

OpenTheo

Zacchaeus, 10 Minas, Triumphal Entry (Part 2)



The Life and Teachings of Christ - Steve Gregg

Steve Gregg discusses the story of Zacchaeus and the parable of the minas in relation to the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. Gregg highlights the importance of stewarding one's possessions and resources in service of the kingdom of God. He also notes the political implications of Jesus' actions, which may have contributed to the hostility of his opponents in the days leading up to his crucifixion. Despite Jesus' efforts to bring peace to Jerusalem, he was ultimately rejected by its people, resulting in the destruction of the city.

Transcript

It's his. It's whatever he's put in our hands, and when he comes back, we will give an account for the way we used it. And hopefully, when he comes back, we will be able to say, oh, you gave me X number of opportunities, X number of assets, X number of, uh, relationships, and I have utilized these, I have put these into your service, I have exploited every opportunity and every dollar I had in order to bring profit to you, Master, to your kingdom.

And there was one guy here who got the shaft because he, he, uh, actually didn't do anything with what he was given. He was given one mina, and he was afraid he might lose it, so he buried it. And, uh, he was rebuked that he didn't at least do the minimal thing, put it in the bank, and at least his master would have some interest from it.

Yes. Yes, I'm in here. So he called 10 of his servants, delivered them 10 minas.

That is interesting. Yeah, I'm not sure if that means that, yeah, I'm not sure how that's to be understood. You know, if they each got one, 10 servants, 10 minas, one each, or if they got 10 each.

The, the interesting thing is, in the reckoning, that some of them didn't, uh, well, let me see here. Oh, yeah, you're right, you're right. You know what? Yeah, you know what happened, what's that? They each got one? Okay, you got it, you got it right.

I'm getting the Parable of the Talents mixed up with this. See, I read both parables in

preparation for teaching this, and I'm getting the details of the Parable of the Talents mixed up with this. You're right.

He didn't give them different amounts. He gave them all the same amount. He gave one each.

There we go. Thank you. And each, you know, produced different amounts of profit with it.

One guy was, you know, made, made better investments and got a tenfold return. Another got a fivefold return. Another didn't get any return.

He just put it away. And essentially, you know, that corresponds to someone just wasting their opportunity. The fact that he didn't do anything with it means that he deprived his master of potentially five or ten times as much he could have given back, since some who had the same amount made that much with it.

Now, there's no telling how much this wasteful steward might have made for his master had he put it to use. The fact that one steward had made tenfold return on it means that it's not impossible that he could have done that, even if he'd made only a fivefold return, he would have had the pleasure of his master. In fact, his master even suggested, I wouldn't have even been so bugged if he just put in the bank and I got, you know, five percent interest on it.

You know, that'd be better than nothing. And the idea here is that the one who didn't do anything with it was the one who wasted his opportunities. He'd been given something by his master, something which other parties who diligently used the same substance would be able to produce tremendous benefit for their master.

He had done nothing with it for his master. And to my mind, that, of course, is a very frightening thing. Now, in the talent parable in Matthew 25, this servant who buried the one talent he had, he was cast out where there's weeping and gnashing of teeth.

That's the end of that story. In this one, we're told specifically that this guy had taken away from him what was given to him. And it would appear that no further harm was done to him, but he lost everything.

He was given one. He lost it. He didn't have his master's pleasure and he didn't have any minas either.

You know, it was all over. Whereas the guy who invested it and got ten, he showed himself capable. A great manager, a great administrator.

So he said, I'll put you over ten cities. You're pretty good at using money. I mean, you know how to turn a dollar into ten dollars.

A thousand into ten thousand. I think I'll give you a big responsibility. I'll give you ten cities to rule over.

And the one who only produced fivefold, he says, well, you're pretty good too. Not quite as good. I'll give you five cities to rule over.

Your administrative abilities suggest that you're a pretty good administrator too, but we'll give you something proportionate to your talents. But the guy who didn't do anything with it, he got no reward. He got no authority.

He got nothing in the kingdom. When the master came back, he had a kingdom to distribute jobs in. He had cities to rule over.

He says, hey, you were real good with my talent. I'm going to give you ten of my cities to rule over. I'm going to make you governor of ten cities.

I'm going to give you five. I'm not going to give you any. You're losing everything.

In fact, I'm going to take yours and give it to the guy who had ten. He's going to have eleven now. And that's what Jesus is saying is the kingdom isn't going to come immediately, but when it does, that is, it's not going to have a pyramid.

