

Jesus Silences the Pharisees

📖 Matthew 22:34-46

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 August 17, 2016

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Leading up to the final week of Jesus, He and His disciples entered Bethany on Saturday night and had dinner with Mary, Martha and Lazarus. On that night Mary anointed His body in preparation for burial. On Sunday the crowds gathered at Bethany to see Lazarus and discovered Jesus had arrived. He went into Jerusalem and briefly looked into the Temple. On Monday, He entered in the procession known as the Triumphal Entry, but it was not a triumph in the sense that He was received and enthroned as King. On Tuesday, He cursed the fig tree which represented 1st century Israel who showed external promise of fruit but was barren. He then entered and cleansed the Temple, healing the lame and the blind. On Wednesday, the Pharisees had conspired against Him and so when He entered the Temple and began to teach they confronted Him as to the source of His authority. They did not really want to know. They only wanted to have cause to arrest and execute Him. He answered in the form of rabbinic debate with a question that if they agreed to answer then He would tell them the source of His authority. His question about John's baptism put them in a straightjacket and so they would not answer. He then gave the three parables directed at the religious leaders; the parable of the two sons showed the blatant rejection, the parable of the landowner showed God's continued stretching out to them and their continual rejection and the consequent postponement of the kingdom, the parable of the wedding feast showed God's intense displeasure and His soon destruction of Jerusalem and the sending of another invitation to attend the kingdom. This invitation would go to any and all who would come.

Then, beginning in 22:15 Matthew recounts how Jesus silenced the Herodians, the Sadducees and the Pharisees all in the same day. We start in verse 15 with the plot between the Pharisees and the Herodians, two groups that were usually opposed to one another. But Jesus was a threat to both groups and so they allied to oppose Him. In 22:15 the Pharisees plotted maliciously to cause Jesus to fall into a snare from which He could not escape. In 22:16 they sent their disciples who were spies, along with the Herodians, and said, "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." This was spoken in flattery in order to get Jesus to lower His guard. In 22:17 they said, "Tell us then, what do You think? Is it lawful to give a poll-tax to Caesar, or not?" The poll-tax was a controversy among the Jews at the time. It was a litmus test for one's sentiments toward Rome. They reasoned that if Jesus sided with Rome then it would isolate

Him from the majority of Israel but if He sided with the majority of Israel then it would set Him against Rome. Either way they thought He would fall into the trap and be unable to escape. However, in 22:18, Jesus perceived their malice and said, "Why are you testing Me, you hypocrites?" The word testing involves the idea of trapping Him contrary to their smooth words. Therefore, they were hypocritical in their approach. He now used this question as an opportunity to teach a lesson. In 22:19 He said bring me the coin used to pay the poll-tax. They brought Him a denarius, the small silver coin used to pay the poll-tax. In 22:20 He asked, "Whose likeness and inscription is this?" In 22:2 they said Caesar's. He then replied, "Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and render to God the things that are God's." In other words, they had two spheres of obligation. They were living in the times of the Gentiles and God had granted sovereignty to the Gentile nations until the kingdom of God comes. Therefore, during this period they had two obligations in distinct spheres, an obligation to God and an obligation to the Gentile government under which they lived. Their poor theology could not solve the apparent dilemma but the right theology easily solves the dilemma. In 22:22, they were amazed at His answer. The words "leaving Him" refer to their physical departure. The words "they went away" mean they never tested Him again. Jesus was too skilled with the text of Scripture to ensnare and they knew that if they continued to challenge Him He would punch more holes in their poor theology. The bottom line is their testing had evil intent because they were rejecting Him.

