epistles (cf. Jeremias, “*poimēn*,” 493).

79. Among the growing literature devoted to the characterization of Peter in the Fourth Gospel is Arthur J. Droge, “The Status of Peter in the Fourth Gospel: A Note on John 18:10–11,” *JBL* 109 (1990): 307–11. Droge believes that Peter is characterized in the Fourth Gospel as “a man who has come dangerously close to being placed beyond the Johannine pale” (p. 311). To sustain this conclusion, however, Droge has to deemphasize passages such as the final commissioning of Peter by Jesus. Why would Peter, representative of the Jewish mission, be shown as commissioned by Jesus in John, if the animosity of the “Johannine community” toward the Jews prevailed at the time of writing the Gospel? The only satisfactory explanation is that Peter’s characterization in the Fourth Gospel is not anachronistic but based on an accurate historical reflection on how Jesus treated Peter. See further the discussion below.

80. Note M. Sabbe, “John 10 and Its Relationship to the Synoptic Gospels,” 87, who hypothesizes that John 10:16 may in fact be a “heightening” of Synoptic passages such as Matt 10:6 and 15:24, where “the lost sheep of the house of Israel” are the object of Jesus’ concern. As argued above, Sabbe’s work suffers from an undue unilateral emphasis on

who believe in Jesus the Messiah are, in a sense, considered to be part of “the dispersed of Israel,” the unbelieving Jews are shown to be beyond the pale of God’s “flock.” Jesus’ coming can thus be said to have functioned as a catalyst for surfacing the “true Israel of God.” This was a reality in a sense “hidden” until the time of his coming. Many Jews who really were unbelieving nonetheless considered themselves to be part of God’s chosen people. It is Jesus who unmasks this presumption. No longer is it possible to claim being a “Jew” without believing in the Jewish Messiah. This unbelief demonstrates that a given Jew in fact has not been a “true Israelite” all along.

On the other hand, if a non-Jew believes in Jesus the Messiah, he is showing himself to be part of God’s “flock.” The basis of belonging to God’s flock thus is faith in Jesus the Messiah, not one’s Jewishness. While the basic flock is still Israel, Jesus affirms that other dispersed people are to be gathered to Israel. By redefining “Israel” as all those who believe in the Messiah, the Lord abolishes the notion of any “Israel” apart from faith in the Messiah. Ironically, Jesus, who came to unite Israel (Ezek 37:21–22; compare with Matt 10:34), actually became a cause of its scattering (see the “stone *testimonia*” in 1 Pet 2).

When Jesus utters his words in John 10, and especially 10:16, the realization of his vision of a united “flock” is still in the realm of expectation.⁸¹ At the time of John’s writing, however, his mode of presentation makes clear that Jesus’ vision has to a significant extent already become a reality. As a matter of fact, it is the presentation of this very “universalism” that is one of the major emphases in the Fourth Gospel: God’s love for “the world” in Jesus (John 3:16) coupled with the criterion of “everyone who believes” (3:15, 16, 18, 36; 5:24; 6:35, 40, 47; 7:38; 11:25, 26; 12:44, 46; 14:12; compare with 1:7, 12; 20:31). If there was any doubt in the minds of the original hearers of Jesus’ statement in John 10:16, by the time of the writing of the Fourth Gospel one thing is clear: the gospel could not be contained in the Jewish shell in which it originated. It had launched its irresistible course throughout all the world.⁸²

the literary dimension of Gospel relationships at the expense of the level of the historical Jesus.

81. See the future tenses in 10:16 that express Jesus’ expectation that his words will become a reality. Note that Jesus does not specify the exact time at which he expects his words to be fulfilled. Jeremias may be right when he points to the eschatological pilgrimage to the mountain of God as Jesus’ reference point (*Jesus Verheissung*, 55). But in the context of John’s eschatological presentation, the emphasis is on Jesus’ present decisive declaration of an eschatological reality fulfilled in and through his ministry.

82. The question that Jeremias addresses is the great tension of Jesus’ confining himself to the Jews during his own earthly, preresurrection ministry and his prediction of the Gentile mission subsequent to his ascension (*Jesus’ Promise to the Nations*). He notes

*D. Warrants for Jesus' Use of Old Testament Motifs in John 10:16*⁸³

Significantly, the decisive application of shepherd imagery to a future Davidic figure took place in exilic and postexilic prophecy.⁸⁴ This is also the time when the "remnant motif" was developed in greater detail. There are intertestamental traditions in which the Jews consider themselves as in a sense still in exile, waiting for their Messiah. There also appears to have been an awareness that being Jewish was by itself insufficient but that God would save a remnant of faithful Jews (Qumran, apocalyptic literature).

