

Matthew 22 Commentary

PREVIOUS

NEXT

CLICK VERSE


To go directly to that verse

Matthew 22:1
Matthew 22:2
Matthew 22:3
Matthew 22:4
Matthew 22:5
Matthew 22:6
Matthew 22:7
Matthew 22:8
Matthew 22:9
Matthew 22:10
Matthew 22:11
Matthew 22:12
Matthew 22:13
Matthew 22:14
Matthew 22:15
Matthew 22:16
Matthew 22:17
Matthew 22:18
Matthew 22:19
Matthew 22:20
Matthew 22:21
Matthew 22:22
Matthew 22:23
Matthew 22:24
Matthew 22:25
Matthew 22:26
Matthew 22:27
Matthew 22:28
Matthew 22:29
Matthew 22:30
Matthew 22:31
Matthew 22:32
Matthew 22:33
Matthew 22:34
Matthew 22:35
Matthew 22:36
Matthew 22:37
Matthew 22:38
Matthew 22:39
Matthew 22:40
Matthew 22:41
Matthew 22:42
Matthew 22:43
Matthew 22:44
Matthew 22:45
Matthew 22:46

MATTHEW CONTAINS 15 PARABLES 20 MIRACLES


KEY VERSES: 1:1 "The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham."

2:2 "Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him."




Click chart to enlarge
Charts from [Jensen's Survey of the NT](#) - used by permission
Another Chart from Swindoll

THE LIFE OF JESUS AS COVERED BY MATTHEW (shaded area)



Click chart to enlarge



Source: Borrow [Ryrie Study Bible](#)

Matthew 22:1 Jesus spoke to them again in parables, saying,

KJV Matthew 22:1 And Jesus answered and spake unto them again by parables, and said,

BGT Matthew 22:1 Κα ποκριθε ς ησο ς π λιν ε πεν ν παραβολα ς α το ς λ γων·

NET Matthew 22:1 Jesus spoke to them again in parables, saying:

CSB Matthew 22:1 Once more Jesus spoke to them in parables:

ESV Matthew 22:1 And again Jesus spoke to them in parables, saying,

NIV Matthew 22:1 Jesus spoke to them again in parables, saying:

NLT Matthew 22:1 Jesus also told them other parables. He said,

NRS Matthew 22:1 Once more Jesus spoke to them in parables, saying:

NAB Matthew 22:1 Jesus again in reply spoke to them in parables, saying,

YLT Matthew 22:1 And Jesus answering, again spake to them in similes, saying,

- Mt 9:15-17 12:43-45 13:3-11 20:1-16 Mt 21:28-46 Mk 4:33,34 Lu 8:10 Lu 14:16

Related Passages:

Matthew 21:45-46+ When the chief priests and the Pharisees heard His parables, they understood that He was speaking about them. When they sought to seize Him, they feared the people, because they considered Him to be a prophet.

The **ESV** translation is more accurate for it translates the Greek word for "and" (kai) which is left untranslated in NAS, NET, CSB, NLT, NIV, et al. And (kai) is a copulative and despite the arbitrary chapter division fits nicely with Mt 21:46 "When they sought to seize Him, they feared the people, because they considered Him to be a prophet." The "and" links the present parable with the response of the religious leaders to the previous parable. Jesus was undeterred by their desire to seize Him. As always He was in full control of the situation, and would "turn Himself over" to these evil men when He knew the time had arrived! Thus, the importance of translating the literal Greek as Young's Literal version does "And Jesus answering...."

Jesus spoke to them again in parables ([parabole](#)) , **saying** - Who is **them**? While there surely is a crowd surrounding Jesus as He is speaking (and presumably in the Temple complex for He never left that area in Matthew 21) ultimately this parable is directly to the "uncircumcised" ears of the Jewish religious elite who had been the "beneficiaries" of the previous 2 parables in response to their attempt to trap Him by asking who gave Him his authority (Mt 21:23+)? The adverb again (palin) indicates that He spoke "once more" to the crowd but again especially to the religious leaders.. He had first responded with a question to them about John the Baptist (Mt 21:24-27+) and then began teaching them the first of three parables (First, the Parable of the Two Sons = Mt 21:28-32+, followed by the Parable of the Vineyard Owner = Mt 21:33-46+).

THOUGHT - Even in judgment, there's grace in repetition. Jesus gives another chance to listen and understand and specifically to understand the danger of rejection His offer of salvation by grace through faith (Eph 2:8-9+).

Mark Moore points out that "This parable has several similarities to one told in Luke 14:15–24+. But they are told at different times, with different details and for different purposes. It simply does not seem reasonable to view them as stemming from the same "core" and being edited into their present form. Certainly Jesus was clever enough to create two entirely distinct parables from a single theme, especially one as common and rich as a "banquet." (Borrow [The chronological life of Christ page 162](#))

Parables (symbol) ([3850](#)) [parabole](#) from **para** = beside, near + **ballo** = throw, cast; English "parable") is literally a throwing beside or placing of one thing by the side of another (juxtaposition as of ships in battle in classic Greek). The metaphorical meaning is to place or lay something besides something else for the purpose of comparison. (Mt 24:32, Mk 13:28, Mk 3:23, Lk 14:7). An illustration (Mt 13:3). In Hebrews 9:9 the idea is of something (OT Tabernacle) that serves as a model or example pointing beyond itself for later realization and thus a type or a figure.

John MacArthur says **parabole** is "A spiritual or moral truth would often be expressed by laying it alongside, so to speak, a physical example that could be more easily understood. A common, observable object or practice was used to illustrate a subjective truth or principle. That which was well known was laid alongside that which was not known or understood in order to explain it. The known elucidated the unknown. The parable was a common form of Jewish teaching... Teaching through parables and other figurative means is effective because it helps make abstract truth more concrete, more interesting, easier to remember, and easier to apply to life. When a truth is externalized in the figures of a parable, the internalizing of moral and spiritual meaning is much easier. In the series of parables in chapter 13, Jesus uses such familiar figures as soil, seed, birds, thorns, rocks, sun, wheat, tares, mustard seed, leaven, hidden treasure, and a pearl. But in these

particular parables themselves the truth is not made clear, because the basic story tells nothing but the literal account, without presenting the moral or spiritual truth. It was only to His disciples that Jesus explained what the soil, the seed, the thorns, and the other figures represent. And an unexplained parable was nothing but an impossible riddle, whose meaning could only be guessed at." (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

Related Resources:

[Parable in Baker's Evangelical Dictionary of Biblical Theology](#)

[What is a parable? | GotQuestions.org](#)

Matthew Henry Concise Mt 22:1-14. The provision made for perishing souls in the gospel, is represented by a royal feast made by a king, with eastern liberality, on the marriage of his son. Our merciful God has not only provided food, but a royal feast, for the perishing souls of his rebellious creatures. There is enough and to spare, of every thing that can add to our present comfort and everlasting happiness, in the salvation of his Son Jesus Christ. The guests first invited were the Jews. When the prophets of the Old Testament prevailed not, nor John the Baptist, nor Christ himself, who told them the kingdom of God was at hand, the apostles and ministers of the gospel were sent, after Christ's resurrection, to tell them it was come, and to persuade them to accept the offer. The reason why sinners come not to Christ and salvation by him, is, not because they cannot, but because they will not. Making light of Christ, and of the great salvation wrought out by him, is the damning sin of the world. They were careless. Multitudes perish for ever through mere carelessness, who show no direct aversion, but are careless as to their souls. Also the business and profit of worldly employments hinder many in closing with the Saviour. Both farmers and merchants must be diligent; but whatever we have of the world in our hands, our care must be to keep it out of our hearts, lest it come between us and Christ. The utter ruin coming upon the Jewish church and nation, is here represented. Persecution of Christ's faithful ministers fills up the measure of guilt of any people. The offer of Christ and salvation to the Gentiles was not expected; it was such a surprise as it would be to wayfaring men, to be invited to a royal wedding-feast. The design of the gospel is to gather souls to Christ; all the children of God scattered abroad, John 10:16; 11:52. The case of hypocrites is represented by the guest that had not on a wedding-garment. It concerns all to prepare for the scrutiny; and those, and those only, who put on the Lord Jesus, who have a Christian temper of mind, who live by faith in Christ, and to whom he is all in all, have the wedding-garment. The imputed righteousness of Christ, and the sanctification of the Spirit, are both alike necessary. No man has the wedding-garment by nature, or can form it for himself. The day is coming, when hypocrites will be called to account for all their presumptuous intruding into gospel ordinances, and usurpation of gospel privileges. Take him away. Those that walk unworthy of Christianity, forfeit all the happiness they presumptuously claimed. Our Saviour here passes out of the parable into that which it teaches. Hypocrites go by the light of the gospel itself down to utter darkness. Many are called to the wedding-feast, that is, to salvation, but few have the wedding-garment, the righteousness of Christ, the sanctification of the Spirit. Then let us examine ourselves whether we are in the faith, and seek to be approved by the King.

Son ([5207](#)) (huios means "a son," primarily signifying the relation of offspring to parent, is used of the "foal" of an ass in Matt. 21:5.

Vine- primarily signifies the relation of offspring to parent (see John 9:18-20; Gal. 4:30. It is often used metaphorically of prominent moral characteristics (see below). "It is used in the NT of (a) male offspring, Gal. 4:30; (b) legitimate, as opposed to illegitimate offspring, Heb. 12:8; (c) descendants, without reference to sex, Rom. 9:27; (d) friends attending a wedding, Matt. 9:15; (e) those who enjoy certain privileges, Acts 3:25; (f) those who act in a certain way, whether evil, Matt. 23:31, or good, Gal. 3:7; (g) those who manifest a certain character, whether evil, Acts 13:10; Eph. 2:2, or good, Luke 6:35; Acts 4:36; Rom. 8:14; (h) the destiny that corresponds with the character, whether evil, Matt. 23:15; John 17:12; 2 Thess. 2:3, or good, Luke 20:36; (i) the dignity of the relationship with God whereinto men are brought by the Holy Spirit when they believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 8:19; Gal. 3:26.

"The Apostle John does not use huios, 'son,' of the believer, he reserves that title for the Lord; but he does use teknon, 'child,' as in his Gospel, John 1:12; 1 John 3:1, 2; Rev. 21:7 (huios) is a quotation from 2 Sam. 7:14.

"The Lord Jesus used huios in a very significant way, as in Matt. 5:9, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God,' and Matt. 5:44, 45, 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be (become) sons of your Father which is in heaven.' The disciples were to do these things, not in order that they might become children of God, but that, being children (note 'your Father' throughout), they might make the fact manifest in their character, might 'become sons.' See also 2 Cor. 6:17, 18.

"As to moral characteristics, the following phrases are used: (a) sons of God, Matt. 5:9, 45; Luke 6:35; (b) sons of the light, Luke 16:8; John 12:36; (c) sons of the day, 1 Thess. 5:5; (d) sons of peace, Luke 10:6; (e) sons of this world, Luke 16:8; (f) sons of disobedience, Eph. 2:2; (g) sons of the evil one, Matt. 13:38, cp. 'of the Devil,' Acts 13:10; (h) son of perdition, John 17:12; 2 Thess. 2:3. It is also used to describe characteristics other than moral, as: (i) sons of the resurrection, Luke 20:36; (j) sons of the Kingdom, Matt. 8:12; Matt. 13:38;

(k) sons of the bridechamber, Mark 2:19; (l) sons of exhortation, Acts 4:36; (m) sons of thunder, Boanerges, Mark 3:17."* [* From Notes on Galatians, by Hogg and Vine, pp. 167-169, and on Thessalonians, pp. 158,159.]

Notes: (1) For the synonyms teknon and teknion see under CHILD. The difference between believers as "children of God" and as "sons of God" is brought out in Rom. 8:14-21. The Spirit bears witness with their spirit that they are "children of God," and, as such, they are His heirs and joint-heirs with Christ. This stresses the fact of their spiritual birth (Rom. 8:16, 17). On the other hand, "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God," i.e., "these and no other." Their conduct gives evidence of the dignity of their relationship and their likeness to His character. (2) Pais is rendered "son" in John 4:51. For Acts 13:13, 26 see below.

The Son of God

In this title the word "Son" is used sometimes (a) of relationship, sometimes (b) of the expression of character. "Thus, e.g., when the disciples so addressed Him, Matt. 14:33; Matt. 16:16; John 1:49, when the centurion so spoke of Him, Matt. 27:54, they probably meant that (b) He was a manifestation of God in human form. But in such passages as Luke 1:32, 35; Acts 13:33, which refer to the humanity of the Lord Jesus, ... the word is used in sense (a).

"The Lord Jesus Himself used the full title on occasion, John 5:25; John 9:35 [some mss. have 'the Son of Man'; see RV marg.]; Son 11:4, and on the more frequent occasions on which He spoke of Himself as 'the Son,' the words are to be understood as an abbreviation of 'the Son of God,' not of 'the Son of Man'; this latter He always expressed in full; see Luke 10:22; John 5:19, etc.

"John uses both the longer and shorter forms of the title in his Gospel, see John 3:16-18; John 20:31, e.g., and in his Epistles; cp. Rev. 2:18. So does the writer of Hebrews, Heb. 1:2; Heb. 4:14; Heb. 6:6, etc. An eternal relation subsisting between the Son and the Father in the Godhead is to be understood. That is to say, the Son of God, in His eternal relationship with the Father, is not so entitled because He at any time began to derive His being from the Father (in which case He could not be co-eternal with the Father), but because He is and ever has been the expression of what the Father is; cp. John 14:9, 'he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' The words of Heb. 1:3, 'Who being the effulgence of His (God's) glory, and the very image of His (God's) substance' are a definition of what is meant by 'Son of God.' Thus absolute Godhead, not Godhead in a secondary or derived sense, is intended in the title." * [* From Notes on Galatians, by Hogg and Vine, pp. 99, 100.]

Other titles of Christ as the "Son of God" are: "His Son," 1 Thess. 1:10 (in Acts 13:13, 26, RV, pais is rendered "servant"); "His own Son," Rom. 8:32; "My beloved Son," Matt. 3:17; "His Only Begotten Son," John 3:16; "the Son of His love," Col. 1:13.

"The Son is the eternal object of the Father's love, John 17:24, and the sole Revealer of the Father's character, John 1:14; Heb. 1:3. The words, 'Father' and 'Son,' are never in the NT so used as to suggest that the Father existed before the Son; the Prologue to the Gospel according to John distinctly asserts that the Word existed 'in the beginning,' and that this Word is the Son, Who 'became flesh and dwelt among us.'" * [* From Notes on Thessalonians, by Hogg and Vine pp. 46,47.]

In addressing the Father in His prayer in John 17 He says, "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the World." Accordingly in the timeless past the Father and the "Son" existed in that relationship, a relationship of love, as well as of absolute Deity. In this passage the "Son" gives evidence that there was no more powerful plea in the Father's estimation than that coeternal love existing between the Father and Himself.

The declaration "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee," Psa. 2:7, quoted in Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; Heb. 5:5, refers to the birth of Christ, not to His resurrection. In Acts 13:33 the verb "raise up" is used of the raising up of a person to occupy a special position in the nation, as of David in Acts 13:22 (so of Christ as a Prophet in Acts 3:22; Acts 7:37). The word "again" in the AV in Acts 13:33 represents nothing in the original. The RV rightly omits it. In Acts 13:34 the statement as to the resurrection of Christ receives the greater stress in this respect through the emphatic contrast to that in Acts 13:33 as to His being raised up in the nation, a stress imparted by the added words "from the dead." Accordingly ver. 33 speaks of His incarnation, ver. 34 of His resurrection.

In Heb. 1:5, that the declaration refers to the Birth is confirmed by the contrast in verse 6. Here the word "again" is rightly placed in the RV, "when He again bringeth in the Firstborn into the world." This points on to His Second Advent, which is set in contrast to His first Advent, when God brought His Firstborn into the world the first time (see FIRSTBORN).* [* The Western text of Luke 3:22 reads "Thou art My Son, this day have I

begotten Thee," instead of "Thou art My beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased." There is probably some connection between this and those early heresies which taught that our Lord's Deity began at His baptism.

So again in Heb. 5:5, where the High Priesthood of Christ is shown to fulfill all that was foreshadowed in the Levitical priesthood, the passage stresses the facts of His humanity, the days of His flesh, His perfect obedience and His sufferings.

Son of Man

In the NT this is a designation of Christ, almost entirely confined to the Gospels. Elsewhere it is found in Acts 7:56, the only occasion where a disciple applied it to the Lord and in Rev. 1:13; Rev. 14:14 (see below).

"Son of Man" is the title Christ used of Himself; John 12:34 is not an exception, for the quotation by the multitude was from His own statement. The title is found especially in the Synoptic Gospels. The occurrences in John's Gospel, John 1:51; John 3:13, 14; John 5:27; John 6:27, 53, 62; John 8:28 (John 9:35 in some texts); John 12:23, 34 (twice); John 13:31, are not parallel to those in the Synoptic Gospels. In the latter the use of the title falls into two groups, (a) those in which it refers to Christ's humanity, His earthly work, sufferings and death, e.g., Matt. 8:20; Matt. 11:19; Matt. 12:40; Matt. 26:2, 24; (b) those which refer to His glory in resurrection and to that of His future advent, e.g., Matt. 10:23; Matt. 13:41; Matt. 16:27, 28; Matt. 17:9; Matt. 24:27, 30 (twice), 37, 39, 44.

While it is a Messianic title it is evident that the Lord applied it to Himself in a distinctive way, for it indicates more than Messiahship, even universal headship on the part of One who is Man. It therefore stresses His manhood, manhood of a unique order in comparison with all other men, for He is declared to be of heaven, 1 Cor. 15:47, and even while here below, was "the Son of Man, which is in Heaven," John 3:13. As the "Son of Man" He must be appropriated spiritually as a condition of possessing eternal life, John 6:53. In His death, as in His life, the glory of His Manhood was displayed in the absolute obedience and submission to the will of the Father (John 12:23; John 13:31), and, in view of this, all judgment has been committed to Him, who will judge in full understanding experimentally of human conditions, sin apart, and will exercise the judgment as sharing the nature of those judged, John 5:22, 27.

Not only is He man, but He is "Son of Man," not by human generation but, according to the Semitic usage of the expression, partaking of the characteristics (sin apart) of manhood belonging to the category of mankind. Twice in the Apocalypse, Rev. 1:13; Rev. 14:14, He is described as "One like unto a Son of man," RV (AV, "... the Son of Man"), cp. Dan. 7:13. He who was thus seen was indeed the "Son of Man," but the absence of the article in the original serves to stress what morally characterizes Him as such. Accordingly in these passages He is revealed, not as the Person known by the title, but as the One who is qualified to act as the Judge of all men. He is the same Person as in the days of His flesh, still continuing His humanity with His Deity. The phrase "like unto" serves to distinguish Him as there seen in His glory and majesty in contrast to the days of His humiliation. (Online [Vine's Expository Dictionary](#))

Gilbrant ([Complete Biblical Library](#)) - Classical Greek - *huios* means "son" in the broadest sense in classical Greek. Thus it means not only "son" as in the male offspring of human parents but also "offspring" as in the offspring of animals or even plants. Neither is it restricted to meaning the offspring of the first generation, for it can be used of "grandchildren" or of "descendants" in general.

The relationship between a teacher and a student may also be conveyed in terms of the father-son relationship. In addition it can describe nationality (e.g., son of Achaia; cf. Braumann, "Child," Colin Brown, 1:287). Finally *huios* functions in a religious capacity, such as in the expressions "the sons of darkness" or "the sons of light" (ibid.).

Septuagint Usage - The understanding of *huios* in classical Greek closely parallels the understanding of *bēn*, "son," in Hebrew, an equivalency that occurs in the Septuagint no less than 4,800 times. Besides the simple denotation of "male child" the words son or sons carry quite a number of nuances in Scripture. Thus, *huios* can stand for a "grandson" (Genesis 29:5; 2 Samuel 19:24 [LXX 2 Kings 19:24]) or for "descendants" in general (Numbers 2:14), or it can denote a people (for example the "children of the east," 1 Kings 4:30 [LXX 3 Kings 4:30]). Furthermore, the high priest Eli called his disciple Samuel his "son" (1 Samuel 3:6 [LXX 1 Kings 3:6]). Figuratively an arrow is the "son" of a bow (Job 41:28, see NASB, margin note; cf. the expression "the arrows of his quiver," Psalm 127:4,5 [LXX 126:4,5], a figure of speech for children).

The metaphoric use of son was even more common in Israel than among the Greeks. The Hellenistic Jews of the New Testament period commonly used the terminology in this way. The documents from the Qumran

community provide us with a valuable example of how extensive such usage was. The members of that group distinguish between “sons of light” and “sons of darkness,” or “sons of righteousness” and “sons of unrighteousness,” and the “sons of Belial” and the “sons of the good pleasure of God.” They saw the world in dualistic terms, and the line of separation is between the “sons of heaven and grace” and the “sons of the world, the sons of transgressions and destruction” (ibid., 1:288).

Being able to have many children was considered a blessing in Israel (Genesis 1:28); it was a tremendous privilege to see one’s descendants (Genesis 50:23; Proverbs 17:6). Corresponding to this view, the birth of a child was a time of great joy and celebration (cf. Genesis 30:23). This was even more the case if the child were a boy (Psalm 127:4,5, see RSV). Unlike daughters who would leave the family when they married, male offspring insured ongoing protection and provision under the patriarchal family system.

Within a family the eldest son held the privileged position among his siblings. Upon the father’s death he assumed the duties and responsibilities of the head of the family. He received a double portion of the inheritance (see also *teknon* [4891]).

Son acquires a unique significance when it concerns a relationship with God. The title “Son of God” is given a wide and diverse range of meaning in the Biblical account (ibid.). Essentially it describes a personal being who somehow, either spiritually or morally, stands in a unique relation to God. The angels are depicted as “sons of God” because they are considered to be particularly near God and because they are spirit beings (Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Psalm 89:6).

The first man, Adam, who was a direct creation of the Creator, was the son of God in a very unique way (cf. Luke 3:38). On a grander scale, Israel, as God’s chosen people, was called the “son of God” or the “sons of God.” The Lord called Israel “my son . . . my firstborn,” an allusion to His having chosen them (Exodus 4:22). Israelites were the sons of God because they were a people created for His glory and called by His name (Isaiah 43:6; cf. Deuteronomy 32:6; Isaiah 64:8; Malachi 2:10). As the chosen sons of God they were uniquely the object of His love and care (Jeremiah 31:20; Hosea 11:1). Along with the privileges of sonship came a special demand for obedience and service. As a “son” Israel was also the “servant” of the Lord (Isaiah 1:2; 44:1; 45:4; Malachi 1:6). The people of Israel recognized that the status of son belonged first and foremost to them (Romans 9:4). They were initially participants in that relationship, and they are the “first” to whom salvation is offered (Romans 1:16).

The king of the people represented the entire nation. He, likewise, was the one responsible for establishing God’s kingdom on earth; i.e., he was God’s representative. This relationship is depicted in terms of “the chosen one” whose Father is God: “I will be his father, and he shall be my son” (2 Samuel 7:14). The king—as God’s son—came under God’s special care and protection (Psalm 89:27f.). He was uniquely charged to obey God and to execute His will on earth. Nonetheless, despite this unique relationship, the kings of Israel were never regarded as divine themselves; the same could not be said for the practices of some of its neighbors. The king was God’s son only because he was the instrument chosen for carrying out the will (i.e., the kingdom) of God. The king of Israel was God’s son only as he functioned in the theocratic (i.e., “God-ruled”) government in Israel.

