that passion-Psalm, was the marring and  
wasting of the Saviour’s frame by His zeal  
for God and God’s Church, which resulted  
in the buffeting, the scourging, the Cross.

**18.]** On the demand of the Jews,  
sec Deut. xiii. 1—3. It was not only to  
justify His having driven out the abomination; this any one might have done ;—  
but to justify the mission and the whole  
course of action which the words **my  
Father’s house** implied. They used the  
same expression at the end of His ministry,  
Matt. xxi. 23.

**19.]** This answer of  
our Lord has been involved in needless  
difficulty. That in uttering the words,  
this temple, He *pointed* to His own Body,  
is inconceivable ;—for thus both the Jews  
and His own disciples must have understood Him, which (see vv. 20, 22) neither  
of them did. That He implied in saying,  
**Destroy this temple**, *that their lawless  
proceedings in the temple would at last  
bring it to an end*, is equally inconceivable;  
both on account of the latter part of His  
declaration, which would thus have no  
meaning,—and because of the use in this  
case of the peculiar word,— which signifies  
*the holy and the holiest place*, the *temple  
itself*,—as distinguished from the whole  
enceinte of the sacred buildings. Stier has  
well remarked that our Lord in this saying  
*comprehended in the reality*,—His own  
Body, *its type and symbol*,—the temple  
then before them. That temple, with all  
its ordinances and holy places, was but  
the shadow of the Christian Church;—  
that, the type of the Body of the Lord,  
represented the Church, which is *veritably  
His Body*. And so the saying was fulfilled by the slaying of His actual Body,  
in which rejection of Him the destruction  
of the Jewish temple and city was involved,—and the raising of that Body  
after three days, in which resurrection  
we, all the members of His new glorified  
Body, are risen again. The difficulties  
attending the interpretation are,—hesides  
the double meaning which I have treated  
above,—

(1) *the use of the imperative, as  
applied to the death of Christ*. But this  
surely may be understood as used hypothetically, and not by way of command.  
Matt. xii. 33 (“muke the tree good, &c.”) is an instance in point.

(2) *The words***I will raise it up**—seeing that the resurrection of the Lord is ever spoken of as  
*the work of the Father*. Yes,—but by  
power committed to Christ Himself ;—see  
ch. x. 18, where this is distinctly asserted :  
and ch. vi. 39, 40, 44, where it is implied,  
for He is the first-fruits of them that  
sleep,—and (though the whole course of  
His working was after the will of the  
Father,—and in the Spirit, which wrought  
in Him) strictly and truly *raised Himself*from the dead in the sense here intended.

(3) *The utterance of such a prophecy at so  
early a period of His official life.* But it  
was not a prophecy known and understood,—but a *dark saying*, from which no  
one could then draw an inference as to  
His death or resurrection. The disciples  
did not understand it; and I cannot agree  
with Stier that the Jews could have had  
any idea of such being His meaning.  
Chrysostom says, “He speaks many such  
things, which were not plain to men at the  
time, but to those who should come after.  
Why does He do this? that He might be  
shewn to Lave foreknown future events,  
when the accomplishment of the prophecy  
should have come: which has come to pass  
in the case of this very prophecy.” Lücke   
remarks, that the circumstance of the  
words being spoken so long before his trial  
by the Sanhedrim, would make it more  
easy for the false witnesses to distort them.  
This they did, but not so as to agree with  
one another. They reported it, ‘I can destroy,’ &c. which makes a wide difference,  
and represents our Lord as an enemy  
of the temple (Matt. xxvi. 61), and some  
added to **this temple** the epithet “*which is  
made with hands*,” and that He would  
raise another “*made without hands*” (Mark  
xiv. 58).

**20.]** The building of the  
temple by Herod the Great is stated by  
Josephus in one place to have been begun  
in the *eighteenth* year of his reign; in  
another, in the *fifteenth*; the ditlerence  
being made by counting his reign from the  
death of Antigonus, or from his appointment by the Romans. Reckoning from  
this latter, we shall have twenty years till  
the birth of Christ, and thirty years since  
that event, from which fifty, however, four