

Building on the Rock

📖 Matthew 7:21-29

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 January 21, 2015

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Q: Why are we thinking that the Sermon on the Mount is corporate and not individual?

A: I want to answer this question by clarifying that the Sermon on the Mount is both corporate and individual. The Sermon begins in Matt 5:1-2 by Jesus going up on the mountain, sitting down, His disciples coming to Him and Him beginning to teach them individually. His disciples had already believed and were therefore justified so that they had a positional righteousness before God. That positional righteousness is all that was necessary for them to enter the kingdom. However, how might they enter the kingdom with an abundance of rewards? By producing an experiential righteousness! The Beatitudes, in 5:3-12, pronounce great blessing of reward in the kingdom for Jewish saints who produce experiential righteousness like being a peacemaker, being gentle, etc... What was God's plan for Jews to produce experiential righteousness. Follow the Law! The Mosaic Law. That was the rule of life set out before the individual Jew. And that is the same thing Jesus is setting before His disciples. The issue then was what interpretation of the Mosaic Law? There was a popular interpretation floating around. Who gave that interpretation? The scribes and Pharisees. What had they done by giving their popular interpretation? Abolished the Law and the Prophets. So what would happen if a Jewish believer followed the interpretations of the scribes and the Pharisees? 5:19 says he would be called least in the kingdom. But what if a Jewish believer followed the interpretations of Jesus as expressed in this Sermon? 5:19 says he would be called great in the kingdom. I think that relates to rewards.

But I think also that another thing that is happening is a corporate issue. The disciples are being commissioned, so to speak, where Jesus calls them salt and light. Both are substances that influence and the disciples need to influence the nation to follow Jesus' teachings. Which way as a whole was the nation going to go? Were they going to follow the scribes and the Pharisees or Jesus? If they continued to follow the scribes and Pharisees they would not have the experiential righteousness necessary to enter the kingdom. That's what I think 5:20 is pointing out. One generation of Israel has to have an experiential righteousness that surpassed the phony righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees in order

to recognize their King and enthrone Him. Since the experiential righteousness is interpreted in terms of the Mosaic Law then that becomes the issue.

The body of the sermon is Jesus' contrast of His interpretation of the Law with that of the scribes and Pharisees. Individual Jewish believers have a choice who to follow and that will impact their rewards. As a whole the nation Israel has a choice to follow and that will impact whether that generation enters the kingdom. So both are really going on and there's no contradiction.

What needs to be clear is three things. First, for an individual to enter the kingdom the condition has always been the same, faith alone in the Messiah, whether the Messiah was still future or whether He was present or already come. When someone has faith in Him His righteousness is imputed to their account. Second, for an individual Jewish believer to enter the kingdom with an abundance of rewards the condition was always living according to the Mosaic Law which is an experiential righteousness. When they lived according to that Law as it was intended to be interpreted there was blessing pronounced on them in the future kingdom, treasure was being stored up. Third, for the nation of Israel to enter the kingdom the condition is that a sufficient portion of the nation be living according to the Mosaic Law which is an experiential righteousness. This is the condition I have been harping on because the context is the King's announcement that the kingdom was 'at hand.' Therefore it was a viable option that the nation repent of the teachings of the scribes and Pharisees and return to the Law producing an experiential righteousness that would render them able to see their King. While I've made much of this I don't think this is the only thing in view. The first thing I think is presupposed. In other words, I don't think Jesus is proclaiming anywhere in the Sermon on the Mount the need for imputed righteousness. By the end of the Sermon there may be unbelievers present but I don't think He addresses them anywhere like He did Nicodemus in John 3. Nowhere does he call for faith of an individual as He does there. I think He is addressing the second and third things here; the need for individual Jewish believers to follow the Mosaic Law in order to be storing up a wealth of rewards in the future kingdom and the need for a generation of Israel to come along and produce an experiential righteousness that is in accord with the true interpretation of the Mosaic Law so the kingdom could come. Historically traditional dispensationalists have been fairly univocal in stating that the condition for the kingdom to come is Israel's repentance. All I've done is try to develop the spiritual state of affairs that must be in order for the kingdom to actually come. Yes, Israel has to repent, yes, Israel has to return. But what Israel is going to repent and return to if they have not already believed in Him? So it presupposes a large number of Israeli's coming to faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Those who do will return to the Law. Then they will call on the King and He will return and establish the Kingdom, fulfilling the New Covenant. I've emphasized this corporate aspect but I do want to be clear that I do think that in the Sermon Jesus also addresses the need for individual believing Jews to follow the Law in order to store up rewards in the kingdom. Does that clarify?