The coming Messiah was seen as God’s Son to an even larger degree. The starting point for the view that Messiah was the Son of God is found in Nathan’s prophecy in 2 Samuel (7:13f.). This messianic prophecy declares: “I will be his father, and he shall be my son.” The hope for a future, eschatological king emerged most prominently after the kingdom in Israel had fallen. In Psalms 2:7 and 89:28,29, both of which are eschatological psalms, Messiah is called the Son of God. Of all the Old Testament messianic passages Psalm 89 draws the most complete picture of the Messiah as God’s Son. Isaiah 9:6 connects the deity of the Messiah with the fact that He is God’s Son.

All the privileges of sonship granted to Israel, as well as to kings as God’s sons, are bestowed upon Messiah in a unique way. He is the only begotten of God and His chosen one in a sense unlike any before Him. He is God’s absolute representative on earth; He, in God’s stead, makes known the promises of salvation. Israel’s role as God’s servant is realized in His person, and He fulfills this role in perfect obedience.

New Testament Usage These Old Testament prophecies are resumed in the New Testament. Here, however, the title “Son of God” is exclusively applied to God’s only Son, Jesus Christ. Jesus’ unique status as God’s Son is declared by angels upon His entrance into the history of mankind: “The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee (Mary), and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God” (Luke 1:35).

Jesus' own testimony about himself defines further His unique status as God's Son. As He offers praise to the Father He says: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matthew 11:27). In His eschatological discourse in Mark chapter 13 Jesus comments about the time of His return: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (verse 32). He shows us in this statement that He sees himself above both heavenly and earthly beings.

Another significant witness to Jesus' sonship is contained in Jesus' own summons to missions: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 28:19). Here Jesus unites himself with the Father and the Spirit and gives us a glimpse of the divine Trinity.

Jesus' self-testimony of His status as Son climaxes in John's Gospel. He acknowledges that He is the only begotten Son of God whom the Father in His love sent to save the world (John 3:16-18). No one else can claim the position of Son as Jesus does. He alone is the object of the Father's love (John 3:35; 5:20; 17:24-26). He is aware of His preexistent nature: "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58). "Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5; cf. 3:13; 6:62).

Jesus further witnessed to His unique status as Son through His works. His miracles far surpass mere human ability; they point to the Father who has given Him the authority to do them (John 5:19-30). The Father has entrusted the Son with two important tasks: to make alive and to judge (cf. 5:21,22). Both take place on two different planes; the one is eternal, and the other is spiritual (verses 24-29). Jesus realizes that not even His most ardent followers can achieve the kind of relationship He has with His Father. Therefore, we see He exclusively refers to "my Father" and "your Father" but never "our Father." He did teach His disciples to pray the Lord's Prayer, but He never included himself in this prayer: "After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father . . ." (Matthew 6:9).

God's testimony to His Son resounds throughout the New Testament writings in various ways. First, God attests to His Son in the voice which was heard at Jesus' baptism and on the Mount of Transfiguration: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matthew 3:17; 17:5). In these instances God is giving express testimony to His Son.

Second, the writings of John purport to be written so the readers "might believe (keep believing) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing (they) might have (keep having) life through his name" (John 20:31) and that they might have fellowship with "the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ" (1 John 1:3). He greeted the readers of his second letter with: "Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love" (2 John 3).

The apostolic witnesses consistently confirm that Jesus is the Son of God in the ultimate sense of that relationship. Even on the way to the suffering awaiting Jesus in Jerusalem, Peter, as spokesman for the disciples, confessed: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16). This confession was confirmed further by the disciple's experience on the Mount of Transfiguration: "For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (2 Peter 1:17).

Following Paul's dramatic conversion in which God revealed "his Son" to him (Galatians 1:16), Paul made this a fundamental element of his preaching: "And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God" (Acts 9:20). The essence of his gospel message was Jesus, who was "declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Romans 1:4).

The testimony of the Church to Jesus' status as God's Son appears in various New Testament passages, such as Romans 1:3,4, a confession, and Philippians 2:6-9, possibly an early hymn.

Huios is also used in the New Testament to denote the relationship of the "son" to his father (Mark 10:46) or to his mother (Luke 1:13) or even to ancestors (Matthew 1:20; 23:31; Luke 19:9). Paul, in particular, also called attention to the "sons of God" (e.g., Romans 8:14f.) where those who become Christians receive "sonship" by adoption (Galatians 4:5). A believer's "sonship" to God is both a present reality and the goal of hope for future fulfillment in eternity (Romans 8:23; cf. James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23; *ibid.*, 1:288f.). ([Complete Biblical Library](#))

HUIOS - **347V** - Matt. 1:1,20-21,23,25; 2:15; 3:17; 4:3,6; 5:9,45; 7:9; 8:12,20,29; 9:6,15,27; 10:23,37; 11:19,27; 12:8,23,27,32,40; 13:37-38,41,55; 14:33; 15:22; 16:13,16,27-28; 17:5,9,12,15,22,25-26; 18:11;

19:28; 20:18,20-21,28,30-31; 21:5,9,15,37-38; 22:2,42,45; 23:15,31,35; 24:27,30,36-37,39,44; 25:31; 26:2,24,37,45,63-64; 27:9,40,43,54,56; 28:19; Mk. 1:1,11; 2:10,19,28; 3:11,17,28; 5:7; 6:3; 8:31,38; 9:7,9,12,17,31; 10:33,35,45-48; 12:6,35,37; 13:26,32; 14:21,41,61-62; 15:39; Lk. 1:13,16,31-32,35-36,57; 2:7; 3:2,22-23; 4:3,9,22,41; 5:10,24,34; 6:5,22,35; 7:12,34; 8:28; 9:22,26,35,38,41,44,56,58; 10:6,22; 11:11,19,30; 12:8,10,40,53; 14:5; 15:11,13,19,21,24-25,30; 16:8; 17:22,24,26,30; 18:8,31,38-39; 19:9-10; 20:13,34,36,41,44; 21:27,36; 22:22,48,69-70; 24:7; Jn. 1:34,42,45,49,51; 3:13-14,16-18,35-36; 4:5,12,46-47,50,53; 5:19ff,25-27; 6:27,40,42,53,62; 8:28,35-36; 9:19-20,35; 10:36; 11:4,27; 12:23,34,36; 13:31; 14:13; 17:1,12; 19:7,26; 20:31; Acts 2:17; 3:25; 4:36; 5:21; 7:16,21,23,29,37,56; 8:37; 9:15,20; 10:36; 13:10,21,26,33; 16:1; 19:14; 23:6,16; Rom. 1:3-4,9; 5:10; 8:3,14,19,29,32; 9:9,26-27; 1 Co. 1:9; 15:28; 2 Co. 1:19; 3:7,13; 6:18; Gal. 1:16; 2:20; 3:7,26; 4:4,6-7,22,30; Eph. 2:2; 3:5; 4:13; 5:6; Col. 1:13; 3:6; 1 Thess. 1:10; 5:5; 2 Thess. 2:3; Heb. 1:2,5,8; 2:6,10; 3:6; 4:14; 5:5,8; 6:6; 7:3,5,28; 10:29; 11:21-22,24; 12:5-8; Jas. 2:21; 1 Pet. 5:13; 2 Pet. 1:17; 1 Jn. 1:3,7; 2:22-24; 3:8,23; 4:9-10,14-15; 5:5,9ff,20; 2 Jn. 1:3,9; Rev. 1:13; 2:14,18; 7:4; 12:5; 14:14; 21:7,12

HUIOS IN SEPTUAGINT - OVER 3000 HITS - ONLY GENESIS IS LISTED HERE - Gen. 4:17,25-26; 5:4,7,10,13,16,19,22,26,28,30,32; 6:2,4,10,18; 7:7,13; 8:16,18; 9:1,8,18-19,24; 10:1-4,6-7,20-23,25,29,31-32; 11:5,10-11,13,15,17,19,21,23,25,31; 12:5; 14:12; 15:2; 16:11,15; 17:12,19,23,25-26; 18:10,14,19; 19:12,37-38; 21:2-3,5,7ff,13; 22:2-3,6,9-10,12-13,16,20,23; 23:3,5,7,10,16,18,20; 24:3ff,15,36-38,40,47-48,51; 25:3-6,9ff,16,19,25; 27:1,5-6,8,15,17,20-21,24,27,29-32,42,46; 28:5,9; 29:1,5,12-13,32-35; 30:5-7,10,12,14-17,19-20,23-24,35; 31:1,43; 32:1,33; 33:2; 34:2,5,7-9,13-14,18,20,24-27; 35:5,17-18,22ff,29; 36:2,5-6,10ff,32-33,35,38-39; 37:2-4,32-35; 38:3-5,11,26; 41:50; 42:1,5,11,32,37-38; 45:9-11,21,26,28; 46:5,7ff; 47:5,29; 48:1-2,5,8-9,13; 49:1-2,8-9,22,28,32-33; 50:12-13,23,25

QUESTION - [What is the meaning of the Parable of the Wedding Feast?](#) [WATCH VIDEO](#)

ANSWER - Jesus told the Parable of the Wedding Feast in Matthew 22:1-14. This parable is similar in some ways to the [Parable of the Great Banquet](#) (Luke 14:15-24), but the occasion is different, and it has some important distinctions. To better understand the context of this story, it is important to know some basic facts about weddings in Jesus' day.

In Jewish society, the parents of the betrothed generally drew up the marriage contract. The bride and groom would meet, perhaps for the first time, when this contract was signed. The couple was considered married at this point, but they would separate until the actual time of the ceremony. The bride would remain with her parents, and the groom would leave to prepare their home. This could take quite a while. When the home was all was ready, the groom would return for his bride without notice. The marriage ceremony would then take place, and the wedding banquet would follow.

The wedding banquet was one of the most joyous occasions in Jewish life and could last for up to a week. In His parable, Jesus compares heaven to a wedding banquet that a king had prepared for his son (Matthew 22:2). Many people had been invited, but when the time for the banquet came and the table was set, those invited refused to come (verses 4-5). In fact, the king's servants who brought the joyful message were mistreated and even killed (verse 6).

The king, enraged at the response of those who had been invited, sent his army to avenge the death of his servants (verse 7). He then sent invitations to anyone his servants could find, with the result that the wedding hall was filled (verses 8-10).

During the feast the king noticed a man "who was not wearing wedding clothes" (verse 11). When asked how he came to be there without the furnished attire, the man had no answer and was promptly ejected from the feast "outside, into the darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (verses 12-13). Jesus then ends the parable with this statement: "[For many are invited, but few are chosen](#)" (verse 14).

The king is God the Father, and the son who is being honored at the banquet is Jesus Christ, who "came to that which was his own, but his own did not receive him" (John 1:11). Israel held the invitation to the kingdom, but when the time actually came for the kingdom to appear (see Matthew 3:1), they refused to believe it. Many prophets, including John the Baptist, had been murdered (Matthew 14:10). The king's reprisal against the murderers can be interpreted as a prophecy of Jerusalem's destruction in A.D. 70 at the hands of the Romans (cf. Luke 21:5). More broadly, the king's vengeance speaks of the desolation mentioned in the book of Revelation. God is patient, but He will not tolerate wickedness forever (Obadiah 1:15). His judgment will come upon those who reject His offer of salvation. Considering what that salvation cost Jesus, is not this judgment well deserved (see Hebrews 10:29-31)?

Note that it is not because the invited guests *could not* come to the wedding feast, but that they *would not* come (see Luke 13:34). Everyone had an excuse. How tragic, and how indicative of human nature, to be offered the blessings of God and to refuse them because of the draw of mundane things!

The wedding invitation is extended to anyone and everyone, total strangers, both good and bad. This refers to the gospel being

taken to the Gentiles. This portion of the parable is a foreshadowing of the Jews' rejection of the gospel in Acts 13. Paul and Barnabas were in Pisidian Antioch, where the Jewish leaders strongly opposed them. The apostle's words echo the king's estimation that those invited to the wedding "did not deserve to come": "We had to speak the word of God to you first. Since you reject it and do not consider yourselves worthy of eternal life, we now turn to the Gentiles" (Acts 13:46). The gospel message, Jesus taught, would be made available to everyone.

The matter of the wedding garment is instructive. It would be a gross insult to the king to refuse to wear the garment provided to the guests. The man who was caught wearing his old clothing learned what an offense it was as he was removed from the celebration.

This was Jesus' way of teaching the inadequacy of self-righteousness. From the very beginning, God has provided a "covering" for our sin. To insist on covering ourselves is to be clad in "filthy rags" (Isaiah 64:6). Adam and Eve tried to cover their shame, but they found their fig leaves to be woefully scant. God took away their handmade clothes and replaced them with skins of (sacrificed) animals (Genesis 3:7, 21). In the book of Revelation, we see those in heaven wearing "white robes" (Revelation 7:9), and we learn that the whiteness of the robes is due to their being washed in the blood of the Lamb (verse 14). We trust in God's righteousness, not our own (Philippians 3:9).

Just as the king provided wedding garments for his guests, God provides salvation for mankind. Our wedding garment is the righteousness of Christ, and unless we have it, we will miss the wedding feast. When the religions of the world are stripped down to their basic tenets, we either find man working his way toward God, or we find the cross of Christ. The cross is the only way to salvation (John 14:6).

For his crime against the king, the improperly attired guest is thrown out into the darkness. For their crimes against God, there will be many who will be consigned to "outer darkness"—existence without God for eternity. Christ concludes the parable with the sad fact that "many are invited, but few are chosen." In other words, many people hear the call of God, but only a few heed it.

To summarize the point of the Parable of the Wedding Feast, God sent His Son into the world, and the very people who should have celebrated His coming rejected Him, bringing judgment upon themselves. As a result, the kingdom of heaven was opened up to anyone who will set aside his own righteousness and by faith accept the righteousness God provides in Christ. Those who spurn the gift of salvation and cling instead to their own "good" works will spend eternity in hell.

The self-righteous Pharisees who heard this parable did not miss Jesus' point. In the very next verse, "the Pharisees went out and laid plans to trap him in his words" (Matthew 22:15). The Parable of the Wedding Feast is also a warning to us, to make sure we are relying on God's provision of salvation, not on our own good works or religious service.

James Smith - THE MARRIAGE FEAST Matthew 22:1–14

The scope of this parable is very wide; it seems to embrace the whole of this present dispensation. The "certain King" is God the Father; the "Son," Jesus Christ; the "marriage," the new relationship into which the Son was about to enter; the "servants," the apostles of Christ; "those that were bidden," the Jews, who, as a nation, had received notice long before; the "other servants," perhaps those who went forth after Pentecost; the "dinner," the provision made by God in the death of His Son for hungry, perishing souls; they "made light of it," the rejection of Christ by the Jews, His called ones; the "city burned," destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans thirty years later; "Go into the highways," the universal invitation of the Gospel; the "wedding furnished," the calling out and completion of the Church; "the King came in to see the guests," the second Coming of Christ; "Bind him, and cast him into outer darkness," the separation of the chaff from the wheat; He shall thoroughly purge His floor. The Gospel of the grace of God is here beautifully set forth. Observe the—

I. Provision. "Behold, I have prepared My dinner; all things are ready; come" (v. 4). The provision was wholly His own. "My oxen, my fatlings are killed." He spared not His own Son, but freely gave Him up to the death for us all. "Behold the Lamb of God." The provision was very great; it included "all things." All things are yours if ye are Christ's. Those who came to this feast found what sinners find on coming to Christ—

1. REST on a Princely couch.
2. SHELTER under a Princely roof.
3. SATISFACTION at a Princely table.
4. FELLOWSHIP with Princely friends.

II. **Invitation.** "Come unto the marriage" (v. 4). This invitation is for all. Whosoever will may come; both bad and good were called. The Gospel invitation takes no notice of our character; the vilest as well as the most virtuous must accept the invitation on equal terms. None deserve it. It is the goodness of God freely offered to all. The pompous prince and the poverty-stricken beggar are both alike indebted to the mercy and grace of God for salvation. Because of this many "make light of it." To make light of the invitation is

to make light of the God who gives it. That is no light matter.

III. **Inspection.** “The King came in to see the guests” (v. 11). All who accept the invitation expect to see the King; with joy they wait for His Coming. Those who are living in rebellion against His will, despising His grace, may well dread His appearing. He comes to see and to welcome all those who have believed His Word through His servants. Jesus Christ manifests Himself to those who yield to His call, and accept His offered mercy. Believe, and thou shalt see the glory of God.

IV. **Detection.** “He saw a man which had not on a wedding garment” (v. 11). Only one, but the quick eye of the King soon found him out. The man was conspicuous, not for what he had, but for what he had not. “A wedding garment.” The garment was part of the King’s provision, but he refused it. It is not enough that we merely believe the invitation of the Gospel; we must lay hold of the righteousness of God, which is offered us in Christ Jesus, and upon all them that believe. Remember that mingling among the people of God does not fit us for meeting the King. You may escape the detection of the servants, but the Searcher of hearts will find you out.

V. **Interrogation.** “Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment?” (v. 12). He does not take him by the throat. This is the language of tenderest compassion, but he is faithful and just. It was not the King’s fault, but perhaps he was priding himself in his own good-looking garments, prepared for the occasion, and all duly paid for. He belongs to the family of those “who go about to establish their own righteousness” (Rom. 10:3). “Prepare to meet thy God” (Amos 4:12).


VI. **Conviction.** “He was speechless” (v. 12). He was self-condemned before a court from which there was no appeal. He may have been making fine speeches before the King came in, but now his mouth is stopped. There is no one to plead his cause; in his behalf all his friends are speechless. Oh, friend, boast of nothing now that you will not rejoice in when the King comes. This man does not even ask for mercy, so utterly hopeless is his case now. It is a solemn moment when all the refuges of lies are swept away by the power of His presence, “What wilt thou say when He shall punish thee?” (Jer. 13:21).

VII. **Expulsion.** “Then said the King, Bind him, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness” (v. 13). The man who despises the King’s garment will never taste His feast. Think of what he was taken away from. Away from all his opportunities and companions, into the outer darkness, the darkness of hopeless despair, that is, outside the kingdom of God’s dear Son. What a change! What a disappointment! Out from the presence of a feast into the place of weeping. There will be great and sudden changes when He shall appear. Put on the Lord Jesus Christ.

Matthew 22:2 “The kingdom of heaven may be compared to a king who gave a wedding feast for his son.

- **kingdom:** Mt 13:24,31-33,44-47 25:1,14
- **who:** Mt 25:1-13 Ps 45:10-16 Jn 3:29,30 2Co 11:2 Eph 5:24-32 Rev 19:7-9

KINGDOMS OF GOD



KINGDOM OF GOD/HEAVEN PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE
FROM BIBLE.ORG

KINGDOM OF GOD COMPARED TO A WEDDING FEAST

The kingdom ([basileia](#)) of heaven ([ouranos](#)) - This is a slight change from His previous designation of the kingdom of God (Mt 21:31, 43), but both are synonyms, the phrase Kingdom of God pointing more to the realm of God's sovereign rule.

John MacArthur - In His first two parables Jesus gave no introduction, saving the explanation and application to the end. In this

parable, however, He begins by stating that it illustrates the kingdom of heaven. Because most Jews believed that the kingdom of heaven was reserved exclusively for them, and possibly a few Gentile proselytes, the audience in the Temple immediately knew that what Jesus was going to say closely applied to them.....There are past, present, and future as well as temporal and eternal aspects of the kingdom (OF GOD), but it is not restricted to any era or period of redemptive history. (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

May be compared to a king ([basileus](#)) who gave a wedding feast ([gamos](#)) for his son ([huios](#)) - The wedding feast merged with the actual wedding in the Ancient Near East and was a lengthy event, often lasting a week (or longer for royal weddings) and including meals and festivities. And of course a wedding hosted by a king would picture the wedding of all weddings!

Mark Moore points out that "Wedding banquets often lasted for several days. Therefore preliminary messengers were sent out to alert the guests of the upcoming gala so that they could make plans to attend. When the day rolled around for this banquet to begin, the king urgently sent out the messengers to tell the guests to come immediately since the morning meal [ariston] was on the table. The banquet was often used to symbolize the fellowship between the Messiah and his people (Mt 8:11; Lk 13:29; Rev 19:9). We should also keep in mind that the Messiah is often symbolized as a bridegroom (Mt 9:15; 25:1; Jn 3:29; Eph 5:25-32; Rev 21:2, 9). (Borrow [The chronological life of Christ page 162](#))

Son ([5207](#)) ([huios](#) means "a son," primarily signifying the relation of offspring to parent, is used of the "foal" of an ass in Matt. 21:5.

Vine- primarily signifies the relation of offspring to parent (see John 9:18-20; Gal. 4:30. It is often used metaphorically of prominent moral characteristics (see below). "It is used in the NT of (a) male offspring, Gal. 4:30; (b) legitimate, as opposed to illegitimate offspring, Heb. 12:8; (c) descendants, without reference to sex, Rom. 9:27; (d) friends attending a wedding, Matt. 9:15; (e) those who enjoy certain privileges, Acts 3:25; (f) those who act in a certain way, whether evil, Matt. 23:31, or good, Gal. 3:7; (g) those who manifest a certain character, whether evil, Acts 13:10; Eph. 2:2, or good, Luke 6:35; Acts 4:36; Rom. 8:14; (h) the destiny that corresponds with the character, whether evil, Matt. 23:15; John 17:12; 2 Thess. 2:3, or good, Luke 20:36; (i) the dignity of the relationship with God whereinto men are brought by the Holy Spirit when they believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 8:19; Gal. 3:26.

"The Apostle John does not use [huios](#), 'son,' of the believer, he reserves that title for the Lord; but he does use [teknon](#), 'child,' as in his Gospel, John 1:12; 1 John 3:1, 2; Rev. 21:7 ([hunios](#)) is a quotation from 2 Sam. 7:14.

"The Lord Jesus used [huios](#) in a very significant way, as in Matt. 5:9, 'Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the sons of God,' and Matt. 5:44, 45, 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be (become) sons of your Father which is in heaven.' The disciples were to do these things, not in order that they might become children of God, but that, being children (note 'your Father' throughout), they might make the fact manifest in their character, might 'become sons.' See also 2 Cor. 6:17, 18.

"As to moral characteristics, the following phrases are used: (a) sons of God, Matt. 5:9, 45; Luke 6:35; (b) sons of the light, Luke 16:8; John 12:36; (c) sons of the day, 1 Thess. 5:5; (d) sons of peace, Luke 10:6; (e) sons of this world, Luke 16:8; (f) sons of disobedience, Eph. 2:2; (g) sons of the evil one, Matt. 13:38, cp. 'of the Devil,' Acts 13:10; (h) son of perdition, John 17:12; 2 Thess. 2:3. It is also used to describe characteristics other than moral, as: (i) sons of the resurrection, Luke 20:36; (j) sons of the Kingdom, Matt. 8:12; Matt. 13:38; (k) sons of the bridechamber, Mark 2:19; (l) sons of exhortation, Acts 4:36; (m) sons of thunder, Boanerges, Mark 3:17."* [* From Notes on Galatians, by Hogg and Vine, pp. 167-169, and on Thessalonians, pp. 158,159.]

Notes: (1) For the synonyms [teknon](#) and [teknion](#) see under CHILD. The difference between believers as "children of God" and as "sons of God" is brought out in Rom. 8:14-21. The Spirit bears witness with their spirit that they are "children of God," and, as such, they are His heirs and joint-heirs with Christ. This stresses the fact of their spiritual birth (Rom. 8:16, 17). On the other hand, "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God," i.e., "these and no other." Their conduct gives evidence of the dignity of their relationship and their likeness to His character. (2) [Pais](#) is rendered "son" in John 4:51. For Acts 13:13, 26 see below.

The Son of God

In this title the word "Son" is used sometimes (a) of relationship, sometimes (b) of the expression of character. "Thus, e.g., when the disciples so addressed Him, Matt. 14:33; Matt. 16:16; John 1:49, when the centurion so spoke of Him, Matt. 27:54, they probably meant that (b) He was a manifestation of God in human form. But in such passages as Luke 1:32, 35; Acts 13:33, which refer to the humanity of the Lord Jesus, ... the word is used in sense (a).

