

# Jesus Silences the Herodians and Sadducees

📖 Matthew 22:15-33

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 August 10, 2016

🌐 [fbgbible.org](http://fbgbible.org)

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Last time we finished the three parables that grew out of Jesus' conflict with the religious leaders in the Temple. As a consequence of their extreme rejection of the Messiahship of Jesus, their city, Jerusalem, would be burned and the kingdom's arrival on earth postponed. During the postponement the invitation to attend the kingdom would be offered to any and all who would come. All who receive the offer by faith are clothed in the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ and thereby qualified to enter into the kingdom when it comes. The kingdom will come when a future generation of Israel comes to repentance. At that time all who had faith will enter into the joy of the kingdom and those who did not have faith will be cast into outer darkness where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

Today we come to Matthew 22:15-46. It was the same day Jesus had the conflict with the religious leaders and spoke the three parables, Wednesday of Passion Week. It was the same place, the Temple Compound, where thousands of Jews had gathered. It was the same end, Jesus won. What occurs here are three doctrinal controversies with three different Jewish sects. There may have been other controversies leading up to these three but Matthew records these three as those that silenced once and for all every avenue of opposition. The first doctrinal controversy is with the Herodians in 22:15-22, the second is with the Sadducees in 22:23-33, and the third is with the Pharisees in 22:34-46. Matthew recorded these three controversies to show that all three of these Jewish sects rejected Jesus because He did not agree with their doctrinal positions. The problem was they came with preconceived notions of what the text taught but Jesus shows that their preconceived notions could not account for what the Scriptures actually stated quite plainly. The message is about the importance of handling Scripture correctly and not adding to, subtracting from or distorting the Scriptures as all false systems of theology do.

In 22:15 **Then the Pharisees went and plotted together how they might trap Him in what He said.** The Greek **plotted together** means they conspired. Their mal-intent is obvious from the fact that they **plotted**. The **plot** session was designed to find a way to **trap Him**. The Greek word **trap** is a hunting word that means "to set a snare" so as to secure an animal against escape. They wanted to set a snare that Jesus would fall into and could not escape. It would be through something **He said**. So they want Him to stumble in His speech.

In 22:16 **they sent their disciples to Him**. The Pharisees themselves did not go because Jesus would easily detect the snare so instead they **sent their disciples to Him**. The parallel in Luke 20:20 says they sent “spies who pretended to be righteous.” They were not righteous but they pretended to be. Then note those with whom they made an alliance; they came **along with the Herodians**. This is a different Jewish sect that the Pharisees usually opposed. They had radically different political and religious beliefs but here they make an unholy alliance. So what did these two groups believe?

On one hand, the **Pharisees** were a religious group of Jews that had come into existence during the Intertestamental Times. The word “Pharisee” means “separated one.” Originally the group had formed to maintain their separation from pagan Greek culture. This was a good thing. However, as time passed they allotted more authority to the traditions of the scribes than to the Mosaic Law itself. The result we see in the Gospels is that the Pharisees were more devoted to the traditions of the elders than to the word of God. Politically, they strongly opposed Rome and rejected paying taxes to Rome because they viewed it as accepting Gentile rule when God had set them free from Gentile rule at the Exodus.

On the other hand, the **Herodians** were a political group of Jews that had come to favor the rule of the Herod’s and cooperation with Roman authority. It was easier to just get along with the Romans. Because they supported the Herod’s they received support from Roman tax dollars. Therefore, the two groups were radically opposed to one another. Toussaint said, “Traditionally the Pharisees and Herodians were bitterly opposed to one another.” Why then did they join forces on this occasion? Toussaint said, “...their hatred for Christ is greater than their dislike of one another.”<sup>1</sup> Therefore, a major point of the pericope is to show the great hatred of Jesus the Messiah.

From vv 15-16 we gather that **the Pharisees** initiated the formation of a conspiracy to set a snare that Jesus would fall into and could not escape. This snare involved making an alliance with their bitter rivals, the **Herodians**, yet it was worth it because their opposition to Jesus the Messiah was greater than their opposition to one another.