When it does, there will be positions of honor and authority to be distributed. And those who've shown themselves diligent with what they've been entrusted with and they've used whatever they had to turn a profit for the kingdom of God, they will have greater authority, more responsibility, more honor when Jesus returns. Others will have nothing to show, even what little they have will be taken from them.

Now, just by way of clarification, and I think I alluded to this a moment ago, and I think I've said it on other occasions during the year, so it may not be news to anyone, but while in the story, of course, the thing that they stewarded was actually money, a certain quantity of money, and they made more money with it, in the application to real life, the thing that God has entrusted you might not be in the form of money. It might be, and there are Christians who have money. Obviously, there's every income level among Christians.

In fact, everybody is given the same number of hours of a day. Every human being on the face of the earth has 24 hours every day. That is probably the one thing that everyone has the same, like the one mina that everyone's given.

There's only one thing that everybody has the same. It's the same number of hours of any given day. And so, in a sense, we could almost make a better parallel between time than money, because not everyone has the same amount of money, but everyone has the same amount of time.

Now, some people will go out, let's say I'm going to work a 40-hour week job, and I go out and I flip hamburgers, because that's all I'm qualified to do, or scrub floors or something, and so I make five bucks an hour, and I have a certain amount of money. That money, after I've paid my bills, is necessary for me to invest in the kingdom of God. Another person working the very same eight hours, he's got the same number of hours I do to work, but he works eight hours, and he makes 50 bucks an hour, because he's got something marketable he can do, or he's just real sharp, and he makes the right investments, and he makes a lot more.

Now, of course, the money he has is part of what God has invested in him, and then he's got to decide, of course, how is this money to be invested for the kingdom of God? Some people don't ever have money, but they have other things. They have talents, they have skills, maybe they've got connections, friends, and so forth, that they can somehow use these things to help promote the kingdom of God. The point of the parable, I think, is that whatever you have, everyone has been given something, and everybody's going to have to give an account for what it is they have.

And it's good to do some searching self-assessments, and say, well, do I have a lot of money to give to the Lord? Well, if I do, then I better be a good steward of that money. If the answer to that is no, and for many of you, most of you, probably the answer is no, I don't have a lot of money, then you might say, well, what is it I've got? What is it I've got that God's going to require of me? What is it on the day of judgment, when Jesus comes back to make a reckoning, he's going to say, I gave you that, what do you have to give me back for it? What did you do with it? What have you produced with it? And if you think about it, everybody has some things, probably not just one, but several things that they have that others don't possess. Believe it or not, even just being good-looking counts for something in this world.

It'll open doors where it shouldn't. I mean, it's a shame that the world is that way, but it's that way. Even if you have good looks, look around, there's a lot of people who are repulsive to look at it.

If you're pleasant, if you've got a great smile or something, that can be a door-opener. However, if you use that to bring popularity and self-gratification and satisfy your lust and things like that, which some people do, an awful lot of people do, I really believe God's going to say, now listen, I made you good-looking, didn't I? What did you produce with that? I gave you money. I had you born in America or Canada, where you had a lot more freedom than most people do.

What did you do with that freedom? How did you use that freedom? I don't expect as much out of a person I put in China, but I expect a lot out of someone who was given a lot of liberty, because liberty means opportunity, and opportunity means responsibility, and responsibility means accountability. So, I mean, there's all kinds of things besides

money. If you think about it, there are things that make you to differ from another, and they are things that you've been given.

Paul said, what do you have that you've not been given, that you have not received? What makes you different from another person, but in the things that God has given you? And so, anything that's different about you than anyone else, maybe you're a little more intelligent than some people. Whatever. There is something that you're going to have to give account for, and that's what this parable is saying.

So, the parable is saying, A, the kingdom was not going to appear immediately, and he didn't want people to think it was. B, those people who reject him are going to get beat up, bad, in fact slain, when he comes back. And thirdly, those who haven't rejected him are going to have to give an account to him for how they occupied in his absence.

Life is not a playground. We're not just here to give God a 10% and use the 90% for ourselves and have a blast, either of our money, time, or anything else. We're here as servants owned by God, and all that we have is owned by him, and everything, just like any owner of property is going to ask what his managers did with it.

And that's not to put a heavy burden on anyone. It's just to give you the right perspective that the Bible does. I mean, we need the Bible to tell us these things, because we don't know these things instinctively.