Tonight we aim to finish the Sermon on the Mount. The final section in 7:13-29 is a set of three challenges by way of illustration. In light of the main body of teaching relative to His view of the Law and that of the scribes and the Pharisees the people had a choice. The first challenge is 7:13-14, the choice is between entering the narrow gate or the wide gate. The wide gate is that of the scribes and Pharisees and it led to a broad path that was widely traveled and ends in judgment prior to the kingdom. There were many entering that way. The narrow gate is that of Jesus and it opened to a narrow path of persecution that led to a rich life in the kingdom. Few were finding it. Those who did would certainly be storing up rewards despite the nation's decision. Jesus commands His audience to enter the narrow gate. The second challenge is 7:15-20, the choice is between following the true prophet or the false prophets. The false prophets are the scribes and Pharisees who were leading the way into the wide gate that led to judgment prior to the kingdom. They looked like sheep on the outside, nice religious people, but inwardly they were ravenous wolves. Because they were masquerading Jesus' instruction in 7:16 is the key to identifying them. "You will know them by their fruits." His argument from nature is that a kind of plant has it in its nature the ability to produce only a certain kind of fruit. "Grapes are not gathered from thorn bushes nor figs from thistles, are they?" Of course not. That lesson is readily available from nature. The lesson, however, can be transferred over to identifying true and false prophets. A true prophet can only produce a certain kind of fruit just as a false prophet can only produce a certain kind of fruit. What is the fruit? The fruit is always the words that come forth out of one's heart. The issue then is to listen to what words the prophet proclaims in order to identify what is filling his heart. What words were coming out of the mouths of the scribes and Pharisees? False teaching. Therefore what filled the hearts of the scribes and the Pharisees? Satan. They were mouthpieces of Satan. Satan can do miracles but what can Satan not do? He cannot proclaim truth. He can only produce lies. He is said to be the father of lies. Therefore what do the people need to do? They need to evaluate the teachings of the scribes and the Pharisees. Jesus has been contrasting their teachings with His own so they can see a clear difference. Whether they could do signs, miracles and wonders was not the issue. Jesus is going to do many of those in the following chapters and they were necessary to authenticate, but they only authenticate if what? If it is accompanied by orthodox teaching. Since Satan cannot produce orthodox teaching then the signs, miracles and wonders they did were not authenticating them as true prophets. Verse 17, So every good tree bears good fruit, but the bad tree bears bad fruit." A tree of either nature can produce no other. Verse 18, "A good tree cannot produce bad fruit, nor can a bad tree produce good fruit." That is simply the way it is. This is well known from agriculture but it is equally true of prophets. Verse 19, "Every tree that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire." What does the fire refer to? John said the same thing in Matt 3. Fire refers to judgment preceding the kingdom. John said the Sadducees and Pharisees needed to repent and bring forth the fruit of righteousness. What would the fruit of righteousness be? True orthodox teaching of the OT Law. "So then," verse 20 concludes, "you will know them by their fruits." One can

identify a true or false prophet by their teaching. That is and always will be the standard by which to evaluate.

In verse 21 we move into three verses that are an addendum, or tack on, to the test for true and false prophets. This is not a separate issue but one that connects with what has come before. **Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter the kingdom of heaven, but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven will enter. 22 Many will say to Me on that day, 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in Your name, and in Your name cast out demons, and in Your name perform many miracles?' 23 "And then I will declare to them, 'I never knew you; DEPART FROM ME, YOU WHO PRACTICE LAWLESSNESS.'** You see in verse 22 the connect in the claim to **prophesy**. We also see the two characteristics of a prophet. The first characteristic was the ability to **prophesy**, which is to receive direct revelation from God. The second characteristic is the ability to do signs and **miracles** as an authentication. **Many**, Jesus said, will claim to have done both. And on that basis what do they hope to acquire? Entrance into **the kingdom**.

