

24 HLH Mat 19 D&R BS 770610 1 2p3

Many of the students, of course, are gone, which offers our numbers here.

This evening, normally, the schedule would have had Mr. Richard Rice and myself, for reasons he was not able to be here, and I thought it appropriate since Mr. Chapman has dealt with much of this material to ask him since he was not going to be scheduled in this series.

We would like to pick up, as requested through Mr. Dart's office, to analyze the material in Matthew, and although others may have explained it, there always are new people.

What we are doing, in a sense, briefly, is to go through a certain number of chapters of Matthew as the basis.

We're not trying to compare it with Luke's, with Mark or Luke specifically, unless necessary.

We're taking, in other words, a quick look at a gospel account, and we're tying in some special items in John, which I especially want to do this evening, that would seem to fit in the area or complement it, rather than merely to analyze the three gospels, which were much more alike.

This evening calls for some special evaluation of important subjects.

I think we will be limiting ourselves to chapters 19 through 23, if my memory serves me correctly, on the paper.

I told Mr. Guy Ames, who drew the schedule up and submitted it to Mr. Steve Martin, that I much preferred to have this section, although the last chapters, following this section were falling my loft, but a happy change occurred, and I was very happy to get this particular section, because I think it is especially meaningful and contains things that I would like to be able to comment on.

First, I would like you to take a quick look at the substance in the material that we're going to see tonight, and then we will dwell on specific topics, as each of us might like to comment on these.

In chapter 19, we have the fundamental question about divorce, and I think that we should take a reasonably thorough look at the fundamental points of this chapter.

Then we proceed in chapter 20, and we have some lessons here in terms of when one is called and what one's responsibility is and what the fundamental goal is.

In chapter 21, we have the important events recorded here, and elsewhere, I don't think that's as critical a chapter for what I would like to comment on, but in chapter 22, we have these parables that are being brought out, and Jesus is both addressing the question of the kingdom of God, his authority, and where the Pharisees, in fact, were unwilling to commit themselves.

These are asides, and then when we come to chapter 22, we have this very important issue of what's lawful in terms of tribute to Caesar and human governments, what our role is, and then in chapter 23, a very fundamental evaluation of the scribes and Pharisees sitting in Moses' seat, what were the lesser or greater points of the law, the role of tithing.

So we are really dealing this evening, whether we like it or not, with some very fundamental issues that we call moral, preferably spiritual, and matters of government.

Then there are some parallels in terms of the time element in John 8, 9, 10, and 11, which we can bring in as time permits, though the emphasis must be on Matthew's account.

And of necessity, I will have to go back and include chapter 7 in John because there's a very important link, and chapter 7 cannot be divorced from the things that follow.

So let's turn now for the moment back to the theme, if we can, in Matthew chapter 19.

First of all here, the primary issue is being addressed beginning in verse 3 of chapter 19.

Jesus had departed from Galilee, he came to the coast of Judea beyond Jordan.

Many followed him and he healed them there.

Now the Pharisees come and they're not interested in a solution to a problem.

They're not interested in addressing the issue of why we have divorce.

What is the cause? What should we be doing to solve the problem? The issue is they came to trap him by asking him a question.

Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause? Now he said to them, have you not read that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female? Here we discover that Jesus often sidesteps the tricky issue and gets back to what is fundamental to the problem.

The issue is not really whether it's lawful or not lawful.

It still doesn't solve every cause that's brought up.

What you need to get back to is at the beginning of the story and find out what marriage was like at the beginning.

That's the approach we ought to take.

At the beginning he defines the relationship which is given here.

Wherefore, any two who have left and have wanted to become husband and wife are no more two but one flesh, the marriage ceremony or the custom of whatever culture that stands for it, because not every society perceives it at the same level, it's sufficient that there are no more two separate people who have no right to each other but one flesh.

And now the fundamental point, what therefore God has joined together, let not man put asunder.

This was the verse that for many years, probably 30 years or more, was the fundamental verse which determined the policy in the Church of God.

Now, it was really our understanding of the verse, so we ought to correct my statement, because sometimes we think it the verse when in reality it is our understanding of it.

First of all, no one verse is of its own interpretation.

We should have looked at other verses and weighed the possible conclusions.

Now, without any doubt, it is true that what God has joined together, man shouldn't put asunder.

Let not man do that.

Now, the putting asunder we assumed was wholly a reference to divorce.

I think that was the issue in our minds, because it was the issue that the Pharisees raised.

Whereas Jesus sees it bigger because he goes back to the beginning.

When two people are united in marriage, there should nothing be done that would put such a relationship asunder.

That means there ought never be porneia ever committed, which is a permission.

We didn't see it that way at all.

We were not grasping the picture, but let me go on to illustrate the point.

The Pharisees immediately saw now that they were on the defensive, and so they were asking questions even to defend Moses.

Why then did Moses command to give a writing of divorce and to put it away? Here they admitted the truth.

Moses gave a commandment.

The commandment was not to divorce.

The commandment was that if you divorce, you must do it in writing so that there can be no legal repercussions in terms of husband, wife, children, property, or anything.

What is commanded was not divorce.

What is commanded by Moses is putting in writing the divorce.

But Moses lays down no rules in Deuteronomy 24 that defined this specifically.

Moses didn't command divorce.

Let's understand that.

Moses accepted the reality and the evil of it for whatever cause it is painful.

The point is there is not a single commandment in all the Bible that the marriage ceremony has to be written.

In our society, we recognize the authority of the state.

Mr. Chapman or I have to sign our names after a ceremony has been conducted and between you all and God, let's say it may be in accordance with the Bible, but even God would say that it is not legally fulfilled until we have done our part to see that it is mailed.

That's our responsibility.

Society asks it of us.

We have to wait, in other words, many hundreds of years after Moses before that was asked, but Moses even asked it of divorce cases in his day.

I think that is an important thing to be cognizant of, but to go on.

Jesus says to them, Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, permitted you.

In other words, the state of affairs of an unconverted nation, albeit the congregation of Israel or of God, was such that something had to be permitted, and so Moses permitted divorce.

But it was not so from the beginning.

The permission was in a sense without any specific limitation, though the implication was something unclear.

That's the implication, but Moses basically left it undefined.

It has clear reference to Jesus' use of the term in Greek *porneia*, translated sometimes fornication, promiscuity, sexual misbehavior of some form.

From the beginning, God's law did not incorporate divorce, because God was not teaching fornication or *porneia*.

He was teaching you the way it ought to go, and divorce was not even stated anywhere until you come down to Moses, though it certainly was being practiced in the Gentile and Israelite worlds.

So divorce was permitted because of the hardness of their hearts.

It is not God's intent that any marriage should ever have to be terminated.

It is also a command of God that we should do nothing to thunder or terminate it.

And divorce is not the cause of the termination, it's the result.

The cause may be any number of sins.

Divorce in itself is a consequence of sin.

We did not see that clearly.

