

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_expository-times\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[Issue]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article].pdf

friendship begins at school and continues right through life. Both lads are attractive, though the hero is a little wild; both men are true and courageous. There is a fine contrast too between them, necessary perhaps to a close lasting friendship.

*My Lady Marcia* (5s.), by Eliza Pollard, is a story of the French Revolution, a thrilling story of a terrible time. It is seen from the side of the aristocracy, not the side that Carlyle taught us to see it from. An English lady of rank and wealth casts in her lot with her persecuted terror-struck relatives, and becomes the worthy heroine. The great and the little are here. It is not so terrible as the reality, and yet it is terrible enough.

The war has had its victims and we have their histories. For many a day sad moving stories will be told of a war that has given much occasion for heroism and for tears. Already there have been not a few tales written. And Miss Evelyn Everett-Green's *A Gordon Highlander* (2s. 6d.) will take a good place among them. The little Gordon is every inch a soldier.

In *The Romance of the South Pole* (2s.) Mr. Barrett Smith gives a graphic account of the expeditions that have gone out to search the Ant-

arctic seas. And in *Up the Creeks* (1s. 6d.) Mr. Edward Shirley writes a stirring story of adventure in West Africa.

*A Sister of the Red Cross* (3s. 6d.)—another story of the Boer War. It is by Mrs. L. T. Meade. A daring story surely, for the hero is one of the officers shut up in Ladysmith and the heroine one of the nurses.

But *Rhoda*, 'a story for girls,' by E. L. Harrisfield (2s. 6d.), takes us away from the war, into the home life and the struggle for daily bread. A better story for the ordinary girl than any tale of love and war, a story of a brave girl, who found room enough at her own fireside to show her bravery.

But Messrs. Nelson have not forgotten the bairns. Here is a great oblong coloured picture book about the sea, called *The Red, White, and Blue* (1s.). And here is another folio with coloured pictures called *The Iron Horse* (1s.). And all the *Fairy Tales* (1s.) we know are given in brief, and again with wonderful coloured pictures. Add *Baby's Picture Book* (6d.) and *Baby's Picture Gallery* (6d.), and it will be admitted that the little ones in all their degrees of bigness have not been forgotten.

---

## The Judaean Ministry of Jesus.

BY THE REV. THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M.A., CANON OF WELLS.

### II.

#### The Testimony in the Temple.

THE first stage of our Lord's ministry occupies but a small space in the history; in respect of details of word and deed that work in Judæa is shrouded from our view. It does not fall within the scope of the synoptic narratives, and St. John, who gives full reports of later acts and discourses in Jerusalem, has little to say on this earlier work. We may suppose that at that time the disciples felt no special responsibility as witnesses of their Master's acts, and that only the Twelve when separated and 'ordained to be with Him' learned to regard themselves as depositaries of these sacred memories for communication and testimony. However that may be, we are sure that silence as well as statement belongs to a divine plan in the creation of the evangelical records.

Of our Lord's teaching in Jerusalem and His relations with 'the Jews' we are sufficiently informed in later chapters of the Fourth Gospel; and this previous history, though given briefly and in general terms, notes the chief features, and makes the final issue plain. Two incidents only are related, worthy indeed to be thrown into clear relief, one that of the Testimony in the Temple, the other that of the Teaching in the house; the former at the beginning of action in Jerusalem, the latter near its close, after many signs have been wrought. On each of these occasions there is a clearly expressed prescience of how the history will end, of the death and resurrection in which the manifestation will culminate, to become constituent facts in the future gospel.

The incident in the Temple, to be now considered, is a testimony of Jesus concerning the Temple, and then concerning Himself in relation to the Temple. This testimony is given by a public act of moral command, followed by a parabolic word of prophecy. It is the opening of His mission to His people. For this the Temple is the proper place, and the Passover is the proper time; the one being the local centre of their religious life, the other the great anniversary of their religious history.

In the time of preparation for the Passover Jesus has arrived at Jerusalem; and (as has been suggested) the act which followed His arrival would probably occur on the day when there was formal purgation of every house, by careful inspection of all the chambers for removal of every particle of leaven. One house there was which needed purgation from the leaven of worldly business, which, if ever so honest, should have had no place there, but which in fact was deeply infected with the vices of covetousness and fraud. Dr. Edersheim, in his *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (vol. i. pp. 367-371), has given a full account of the system of sacrificial sales and money-changing in the Temple market. Every Jew and proselyte had to pay the Temple tribute, and this was most largely done on these occasions. It was to be paid in the proper coin, the exact half-shekel of the sanctuary (about 1s. 2d. of our money), and there was an extra charge of a *maah*, about one-tenth of the same, which went by the name of *golbon*, and the like charge was made on all additional change for other purposes. When it is remembered that, besides Palestinian silver and copper coins, Persian, Syrian, Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman money circulated in the country, and was brought by Jews of the Dispersion, it will be seen what work the money-changers had to do. Then there were the transactions with the dealers, who had brought in the sacrificial animals for sale, after inspection and certificate of ceremonial fitness, and with sellers of doves and of the proper materials for purification. Great must have been the activity of the scene, and great its opportunities for the weighing and disputing, the bargaining and overreaching natural in Oriental—we are apt to say, in Jewish—transactions.