"The Lord Jesus Himself used the full title on occasion, John 5:25; John 9:35 [some mss. have 'the Son of Man'; see RV marg.]; Son 11:4, and on the more frequent occasions on which He spoke of Himself as 'the

Son,' the words are to be understood as an abbreviation of 'the Son of God,' not of 'the Son of Man'; this latter He always expressed in full; see Luke 10:22; John 5:19, etc.

"John uses both the longer and shorter forms of the title in his Gospel, see John 3:16-18; John 20:31, e.g., and in his Epistles; cp. Rev. 2:18. So does the writer of Hebrews, Heb. 1:2; Heb. 4:14; Heb. 6:6, etc. An eternal relation subsisting between the Son and the Father in the Godhead is to be understood. That is to say, the Son of God, in His eternal relationship with the Father, is not so entitled because He at any time began to derive His being from the Father (in which case He could not be co-eternal with the Father), but because He is and ever has been the expression of what the Father is; cp. John 14:9, 'he that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.' The words of Heb. 1:3, 'Who being the effulgence of His (God's) glory, and the very image of His (God's) substance' are a definition of what is meant by 'Son of God.' Thus absolute Godhead, not Godhead in a secondary or derived sense, is intended in the title." * [* From Notes on Galatians, by Hogg and Vine, pp. 99, 100.]

Other titles of Christ as the "Son of God" are: "His Son," 1 Thess. 1:10 (in Acts 13:13, 26, RV, pais is rendered "servant"); "His own Son," Rom. 8:32; "My beloved Son," Matt. 3:17; "His Only Begotten Son," John 3:16; "the Son of His love," Col. 1:13.

"The Son is the eternal object of the Father's love, John 17:24, and the sole Revealer of the Father's character, John 1:14; Heb. 1:3. The words, 'Father' and 'Son,' are never in the NT so used as to suggest that the Father existed before the Son; the Prologue to the Gospel according to John distinctly asserts that the Word existed 'in the beginning,' and that this Word is the Son, Who 'became flesh and dwelt among us.'" * [* From Notes on Thessalonians, by Hogg and Vine pp. 46,47.]

In addressing the Father in His prayer in John 17 He says, "Thou lovedst Me before the foundation of the World." Accordingly in the timeless past the Father and the "Son" existed in that relationship, a relationship of love, as well as of absolute Deity. In this passage the "Son" gives evidence that there was no more powerful plea in the Father's estimation than that coeternal love existing between the Father and Himself.

The declaration "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee," Psa. 2:7, quoted in Acts 13:33; Heb. 1:5; Heb. 5:5, refers to the birth of Christ, not to His resurrection. In Acts 13:33 the verb "raise up" is used of the raising up of a person to occupy a special position in the nation, as of David in Acts 13:22 (so of Christ as a Prophet in Acts 3:22; Acts 7:37). The word "again" in the AV in Acts 13:33 represents nothing in the original. The RV rightly omits it. In Acts 13:34 the statement as to the resurrection of Christ receives the greater stress in this respect through the emphatic contrast to that in Acts 13:33 as to His being raised up in the nation, a stress imparted by the added words "from the dead." Accordingly ver. 33 speaks of His incarnation, ver. 34 of His resurrection.

In Heb. 1:5, that the declaration refers to the Birth is confirmed by the contrast in verse 6. Here the word "again" is rightly placed in the RV, "when He again bringeth in the Firstborn into the world." This points on to His Second Advent, which is set in contrast to His first Advent, when God brought His Firstborn into the world the first time (see FIRSTBORN).* [* The Western text of Luke 3:22 reads "Thou art My Son, this day have I begotten Thee," instead of "Thou art My beloved Son, in Thee I am well pleased." There is probably some connection between this and those early heresies which taught that our Lord's Deity began at His baptism.

So again in Heb. 5:5, where the High Priesthood of Christ is shown to fulfill all that was foreshadowed in the Levitical priesthood, the passage stresses the facts of His humanity, the days of His flesh, His perfect obedience and His sufferings.

Son of Man

In the NT this is a designation of Christ, almost entirely confined to the Gospels. Elsewhere it is found in Acts 7:56, the only occasion where a disciple applied it to the Lord and in Rev. 1:13; Rev. 14:14 (see below).

"Son of Man" is the title Christ used of Himself; John 12:34 is not an exception, for the quotation by the multitude was from His own statement. The title is found especially in the Synoptic Gospels. The occurrences in John's Gospel, John 1:51; John 3:13, 14; John 5:27; John 6:27, 53, 62; John 8:28 (John 9:35 in some texts); John 12:23, 34 (twice); John 13:31, are not parallel to those in the Synoptic Gospels. In the latter the use of the title falls into two groups, (a) those in which it refers to Christ's humanity, His earthly work, sufferings and death, e.g., Matt. 8:20; Matt. 11:19; Matt. 12:40; Matt. 26:2, 24; (b) those which refer to His glory in resurrection and to that of His future advent, e.g., Matt. 10:23; Matt. 13:41; Matt. 16:27, 28; Matt. 17:9; Matt. 24:27, 30 (twice), 37, 39, 44.

While it is a Messianic title it is evident that the Lord applied it to Himself in a distinctive way, for it indicates more than Messiahship, even universal headship on the part of One who is Man. It therefore stresses His manhood, manhood of a unique order in comparison with all other men, for He is declared to be of heaven, 1 Cor. 15:47, and even while here below, was "the Son of Man, which is in Heaven," John 3:13. As the "Son of Man" He must be appropriated spiritually as a condition of possessing eternal life, John 6:53. In His death, as in His life, the glory of His Manhood was displayed in the absolute obedience and submission to the will of the Father (John 12:23; John 13:31), and, in view of this, all judgment has been committed to Him, who will judge in full understanding experimentally of human conditions, sin apart, and will exercise the judgment as sharing the nature of those judged, John 5:22, 27.

Not only is He man, but He is "Son of Man," not by human generation but, according to the Semitic usage of the expression, partaking of the characteristics (sin apart) of manhood belonging to the category of mankind. Twice in the Apocalypse, Rev. 1:13; Rev. 14:14, He is described as "One like unto a Son of man," RV (AV, "... the Son of Man"), cp. Dan. 7:13. He who was thus seen was indeed the "Son of Man," but the absence of the article in the original serves to stress what morally characterizes Him as such. Accordingly in these passages He is revealed, not as the Person known by the title, but as the One who is qualified to act as the Judge of all men. He is the same Person as in the days of His flesh, still continuing His humanity with His Deity. The phrase "like unto" serves to distinguish Him as there seen in His glory and majesty in contrast to the days of His humiliation. (Online [Vine's Expository Dictionary](#))

Gilbrant ([Complete Biblical Library](#)) - **Classical Greek** - *Huios* means "son" in the broadest sense in classical Greek. Thus it means not only "son" as in the male offspring of human parents but also "offspring" as in the offspring of animals or even plants. Neither is it restricted to meaning the offspring of the first generation, for it can be used of "grandchildren" or of "descendants" in general.

The relationship between a teacher and a student may also be conveyed in terms of the father-son relationship. In addition it can describe nationality (e.g., son of Achaia; cf. Braumann, "Child," Colin Brown, 1:287). Finally *huios* functions in a religious capacity, such as in the expressions "the sons of darkness" or "the sons of light" (*ibid.*).

Septuagint Usage - The understanding of *huios* in classical Greek closely parallels the understanding of *bēn*, "son," in Hebrew, an equivalency that occurs in the Septuagint no less than 4,800 times. Besides the simple denotation of "male child" the words son or sons carry quite a number of nuances in Scripture. Thus, *huios* can stand for a "grandson" (Genesis 29:5; 2 Samuel 19:24 [LXX 2 Kings 19:24]) or for "descendants" in general (Numbers 2:14), or it can denote a people (for example the "children of the east," 1 Kings 4:30 [LXX 3 Kings 4:30]). Furthermore, the high priest Eli called his disciple Samuel his "son" (1 Samuel 3:6 [LXX 1 Kings 3:6]). Figuratively an arrow is the "son" of a bow (Job 41:28, see NASB, margin note; cf. the expression "the arrows of his quiver," Psalm 127:4,5 [LXX 126:4,5], a figure of speech for children).

The metaphoric use of son was even more common in Israel than among the Greeks. The Hellenistic Jews of the New Testament period commonly used the terminology in this way. The documents from the Qumran community provide us with a valuable example of how extensive such usage was. The members of that group distinguish between "sons of light" and "sons of darkness," or "sons of righteousness" and "sons of unrighteousness," and the "sons of Belial" and the "sons of the good pleasure of God." They saw the world in dualistic terms, and the line of separation is between the "sons of heaven and grace" and the "sons of the world, the sons of transgressions and destruction" (*ibid.*, 1:288).

Being able to have many children was considered a blessing in Israel (Genesis 1:28); it was a tremendous privilege to see one's descendants (Genesis 50:23; Proverbs 17:6). Corresponding to this view, the birth of a child was a time of great joy and celebration (cf. Genesis 30:23). This was even more the case if the child were a boy (Psalm 127:4,5, see RSV). Unlike daughters who would leave the family when they married, male offspring insured ongoing protection and provision under the patriarchal family system.

Within a family the eldest son held the privileged position among his siblings. Upon the father's death he assumed the duties and responsibilities of the head of the family. He received a double portion of the inheritance (see also *teknon* [4891]).

Son acquires a unique significance when it concerns a relationship with God. The title "Son of God" is given a wide and diverse range of meaning in the Biblical account (*ibid.*). Essentially it describes a personal being who somehow, either spiritually or morally, stands in a unique relation to God. The angels are depicted as "sons of God" because they are considered to be particularly near God and because they are spirit beings (Job 1:6;

2:1; 38:7; Psalm 89:6).

The first man, Adam, who was a direct creation of the Creator, was the son of God in a very unique way (cf. Luke 3:38). On a grander scale, Israel, as God's chosen people, was called the "son of God" or the "sons of God." The Lord called Israel "my son . . . my firstborn," an allusion to His having chosen them (Exodus 4:22). Israelites were the sons of God because they were a people created for His glory and called by His name (Isaiah 43:6; cf. Deuteronomy 32:6; Isaiah 64:8; Malachi 2:10). As the chosen sons of God they were uniquely the object of His love and care (Jeremiah 31:20; Hosea 11:1). Along with the privileges of sonship came a special demand for obedience and service. As a "son" Israel was also the "servant" of the Lord (Isaiah 1:2; 44:1; 45:4; Malachi 1:6). The people of Israel recognized that the status of son belonged first and foremost to them (Romans 9:4). They were initially participants in that relationship, and they are the "first" to whom salvation is offered (Romans 1:16).

The king of the people represented the entire nation. He, likewise, was the one responsible for establishing God's kingdom on earth; i.e., he was God's representative. This relationship is depicted in terms of "the chosen one" whose Father is God: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son" (2 Samuel 7:14). The king—as God's son—came under God's special care and protection (Psalm 89:27f.). He was uniquely charged to obey God and to execute His will on earth. Nonetheless, despite this unique relationship, the kings of Israel were never regarded as divine themselves; the same could not be said for the practices of some of its neighbors. The king was God's son only because he was the instrument chosen for carrying out the will (i.e., the kingdom) of God. The king of Israel was God's son only as he functioned in the theocratic (i.e., "God-ruled") government in Israel.

The coming Messiah was seen as God's Son to an even larger degree. The starting point for the view that Messiah was the Son of God is found in Nathan's prophecy in 2 Samuel (7:13f.). This messianic prophecy declares: "I will be his father, and he shall be my son." The hope for a future, eschatological king emerged most prominently after the kingdom in Israel had fallen. In Psalms 2:7 and 89:28,29, both of which are eschatological psalms, Messiah is called the Son of God. Of all the Old Testament messianic passages Psalm 89 draws the most complete picture of the Messiah as God's Son. Isaiah 9:6 connects the deity of the Messiah with the fact that He is God's Son.

All the privileges of sonship granted to Israel, as well as to kings as God's sons, are bestowed upon Messiah in a unique way. He is the only begotten of God and His chosen one in a sense unlike any before Him. He is God's absolute representative on earth; He, in God's stead, makes known the promises of salvation. Israel's role as God's servant is realized in His person, and He fulfills this role in perfect obedience.

New Testament Usage These Old Testament prophecies are resumed in the New Testament. Here, however, the title "Son of God" is exclusively applied to God's only Son, Jesus Christ. Jesus' unique status as God's Son is declared by angels upon His entrance into the history of mankind: "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee (Mary), and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee: therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God" (Luke 1:35).

Jesus' own testimony about himself defines further His unique status as God's Son. As He offers praise to the Father He says: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him" (Matthew 11:27). In His eschatological discourse in Mark chapter 13 Jesus comments about the time of His return: "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (verse 32). He shows us in this statement that He sees himself above both heavenly and earthly beings.

Another significant witness to Jesus' sonship is contained in Jesus' own summons to missions: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost" (Matthew 28:19). Here Jesus unites himself with the Father and the Spirit and gives us a glimpse of the divine Trinity.

Jesus' self-testimony of His status as Son climaxes in John's Gospel. He acknowledges that He is the only begotten Son of God whom the Father in His love sent to save the world (John 3:16-18). No one else can claim the position of Son as Jesus does. He alone is the object of the Father's love (John 3:35; 5:20; 17:24-26). He is aware of His preexistent nature: "Before Abraham was, I am" (John 8:58). "Glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 17:5; cf. 3:13; 6:62).

Jesus further witnessed to His unique status as Son through His works. His miracles far surpass mere human

ability; they point to the Father who has given Him the authority to do them (John 5:19-30). The Father has entrusted the Son with two important tasks: to make alive and to judge (cf. 5:21,22). Both take place on two different planes; the one is eternal, and the other is spiritual (verses 24-29). Jesus realizes that not even His most ardent followers can achieve the kind of relationship He has with His Father. Therefore, we see He exclusively refers to “my Father” and “your Father” but never “our Father.” He did teach His disciples to pray the Lord’s Prayer, but He never included himself in this prayer: “After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father . . .” (Matthew 6:9).

God’s testimony to His Son resounds throughout the New Testament writings in various ways. First, God attests to His Son in the voice which was heard at Jesus’ baptism and on the Mount of Transfiguration: “This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Matthew 3:17; 17:5). In these instances God is giving express testimony to His Son.

Second, the writings of John purport to be written so the readers “might believe (keep believing) that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing (they) might have (keep having) life through his name” (John 20:31) and that they might have fellowship with “the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ” (1 John 1:3). He greeted the readers of his second letter with: “Grace be with you, mercy, and peace, from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, in truth and love” (2 John 3).

The apostolic witnesses consistently confirm that Jesus is the Son of God in the ultimate sense of that relationship. Even on the way to the suffering awaiting Jesus in Jerusalem, Peter, as spokesman for the disciples, confessed: “Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God” (Matthew 16:16). This confession was confirmed further by the disciple’s experience on the Mount of Transfiguration: “For he received from God the Father honor and glory, when there came such a voice to him from the excellent glory, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (2 Peter 1:17).

Following Paul’s dramatic conversion in which God revealed “his Son” to him (Galatians 1:16), Paul made this a fundamental element of his preaching: “And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God” (Acts 9:20). The essence of his gospel message was Jesus, who was “declared to be the Son of God with power, according to the Spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead” (Romans 1:4).

The testimony of the Church to Jesus’ status as God’s Son appears in various New Testament passages, such as Romans 1:3,4, a confession, and Philipians 2:6-9, possibly an early hymn.

Huios is also used in the New Testament to denote the relationship of the “son” to his father (Mark 10:46) or to his mother (Luke 1:13) or even to ancestors (Matthew 1:20; 23:31; Luke 19:9). Paul, in particular, also called attention to the “sons of God” (e.g., Romans 8:14f.) where those who become Christians receive “sonship” by adoption (Galatians 4:5). A believer’s “sonship” to God is both a present reality and the goal of hope for future fulfillment in eternity (Romans 8:23; cf. James 1:18; 1 Peter 1:23; *ibid.*, 1:288f.). ([Complete Biblical Library](#))

HUIOS - 347V - Matt. 1:1,20-21,23,25; 2:15; 3:17; 4:3,6; 5:9,45; 7:9; 8:12,20,29; 9:6,15,27; 10:23,37; 11:19,27; 12:8,23,27,32,40; 13:37-38,41,55; 14:33; 15:22; 16:13,16,27-28; 17:5,9,12,15,22,25-26; 18:11; 19:28; 20:18,20-21,28,30-31; 21:5,9,15,37-38; 22:2,42,45; 23:15,31,35; 24:27,30,36-37,39,44; 25:31; 26:2,24,37,45,63-64; 27:9,40,43,54,56; 28:19; Mk. 1:1,11; 2:10,19,28; 3:11,17,28; 5:7; 6:3; 8:31,38; 9:7,9,12,17,31; 10:33,35,45-48; 12:6,35,37; 13:26,32; 14:21,41,61-62; 15:39; Lk. 1:13,16,31-32,35-36,57; 2:7; 3:2,22-23; 4:3,9,22,41; 5:10,24,34; 6:5,22,35; 7:12,34; 8:28; 9:22,26,35,38,41,44,56,58; 10:6,22; 11:11,19,30; 12:8,10,40,53; 14:5; 15:11,13,19,21,24-25,30; 16:8; 17:22,24,26,30; 18:8,31,38-39; 19:9-10; 20:13,34,36,41,44; 21:27,36; 22:22,48,69-70; 24:7; Jn. 1:34,42,45,49,51; 3:13-14,16-18,35-36; 4:5,12,46-47,50,53; 5:19ff,25-27; 6:27,40,42,53,62; 8:28,35-36; 9:19-20,35; 10:36; 11:4,27; 12:23,34,36; 13:31; 14:13; 17:1,12; 19:7,26; 20:31; Acts 2:17; 3:25; 4:36; 5:21; 7:16,21,23,29,37,56; 8:37; 9:15,20; 10:36; 13:10,21,26,33; 16:1; 19:14; 23:6,16; Rom. 1:3-4,9; 5:10; 8:3,14,19,29,32; 9:9,26-27; 1 Co. 1:9; 15:28; 2 Co. 1:19; 3:7,13; 6:18; Gal. 1:16; 2:20; 3:7,26; 4:4,6-7,22,30; Eph. 2:2; 3:5; 4:13; 5:6; Col. 1:13; 3:6; 1 Thess. 1:10; 5:5; 2 Thess. 2:3; Heb. 1:2,5,8; 2:6,10; 3:6; 4:14; 5:5,8; 6:6; 7:3,5,28; 10:29; 11:21-22,24; 12:5-8; Jas. 2:21; 1 Pet. 5:13; 2 Pet. 1:17; 1 Jn. 1:3,7; 2:22-24; 3:8,23; 4:9-10,14-15; 5:5,9ff,20; 2 Jn. 1:3,9; Rev. 1:13; 2:14,18; 7:4; 12:5; 14:14; 21:7,12

HUIOS IN SEPTUAGINT - OVER 3000 HITS - ONLY GENESIS IS LISTED HERE - Gen. 4:17,25-26; 5:4,7,10,13,16,19,22,26,28,30,32; 6:2,4,10,18; 7:7,13; 8:16,18; 9:1,8,18-19,24; 10:1-4,6-7,20-23,25,29,31-32; 11:5,10-11,13,15,17,19,21,23,25,31; 12:5; 14:12; 15:2; 16:11,15; 17:12,19,23,25-26; 18:10,14,19; 19:12,37-38; 21:2-3,5,7ff,13; 22:2-3,6,9-10,12-13,16,20,23; 23:3,5,7,10,16,18,20; 24:3ff,15,36-38,40,47-48,51; 25:3-6,9ff,16,19,25; 27:1,5-6,8,15,17,20-21,24,27,29-32,42,46; 28:5,9; 29:1,5,12-13,32-35; 30:5-7,10,12,14-17,19-

20,23-24,35; 31:1,43; 32:1,33; 33:2; 34:2,5,7-9,13-14,18,20,24-27; 35:5,17-18,22ff,29; 36:2,5-6,10ff,32-33,35,38-39; 37:2-4,32-35; 38:3-5,11,26; 41:50; 42:1,5,11,32,37-38; 45:9-11,21,26,28; 46:5,7ff; 47:5,29; 48:1-2,5,8-9,13; 49:1-2,8-9,22,28,32-33; 50:12-13,23,25

Matthew 22:3 “And he sent out his slaves to call those who had been invited to the wedding feast, and they were unwilling to come.

KJV Matthew 22:3 And sent forth his servants to call them that were bidden to the wedding: and they would not come.

BGT Matthew 22:3 καὶ πᾶς ἀπέστειλεν τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ καλεῖν τοὺς κεκλημένους εἰς τὸ γάμου, καὶ οὐκ ἠθέλοντες ἔλθαι.

NET Matthew 22:3 He sent his slaves to summon those who had been invited to the banquet, but they would not come.

CSB Matthew 22:3 He sent out his slaves to summon those invited to the banquet, but they didn't want to come.

ESV Matthew 22:3 and sent his servants to call those who were invited to the wedding feast, but they would not come.

NIV Matthew 22:3 He sent his servants to those who had been invited to the banquet to tell them to come, but they refused to come.

NLT Matthew 22:3 When the banquet was ready, he sent his servants to notify those who were invited. But they all refused to come!

NRS Matthew 22:3 He sent his slaves to call those who had been invited to the wedding banquet, but they would not come.

NJB Matthew 22:3 He sent his servants to call those who had been invited, but they would not come.

NAB Matthew 22:3 He dispatched his servants to summon the invited guests to the feast, but they refused to come.

YLT Matthew 22:3 and he sent forth his servants to call those having been called to the marriage-feasts, and they were not willing to come.

MIT Matthew 22:3 He sent his couriers to rally those who had been previously invited to the festivities. The invited guests, however, were not interested.

- **sent:** Mt 3:2 10:6,7 Ps 68:11 Pr 9:1-3 Isa 55:1,2 Jer 25:4 35:15 Mk 6:7-11 Lu 9:1-6 14:15-17 Rev 22:17
- **those who had been invited:** 1Sa 9:13 Zep 1:7
- **they were unwilling:** Mt 23:37 Ps 81:10-12 Pr 1:24-32 Isa 30:15 Jer 6:16,17 Ho 11:2,7 Lu 13:34 15:28 19:27 Jn 5:40 Ac 13:45 Ro 10:21 Heb 12:25

Related Passages :

Matthew 8:11+ “I say to you that many will come from east and west, and recline at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven;

Luke 13:29+ “And they will come from east and west and from north and south, and will recline at the table in the kingdom of God.

Revelation 19:9+ Then he *said to me, “Write, ‘Blessed are those who are invited to the marriage supper of the Lamb.’” And he *said to me, “These are true words of God.”