Jesus was not saying what therefore God has joined together, let not man divorce, even though you sin and sin and sin in marriage.

He was saying, let not man do those things which lead to the sundering of it.

And that involves all kinds of mistakes that are defined elsewhere in the Bible.

So we're getting at the root of the picture that when two people are married, they should do nothing that would lead to terminating that marriage.

But and if it's terminated, a divorce must be written, and further, the idea that anything goes as an excuse for divorce, because of hardness of heart, is no longer sufficient grounds or never really was, but it was allowed because the people were not all called to conform to the image of Christ.

I say to you, so here Jesus stands, if you please, above Moses, whoever shall put away his wife, accepted before in the Greek word *porneia*, which has numerous meanings, that essentially involves some kind of sexual misconduct, unless it's for that, and marries another, is actually committing adultery.

That's the principle.

Now, whoever marries her, which is put away, does the same thing.

This is clearly a prohibition against the custom of swinging, against the custom of exchanging mates, because you like the other person, or the money, or the stature in society, or the ability to climb socially, or the job, or the automobile, or whatever.

And there are women and men who will exchange mates, but where there is no basis, and that is outright adultery.

Now the important point, and I have discussed this before, but we want to see it clearly.

Once we had misunderstood the real implication of verse 6, it was impossible to comprehend verse 9.

Now, Jesus said, whoever shall put away or divorce his wife, except for porneia.

And the important lesson here is that porneia, therefore, is an exception to the rule that there should be no divorce, and porneia, therefore, is a valid cause for divorce.

Therefore, divorce is possible.

We assume that porneia had to be before marriage, that it must be an annulment because man was forbidden to put asunder by divorce.

And that was human reason.

And we made a mistake.

And people have endured, and as long as they have, they have a reward coming.

It was an imposition imposed on the church, a prohibition against marriage when people would have been allowed to.

And it is a mistake that the church must acknowledge.

We have to realize the importance of weighing all the Scripture, that it is wonderful if we never had to have divorce.

But the fact remains that even God's people make mistakes.

And some get very far from God, and the mistakes become very serious.

And sometimes they fall in the classification of porneia.

And that is an exception.

And as I said, Jesus said in Matthew 5 that it is an exception.

Jesus said, therefore, you could use it.

He didn't command you to use it.

He commands you to be willing to forgive.

Therefore, God is going to judge you as to whether it was necessary to use porneia.

Could you have made it work? Was the other person repentant? Was it an individual indiscretion? Were you being narrow-minded? Were you being a little tough? Could you have been more generous? You see, the exception is not a proof you must use it.

But it may sometimes be better than living in a relationship that is very unfortunate.

Now, the disciples hadn't really seen this picture clearly and thought, therefore, it was better not to get involved in marriage because they had been so used to practically everything being a cause.

And now they realized how often, and we do too, listen, brethren, how often the biggest problems between husbands and wives don't even involve porneia but involve your own personality that you can't rule over and picking at somebody else's personality.

And when we find that two people have to be seated, when we talk to them and they're seated on one sofa as far away as Mr. Chapman is from me and I've been in cases where he turns the other way and the woman turns this way.

Because I'm over here and some minister is over there and it's, you know, this is a tragedy.

And we encourage them to look at each other sometimes.

And it isn't always easy.

He's not hard to look at.

Now, the point is that when two people have come to that, that's just as likely to tear a marriage apart and yet it isn't any valid reason.

And we have many sad situations and I have said to myself, we often have cases like this where one day there is a very generous husband and a cantankerous woman.

The next day there's a cantankerous husband and an unusually kind and forgiving woman.

And we often wonder, you know, why the marriage had to be like that.

The person who is misbehaving is somehow unable to see the quality of his mate and the problem lies within himself or the problem lies within herself.

And then we frankly sometimes get two people who are both like that and deserve each other.

But those are very serious problems because not everything that comes to break a marriage up is a valid cause.

And I think you ought very seriously to comprehend the importance of the spirit of forgiveness and not holding grudges and not maintaining your anger beyond sunset.

That's a command and a literal one.

I think we should seriously consider it.

Now, Jesus recognized that not all men, certainly in the nation of Judah, could receive that saying.

Some men naturally can, some men are determined to, but not all can.

But again, not all are being called.

But if you're being called, God is asking you to yield yourself to him and to receive his spirit so that it is possible.

You see, with God all things are possible.

We'll come to that in one of the succeeding verses this evening.

I'll stop there for the moment and Mr. Chapman might like to come in anywhere along this because he was often in England or in the other campus in the United States and had many experiences that I've, you know, we've never shared together.

Thank you.

Good evening to all of you.

Folks up there in the balcony look awfully lonesome.

I hope I can look up once or twice to address you as well.

I think what we have here in Matthew chapter 19 proves once again that marriage is for adults.

And I see around me so often, and especially here in Los Angeles, marriage between children.

And in Los Angeles where you have as many divorces as you have marriages, those folks could be greatly helped.

One, they would grow up, and two, which I hope all of you have followed, to seek God's advice and God's help in selecting your mate.

We used to counsel a lot more with young people about marriage.

In fact, we went overboard as the pendulum swung too far one direction years ago where we practically required counseling and required a matching of, let's say, a person's abilities and talents and desires.

In other words, we were a bunch of matchmakers.

We were both right down to it.

And we realized that was wrong.

And I think perhaps sometimes the pendulum has swung a little bit too far the other direction.

Now that's not the way that Dr. Hay or I feel.

Because we're more than happy to help anybody with advice, marriage advice or counseling.

But I just find it difficult, or I find it unusual when people do come to me anymore and ask for advice.

I hear about somebody I've known for years all of a sudden, he or she is getting married.

And I thought, well, I hope they have grown up and they have sought proper counseling.

Indeed, they've looked at each other carefully.

They know where each other's heart lies in respect to the word.

They have sought counsel from God and they are indeed adults.

But far too often, even in the Church of God, even among graduate people in the church for a long time, this is not true.

We end up with sad marriages, marriages that sooner or later end up on the rocks.

And then by law, the divorce has to be given.

And then we have the sticky problem of trying to...

We don't worry about it too much anymore because we put it right back on the shoulders of the individuals, whether or not that was a, quote, binding marriage.

Realize this has been explained many times.

God is not in the marriage-binding business, but God is in the marriage-blessing business.

And that's why it's so important for you to seek His help and His will before you marry.

So He can bless your marriage.

And I think back in the years I've been married and I think that God indeed did bless my marriage.

And we've had a very happy time.

By the way, we were married twice to amplify this point Dr. Hay mentioned, that the courts, the laws require you to perform a ceremony.

And when we were first married, and I kid my wife about this all the time, every time April 11th rolls around, I say, now honey, let's see, when we married on April 6th, she says, no honey, it was April 11th.

But actually we were married both days.

The first time by the registry office in St. Alden, England, that was required by the state.