All this business, which should have been done elsewhere, was brought into the sacred precincts by licence of the officials, to the profit of the

resident leaders of the priesthood and of the high priestly family. 'There can be little doubt,' says Edersheim, 'that this market was what in Rabbinic writings is called "the Bazaars of the Sons of Annas," the family in possession of power, notorious for ambition and avarice.'

Into this market in the Court of the Gentiles the Lord entered with His little band of disciples for His first public act in Jerusalem. Often must He have looked on the same scene before, in Passovers which He had attended, and always with disapproval and displeasure. But He had no call then as a private person to denounce the conduct of the authorities or countermand their actions. In laying down the rule that we should 'do as Jesus did,' there is often a want of consideration of the distinction which ought to be made between what He did as a man, and what in His mission to the world and manifestation as the Christ. He has left us an example that we should follow His steps, but that must be according to the measure of our allotted rights and duties. Things may need correction, but it may not be our part to correct them. The part which the Lord now took belonged to the mission which He had to open, and for which His hour was come. Hence He could no longer look silently on the scene which dishonoured the Temple. So 'having made a scourge of cords,<sup>1</sup> He cast all out of the Temple, both the sheep and the oxen; and He poured out the changers' money,<sup>2</sup> and overthrew their tables; and to them that sold the doves He said, Take these things hence; make not My Father's house a house of merchandise.'

The scourge would not be needed for actual use. We can see in any farmyard how a boy with the wave of a stick drives herd or flock before him. But we might wonder that the men of business should so easily give way, and that the officials should not interfere. Feeling what He did as the action of a prophet, they shrank before it, and there were times when the aspect of Jesus arrested men's action, as striking into the heart. Doubtless there was also present a power of conscience, which knew the evils of the traffic and

<sup>1</sup> The *σχοῦλα*, 'cords' (etymologically of twisted *rushes*) had come to mean any cords (see Ac 27<sup>32</sup>).

<sup>2</sup> Two words are used in the narrative, one describing changers of money, the other takers of the *golbon*. He saw the *κερματιστάς* sitting—He poured out the coins *τῶν κολλυβιστῶν*.

owned the justice of the reproof, 'Make not My Father's house an house of merchandise.'

But what was the effect on the spectators? Of the thought of the disciples there is one word of notice. 'They remembered that it was written, The zeal of Thy house shall eat me up.' The familiar Scriptures were ever in their minds; and words of the Psalmist, thus illustrated in their sight, would rise naturally to their lips. The 69th Psalm is the voice of one suffering for faithfulness and zeal. Twice its words are used by the Lord Himself, once as being 'hated without a cause,' and again in the thirst on the cross; and St. Paul applies to Christ the remainder of the same verse which is here remembered: 'The reproaches of them that reproached Thee fell on me.' The disciples in recalling its first words had as yet no foresight of its darker fulfilment, or of the sad experiences which would appropriate to their Master the language of a servant and sufferer for God in generations of old. It was the zeal for the house of God, shown in such unexpected force, which deeply impressed their minds. The action was to them a lesson of zeal, and such it is for ever. Zeal is intensity of feeling and intensity of action for the cause adopted, and sensitive jealousy on its behalf. In itself the word has no moral colour, deriving its good or evil from the motive inspiring it, the object aimed at, and the nature of the feeling intensified. Hence ζήλος (*zélos*) is used in the N.T. indifferently for an exemplary fervour or for jealousy which is fruitful of evil. We are concerned here only with its nobler meaning, but even that disposition loses its worth, or at least misses its intention if uncontrolled by judgment and knowledge. We sympathize with St. Peter's zeal when he smote with the sword, but we see that he was doing all he could to injure his Master's cause. St. Paul respected in his countrymen their 'zeal of God,' but he saw with pain that it was 'not according to knowledge.' Such considerations, however, do not neutralize the teaching of the Lord's example in the present instance or the reasons for energy in duty, which that example illustrates. This I will express in the words of one to whom I listened in youth—