In 22:23, the Sadducees thought they would take a stab at Him. This was the same day. In 22:23 Matthew sets the stage by noting that the Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection of the dead. The resurrection was a common dispute between the Sadducees and the Pharisees as was the existence of angels and spirits. The Pharisees held to all of these while the Sadducees held to none. However, the Pharisees doctrine of resurrection was not orthodox. They believed that in the resurrection all the material sensualities and relationships of this world would continue. Thus, marriage was a resurrection reality for them. The Sadducees thought this was absurd, and rightly so. They wrongly assumed that Jesus held to the Pharisaic view of resurrection and so they used a common argument to try and trip Him up. In 22:24 the argument is based on the Law of Moses which taught that if an older brother died before having an heir, leaving his wife a widow, then his younger brother, if unmarried, should marry her and raise up children for him. This would show love for the brother and kindness to the widow. In v 25, 26 and 27 they state an extreme application of this law where the first brother died and then the second and then the third, all the way down to the seventh. Since they all married her, in 22:28, whose wife of the seven would she be in the resurrection? The Pharisees could never give a good answer to this question because of their fallacious doctrine of resurrection. But in 22:29 Jesus did have an answer. He said you don't understand the Word of God and you don't understand the power of God. In 22:30 He explains how they did not understand the power of God. In effect, He says, if God can create angels who do not procreate then why can He not resurrect humans so they don't procreate? Since they had not considered this it showed they did not understand the power of God. In 22:31-32 He addressed how they did not understand the Word of God. In effect, He says, that when God said to Moses in Exod 3:6, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God

of Jacob," it implied resurrection, because these men had died centuries before and yet God was still their God. Therefore, these men existed as living spirits awaiting the day of resurrection. In 22:33 the crowds were astonished by this teaching because it so easily answered the Sadducees and yet it was not the Pharisaic doctrine of resurrection. 22:34 says this silenced the Sadducees. They had attempted to show Him to be a fool but they were shown to be the fools. It was too dangerous for them to continue to challenge them so they never did again.

So both the Herodians and the Sadducees had tried to trap Him so far. Why does Matthew include this in his argument? To show that the leaders of every group of Israel rejected Jesus. And by this it is important to remember that as goes the leadership of Israel so go the people. These were two minority groups, but they had their followings and the people would follow their lead in rejecting Him.

Today we come to Matt 22:34 and here we find the majority group, the Pharisees. They dominated every aspect of Jewish society. In 22:34 they **heard that Jesus had silenced the Sadducees**. Without question we can be certain they were happy about this. The parallel in Mk 12:28 says that "one of the scribes" recognized that Jesus had "answered" the Sadducees "well." We don't know if He agreed exactly with Jesus' argument that there was no marriage in the resurrection, but he did recognize that Jesus' answer resolved the apparent dilemma. Because of this he wanted to question Jesus further. The Matthew account says the Pharisees **gathered themselves together**. The Greek expression *συνήχθησαν επι το αυτο* is identical to the LXX of Ps 2:2 where it says, "And the rulers take counsel together..." Since the context of Ps 2:2 is antagonistic then their gathering themselves together here is most likely a plot to destroy Jesus.

In 22:35, the man who took the lead was **a lawyer**, stated in Mk 12:28 to be "one of the scribes." The scribes were almost exclusively, if not exclusively, from among the Pharisees. This man was an expert in the Mosaic Law. Constable said, "He would have been a teacher of the Old Testament who was particularly learned in both theology and law."¹ He worked with the most difficult and perplexing questions of the Mosaic law and how it reconciled with the oral law. He had recognized in Jesus' answer to the Sadducees His wisdom. Still verse 35 says he **asked Him a question, testing Him**, implying that he had mal-intent though Toussaint did not think he asked "with malicious intent."² He thinks he asked only to find out more about Jesus Christ.

In either case, in verse 36 he asked, **Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?** His address of Jesus as **Teacher** is an address of respect but it is unclear if it is true respect or hypocritical. His question, **which is the great commandment in the Law?** was a sticky wicket among the Pharisees. Walvoord said, "...there was controversy concerning which of the Ten Commandment was the greatest, some favoring the third."³ Carson said, "The scene is like an ordination council where the candidate is doing so well that some of the most learned ministers ask him questions they themselves have been unable to answer—in the hope of tripping him up or finding answers."⁴ In reality Vincent is probably correct in framing the issue from the Pharisaic point of view. He said, "The scribes declared that there were 248 affirmative precepts, as many as the members of the human

body; and 365 negative precepts, as many as the days in the year; the total being 613, the number of letters in the Decalogue. Of these they called some *light* and some *heavy*.⁵ By *light* and *heavy* they mean of lesser importance and greater importance. Because they classified the various laws as of lesser and greater importance they may be asking Jesus how one decides.