And then again on April 11th, by the ministry of the church of God, which is really the one that counted, the one that took, so to speak.

At that particular time, the Brickett Wood campus did not have what was called an official sanctuary.

So we had to have the state marriage first.

Notice also that the matter here is not so much divorce as the sin, because that was really the result of sin as Dr. Hay brought out.

The divorce is at the end of the road of a series of mistakes, or bad attitudes, or inability to solve adult problems.

The stress here is if you remarry somebody who has been in the state, you are committing adultery.

That of course is the direct violation of the seventh commandment.

I can think back years ago, even when we thought, and again this was our misinterpretation of the scripture, that even divorcing somebody, even though it was a wretched, miserable marriage with physical violence of the husband towards the wife, or very infrequent, but occasionally the other way, it was considered a sin to divorce.

Well the sin had already been committed all along.

You see the divorce was the final thing that probably in several cases may have led to the salvation of the individual.

You didn't have to continue in this horrible state.

Can you imagine being at your wife's throat all the time, verbally, maybe even abusively, or vice versa, trying to establish the right kind of contact with God? Can you imagine praying and studying and fasting when you're not sure what your husband's going to do to you that night? We had those kind of situations coming up, and thankfully now God has revealed to us the true meaning of not only Matthew 19, but what Paul has to say about it in verse 187.

So that a lot of people have been relieved of terrible burdens that I think have been almost a weight to prevent them from establishing the kind of contact with God that they really could and should.

So that's really all I had to say on that situation.

Because there are always new individuals here, I will just very briefly summarize certain aspects of this to help us be brought up to date.

There are really three areas of responsibility where the presence of a divorce in our society is either mandatory or certainly permitted.

We have the situation where a sin occurs or sins that involve some kind of abuse, pertaining generally to sex or immediately related matters before or after the marriage.

That's what is addressed as an exception.

Now, this is not the only kind of case when Paul says if the unbelieving depart, let him depart, that this wasn't a command he had from the Lord, but he was giving permission that if he wanted to dwell with you peaceably he could or she wanted to dwell with you peaceably she could.

Paul there is pointing up that marriages had occurred prior to conversion.

And when conversion occurred, the actual state of conversion led to a situation that was contrary to the letter of the law or in Deuteronomy, I think it's chapter 7 there, but I'd have to turn to it for the moment.

There are several places. Let me just check it out here.

It was prohibited to enter into a marriage relationship.

Yes, 7 verse 3, you were not to make marriages with individuals who have another religious conviction.

That's in Deuteronomy 7.

We'll compare it with 1 Corinthians of the same number.

Now, the point is there, you suddenly found yourself in a position where in reality you should not have been.

Jesus gave no command either to the apostles or to Jesus, sorry, or to Paul, excuse me, altering the law in Deuteronomy 7.

And so Paul says that I don't have a statement from Christ clarifying Deuteronomy 7, which means that we should not enter into such relationships voluntarily, going out and dating freely with those who are unconverted.

But and if you find yourself now that you're converted in such a state and the unconverted made is willing to live at peace with you, don't break it up.

Otherwise, the law prohibited your staying together.

And if the unconverted raises an issue and wants to leave, that's his responsibility.

The law would have said do it anyway, you know, Ezra and Nehemiah enforced it when the good of the community was involved.

On the other hand, the unconverted may want to stay and force you out.

The issue is not who gets it. It is whether you live at peace.

You are permitted to live together if you can live at peace.

If you can't, and if the unconverted is going to make you pay the bill, then I think it's a matter of getting good legal advice as to who should make what move first.

That has nothing to do with porneas.

That, in fact, involves a case where the marriage shouldn't technically be terminated anyway.

And Jesus gives you permission through Paul not to do it if there is a peaceable relationship possible.

You're doing the unwise thing if you do terminate it.

But, and if you are living in a state that is not suitable, therefore there is perfect reason to terminate it.

Now, what is important? Let's cross-fertilize these two thoughts here.

If an unconverted person can live at peace, and that is what the state of marriage should be, then it brings up a serious issue when two people are in the church and don't live at peace.

The implication is that maybe one or both are either not converted, or you are so carnal-minded that you're not spiritually growing and hence don't have the power of the Spirit of God to play your role.

The role of the woman is to submit to her husband as to Christ, and very few women really ask themselves when they are arguing, are they doing that? The law also says husbands love your wives, not take advantage of them.

Not be abusive, love your wife as Christ loved the church and gave himself to pay for all the mistakes, and don't hold her accountable.

I think neither party in situations like that really are doing their pull.

The other, of course, is situations where in Exodus 21 there are certain responsibilities that a man has toward his wife, and even a slave woman had a right to leave her master or her master's son to whom she was married.

If he would not perform his duty, which were three fundamental areas, Exodus 21, 10, and 11, and if he do not these three, a woman has a right to expect a man to provide for the table, to provide a living, to provide clothing, to provide shelter, and to provide the sexual duty of marriage.

And if any man tries to use a latter as a leverage, he's sinning, and if he is just plain lazy and unwilling to do the other part, he doesn't deserve to have a wife.

That is not a sin of commission.

Porneia is a sin of commission, something you commit that can damage a marriage.

This is a sin of omission, which you are asked to perform toward each other.

And I say if a slave woman has the right to be free, most certainly a free woman does.

And it can be vice versa depending on what the woman's behavior, but most often the man who is at fault in situations like this.

And we have cases where this fits, that is where individuals are worse than infidels who haven't provided for either their wives, their wife, or children.

We have to analyze these things, and Jesus recognizes that this is a situation that isn't even being addressed, that is there's no divorce required in the original form of the law.

It was just a failure.

It's a kind of annulment in a sense that the bond woman was able to walk away because the man had not done his part.

The man had in fact failed deliberately.

He had gotten involved with some other woman who was of interest to him instead.

But of course if he had fulfilled his duty, she wouldn't have been freed, and polygamy there is involved, but it's not the only issue.

In other words, there are sins of omission that are very fundamental, not common, but nevertheless that occur.

And that's more or less in the category that today would probably demand a divorce by the law of the land, but it is in a sense an annulment.

Because no divorce in the law of God is required, an annulment is the logical interpretation that you would give of such a situation.

And the other is the sin of commission that requires a written divorce.

And then the third one, based on 1 Corinthians 7, Deuteronomy 7, is in fact again a case that requires a divorce, a written divorce.

But where indeed the marriage should not have been entered into in the first place, if you knew, and if you became converted afterward, the option there will depend on the state of the mate.

I hope those broad areas will be reasonably clear, and every case needs to be analyzed on its own.

We hope there never have to be cases that there will be.

And now we move into another section.

I would just briefly comment that, one, the disciples were shocked at Jesus' statement, so they said, then it isn't good to marry.

This puts unusual restraints.

Now the next issue Jesus spoke about a rich man.

The man came to him, and you know the rest of the story if you've read this here, but I want to focus in on their comment.