Okay, now, at verse 28, from verse 28 through verse 48, we have a series of events, actually even going on into the next chapter, that are recorded in most of the Gospels. Yes? Okay. And those citizens who reject him will be slain when he comes back.

Yes, so the rebels in verse 14 are slain in verse 27. They are a sub-point, apparently a relatively minor sub-point of the parable, because only very little is said about them. The majority of the parable is talking about the stewardship question, but there's also kind of thrown in as a side issue, there were a bunch of people rejecting him, and they get theirs when he comes back too.

So that's the third point of the parable. Okay, now, the chain of events that begins at verse 28 is common to several Gospels. We have the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem in verses 28 through 40.

Then we have him weeping over Jerusalem in verses 41 through 44. And then we have his going into the temple and driving out the money changers in verses 45 through 48. And then on into chapter 20, the things there are all part of this, what we call the Passion Week.

At verse 28, we mark the beginning of the Passion Week, with the day that we usually have come to call Palm Sunday, when Jesus rode into Jerusalem on a donkey. The order of events in the remainder of this chapter is not, you know, it varies a little bit between

Matthew and Luke. In Matthew, the order of events is the triumphal entry, then the cleansing of the temple.

And then there's a story about a fig tree, Jesus cursing the fig tree. Luke doesn't give this story of the cursing of the fig tree, but both Matthew and Mark do. And, well, I'll bring that in where it fits.

I'm not going to give you all that in advance. Let's just take each of these piece by piece here. In verse 28, it says, When he had said this, he went on ahead, going up to Jerusalem.

And it came to pass, while he came near to Bethphagia and Bethany, at the Mount called Olivet, that he sent two of his disciples, saying, Go into the village opposite you, where you will enter, excuse me, where as you enter, you will find a colt tied, on which no one has ever sat. Loose him, and bring him here. And if anyone asks you, why are you loosing him, thus you shall say to him, Because the Lord has need of him.

So, those who were sent departed and found it just as he had said to them. But as they were loosing the colt, the owners of it said to them, Why are you loosing the colt? And they said, The Lord has need of him. Then they brought him to Jesus.

And they threw their own garments on the colt, and they set Jesus on him. And as he went, they spread their clothes on the road. Then, as he was now drawing near the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice, and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works they had seen, saying, Blessed is the King who comes in the name of the Lord.

Peace in heaven, and glory in the highest. And some of the Pharisees called to him from the crowd, Teacher, rebuke your disciples. But he answered and said to them, I tell you that if these should keep silent, the stones would immediately cry out.

Now, a few things to observe about this. It would appear that Jesus had made an arrangement with the owners of this animal beforehand. One of the things that the reader initially wonders, and rightly so, is how did Jesus know that the disciples, if challenged about taking the donkey, that all they had to say was, The Lord has need of him, and that would settle the question.

One possibility is, of course, Jesus just knew it prophetically. However, that would suggest that Jesus had no influence over the circumstances, and that they were just going to follow their course, and Jesus knew how they would go. But it's not very likely that they would have gone this way without some influence from Jesus in it.

I mean, two strangers walk up, start walking off with your donkey. You say, Hey, where are you going with that? Oh, the Master has need of him. What Master? Whose servants are you? What are you talking about? Why are you taking my donkey? But Jesus said, as

long as you say the Master has need of him, then they'll let you go.

So it sounds as if either Jesus was supernaturally influencing the minds of these owners, so that when the disciples would say this word, it would just kind of blind them to the fact that their animal was being led away, and they'd just say, Oh, whatever, and go off and be distracted with something else. Or else Jesus had made arrangements with this party earlier, unbeknownst to the disciples. If that is the correct theory, that Jesus had made this arrangement in advance with the owner, then we have something like a countersign, like in the spy movies.

You'll meet your operative at such and such a place, and you'll say, the blue crane flew over the white cloud, and he'll say, the sea was green, and you'll say, doesn't it look like rain today? If everyone says all the right countersigns, then you know you've met the right person. It's all planned. There was a bit of cloak and dagger at this point, perhaps.

Although Jesus had gone through Jericho without any attempt to hide or anything like this, now that he was in Jerusalem, there were actual plots in his life. And there was some of the time he spent sneaking around, although half the time he spent out in public. I mean, it's kind of interesting.