No matter what exactly the lawyer intended, Jesus cut straight to the chase in 22:37 saying, **“You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.”** This is a quote from the OT. Where does it come from? Deut 6:5. J. Vernon McGee said, “Notice that He did not pick any one of the Ten Commandments.” However, what is this commandment? It is a summary of the first division of the Ten Commandments. The Ten Commandments may be divided into those which relate to Israel’s responsibility to God and those which relate to Israel’s responsibility to their fellow Israelite. Barbieri said, “The first summarizes the first table of the Law, and the second summarizes the second table.”⁶ The first is a summary of their relationship to God. It summarized the commandments; You shall have no other God’s beside Me... You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain... Remember the Sabbath. If an Israelite did these things they were loving the **the Lord... God with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the mind**. So by quoting Deut 6:5 Jesus did not quote any one of the Ten Commandments but He did quote a summary of the first division of the Ten Commandments. What does the commandment mean? It means the Jews were to love God with their entire being. The divisions of heart, soul and mind are not meant to be a way of dividing man into three parts. As Constable said, “The terms “heart,” “soul,” and “mind” are not completely distinct, watertight categories. They overlap somewhat and together cover the whole person.”⁷ The Jews were to love the Lord their God with their entire being.

Jesus says in 22:38, **This is the great and foremost commandment**. By saying **the great and foremost** He is cutting through all the Pharisaic discussion of laws of lesser and greater importance and cutting straight to the chase. The Greek construction signifies that this one commandment is not only of the **great** category but it is also the **foremost**, that is, it stands at the head of all the commandments. The reason is clear, all the other laws relating to their relationship to God are summed up in this one commandment.

In 22:39 He gives additional information saying, **The second is like it, ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’** This is another quote from the OT. Where does it come from? Lev 19:18. Again, does this come from the Ten Commandments? No. But it is a summary of the second division of the Ten Commandments; those which relate to Israel’s responsibility to their fellow Israelites. This division said: Honor your father and mother, you shall not murder, you shall not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not bear false witness, you shall not covet your neighbor’s things and you shall not covet your neighbor’s wife. If an Israelite was doing all these things he was loving his **neighbor as himself**. What does this commandment mean? Jesus explained in Matt 7:12 that it means “treat people the same way you want them to treat you.” This should be obvious but

because humans are sinful they treat others harshly and want others to treat them kindly. This is a great contradiction in men.

Jesus said this is the **second** great **commandment**. By saying it is **second** it is only less than the **first**. Therefore, their first responsibility was always to God, then their second responsibility was to their fellow Israelite. The order is critical. By application man's first responsibility is always to God, it is a theological responsibility, then man's second responsibility is to his fellow man, it is a social responsibility. If man fails in his first responsibility, he will fail in his second responsibility. If there is not theological responsibility in forming a relationship with God, then the social relationships will fail dramatically. Put another way, one cannot repair his own home or society without first repairing his theology. God must always come first. We are made chiefly for a relationship with God and only secondarily for a relationship with other men.

In 22:40 Jesus concluded, **On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets.** The **Law and the Prophets** refer to the entire OT. The word **depend** comes from the Greek word *κρεμαννυμι* and means "to hang." Jesus is saying the whole OT hangs on **these two commandments**. If one of these falls then all their dealings with respect to God or man would also fall. In this way the Law is seen to be a unit. James agrees, for if you keep the whole law and yet stumble in one point, you are guilty of all! Constable explained it this way. "The rest of the Old Testament hangs from or flows out of these two commandments. All the other laws deal with specific applications of one or the other of these commands."⁸ Put practically, if one fulfilled these two commandments he fulfilled the whole OT. He was loving God and loving his fellow man. He couldn't be worshipping idols or he couldn't be using God's name in a wrong way because that wouldn't be loving God. He couldn't be committing murder or he couldn't be committing perjury because that wouldn't be loving his fellow man. And that goes for those of us in the Church too (Rom 13:8ff; James 2; et. al.).