Jesus' appropriation of eschatological shepherd imagery with reference to himself thus places him in an antithetical relationship with the irresponsible shepherds of Israel who were the cause of Israel's exile. Jesus' coming can be seen as the resolution and the final bringing home of the theological lessons that the exile was designed to teach the Jews, particularly that God was not prepared to overlook Israel's sin and to extend preferential treatment to the nation. By employing scriptural shepherd motifs, Jesus uses typology along salvation-historical lines: Israel's past shepherds are shown to correspond to the Jewish leaders of Jesus' day, while the Davidic deliverer of exilic prophecy finds its antitype in Jesus the Messiah.

Essentially, then, salvation-historical developments were matched by developments in shepherd typology. The decisive point is the exile,

that even in the few instances where Jesus directly ministered to Gentiles (Matt 8:5–13 par. Luke 7:1–10; Mark 7:24–30 par. Matt 15:21–28; Matt 5:1–20 par. Matt 8:21–40; Luke 8:26–39 [?]), he never took the initiative (pp. 28–31). Jeremias notes that not only is this restriction consistently maintained in the Synoptic Gospels, it is also supported by Paul and the Fourth Gospel (cf. John 12:20ff.). He draws attention to the fact that the Gentile mission addressed in John 10:16 is predicated on Jesus' vicarious cross-death mentioned in John 10:15 (cf. John 14:12; Matt 28:18–20; *ibid.*, pp. 37–38). Once again it is evident how clearly John distinguishes between the pre- and the postresurrection perspectives of Jesus and the early church (cf. Carson, "Understanding Misunderstandings in the Fourth Gospel," *TynBul* 33 [1982]: 59–89). Even though in John's day the Gentile mission has long been launched, the evangelist presents it consistently as still future during the time of Jesus' earthly precrucifixion ministry. Jeremias refers to the synagogue's tenth benediction and *Didache* 10:5 for notions of the eschatological gathering of the scattered ones, and to *T. Benj.* 9:2 and Matt 25:32 for the picture of the scattered flock as extended to the Gentile world (p. 64). Why then Jesus' restriction to the Jews during his earthly ministry? Jeremias gives two reasons: (1) the message of salvation must first be addressed to Israel (cf. Mark 7:27; Rom 1:16; 2:9–10; 15:8; Acts 3:25–26; 13:46); (2) the time of the Gentiles must follow the cross (pp. 71–72). Note also Jeremias's conclusion on p. 73.

83. See also the discussion of the OT background for John 10:16 above and the summary below.

84. See esp. Beutler, "Alttestamentlich-jüdischer Hintergrund," 28–29.

where the promise of a coming Davidic shepherd emerges more clearly. In the end, all “good shepherd” motifs, both human and divine, converge in Jesus. Still faint in Joshua’s day, more explicit in David’s time, yet clearer at the time of the Babylonian exile, the motif of a messianic shepherd-king, who gathers God’s “scattered flock” and delivers his people, finds its fulfillment and most pronounced revelation in Jesus the Messiah.

E. Relevance for John’s Readership

But what about the contemporaries of John the evangelist? Why did John select this pericope for inclusion in his Gospel? How was Jesus’ teaching relevant also for John’s audience? How one answers these questions depends to a significant extent on one’s views concerning John’s purpose for writing his Gospel.⁸⁵ For the purpose of this present study, it will tentatively be assumed that among John’s purposes was the validation of Christian communities as the legitimate representatives of truly “Jewish” and biblical tradition.⁸⁶ Jewish-Gentile communities were encouraged by John in chap. 10 to persevere in

85. Even though John states his purpose in 20:30–31, there remains some ambiguity that makes the identification of his purpose less than certain. The two major positions that have been taken are (1) that John wrote to evangelize diaspora Jews and proselytes (W. C. van Unnik, followed by Carson, *Gospel According to John*, 87–95; see p. 91 nn. 1–2); and (2) that John wrote to strengthen believing communities in their struggle against persecution from the outside (“the Jews” and “the world”; cf., e.g., Hahn, *Mission in the New Testament*, 157; Kuhl, *Sendung Jesu*, 226; Rudolf Schnackenburg, “Die Messiasfrage im Johannesevangelium,” in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze. Fs. J. Schmid* [ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, and F. Mussner; Regensburg: Pustet, 1963], 240–64, esp. 262). A mediating position is taken by Moule, *Birth of the New Testament*, 93–95 (esp. 93 n. 3), who concludes that the Fourth Gospel may be “the evangelist’s explanation of Christianity to the cosmopolitan people of Ephesus, Jew and Greek alike” (p. 94).