Then they said, well, if your teaching here is true, that it's easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, which is impossible, than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God, then his disciples were exceedingly amazed.

Now, I would say it would be unlikely that this is merely a low gate called the eye of a needle, and if you really got the camel down low enough, it could go through.

The disciples would hardly be amazed.

They would thought it a little impractical.

He was using a literal expression that meant that it's impossible for a rich man without the spirit of God to enter into the kingdom.

In other words, it is a universal stumbling block, and all people with money better realize it.

So Jesus said, with man it is impossible, but with God all things are possible.

The spirit of God makes more things possible than you realize.

Makes more things possible than I realize, because we all have to grow to understand the capacity of God and his power as expressed through spirit.

Therefore, it is possible for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

It is possible to live with your mate without ever having to have a divorce.

It's possible, but too many don't call on God as they should.

I'll stop here in case there are some comments.

I really passed over a statement, but I wanted to focus in on the place of God's spirit, the shock of the disciples, the fact that without the spirit of God, they didn't even realize how these things were fully possible, and they were yet to learn that after the day of Pentecost.

Jesus could have used any number of other examples here, but he did pick the one thing that does seem to be a stumbling block for so many people.

Not just wealth, but broadened out to include materialism, because this whole world is wrapped up in it, especially here in the United States.

And, of course, materialism can lead to your unfaithfulness and tithing, going further into debt so that you can keep up with the Joneses, the Hayes, the Chappens, whoever it might be, can cause all kinds of troubles.

And so what Jesus is using as an example here is something that we all must be very careful about.

Where your heart is, that's where your treasure will be, and vice versa.

You have your treasure, your desires to support this work, and continue to serve God, and to get the job done in getting the gospel to the world. That's where your heart's going to be.

And it seems so often that when people lose sight of that, and they find greater responsibilities or opportunities to spend their money, something that's more important, including sometimes their tithe, it's more important not to save the second tithe, to attend the Feast of Tabernacles, it's more important to do this or that, and pay your first tithe, then you're in real trouble.

And there, of course, is when you're going to have to really have God's Holy Spirit to help you make it into God's kingdom.

Of course, if you have God's Holy Spirit, then there's no question about it, because God wants to bless every one of us.

He said, I wish above all that you prosper and be in good health.

The two things at all, everybody wants.

He wants to have good health, and he wants to have enough money to take care of his basic needs.

And if you're not careful, it spreads over into your desires, into your wants, into your wishes, and all those other luxuries.

So just be cautious and put the kingdom of God first.

I think that's the main thing that Christ is stressing here, and through the power of the Holy Spirit, it will always remain first.

It was at this point that the Jewish disciples asked, well now we've forsaken all, what are we going to get? Terrible.

It crops right up again.

It's a very interesting analysis, and the disciples, of course, never saw themselves until they were really asked to write it up.

Then they see the picture, and Jesus showed that there are things that we do receive in his service and relationships.

We have many more friends than we ever would.

We know so many more interesting people than we ever could in the world.

And then he gives in chapter 20 a parable of people who were called early and those who were called late in their lives, or in the history of any period of time when the work is being done, and the focus there is not on the one who starts out early in the sequence putting his mind on why he ought to have more than the person who came late.

Now, we could have a whole sermon net on this, and that's not the place, because it's not as important a factor this evening.

We only have so much time.

The point nevertheless is that Jesus introduces this parable right after they got their minds on what things they would have in this life and or the next.

And he wants people to focus in on the principle which is seeking eternal life and not always more than somebody else.

That is, if you work longer, harder to want more, that is, you ought to be rewarded accordingly.

We have to realize that some of you have endured the truth for 30 years, and some only two.

I hope that you don't look at it that way, but I think sometimes some do.

And we must not do it from the point of view of seeking to have some bigger reward because we've endured God's work longer.

That's a wrong point of view.

There was a lot more pleasant sweat in eating grapes while working and feeling you were going to get paid at the end of the day than waiting there the eleventh hour having nothing to eat all day.

Pays to be converted, in other words.

Then he goes right on, and I think this is important.

No sooner had this happened when the mother of the children of Zebedee came and asked for the chief seats in the kingdom.

You'll really see how the disciples, after being with Jesus nearly three years here, had their minds on nothing but lording it over or having bigger rewards.

And Jesus, in a sense, really laid the cards on the table that if they want something important, they will have to pay a price.

And even if they paid the price, he wouldn't guarantee it because that was the father's decision.

And the ten were quite indignant about it toward the other two in verse 24.

So it wasn't just, you know, a wonderful, peaceable relationship.

The twelve were carnal-minded until they were converted.

And if you wonder why there are people like that in the church, you should read Matthew chapter 20.

Then you'll understand.

It is interesting that right after these twelve apostles had requested these positions of authority, you realize also that most people feel like that wealth is equated with power.

Wealth and power are synonymous in some sense.

People don't want a lot of money in this world, just so they can live high on the hog with peace.

Most people want money so they can have power.

So the ultimate thing that the disciples were concerned with was authority or power.

What was their position going to be? And Christ said, you're going to have a fine position.

But in verse 30 of chapter 19, he very quickly added, many of it are first shall be last, and the last shall be first.

And here's how I'm going to prove it to you.

And then he goes right into this parable to show that the last who came into the eleventh hour, indeed, were going to be born into the family of God as well.

The parable, of course, is showing here, as Dr. Hay explained, that you may haven't been in God's church for a long time, and the reward for all of us is still basically the same.

That's to be into God's family, be in the kingdom of God.

But you see, you can't take this parable by itself.

You have to add to that the parable of the pound, the parable of the talent.

And then you realize that the person who really has been faithful in God's church for 30 years is going to have built a tremendous amount more characters, had a lot more experience.

Let me put it, make it practical.

You are a contractor, and you need to construct a home.

And you know that that fellow over there has 30 years of experience, and that one over there has one month of experience.

Which laborer would you choose to build your home if they're both going to receive the same wage? Well, I think reason tells you you're going to choose the man with the greatest experience.

Now put yourself in Christ's shoes.

Here we're born into the family of God.

He has responsibilities, opportunities to hand out.

Which man is going to receive the greater opportunity or the greater responsibility? The one that Christ feels is better qualified.

The one that Christ feels has done more with his talents than the other person has.

You put together the whole picture of the parable of pounds, parable of talents, and this very important one, you realize that everybody will receive the reward of being in the family of God, but there will be positions within that family.

Which will be based upon how much you've done with what you've been given.

And perhaps somebody in a rare instance who's only been in God's church for a year or two, may end up in a higher position.

A greater responsibility than somebody's been in 30 years, but not too often.

Of the 10th of Nissan.

You know, the 10th of Nissan was the day when the lamb was selected, and then on the 14th it was butchered.

Now, the understanding of the church of God without having to go through either the information in a booklet or the subject here, is that the 10th of Nissan in the year of the crucifixion was on a Sabbath.