Matthew 23:37+ “Jerusalem, Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to her! How often I wanted to gather your children together, the way a hen gathers her chicks under her wings, and **you were unwilling.**

WEDDING INVITATIONS

REFUSED

And he sent out ([apostello](#)) his slaves ([doulos](#)) to call ([kaleo](#)) those who had been invited ([kaleo](#)) to the wedding feast ([gamos](#)), and they were unwilling ([ouk](#) = absolutely not + = [thelo](#) - willing) to come ([erchomai](#)) - Note **slaves** plural because there was so many guests invited. Notice also **had been invited** ([kaleo](#)) is past tense indicating they had previously received an invitation and knew they were invited and expected to attend the celebration. **Not willing** is in the imperfect tense picturing one after another repeatedly, persistently refusing the invitation from the king to actually attend the wedding feast! Their wills were set against coming! Amazing! To call this a breach of protocol would be an understatement! If a king invited me I would hardly think of refusing the invitation. Of course, this is a parable and Jesus is ultimately speaking about the invitation to believe in Him, receive eternal life and be allowed to attend the Marriage Supper of the Lamb (Rev 19:9+)! It is notable that a wedding banquet frequently depicted the fellowship of the Messiah with his people at the eschatological consummation (Mt 8:11; cf. Lk 13:29; Rev 19:9+)

THOUGHT - So this king actually repeats his invitation after it has been turned down—a true picture of God's repeated calls of grace (Lenski [interpretation of st. matthew's gospel page 848](#))

Craig Blomberg - The sending of the servants corresponds to the standard Oriental practice of issuing an invitation to an event without specifying the exact time until a later date. (New American Commentary)

David Guzik - Barclay says that when a great social event happened in the Jewish culture of that day, people were invited but without a set time. On the appropriate day, when the host was ready to receive the guests, they sent out messengers to say that all things were ready and it was time to come to the feast. "“So, then, the king in this parable had long ago sent out his invitations; but it was not till everything was prepared that the final summons was issued – and insultingly refused.” (Barclay)

John MacArthur points out that "The wedding feast represented God's promised blessing to Israel, a figure understood by everyone in the Temple that day. According to talmudic literature, the Messiah's coming would be accompanied by a grand banquet given for His chosen people." ([Matthew Commentary - Page 307](#))

Leon Morris - It seems that a second invitation to a feast was usual (cf. Esth. 5:8; 6:14). In a day when people had nothing equivalent to watches and when banquets took a long time to prepare, it was obviously a very helpful thing to be notified in this manner. From the Midrash Rabbah we find that there was another reason: "None of them would attend a banquet unless he was invited twice" (Lamentations 4:2; to explain this the Midrash tells a story of a banquet to which an invitation was sent by mistake to an enemy whose name was very similar to that of a friend; there were disastrous consequences when the enemy, once invited, refused to leave the feast, while the host insisted that he go). So the customary second invitation went out. (See [The Gospel According To Matthew](#))

D A Carson has an interesting thought - The son's wedding banquet doubtless hints at the messianic banquet; but this must not be pressed too hard, for when that banquet comes, there is no possibility of acceptance or refusal. (See [The Expositor's Bible Commentary - Page 98](#))

NET NOTE - Though [δοῦλος](#) ([doulos](#)) is normally translated "servant," the word does not bear the connotation of a free individual serving another. BDAG notes that " 'servant' for 'slave' is largely confined to Biblical transl. and early American times ... in normal usage at the present time the two words are carefully distinguished" (BDAG 260 s.v. 1). The most accurate translation is "bondservant" (sometimes found in the ASV for [δοῦλος](#)) in that it often indicates one who sells himself into slavery to another. But as this is archaic, few today understand its force.

Matthew 22:4 "Again he sent out other slaves saying, **Tell** those who have been invited, "**Behold**, I have prepared my dinner; my oxen and my fattened livestock are all butchered and everything is ready; come to the wedding feast."

KJV Matthew 22:4 Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them which are bidden, Behold, I have prepared my dinner: my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready: come unto the marriage.

BGT Matthew 22:4 π λιν π στειλεν λλους δο λους λ γων· ε πατε το ς κεκλημ νοις· δο τ ριστ ν μου το μακα, ο τα ρο μου κα τ σπιστ τεθυμ να κα π ντα τοιμα· δε τε ε ς το ς γ μουϲ.

NET Matthew 22:4 Again he sent other slaves, saying, 'Tell those who have been invited, "Look! The feast I have prepared for you is ready. My oxen and fattened cattle have been slaughtered, and everything is ready. Come to the wedding banquet."

CSB Matthew 22:4 Again, he sent out other slaves, and said, 'Tell those who are invited: Look, I've prepared my dinner; my oxen and fattened cattle have been slaughtered, and everything is ready. Come to the wedding

banquet.'

ESV Matthew 22:4 Again he sent other servants, saying, 'Tell those who are invited, "See, I have prepared my dinner, my oxen and my fat calves have been slaughtered, and everything is ready. Come to the wedding feast.'"

NIV Matthew 22:4 "Then he sent some more servants and said, 'Tell those who have been invited that I have prepared my dinner: My oxen and fattened cattle have been butchered, and everything is ready. Come to the wedding banquet.'

NLT Matthew 22:4 "So he sent other servants to tell them, 'The feast has been prepared. The bulls and fattened cattle have been killed, and everything is ready. Come to the banquet!'

- **Again he sent out other slaves:** Lu 10:1-16 24:46,47 Ac 1:8 11:19,20 13:46 28:17-31
- **Behold:** Pr 9:1,2 Song 5:1 Jn 6:50-57 Ro 8:32 1Co 5:7,8
- **everything is ready:** Mt 22:8 Ne 9:17 Ps 86:5 Lu 14:17

A SECOND SET OF COURIERS EXPRESS URGENCY TO COME

Again he sent ([apostello](#)) **other slaves** ([doulos](#)) **saying**, '**Tell** ([aorist imperative](#) - conveys sense of urgency) **those who have been invited** ([kaleo](#) - perfect tense) - **Again he** (the king) **sent** indicates the great patience of the king! **Invited** ([kaleo](#)) is in the perfect tense signifying the invitation was sent out in the past and it was still valid.

"Behold, ([idou](#)) **I have prepared** ([hetoimazo](#)) **my dinner** - **Dinner** is the rare noun *ariston* (here, Lk 11:38, 14:12) which strictly speaking refers to the early meal of the day (breakfast) or the noon meal but can refer to any meal generally (Lk 11:38). The verb **prepared** ([hetoimazo](#)) is derived from **ready** ([hetoimos](#)) and serves to emphasize the importance of not delaying in giving the king an affirmative response.

My oxen and my fattened livestock are all butchered ([thuo](#)) **and everything is ready** ([hetoimos](#)); **come** ([deute](#) - [aorist imperative](#) - don't delay! Do this now!) **to the wedding feast** - The bookends (so to speak) of two commands, first to **Behold** and the second to **come**, emphasize the importance of those who were invited to not procrastinate but to make a decision quickly. And to **"sweeten the offer"**, the king provides some mouth watering motivation, emphasizing that he would not be providing "finger food," appetizers, but would provide a sumptuous "meaty" meal. Notice **prepared** and **ready** indicate the invitees have to do only one thing -- receive! Just like the Gospel message - receive it by faith!

THOUGHT - It is interesting to note that the verb **butchered** ([thuo](#)) often conveys the idea of sacrifice and was used for example to describe "the Passover lamb...being sacrificed ([thuo](#))" (Mk 14:12+, Lk 22:7+). While I may be pushing the meaning of the text a bit far, it is notable that the very One teaching this parable was Himself the Lamb of God Who within just a few days would be the ultimate sacrifice to take away the sin of the world (Jn 1:29+) Just a thought to ponder.

Lenski - Each found more satisfaction in these possessions than in accepting the king's grace and favor offered at this son's wedding. This class is found among the Jews as well as among men of all ages. They prefer the earthly to the heavenly, the transient to the eternal. They always treat the divine call with indifference; they always "go away." Because they are so numerous Jesus spoke a special parable about them, Luke 14:16-24+. (Lenski [interpretation of st. matthew's gospel page 849](#))

Behold ([2400](#)) [idou](#) is the second person singular aorist middle imperative of *eidon* which means to see, perceive, look at. In the NT **idou** is used as a demonstrative particle that draws attention to what follows. **Idou** in the **middle voice** means "you yourself look, see, perceive!" The **aorist imperative** is a command emphasizing "Do it now! Don't delay!"

Spurgeon reminds us that **"Behold"** is a word of wonder; it is intended to excite admiration. Wherever you see it hung out in Scripture, it is like an ancient sign-board, signifying that there are rich wares within, or like the hands which solid readers have observed in the margin of the older Puritanic books, drawing attention to something particularly worthy of observation." I would add, **behold** is like a divine highlighter, a divine underlining of an especially striking or important text. It says in effect "Listen up, all ye who would be wise in the ways of Jehovah!"

Come ([1205](#)) [deute](#) is an adverb which means "Come here!" or "Come on!" in the sense of a command or an exhortation. **Deute** is used with the plural imperative either expressed or more often understood (as in Mt 11:28). For example in Mt 4:19 Jesus says **"Follow Me"** or more literally **"Come** you after me" where the adverb **deute** functions as an **aorist imperative**, a command to do

this now! **Deute** is used most often by Jesus - Mt 4:19, 11:28, 19:21, Mt 25:34 (When He reigns as King in the Millennium), Mk 1:17, 6:31, 10:21, 18:22, Jn 11:43 (Call to Lazarus), Jn 21:12 (Post-resurrection invitation to His disciples to eat breakfast).

DEUTE - **21X/21V** - **come(9), come away(1), follow*(2).** Matt 4:19; 11:28; 19:21; 21:38; 22:4; 25:34; 28:6; Mark 1:17; 6:31; 10:21; 12:7; Luke 18:22; John 4:29; 11:43; 21:12; Acts 7:3, 34; Rom 1:13; Rev 17:1; 19:17; 21:9.

Matthew 22:5 "But they paid no attention and went their way, one to his own farm, another to his business,

KJV Matthew 22:5 But they made light of it, and went their ways, one to his farm, another to his merchandise:

BGT Matthew 22:5 ο ὁ μελ σαντες π λθον, ζ μ ν ε ζ τ ν διον γρ ν, ζ δ π τ ν μπορ αν α το ·

NET Matthew 22:5 But they were indifferent and went away, one to his farm, another to his business.

CSB Matthew 22:5 "But they paid no attention and went away, one to his own farm, another to his business.

ESV Matthew 22:5 But they paid no attention and went off, one to his farm, another to his business,

NIV Matthew 22:5 "But they paid no attention and went off--one to his field, another to his business.

NLT Matthew 22:5 But the guests he had invited ignored them and went their own way, one to his farm, another to his business.

NRS Matthew 22:5 But they made light of it and went away, one to his farm, another to his business,

NJB Matthew 22:5 But they were not interested: one went off to his farm, another to his business,

NAB Matthew 22:5 Some ignored the invitation and went away, one to his farm, another to his business.

YLT Matthew 22:5 and they, having disregarded it, went away, the one to his own field, and the other to his merchandise;

MIT Matthew 22:5 But disinterested, they backed off. For instance, one went out into his field and another to his business.

- they: Ge 19:14 25:34 Ps 106:24,25 Pr 1:7,24,25 Ac 2:13 24:25 Ro 2:4 Heb 2:3
- one: Mt 13:22 24:38,39 Lu 14:18-20 17:26-32 Ro 8:6 1Ti 6:9,10 2Ti 3:4 1Jn 2:15,16

DECLINING A GRACIOUS INCREDIBLE INVITATION

But - A sad, even tragic term of contrast, contrasting the king's incredible offer which is still turned down! In short the **'but'** marks a sharp contrast between the king's gracious invitation (v.4) offering a lavish, prepared wedding banquet and the invited guests' callous response (v.5) to ignore the offer and give priority to their daily lives instead.

And as one can easily discern in this parable about the kingdom of heaven, the king was God and the guests called in the past were God's Chosen People, the Jews (Hos 11:1, Amos 3:2; cp the summation statement - "many are called, but few are chosen." Mt 22:14⁺).

They paid no attention ([ameleo](#)) - "were indifferent" (NET), "Made light of it" (KJV), "paid no attention" (CSB), "were not interested" (NJB), "disregarded it" (YLT). The verb [ameleo](#) is interesting because it carries the thought that they recognized the offer but ignored it and failed to act on it. Note that the invitation speaks of grace, for they had done absolutely nothing to warrant the king sending them an invitation. Amazing grace indeed!

And went their way ([aperchomai](#)) - This same verb **went...away** ([aperchomai](#)) is used in the tragic real-life event (in a sense an acting out of the present parable) of the rich young ruler to whom Jesus' gave the following "invitation" -- "If you wish to be complete, **go** and **sell** your possessions and **give** to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven; and **come, follow** Me." (Mt 19:21+ - **red** = 5 commands!) Tragically, Matthew records "But when the young man heard this statement, he **went away** ([aperchomai](#)) - same verb describing those passed on the king's invitation) grieving; for he was one who owned much property." (Mt 19:22+) The difference of course is (1) one is a parable and the other a true story and (2) those in parable simply went back to what they doing before, whereas the young ruler at least went away grieving. Unlike those in the parable, the young man clearly was not indifferent to the idea of inheriting eternal life (Mt 19:16+).

Spurgeon - "The rebel seemed to say, 'Let the King do as he likes with his oxen and his fatlings; I am going to look after my farm, or attend to my merchandise.'"

Grant Osborne: From rudeness they turn to indifference, just walking away (lit., "those who did not care walked away") from the king's emissaries. "Paid no attention" (μελ σάντες) connotes not just inattention but also unconcern. They act as if no invitation has come at all and just return to their daily work. . . The mention of "field" and "business" sums up the basic two categories, agriculture and commerce, which thus stand for all the different occupations. Luke 14:18–20 is similar, with the people providing excuses for not coming—buying a field, buying five oxen, and recently getting married. Again, the insult is far greater than we realize. These typify the reaction of the Jewish people to Jesus—rejection and apathy. (See [Matthew - Page 799](#))

William Barclay: It reminds us that the things which make people deaf to the invitation of Christ are not necessarily bad in themselves. In the parable, one man went to his estate: the other to his business. They did not go off on a wild binge or an immoral adventure. They went off on the, in itself, excellent task of efficiently administering their business life. It is very easy to be so busy with the things of the present that the things of eternity are forgotten, to be so preoccupied with the things which are seen that the things which are unseen are forgotten, to hear so insistently the claims of the world that the soft invitation of the voice of Christ cannot be heard. The tragedy of life is that it is so often the second bests which shut out the bests, that it is things which are good in themselves which shut out the things that are supreme. We can be so busy making a living that we fail to make a life; we can be so busy with the administration and the organization of life that we forget life itself.

One to his own farm (agros), another to his business (merchandise) - They were preoccupied with their personal concerns for profit, their secular activities clearly taking precedence over the royal offer from the king! Imagine being willing to trade a place at the king's table with more time in your dirty field ([agros](#) means field)! As the saying goes they were [looking out for number one](#) and had no interest in honoring the king.

Van Parunak: In the present context, the interpretation is straightforward. Remember from v. 1 that the feast represents the kingdom of heaven. These first verses recall the history of the invitation to the Jewish nation. Throughout the OT, the Lord taught Israel the basic principles of his kingdom. They had an early invitation to enter into it, and were given many clear signs when it should arrive—so much so that in the first century, there were those like Simeon, "waiting for the consolation of Israel" (Luke 2:25), or Anna, who "spoke ... to all them that looked for redemption in Israel" (Luke 2:38), or Joseph of Arimathea, "who also himself waited for the kingdom of God" (Luke 2:51). Even the pagan wise men, knowing Daniel's prophecies, recognized that the time was right for the arrival of "the king of the Jews." During his earthly ministry, the Lord's focus was on "the lost sheep of the house of Israel." He told his disciples to go only to these (10:6) and he rebuffed the Canaanite woman on the same grounds (15:24). But these were exceptions. The bulk of the nation rejected the prophets when they brought additional details of the invitation, just as we saw in the previous parable. Now, when the final invitation arrives, announcing that the kingdom of God is at hand, their leaders spurn the king's son, who will rule over the kingdom. Their behavior is parallel to that of the husbandmen in the previous parable.

Paid no attention (neglected) ([272](#)) [ameleo](#) from "a" = without + **melo** = to care for, to show concern, forethought or interest) means literally without care and thus showing no concern. To be careless. To be unconcerned about or to care nothing for something or someone. It is to recognize but to ignore, to know but to fail to do, to admit but not to administer. **Ameleo** describes the opposite attitude or response to the parallel verb **prosecho** (used in Hebrews 2:1) which calls for one to be in a continuous state of readiness to learn of a danger, need, error, etc, and to respond appropriately.

AMELEO - 4V - care(1), neglect(2), paid no attention(1). Matt. 22:5; 1 Tim. 4:14; Heb. 2:3; 8:9

Matthew 22:6 and the rest seized his slaves and mistreated them and killed them.

KJV Matthew 22:6 And the remnant took his servants, and entreated them spitefully, and slew them.

BGT Matthew 22:6 ο ὁ λοιπο κρατ σάντες το ς δο λους α το βρισαν κα π κτειναν.

NET Matthew 22:6 The rest seized his slaves, insolently mistreated them, and killed them.

CSB Matthew 22:6 And the others seized his slaves, treated them outrageously and killed them.

ESV Matthew 22:6 while the rest seized his servants, treated them shamefully, and killed them.

NIV Matthew 22:6 The rest seized his servants, mistreated them and killed them.

NLT Matthew 22:6 Others seized his messengers and insulted them and killed them.

NRS Matthew 22:6 while the rest seized his slaves, mistreated them, and killed them.

NJB Matthew 22:6 and the rest seized his servants, maltreated them and killed them.

NAB Matthew 22:6 The rest laid hold of his servants, mistreated them, and killed them.

YLT Matthew 22:6 and the rest, having laid hold on his servants, did insult and slay them.

MIT Matthew 22:6 The rest, having seized his couriers, humiliated them, even to the point of killing them.

- **the rest:** Mt 5:10-12 10:12-18,22-25 21:35-39 23:34-37 Jn 15:19,20 16:2,3 Ac 4:1-3 5:40,41 7:51-57 8:1 1Th 2:14,15

Related Passages:

Luke 8:10+ And He said, "To you it has been granted to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, but **to the rest** ([loipos](#)) it is in parables, so that SEEING THEY MAY NOT SEE, AND HEARING THEY MAY NOT UNDERSTAND.

THE VILE REJECTERS TURN VIOLENT

And - While the previous group was indifferent, this group is far from indifferent, their actions showing brazen contempt for the king's offer of grace!

the rest ([loipos](#) - see use in Lk 8:10+ above) **seized** ([krateo](#)) **his slaves** ([doulos](#)) **and mistreated** ([hubrizo](#)) **them and killed** ([apokteino](#)) **them** - Who are the rest? Others had just gone back to their secular interests. This word **rest** ([loipos](#)) indicates some individuals were remaining and violently attached the king's couriers. In the context of the nation of Israel this would speak of those who killed the prophets, the "couriers" the King had sent to invite them into the Kingdom of God. It should also be noted that Jesus had just used this same verb [krateo](#) in the previous parable, Matthew recording "When they (THE HYPOCRITICAL RELIGIOUS LEADERS) sought to **seize** ([krateo](#)) Him, they feared the people, because they considered Him to be a prophet." (Mt 21:46+) In fact the verb [krateo](#) would be used 5 times in Matthew 26 all referring to seizure of Jesus, especially the evil plans of Judas. (Matt. 26:4; Matt. 26:48; Matt. 26:50; Matt. 26:55; Matt. 26:57)

And mistreated ([hubrizo](#)) **them** - "Did insult" (YLT), "Humiliated them" (MIT), "Maltreated them" (NJB), "insolently mistreated them" (NET), "treated them outrageously" (CSB), "treated them shamefully" (ESV)

And killed ([apokteino](#)) **them** - **Mistreated** implies they attacked more with words, but **killed** indicates they attacked with acts! By now the crowd and especially the religious fakers must have been getting an "[ear full](#)" of this Greek word **killed** ([apokteino](#)) because Jesus had used it 3 times in the preceding parable of the vine-grower, and it had clearly incited a desire in the religious hacksters to seize Jesus (and ultimately to kill Him) (Mt 21:46+)! In short, this third parable was like Jesus [pouring salt on their wounds](#)!

Seized (2902) [krateo](#) from **kratos** = strength) has basic meaning be strong or possess power and thus means to take hold of, grasp, hold fast. **Krateo** is used most often in the sense of "take hold of forcibly" as when Pharisees wanted to "take hold of" Jesus (Mt 21:46; Mark 12:12). **Krateō** can also mean "hold fast" with the idea of being loyal to or closely united with someone or something. The Pharisees were admonished for holding the traditions of the elders (Mark 7:3ff.), while Christians are encouraged to hold to the traditions of Christianity (2 Th 2:15). (1) take hold of (forcibly), seize, grasp (Mt 9:25); (2) take into custody, seize, arrest (Mt 14:3); (3) take control of, hold (fast) (Acts 2:24); (4) hold back, restrain from, hinder, prevent (Lk 24:16);

Mistreated (insulted) (5195) [hubrizo](#) from **húbris** = injury, insult, reproach, arrogance, insolence, ill-treatment. Our English word **hubris** refers to exaggerated pride or self-confidence) means act with insolence, wantonness, wicked violence, to treat injuriously. To act spitefully toward someone, treat shamefully, and therefore to injure or to abuse. It conveys the idea of treating someone contemptuously in an insolent and arrogant way. **Hubrizo** expresses insulting and outrageous treatment and especially treatment which is calculated to publicly insult and openly humiliate the victim. **Thayer** writes that "in Greek usage the mental injury and the wantonness of its infliction being prominent." in Classical Greek "**Hubrizō** means "to run riot," especially "in the use of superior strength or power, or in sensual indulgence" (Liddell-Scott; cf. the noun hubris, "wanton violence," and hubristēs, "a violent person"). Thus, it can mean "to mistreat, to insult," or passively, "to be arrogant, rude." The word has the connotation of severity and harshness. In the papyri it occurs at times in connection with a husband's mistreatment of his wife; the example illustrates the intensity behind hubrizō (Moulton-Milligan; cf. Trench's comments on hubris; he suggests the motive for hubris is the "pleasure" of the inflicting party [Synonyms of the New Testament, pp.97f.]). (Complete Biblical Library Greek-English Dictionary)

KJV Matthew 22:7 But when the king heard thereof, he was wroth: and he sent forth his armies, and destroyed those murderers, and burned up their city.

BGT Matthew 22:7 ὁ βασιλεὺς ῥῆσθη καὶ πμψας τὰ στρατεύματα αὐτοῦ πῦρ ἐθηκεν ἐπὶ τοὺς φονεὺς καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτὴν ὤκνησεν.

NET Matthew 22:7 The king was furious! He sent his soldiers, and they put those murderers to death and set their city on fire.

CSB Matthew 22:7 The king was enraged, so he sent out his troops, destroyed those murderers, and burned down their city.

ESV Matthew 22:7 The king was angry, and he sent his troops and destroyed those murderers and burned their city.

NIV Matthew 22:7 The king was enraged. He sent his army and destroyed those murderers and burned their city.

NLT Matthew 22:7 "The king was furious, and he sent out his army to destroy the murderers and burn their town.

NRS Matthew 22:7 The king was enraged. He sent his troops, destroyed those murderers, and burned their city.

NJB Matthew 22:7 The king was furious. He despatched his troops, destroyed those murderers and burnt their town.

NAB Matthew 22:7 The king was enraged and sent his troops, destroyed those murderers, and burned their city.

YLT Matthew 22:7 'And the king having heard, was wroth, and having sent forth his soldiers, he destroyed those murderers, and their city he set on fire;

MIT Matthew 22:7 Then the king, having become furious, sent his militia, executed those murderers, and set their city ablaze.

GWN Matthew 22:7 "The king became angry. He sent his soldiers, killed those murderers, and burned their city.

- he was: Mt 21:40,41 Da 9:26 Zec 14:1,2 Lu 19:27,42-44 21:21,24 1Th 2:16 1Pe 4:17,18
- his: De 28:49-68 Isa 10:5-7 13:2-5 Jer 51:20-23 Joe 2:11,25 3:2 Lu 19:27

PATIENT INVITATION TURNS INTO A DECISIVE JUDGMENT

But - Term of contrast. Violent treatment of slaves versus vindictive treatment of the violators! The **but** introduces a turn from patient invitation to decisive judgment. God's grace and patience have their limits and here give way to anger, which should never be equated with human anger, but with perfectly righteous and fully justified anger at persistent refusal of His offer of amazing grace.