86. To hold that the Fourth Gospel was primarily written to strengthen the Christian communities of John’s day against their opponents and to affirm them as the legitimate heirs of Jewish and biblical (messianic) tradition, it is not necessary to hold to the anachronistic views of scholars in the wake of J. Louis Martyn. See, for example, John Painter, “Tradition, History, and Interpretation in John 10,” in Beutler and Fortna, *Shepherd Discourse*, 65–66, who sees the “Johannine community” as the sheepfold and the “other sheep” as prospective converts to the “Johannine community.” But the universalism pervading the whole Gospel and the passages regarding the new messianic community’s mission to the world militate against construing the Fourth Gospel as a sectarian document. See also Severino Pancaro, “The Relationship of the Church to Israel in the Gospel of St. John,” *NTS* 21 (1975): 396–405, whose treatment is representative of scholarship focusing on the level of the “Johannine community” while all but ignoring the OT background. Thus some helpful insights are offset by conjecture lacking sufficient biblical-theological grounding. The same criticism applies to R. E. Brown, “Other Sheep Not of This Fold,” 5–22.

unity against Jews who call themselves “Jews” but in fact are no (true) Jews at all.⁸⁷ They must learn the lessons that “the Jews” of Jesus’ day failed to learn—that is, not to presume upon their Jewish heritage but to trust in Jesus as Messiah.⁸⁸ This encouragement is addressed to Jews and Gentiles alike. Jesus’ kingdom or “new creation” (John 1:1ff.; 3:3, 5; 18:36; 20:22) is set in antithesis to the sinful “world” of those who reject God’s revelation in Jesus.⁸⁹

While John remains faithful to the historical Jewish context of Jesus’ ministry, he clearly presents Jesus to a cosmopolitan audience. His horizon, and the horizon of his readers, is wider than that of the unbelieving Jews of Jesus’ day.⁹⁰ There are no more misunderstandings regarding Jesus’ identity.⁹¹ The danger now is religious persecution from without and a perverted christology from within (see 1 John). These are the two key threats to the Christian communities of John’s day and the influences he seeks to divert by way of writing his Gospel. He shows the diabolical underpinnings of a Judaism without Christ and presents a christology faithful to the earthly Jesus’ self-revelation.

VI. SUMMARY

Before stating some succinct conclusions, I will give a summary in extended outline form that traces the development of shepherding imagery in biblical and intertestamental literature.⁹²

87. David J. Hawkin, “Orthodoxy and Heresy in John 10:1–21 and 15:1–17” *EvQ* 47 (1975): 208–13, argues that John 10 and 15 reflect the evangelist’s concern for the Christian communities of his time. Hawkin’s primary concern is to interact with W. Bauer’s thesis that “orthodoxy” and “heresy” are categories still absent at the end of the first century.

88. Cf. Kiefer, *Hirtenrede*, 72, who sees not only a missionary but also a polemic tendency in John 10:16.

89. An interesting clue may be provided by Acts 20:28, which records Paul’s farewell to the Ephesian elders. Paul warns them to guard their “flock,” to shepherd the church of God, and to watch out for “savage wolves” that will arise from their own midst, “not sparing the flock.” In Rev 2:6, in the exalted Christ’s letter to the Ephesian church delivered through John, the Nicolaitans are singled out as opponents (cf. 2:15). While little is known about this group, strong anti-Jewish polemic is found elsewhere in the letters to the seven churches in Rev (esp. 2:9 and 3:9). Thus it seems reasonable to consider Christian-Jewish clashes in Asia Minor to constitute a significant background to the Fourth Gospel.

90. Moule, *Birth of the New Testament*, 95, expresses “an irresistible impression that a genuine piece of dominical tradition is being retold in the light of the prevailing conflicts.”