In 22:16 they said to Him, “**Teacher, we know that You are truthful and teach the way of God in truth, and defer to no one, for You are not partial to any.**” Now what they are saying is true and this is a kind of backhanded compliment. Jesus did tell the truth, Jesus did teach the way of God in truth, Jesus did not defer to anyone and Jesus did not show partiality. But they didn’t believe it for a minute. This is pure flattery. They are trying to butter up Jesus, disarm Him so that He will lower His guard. One of Satan’s tactics is to get those who walk in the truth to lower their guard, flatter you so that he can trap you. That is what they are doing here. Walvoord said, “The Herodians, having paved the way in a manner they regarded as disarming Christ, then said,”<sup>2</sup> **Tell us then, what do You think? Is it lawful to give a poll-tax to Caesar, or not?**” Remember, the Herodians agreed with paying taxes to Rome. They actually benefited from them because they supported the Herod’s. But the Pharisees disagreed with paying taxes to Rome. They thought it admitted the right of Gentile

sovereignty and denied God's work at the Exodus. This was a controversy among the Jews. Pentecost said, "There was currently a controversy in Israel over this question."<sup>3</sup>

Now the particular tax in view here was the **poll-tax**. There were many other taxes that Rome enforced. For example, 20% tax on fruits and produce and other taxes on land. But the tax in question here was the one chosen as the snare. What was the **poll-tax**? The **poll-tax** was a small tax. As you see in verse 19 it was only "a denarius," which was a silver coin equivalent to a day's wages. It was levied by Rome on all women between the ages of 12 and 65 and all men between 14 and 65. Walvoord said, "The Pharisees had chosen the least of the taxes, but to pay it was to recognize Roman oppression, which was most unpopular with the Jews."<sup>4</sup> Constable said, "Paying the poll tax or head tax was a kind of litmus test of one's feelings toward Rome..."<sup>5</sup> So because it was the most unpopular tax among the Jews, however Jesus answered it would get Him in trouble, there would be no escape, or so they thought. If, on one hand, Jesus said it was **lawful to give a poll-tax to Caesar**, then Jesus would be siding with Rome and committing treason against Israel. This would alienate Him from the people of Israel and destroy His messianic expectations. However, on the other hand, if Jesus said it was unlawful **to give a poll-tax to Caesar** then He would be committing treason against Rome. This would pit Him against the authority and law of Rome. Either way He would be embroiled in controversy. According to the parallel in Luke 20:20, they expected Him to agree with the majority of Jews in order to salvage his popularity. This would mean committing treason against Rome. Then they could turn Him over to the Roman authorities and Rome would take care of Him.

However, in 22:18, **Jesus perceived their malice**. Even though the Pharisees sent their spies Jesus could perceive their evil intent. They had tried to flatter Him but He saw through the flattery to the issue at stake and said, "**Why are you testing Me, you hypocrites?**" The word **testing** is *πειραζω* and means "to test so as to cause to fall." They wanted Jesus to fall into their snare but Jesus detected the snare. He then referred to them as **hypocrites**. The Greek word **hypocrite** means "a play actor," "a pretender." They pretended to be curious about his beliefs but they were not really curious at all. As a result, He calls them out for what they really are, **hypocrites**. A. T. Robertson says, "This is the hardest word that Jesus has for any class of people and he employs it for these pious pretenders who pose as perfect."<sup>6</sup>

In 22:19 He says, **Show Me the coin used for the poll-tax**. By asking them to **Show Him the coin used for the poll-tax** He was drawing attention to the coin as an object lesson. **And so they brought Him a denarius**. The **denarius** was a small silver coin equivalent to a day's wages.

In 22:20 **And He said to them, "Whose likeness and inscription is this?" They said to Him, "Caesar's."** Caesar at the time was Tiberius. All emperor's had by this time taken the title **Caesar**. The image on the coin was most likely that of Tiberius. **Then He said to them, "Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's."** Now this answer was not what they were expecting. What Jesus essentially said was that the Jews had two obligations; an earthly obligation and a heavenly obligation. What they had done

was pitted the two against one another, thinking Jesus would have to side with one or the other. But what Jesus did was separate the two spheres and say they had an obligation to each. This was the biblical answer because the Jews were living in the times of the Gentiles as outlined by Daniel. God had given sovereignty to Gentile kingdoms and Jews were subservient to these Gentile kingdoms. Therefore, they had an obligation to pay taxes to these Gentile kingdoms. At the same time, they were still the people of God and therefore had an obligation to God. The two were not in opposition to one another but complemented one another. God had given them into the hands of Gentile powers and those who served in Rome's government were ministers of God. Therefore, they should honor and respect them and pay taxes to them while at the same time honoring and worshipping God. Neither the Herodians nor the Pharisees had the right point of view. They erected an absolute that was not an absolute and Jesus demolished it.