The king ([basileus](#)) was enraged ([orgizo](#)), and he sent his armies ([strateuma](#)) and destroyed ([apollumi](#)) those murderers ([phoneus](#)) and set their city on fire - This verse is surely prophetic, picturing the coming judgment on Jerusalem in AD 70, when the Roman armies destroyed the city. Some argue this was not a prophecy of destruction in 70 AD because, while the Temple was burned, the entire city was not burned. Notice that while Jesus has portrayed a king (God) who is slow to anger in Mt 22:3-4, ultimately he is a king who is just and thus passes fair judgment in this verse. The “**but**” in verse 7 is a hinge word marking the moment when divine mercy gives way to divine justice!

[MacArthur](#) - When the Roman general Titus conquered Jerusalem in that year, he killed some 1,100,000 Jews, threw their bodies over the wall, and slaughtered countless thousands more throughout Palestine. In his Jewish War, the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus, who witnessed the destruction of Jerusalem, graphically chronicled the horrible scene:

That building [the Temple at Jerusalem], however, God long ago had sentenced to the flames; but now in the revolution of the time periods the fateful day had arrived, the tenth of the month Lous, the very day on which

previously it had been burned by the king of Babylon.... One of the soldiers, neither awaiting orders nor filled with horror of so dread an undertaking, but moved by some supernatural impulse, snatched a brand from the blazing timber and, hoisted up by one of his fellow soldiers, flung the fiery missile through a golden window.... When the flame arose, a scream, as poignant as the tragedy, went up from the Jews ... now that the object which before they had guarded so closely was going to ruin.... While the sanctuary was burning, ... neither pity for age nor respect for rank was shown; on the contrary, children and old people, laity and priests alike were massacred.... The emperor ordered the entire city and sanctuary to be razed to the ground, except only the highest towers, Phasael, Hippicus, and Mariamne, and that part of the wall that enclosed the city on the west.

NET NOTE - Grk “he sent his soldiers, destroyed those murderers.” The verb πώλεσεν (apōlesen) is causative, indicating that the king was the one behind the execution of the murderers. In English the causative idea is not expressed naturally here; either a purpose clause (“he sent his soldiers to put those murderers to death”) or a relative clause (“he sent his soldier who put those murderers to death”) is preferred. **The Greek text reads here πόλις (polis)**, which could be translated “town” or “city.” The prophetic reference is to the city of Jerusalem, so “city” is more appropriate here.

Enraged (3710) **orgizo** from **orge** = wrath) describes a brooding, simmering anger that is nurtured and not allowed to die. It is seen in the holding of a grudge, in the smoldering bitterness that refuses to forgive. It is the anger that cherishes resentment and does not want reconciliation.

TDNT - (Root word **orge**) denotes “upsurging” (of sap of vigor), comes to be used for “impulsive nature.” This is a tragic element in drama, since it inclines people to decisive acts. A demonic excess of will combines with fate to bring disaster. A second and resultant meaning is “anger” as the most striking manifestation of impulsive passion. Unlike **thumos**, a complementary term, **orge** is especially oriented to revenge or punishment. Thus it is applied to rulers who must avenge injustice. There then develops the sense of “punishment.” Apart from this legitimate form, however, orge is recognized to be an evil, or the source of other evils.

Matthew 22:8 “Then he *said to his slaves, ‘The wedding is ready, but those who were invited were not worthy.

KJV Matthew 22:8 Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they which were bidden were not worthy.

BGT Matthew 22:8 τ τε λ γει το ς δο λοις α το · μ ν γ μο ς τοιμ ς σπιν, ο δ κεκλημ νοι ο κ σαν ξιοι·

NET Matthew 22:8 Then he said to his slaves, 'The wedding is ready, but the ones who had been invited were not worthy.

CSB Matthew 22:8 "Then he told his slaves, 'The banquet is ready, but those who were invited were not worthy.

ESV Matthew 22:8 Then he said to his servants, 'The wedding feast is ready, but those invited were not worthy.

NIV Matthew 22:8 "Then he said to his servants, 'The wedding banquet is ready, but those I invited did not deserve to come.

NLT Matthew 22:8 And he said to his servants, 'The wedding feast is ready, and the guests I invited aren't worthy of the honor.

NRS Matthew 22:8 Then he said to his slaves, 'The wedding is ready, but those invited were not worthy.

- **The wedding:** Mt 22:4
- **but:** Mt 10:11-13,37,38 Lu 20:35 21:36 Ac 13:46 2Th 1:5 Rev 3:4 22:14

INVITATION DOES NOT GUARANTEE ADMISSION!

Then he *said ([historical present tense](#)) **to his slaves** ([doulos](#)), **‘The wedding** ([gamos](#)) **is ready** ([hetoimos](#), **but** (strong, sad term of contrast) **those who were invited** ([kaleo](#)) **were not** ([ouk](#) - absolutely not) **worthy** ([axios](#)) (did not deserve the honor to come) (‘worthy to come’ [NCV], ‘worthy of the honor’ [NLT], ‘fit’ [BAGD]) - The fact that they were **not worthy** is because they refused the

invitation which ironically itself was based solely on grace and not on their worthiness to receive the invitation. There is only one way to be declared **worthy** and that is by accepting the king's gracious invitation. The "invitation rejecters" are like those in Acts 13:46+ who repudiated "it (THE WORD OF GOD ~ THE GOSPEL) and judge yourselves (NOTE WHO BRINGS THE JUDGMENT ON THEM - THEMSELVES!) **unworthy** ([ouk](#) - absolutely not + [axios](#)) of eternal life." In short, their unworthiness was not in the lack of some particular merit (grace cannot be earned), but in their willful persistent rejection of the king's offer of grace! In the context of this parable their unworthiness is the result of their persistent rejection of the Gospel and the wooing of the Holy Spirit (see Acts 7:51+).

One of Matthew's favorite themes is worthiness (see Mt 3:8; 10:10–11, 13, 37–38)

MacArthur says "The people God here declared not worthy were His chosen people, Israel, who would not come to Him freely and without merit through His Son. And because they rejected the Son, God rejected them for a season. Because they rejected their own Messiah, they were temporarily cast off as a nation and as God's unique chosen people. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 309](#))

Worthy (adjective) ([514](#)) [áxios](#) ([axios](#)) from [ágō](#) = to weigh) strictly speaking means bringing up the other beam of the scales. Having the weight of another thing of like value, worth as much. Counterbalancing - weighing as much (of like value, worth as much). Bringing into balance and hence equivalent or equal value/similar worth (Ro 8:18, see use in Lxx of Pr 3:15, 8:11). Other nuances of [axios](#) include describing that which is fitting or appropriate (1Cor 16:2), that which is deserving (Mt 10:10), that which "deserves" to be considered or accepted (1Ti 1:15), that which is worthy of praise (Rev 4:11), that which corresponds to or is congruent with something else (Mt 3:8, Luke 3:8, 23:41, 26:20). Worthy or deserving of evil (Rev 16:6).

AXIOS - 39V - Matt. 3:8; Matt. 10:10; Matt. 10:11; Matt. 10:13; Matt. 10:37; Matt. 10:38; Matt. 22:8; Lk. 3:8; Lk. 7:4; Lk. 10:7; Lk. 12:48; Lk. 15:19; Lk. 15:21; Lk. 23:15; Lk. 23:41; Jn. 1:27; Acts 13:25; Acts 13:46; Acts 23:29; Acts 25:11; Acts 25:25; Acts 26:20; Acts 26:31; Rom. 1:32; Rom. 8:18; 1 Co. 16:4; 2 Thess. 1:3; 1 Tim. 1:15; 1 Tim. 4:9; 1 Tim. 5:18; 1 Tim. 6:1; Heb. 11:38; Rev. 3:4; Rev. 4:11; Rev. 5:2; Rev. 5:4; Rev. 5:9; Rev. 5:12; Rev. 16:6

Matthew 22:9 'Go therefore to the main highways, and as many as you find there, invite to the wedding feast.'

KJV Matthew 22:9 Go ye therefore into the highways, and as many as ye shall find, bid to the marriage.

BGT Matthew 22:9 πορε εσθε ο ν π τ ς διεξ δους τ ν δ ν κα σου ς ν ε ρητε καλ σατε ε ς το ς γ μους.

NET Matthew 22:9 So go into the main streets and invite everyone you find to the wedding banquet.'

CSB Matthew 22:9 Therefore go to where the roads exit the city and invite everyone you find to the banquet.'

ESV Matthew 22:9 Go therefore to the main roads and invite to the wedding feast as many as you find.'

NIV Matthew 22:9 Go to the street corners and invite to the banquet anyone you find.'

NLT Matthew 22:9 Now go out to the street corners and invite everyone you see.'

NRS Matthew 22:9 Go therefore into the main streets, and invite everyone you find to the wedding banquet.'

NJB Matthew 22:9 go to the main crossroads and invite everyone you can find to come to the wedding."

- Pr 1:20-23 8:1-5 9:4-6 Isa 55:1-3,6,7 Mk 16:15,16 Lu 14:21-24 Lu 24:47 Ac 13:47 Eph 3:8 Rev 22:17

Go ([present imperative](#) - keep on going!) **therefore to the main** ([diexodos](#) - only here) **highways** ([hodos](#)) ("main streets," "roads that exit the city," "street corners," "intersections," "main crossroads"), **and as many as you find** ([heurisko](#) - by searching or by "accident" ~ providence) **there, invite** ([kaleo](#)) **to the wedding feast** ([gamos](#)) - **Invite** ([kaleo](#)) is a command in the [aorist imperative](#) which means "Do this now!" "Do not delay!" It conveys a sense of urgency.

Main ([diexodos](#) - only here) strictly speaking means passage through, the place where a main street cuts through the city boundary and goes out into the open country (BDAG). Leon Morris says it ([diexodos](#)) "seems to mean the places where the main highways go out from the city to the country, evidently places where poor people tended to congregate. Such people would not expect to find themselves as guests at a royal banquet, but the king is determined that the wedding feast go ahead, and that means that there must be guests to fill the places. Poor people at the road junctions are unlikely to refuse such an invitation. " (See [The Gospel According To Matthew](#))

Is this ultimately not the "**GO**" of the great commission in Matthew 28:19-20+? "Go therefore and **make disciples** ([aorist imperative](#) see [our need to depend on the Holy Spirit to obey](#)) of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, 20 teaching them to observe all that I commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the age."

Who are the **many** they will find? Many would be Gentiles (cf Ro 11:11+). Paul alludes to this in Romans 9:25-26+ (quoting Hos 2:23, 1:10) "As He says also in Hosea, 'I WILL CALL THOSE WHO WERE NOT MY PEOPLE, 'MY PEOPLE,' AND HER WHO WAS NOT BELOVED, 'BELOVED.'" "AND IT SHALL BE THAT IN THE PLACE WHERE IT WAS SAID TO THEM, 'YOU ARE NOT MY PEOPLE,' THERE THEY SHALL BE CALLED SONS OF THE LIVING GOD."

Matthew 22:10 "Those slaves went out into the streets and gathered together all they found, both evil and good; and the wedding hall was filled with dinner guests.

KJV Matthew 22:10 So those servants went out into the highways, and gathered together all as many as they found, both bad and good: and the wedding was furnished with guests.

BGT Matthew 22:10 καὶ ἐξελθόντες οἱ δούλοι ἐστῆσαν ὅσοι συνῆλθον πῶς ἔρερον, πονηροὶ τε καὶ καλοὶ· καὶ πλησθὲν γὰρ τοῦ νακεῖμνων.

NET Matthew 22:10 And those slaves went out into the streets and gathered all they found, both bad and good, and the wedding hall was filled with guests.

CSB Matthew 22:10 So those slaves went out on the roads and gathered everyone they found, both evil and good. The wedding banquet was filled with guests.

ESV Matthew 22:10 And those servants went out into the roads and gathered all whom they found, both bad and good. So the wedding hall was filled with guests.

NIV Matthew 22:10 So the servants went out into the streets and gathered all the people they could find, both good and bad, and the wedding hall was filled with guests.

NLT Matthew 22:10 So the servants brought in everyone they could find, good and bad alike, and the banquet hall was filled with guests.

NRS Matthew 22:10 Those slaves went out into the streets and gathered all whom they found, both good and bad; so the wedding hall was filled with guests.

- **both:** Mt 22:11,12 13:38,47,48 25:1,2 1Co 6:9-11 2Co 12:21 1Jn 2:19 Rev 2:14,15,20-23
- **and the:** Mt 25:10 Rev 5:9 Rev 7:9 Rev 19:6-9

Related Passages:

1 Corinthians 6:9-11+ Or do you not know that **the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God**? Do not be deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor homosexuals, 10 nor thieves, nor the covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor swindlers, will inherit the kingdom of God. 11 Such were some of you; but you were washed, but you were sanctified, but you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God.

Revelation 5:9+ And they *sang a new song, saying, "Worthy are You to take the book and to break its seals; for You were slain, and purchased for God with Your blood men from every tribe and tongue and people and nation.

Revelation 7:9+ After these things I looked, and behold, a great multitude which no one could count, from every nation and all tribes and peoples and tongues, standing before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed in white robes, and palm branches were in their hands;

Revelation 19:6-9+ Then I heard something like the voice of a great multitude and like the sound of many waters and like the sound of mighty peals of thunder, saying, "Hallelujah! For the Lord our God, the Almighty, reigns. 7 "Let us rejoice and be glad and give the glory to Him, for the marriage of the Lamb has come and His bride has made herself ready." 8 It was given to her to clothe herself in fine linen, bright and clean; for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints. 9 Then he *said to me, "Write, 'Blessed are those who are invited to

the marriage supper of the Lamb.” And he *said to me, “These are true words of God.”

Psalm 126:5-6+ Those who sow in tears shall reap with joyful shouting. 6 He who goes to and fro weeping, carrying his bag of seed, Shall indeed come again with a shout of joy, bringing his sheaves with him.

GATHERING IN THE SHEAVES

Those slaves ([doulos](#)) went out into the streets and gathered together ([synago](#)) all they found ([heurisko](#) - by searching or by "accident" ~ providence), both evil ([poneros](#)) and good ([agathos](#)) - Who are both evil ([poneros](#) - bad) and good ([agathos](#))? Note that in God's eyes there is no one who does good, not even one (Ro 3:12+), so even the "good" are not good in His eyes. Aren't we grateful that he did not just say gather in the good people, the elite? He places no restrictions on their moral state! He accepts the worst of the good, the bad and the ugly if they simply believe in His Son. **Evil and good would describe their general moral character and behavior, for some people are much more moral than others. But both are in need of being gathered and made able to enter the wedding hall by grace through faith (Eph 2:8-9+).**

And the wedding hall ([numphon](#)) was filled ([pimplemi](#)) with dinner guests ([anakeimai](#)) - Filled implies in the context of this parable that the slaves found many persons who gladly received the wedding invitation (aka the Gospel of Jesus Christ) and were then clothed with Christ's righteousness, the only garment acceptable in the **wedding hall**.

BRINGING IN THE SHEAVES (play)

“Bringing in the sheaves, bringing in the sheaves,
We shall come rejoicing, bringing in the sheaves...”

Matthew 22:11 “But when the king came in to look over the dinner guests, he saw a man there who was not dressed in wedding clothes,

KJV Matthew 22:11 And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw there a man which had not on a wedding garment:

BGT Matthew 22:11 εσελθεν ὁ βασιλεὺς θεσασθαι τοὺς νυμφεῖς καὶ εὗρεν ἕνα ἄνθρωπον ὃς οὐκ ἦν νυμφεῖς·

NET Matthew 22:11 But when the king came in to see the wedding guests, he saw a man there who was not wearing wedding clothes.

CSB Matthew 22:11 But when the king came in to view the guests, he saw a man there who was not dressed for a wedding.

ESV Matthew 22:11 "But when the king came in to look at the guests, he saw there a man who had no wedding garment.

NIV Matthew 22:11 "But when the king came in to see the guests, he noticed a man there who was not wearing wedding clothes.

NLT Matthew 22:11 "But when the king came in to meet the guests, he noticed a man who wasn't wearing the proper clothes for a wedding.

NRS Matthew 22:11 "But when the king came in to see the guests, he noticed a man there who was not wearing a wedding robe,

NJB Matthew 22:11 When the king came in to look at the guests he noticed one man who was not wearing a wedding garment,

NAB Matthew 22:11 But when the king came in to meet the guests he saw a man there not dressed in a wedding garment.

YLT Matthew 22:11 'And the king having come in to view those reclining, saw there a man not clothed with clothing of the marriage-feast,

- **when:** Mt 3:12 13:30 25:31,32 Zep 1:12 1Co 4:5 Heb 4:12,13 Rev 2:23
- **which:** 2Ki 10:22 Ps 45:13,14 Isa 52:1 Isa 61:3-10 Isa 64:6 Zec 3:3,4 La 5:22 Ro 3:22 Ro 13:14 Ga 3:27 2Co 5:3 Eph 4:24 Col 3:10-11 Rev 3:4,5,18 Rev 16:15 Rev 19:8

Related Passages:

Romans 3:21-22+ But now apart from the Law the righteousness of God has been manifested, being witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, 22 even the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all those who believe; for there is no distinction; 23 for all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God, 24 being justified **as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus;**

Galatians 3:27+ For all of you who were baptized into (~IDENTIFIED WITH) Christ **have clothed yourselves with Christ.**

Romans 13:14+ But **put on the Lord Jesus Christ**, and make no provision for the flesh in regard to its lusts.

2 Corinthians 5:2-3+ For indeed in this house we groan, **longing to be clothed with our dwelling from heaven**, 3 inasmuch as we, having put it on, will not be found naked.

Colossians 3:10-11+ and **have put on the new self** who is being renewed to a true knowledge according to the image of the One who created him— 11 a renewal in which there is no distinction between Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave and freeman, but Christ is all, and in all.

But (term of contrast) **when the king** ([basileus](#)) **came in** ([eiserchomai](#)) **to look over** ([theaomai](#)) **the dinner guests** ([anakeimai](#)), **he saw a man there who was not dressed** ([enduo](#)) **in wedding** ([gamos](#)) **clothes** - Who (or what) does this undressed man represent? Most favor these "wedding crashers" (see [party crashers](#) - not totally accurate for a true party crasher was never invited) represent those who profess to be Jesus' disciples but do not possess proper attire, for ALL their "righteous deeds are like a filthy garment." (Isa 64:6). In short, they are not clothed in robes of righteousness (cf Isa 61:10, Ge 3:21+, Gal 3:27), such approved attire being provided as a gift from God for all who are in Christ by grace through faith. John describes the proper attire for the wedding feast writing "It was given to her (THE BRIDE - THE CHURCH) to clothe herself in fine linen, bright and clean; for the fine linen is the righteous acts of the saints." (Rev 19:8+). Note that last phrase "fine linen is the righteous acts" which describes the acts of saints initiated and empowered by the Holy Spirit. Unconverted persons can produce absolutely no works that are righteous in the sight of God! (cf Jn 15:5+)

[Paul Apple](#) on improper dress - [Traditional View:] Homer Kent: It represents the robe of imputed righteousness that God graciously provides to man through faith (Isa 61:10). [Alternate View:] Van Parunak: So the picture is the same as in Colossians: the white garments are the practical righteousness in the lives of believers, which is made possible by God's gracious gift of free salvation. Putting these results together, the guest without a garment is a false professor in the church who is revealed by the lack of righteousness in his life. The parable thus repeats what the Lord taught about false prophets in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 7:15-23)....The one thought of the parable, then, is this: "Accept God's gracious invitation, lest while others enter into glory you be lost. But remember that membership in the visible church does not guarantee salvation. Complete renewal (including both justification and sanctification), the putting on of Christ, is what is necessary."

Matthew 22:12 and he *said to him, 'Friend, how did you come in here without wedding clothes?' And the man was speechless.

KJV Matthew 22:12 And he saith unto him, Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment? And he was speechless.

BGT Matthew 22:12 κα λγει α τ · τα ρε, π ς ε σ λθες δε μ χων νδυμα γ μου; δ φιμ θη.

NET Matthew 22:12 And he said to him, 'Friend, how did you get in here without wedding clothes?' But he had nothing to say.

CSB Matthew 22:12 So he said to him, 'Friend, how did you get in here without wedding clothes?' The man was speechless.

ESV Matthew 22:12 And he said to him, 'Friend, how did you get in here without a wedding garment?' And he was speechless.

NIV Matthew 22:12 'Friend,' he asked, 'how did you get in here without wedding clothes?' The man was

speechless.

NLT Matthew 22:12 'Friend,' he asked, 'how is it that you are here without wedding clothes?' But the man had no reply.

NRS Matthew 22:12 and he said to him, 'Friend, how did you get in here without a wedding robe?' And he was speechless.

NJB Matthew 22:12 and said to him, "How did you get in here, my friend, without a wedding garment?" And the man was silent.

NAB Matthew 22:12 He said to him, 'My friend, how is it that you came in here without a wedding garment?' But he was reduced to silence.

YLT Matthew 22:12 and he saith to him, Comrade, how didst thou come in hither, not having clothing of the marriage-feast? and he was speechless.

MIT Matthew 22:12 He said to him, "Fellow, how did you get in here not wearing wedding clothes?" But the man remained speechless.

- **Friend:** Mt 20:13 26:50
- **how:** Mt 5:20 Ac 5:2-11 8:20-23 1Co 4:5
- **And he was:** 1Sa 2:9 Job 5:16 Ps 107:42 Jer 2:23,26 Ro 3:19 Titus 3:11

and he ***said** ([historical present tense](#)) to him, 'Friend ([hetairois](#))' - **Friend** sounds positive but is most often used with a sense of rebuke so that friend is more of a distancing way to address someone.

How did you come in here without wedding clothes?' And the man was speechless ([phimoo](#) - Lit - "he was silent") - The man was speechless because he knew he had no excuses. One is reminded of the somber scene of the Great White Throne judgment in Rev 20:11-15+ where "the great and the small, standing before the throne" are given their sentence and are **speechless**, having nothing to say regarding their judgment because they know they are guilty! The only acceptable wedding clothes are those obtained by faith in Christ and receipt of [His imputed righteousness](#).

THOUGHT - How might we apply this to the church today? Are there some in the church who do not have the proper attire to give them admission to the wedding supper of the Lamb? I fear there are many in churches around America who know ABOUT Jesus and openly make that PROFESSION, but they do not truly KNOW Him personally by grace through faith (Eph 2:8-9+0 and tragically are living lives that have no supernatural fruit that shows they are genuine POSSESSORS of a personal relationship with Christ.

Spurgeon - He came because he was invited, but he came only in appearance. The banquet was intended to honor the King's Son, but this man meant nothing of the kind; he was willing to eat the good things set before him, but in his heart there was no love either for the King or his well-beloved Son."

MacArthur comments "Until that point the man had been utterly presumptuous, thinking he could come to the king's feast on his own terms, in any clothes he wanted. He was proud and self-willed, thoughtless of the others, and, worst of all, insulting to the king. Arrogantly defying royal protocol, he was determined to "be himself." (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

Trapp on **speechless** - He was muzzled or haltered up, that is, he held his peace, as though he had had a bridle or a halter in his mouth. This is the import of the Greek word here used."

John Calvin: Let us not flatter ourselves with the empty title of faith, but let every man seriously examine himself, that at the final review he may be pronounced to be one of the lawful guests; for, as Paul reminds us, that the vessels in the Lord's house are not all of the same kind, so let every one that calleth on the name of the Lord depart from iniquity, (2 Timothy 2:19.) I enter no farther, at present, into the question about the eternal election of God; for the words of Christ mean nothing more than this, that the external profession of faith is not a sufficient proof that God will acknowledge as his people all who appear to have accepted of his invitation.