So what is this passage all about? It is about entering the kingdom. According to this passage who will enter the kingdom? Verse 21, those who do **the will of My Father who is in heaven will enter**. Who will not enter? Verse 21, those who DO **LAWLESSNESS** will not enter. The issue is **practice** is it not? It is very difficult to be honest to the text and not conclude that Jesus is teaching that one must do something to **enter the kingdom of heaven** and that thing is **the will of the Father**.

Now, we'll deal with the **will of the Father** in a moment but do you see why I keep saying that Jesus is not giving the condition for an individual to enter the kingdom? Jesus gave that condition in John 3 to Nicodemus when he said in verse 5, "unless one is born of water and the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." The two conditions there are born of water, which is physical birth, the very thing a Pharisee was banking on for entrance, and born of the Spirit, which is spiritual birth, a thing Nicodemus seemed ignorant of. Jesus says in verse 15 that the spiritual birth is conditioned on belief, something Nicodemus did not have. But do you see anything about faith here? Many will turn quickly to John 6:40 where Jesus says, "This is the will of My Father, that everyone who beholds the Son and believes in Him will have eternal life." That is fine and dandy in that context. John's gospel is all about how to receive eternal life. But is that what Matthew's gospel is all about? No. Matthew's gospel is about what? The kingdom program. What is almost universally forgotten is that the OT taught that one generation of Israel must repent and return to obedience in order for the kingdom to come. Only when the nation confesses its sin and humbles itself and returns to Him will He remember the covenant He made with Abraham and the covenant He made with Isaac and the covenant He made with Jacob and the land. That covenant is the Abrahamic covenant. But what covenant declared the conditions Israel must meet for enjoyment under the Abrahamic covenant? The Mosaic covenant. They had to obey in order to

enjoy blessing. Where will ultimate blessing be enjoyed? In the kingdom. Isn't that what Jesus is talking about in Matt 7:21?

What is the issue? Entering what? **The kingdom of heaven.** There was a kingdom offer on the table. The King was there. It should be evident from the future tenses that **the kingdom of heaven** had not yet come in the person of the King. The King Himself said, "the kingdom of heaven was 'at hand'" (4:17). This means the kingdom was *near*, it does not mean it was *here*. Those who say the kingdom had already come in a spiritual way must invent a new meaning for the expression **kingdom of heaven** that had never been known. Where do we learn the meaning of the expression **the kingdom of heaven**? From the Book of Daniel. What does Daniel say? That the God of heaven will set up a kingdom on earth after crushing all human kingdoms (cf Dan 2:44). It is too bad that people think of **the kingdom of heaven** as a spiritual kingdom like heaven since that totally misses the point of Israel's covenant program on earth replete with a Davidic king ruling on David's earthly throne. Israel's covenant destiny is not heaven but **the kingdom of heaven.** This expression means that it is a kingdom that comes from heaven, not a kingdom that it is located in heaven. Even Jesus said in the Beatitudes of Matthew 5:5, "Blessed are the gentle, for they shall inherit the earth" and this in the context of verses 3 and 10 which speak of **the kingdom of heaven.** I can't see scripturally any other kingdom than the one in heaven where God presently reigns that will in the future come to earth. That is why Jesus uses the future tense in verse 21, **will enter**, not is entering, and another future tense in verse 22, **Many will say to Me on that day**, a clear reference to a judgment preceding the future kingdom.

Who will enter this kingdom? Jesus says in verse 21, **Not everyone who says to Me, 'Lord, Lord,' will enter.** This is a negative statement, **Not everyone** who says to Jesus **'Lord, Lord.** We need to understand this title. **'Lord, Lord'** is *κυριε, κυριε*. It referred at the time to a term of respect due to a teacher. Glasscock says, "Often the word *kurios* was used of rabbis as synonymous with the word "teacher." In Jewish culture the rabbi was given greater honor and respect than a teacher during the Church age. A rabbi's words were considered authoritative and the hearer was expected to obey. Therefore, to call Jesus **Lord, Lord** and then not do what He said was hypocritical. If they really meant it they would have done what He said. This establishes the whole tenor of the passage as one denoting obedience to Jesus or lack thereof. Merely referring to Him as **Lord**, even in a fervent manner, repeating it, saying, **Lord, Lord**, was not sufficient to enter the future kingdom of heaven. Something much more was required. Jesus states that something in the next expression, **but he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven will enter.** This is a positive statement. Jesus is claiming here an authority far greater than any rabbi. Note that He refers to the **Father...In heaven** as His Father. If that is so then He Himself came down out of **heaven.** This relationship to the **Father** and this origin **in heaven** mean that Jesus is claiming to be the very Son of God. Such a claim was the highest claim anyone could possibly make. The crowd's response in verse 28-29 concerning His authority is largely in relation to these claims