Now significantly, the way they phrased the question in verse 17 is different from the way Jesus answered it in verse 21. Note, they asked, "**Is it lawful to give a poll-tax,**" using the word *διδομι* to refer to "a charitable donation," whereas Jesus answered "**Therefore render to Caesar,**" using the intensive form *αποδιδομι* to refer to "an obligation." In effect Jesus said by paying the poll-tax you are not doing Rome a favor, you are fulfilling an obligation. By granting the Gentiles sovereignty, God had obligated the Jews to pay tribute to Gentile kingdoms and obey their commands. In Babylon Jeremiah had said over and over to the Jews, do not rebel against the King of Babylon or you will be destroyed but they would not listen to them. The bottom line is that they had an obligation to the earthly Gentile rulers and an obligation to God in heaven.

In 22:22, **Upon hearing this, they were amazed, and leaving Him, they went away.** Jesus handled the problem with ease from the biblical worldview. They had presented Jesus with a trap that they thought He would inevitably fall into and become ensnared. Jesus did not fall into the trap. They were **amazed** at His answer and **left Him**, in the sense of walking away, and **went away**, in the sense of never trying to set a trap for Him again.

Why is this included? Toussaint says, "This incident reveals the terrible enmity of the leaders of Israel for Jesus. Traditionally the Pharisees and Herodians were bitterly opposed to one another. But their hatred for Christ is greater than their dislike of one another. This episode also provided a means for the King to instruct His disciples in preparation for His absence. Although they were heirs of the kingdom, they were to maintain allegiance to their earthly rulers."<sup>7</sup> In like manner, we still live in the times of the Gentiles. God has granted sovereignty to Gentile nations and its ministers are ministers of God. That obligates us to obey our respective civil authorities. Therefore, to refuse to honor them and pay taxes to them is to disobey God and contribute to the increasing lawlessness of our age. This teaching is the background for Paul's exposition in Rom 13:1-7 on the Christian's relationship to the governing authorities, and especially honoring them and paying taxes. Therefore, render unto the government what belongs to the government and to God what belongs to God.

After dispensing of the Herodians, in 22:23-33, He is approached by the Sadducees and He dispenses with them. Out of interest, I gave a lesson on this passage years ago on Easter and Eleanor Wilpitz said this was her favorite Easter message of all time! Note in v 23, **On that day**, it was the same day, all of this happened on the same day. **On that day some Sadducees** and then note the parenthetical explaining one point of their belief system, namely, **(there is no resurrection)**. Now Matthew does not usually give parenthetical remarks to explain beliefs or customs among Jewish sects because he wrote to believing Jews who would already know these things. But he did here and we are the better for it since this gives the background for this doctrinal controversy with the Sadducees.

So who are the Sadducees? The Sadducees grew up during the intertestamental times as a reaction to the Pharisees. The Pharisees were “the separate ones,” they separated from society with strict rules and regulations recorded in oral law that went beyond the Scriptures. The Sadducees were “the destroyers,” they destroyed the Bible by limiting their beliefs to only what was explicitly taught in the Torah or Law so they could more easily adapt to Greek culture. Because they had different views on what Scriptures were authoritative and because they interpreted Scripture differently the two sects disagreed on every major point of doctrine. Acts 23:8 says “the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, nor an angel, nor a spirit, but the Pharisees acknowledge them all.” So these were some differences. In the 1<sup>st</sup> century milieu, the Pharisees were the majority and controlled the people of Israel, whereas the Sadducees were the minority and controlled only the Temple. When we come to the doctrine of resurrection the Sadducees official doctrine is expressed in the Talmud which says, “the real principle of the Sadducees was not that there was no resurrection, but only that it could not be proved from the Torah, or Law.” However, because they believed it could not be proved, in effect they said **there is no resurrection**.