Now Matthew did not record the response of the lawyer but the parallel in Mark 12:32 says that he said, "Right, Teacher; You have truly stated..." And "when Jesus saw that he had answered intelligently, He said to him, "You are not far from the kingdom of God." The reason this lawyer was not far from the kingdom of God was because he was not far from realizing that one could not keep the entire law and so must come to God by faith in Jesus as the Messiah. Pentecost said, "The one who so properly understood the requirements of the law must have realized that no person could fulfill those requirements. Surely that one would consequently come to Christ to receive the salvation that He offered."⁹ It is that topic that Jesus now turns to as He asks them a question of His own.

The issues they brought up were what does the Bible teach about taxes? What does it teach about the resurrection? And what is the great commandment? As important as those questions may be the greatest question is what does the Bible teach about the Messiah? That is what He chose to ask them. In 22:41, **Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question:** ⁴²**"What do you think about the Messiah, whose son is He?"** The Pharisees **said to Him, "The son of David."** This was a standard answer. In

1 Chron 17:11 the prophet Nathan told David that he would go to the grave but one of his distant descendants would be established in the kingdom forever on the Davidic throne forever in the Temple forever. In Isa 11:1 it was revealed that “a shoot will spring from the stem of Jesse, And a branch from his roots will bear fruit.” In Jer 23:5 the LORD declares “I will raise up for David a righteous branch; And He will reign as king and act wisely And do justice and righteousness in the land.” The Pharisees viewed these passages as Messianic. They viewed Messiah as the human **son of David**. Even a small Jewish child would be able to answer this question correctly. It is true that the Messiah was to be a true human. They must have thought this was an easy question.

Now, however, Jesus gives them a more difficult question. Verse 43, **“Then how does David in the Spirit call Him ‘Lord,’ saying, ‘The Lord said to my Lord, Sit at My right hand, Until I put Your enemies beneath Your feet’”? 45 If David then calls Him ‘Lord,’ how is He his son?”** This quote comes from where in the OT? Ps 110:1. Psalm 110 was universally recognized by the Jews to be Messianic. The problem was that if the Messiah was simply a human son of David then why did David refer to Him as his Lord? As Pentecost said, “It was not natural for one to call his own son “my Lord.”¹⁰ And besides, the Messiah to come from David was not born in David’s day. So how then could David refer to the Messiah as his Lord before His birth? The Pharisees had no trouble affirming that the Messiah was a true human, and in that they were correct, but they did not hold that the Messiah was to be truly God, and in that their view of Messiah was deficient.

The problem is an acute one because note how Jesus presses the point saying **David** said this **in the Spirit**. In other words, David didn’t say this on his own accord but He was carried along by the **Spirit** of God when he uttered this. This was inspired Scripture.

In the original Ps 110, what David said employed two different Hebrew words translated **Lord**. The first one is YHWH and the second one is Adonai. These are both names of God. Yet there was a distinction in God. The first Lord is the Hebrew YHWH and He is pictured as talking to the second Lord, who in the Hebrew is Adonai. It was the second Lord, Adonai, that David said is my Lord. This meant that David recognized Adonai as superior to himself. Yet everyone recognized that this Adonai was the Messiah. So Jesus is asking in verse 45, **If David calls the Messiah Adonai, a title for God, how is He his son?** Well, they couldn’t answer. They had a correct view that the Messiah was to be a true human descended from David but that alone was a deficient view of Messiah because the OT taught that the Messiah is also true divinity, Adonai. Pentecost summarizes, “The fact that Messiah was David’s Son testified to Messiah’s true humanity, but the fact that David called Him “my Lord” testified to His true and undiminished deity, for *Lord* was a title for Deity.”¹¹