He was making for Himself. No scribe had ever claimed to be the Son of God the Father and no scribe had ever claimed to have come down from heaven. This was essentially a claim to have been with God the Father when He gave the Law at Mt Sinai. Such a claim is obviously no less than a claim to be God Himself. That this is a claim to be God is seen under the principle that to be the son of a father is to share the same essence as the father. Since Jesus claimed to be the Son of God the Father then Jesus was claiming to share the same essence as God the Father. Some today may object saying that Jesus was not God but no one can object that Jesus did not claim to be God. Jesus is here claiming to be co-equal, co-eternal and co-powerful with God the Father.

Many Jews both then and now say that God cannot become a man but Isaiah said in 9:6, "A child will be born to us, a son will be given to us." There's a difference between being born and being given. Micah 5:2 says, "From you [Bethlehem] One will go forth for Me to be ruler in Israel. His goings forth are from long ago, From the days of eternity." There is a difference between originating in Bethlehem and originating from all eternity. It's these two passages that have convinced many Messianic Jews of the deity of the Messiah because they show two things; one, a heavenly eternal origin and two, an earthly temporal origin. They show convincingly that the Messiah was to be both God and man; we say God in the flesh. Jesus' claim in verse 21 was entirely clear to His audience. He was making the greatest possible claim one could make; the claim to be God. As God He claimed the way for one to enter into the kingdom when the time came, which time was 'at hand' was to **do the will of His Father.**

The one who would **enter the kingdom of heaven** is **he who does the will of Jesus' Father who is in heaven.** What does it mean to do the **will of Jesus' Father?** To answer this question we must answer the question, "What was the Father's will at that time? Under that dispensational arrangement?" The only valid answer is to obey the Mosaic Law. This was God's will for each individual Israelite and for the nation as a whole. Under that covenant if they obeyed they would be blessed. If they disobeyed they would be cursed. As obvious as this answer is in the context it is met with much opposition among the commentators. For example, Glasscock says, "Unquestionably, if Jesus meant that doing the will of the Father was keeping legal codes, then the scribes and Pharisees would have been leading the way into the kingdom."¹ This statement misses the entire point of the Sermon. Jesus has shown that the scribes and Pharisees were *not* following the legal code of the OT but were re-interpreting it in order to create the façade that they were keeping it. The point of the Sermon is that if the nation continued to follow these erroneous interpretations they would not enter the kingdom. Glasscock's comment could not be further from accurate despite his strong verbiage that his conclusion is 'unquestionable.' Another who opposes the Law interpretation is Carson who says, "It quite misses the point to say that the Father's will is simply the OT law," because, first, the keeping of the Law is beyond mere human effort and, second, no one is justified by the Law."² Of course no one is justified by the Law and no one could keep the Law by mere human effort, that is child's play, but these two objections upon closer scrutiny are shown to be