Friend (2083) [hetairois](#) possibly from hetes = clansman but exact derivation is unclear). comrade, companion, friend. New Testament Usage In the New Testament the word is used only three times: in Matthew 20:13; 22:12; and 26:50 (Matthew 11:16 reads heterois [see 2066], "others," in the earlier manuscripts). Each time the word is used it is in the form of an address. Hetairios occurs in the Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard as a means of address for the vineyard owner when he answered his grumbling worker: "Friend, I do thee no wrong" (Matthew 20:13). It appears on the lips of the king in the Parable of the Marriage Feast (Matthew 22:12) when he addressed the man without a wedding garment: "Friend, how camest thou in hither not having a wedding garment?" It was

also used by Jesus to address Judas when he betrayed the Lord (Matthew 26:50). Each use of the word indicates the existence of a bond between speaker and hearer which the hearer has somehow disregarded or even spurned. In many cases generosity is shown on the part of the speaker, in spite of the self-assertion of the hearer. Finally, the word is to be distinguished from its related term *philos*, “beloved.” Jesus called His disciples *philo*i, never *hetairoi* (John 15:14,15).

HETAIROS - 3V - Matt. 20:13; Matt. 22:12; Matt. 26:50

Speechless (muzzle) (5392) **phimoo** from from **phimós** = **muzzle for a beast's mouth** means to close the mouth with a muzzle, to muzzle, gag, restrain as an ox (1 Co 9:9; 1 Ti 5:18). Figuratively, **phimoo** means to stop one's mouth in order make speechless or reduce to silence (Mt 22:34; 1 Pe 2:15) It was used especially as in this passage of reducing an adversary to silence. Christ commanded the evil spirit not to speak (Mk 1:25; Lu 4:35) and the raging sea to be still (Mk 4:3). He muzzled the Sadducees (for muzzling [see English definition](#)) (Mt 22:34). Jesus also silenced the raging elements with His word's "**Hush!** (*siopao*) **Be still** (*phimoo*)" (Both verbs are commands - Mark 4:39). **Phimoo** is a more vigorous word than just "Be Quiet" as NASB translates in Mk 1:25. The picture is "Be muzzled" like an ox. Gould renders it "Shut up." "Shut your mouth" would be too colloquial. **Phimoo** is used once in the Septuagint in Deuteronomy 25:4 "You shall not muzzle the ox while he is threshing."

Matthew 22:13 "Then the king said to the servants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and **throw** him into the outer darkness; in that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

KJV Matthew 22:13 Then said the king to the servants, Bind him hand and foot, and take him away, and cast him into outer darkness; there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

BGT Matthew 22:13 τ τε βασιλε ς ε πεν το ς διακ νοις· δ σαντες α το π δας κα χε ρας κβ λετε α τ ν ε ς τ σκ το ς τ ξ τερον· κε σται κλαυθμ ς κα βρυγμ ς τ ν δ ντων.

NET Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to his attendants, 'Tie him up hand and foot and throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth!'

CSB Matthew 22:13 "Then the king told the attendants, 'Tie him up hand and foot, and throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

ESV Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot and cast him into the outer darkness. In that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

NIV Matthew 22:13 "Then the king told the attendants, 'Tie him hand and foot, and throw him outside, into the darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

NLT Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to his aides, 'Bind his hands and feet and throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

NRS Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to the attendants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and throw him into the outer darkness, where there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth.'

NJB Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to the attendants, "Bind him hand and foot and throw him into the darkness outside, where there will be weeping and grinding of teeth."

NAB Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to his attendants, 'Bind his hands and feet, and cast him into the darkness outside, where there will be wailing and grinding of teeth.'

YLT Matthew 22:13 'Then said the king to the ministrants, Having bound his feet and hands, take him up and cast forth to the outer darkness, there shall be the weeping and the gnashing of the teeth;

MIT Matthew 22:13 Then the king said to his servants, "Tie him up feet and hands and eject him into the exterior darkness, where there will be crying and grimacing with clenched teeth."

- **Bind:** Mt 12:29 Mt 13:30 Isa 52:1 Da 3:20 Jn 21:18 Ac 21:11 Rev 21:27
- **the outer darkness:** Mt 8:11-12 Mt 25:30 2Th 1:9 2Pe 2:4,17 Jude 1:6,13
- **in that place there:** Mt 13:42,50 24:51 Ps 37:12 112:10 Lu 13:28 Ac 7:54

Related Passages:

Matthew 7:21–23+ 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.**’

Matthew 13:42, 50+ and will throw them into the furnace of fire; in that place there will be **weeping and gnashing of teeth**. 50 and will throw them into the furnace of fire; in that place there will be **weeping and gnashing of teeth**.

Matthew 24:51+ and will cut him in pieces and assign him a place with the hypocrites; in that place there will be **weeping and gnashing of teeth**.

Matthew 8:11-12+ “I say to you that many will come from east and west, and recline at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; 12 but the sons of the kingdom will be **cast out into the outer darkness**; in that place there will be **weeping and gnashing of teeth**.”

Matthew 25:30+ “Throw out the worthless slave into the **outer darkness**; in that place there will be **weeping and gnashing of teeth**.”

Matthew 13:30+ ‘Allow both to grow together until the harvest; and in the time of the harvest I will say to the reapers, “First gather up the tares and bind them in bundles to burn them up; but gather the wheat into my barn.”’

Revelation 21:27+ and nothing unclean, and no one who practices abomination and lying, shall ever come into it, but only those whose names are written in the Lamb’s book of life.

A DARK, DISMAL END FOR "WEDDING CRASHERS!"

Then (time phrase) **the king said to the servants, ‘Bind him hand and foot, and throw** ([ekbállō](#) - [aorist imperative](#) - Do not delay!) **him into the outer darkness** ([skotos](#)) ; **in that place there will be weeping** ([klauthmos](#) - wailing) **and gnashing** ([brugmos](#)) **of teeth** = The penalty for improper wedding clothes was not just to be tossed out the door. Clearly at the point the parable takes on a meaning one would not expect at a typical Jewish wedding. The picture is clearly that of tossing the improperly dressed man into eternal punishment. Jesus gives three horrible aspects of eternal punishment - outer darkness, place of weeping and place of gnashing of teeth (almost certainly communicating pain).

Spurgeon - He had, by his action, if not in words, said, ‘I am a free man, and will do as I like.’ So the king said to the servants, ‘Bind him.’ Pinion him; let him never be free again. He had made too free with holy things; he had actively insulted the King.”

David Guzik - This parable demonstrates that those indifferent to the gospel, those antagonistic against the gospel, and those unchanged by the gospel share the same fate. None of them enjoyed the king’s feast.

John MacArthur - Since Cain’s first attempt to please God by offering his self-appointed sacrifice, men have been trying to come to the Lord on their own terms. They may fellowship with believers, join the church, become active in the leadership, give generously to its support, and speak of devotion to God. Like the tares among the wheat, they freely coexist for a while with God’s people. But in the day of judgment their falsehood will become obvious and their removal certain. Some will dare to say to God “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?’ And then [Christ] will declare to them, ‘I never knew you; depart from Me, you who practice lawlessness’ ” (Matt. 7:21–23+). The proper wedding garment of a true believer is God-imputed righteousness, without which no one can enter or live in the kingdom. Unless a person’s righteousness exceeds the hypocritical self-righteousness that typified the scribes and Pharisees, he “shall not enter the kingdom of heaven” (Matt. 5:20). The only acceptable wedding garment is the genuine “sanctification without which no one will see the Lord” (Heb. 12:14). (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

Weeping (2805) [klauthmos](#) from [klaio](#) = to weep or bewail) is a noun which describes a strong inner emotion which is evoked in weeping, crying, lamentation (cries of grief, the act of bewailing as an expression of sorrow). Hell is a place of conscious sorrow for the unconscious would not weep.

KLAUTHMOS - 8V - Matt. 2:18; Matt. 8:12; Matt. 13:42; Matt. 13:50; Matt. 22:13; Matt. 24:51; Matt. 25:30; Lk. 13:28; Acts 20:37 In most of these NT uses the tears are genuine, but their effect on the wrath of God is nil, as it is too late for those who shed them. The image is of utter hopelessness and is intended as a **warning** to those who read or hear these difficult to accept sayings!

Gnashing (1030) (**brugmos** from **brucho** = grind, make sounds striking teeth together)(see [gnashing teeth](#)) describes striking, grinding or biting of teeth together. The picture is of one making a grating sound by rubbing one's teeth together as an expression of anger, pain, suffering. In the context of the NT **brugmos** is a manifestation or picture of the extreme anguish and utter despair of those consigned to eternal torment in hell. **Webster** says gnash means to strike the teeth together as in anger or pain, both emotions probably in play in the fires of hell. The root verb **brucho** is used in [Acts 7:54+](#) to describe the Jews who were "cut to the quick" by Stephen's sermon and began "**gnashing** their teeth at him", clearly a manifestation of intense anger (and guilt). **TDNT** says the root **brucho** was used "of the cry of pain of a stag mortally wounded by snake-bite."

BRUGMOS - 7x/7v - Matt. 8:12; Matt. 13:42; Matt. 13:50; Matt. 22:13; Matt. 24:51; Matt. 25:30; Lk. 13:28 (see these passages above under the discussion of weeping) The only OT use is in the **Septuagint** translation of Pr 19:12.= "King's wrath is like the **roaring** (growling; Lxx = brugmos) of a lion."

QUESTION - [What does the Bible mean when it refers to the gnashing of teeth? | GotQuestions.org](#)

ANSWER - The precise phrase *gnashing of teeth* is found in several places in the Bible and is used exclusively in reference to the final judgment of sinners, where it is combined with either weeping or wailing. The Greek phrase for "gnashing of teeth" literally means "grinding one's teeth together."

Surely, part of what the gnashing of teeth communicates is pain, especially when the gnashing is combined with weeping. When a person hits his thumb with a hammer, he will commonly squeeze his eyes closed and grind his teeth together hard. The weeping and gnashing of teeth in Scripture, however, is much more dreadful, partly because it lasts for eternity.

Gnashing one's teeth shows up elsewhere in Scripture in contexts other than feeling pain. In Acts 7:54 the gnashing of teeth is done in anger because of what [Stephen](#) had said to the Jewish Council: "They were furious and gnashed their teeth at him." Psalm 37:12 says, "The wicked plot against the righteous and gnash their teeth at them" (see also Psalm 35:16; 112:10; and Lamentations 2:16). In these passages, wicked persons gnash their teeth at righteous persons as the wicked plot against them or disapprove of them. Apparently, gnashing teeth was a sign of great disrespect and anger.

Jesus' first reference to weeping and gnashing of teeth comes in Matthew 8:12 where He compares the kingdom of heaven to a feast where "many" come from all parts of the world to "recline at the table with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." The others, however, are thrown into "outer darkness" where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth. In His [parable of the weeds](#) sown in the field, Jesus again describes the fate of those who reject Him, this time adding to the description "the fiery furnace" into which they will be cast (Matthew 13:41–42). The story of the guest who comes to the wedding feast of the Lamb without the proper clothing is cast into outer darkness where there is weeping and gnashing of teeth (Matthew 22:11–13), as is the wicked servant described in Matthew 24:44–51 and the worthless servant in the [parable of the talents](#) (Matthew 25:14–30).

All these references to weeping and gnashing of teeth have one thing in common—the undeniable fact that those who do not belong to Christ will suffer a terrible fate, while His children will enjoy bliss in heaven with Him forever. Hell will be a place of anguish, remorse, pain, and misery. Heaven will be a place where God eventually "will wipe every tear from their eyes. There will be no more death or mourning or crying or pain, for the old order of things has passed away" (Revelation 21:4). The misery that causes the gnashing of teeth will be unknown in heaven, and there will be no weeping, no wailing, and no tears.

Sadly, those who reject God will realize in hell what they have truly lost, and the realization that there is no "second chance" will cause them to feel the full weight of the pain that goes with that knowledge. The anguish of being separated from God does not go away. It is eternal and unrelenting. We all deserve that kind of punishment: "For all have sinned and fall short of the glory of God" (Romans 3:23), but God, in His mercy, made it possible for us to avoid that eternal pain and suffering. Paul explains, "For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Romans 6:23).

All who accept the gift God has provided through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ will escape the everlasting weeping and gnashing of teeth. Paul proclaims, "If you confess with your mouth, 'Jesus is Lord,' and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved. For it is with your heart that you believe and are justified, and it is with your mouth that you confess and are saved" (Romans 10:9–10). Jesus uses powerful imagery like wailing and gnashing of teeth to illustrate the importance of turning away from the sin that leads to hell and turning to Him who alone provides salvation.

QUESTION - [Why will there be weeping and gnashing of teeth in hell | GotQuestions.org](#)

ANSWER - On multiple occasions, [Jesus refers to hell](#) as a place where "there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth" (Matthew 8:12; 13:42, 50; 22:13; 24:51; 25:30). This coupling of *weeping* and *gnashing of teeth* in hell reflects the unspeakable torment of those who will be separated from God for all eternity.

In the Bible, both “weeping” and “gnashing of teeth” represent physical and spiritual anguish. When Jerusalem was destroyed, and the Jews were exiled from their homeland, the people wept in anguish (Isaiah 22:12; Lamentations 1:2, 16; 2:11). In the New Testament, James warned the rich oppressors to prepare for God’s judgment, advising, “weep and wail because of the misery that is coming on you” (James 5:1). *Gnashing (or “grinding”) of teeth* also appears throughout the Bible, always depicting people in moments of violent, furious torment and vexation (Psalm 37:12; Lamentations 2:16; Acts 7:54).

In every instance that Jesus uses the expression *weeping and gnashing of teeth*, He associates it with someone coming to the excruciating realization that he or she will not be allowed to enter the kingdom of heaven. In Matthew 8:12, it is the Jewish people who reject Christ’s salvation; in Matthew 13:36–43, it is the evil enemies of God; in Matthew 13:47–52, it is the wicked; in Matthew 22:1–14, it is all who refuse Christ’s invitation; in Matthew 24:48–51, it is the evil, disobedient servant; and in Matthew 25:14–30, it is the worthless, faithless servant.

Long before Jesus talked about weeping and gnashing of teeth in hell, the psalmist presented an end-of-the-world snapshot of the wicked observing the blissful destiny of the righteous (Psalm 112:1–9) while gnashing their teeth in rage (Psalm 112:10). There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth in hell because the unredeemed will finally see and understand all that they have lost.

Likewise, there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth in hell because it is a place of eternal punishment (Jude 1:7). Hell was originally intended for Satan and his angels (Matthew 25:41; 2 Peter 2:4; Revelation 20:1–3, 10), but it is also for people who [choose to reject the Lord](#) (Matthew 13:40–42; Mark 9:42–48; Romans 2:8; Hebrews 10:26–29; 2 Peter 3:7; Revelation 20:15; 21:8).

Since God is a God of love (1 John 4:7–8), He wants everyone to understand the truth about hell. Through a relationship with Jesus Christ, God offers us eternal life in the kingdom of heaven (Matthew 4:17; 25:31–34; John 3:16–18). If we reject His offer, the alternative is hell. And Scripture is clear—hell is a reality not to be taken lightly or ignored. Judgment and punishment in hell are expressed in the Bible as “God’s wrath” (John 3:36; Deuteronomy 32:22; Zephaniah 1:18; Romans 2:5), “torment” (Luke 16:23–24; Revelation 14:11; Revelation 20:10), “destruction” and “corruption” (Psalm 55:23; Romans 9:22; Philippians 3:18–19; Galatians 6:8; 2 Peter 1:4), and “eternal” and “unquenchable fire” (Matthew 3:12; Hebrews 10:27; Revelation 19:20). Scripture also emphasizes the extreme isolation of hell, referring to it as “blackest darkness” (Jude 1:6, 13; 2 Peter 2:17), “the Abyss” (Revelation 9:1–2), and “death” (John 8:21; Romans 6:23; 1 Corinthians 15:26; 1 Corinthians 15:54–55; Revelation 20:14–15; 21:8).

Perhaps the most distressing aspect of hell is that it means total and eternal separation from God (Matthew 7:23). The apostle Paul describes the Lord’s judgment as coming “in flaming fire . . . on those who don’t know God and on those who refuse to obey the Good News of our Lord Jesus. They will be punished with eternal destruction, forever separated from the Lord and from his glorious power” (2 Thessalonians 1:8–9, NLT).

The finality of hell is cause for anguish and torment, for there will be [no escape](#) for those who find themselves there (Luke 16:26 Hebrews 6:4–6; 10:26–27). In the endless absence of God’s love, light, peace, and joy, there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth. But for all who enter God’s eternal dwelling, “He will wipe every tear from their eyes, and there will be no more death or sorrow or crying or pain” (Revelation 21:4, NLT).

QUESTION - [What is the outer darkness in Matthew 22:13? | GotQuestions.org](#)

ANSWER - In the [Parable of the Wedding Feast](#), Jesus tells of a “wedding crasher” of sorts: a man in the wedding hall was discovered to have entered the feast without authorization. Jesus says that the king, the master of the feast, issued a dire command concerning the interloper: “Bind him hand and foot and cast him into the outer darkness” (ESV).

Jesus uses the term “outer darkness” in the parable to describe a condition of great sorrow, loss and woe. It stands in vivid contrast to the brightly lit and joyous celebration attended by those who accepted the king’s invitation. Interpreting the wedding feast as heaven, the “outer darkness” must be the place of eternal punishment. Most Bible scholars agree that the phrase “outer darkness” refers to hell or, more properly, the lake of fire (Matthew 8:12; 13:42; 13:50; and 25:30,41).

The outer darkness of Jesus’ parable is called “blackest darkness” in Jude 1:13. Again, a place of judgment is the obvious meaning, since it is reserved for “godless men” (verse 4).

Perhaps the place of judgment is pictured as “dark” because of the absence of God’s cheering presence. “When you hide your face, they are terrified” (Psalm 104:29). God is called “light” in 1 John 1:5, and if He withdraws His blessing, only darkness is left. Throughout the Scriptures light symbolizes God’s purity, holiness, and glory. Darkness is used as a symbol of moral depravity (Psalm 82:5; Proverbs 2:13; Romans 3:12). Darkness can also refer to trouble and affliction (Job 5:12; Proverbs 20:20; Isaiah 9:2) and to death and nothingness (1 Samuel 2:9; Ecclesiastes 11:8; Job 3:4-6).

The outer darkness of judgment is accompanied by “weeping and gnashing of teeth.” The “weeping” describes an inner pain of the

heart, mind, and soul. The word in the original denotes a bewailing or lamentation by beating the breast in an expression of immense sorrow. The “gnashing of teeth” describes an outward pain of the body. Taken together, the weeping and gnashing of teeth says hell is a place of indescribable spiritual agony and unending physical pain (see Luke 16:23-28). The outer darkness is a place of anguish, heartache, grief, and unspeakable suffering. Such will be the lot of all who reject Christ (John 3:18, 36).

Christ is the Light of the World (John 8:12). When one rejects the Light, he will be cast into eternal darkness. Just like the man in the parable, the one who rejects Christ will lose his chance for joy, blessing and fellowship and will be left with nothing but darkness and eternal regret.

Matthew 22:14 “For many are called, but few are chosen.”

KJV Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen.

BGT Matthew 22:14 πολλοὶ ὄρεσιν κλητοί, ὅλγοι δὲ κλεκτοί.

NET Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen."

CSB Matthew 22:14 "For many are invited, but few are chosen."

ESV Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen."

NIV Matthew 22:14 "For many are invited, but few are chosen."

NLT Matthew 22:14 "For many are called, but few are chosen."

NRS Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen."

NJB Matthew 22:14 For many are invited but not all are chosen.'

NAB Matthew 22:14 Many are invited, but few are chosen."

YLT Matthew 22:14 for many are called, and few chosen.'

MIT Matthew 22:14 Many are invited but few are chosen.

GWN Matthew 22:14 "Therefore, many are invited, but few of those are chosen to stay."

BBE Matthew 22:14 For out of all to whom the good news has come, only a small number will get salvation.

RSV Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen."

NKJ Matthew 22:14 "For many are called, but few are chosen."

ASV Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few chosen.

DBY Matthew 22:14 For many are called ones, but few chosen ones.

NIRV Matthew 22:14 "Many are invited, but few are chosen."

RWB Matthew 22:14 For many are called, but few are chosen.

- Mt 7:13-14 Mt 20:16 Lu 13:23-24

Related Passages:

Luke 13:23-28+ And someone said to Him, “Lord, **are there just a few who are being saved?**” And He said to them, 24 “**Strive** ([present imperative](#) see [our need to depend on the Holy Spirit to obey](#)) to enter through the narrow door; for many, I tell you, will seek to enter and will not be able. 25 “Once the head of the house gets up and shuts the door, and you begin to stand outside and knock on the door, saying, ‘Lord, open up to us!’ then He will answer and say to you, ‘**I do not know where you are from**’ (COMPARE Mt 7:23+) 26 “Then you will begin to say, ‘We ate and drank in Your presence, and You taught in our streets’ 27 and He will say, ‘I tell you, I **do not know where you are from**, **DEPART** ([aorist imperative](#)) FROM ME, ALL YOU EVILDOERS.’ 28 “In that place there will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, but yourselves being thrown out.

MANY CALLED FEW CHOSEN

For ([gar](#)) - This is a very strategic term of explanation, explaining why many will suffer the fate of eternal punishment.

Many are called ([kletos](#) - invited), **but few** (oligos) **are chosen** ([ekletos](#)) - GWT "few of those are chosen to stay." BBE="For out of all to whom the good news has come, only a small number will get salvation." **Many are called** refers to all those who hear the Gospel. Though many are invited, only some (the "chosen") accept the gift of salvation and are clothed in the righteousness of Christ. Few are chosen describes those who heard the Gospel but were unwilling to accept it.

The **few are chosen** parallels Jesus' quantitative description in Matthew 7 commanding His hearers on the Sermon on the Mount to **"Enter"** ([aorist imperative](#) and the only way to obey is by [the work of the Holy Spirit enabling you to obey](#)) through the narrow gate; **FOR** (term of explanation) the gate is wide and the way is broad that leads to destruction, and there are **MANY** (COMPARE MANY ARE CALLED BUT FEW CHOSEN) who enter through it. "FOR (term of explanation) the gate is small and the way is narrow that leads to (ETERNAL) life, and there are **FEW** (COMPARE MANY ARE CALLED BUT FEW CHOSEN) who find it." (Mt 7:13-14+)

People must respond to God's summons

with both repentance and right (ED: SUPERNATURAL) living to be part of God's elect!

-- Grant Osborne

David Guzik highlights the mysterious teaching of God's sovereignty and Man's responsibility writing "This statement of Jesus, in this context, touches on the great working together of the choices of man and the choosing of God. Why did they not come to the wedding party? Because they refused the invitation. Why did they not come to the wedding party? Because they were called, but not chosen.

John MacArthur - The gospel invitation is sent to everyone, because it is not the Father's will that a single person be excluded from His kingdom and perish in the outer darkness of hell (2 Pet. 3:9). But not everyone wants God, and many who claim to want Him do not want Him on His terms. Those who are saved enter God's kingdom because of their willing acceptance of His sovereign, gracious provision. Those who are lost are excluded from the kingdom because of their willing rejection of that same sovereign grace. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 313](#))

Called ([2822](#)) [kletos](#) rom [kaleo](#) = basic meaning is to call - see amplification below. See study of related word [klesis](#)) is a "verbal adjective" which is sometimes used as a verb and sometimes used as a noun referring to believers. Literally **kletos** means invited or welcomed and was originally used to designate those invited to a banquet. In fact in 1Ki 1:41, 49 **kletos** is used in the Septuagint in the sense of called or invited to a meal or banquet. In the NT **kletos** is generally used of one who has accepted a calling or an invitation to become a guest or member of a select group. Believers have been invited by God in the proclamation of the Gospel to obtain eternal salvation in the kingdom through Christ.