Now the Pharisees did believe in the resurrection but their doctrine was a distortion of what the Bible really teaches about resurrection and this is what led to this challenge. You see, they thought Jesus sided with the Pharisees on this issue. Shepard says, “The current popular idea with reference to the future life was that the resurrection would restore to men their former bodies, appetites, passions, and the usual material conditions and relationships. This low...sensual conception of the future was the occasion and cause of the Sadducean ridicule and derision.”<sup>8</sup> So with the sensual concept of the resurrection as taught by the Pharisees in hand, in verse 23 the Sadducees **came to Jesus and questioned Him**, thinking that they could trap Him. A. T. Robertson said, “It was probably an old conundrum that they had used to the discomfiture of the Pharisees.”<sup>9</sup>

In verse 24 they address Him as **Teacher**, a respectful title, and then present Scripture, **Moses said, ‘If a man dies having no children, his brother as next of kin shall marry his wife, and raise up children for his brother.’** Where does this OT quote come from? Deut 25:5. This was from the Torah or Law, the first five books, and so they considered this passage to be the inspired and authoritative word of God. If we were to look at the full passage we would find that it teaches that if two brothers live on the same estate and the older brother is

married but dies before having an heir, and the younger brother is unmarried, he is to marry his dead brother's wife and the firstborn son is to assume the name of the dead brother so as to perpetuate his name and inheritance. Constable says, "This law encouraged the younger brother to marry his deceased brother's widow and have children by her. People considered the children born to be the older brother's heirs, and they would perpetuate his name in Israel."<sup>10</sup> To not fulfill this obligation was a disgrace because it did not respect the dead brother or provide for the welfare of the widow.

On the basis of this passage, in verse 25, the Sadducees present what they considered a conundrum for the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection. **Now there were seven brothers with us; and the first married and died, and having no children left his wife to his brother; so also the second, and the third, down to the seventh. Last of all, the woman died. In the resurrection, therefore, whose wife of the seven will she be? For they all had married her.**" Now you would think the real conundrum would be "Why did all these men die while married to this woman?" You would also think the third or fourth brother would get smart and refuse to marry the woman. But they present this very unlikely situation to make the point that resurrection is an absurdity because if she had been the wife of all seven then in the resurrection one woman would be married to seven men and that would be incest.

Now their question has some preconceived notions and that is what Jesus goes after and demolishes. In verse 29, **But Jesus answered and said to them, "You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God."** They were **mistaken** regarding two things. First, they did **not understand the Scriptures** and second, **they did not understand....the power of God.** Jesus refutes the second misunderstanding in verse 30. First, they did not understand...**the power of God.** Why? **For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.** The Pharisees taught that in the resurrection all the sensual realities of this world will continue. That would mean that marriage would continue in the resurrection world. If that were the case then the Sadducees had a point, **whose wife of the seven would she be?** The Pharisees could never answer but Jesus says that conception of resurrection is false. In the resurrection the human state is transformed into a different reality. Toussaint said, "...the fact that God could translate bodies into another existence was unknown to them."<sup>11</sup> **In the resurrection humans neither marry nor are given in marriage.** This was a doctrine of resurrection they were not familiar with but one that avoided the absurdity. Jesus also confirmed the existence of **angels** which they denied saying, **but are like angels in heaven. Angels** exist in a state where **they neither marry nor are given in marriage.** If this is a reality for angels why is it so difficult to imagine that it is a reality for humans in the resurrection? Is God not powerful enough to translate humans into that new reality of existence? Their first failure was to understand **the power of God** and it led to their mistaken disregard for the doctrine of resurrection.

Second, **they did not understand the Scriptures.** Jesus explains this in verse 31-32, **But regarding the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was spoken to you by God: <sup>32</sup>'I am the God of Abraham,**

**and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? He is not the God of the dead but of the living.**" This is a quote from the OT. Where does it come from? Exod 3:6. Is Exodus 3:6 a part of the Scriptures the Sadducees claimed to believe was the inspired word of God? Yes. Jesus didn't go to Scriptures in the Prophets that would have proved the resurrection. He could have, Isa 26:19 and Dan 12:2 certainly teach the resurrection. But they didn't believe the Prophets had the same authority as the Torah. And while they were wrong about that point, rather than dealing with every issue Jesus quoted from what they did consider to be authoritative and went to the greater issue, resurrection itself. What is the context of Exod 3:6? Moses and the burning bush. When God called to Moses He told him to come near and remove his sandals for the place he was standing was holy ground. He also said what Jesus quoted here, **'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'**? Now the Sadducees claimed to believe this Scripture. But did they understand this Scripture? When did **Abraham, Isaac** and **Jacob** live with respect to Moses? Abraham lived about 2000BC, Isaac about 1900BC and Jacob about 1850BC. When did Moses live? About 1450BC. So what's the difference in the time of their lives? Over 400 years. So what's the logic? If God is the **God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'** in the time of Moses, over 400 years after the deaths of **Abraham, Isaac** and **Jacob** then how can that be unless there is resurrection? That is why Jesus says, **He is not the God of the dead but of the living.** These men will be raised to partake of the kingdom. Resurrection is part and parcel of the Abrahamic Covenant which promised a kingdom. If there is no resurrection, then God will not fulfill the Abrahamic Covenant and if He does not fulfill the Abrahamic Covenant there will be no kingdom. The Sadducees **did not understand the Scriptures.**