'Zeal is one of the elementary religious qualifications: that is, one of those which are essential in the notion of a religious man. A man cannot be said to be in earnest in religion, till he magnifies his God and Saviour, till he so far consecrates and exalts the thought of Him in his heart, as an object of praise, adoration, and rejoicing, as to be

pained and grieved at dishonour shown to Him, and eager to avenge Him. In a word a religious temper is one of loyalty to God.'—He goes on to show how loyalty will work, and how it did work in Scripture saints, and then continues: 'Such is zeal, a Christian grace to the last, while it is also an elementary virtue; equally belonging to the young convert and the matured believer: displayed by Moses at the first, when he slew the Egyptian, and by St. Paul in his last hours, while he reached forth his hand for his heavenly crown. On the other hand, zeal is an imperfect virtue; that is, in our fallen state it will ever be attended by unchristian feeling if it is cherished by itself; but this is the case with many other tempers of mind which yet are absolutely required of us.'—He dwells on the necessity for its combination with the special grace of the gospel, the general temper of gentleness, meekness, sympathy, tender consideration, open-heartedness towards all men, brother or stranger, who come in our way. Thus the saints of God have gone on unto perfection. St. John, who would call down fire from heaven, became the apostle of love; St. Paul, who persecuted Christ's servants, 'was made all things to all men'; yet neither of them lost their zeal, though they trained it to be spiritual (J. H. Newman, *Sermon on St. Simon and St. Jude*).

But to return to the narrative. The zeal here is 'the zeal of Thine house.' That is to say zeal for the honour of Him who has chosen to set His name there and to make it the home of His people and the heart of their religion. This zeal will burn more fiercely on account of the prolonged obstinacy of sin, when on the last visit to the Temple this action will be repeated, and the grave reproof for 'a house of merchandise' will become a stern denunciation of a den of robbers. It is sad to think how often the milder and even the severer form of this rebuke has been deserved in the secular history of the Christian Church.

But there is a word on this occasion which rules the whole situation. A pious Jew, a prophet, might have pleaded for the honour of *our* Father's house, though that filial language was in general beyond them; but to say *My* Father's house, in right of a separate relation, belonged only to One who knew that relation was His own. Was it not here, at the first attendance in the Temple, that the consciousness of it first broke from His lips? 'Child,' said the mother, 'why hast Thou thus dealt with us? Behold, Thy father and I have sought Thee sorrowing?' And the answer came, 'How is it that ye sought Me? Wist ye not that I must be in the things of My Father' (*ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου*)—that is, in His house and in the things that are done therein? What a word was this! It told that He knew the

truth. The mother laid it up in her heart. The secret of the divine paternity was thenceforth silently understood between them. That Sonship known in its still higher and eternal sense, is now become the power of the manifestation, the right in which all is spoken and all is done.

There were some who could admit the claim which they could not yet explain, through a present conviction of faith, waiting for light that would come. Such were the disciples; not such 'the Jews,' represented here by Temple officials and the men of their company. They have recourse to the legal demand, 'What sign showeth Thou unto us, seeing that Thou doest these things?' That was but natural. 'The Jews require a sign;' and surely a Prophet from Galilee is bound to show His credentials. He will give signs enough, but not of their choosing, and they will be given in vain. For them there is one sign, now only a prophecy, to become a sign in the day of its fulfilment. 'Jesus answered, Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' A strange criterion! which might have seemed absurd, but for the sense of majesty and mystery which kept the words in their minds, as an augury of ill. At the final trial some of these persons will attempt to give them, in evidence, according to their own version of them. The attempt will fail before the precise requirements of the law; but it will be made the occasion of the solemn adjuration, and so of the sentence of death, and thus the prophecy had a part in assisting its own fulfilment. This we learn from the first two Gospels, which contain no record of the words being spoken or of the circumstances which called them forth.

One word there is in this saying, in which its significance as prophecy is concentrated; but to the English reader its distinctness is lost. The Temple spoken of hitherto is the *hieron* (ἱερόν), the whole sacred enclosure. The Temple spoken of now is the *naos* (ναός), the central fane or sanctuary. On the highest of the tier of terraces, its exquisite workmanship shining in marble and gold, stood the real 'Temple,' containing the Holy place and the Holy of Holies, dominating and sanctifying all beneath and around it. This is the object to which the Lord suddenly turns all eyes and thoughts by the words, 'Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up.' The hearers are bewildered. The act supposed on their part is inconceivable, and they pass it over. The

promise on His part is impossible, and they would show its absurdity. 'Forty and six years was this Temple in building; and wilt Thou raise it up in three days?' 'But (adds the Evangelist) He spake of the Temple of His Body.'