And that, the 14th, was in the middle of the week or a Wednesday, when Christ was slain.

And therefore we have the background here of Jesus being selected and the people giving ovation to him in a manner that would not have been appropriate for any other than the Messiah.

Hosanna in the highest.

Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.

This is all a part of verse 9.

Hosanna to the son of David.

There wasn't any question.

They knew that the Messiah would come from the house of David.

In some way, he'd sit on the throne of David.

Now, whether they comprehended it in the sense of being able to explain all the scriptures, that's a separate matter.

But they were clearly emotionally swept off their feet.

They said that this is clearly, you see, that is the disciple or apostle Matthew, that this was a fulfillment, that your king comes to you.

This is in verse 5.

Now, he's writing in a certain manner.

So there wasn't any question that when he appeared in this way, that the people recognized this as a fulfillment.

Not the only fulfillment, which may well have its parallel when Jesus returns and is officially accepted by the house of Judah and or Israel.

But nevertheless, a fulfillment.

And in Zechariah 9.9, you have the parallel.

We won't turn to that here.

When they saw him riding upon the ass, a colt, which was the foal of an ass, they clearly threw the palm leaves in front.

And they knew that they were accepting the one who was coming to Zion as king and Messiah.

And they made these shouts.

And clearly on this day, perhaps without even realizing it was the 10th of Nissan, and they were accepting at the time a king.

They were also accepting him as the one whom they would be used by the chief priests and others to demand his blood and to have him slain on the 14th, only a few days hence.

I would like you at some other time, and certainly the very best time is that time of year when this event occurs, that you should read this and you should read Mark's account in chapter 11 and Luke's account in chapter 19.

And the time setting will also be given, though no reference to this occasion is immediately made, in John chapter 12 at the very beginning.

I have, in fact, given a whole sermon strictly on this subject when the Passover falls on Wednesday, 14th, or when the 10th falls on a Sabbath.

And there are many things that one can go through here.

But if it takes a whole, you know, a whole hour's sermon, it's not appropriate to do it here.

I would like to encourage you in this study, however, to utilize the time through the year to read some of these things.

The Jewish Church, the congregation of Israel from the days of Ezra and Nehemiah most certainly consistently read certain passages that seemed especially appropriate for those times of the year.

And we do that for the Passover, but maybe we ought to do this on this day that precedes, which is the 10th of the month.

Now, there was a reason.

God chose the 10th of the month for a reason.

Now, whether it was due to the fact that on this Sabbath day it was going to work out just right when everybody would be there, that the 10th would fall on a Sabbath, if the Passover falls on the middle of the week or Wednesday.

We don't know why he chose the 10th, but in this case it made it possible for this to be just such an event.

Now, I won't take more time here.

I will only suggest that you read it because we have some very important verses, perhaps more meaningful for this evening than some of the specific things at this part of it.

And then there are certain things which follow where Jesus, in fact, lays out his claim to authority without stating it by posing a question which, if the Pharisees had answered it correctly, they would have known who he was.

Just about takes care of most of chapter 21.

All right.

We'll quickly, at this point, move into 22 where he dwells on the kingdom of heaven, and he compares it with the marriage of a king's son.

And we find that some were asked to be there, and then the whole history of the Old Testament, if you please, is laid out in terms of how the people who were called and who were given an opportunity to read the Bible and to learn abused the men who were sent on behalf of the king for the son's wedding.

In other words, the prophets of old and other learned men were, in fact, calling on the people and extending their hand and asking them to be prepared for the time when the son's marriage should occur, and they refused.

And the story, of course, goes on.

When the king heard of that, he was very angry, and he finally sent his armies and destroyed those murderers and burned up their city, and that's the terrible, terrible event that finalized the history of Judah in Palestine in 70 A.D.

And now he says, go out into the byways, because the wedding, you see, is really getting ready, and he needed guests there.

He wasn't going to have a son without people in his presence.

So he says, go out into the highways, and as many as you find bid to the marriage.

Now, like good servants, they went out to the highways and gathered together as many as they found bad and good.

And I'm afraid that's the state of the Church of God through 19th centuries that we call and a lot of people come in, and God's servants in the ministry, or young men sent out, or others, let people in bad or good.

It's what it says there.

I think we just have to be realistic.

And the wedding was furnished with guests, and of course there may be variations in this parable that don't take place exactly the way it will be in its fulfillment.

But nevertheless, there is the focus on an individual without a wedding garment.

And the garment, of course, is a symbol of righteousness.

You see, a wedding demands a certain respect and honor on that occasion.

And the wedding garment, in this case, certainly means someone who hadn't qualified, who was not fit to be a guest.

And he's dealt with uniquely, although clearly there were others bad as well as good.

But one is focused on because he's just trying to get down to the detail, and you can see how many others might have been like this.

And he's dealt with, and he's a person who's cast out.

Many are called, and few are chosen. Many are invited.

We invite a great many, but very few are ultimately chosen because many who respond initially are really only appreciating you.

They're not really appreciating Christ.

They like your company. They like your social occasions.

They like God's people, and they like the spirit in God's people.

And so they like to be around us.

And Daniel says that they cleave with flatteries.

And then when the going gets rough, they leave.

Or when they become offended, and no righteous person ever needs to be offended, or there's something wrong.

Now, there are many people who give offense and woe to those who do, but it's no excuse for the others who become offended.

Jones's problem, pardon me if there's a Jones here.

There's a Jones's problem, not mine.

And he has to deal with Christ about it in a judgment.

And why should I see his problem so great that I say, well, look, if Christ's going to let him into the kingdom of God, I'm not going to be there. I've heard people say that.

That if you're going to be in the kingdom of God, I won't be there.

Well, that's their decision. I'm not going to change my mind for their sake.

Paul wished, you know, that he even might be accursed, that they might all be saved, but he knew that was an invalid wish.

That's why he put it in those terms.

And I think this is important to realize that we're really dealing with a picture of all who are called, and there are a lot of people among us, and we just have to realize that they're good and bad.

And we don't always, as God's servants, distinguish between the two.

I haven't a perfect record.

Mr. Chapman hasn't a perfect record.

Herbert Armstrong hasn't a perfect record.

On this, we have not always been able.

The longer we are in, the more we are able to proceed.

But we just have to face this reality.

I recall that Simon Megas even was baptized.

So even the apostles and some of the early chief ministers in God's church made occasional mistakes.

Well, that brings us down then to, I think, a very important portion of the Scripture that not only deals with how Christ dealt with the Pharisees and the Sadducees and those enemies of His at that time, but contains some very valuable lessons for us.

This was the very tail end, you might say, of Jesus Christ's life.

He had been over beyond Jordan when we began the Bible study tonight.

He passed through Jericho and continued his righteous works of healing.

And then up to Bethany where he spent the night after writing into Jerusalem.

And it is possibility, although I've never heard Dr. Hayes sermon on this, but that many of these Scriptures, chapters 21 and 22 and 23 and 24, could have all been delivered on that same Sabbath day that he actually wrote into Jerusalem on the previous Friday evening after sunset.