We need to make three or four theological points here. First, the passage affirms that Messiah is true humanity. Jesus never challenged that notion. He is a true human that as Paul explains “came in the likeness of sinful flesh.” That is to say that He is a true human devoid of a sinful nature. The sin nature is not a necessary component of true humanity, it is an addendum to true humanity that was acquired by Adam and Eve at the Fall and transmitted to each human by the father at conception through procreation. Jesus, in the virgin birth, avoided

this transmission. As such He is true human but devoid of a sinful nature. Second, the passage affirms the pre-existence of Messiah. If Messiah was present in David's day then the Messiah was present before His birth. This proves the pre-existence of Messiah. Third, the passage affirms that Messiah is undiminished deity. The Greek translation of Ps 110:1 in verse 44 translates both Lord's by the same word *κυριος*, making YHWH and Adonai of the Hebrew OT equal in essence to one another. The second person is the Messiah and He is equal in essence to God. David's Lord, your Lord and my Lord. There should be no question that Jesus is God and took to Himself true humanity in the incarnation. Fourth, if there are two who are referred to as God, as here and in Ps 110:1, and yet God is one, then logically God must be a unity of essence with a diversity of Person within that essence. This is Trinitarianism, over and against the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Mormons, Muslims, Judaism and every other cult that denies the deity of Jesus and the Trinity. The Father and the Son share the same essence. There is but one God, but within that God there are three distinct Persons. This is taught in the OT and developed in the NT. Fifth, the statement that David said this in the Spirit is confirmation that Jesus believed in the inspiration of the OT. This doctrine teaches that men did not write Scripture as an act of their own will but were carried along by the Spirit such that the end result is the very word of God.

In 22:46, **No one was able to answer Him a word, nor did anyone dare from that day on to ask Him another question.** That did it. They thought they would trap Him but repeatedly He trapped them. They had raised many trivial questions; about taxes, about resurrection, about the greatest commandment. But He raised the ultimate One? What do you say about Messiah? Who do you say that I am? When Jesus had asked the disciples this Peter did not hesitate to say, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the living God." The Pharisees theology would not permit them to say this. If they did they would have to admit that Jesus, who claimed to be God and was a descendant of David, was the Messiah. This they would not do! J. Dwight Pentecost made a big deal out of this. He argued that in the Gospels and in secular history you don't once see the Pharisees or Sadducees arguing that Jesus could not be the Messiah because He wasn't a son of David. It's an argument from silence but the silence is deafening. If they had wanted to discredit His claim to be Messiah all they had to do was show that He was not a son of David. This they never did because He was registered at the Temple as a Son of David through Mary and Joseph and they knew this. On top of that He claimed to be God and they rejected the claim saying it was blasphemy. But Ps 110:1 taught that Messiah was to be God. And when confronted with this verse they had not one single word to say.

And **from that day on** we read no one **dared ask Him another question.** It was silence. And that is the way it is going to be when people stand before Christ and have to give an answer. They will have no answer. It will be silence. Jesus is simply too skilled with the text of the word of God. Look what He did to these guy's theology in two sentences. He demolished it to the point they didn't want to discuss the Bible with Him anymore. And if you run into that, where someone refuses to discuss on the basis of the Bible, you are not seeing antagonism against yourself, you are seeing antagonism against God. They don't have an answer and they don't want to believe the word of God. They want to go on believing whatever they want to believe. And it's sad, but it's true, they are a

law unto themselves, they are their own god. But it's interesting, in the parallel of Mark 12:37 it adds that "the large crowd enjoyed listening to Him." They enjoyed seeing the Pharisees stumped by the word of God. It's hard to tell but it seems they got a kick out of it.

Why is this included in Matthew's argument? To show the rejection of the leadership. And as go the leadership of Israel so go the people. They said no to the greatest person ever to walk the planet.