In verse 33, **When the crowds heard this, they were astonished at His teaching.** They were **astonished** because this was a common problem cited by the Sadducees that was considered insurmountable and Jesus easily dismantled it. Verse 34 indicates that the Sadducees were silenced. They had no response. Walvoord said, "The Sadducees could not attack this statement of Christ without being in the position of attacking Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob. They were neatly trapped in their own hypocrisy."<sup>12</sup> It is a good reminder that when people present their arguments to God for not believing they will have to face His questions and they will not have an answer. Every mouth will be closed and every tongue will confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of the Father. There are no valid arguments for not believing. They are all easily answerable. If only we had the skill that Jesus had with the text...

Why is this pericope included? To show that, in addition to the Herodians, the sect of the Sadducees also opposed Jesus. Jesus did not come in the way of their doctrines. He did not come with their preconceived notions. He came in the way of the truth of the Scriptures and He obliterated their false doctrines from the very Scriptures they considered authoritative.

In summary, in one day Jesus silenced the Herodians, the Sadducees and the Pharisees. In 22:15 the Pharisees plotted maliciously to cause Jesus to fall into a snare which He could not escape. In 22:16 they sent their disciples who were spies to Him along with the Herodians, a sect of Jews who sided with the Herod's and were usually

their opponents. But in this case the greater opponent of both was Jesus. With flattery they say, "Teacher, we know that You are truthful and teach the way of God in truth, and defer to no one; for you are not partial to any." It was a lot of hot air and flattery to get Jesus to lower His guard. In 22:17 they say, "Tell us then, what do You think? Is it lawful to give a poll-tax to Caesar, or not?" This was a controversy that no matter how Jesus answered they thought would embroil Him in controversy and either isolate Him from the majority opinion that the tax should not be given or set Him against Roman authority. But in 22:18, Jesus perceived their malice and said, "Why are you testing Me, you hypocrites?" Jesus always had His guard up and knew they were trying to trap Him. In 22:19 He used the denarius, a small silver coin equal to the poll-tax, as an object lesson asking in 22:20, "Whose likeness and inscription is this?" In 22:2 they said Caesar's. Then He said, "Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's," using a word that means obligation, "and render to God the things that are God's." There are two spheres of obligation, not one, and one does not negate the other, this is still a commonly misunderstood teaching. In 22:22, they were amazed and left Him physically and went away so as to never test Him again for they had been ensnared in their own trap.

What lesson can we learn from that episode. First, the episode with the Herodians teaches us that coming with a false dichotomy between loyalty to God and loyalty to civil authorities will lead to false doctrine and application. God has given us an obligation to both civil authorities and Himself in their respective spheres. We are to render to the government what belongs to the government and we are to render to God what belongs to God. It is not one or the other. We may not like the governing officials but God says they are His ministers and we should honor them and pay our taxes. If we don't we are disobeying God. What they do with the taxes is between Him and them. Leave room for the wrath of God, God says, "Vengeance is Mine, I will repay." It is not our place to lead a crusade against the government. It is not our place to contribute to lawlessness. It is our place to render to the government what belongs to the government and render to God what belongs to God.