Before considering the apostle's interpretation, we may thank the Jews for an accidental service they have rendered us in settling our chronology. The year in which Herod commenced the rebuilding of the Temple is fixed by Josephus as the eighteenth of his reign in Roman reckoning, 734-35 U.C. The date therefore of the present incident, that is to say, of the commencement of the Lord's manifestation is 781 U.C. And He being then about thirty years of age, the Nativity is placed at 750-51 U.C., about three and a half years earlier than the accepted Christian era. These words of the Jews are an additional item in the calculations which yield that result. But what they say is for us parenthetical. We are concerned not with their words but with those of Jesus.

His apostle is His interpreter, and he makes the interpretation sure. We may wish he had been also the expositor, to make the exposition clear; for great are the facts of history, the lines of thought, and the revelations of truth condensed in this brief phrase, 'He spake of the Temple of His Body.' What then constitutes a temple? or rather, what constituted that particular Temple which we have before us? Not the marble and the gold of the later time, any more than the cords and curtains of its original; but the Presence of God, resident among His people. That was the truth proclaimed when the Tabernacle was made according to the pattern showed in the mount, and renewed when the more stately structure took its place, as a standing answer to the question, 'Will God in very deed dwell with men upon the earth?' (2 Chr 6<sup>18</sup>). Yet, further, this Temple was the habitation of the Divine Presence, in a particular relation and for a particular purpose, namely, in the living relation of God with Israel, and for the covenant transactions by which this was secured. Here alone was the ordained meeting-place between God and the people, where priesthood was valid and sacrifice effectual. Typical and provisional it all was, and carried on in the region of the flesh, till He should come, who would be in His own person all that the Temple signified, and realize its meaning in spirit and in truth. And now He is come, no heavenly

messenger, but true Immanuel, the Son incarnate, the Word made flesh and tabernacling among us. If the Divine Presence thus dwells in a material organism and corporeal frame, it is no mere metaphor or flight of rhetoric, but the shortest form in which the truth can be stated, to speak of 'the Temple of His Body.' Yet, as has been said, that word includes more than the presence. It implies the relations and the purposes for which that presence is here; and these will not be realized till the Temple has been stricken down, and raised up on the third day. Till then the old order continues. But how will it perish? By the act of the people themselves, by the rejection and crucifixion of the Christ. In prophecy the cutting off of Messiah brings on the power which destroys the city and the sanctuary (Dan 9<sup>26</sup>). But in fact the sanctuary fell when Jesus died. Then the Veil of the Temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom, showing on the one side that the uses of the typical system were now over, and on the other that in the better covenant which is in Christ, 'a new and living way is opened through the Veil, that is to say, His flesh' (Heb 10<sup>20</sup>). Therefore, He says, 'Destroy this Temple' (*λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον*), for that is what you will unwittingly do in the course you are taking; by the final act abolish its sanctity and its right to exist. On the third day I will raise it up, a ruin changed to glory, a Temple not in type but in truth, not national but universal, the meeting place between God and man, the source and centre of eternal life. Such is the person of the risen Lord. His Church by His indwelling spirit becomes itself a Temple. 'Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?' (1 Co 3<sup>17</sup>). In this sense some commentators have explained the prophetic word. But the three days fix the meaning. Not on the third day, but on the fiftieth the Church was filled with the Spirit. And the Church is a Temple

in the way of consequence, not of origination. That exists not in the mystical body but in the glorified person of the Redeemer.

The prophetic saying was not forgotten: it was recalled by enemies in the blindness of triumphant hatred. 'Ha! Thou that destroyest the Temple and buildest it in three days, save Thyself and come down from the cross' (Mk 15<sup>29</sup>). It was recalled by the disciples, when the dark hour was past, and when the light was breaking in upon their souls. We are told what they thought and said one to another: 'When therefore He was risen from the dead, His disciples remembered that He spake this; and they believed the scripture and the word which Jesus had said.' They felt their faith deepened and enlightened by the concurrence of the written and the spoken word. But what scripture? none has been cited. 'The scripture,' thus expressed, intends, not this or that text, but the whole record of the purpose and foreknowledge of God bearing on to the central event of the Resurrection with all its consequences. Hence St. Paul in his brief creed (1 Co 15<sup>4</sup>), and, again, the Catholic Church in the Nicene symbol, makes it an article of faith, that 'He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.' So it was that Scripture and fact, prophecy and fulfilment, spoken words and the course of events, wrought together to evolve the gospel in men's minds at the first; and so it is still. In the history of the Church great truths, wrapped in guarded forms of speech, have long lain dormant till some conjuncture of circumstances brought them to the front and discovered their powers afresh. And so it is with ourselves. Vital and fruitful sayings have often remained with us, as sacred deposits, but scarcely guessed enigmas; till some experience outward or inward has come to interpret all their truth, bringing it into contact with our lives, and flooding them with the light of heaven.