In summary, in 22:34 when the Pharisees heard that Jesus had silenced the Sadducees they were pleased but they gathered together in opposition to destroy Him. In 22:35, one of the experts in the law who had overheard His wise answer to the Sadducees asked Him a question which appears to be malicious, asking in 22:36, "Teacher, what is the great commandment in the Law?" This probably means something like what is the criteria for establishing which laws are of greater importance. This was a debate among the Pharisees, one they could not solve. It is like a professor asking a student to solve something he and his fellow professors cannot solve. Little did they know what they were up against. In 22:37 Jesus answered with Deut 6:5, "You shall love the Lord your God with your entire being." This is a summary of the first table of the Ten Commandments. In 22:38, this is the great commandment, and not only that but the foremost, the one that stands at the head of all others. In 22:39 He adds, the second is like it, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself." You are to treat them as you want them to treat you. In 22:40 He says, "on these two commandments hang the entire OT." This is what it comes down to in a nutshell, love for God and love for one's neighbor, one's theological relationship and one's social relationship. But in reality this is all fun and games, it's trivia in the grand scheme, and so in 22:41 Jesus asked them a question that gets right to the heart of the issue. 22:42, "What do you think about the Messiah, whose son is He?" They gave the classic answer any Hebrew child could give, "The son of David." In 22:43 He presents the challenge which shows the deficiency of their handling of the OT. "Then how does David, under inspiration of the Spirit call Him God, saying, "YHWH said to Adonai, Sit at My right hand, Until I put Your enemies beneath Your feet?" If David then calls Messiah Lord, how is Messiah his son?" It's not sufficient to simply say Messiah is the son of David. It must also be said that Messiah is God. They would not say this because they did not want to say that Jesus' claims to be God were in line with His Davidic sonship. That was the end of it. The crowds enjoyed listening to Him but no one dared to ask Him another question from that day on. He was just too dangerous with the Scriptures and that is how you want to be, just like Jesus, dangerous with the Scriptures. It's a sword, the sword of the Spirit and you want to be able to wield it like Jesus. You are to know and live this book...there are no excuses.

In conclusion, what kinds of applications can we make? First, if someone asked you to summarize what the OT taught God wanted from man what would you say? Love God and love your fellow man. Everything else is an outworking of these two commandments. But you see, that's supposed to bring you to the logical conclusion that you don't do this all the time. And that is to drive you to faith. You see, that lawyer was not far from the

kingdom of God because he knew what God requires and he probably realized he did not meet the requirement. Jesus Christ alone met the requirement and through faith in Him we meet the requirement. Second, these two commandments still apply for believers in the Church age. We're not under the Law of Moses. That Law is unit and as such it has been rendered inoperative by the death of Christ. But many of those laws are repeated under the Law of Messiah and that we are under. Both of these, of course, are repeated. And so love God chiefly. That means in John 14:15 to keep His commandments. If you love Me, you will keep My commandments. The fortunate thing is that we have something that the Old Testament believers did not have to help us keep His commandments, we have the enabling of the Holy Spirit. This is the greater grace of John 1:16-17 and when we walk by the Spirit we fulfill the righteous requirement of the Law. And to love one's neighbor. We love all men and do good to them but especially those of the household of God. Do you treat others as you would have them treat you? Why do you treat them in one way and desire them to treat you in a different way? That is a great and troubling problem, even among Christians. The Law of Messiah says we are to treat others better than ourselves and to put others before ourselves. This life is about serving others, not being served by others. You are not kings and queens yet. Oh, says Paul, that I wish we were kings together, but that is something related to rewards in the kingdom to come. As for now, service! Third, are you going to allow the text to inform your theology or your theology to inform the text. You always end up with troubling passages when you bring your theology to the text and try to fit the text into that window. That's the wrong way and yet that is what 99% of Christian theology and denominations and people are doing. I see it all day long every day I'm in study. They trivialize the momentous and complicate the obvious in order to support what they want to believe. It is a dangerous game people are playing with the text. Don't play that game. As Walvoord said, "Their hypocrisy and unbelief led Jesus, in the next chapter, to denounce the scribes and Pharisees in unsparing language."¹² There are no excuses.

¹ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 22:35.

² Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 259.

³ John F Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 168.

⁴ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 22:35.

⁵ Vincent, *Word Studies*, 1:122.

⁶ 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), 73.

⁷ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 22:37.

⁸ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 22:40.

⁹ J Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 391.

¹⁰ J Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 391.

¹¹ J Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 391-2.

¹² John F Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 169.