The sun was setting, cleansed the temple following morning, and of course that was, I think, also pointing out that here again he was establishing himself as the called and chosen Messiah.

He was doing those things which all the Jews, if they had enough sense to recognize, especially the Pharisees and Sadducees, should have seen here as the Messiah the things that only he could.

But of course they were very bitter and heart of heart, and now as verse 15 brings out, they were going to try to trap him.

They were going to try to entangle him.

And of course they asked this question, what do you think, is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not? In hopes that they could trip him up.

They very quickly perceived that they were a bunch of hypocrites and their wickedness, and Christ having tremendous wisdom, showed those Pharisees that there were some things that really were lawful or right that you should present to Caesar, like tax money.

He says he brought him a penny.

He said whose image is it? And they said it's Caesar's.

The gender under the government or under Caesar are the things which are Caesar's.

Today we have the parallel.

There are certain things this government of this country not only requires of us, but I like to look at it positively, allows us to do.

The fact that Dr. Hay and I can sit here tonight and have freedom of worship and freedom of assembly is because the government allows us to do that.

There are many other things that we in the Church of God, perhaps for many years, have not taken advantage of.

But I think we're gaining maturity, we're gaining understanding, we're gaining perhaps a better understanding of verse 21, that there are some things in the government, government permits that are perfectly all right.

And I don't want to go into great details about this matter of voting, but I think there will be something coming out fairly soon on subject that will perhaps clarify further your responsibility and your opportunity, your permission well within the scripture in the matter of voting.

And there are a lot of other things that Christ carries on here in his discussion with the Sadducees and the Pharisees.

But the one thing I want to stress here is that we have a government that is really a very benevolent government.

All they might have their graft and their corruption and maybe they have crooked politicians here and there, but nonetheless it is a government that is unique on the face of this earth.

I might throw in, of course, or include the governments of a lot of the nations of Israel, but especially this country right here that allows free radio, television, repress, freedom of assembly, freedom of religion, freedom of courts, you name it, that are all protections for us.

It allows us to live in a land that is, well, a land that many, many people of many other nations covet and wish they could be here and would like to enjoy.

And I think sometimes maybe we take all the freedoms we have too much for granted.

And it's not wrong, for instance, to pay proper respect to the flag.

You should.

You should all have a flag.

You should fly on on Flag Day as far as that goes.

And whenever the flag, whenever you have Pledge of Allegiance, you should follow along and do it.

I wonder how many of you know what it is to go through the Pledge of Allegiance.

Have you forgotten? I've had quite a few opportunities working with the Boy Scouts and the Cub Scouts to have given Pledge of Allegiance quite often.

It makes me feel good to realize, well, this is a free nation, great opportunities to live in it, to worship my God and your God in freedom.

I would comment here that Jesus was asked a trick question.

Tell us, what do you think? And Jesus perceiving, he responds pretty bluntly, but the point is, he puts the burden of proof on them.

He asks for the money and asks whose superscription is this.

And when they saw it was Caesar's, it was a little difficult to deny that indeed Caesar, who had the money coined, had some authority in terms of what he could do with the money, because God's image was not there.

And in this connection, I would say that there was a case, some of you have heard the story.

It was a child custody case.

And there was a trick question like this asked, and it did pertain to the issue of whether somebody who sits on a judicial bench had to lay aside his office in order to become a church member.

Now, the question of voting and the question of entering into military service, all these things are tied together, and this is not the evening to discuss that.

But I'm going to put Mr. Chapman on the bench.

This judge was a Roman Catholic, he was an Italian, and I will use Mr. Chapman as an illustration in this case, because the lawyer for the opposition had a trick question, and he wanted to get me into trouble, you see, with Judge Chapman.

And his theme was, now do you mean that Judge Chapman would have to lay aside his office in order to become a member of your church? And I immediately saw that, in fact, he laid a trap for himself.

I said, now, if Judge Chapman can, in all good conscience, uphold the constitution of the state of California, and obey the biblical injunctions and the law of God, there's no reason he should have to lay aside his judicial ropes.

And the decision had to be the judge.

In his conscience, he knew right away that when he took the oath to the state of California, he was sooner or later either going to have to step aside from the case after case, or he would conscientiously be unable to fulfill the laws that are in the Bible, because there are conflicts without any question.

The important lesson is to learn how Jesus handles some of these cases, and where you place the responsibility.

You make the other person who comes with some tricky question responsible for answering it, and he soon will go off in another direction, because this lawyer didn't want to put the judge on the spot.

Now, to take note briefly of what follows, I don't think here we need to dwell on the issue of the resurrection in particular, except the Pharisees then were succeeded by the Sadducees, and they brought up this question, and Jesus shows that some scriptures are a little unusual in the sense that maybe we don't think in these terms, but when the expression is used by God, I am the God, verse 32 of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob.

Not I have been the God of Abraham, but he's now dead, and I have been the God of Isaac, but that I am is, in fact, a looking forward to the resurrection, because God, of course, as you know, is not the God of the dead, because the dead know nothing.

He's a God of living people, and when he says, I am the God of Jacob, he's looking forward to the lifetime of Jacob, and that can only be possible through the resurrection.

He was clearly not referring to the immortality of the soul, that you go on living and thinking and acting in another world, even if you're dead.

He's addressing the resurrection and using their kind of reasoning and pointing up that after they're dead, if he says, I am, that means that since he is not the God of the dead, but of the living, he's looking forward to a resurrection, and that is in itself a kind of logical proof.

It is not what we would commonly use, but it is what those people who were dealing with Scripture and who were seeking to find some defense of some idea would use.

We would undoubtedly go to some reference to the resurrection today, but I think the point nevertheless is clear that there are many Scriptures that were intended to have meanings that are not immediately obvious, and this I think is an illustration.

The issue of the great commandment, I don't think we need to dwell beyond the fact that Jesus made it pretty plain.

The two greatest commandments are neither of them in the ten.

The two greatest are found in, in fact, the laws that God gave through Moses, and we should not try to distinguish the ten commandments and say we keep them in the letters they were given, but we throw out all the book of Moses, the book of the law through Moses, or the book of the covenant.

That is a mistaken idea.

We need to have a whole new evaluation because we are asked to have the law not written with ink, not written on tables of stone, but written in our heart, where indeed the implication is that what was both on the ten commandments or the two tables of stone, that is the ten commandments, and in the book of the law, or the book of the covenant, written with ink, that is also to be in us according to intent and purpose.

And so if anyone wants to try to lay aside aspects of the law beyond the ten commandments, and I know some denominations even that have great prominence of the Sabbath in their worship have neglected many other parts of the Bible, sadly they ought to look and see that the two greatest

commandments are in those very areas in which Moses is speaking of various things that came to mind in addressing the people.