KLETOS - 10V - Matt. 22:14; Rom. 1:1; Rom. 1:6; Rom. 1:7; Rom. 8:28; 1 Co. 1:1; 1 Co. 1:2; 1 Co. 1:24; Jude 1:1; Rev. 17:14

In **Stephen Motyer's** well done article on [Call, Calling](#) he writes that...

This prominent biblical term is used with particular theological significance in three ways: in connection with **worship**, with election, and with **vocation**.

(1) Worship. To "call on" God or the Lord is a frequent biblical expression: it occurs fifty-six times in total (Old Testament, 45; New Testament, 11); on four occasions it is applied to other gods. It often appears in the fuller form, "call on the name of" (31 times). The highest concentration is in the psalms (16 times). ([Click for full discussion on "Worship"](#))...

(2) Election. "Call" is one of the biblical words associated with the theme of election. In both Hebrew and Greek, "call" can be used in the sense of "naming" (Ge 2:19; Luke 1:13), and in biblical thought to give a name to something or someone was to bestow an identity. Names often encapsulated a message about the person concerned (Ruth 1:20, 21; Jn 1:42; cf. Mt 16:18). When God is the one who bestows names, the action is almost equivalent to creation: "Who created all these? He who brings out the starry host one by one, and calls them each by name. Because of his great power and mighty strength, not one of them is missing" (Isa 40:26).

This theme is developed particularly in Isaiah 40-55, which forms an important background to the New Testament use of the term. The creative "calling" of the stars is matched by the "calling" of Abraham, which meant both the summons to leave Ur and the call to be the father of Israel: "When I called him he was but one,

and I blessed him and made him many" (Is 51:2). Similarly Israel the nation has been called-"I took you from the ends of the earth, from its farthest corners I called you" (Is 41:9; cf. Is 48:12)-and this means that they are "called by my name ... created for my glory" (Is 43:7; cf. Hos 1:10). God has bestowed his own name upon Israel as part of the creative act that made Israel his own elect people. Now also the Servant of the Lord has been "called" to be the Savior of the world (Is 42:6; 49:1); and so has Cyrus, to be the instrument of judgment of Babylon (Is 48:15).

Thus in Isaiah "**call**" brings together the ideas of **naming**, **election**, **ownership**, and **appointment**, as the word is used with different nuances in different contexts. It connotes **the creative word of God**, by which he acts effectively within the world.

The New Testament picks up all these ideas and takes them further. The influence of Isaiah is seen particularly in the writings of Paul and Peter, who use "**call**" as a semi-technical term denoting God's **effective summons** of people to faith in Christ; verb and noun together are used approximately forty-three times with this general denotation. However, within this overall usage various shades of meaning of and nuances may be discerned: Initiation... Naming... Destiny... Holiness ([Click for full discussion of each of these "nuances" of call, calling](#))...

Vocation. The notion of appointment to office, which we observed in Isaiah, is also taken up in the New Testament. When Paul was "called by grace," it meant not just his conversion but also his appointment as apostle to the Gentiles (Gal 1:15). He is therefore "called to be an apostle" (Ro 1:1; 1Co 1:1). ([Click for Stephen Motyer's full discussion on Call, Calling](#)). (Bolding added)

Related Resource:

- [What is the effectual calling/call? | GotQuestions.org](#)

Elect (1588) [eklektos](#); [Chosen in Christ](#) from verb **eklego** which in middle voice [eklegomai] means select or pick out for one's self which is derived from **ek** =out + **lego** =call) means literally the "called out ones" or "chosen out ones". The idea of **eklektos** is the ones who have been chosen for one's self, selected out of a larger number.

In regard to **election** as related to salvation, **Wuest** comments that "This **election does not** imply the rejection of the rest (those not chosen out), but is the outcome of the love of God lavished upon those **chosen-out**.")

EKLETOS - 22V - Matt. 22:14; Matt. 24:22; Matt. 24:24; Matt. 24:31; Mk. 13:20; Mk. 13:22; Mk. 13:27; Lk. 18:7; Lk. 23:35; Rom. 8:33; Rom. 16:13; Col. 3:12; 1 Tim. 5:21; 2 Tim. 2:10; Tit. 1:1; 1 Pet. 1:1; 1 Pet. 2:4; 1 Pet. 2:6; 1 Pet. 2:9; 2 Jn. 1:1; 2 Jn. 1:13; Rev. 17:14

Related Resources:

- [Unconditional election - is it biblical? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [What is conditional election? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [What is the doctrine of election? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Who are the elect of God? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [How can I know if I am one of the elect? | GotQuestions.org](#)

QUESTION - [What does "Many are called but few are chosen" in Matthew 22:14 mean? gotquestions.org](#) [WATCH VIDEO](#)

ANSWER - This statement is the conclusion to the Parable of the Wedding Feast. Jesus spoke this parable to show what the kingdom of heaven will be like when the end of the age comes. In the parable, the king sends his servants out to gather the wedding guests to the wedding feast. But those invited refused to come, some because they were too busy with their own worldly pursuits and some because they were positively hostile toward the king. So the king commands his servants to go out and invite anyone they find, and many come and fill the wedding hall. But the king sees one man without wedding clothes, and he sends him away. Jesus concludes by saying that many are called/invited to the kingdom, but only those who have been "chosen" and have received Christ will come. Those who try to come without the covering of the blood of Christ for their sins are inadequately clothed and will be sent into "outer darkness," (v. 13) i.e., hell.

Many people hear the call of God coming through His revelation of Himself through creation, the conscience, and the preaching of the Word. But only the "few" will respond because they are the ones who are truly hearing. Jesus said many times, "He who has ears to hear, let him hear" (Matthew 11:15; Mark 4:9; Luke 8:8, 14:35). The point is that everyone has ears, but only a few are listening and responding. Not everyone who hears the gospel receives it but only the "few" who have ears to hear. The "many" hear,

but there is no interest or there is outright antagonism toward God. Many are called or invited into the kingdom, but none are able to come on their own. God must draw the hearts of those who come; otherwise they will not (John 6:44).

2 Corinthians 5:17 says, "Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creation; the old has gone, the new has come." God creates life, grants repentance and gives faith. Man is totally unable by himself to do these things which are necessary to enter the kingdom of heaven. Ephesians 1:4-6: "For he chose us in him before the creation of the world to be holy and blameless in his sight. In love he predestined us to be adopted as his sons through Jesus Christ, in accordance with his pleasure and will—to the praise of his glorious grace, which he has freely given us in the One he loves." Salvation is by God's will and pleasure for His glory. John 6:37-39, 44-45: "All that the Father gives me will come to me, and whoever comes to me I will never drive away. For I have come down from heaven not to do my will but to do the will of him who sent me. And this is the will of him who sent me, that I shall lose none of all that he has given me, but raise them up at the last day...No one can come to me unless the Father who sent me draws him, and I will raise him up at the last day. It is written in the Prophets: 'They will all be taught by God.' Everyone who listens to the Father and learns from him comes to me."

So, all of God's "chosen" will be saved without exception; they will hear and respond because they have spiritual ears to hear the truth. God's power makes this certain. Romans 8:28-30: "And we know that in all things God works for the good of those who love him, who have been called according to his purpose. For those God foreknew (loved) he also predestined to be conformed to the likeness of his Son, that he might be the firstborn among many brothers. And those he predestined, he also called; those he called, he also justified; those he justified, he also glorified."

How do we know if we are among the few that have ears to hear? By responding to the call. Assurance of this certain call, this chosen call, is from the Holy Spirit. Consider Philippians 1:6, which says, "Being confident of this, that he who began a good work in you will carry it on to completion until the day of Christ Jesus." "Therefore, my dear friends, as you have always obeyed—not only in my presence, but now much more in my absence—continue to work out your salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God who works in you to will and to act according to his good purpose" (Philippians 2:12-13.) If we listen with our spiritual ears and respond to the invitation, there will be fear and trembling in our souls as we recognize that it was God's work in us that caused our salvation.

Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went and plotted together how they might trap Him in what He said.

KJV Matthew 22:15 Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle him in his talk.

BGT Matthew 22:15 Τ τε πορευθ ντες ο Φαρισα οι συμβο λιον λαβον πως α τ ν παγιδε σωσιν ν λ γ .

NET Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went out and planned together to entrap him with his own words.

CSB Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went and plotted how to trap Him by what He said.

ESV Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went and plotted how to entangle him in his words.

NIV Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went out and laid plans to trap him in his words.

NLT Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees met together to plot how to trap Jesus into saying something for which he could be arrested.

NRS Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went and plotted to entrap him in what he said.

NJB Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went away to work out between them how to trap him in what he said.

NAB Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees went off and plotted how they might entrap him in speech.

YLT Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees having gone, took counsel how they might ensnare him in words,

MIT Matthew 22:15 Then the Pharisees conferred and concocted a scam by which they would entrap him in something he would say.

- **went and plotted together** : Ps 2:2 Mk 12:13-17 Lu 20:20-26
- **how**: Ps 41:6 56:5-7 57:6 59:3 Isa 29:21 Jer 18:18 20:10 Lu 11:53,54 Heb 12:3

PHARISEES PREPARE A VERBAL TRAP FOR JESUS

Then ([tote](#) - time phrase) - **Then** marks progress in a narrative and in this case it was as if the religious leaders had heard enough!

The three previous parables had clearly incriminated and in a sense judged them which motivated them to take more direct measures to get rid of Jesus. In this context **Then** ([tote](#)) primarily indicates a sequence of events, but there is also a logical aspect in that the Pharisees were taking counsel together because of what had just occurred.

The Pharisees ([pharisaiois](#)) **went** ([poreuo](#)) **and plotted together** ([sumboulion](#)) **how they might trap** ([pagideuo](#)) **Him in what He said** ([logos](#) - "ensnare Him in words") - **Went** ([poreuo](#)) literally means to go from one place to another and here indicates this brood of vipers left the area where Jesus was teaching (probably gathering privately in another part of the Temple) to concoct their scheme. **Plotted together** ([sumboulion](#)) indicates these religious hypocrites sought to engage in joint planning so as to devise a course of common action with an evil purpose to of catching Jesus off guard, catching Him in a mistake and entrapping Him by provoking Him to speak without forethought. The first group to try their hand at outwitting Jesus is a tag-team of Pharisees and Herodians normally not on friendly terms.

NET NOTE - Pharisees were members of one of the most important and influential religious and political parties of Judaism in the time of Jesus. There were more Pharisees than Sadducees (according to Josephus, Ant. 17.2.4 [17.42] there were more than 6,000 Pharisees at about this time). Pharisees differed with Sadducees (**ED: ANTI-SUPERNATURALISTS**) on certain doctrines and patterns of behavior. The Pharisees were strict and zealous adherents to the laws of the OT and to numerous additional traditions such as angels and bodily resurrection.

Matthew Henry Concise Mt 22:15-22. The Pharisees sent their disciples with the Herodians, a party among the Jews, who were for full subjection to the Roman emperor. Though opposed to each other, they joined against Christ. What they said of Christ was right; whether they knew it or not, blessed be God we know it. Jesus Christ was a faithful Teacher, and a bold reprover. Christ saw their wickedness. Whatever mask the hypocrite puts on, our Lord Jesus sees through it. Christ did not interpose as a judge in matters of this nature, for his kingdom is not of this world, but he enjoins peaceable subjection to the powers that be. His adversaries were reprov'd, and his disciples were taught that the Christian religion is no enemy to civil government. Christ is, and will be, the wonder, not only of his friends, but of his enemies. They admire his wisdom, but will not be guided by it; his power, but will not submit to it.

Pharisees ([5330](#)) [pharisaiois](#) is transliterated from the Hebrew **parash** ([06567](#) - to separate) from Aramaic word **peras** ([06537](#)) ("Peres" in Da 5:28-[note](#)), signifying to separate, owing to a different manner of life from that of the general public. After the resettling of the Jewish people in Judea on their return from the Babylonian captivity, there were two religious groups among them. One party contented themselves with following only what was written in the Law of Moses. These were called **Zadikim**, the righteous. The other group added the constitutions and traditions of the elders, as well as other rigorous observances, to the Law and voluntarily complied with them. They were called **Chasidim** or the pious. From the Zadikim the sects of the Sadducees and Karaites were derived. From the Chasidim were derived the Pharisees and the Essenes. In I Mac2:42, among the persons who joined Mattathias against Antiochus IV (Epiphanes), about 167 b.c., are named the Asideans (Asidaioi), who are described as voluntarily devoted to the law. The Asideans are mentioned also in I Mac 7:13; II Mac14:6. In the time of our Lord, the Pharisees were the separatists of their day, as well as the principal sect among the Jews. The Pharisees considered themselves much holier than the common people (Lu 18:11, 12). They wore special garments to distinguish themselves from others. **PRINCIPLE TENETS OF PHARISEES:** In opposition to those of the Sadducees, and the former group maintained the existence of angels and spirits and the doctrine of the resurrection (Acts 23:8), which the latter party denied (Mt 22:23; Mk 12:18; Lu 20:27). The Pharisees made everything dependent upon God and fate (Josephus, The Jewish Wars, ii.8.14). However, they did not deny the role of the human will in affecting events (Josephus, Antiquities, xviii.1.3). **ZEAL FOR TRADITION:** The Pharisees distinguished themselves with their zeal for the traditions of the elders, which they taught was derived from the same fountain as the written Word itself, claiming both to have been delivered to Moses on Mount Sinai (Mt 15:1-6; Mk 7:3-5). See also *parádosis*, tradition, and *éntalma*, a religious precept versus *entole*, commandment. ([See more detailed notes from William Barclay](#))

Jesus's strongest invective is directed toward the Pharisees (esp. Matt. 5:20; 9:11, 34; 12:2, 14, 24, 38; 15:1, 12; 16:1, 6, 11-12; 19:3; 21:45; 22:15, 34, 41; 23:2, 13, 15, 23, 25, 26, 27, 29; 27:62).

PHARISAIOS IN MATTHEW - Matt. 3:7; Matt. 5:20; Matt. 9:11; Matt. 9:14; Matt. 9:34; Matt. 12:2; Matt. 12:14; Matt. 12:24; Matt. 12:38; Matt. 15:1; Matt. 15:12; Matt. 16:1; Matt. 16:6; Matt. 16:11; Matt. 16:12; Matt. 19:3; Matt. 21:45; Matt. 22:15; Matt. 22:34; Matt. 22:41; Matt. 23:2; Matt. 23:13; Matt. 23:14; Matt. 23:15; Matt. 23:23; Matt. 23:25; Matt. 23:26; Matt. 23:27; Matt. 23:29; Matt. 27:62;

Plotted together ([4824](#)) [sumboulion](#) rom **sún** = together + **boulé** = counsel) speaks of what is related to consultation with *lambánō* (receive) meaning to form a plan (in negative sense - plot - Mt 22:15) with *poiéō* (do or make) meaning to make or take council (Mark 3:6 = conspiring; Mk 15:1 - held a consultation). to take or receive counsel, to hold or take a consultation (Matt. 12:14; 22:15; 27:1, 7; 28:12) This noun refers to a council with the emphasis placed on the result of the council's deliberations.

Sunboulion denotes an advisory council or an official deliberative assembly as a body (council session, meeting) In Acts 25:12 it means a council, an advisory council, and speaks of persons who sat in public trials with the governor of a province.

SUMBOULION - 8V - Matt. 12:14; Matt. 22:15; Matt. 27:1; Matt. 27:7; Matt. 28:12; Mk. 3:6; Mk. 15:1; Acts 25:12

Trap (3802) pagideuo from **pagis** - trap from **pegnumi** - to make fast) mean was a hunting term that meant to lay a snare, set a trap, entice into a trap. In this only use in the NT it is figurative, meaning to catch off guard, catch in a mistake, entrap Jesus deliberately by provoking Him to speak without forethought (Mt 22:15) Used 2x in the Septuagint -1Sa 28:9; Eccl. 9:12.

Matthew 22:16 And they *sent their disciples to Him, along with the Herodians, saying, "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.

KJV Matthew 22:16 And they sent out unto him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, Master, we know that thou art true, and teachest the way of God in truth, neither carest thou for any man: for thou regardest not the person of men.

BGT Matthew 22:16 κα ποστ λλουσιν α τ το ς μαθητ ς α τ ν μετ τ ν ρ διαν ν λ γοντες· διδ σκαλε, ο δαμεν τι ληθ ς ε κα τ ν δ ν το θεο ν ληθε διδ σκεις κα ο μ λει σοι περ ο δεν ς. ο γ ρ βλ πεις ε ς πρ σωπον νθρ πων,

NET Matthew 22:16 They sent to him their disciples along with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are truthful, and teach the way of God in accordance with the truth. You do not court anyone's favor because you show no partiality.

CSB Matthew 22:16 They sent their disciples to Him, with the Herodians. "Teacher," they said, "we know that You are truthful and teach truthfully the way of God. You defer to no one, for You don't show partiality.

ESV Matthew 22:16 And they sent their disciples to him, along with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are true and teach the way of God truthfully, and you do not care about anyone's opinion, for you are not swayed by appearances.

NIV Matthew 22:16 They sent their disciples to him along with the Herodians. "Teacher," they said, "we know you are a man of integrity and that you teach the way of God in accordance with the truth. You aren't swayed by men, because you pay no attention to who they are.

NLT Matthew 22:16 They sent some of their disciples, along with the supporters of Herod, to meet with him. "Teacher," they said, "we know how honest you are. You teach the way of God truthfully. You are impartial and don't play favorites.

NRS Matthew 22:16 So they sent their disciples to him, along with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are sincere, and teach the way of God in accordance with truth, and show deference to no one; for you do not regard people with partiality.

NJB Matthew 22:16 And they sent their disciples to him, together with some Herodians, to say, 'Master, we know that you are an honest man and teach the way of God in all honesty, and that you are not afraid of anyone, because human rank means nothing to you.

NAB Matthew 22:16 They sent their disciples to him, with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are a truthful man and that you teach the way of God in accordance with the truth. And you are not concerned with anyone's opinion, for you do not regard a person's status.

YLT Matthew 22:16 and they send to him their disciples with the Herodians, saying, 'Teacher, we have known that thou art true, and the way of God in truth thou dost teach, and thou art not caring for any one, for thou dost not look to the face of men;

MIT Matthew 22:16 They sent to him their students together with the Herodians. This was their line: "Teacher, we know you are authentic, and that you teach God's way accurately. Furthermore, you are not swayed by anything, for you do not base your actions on popular approval.

GWN Matthew 22:16 They sent their disciples to him along with Herod's followers. They said to him, "Teacher, we know that you tell the truth and that you teach the truth about the way of God. You don't favor individuals because of who they are.

BBE Matthew 22:16 And they sent to him their disciples, with the Herodians, saying, Master, we see that you are true, and that you are teaching the true way of God, and have no fear of anyone, because you have no respect for a man's position.

RSV Matthew 22:16 And they sent their disciples to him, along with the Herodians, saying, "Teacher, we know that you are true, and teach the way of God truthfully, and care for no man; for you do not regard the position of men.

- **Herodians:** Mt 16:11,12 Mk 3:6 8:15
- **Teacher:** Mt 22:24,26 26:18,49 Mk 10:17 Lu 7:40
- **we know:** Ps 5:9 12:2 55:21 Pr 29:5 Isa 59:13-15 Jer 9:3-5 Eze 33:30,31
- **true:** Mal 2:6 Jn 7:18 14:6 18:37 2Co 2:17 4:2 1Jn 5:20
- **neither:** De 33:9 1Ki 22:14 Job 32:21,22 Mic 3:9-12 Mal 2:9 Mk 12:14 Lu 20:21 2Co 5:16 Ga 1:10 2:6 1Th 2:4 Jas 3:17

Related Passages:

Luke 20:20+ So they watched Him, and sent spies who pretended to be righteous, in order that they might catch Him in some statement, so that they could deliver Him to the rule and the authority of the governor.

ASSESSMENT OF JESUS IS UTTER HYPOCRISY

And they *sent ([apostello](#) - [historical present tense](#)) **their disciples** ([mathetes](#)) **to Him, along with the Herodians** - Pharisees and Herodians were normally antagonistic to each other but here we see them invoke the old adage that **the enemy of my enemy is my friend**. The interesting point is that the Pharisees (anti-Rome) and the Herodians (supporters of Rome) disagreed on whether it was right to pay taxes to Rome, but this would be the very point on which they would attempt to trap Jesus!

MacArthur on why the Pharisees would send **their disciples** - Probably because the Pharisees were easily distinguished by their dress and many of them were known to Jesus by sight, they decided to send their disciples to Him. The Pharisees were Jesus' harshest critics and He theirs, and for them to flatter Him directly would have been ludicrous and self-defeating. Presumably their disciples would not be recognized as such and they could pretend simply to be a group of sincere admirers who wanted Jesus' advice about a question that burned in the minds of most Jews of that day. They hoped He would be caught off guard and entrap Himself before He realized what was happening. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 317](#))

Saying, "Teacher ([didaskalos](#)) - This mode of address was considered a high honor usually reserved for distinguished rabbis. The Talmud said, "The one who teaches the law shall gain a seat in the academy on high."

We know ([eido](#) - beyond a shadow of a doubt) **that You are truthful** ([alethes](#)) **and teach** ([didasko](#)) **the way of** ([hodos](#)) **God in truth** ([aletheia](#)), **and defer** ([melo](#)) **to no one** (NET = "You do not court anyone's favor" ESV = "you do not care about anyone's opinion" NIV = "You aren't swayed by men") - **Teach the way of God in accordance with the truth** is utterly deceitful for they did not really believe this at all. The Pharisees were setting verbal snares for Jesus. By their flattery they hoped to design a trap that would effectively ensnare the Lord.

It intrigues me that these hypocrites playing word games use some of the same words Jesus used of Himself in John 14:6+ (**way...truth**), but they clearly left out the truth that He taught the way of life!

David Turner points out that "If they really believed that Jesus teaches truth without partiality, they would not attempt to flatter him." (See [Matthew Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament](#))

For ([gar](#)) **You are not partial to any** - This is an idiom. Literally = "And it is not a concern to you about anyone because you do not see ([blepo](#) - present tense) the face ([prosopon](#)) of men." **MIT** = "for you do not base your actions on popular approval." NCV - 'you are not afraid of what other people think about you' - They explain their flattering remarks with a statement that is certainly true of Jesus. As God He was impartial.

NET NOTE - The **Herodians** are mentioned in the NT only once in Matt (Mt 22:16 = Mark 12:13) and twice in Mark 3:6; 12:13 (some MSS also read "Herodians" instead of "Herod" in Mark 8:15). It is generally assumed that as a group the **Herodians** were Jewish supporters of the Herodian dynasty (or of Herod Antipas in particular). In every instance they are linked with the Pharisees. This probably reflects agreement regarding political objectives (nationalism as opposed to submission to the yoke of Roman oppression) rather than philosophy or religious beliefs.

KJV Matthew 22:17 Tell us therefore, What thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute unto Caesar, or not?

BGT Matthew 22:17 ε π ο ν μ ν τ σοι δοκε · ξεστιν δο ναι κ νσον Κα σαρι ο ;

NET Matthew 22:17 Tell us then, what do you think? Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"

CSB Matthew 22:17 Tell us, therefore, what You think. Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"

ESV Matthew 22:17 Tell us, then, what you think. Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?"

NIV Matthew 22:17 Tell us then, what is your opinion? Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"

NLT Matthew 22:17 Now tell us what you think about this: Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"

NRS Matthew 22:17 Tell us, then, what you think. Is it lawful to pay taxes to the emperor, or not?"

NJB Matthew 22:17 Give us your opinion, then. Is it permissible to pay taxes to Caesar or not?"