91. Cf. Carson, “Misunderstandings.”

92. For an interesting treatment of various patristic interpretations of John 10, see Rowan A. Greer, “The Good Shepherd: Canonical Interpretations in the Early

- I. Pentateuch/Historical Books: God's initiative (shepherd typology yet largely subconscious)
 - A. Pentateuch
 1. Gen 48:15 ("Israel" blesses Joseph: God of Abraham and Isaac has been my shepherd); 49:24 ("Israel" about Joseph: the Mighty One of Jacob, the Shepherd, the Stone of Israel)
 2. Shepherd terminology in Exodus/Numbers/Deuteronomy (esp. Num 27:17)
 - B. Historical Books
 3. God's choice of David to "shepherd" his people Israel (1 Sam 16:11, 19; 17:15, 20, 34–36; 2 Sam 5:2 = 1 Chr 11:2; 7:7 = 1 Chr 17:6; 24:17 = 1 Chr 21:17)
- II. Psalms: Reflection upon God's work in Israel's history under patriarchs, Moses, and David (shepherd typology first consciously applied to God by David and other psalmists)
 4. Pss 23:1–3 (David calls the LORD his shepherd); 28:9; 74:1, 12; 77:20 (refers to Israel under Moses and Aaron; cf. 78:52); 78:70–72; 79:13; 80:1–2 (takes up Gen 48:15: "restore and save us!" references to Israel as God's vine, and to the man of God's right hand, the son of man [v. 17]); 82:9; 95:3, 7 (also alludes to wilderness wanderings); 100:3; 121:4; 2:9 (LXX)
- III. Prophets: God's revelatory (and man's prophetic) initiative in the development of shepherd typology and its application to Israel's messianic expectations (Micah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Zechariah)
 - A. Preexilic
 5. Mic 2:12 ("I will surely gather the remnant of Israel . . . like sheep . . . like a flock"); 4:6–8; 5:2–5 (a "ruler" with eternal beginnings, from Bethlehem of Judah; remaining brethren will return to sons of Israel; ca. 700 BC)
 6. Isa 56:8 (the LORD God who gathers the dispersed of Israel declares, "Yet others I will gather to them, to those already gathered"; ca. 680 BC?); 40:11; 44:28 (Cyrus); 49:9–10; 63:11 (Moses)
 - B. Exilic
 7. Jer 3:15 ("Return, faithless people . . . I will choose you . . . and bring you to Zion. Then I will give you shepherds after my own heart, who will lead you with knowledge and understanding")
 8. Jer 23:1–8 (first instance of "antishepherd polemic," reference to a "righteous branch of David who will reign as king" [v. 5]; ca. 605 BC); 31:10; 50:19
 9. Ezek 34 (extended "antishepherd polemic," "my servant David" will "be their shepherd," esp. v. 23); 37:21–24 ("my servant David will be king over them, and they will all have one shepherd"; ca. 597 BC [cf. 33:21])

C. Postexilic

10. Zech 9–14 (9:9: “Rejoice, O Zion, your king is coming to you, humble, mounted on a donkey”; chap. 11: sharp “antishepherd polemic”; covenant and relationship Judah/Israel broken; 30 shekels of silver; chap. 12: God will restore the glory of the house of David [vv. 7–8]; they “will look on him whom they have pierced” [v. 10]; 13:7: “Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man, my associate, declares the Lord of hosts, ‘Strike the shepherd, that the sheep may be scattered’”; ca. 520 BC)

IV. Intertestamental literature: Various efforts to rework and develop OT shepherd motifs, most notably in apocalyptic writings

A. Qumran

11. CD 7:13ff. (references to Zech 13:7; Amos 9:11; Num 24:17); CD 13:9 (the priest “shall . . . carry them in all their distress like a shepherd his sheep”; ca. 100 BC)

B. Apocrypha and pseudepigrapha

12. Sir 18:13 (“the Lord’s compassion is for all living beings . . . he turns them back as a shepherd his flock”; ca. 180 BC)
13. *Ezekiel Apocryphon* (fifth fragment; cf. Ezek 34:14–16; ca. 50 BC–AD 50)
14. *1 En.* 83–90 (Israel’s history from patriarchs through Babylonian exile to Maccabean period in terms of sheep, shepherds, and wolves; 175–165 BC?)
15. *Pss. Sol.* 17 (Davidic shepherd for the Lord’s flock; esp. vv. 21, 26, 30, 32, 40) and 18 (both first cent. BC)
16. *2 Esdr* 5:18 (“Rise therefore . . . so that you may not forsake us, like a shepherd who leaves his flock in the power of cruel wolves”; end of first cent. AD); 2:33–34 (“O nations that hear and understand, await your shepherd; he will give you everlasting rest, because he who will come at the end of the age is close at hand”; ca. 150 AD?)
17. *2 Bar.* 77:13–17 (“For the shepherds of Israel have perished, and the lamps which gave light are extinguished, and the fountains from which we used to drink have withheld their streams. Now we have been left in the darkness. . . . And I answered and said to them: ‘Shepherds and lamps and fountains came from the Law. . . . If you, therefore, look upon the Law . . . the shepherd will not give way . . .’”; 2d cent. AD)