vain. The fundamental problem with Carson's view is that it fails to acknowledge that there were multiple purposes of the Law. Far too often scholars and lay people alike think that the only purpose of the Law is the one they read in the NT epistles; to show people their sin. This purpose serves its role in Paul's arguments to the Galatians and Romans but it does not exhaust the purposes of the Law stated elsewhere. What were some of the purposes of the Law? The first purpose of the Law was for the nation Israel to be set apart from all the other nations. Its laws were distinctly divine in origin in contrast to all mere human laws. This set them apart from the other nations. A second purpose of the Law was for the nation Israel to learn loyalty to God. The nation was looked upon as a son that was born out of Egypt and needed to grow to maturity by learning loyalty to God by the Law. By loyalty to God is not meant sinless perfection, but like David, a man after God's own heart, the nation was to become a nation after God's own heart. A third purpose of the Law was for sin to increase. With the revelation of Law at Sinai the sin nature was given a base to press against so that when the Law became known sin increased. This was to show them they did not have sinless perfection and did need an external righteousness. A fourth purpose of the Law grows out of the third and that is that it was to be a tutor to lead them to Christ. If they were not sinlessly perfect they would need someone to come who was perfectly righteous. Therefore the Law was a tutor to lead them to Christ, the perfectly righteous one. Carson chooses the last two purposes of the Law upon which to base his objection that the will of the Father at this time was to obey the Law. He forgets that the other two purposes are what is truly in view in the Sermon on the Mount; the need for the nation to be set apart from other nations and the basis for learning loyalty to God. This is essentially what Jesus was calling for in the Sermon when He said at the end of chapter 5, "You are to be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect." The idea was not sinless perfection. Glasscock agrees saying, "The word perfect (*teleios*) actually does not mean without flaw or sinless but implies to be "complete, whole, mature."³ God was looking for His Son Israel to have grown to maturity by learning loyalty to Him through His word.⁴ With the present leadership of the nation distorting His word the nation was being misled. As long as they continued to follow this flawed leadership they could not learn loyalty to God. With the King now on the scene and the kingdom 'at hand,' a choice needed to be made as to who they would follow. Only when a generation of Israel learns loyalty to God, reflecting the very nature of their heavenly Father and so walking in obedience and welcoming the King would the kingdom come. This is what Jesus is addressing in verse 21 by the expression, **he who does the will of My Father who is in heaven will enter**. His **will** therefore does refer to His will under the Mosaic dispensation, the Law which had to be kept in order to enjoy blessing under the Abrahamic Covenant.

Verse 22, **Many will say to Me on that day**. What day? The **day** of judgment that precedes the kingdom. Clearly the kingdom had not yet come since the judgment had not yet come. Toussaint says, "The verb "will say" (*ερωσι*) indicates that judgment shall precede the establishment of the kingdom."⁵ This is clearly in the future. At that judgment what **will many say? 'Lord, Lord, did we not prophesy in**

Your name, and in Your name cast out demons, and in Your name perform many miracles? Who then is the judge preceding the kingdom? Jesus Christ. That **many** will claim to have done these things in His name show that things that either are miraculous or appear miraculous were not entirely uncommon in Jesus' day. Apparently, however, the scribes and Pharisees did these things by the power of Satan. We know from many passages that Satan can do miraculous things. He did them through Pharaoh's magicians and sorcerers in the book of Exodus. He will do them through anti-Christ and the false prophet in the book of Revelation. And he was doing them at the time of Christ. Usually intense miracles occur relative to something happening with the kingdom. Either the kingdom is being born as with the Exodus or the kingdom is being offered as with the Matthew or the kingdom is about to come as with Revelation. Miracles, both true and false, seem to have high intensity relative to something dramatic happening with the kingdom. The kingdom was 'at hand' and Satan's deception was heightened. Many of the scribes and Pharisees were doing miracles by His power to draw people astray. Rather than listening to their teaching and evaluating it according to Scripture they were following after the scribes and Pharisees who did these mighty things. The scribes and Pharisees themselves were depending on these things as a basis for entering the kingdom. From this we know they did not know what was required to enter the kingdom. What was required? Of an individual, faith of course! That was clearly revealed as early as Gen 15:6, a faith like Abraham but is that what is in view? Clearly verse 23 says, **'I never knew you; DEPART FROM ME, YOU WHO PRACTICE LAWLESSNESS.'** The scribes and Pharisees would be excluded from the kingdom (cf 5:20) but what I think is happening is Jesus is still warning His audience not to follow the scribes and Pharisees because the path they are going down is not going to end in the kingdom. Therefore they should follow Jesus and His teaching. That is the challenge in verse 24.