Judas had to be paid to tell the chief priests where they could find Jesus privately, which means that Jesus had certain secret places that only his insiders knew. Jesus did come out in public when there were large groups of supporters around, when the leaders of the Jews would be afraid to take him in the crowd. But in some respects, his private whereabouts were kept a secret.

He knew that if his enemies knew where to catch him alone, they would. And so he had certain secrets, and it may be that he didn't want any attention drawn to his whereabouts, and he had made this kind of clandestine arrangement. Now, to the owner of the donkey, I'm going to send a couple of my guys, and they'll start taking your donkey.

And the guy says, well, how do I know that it's your guys taking my donkey and not just a couple of thieves walking up? Well, ask them what are they doing with it, and they'll say to you, the answer is neither of it, and when you hear that, you'll know that they're my guys. So, I mean, it's very likely that something like that happened. I'm not one to try to remove supernatural elements from Jesus' foresight or anything like that, but of all the options, it seems most likely that this was an arrangement Jesus had made, that there would be this countersign between the owner of the donkey and the disciples.

Now, the disciples, we have the impression, didn't know anything about this previously, so when Jesus made the arrangements, we can't say. We don't know who the two disciples are. However, there is another story that occurs later in the account of Jesus sending a couple of disciples, unnamed, in Mark, to prepare the Passover for him.

This was later in the same week. It says he sent two of his disciples to prepare the Passover. And there's a similar kind of a deal going on there in that story.

I believe it's, I think you'll find it in Mark chapter 14. And in verse 12, Mark 14, 12 says, Now on the first day of unleavened bread, when they killed the Passover lamb, his disciples said to him, Where do you want us to go and prepare that you may eat the Passover? So he sent two of his disciples and said to them, Go into the city, and a man will meet you carrying a pitcher of water. Follow him, and wherever he goes, say to the master of the house, The teacher says, Where is my guest room in which I may eat the Passover with my disciples? Then he will show you a large room furnished and prepared.

Obviously, Jesus had made arrangements with this too sometime with the disciples. But there is also this kind of clandestine thing. You'll see a guy carrying a pitcher of water in his hand.

Now that was unusual. Women usually carried the water on their heads, and that's the size for a man to be doing it. That'll call, you'll see that as an unusual situation.

Follow him. So you wind through the alleys, and you go up through the stairways and stuff, and finally you get to a private place and say, The master wants to know where he's going to have his Passover. And you say, Oh, okay, follow me.

And they go and find this place that's already prepared for him. They've already prepared it, expecting this whole thing. So we can see that Jesus, without his disciples' knowledge even, was at times arranging for things with other parties.

But the thing I wanted to say is that it says there in Mark 14, 13, that he sent out two of his disciples to make this clandestine meeting also. It doesn't say it was the same two, but it might have been. We know that in that latter case, the two disciples were John and Peter.

And the reason we know it is because Luke's parallel tells us so. In Luke 22, verse 8, Luke 22, 8, it says, And he sent Peter and John and said, Go prepare the Passover that we may eat. And they said, Where do you want us to prepare? And he said, Behold, when you have entered the city, a man will meet you carrying a pitcher of water and silver.

So where Mark just tells us he sent two disciples, Luke tells us those two were Peter and John. Now we have Luke telling us he sent two disciples. It doesn't give us their names.

But since he had sent his two leading guys in one of the stories, Peter and John were his top guys, we may be safe in assuming that they're the guys he usually entrusted with this kind of stuff. It's only a guess, and it's not very important, but these two disciples he sent may well have been Peter and John on this occasion, just as it was so later when he sent two to prepare the Passover. Now another thing I need to observe is in verse 30, he

said, You'll enter and you'll find a colt tied on which no one has ever sat.

The main thing to observe is that in Matthew's parallel, which is in Matthew 21, verse 2, he indicated they'd find not only a colt, but also the colt's mother. He said to them, Go into the village opposite you, Matthew 21, 2, and immediately you'll find a donkey tied and a colt with her. Loose them and bring them to me.

And thus throughout the entire narrative in Matthew, there's two animals, the colt and its mother. In Mark and Luke, there's no reference to the mother of the animal, only the colt. Now once again, we have one of those situations where one gospel tells more details than the other.