In the second pericope 22:23, the Sadducees came to Him on the same day. They did not believe in the resurrection of the dead and it was a common dispute between themselves and the Pharisees; the Pharisees holding to a malignant doctrine of resurrection that assumed all the material sensualities and relationships would continue. Assuming Jesus held to the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection they came to Him to trip Him up. In 22:24 they based their argument on a scripture from Moses regarding a younger brother marrying an older brother's widow and raising up children for him and in v 25, 26 and 27 stating an extreme situation where all seven brothers ended up marrying the woman. In 22:28 they asked, "In the resurrection, therefore, whose wife of the seven will she be? For they all had married her." This was an impossible question for the Pharisees to answer since they believed resurrection life included marriage and yet such a scenario would involve incest. But in 22:29 Jesus answered and said to them, "You are mistaken on two counts. First, you don't understand the Scriptures and second, you don't understand the power of God. In 22:30 the power of God is able to translate a human from a creature that marries and reproduces in this reality to a reality where he does not marry and reproduce. In this respect we are like angels in heaven. In 22:31-32 the Scriptures implicitly teach resurrection in the Torah or

Law where God said to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Since God is not the God of the dead but of the living then these men are presently spirit beings to be raised in conjunction with the second advent to enter into the kingdom covenanted to them.

What can we learn from this pericope? First, the episode with the Sadducees teaches us that rejecting a doctrine outright because someone misrepresents the doctrine is illegitimate. The Sadducees rejected the doctrine of resurrection because the Pharisees taught that in the resurrection all sensual pleasures would continue, including marriage. We should never reject a doctrine simply because someone misrepresents it. For example, the pre-trib rapture is often rejected because it is misrepresented as an escapist mentality that leads to lack of engagement in this world. Yet the true doctrine of the pre-trib rapture leads to an expectation mentality that leads to continual productivity and engagement in eager expectation of His arrival. (1 Thess 1:10). The point is we should never reject a doctrine outright because of a poor misrepresentation of it. We should believe what Scripture teaches about it. Second, the episode of the Sadducees also teaches us that we should read Scripture not just for its explicit statements but also for its implicit teachings. They rejected resurrection because there was no single verse in the Torah that explicitly taught resurrection. However, it was implicit in the Exodus text, "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." Therefore, they should have believed in the resurrection. This means there is a right way to read Scripture and leads to the third point. Third, the episode teaches us that we are accountable for reading Scripture correctly. Jesus held the Sadducees accountable for reading it correctly. "Did you not read," He asked? My question for all of you is, first, do you read it? You will be held accountable for reading it. If you are not reading it, you will have to give an answer. And second, do you understand what you are reading? You will be held accountable for understanding it. Jesus held the Sadducees accountable for understanding it. There are valid helps for this. Remember the Ethiopian eunuch riding in the chariot in Acts 8, and Philip came alongside of him and said, do you know what you are reading? He was reading Isa 53 and the eunuch said, "How can I unless someone guides me?" And Philip joined him in his chariot and opened his mouth and began to expound the Scriptures. That is what Dennis and I are here for. We are here to help guide you in understanding the Scriptures, to expound them. It is not easy to understand the Scriptures and so God has given gifted teachers to the Church to expound them. And the bottom line is this when it comes to Bible expositors; he who has the best Scriptural arguments wins. It's not a matter of who you like or don't like. It's a matter of who has the best Scriptural arguments and can validate them from Scripture. I would say there are a good number of Bible teachers and authors but there are not a good number of good Bible teachers and good authors. Actually I can recommend on one hand the books I would heartily recommend as thoroughly biblical. Other lesser points that could be made are fourth, angels neither marry nor are given in marriage, whether on earth or in heaven. That means that Gen 6 is not talking about an intermarriage between fallen angels and daughters of men. That would contradict the creation principle of reproducing after one's own kind. "Sons of God" is never used of fallen angels, only of good angels and believers. The context is man's sin and corruption, not angels. It doesn't fit the storyline and so forth and so on. That's a view I changed this year after a

lot of investigation. I now have about fifteen arguments against that view and I hope to expound it later this year on a Wednesday night. Fifth, individuals will be identifiable in the resurrection. Abraham will be Abraham, Isaac will be Isaac, Jacob will be Jacob, you will be you and I will be I. So you'll know people as they are but in a transformed existence.

---

<sup>1</sup> Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 257.

<sup>2</sup> John Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 166.

<sup>3</sup> Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 387.

<sup>4</sup> John Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 166.

<sup>5</sup> Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible*, Matt 22:16.

<sup>6</sup> A.T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1933), Mt 6:2.

<sup>7</sup> Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 257.

<sup>8</sup> Shepard, *The Christ*, p 500 cited by J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 389.

<sup>9</sup> A.T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1933), Mt 22:24.

<sup>10</sup> Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 22:24.

<sup>11</sup> Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 258.

<sup>12</sup> John Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 168.