After this we will take note of Jesus' brief reference to the fact that David's son is also his Lord, because clearly the Messiah was to descend from the family of David on the one hand, and David even then called him his Lord.

That is right in the Psalm itself, which David is quoting, Psalm 110.1, and Jesus is here, or David is writing and Jesus is quoting.

And the Pharisees, of course, had no way to explain it, because they knew that if they tried to, they would be confronted with the obvious answer that Jesus Christ was the God who was then alive and addressed as the Lord, and that he was to be born of the family of David, and there is no other explanation but what this was that man, because up to this point everything had fulfilled it.

And now we will be coming to chapter 23, which is a very important chapter, but if you, Chapman, you might have some few things scattered here in 22 yet.

I don't believe so.

I think that by this time the Sadducees and the Pharisees realize that even with their very best, you see a Pharisee whole lawyer up in verse 35, they could not trap Jesus, and in their hearts many of them knew who he really was.

Remember Nicodemus was one of the Pharisees, and he knew that Christ was the master, and they called him the master right here.

And then to acknowledge that indeed he was the son of David, they would have to admit that he was the Messiah, he was the God of the Old Testament, and they weren't going to do that.

And so from that point on in verse 46 it says, from that day forth they ask him no more questions.

Of course his life only extended for three or four more days.

And then chapter 23.

After he had in fact blasted the lawyers, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the scribes, the Herodians, lest the people get the idea of revolt in the church, he said to the multitude and his disciples, the scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat.

Not they've sat themselves there, but really should be kicked out.

Now indeed they sat down on Moses' seat, that's the reference.

And you can argue the point, but nevertheless Jesus recognizes that's where they were sitting.

Because he said, all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do.

But do not after their works, for they say and do not.

It was not an issue where they were teaching idolatry, Sunday instead of the Sabbath, and breaking all kinds of commandments.

Why in the parallel case in John's account, which I do want to come to before the evening's over, they even brought a woman taking an adultery because they could wax eloquent about somebody committing adultery.

That's talking, see, but when it came to doing, they didn't do what they were saying.

They expected of the common sinner, the people of the land, that they would be sinning and they were condemned.

But they looked upon themselves, kind of an upper crust in the church unfortunately, as above that kind of thing while they were in fact doing it anyway.

So Jesus makes it very plain that the scribes in the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat or have set themselves on it, and he asks them to observe and do whatever they are bidden, whether required by the Scripture, which they certainly should have done, or whether it was added even beyond the necessity of Scripture, because they had a lot of do's and don'ts to keep people from sinning.

That is, they built all kinds of fences around the law, greater burdens than were required by the law of God for the Sabbath as an illustration.

But don't do according to their private lives, he said, for they bind heavy burdens, they ask you to even do more than the Bible asks, and they are grievous to be born, and they lay them on men's shoulders, but they will not move them with one of their fingers.

But all their works, they do to be seen of men, and of course they broaden their phylacteries.

He didn't say they had to get rid of them, but they made these very broads so they seemed more righteous because they were bigger, more prominent, and they had the blue fringes on their garments.

They made those bigger than would even look good in order they could be seen to be very sure of fulfilling the law of Moses, not having little fringes.

And they love the uppermost, you know, rooms at feasts, the chief seats in the synagogue, greetings in the marketplace, and all these other things.

And they wanted to exalt themselves.

Jesus said, whoever is greatest among you should be your servant.

Whoever should exalt himself will be a baste, and whoever humbles himself will be exalted.

So the issue is important here.

Sometimes we in God's church have to ask you to do something that isn't in the scripture directly.

When you come for a Bible study, which is voluntary, when you come for a commanded assembly, and where to assemble, these things do rest at the level of government in the church.

We can't all be deciding every week whether we want to change the schedule.

I'm just giving an illustration that we all accept some things that go beyond.

Just like in a family, decisions have to be made that are not always decided when the marriage ceremony is read.

There are new decisions that constantly come along.

Now this led, of course, to a condemnation of the deeds, and Jesus pronounces woes on their deeds, after he's told them, the people, what their duty is, then he warns them about this kind of conduct.

And this begins with verse 13, and there's woe after woe, and he calls them what they were, fools and blind, a very strong condemnation then he shows, a very important section here, while addressing the multitudes and his disciples who came to hear him.

He pronounces another woe on people who went to the utmost extreme, even in tithing and neglected weightier matters.

And he clearly pointed up at the end of verse 23, that the one which they were doing, of course, should have been done, but the other things of even greater merit than tithing little seeds from your garden or your herb garden should never, never have been left undone.

This is not an argument against tithing.

It is an argument that if you tithe, you should do that correctly and properly and not be a hypocrite and not want to be seen for tithing.

But you must see it in its total picture as one of varied matters of which law, judgment, mercy, faith are all to be seen in their perspective.

I'll stop right here.

Mr. Chapman surely would have a comment somewhere along this line.

Well, if we're going to have a little bit of time to go to John, maybe I should finish up a few of the things here and then let you go back to John.

Christ is hitting pretty hard at this matter of hypocrisy, putting on a good front or a good face.

Or as the old saying goes, you can come to church and sit in the congregation that doesn't make you a member of God's church.

You are a part of the body because Christ is the power of the Holy Spirit.

You are baptized into that body.

The old saying going to a garage doesn't make you an automobile.

So what he is saying is here, you could put on a fine suit of clothes and you could have a smile on your face, but if you have hatred in your heart and if you have sins in your heart, if you have things that are not repented of in your heart, then you are just as these Pharisees, a bunch of hypocrites.

So he's really stressing this matter of hypocrisy.

You have to do and believe and feel like a Christian and not just act, put on an act, but really be a Christian.

Be somebody who's dedicated to God.

And you can fool others in the congregation.

You can fool me.

You can fool any minister, but you cannot fool God.

You can't play games with God.

And unfortunately there are a number, or a few at least in God's church who seem to think they can get away with playing with God.

They're going to be surprised.

So he says in verse 27, again, you're a bunch of hypocrites.

You're like white and sepulchers.

You appear beautifully or beautiful outward, but inside you're just full of uncleanness.

Even so, you also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within you're full of hypocrisy and iniquity.

So again, it's a matter that we're all going to be measured against the yardstick of Christ's maturity, not brother or sister Jones.

You're sure picking on Mr. Jones tonight? Short and simple name.

Right.

Schickel Gruber's a little hard to say.

So he says, how are you going to escape damnation? In verse 33, or judgment? And the same thing can be said to all in God's church who like to play little games with God.

How are you going to escape judgment? Behold, I send you among prophets and wise men, rather unto prophets and wise men and scribes.

He said, watch out, because some of them you shall kill and crucify, some of them shall you scourge in your synagogues and persecute them from city to city.

It's not going to be a happy state or affairs.

I think most of us realize that some of us in God's church are going to be persecuted from city to city, and some of you already have been.

And some of God's people have died.

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth and the blood of righteous Abel to the blood of Zacharias the son of Barcaes.