There's no problem in believing that the colt's mother accompanied the colt, although Jesus sat on the colt, and therefore the other two gospels only mention the colt. One reason that Matthew may have for mentioning both animals is because in Matthew 21, verse 4 and 5, Matthew wants to point out the similarity to what happened with what was predicted to happen back in Zechariah, chapter 9 and verse 9. Matthew 21, verse 4 says, All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, Tell the daughter of Zion, Behold, your king is coming to you, lowly and sitting on a donkey, a colt, the foal of a donkey. Now, that's Zechariah 9.9 he's quoting.

But notice it says, He's lowly sitting on a donkey, a colt, the foal of a donkey. Now this is just your Hebrew repetition of poetry. The foal of the donkey in the last line is the same as the donkey in the third line.

However, some have felt that Matthew wanted to point out there were two donkeys because there was a donkey and there was the foal of a donkey mentioned in the prophecy. It's hard to know whether that was Matthew's intention or not. But Matthew does quote that verse, whereas Mark and Luke do not.

And Matthew is the only one who tells us that there was a donkey and a colt. So some have felt Matthew gave that detail because he wanted to show the parallel to the prophecy about a donkey and a colt. Anyway, no big deal.

The mother was brought along. The colt was an unbroken colt. We're told that no man had ever sat on it.

Which means, of course, if Jesus was able to ride it, it shows his mastery over the wild nature of an animal, of a donkey. We've seen his mastery over the wind and the waves and so forth in other stories. He's the master of nature.

So that here an animal that would ordinarily buck off anyone who jumped on it, an unbroken colt, Jesus is able to sit on it and no problem. Seems to be fully under his control. The bringing of the mother along, some might think, was to help calm the colt and make it easier to ride.

But I don't think Jesus had any problem mastering the colt. I think it's very probable that the mother donkey was taken along so the disciples would have an easier time taking the colt. The colt would be more manageable with its mother along and that way the disciples would have an easier time taking it.

Anyway, we read on down in verse 35. Then they brought this colt to Jesus and they threw their own garments on the colt and they set Jesus on him. And as he went, they spread their clothes on the road.

Now, this is the only account that doesn't mention branches on the road. Luke only mentions that they put clothing on the road. Matthew and Mark mention not only that there was clothing on the road, but also they cut branches off of nearby trees and put them on the road.

In Matthew 21.8, Mark 11.8, and also in John. John has a parallel to this. In John 12.13, he specifies palm branches, which I only make this point because we always call this Palm Sunday.

And that's because of the assumption that there were palm branches put on the road before Jesus. And it's John's gospel alone that makes mention of palm branches. Matthew and Mark mention branches of trees, but only John tells us of palm branches.

Now, palm branches were an emblem of honor in more than one situation in the Bible, and even in extra-biblical literature. In 1 Maccabees 13.51. 1 Maccabees 13.51 tells of how Simon, the last surviving Maccabean leader, having conquered all of Israel's foes, rode triumphantly into Jerusalem. And as I say, 1 Maccabees 13.51 says that as he rode into Jerusalem, the people waved palm branches in front of him to show their honor of him as the conqueror.

And this was like a triumphal entry into Jerusalem also by Simon of the Maccabean family, back 160-something years before Christ. But also in the book of Revelation, there's a company of people seen in heaven, worshipping God, and they're waving palm branches around, it would appear. And it says in Revelation 7.9, After these things I looked, and behold, a great multitude, which no one could number, of all nations, tribes, peoples, tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes and with palm branches in their hands.

And they were crying out with a loud voice, saying, Salvation belongs to our God who sits upon the throne and to the Lamb. And so here we have palm branches. Is there an emblem of homage and worship? And that's no doubt how we're to understand what was going on here.

The people of Jerusalem, and by this time, there were, of course, because the Passover was near, there were people who were there who were not inhabitants of Jerusalem, but

were pilgrims who had come for the feast. They all saw this as the day that Jesus was coming to declare himself ready to accept kingship. They were treating him as a conqueror coming to town to rule.

Now, this obviously made Christ's enemies a bit edgy. For example, verse 39 says, Some of the Pharisees called to him from the crowd, saying, Teacher, rebuke your disciples. Over in John chapter 12, verse 19, we have another record of the Pharisees' discomfort about this whole situation.

A little different reaction, but in John 12, 19, it says, The Pharisees therefore said among themselves, You see that you are accomplishing nothing. Look, the world has gone after him. This was at the triumphal entry they said this.

John 12, 19. So the Pharisees, they saw this as their day of defeat. For three and a half years, they've been trying to end this guy's career, but look, the whole world's going after him.