C. Rabbinic literature

18. *M. Šeb.* 8; *m. B. Mešī’a* 7; *Mek.* 13b.14; discussions regarding *goyim*’s share in future world (cf. Ps 9:17; ca. AD 90)

V. Jesus and the Gospels: Centering in Jesus the Lord’s shepherd, the Messiah

A. Synoptics

19. a. Mark 6:34 = Matt 9:36 (evangelists: people “like sheep without a shepherd”; cf. Num 27:17)
- b. Mark 14:27 = Matt 26:31 (quoting Zech 13:7)

- c. Matt 7:15 (false prophets in “sheep’s clothing,” but inwardly “ravenous wolves”)
- d. Matt 10:6 (Jesus sends disciples to go to “lost sheep of house of Israel”)
- e. Matt 15:24 (Jesus sent to “lost sheep of Israel” himself)
- f. Matt 25:32–33 (last judgment is like shepherd separating sheep from goats)
- g. Matt 10:16 = Luke 10:3 (disciples sent out as sheep in the midst of wolves)
- h. Matt 18:12–14 = Luke 15:3–7 (parable of lost sheep)
- i. Luke 12:32 (Father gives kingdom to “little flock”)
- j. 19:10 (“Son of Man has come to seek and to save that which was lost”: Zacchaeus)

B. John

- 20. a. John 10 (the “good shepherd” who gives his life for his sheep; “antishpherd polemic,” “one flock, one shepherd”)
- b. 11:52 (Jesus to “gather together into one the children of God who are scattered abroad”)
- c. 16:32 (disciples will be scattered)
- d. 17:12 (Jesus kept and guarded disciples while with them [?]); 21:15–19 (Jesus commissions Peter: “shepherd/tend my sheep”)

VI. Paul, Petrine writings, Hebrews, Revelation: Guarding of “Jesus tradition,” further theological application and development, incorporation into apostolic proclamation and early church’s life and liturgy

- 21. Paul in Acts 20:28–31 (guard the flock . . . shepherd the church which was purchased with Jesus’ blood; “savage wolves” will come “not sparing the flock”)
- 22. Peter in
 - a. 1 Pet 2:25 (“Jesus the shepherd and guardian of your souls”)
 - b. 1 Pet 5:2 (“shepherd the flock”)
 - c. 1 Pet 5:4 (“when the Chief shepherd appears”)
- 23. Heb 13:20 (“the Great shepherd of the sheep . . . Jesus our Lord”; benediction)
- 24. Rev 7:17 (“the Lamb in the center of the throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them to springs of the water of life”)

VII. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I briefly summarize the most significant findings of this study:

First, his appropriation of messianic shepherd imagery in John 10 presents Jesus as a faithful interpreter of the Hebrew Scriptures. It is not so much that Jesus adds significant new substance to the Scriptures. His decisive contribution is rather that he interprets the Scriptures in

their totality yet with sensitivity to the developing biblical theology in the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets, and with reference to himself.

Second, as to messianic consciousness, the above study of John 10 has made clear that Jesus understood himself as the eschatological Davidic messianic "shepherd." As such, he would "gather the lost sheep of Israel." His parting vision was for his followers to gather, on the basis of his substitutionary cross-death, Gentile "sheep" as well and to incorporate them into the "fold" of the new messianic community (10:16).

Third, John the evangelist presents Jesus as both the Jewish Messiah and the universal Savior of the world. The message of John's Gospel was designed to appeal to the cosmopolitan population of the Asia Minor of his day and to strengthen the Johannine churches against Jewish opposition. By including Jesus' self-portrait as the Good Shepherd, of both believing Jews and Gentiles, John holds up the lofty vision of a community united by faith in the God-sent Messiah.

This new messianic community, consisting of believers in Jesus, is the legitimate heir of Hebrew scriptural traditions and messianic expectations, and faith in Jesus the Messiah, the Good Shepherd *par excellence*, is the bond that unites God's people and makes them his new covenant community. So Ezekiel's words have come true, echoed by Jesus himself, and recorded in John's Gospel: "And there will be one flock, one shepherd."