And the Pharisees are going to be judged finally in the Sadducees.

In fact, all unrighteous people will be judged.

And the blame we put squarely where it belongs.

All these things shall come upon this generation.

And indeed it did in 70 A.D. when the terrible destruction of Jerusalem.

But also he could be referring down in type to the final fulfillment when the last end time generation of God's people and God's prophets and God's wise men and God's scribes will likewise be killed.

And upon that generation all things will come to pass.

O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, you that kill the prophets and stone them which are sent unto you, how often would I have gathered you as children together that you simply wouldn't have it? So your house is going to be desolate.

And by the time Christ had finished with these Pharisees there was nothing but pure hatred in their hearts.

They could not wait until they could get away and scheme how they could destroy this man who was condemning them for what they really were.

A bunch of hypocrites and unrighteous whiteness.

It was a very great tragedy that that nation came to that state.

And not every generation comes to that state of mind.

Different generations behave differently.

And it was just a set of circumstances.

I guess by contrast to other peoples it just came to be their role to seem to appear that way.

But they didn't have to.

And Jesus gave them warning. They could have changed.

The suggestion was that some important things should not be overlooked where neither Matthew, Mark or Luke dwell on them.

So chapters 8 through 11 and in fact into the very beginning of 12 bring us up to date in John's account.

And although these were parallel one really needs to go back to a section in chapter 7 and tie it in with the area of 8 and 9, 7, 8 and 9.

I think these are the important verses, sorry, chapters.

And then 10 and 11 have a few points.

But you really have to go all the way back to that point that is chapter 7 to get the whole story here if this has not been dealt with before.

And I wanted to take just a brief time because we could.

We should deal with it in another manner, but I feel it is important.

Some years ago I had asked our students, Mr. Freibergs was commonly in the class on that occasion, assisting if we could find some indication of the relationship of the day of the month or a holy day, time of the month with the day of the week.

And I looked through all the New Testament account and find nothing and Mr. Freibergs brought up a remarkable series of events that somehow I had not seen in reading.

Then I realized that I had indeed looked into the revised standard version for the information.

He went through the King James and in this case, the key lay in what was in the footnote in the revised standard, delightful place for the information.

The story, of course, is the woman taken in adultery during the festive season.

I point up here very briefly at the account beginning with chapter 7, verse 53, the last verse, and chapter 8, 1 through 11, and therefore hooking up with verse 12.

All of this really belongs as a part of the sequence of scripture, and it has been in doubt only because some people thought Jesus was giving permission for a woman who was an adulteress, and the Greek church had some doubts that this was good for Greek women to have heard read, and so they put asterisk by it so that it would be left out and no Greek woman would have an excuse like this one who got away with it.

This was their reasoning.

It's all a part of it, and the important thing that I draw to your attention is that it's the time of the Feast of Tabernacles just before the crucifixion, which was the following spring, and it says in verse 37 in the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus said a certain thing here, and then we are told that after the comments that are given there, every man went to his own house, and Jesus went to the Mount of Olives, and then early in the morning he comes again to the temple, and he talks again to the people, and here's the story of the woman taken in adultery, which should be left here, and then we discover a further discussion after that, and there arose a controversy such that the Jews wanted to stone Jesus, they took up stones in verse 59 of chapter 8, cast them at him, Jesus hit himself, went out of the temple, and going out through the midst of them, not even being recognized by them, he saw passed by, and as he passed by, he saw a man who was blind, he healed the man, and we are told that they brought to the Pharisees him who had been blind, and of course it was the Sabbath day when Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes, and this is an important thing.

I wanted to draw attention to the fact that it is the Sabbath day in verse 14, when this occurred, it occurred as he passed by, and he passed by following the attempt of stoning, and the stoning arose as a result of a heated controversy which immediately followed on the heels of the case of the woman taken in adultery, which was a matter early in the morning when Jesus came to the temple, I'm just going back, after he had been in the Mount of Olives, and the evening there had transpired, and the day before is called the last day, the great day of the feast.

So the time sequence is rather clear as to the events here, and it really ties this up very well, and I thought I have quickly summarized this is not something that I could ever ask you to put down in the evening, but I just wanted to point up the fact that whereas Matthew, Mark, and Luke failed to give, and had no reason to give, the information John, in fact, gives in here without ever addressing the issue, he gives the clue that tells you the nature of the calendar in the autumn before the spring with respect to the Sabbath day.

Now, for instance, if the crucifixion were on a Passover in 30 A.D., I just say if it were, then the Feast of Tabernacles, the seventh day, would have ended on a Monday, and the eighth day, a separate feast, would have ended on a Tuesday, and therefore, by the fixed calendar as we have, it would have been impossible, or even by observation, it wouldn't have been on any other than a Tuesday or a Wednesday.

We may therefore draw the conclusion since the reference is to the Sabbath day, seventh day of the week, not some holy day.

It may have been a holy day as well, that's not the issue.

It was the Sabbath day, it was the seventh day of the week, so that we may conclude, therefore, that we not only have an indication, you see, if we want to determine the time of the crucifixion, we not only have the indication of which day of the week the crucifixion occurred on, we also have the indication of how the Feast of Tabernacles closed with respect to the Sabbath day, the 30 AD, the crucifixion, therefore, could not have occurred because in 29 AD, just before it, the Feast of

Tabernacles, whether by calculation as the fixed calendar is today, or by observation of the new moon, the Feast of Tabernacles would have ended before the middle of the week was over, and not a Sabbath day.

And interestingly enough, of course, if you were to analyze it, whereas, for instance, you could go back and have an argument, you could say that it's possible to have this story in John's account fit in AD 27, and the crucifixion, therefore, might have been AD 28, but in this case, the Passover would have been on a Monday.

So that wouldn't work.

In 29, it won't work at all.

The year is 2829, and I showed you that 2930 would not.

Some people have tried to make it be that because they think in 30 AD, the crucifixion was on a Friday, which would have been the case if there had been observation.

It would have been a Wednesday if there had been calculations such as we use the calendar.

Now, interestingly in 31 AD, the crucifixion, therefore, could have occurred by either calculation or observation.

There was no difference, and it would have been on a Wednesday, April 25th and 31.

And the Feast of Tabernacles would have ended on Friday, the seventh day of the festival, and the eighth day, the last of the festivals would have been on a Sabbath.

And that would have been by the fixed calendar.

By observation, it would have been a Sunday and a Monday.

And we have, by this statement, therefore, supportive evidence that in Jesus' ministry, the calendar was a fixed calendar when the Sadducees were still in control.

And when the Pharisees got in control, they altered it to observation.

And hence, Paul introduces in Colossians 2, 16, the New Moons, because they had become important when he writes that in the 50s AD.

For by that time, the Pharisees had been able to get control of the control of the calendar and to introduce the custom of observing two holy days in a row outside of Judea.

Now, the reason I bring this up, it's out of season, but it's in context and bringing us up...