He's finally won. He's coming in to rule. We've lost the kingdom.

We've lost the nation to this guy. He's going to be the king after all, after all of our attempts to stop him. Of course, they were wrong in one sense, because he wasn't coming in to do what they thought he was coming in to do.

He didn't come to rule. It may be that this very furor of expectation on the part of the people and his refusal to do anything in that direction, that is, in the direction of trying to remove the Romans or anything like that, may have been what caused the crowds to be so hostile to him a week later or five days later when they called for his crucifixion. At this point, they wanted him to be their king, but five days later, they're saying, We have no king but Caesar.

Crucify this scoundrel. If one would wonder, why is it that the people turned on him so badly in so short a time? I don't know an obvious answer, but there is a possible answer in this, that the Bible says, Hope deferred makes the heart sick. Bitterness toward people usually does not occur unless you find that they are disappointing your expectations that you had for them.

In relationships, you're not likely to get bitter or upset with anyone unless you expected something different from them than what they delivered. If you had no expectations, you have no disappointment. But if you expect something and they don't deliver, then you're disappointed, and it's that kind of thing that makes the heart sick.

It's a hope that's deferred. It brings bitterness of soul. And I think very possibly on this occasion, the people who had been wondering all through the past three or so years that Jesus had been a public figure, they were saying, When is this guy going to finally make his move and come in power? And now it looked like this was the time.

They all came out. They waved the palm branches. They sung his praises.

And they called him the son of David. And they probably thought he was going to march right in with an ultimatum for Pilate and say, Empty your desk. You're fired.

I'm moving into your palace today. But he didn't do that. All he did was go into the temple each day for that week and teach there.

Just like he'd done on many other occasions in Jerusalem. He didn't do anything out of the ordinary after this. They were calling him king.

And that he was. But he didn't act the king role that they thought he would. And that may be what embittered them.

That he just disappointed them in that respect. As far as what they said while they were praising him as he was writing, it's found, of course, in Luke 19, 38. It has them saying, Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord.

Peace in heaven and glory in the highest. Now, their song is recorded in somewhat different words in each of the Gospels. In Matthew, it's quite different.

In Matthew 21, 9, they say, Hosanna to the son of David. A line that's not even found in Luke. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.

That's similar to what's in Luke. In Luke it says, Blessed is the king who comes in the name of the Lord. And then they say, Hosanna in the highest.

Now, the way it reads in Matthew, resembles a statement in the Psalms. In Psalm 118, verse 25. If you'd like to look there.

Psalm 118, they were actually quoting it. And verses 25 and 26, the Psalmist says, Save now, I pray. That's what Hosanna means.

Hosanna means save now. So he says, Hosanna, I pray, O Lord. O Lord, I pray, send now prosperity.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. We have blessed you from the house of the Lord. Okay? So, they were actually quoting from this Psalm.

Hosanna means save now. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. They were singing these Messianic praises to him.

And according to Matthew, they were saying, Hosanna to the son of David. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. So they're saying, the Messiah.

They're calling him the Messiah. Mark's Gospel gives the longest version of their song. And it has somewhat different elements in it.

But some of the same. In Mark 11, in verse 9 and 10, their song is recorded as follows. Hosanna.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Thus far, of course, is the quote from Psalm 118, verses 25 and 26. But then it has, Blessed is the kingdom of our father David that comes in the name of the Lord.

Hosanna in the highest. Now, that's not exactly... You do have some similar wording in the other versions. But this has them blessing the kingdom of David.

The Davidic kingdom. Now, the Davidic kingdom, as we know, is a constant theme of Old Testament prophecy. And they had their own ideas of what that meant.

And they were saying, Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. But at a later time, Jesus would point out to them that they're going to have to say it again because it didn't work the first time. That is, they didn't understand what they were saying, for one thing.

For example, in Matthew 23, recording a later time in the same week, Matthew 23, verses 38 and 39, Jesus said, See, your house has left you desolate. For I say to you, you shall see me no more till you shall say, Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Well, they'd already said that during the triumphal entry.

But, he was saying, you still haven't got the message. You still haven't really received me. You've received me as you want me, but you haven't received me as I am.

And until you can come to a place where you can bless the one who comes in the name of the Lord for not who you want him to be and what you want him to do, but for what the Lord is sending him to do and who he really is, you won't see me anymore. So, Jesus, although on this occasion they did say, Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. And by the way, all three of the synoptics include that part of their song.