Therefore everyone who hears these words of Mine and acts on them, may be compared to a wise man who built his house on the rock. What words has Jesus spoken in this Sermon? The true interpretation of the Mosaic Law. Those who listen to His words and not only listen but also act on them or do them, are considered **wise**. **Wise** like a **man who built his house on the rock**. The critical component is the firmness of the foundation Jesus laid with His teaching of the Mosaic Law. This foundation was necessary for them to build their lives upon in order for the kingdom to come and for them to have a rich entrance into it. Note in verse 25 the firmness of this foundation. **And the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and slammed against that house; and yet it did not fall, for it had been founded on the rock.** Jesus' teachings of the Law were a firm foundation upon which to build one's life. If they did they would be classified as **wise**. The same Greek word is used in Matt 25:1-13 in the parable of the ten virgins, five of whom were wise and five of whom were foolish. Only the five wise virgins were prepared to enter the kingdom. The two passages teach the same lesson.

Note the other group in verse 26, **Everyone who hears these words of Mine and does not act on them, will be like a foolish man who built his house on the sand.** Sand is a shifting foundation. The only alternative to building their lives on the rock of Jesus' teachings of the Law was to erect their lives on the shifting sands of the scribes and Pharisees teaching. Such an endeavor would be foolish because it would not supply the righteousness necessary for the kingdom to come and for them to have a rich entrance into it. Verse 27 says, **The rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and slammed against that house; and it fell-and great was its fall.** The clear teaching is that to build one's life on the foundation of the scribes and Pharisees, which was essentially a false religion, would result in a devastating end. The devastating end in the two prior illustrations was judgment prior to the kingdom that resulted in not entering the kingdom. That generation was being given an opportunity to be wise by hearing and acting on Jesus' teachings. If they did they would be building on the rock that remained in the kingdom; if not they would foolishly be building on the sand and face judgment prior to the kingdom.

Verse 28, **When Jesus had finished these words, the crowds were amazed at His teaching; Why were they astonished?** Verse 29 explains, **For He was teaching them as one having authority, and not as their scribes.** In part this astonishment must have been due to His claim in verse 21 of being equal with the Father, having come from heaven and therefore being the final judge for kingdom entrance. Such a claim would mean He was the ultimate authority. To quote scribe after scribe as a typical scribe taught would not enhance His authority but negate it. Farrar describes their teaching in the time of Christ as follows; "Secondhandedness, the slavish dependence on precedent and authority, is the most remarkable characteristic of Rabbinical teaching. It very rarely rises above the level of a commentary..."⁶ Jesus' teaching required no dependence on precedent or authority. He was the self-attesting authority. Shepard says, "It was different from the sermons of the Scribes which they were accustomed to hearing. Specimens of these discourses in the Mishna and Gemara show that they were dull collections of disjointed comments on many subjects. Their teachings were narrow, dogmatic, second-hand, having no freshness, force, or power to move the heart to emotion or the will to action. They dealt with the minutiae of mint, anise, cumin, the length of fringes and breadth of phylacteries, thus neglecting the weightier matters and vital subjects. The sermon of Jesus, quite to the contrary, with a swift intuitive insight pierced to the depths of the human heart, stirring the conscience and moving the will to action."⁷ It is no wonder that in 8:1 "large crowds followed Him" down the mountain. They had never heard such teaching.

In conclusion, the nation Israel had a choice to make; their King had come, the kingdom offer was on the table, they could continue to follow the established religious leadership or repent and follow Jesus. Jesus insists that if they continued to follow the established leadership it would end in judgment but if

they repented and followed Him it would result in a rich entrance into the kingdom. They had a choice to make.

What can we say by way of final application? In the church there is also an established leadership; voices that are known around the world, whether John MacArthur, R. C. Sproul, Billy Graham, Joel Osteen or countless others. We should evaluate this leadership according to Scripture by comparing their teachings with Scripture. In the end we should follow the Scriptures. If we do it will result in a well-done good and faithful servant at the judgment seat of Christ and a rich entrance into the kingdom when we return with Christ to reign on earth.

¹ Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 175.

² Carson cited by Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 175.

³ Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 137.

⁴ Barbieri agrees saying, God "...did not lower His standard to accommodate humans; instead He set forth His absolute holiness as the standard. Though this standard can never be perfectly met by man himself, a person who by faith trusts in God enjoys His righteousness being reproduced in his life." Louis A. Barbieri, Jr., "Matthew," in *The Bible Knowledge Commentary: An Exposition of the Scriptures*, ed. J. F. Walvoord and R. B. Zuck, vol. 2 (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1985), 32.

⁵ Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 117.

⁶ Farrar quoted by Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 189.

⁷ Shepard quoted by Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 188-9.