Yet, he did not accept that as a true and genuine appreciation of what he was there for. In Luke 19 and verse 37, it says, Then as he was now drawing near to the descent of the Mount of Olives, the whole multitude of the disciples began to rejoice and praise God with a loud voice for all the mighty works they had seen. Now, John singles out one of the mighty works that was being discussed at that time.

In John chapter 12 and verses 17 and 18. John 12, verses 17 and 18. This is the story of the triumphal entry here in John.

It says, Therefore the people who were with him when he called Lazarus out of his tomb and had raised him from the dead bore witness. For this reason the people also met him, because they had heard that he had done this sign. So, one reason the crowds came out to see him coming on the donkey is that a lot of them had heard the testimony of those

who had seen Lazarus rise from the dead.

And John says, On the strength of that testimony of what Jesus had done in raising Lazarus, a lot of people curiously wanted to come out and see him. And they went out to meet him. Luke is more generic.

It says, They were praising him for all the mighty works that they had seen. No doubt including the raising of Lazarus, but there were others in their minds as well. One other thing that needs to be mentioned before we go on from this story is that there was a further reaction of the crowd recorded in Matthew.

Matthew 21, verses 10 and 11. No, not there, is it? Yeah. Matthew 21, 10 and 11.

It says, And when he had come into Jerusalem, this is the close of this same story, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this? See, there were probably a lot of pilgrims coming for the Passover from other places who had never heard of Jesus before. What's all this hubbub? Why are they treating this guy this way? Who is he anyway? So, the multitude said, This is Jesus, the prophet from Nazareth of Galilee. So, he was getting a lot of attention here.

And some were confused. Some didn't know who he was. Some regarded him as a prophet.

Some regarded him as the son of David, the Messiah. Now, the reaction of the Pharisees in Luke 19, verse 39, is that they called to Jesus from the crowd. The crowds included not only his friends, but his enemies.

Some of the Pharisees were there, either as, hopefully, damage control, or whatever. I don't know what they were there for, but they were just spying him out, probably. But they were really concerned.

They were really concerned about what was happening. This is the very thing that they had feared might happen. Namely, that Jesus might accept popular acclaim as king.

And that could lead to a revolt against Rome, resulting then in the Romans coming in and crushing the revolt and destroying the Jewish nation altogether. And, of course, that eventually did happen in 70 AD. But not because of anything Jesus did on this occasion.

More to do with what the Pharisees and others did. But the Pharisees were worried about this situation. It could become volatile.

It becomes very politically dangerous. And they called from the crowd to Jesus saying, Teacher, rebuke your disciples. They didn't even come out of the crowd and take him aside and say this to him.

They just shouted out publicly from the crowd, Rebuke these people. Jesus, don't let

them say these things. But Jesus answered and said to them, I tell you that if these should keep silence, the stones would immediately cry out.

Now, Jesus had not allowed even his disciples to tell anyone that he was the Christ before this. But now the people were publicly proclaiming him to be Christ. Not only did he defend them, he said there's no way to keep this message out of the public's ears.

Because if these people wouldn't say it, God would make sure they heard it some other way. He'd open the mouths of the stones themselves. Because this is the day that this needs to be proclaimed.

And that ties well with the next part, verse 41. Now, as he drew near, he saw the city and wept over it, saying, if you had known, even you, especially in this your day, the things that make for your peace, but now they are hidden from your eyes. For the days will come upon you when your enemies will build an embankment around you, surround you and close you in on every side, and level you and your children within you to the ground.

And they will not leave in you one stone upon another because you did not know the time of your visitation. Now, to dispensational teachers, this represents an actual offer on Jesus' part to the Jews to accept him as a political ruler. Dispensationalists teach that Jesus on this occasion was presenting himself as a political ruler, willing to fulfill the Jews' expectations of the Davidic kingdom in the political sense of that word.

And according to dispensationalism, the Jews did not accept him in this role, and therefore he wept over them and said, well, this was your big opportunity, now I'm going to take it away. You missed your day of visitation, and now you won't have it again until the second coming of Christ. That's how they understand it.

I don't see here necessarily that Jesus said anything about offering himself as a Davidic king. People were saying those things, and what was in their mind, he didn't explain things to them. It's true.

But we know from his many teachings about the kingdom that he didn't want to be a political king. His kingdom was not political in nature. It was spiritual.

It was invisible. He had just said that recently to the Pharisees. And we know that once, at least, the people had tried to forcibly take him and make him a king, and he wouldn't let them.

So as far as why he wrote into Jerusalem on this occasion, I think it's just basically to fulfill prophecy. Zechariah said that the king would do this in Zechariah 9.9. But also to proclaim that, in fact, he was the Messiah, but not necessarily to affirm any of their ideas about the political nature of the Messiah's career. If he wanted to do that, he could have done something about that right now.

He had this great multitude with him. He could have gone up to the Sanhedrin and said, You're fired. I'm taking over your duties.

And walked up to Pilate and said, Listen, you're out of here. And if you don't like it, I'll strike you dead with a lightning bolt. He could have done all those things if that's what he wanted to do.

And no one can really say the Jews rejected him. What were all these people doing if they were rejecting him? They were proclaiming him as the Messiah. So the dispensational idea that the Jews rejected his offer of a political kingdom isn't quite right.

It seems to be just the opposite. They were begging him to be the king over a political kingdom and he wasn't accepting that picture. But he was allowing them to recognize him as Messiah now because that's what he was.

And it was time for him to say so. And this was the time of Israel or Jerusalem's visitation. Now he weeps over the city.

He draws near the city and weeps over it. And he predicts, of course, the destruction of the city in verse 43 and 44. And he says, that's going to happen to you at the end of verse 44 because you did not know the time of your visitation.

Did not know, no doubt means did not, we're not willing to acknowledge. In verse 42 he says, if you had known, especially in this your day, this was a day of proclamation of Jesus as Messiah and the Jews could have accepted him as Messiah. That doesn't mean he would have set up a political kingdom like they wanted, but they had the opportunity to embrace him as the Messiah in any case.

And he said, you're not doing that. If you did, it would result in peace to your city. He says, you don't know the things that would make for your peace.

But now this peace that you desire is going to be hidden from your eyes. In verse 42, instead of peace you're going to have a holocaust. Your enemies are going to build an embankment around you.

They're going to come upon you. They're going to surround you and close you on every side. They're going to kill you and your children and you.

They're going to knock down the walls and not one stone will be left standing or another. And all of this is because you have not acknowledged me. You have not accepted me.

You've rejected me. Now, it's important that we notice this. This is one of the more important statements Jesus makes about 70 AD.

He makes a lot of statements about 70 AD, but this is one of the ones, there's perhaps one other I can think of, where Jesus actually says the reason for what happened in 70

AD was because of their rejection of Jesus Christ. I said I can think of one other. That other is in Matthew 22 in the parable of the marriage feast, where the marriage feast is, of course, a king wanting to make a marriage for his son, Jesus.

But those who are invited make excuses instead of coming. And the king gets angry and goes out and burns down their city because they wouldn't come and embrace his son. They wouldn't come and honor his son.

That's in Matthew 22. The parable is quite long, but in particular, verse 7 says, but when the king heard about it, he was furious. He sent out his armies and destroyed those murderers and burned up their city.

So, that parable and this statement of Jesus, I'm not sure if there's any others that are quite this clear, make it clear that what happened in 70 AD was a judgment of God upon Jerusalem for their rejection of Jesus. Now, of course, that has some ramifications on how we understand the present situation in Jerusalem and Israel. If God drove them out of their city, punished them, deprived them of their land because they rejected Jesus, how is it that some Christians think that God's given it all back to them even though they still reject Jesus? It's a peculiar doctrine in my mind.

Anyway, Mark's version closes this account. Mark 11, 11 says, And Jesus went into Jerusalem and into the temple. So, when he had looked around at all things, as the hour was already late, he went out to Bethany with the twelve.

Now, the next thing we read is about the cleansing of the temple, but he didn't cleanse the temple when he first came in. According to Mark 11, 11, which is what I just read, Jesus made his triumphal entry. As he approached the city, he wept over the city, predicted its destruction in 70 AD, and then he got into the city, but it was already late.

It was not early in the day, a little late to cleanse the temple. So, he just looked around, took things in, assessed the situation, then went back to Bethany with his disciples, came back to Jerusalem the next day. We're going to have to stop there because the cleansing of the temple is connected in the Gospels with the cursing of the fig tree.

The cursing of the fig tree is not in Luke, but it's in Mark and Matthew, and we need to look at that and the chronology more closely than we have time to do right now. So, we'll just have to close with this, and we'll pick it up from there next time.