NAB Matthew 22:17 Tell us, then, what is your opinion: Is it lawful to pay the census tax to Caesar or not?"

YLT Matthew 22:17 tell us, therefore, what dost thou think? is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar or not?"

MIT Matthew 22:17 Therefore, render to us your judgment: Is it right to pay a head tax to Caesar, or not?"

- **What:** Jer 42:2,3,20 Ac 28:22
- **is:** De 17:14,15 Ezr 4:13 7:24 Ne 5:4 9:37 Ac 5:37 Ro 13:6,7
- **Caesar:** Lu 2:1 Jn 19:12-15 Ac 17:7 25:8

GIVE US YOUR OPINION ON THE POLL TAX

Tell ([aorist imperative](#) - Do this now! Do not delay!) **us then** ([oun](#) - term of conclusion based on their flattery), **what do You think** ([dokeo](#)) **Is it lawful** ([exesti](#)) **to give a poll-tax** ([kensos](#)) **to Caesar** ([kaisar](#)), **or not** ([ou](#) - absolutely not) - Clearly they are trying to put Jesus on horns of a dilemma. If He says unlawful, they will accuse Him of treasonous talk against Rome and set the stage for His arrest and execution as an insurrectionist. If lawful, they would use this to convince the people to oppose Him, for they hated the Roman taxes. And then with this loss of popularity, they would feel safer to have Him arrested.

MacArthur - Assuming that Jesus was inwardly reveling in their flattery, the men sprang their trap question: "Tell us therefore, what do You think? Is it lawful to give a poll-tax to Caesar, or not?" One of the highest forms of praise is to ask a person's advice on an important issue. Therefore, after Jesus' ego was, as they supposed, stimulated by the previous compliments, the questioners were certain that, like most men, He would be eager to display the wisdom for which He had just been praised. In doing so He would blurt out an unguarded answer that would become His death warrant. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 318](#))

David Turner points out that "Their question about paying taxes to the Roman emperor is evidently about the "head tax" (tributum capitis), which was based on a census of Israel's population by the Romans (Luke 2:1–5; Josephus, J.W. 1.154; 2.118, 403–5, 433; Tacitus, Ann. 2.42; Schürer 1973: 1.399–427). This is different from the biblically mandated tax to support the temple, which Jesus did pay (17:24–27)." (See [Matthew Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament](#))

NET NOTE - poll-tax - According to L&N 57.180 the term κ νσοϛ (kēnsos) was borrowed from Latin and referred to a poll tax, a tax paid by each adult male to the Roman government. This question concerning taxes was specifically designed to trap Jesus. If he answered yes, then his opponents could publicly discredit him as a sympathizer with Rome. If he answered no, then they could go to the Roman governor and accuse Jesus of rebellion.

Poll-tax ([tribute](#))([2778](#)) [kensos](#) from Latin **census**, which means a counting of the people and valuation of property. Kensos is equivalent to the Greek word apographé ([582](#)) which literally means a write-up or an assessment. In the NT, tribute or **poll-tax** paid by each person whose name was taken in the census which the Greeks called epikephálaion, head tax (found 4x - Mt 17:25, 22:17, 19, Mk 12:14). **Gilbrant** adds "This noun (kensos) is the Greek transliteration of the Latin word **censēre**, meaning "enrollment" (cf. the English word census). It is quoted in Greek literature from the First Century B.C. meaning "poll tax, tribute." The Romans always levied a tax in conjunction with a census, so the two meanings of "enrollment" and "tax" were closely associated. It

occurs only four times in the New Testament. In Mt 17:25; 22:17,19; and Mk 12:14, the tax in view is the “census” or “poll tax” paid with a Roman coin on which appeared Caesar’s image, such an image being objectionable to the Jews. It is significant that Matthew, a tax collector, should use this term.” ([Complete Biblical Library](#))

KENSOS - 4V - Matt. 17:25; Matt. 22:17; Matt. 22:19; Mk. 12:14

QUESTION - [What does the Bible say about paying taxes? | GotQuestions.org](#)

ANSWER - In Matthew 22:17–21, the Pharisees asked Jesus a question: "'Tell us then, what is your opinion? Is it right to pay taxes to Caesar or not?' But Jesus, knowing their evil intent, said, 'You hypocrites, why are you trying to trap me? Show me the coin used for paying the tax.' They brought Him a denarius, and He asked them, 'Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?' 'Caesar's,' they replied. Then He said to them, 'Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's.'" In full agreement, the apostle Paul taught, "This is also why you pay taxes, for the authorities are God's servants, who give their full time to governing. Give everyone what you owe him: If you owe taxes, pay taxes; if revenue, then revenue; if respect, then respect; if honor, then honor" (Romans 13:6–7).

It seems there is an endless amount of the types of taxes to which citizens and participants in the local and global economy are subjected. Taxes are unpopular, and sometimes the government agencies in charge of collecting those taxes are thought of with disgust, whether they are corrupt or not. This is nothing new. Tax collectors were not thought highly of in Bible times either (Matthew 11:19; 21:31–32; Luke 3:12–13).

As much as we hate taxes, as much as any tax system can be corrupt and unfair, as much as we believe there are far better things our money could go toward—the Bible commands, yes, commands us to pay our taxes. Romans 13:1–7 makes it clear that we are to submit ourselves to the government. The only instance in which we are allowed to disobey the government is when it tells us to do something the Bible forbids. The Bible does not forbid paying taxes. In fact, the Bible encourages us to pay taxes. Therefore, we must submit to God and His Word—and pay our taxes.

Generally speaking, taxes are intended to enable the beneficial running of society. Depending on one's priorities, tax revenue is not always put to the best use. The most frequent objection to paying taxes is that the money is being misused by the government or even used for evil purposes by the government. That, however, is not our concern. When Jesus said, "Give to Caesar...", the Roman government was by no means a righteous government. When Paul instructed us to pay taxes, Nero, one of the most evil Roman emperors in history, was the head of the government. We are to pay our taxes even when the government is not God-honoring.

We are free to take every legal tax deduction available. We do not have to pay the maximum amount of taxes possible. If the government allows you a tax break, you are free to take it. If there is a legal way you can shelter some of your money from being taxed, you are free to shelter it. Illegal and/or dishonest methods of evading taxes must be rejected. Romans 13:2 reminds us, "Consequently, he who rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted, and those who do so will bring judgment on themselves."

Christians know that everything we have ultimately belongs to God. We are stewards and are called upon to invest our money and other resources into things with eternal value. We are called upon to provide for our families (1 Timothy 5:8) and to give generously (2 Corinthians 9:6–8). It is also wise to save (Proverbs 6:6–8) and perfectly acceptable to spend money on ourselves and thank God for His good gifts (James 1:17; Colossians 3:17). Paying taxes is the duty of a citizen, and Christians are called to be good citizens. But Christians are ultimately citizens of heaven (Philippians 3:20). Reducing our tax burden in this life should have as its goal investing in God's kingdom for eternity.

Matthew 22:18 But Jesus perceived their malice, and said, "Why are you testing Me, you hypocrites?"

KJV Matthew 22:18 But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said, Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites?

BGT Matthew 22:18 γνοϋς δὲ ἡσοϋ τὴν πονηρὰν αὐτὴν ἐπεὶ τὸ μετὰ πειρᾶς ζεῖτε, ποκρίται;

NET Matthew 22:18 But Jesus realized their evil intentions and said, "Hypocrites! Why are you testing me?"

CSB Matthew 22:18 But perceiving their malice, Jesus said, "Why are you testing Me, hypocrites?"

ESV Matthew 22:18 But Jesus, aware of their malice, said, "Why put me to the test, you hypocrites?"

NIV Matthew 22:18 But Jesus, knowing their evil intent, said, "You hypocrites, why are you trying to trap me?"

NLT Matthew 22:18 But Jesus knew their evil motives. "You hypocrites!" he said. "Why are you trying to trap

me?

NRS Matthew 22:18 But Jesus, aware of their malice, said, "Why are you putting me to the test, you hypocrites?"

NJB Matthew 22:18 But Jesus was aware of their malice and replied, 'You hypocrites! Why are you putting me to the test?'

NAB Matthew 22:18 Knowing their malice, Jesus said, "Why are you testing me, you hypocrites?"

YLT Matthew 22:18 And Jesus having known their wickedness, said, 'Why me do ye tempt, hypocrites?'

- **perceived:** Mk 2:8 Lu 5:22 9:47 20:23 Jn 2:25 Rev 2:23
- **Why:** Mt 16:1-4 19:3 Mk 12:5 Lu 10:25 Jn 8:6 Ac 5:9

JESUS PERCEIVES THE HYPOCRITES' TEST

But (term of contrast) **Jesus perceived** ([ginosko](#)) **their malice** ([poneria](#)), **and said**, "**Why are you testing** ([peirazo](#)) **Me, you hypocrites** ([hupokrites](#) - "religious actors") - One could say He arrived at this perception by His "divine discernment" (MacArthur - Jn 2:25), but normal logic would have told Him this was a trap spoken by a brood of vipers seeking to inflict a fatal wound. Therefore Jesus immediately exposes their evil ruse and as He so often did, answer their question with His question, knowing full well the answer. These **hypocrites** were great pretenders, pretending to be righteous like whitewashed tombs on the outside appearing beautiful but inside full of dead men's bones and uncleanness (Mt 23:25+).

THOUGHT - He is forcing them to look at their own hearts in this matter. Their hearts are hard and their consciences are surely seared by this time, so the effect would be nil. One wonders if some of these men later on recalled Jesus' piercing questions like this one and were moved by His words and the Spirit to come to their senses and believe in Him.

Testing (3985) [peirazo](#) (from the noun **peira** = test from **peíro** = perforate, pierce through to test durability of things) is a morally neutral word simply meaning "to test". Whether the **test** is for a good (as it proved to be in Heb 11:17) or evil (Mt 4:1 "*Then Jesus was led up by the Spirit into the wilderness to be **tempted** by the devil*") depends on the intent of the one giving the test and also on the response of the one tested. (See study of similar word [dokimazo](#)) See also word study on related word - [peirasmos](#)

PEIRAZO - 35V - Matt. 4:1; Matt. 4:3; Matt. 16:1; Matt. 19:3; Matt. 22:18; Matt. 22:35; Mk. 1:13; Mk. 8:11; Mk. 10:2; Mk. 12:15; Lk. 4:2; Lk. 11:16; Jn. 6:6; Jn. 8:6; Acts 5:9; Acts 9:26; Acts 15:10; Acts 16:7; Acts 24:6; 1 Co. 7:5; 1 Co. 10:9; 1 Co. 10:13; 2 Co. 13:5; Gal. 6:1; 1 Thess. 3:5; Heb. 2:18; Heb. 3:9; Heb. 4:15; Heb. 11:17; Heb. 11:37; Jas. 1:13; Jas. 1:14; Rev. 2:2; Rev. 2:10; Rev. 3:10

Hypocrites (5273) [hupokrites](#) (from **hupó** = under, indicating secrecy + **krino** = to judge) describes one who acts pretentiously, a counterfeit, a man who assumes and speaks or acts under a feigned character. A hypocrite is someone who pretends to be something he or she is not. The 1828 Webster's English dictionary says a **hypocrite** is "One who feigns to be what he is not;

William Barclay on hupokrites - Originally the Greek word hupokrites (Greek #5273) meant one who answers; it then came to be specially connected with the statement and answer, the dialogue, of the stage; and it is the regular Greek word for an actor. It then came to mean an actor in the worse sense of the term, a pretender, one who acts a part, one who wears a mask to cover his true feelings, one who puts on an external show while inwardly his thoughts and feelings are very different. To Jesus the Scribes and Pharisees were men who were acting a part. What he meant was this. Their whole idea of religion consisted in outward observances, the wearing of elaborate phylacteries and tassels, the meticulous observance of the rules and regulations of the Law. But in their hearts there was bitterness and envy and pride and arrogance. To Jesus these Scribes and Pharisees were men who, under a mask of elaborate godliness, concealed hearts in which the most godless feelings and emotions held sway. And that accusation holds good in greater or lesser degree of any man who lives life on the assumption that religion consists in external observances and external acts. There is an unwritten saying of Jesus which says, "The key of the Kingdom they hid." His condemnation of these Scribes and Pharisees is that they are not only failing to enter the Kingdom themselves, they shut the door on the faces of those who seek to enter. What did he mean by this accusation? We have already seen (Matthew 6:10) that the best way to think of the Kingdom is to think of it as a society on earth where God's will is as perfectly done as it is in heaven. To be a citizen of the Kingdom, and to do God's will, are one and the same thing. The Pharisees believed that to do God's will was to observe their thousands of petty rules and

regulations; and nothing could be further from that Kingdom whose basic idea is love. When people tried to find entry into the Kingdom the Pharisees presented them with these rules and regulations, which was as good as shutting the door in their faces. The Pharisees preferred their ideas of religion to God's idea of religion. They had forgotten the basic truth that, if a man would teach others, he must himself first listen to God. The gravest danger which any teacher or preacher encounters is that he should erect his own prejudices into universal principles and substitute his own ideas for the truth of God. When he does that he is not a guide, but a barrier, to the Kingdom, for, misled himself, he misleads others. ([Matthew 23 - William Barclay's Daily Study Bible](#))

HUPOKRITES - 18V - Matt. 6:2; Matt. 6:5; Matt. 6:16; Matt. 7:5; Matt. 15:7; Matt. 22:18; Matt. 23:13; Matt. 23:14; Matt. 23:15; Matt. 23:23; Matt. 23:25; Matt. 23:27; Matt. 23:29; Matt. 24:51; Mk. 7:6; Lk. 6:42; Lk. 12:56; Lk. 13:15

Matthew 22:19 “Show Me the coin used for the poll-tax.” And they brought Him a denarius.

KJV Matthew 22:19 Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto him a penny.

BGT Matthew 22:19 πιδε ξατ μοι τ ν μισμα το κ νσου. ο δ προσ νεγκαν ατ δην ριον.

NET Matthew 22:19 Show me the coin used for the tax." So they brought him a denarius.

CSB Matthew 22:19 Show Me the coin used for the tax." So they brought Him a denarius.

ESV Matthew 22:19 Show me the coin for the tax." And they brought him a denarius.

NIV Matthew 22:19 Show me the coin used for paying the tax." They brought him a denarius,

NLT Matthew 22:19 Here, show me the coin used for the tax." When they handed him a Roman coin,

NRS Matthew 22:19 Show me the coin used for the tax." And they brought him a denarius.

NJB Matthew 22:19 Show me the money you pay the tax with.' They handed him a denarius,

NAB Matthew 22:19 Show me the coin that pays the census tax." Then they handed him the Roman coin.

YLT Matthew 22:19 show me the tribute-coin?' and they brought to him a denary;

MIT Matthew 22:19 Show me the coin required for the tax." They brought to him a denarius.

- a penny: "In value sevenpence halfpenny." Mt 18:28 20:2 Rev 6:6

SHOW ME THE MONEY!

Show ([epideiknumi](#) - [aorist imperative](#) - do it now! Don't delay!) **Me the coin used for the poll-tax** ([kensos](#)).” **And they brought** ([prosphero](#)) **Him a denarius** ([denarion](#)) - **The coin** has the definite article pointing to the specific coin Jews used to pay the poll-tax and had the image of Caesar. The coin itself was in a sense blasphemous for it held an image of the emperor with the words “Divine Caesar,” and “High Priest.” As France says, “The two titles together could hardly be more calculated to offend Jewish piety” (See [Kenotic Politics- Page 29](#)).

MacArthur explains why Jesus asked for a **denarius** - only the Roman denarius could be used to pay the poll-tax. It was a silver coin, minted expressly by the emperor, who alone had the authority to issue coins in silver or gold. All such coins, including the denarius, bore an engraving of the emperor on one side and an identifying inscription on the other. That fact made the coins especially offensive to Jews for several reasons. For one thing, the emperor's picture was a reminder of Roman oppression, and for another, the Mosaic law specifically forbade the making of images (Ex. 20:4). In modern Israel, certain extremely orthodox Jews strictly forbid the taking of their photographs, because the resulting picture is considered a graven image. If the particular coin in Jesus' hand was minted by Tiberius, one side bore an engraving of his face and the reverse an engraving of him sitting on his throne in priestly robes, with an inscription designating him as the high priest. Several emperors, including Julius Caesar, had even accepted appellations of deity for themselves, thereby demanding religious as well as political homage. At the appearance of an unusual star in 17 B.C., Augustus Caesar had proclaimed a twelve-day celebration, at which the Roman college of priests, of which he was chief, granted mass absolution from sin for all the people of the empire. During that same year coins were minted claiming Augustus as the Son of God. And the idea of a divine emperor was inconceivably repulsive to Jews. (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

NET NOTE - **denarius** - Here the specific name of the coin was retained in the translation, because not all coins in circulation in Palestine at the time carried the image of Caesar. In other places δηνάριον (dēnaron) has been translated simply as “silver coin” with an explanatory note. A **denarius** was a silver coin worth approximately one day’s wage for a laborer. The fact that they had such a coin showed that they already operated in the economic world of Rome. The denarius would have had a picture of Tiberius Caesar stamped on it.

Matthew 22:20 And He *said to them, “Whose likeness and inscription is this?”

KJV Matthew 22:20 And he saith unto them, Whose is this image and superscription?

BGT Matthew 22:20 κα λ γει α το ς τ νο ς ε κ ν α τη κα πιγραφ ;

NET Matthew 22:20 Jesus said to them, "Whose image is this, and whose inscription?"

CSB Matthew 22:20 "Whose image and inscription is this?" He asked them.

ESV Matthew 22:20 And Jesus said to them, "Whose likeness and inscription is this?"

NIV Matthew 22:20 and he asked them, "Whose portrait is this? And whose inscription?"

NLT Matthew 22:20 he asked, "Whose picture and title are stamped on it?"

NRS Matthew 22:20 Then he said to them, "Whose head is this, and whose title?"

NJB Matthew 22:20 and he said, 'Whose portrait is this? Whose title?'

NAB Matthew 22:20 He said to them, "Whose image is this and whose inscription?"

YLT Matthew 22:20 and he saith to them, 'Whose is this image and the inscription?'

MIT Matthew 22:20 Then he said to them, "Whose image and inscription are struck on the coin?"

- **inscription**, Lu 20:24

Related Passages:

Mark 12:16 They brought one. And He *said to them, “Whose likeness and inscription is this?” And they said to Him, “Caesar’s.”

Luke 20:24+ “Show Me a denarius. Whose likeness and inscription does it have?” They said, “Caesar’s.”

TRICK QUESTION TURNED INTO TRUTH

And He *said ([historical present tense](#)) **to them**, “**Whose likeness** ([eikon](#)) **and inscription** ([epigraphe](#)) **is this?**” - Again Jesus is the interrogator drawing them into His argument/defense. Jesus takes their “**either-or**” **QUESTION** and gives a brilliant “**both-and**” **ANSWER!**

Hughes - One side bore the head of Caesar and the abbreviated inscription TI. CAESAR DIVI AVG. F. AVGVSTVS (“Tiberius Caesar, son of the divine Augustus, Augustus”). The denarius was the amount that had to be paid into the Roman fiscus (treasury) by all adult men and women just for the privilege of existing. It could only be paid with that coin bearing Caesar’s image and inscription. (See [Mark: Jesus, Servant and Savior](#))

THOUGHT - It is interesting that this same Greek word [epigraphe](#) would soon describe another **inscription** just above the Head of our crucified Lord “This is the King of the Jews” (Lk 23:38+, also Mk 15:26+).

James Brooke - The coin that was minted by the emperor and had his image stamped on it was considered to be his personal property even while it was in circulation. Therefore it was proper for Jews and (later) Christians to return it to him. By so saying, Jesus acknowledged that God’s people have an obligation to the state, although he did not define that obligation. (New American Commentary – Volume 23: Mark)

Stevenson - There is a principle here. It is that the state is ordained by God. The state brings valuable services to the people of God. And as we share in the benefits of the state, so also we are to share in the responsibilities of the state. But what about paying taxes to a government that has set itself up against God? Is it right to pay your good, hard-earned money to a government that

wastes it, or puts it to a purpose that you adamantly oppose? Jesus says that it is. He calls us to give to Caesar that which belongs to Caesar. But notice that there is a limit as to what belongs to Caesar. Our ultimate allegiance is to belong to God. Caesar may own our money. But God owns US. This has a direct impact upon the underlying issue in this chapter. That issue is one of **AUTHORITY**. Legal and political authority is real, but it is only of limited scope and duration. Final and lasting authority is in the hands of God. BOTH of these types of authority are ordained by God. Jesus was not advocating an abolition of the Jewish authorities in Jerusalem. Neither was He advocating a rebellion against Rome. Rather, He was establishing His claims to a higher authority - one that would be eternal both in scope and in nature.

NET NOTE - likeness - In this passage Jesus points to the image (Grk εἰκών, eikōn) of Caesar on the coin. This same Greek word is used in Gen 1:26 (LXX) to state that humanity is made in the "image" of God. Jesus is making a subtle yet powerful contrast: Caesar's image is on the denarius, so he can lay claim to money through taxation, but God's image is on humanity, so he can lay claim to each individual life.

Marvin Vincent - Images on coins were not approved by the Jews. Out of respect to this prejudice none of the earlier Herods had his own image impressed on them. Herod Agrippa I., who murdered James and imprisoned Peter, introduced the practice. The coin shown to Christ must either have been struck in Rome, or else was one of the Tetrarch Philip, who was the first to introduce the image of Caesar on strictly Jewish coins. (

Word Studies in the New Testament)

William MacDonald - Their question had boomeranged. They had hoped to trap Jesus on the question of tribute to Caesar. He exposed their failure to give tribute to God. Galling as it was, they did give Caesar his due, but they had disregarded the claims of God on their lives. And One stood before them who is the express image of God's Person (Heb. 1:3) and they failed to give Him His rightful place. Jesus' reply shows that the believer has dual citizenship. He is responsible to obey and financially support human government. He is not to speak evil of his rulers nor work to overthrow his government. He is to pray for those in authority. As a citizen of heaven, he is responsible to obey God. If there is ever a conflict between the two, his first loyalty is to God (Acts 5:29). In quoting verse 21, most of us emphasize the part about Caesar and skip lightly over the part about God—exactly the fault for which Jesus reprehended the Pharisees! (Borrow [Believer's Bible Commentary](#))

Jewish Leaders	Jesus
Had a limited and finite authority over the nation of Israel.	Has been given authority over a eternal kingdom.
Required to pay taxes to Rome in coins bearing the image of the Emperor.	The recipient of that which is in the image of God.
An earthly authority.	A heavenly authority.
This authority shall end.	This authority shall never end.

Likeness(1504) **eikon** properly, "mirror-like representation," i.e. what is very close in resemblance (like a "high-definition" projection, as defined by the context). **Eikon** is an artistic representation, as one might see on a coin or statue (an image or a likeness, as in Mt 22:20). **Eikon** can also refer to a visible manifestation of an invisible and heavenly reality form (see Hebrews 10:1^{[note](#)}) As used here in Colossians 1:15 **eikon** speaks of an embodiment or living manifestation of God. **Eikon** exactly reflects its source (what it directly corresponds to) and so here Paul says Christ is the very image (**eikon**, "supreme expression") of the Godhead (cp 2Cor 4:4). **Eikon** is the same Greek word is used in in the [Lxx](#) of Gen 1:26 to describe man made in the "image" of God. **TDNTA** - (**Eikon**) "does not imply a weakening or a feeble copy of something. It implies the illumination of its inner core and essence." **Eikon** expresses two ideas (but see Constable below). First, **likeness**, as in the image on a coin or the reflection in a mirror. Second, **manifestation**, with the sense that God is fully revealed in Jesus.

EIKON - 20V - Matt. 22:20; Mk. 12:16; Lk. 20:24; Rom. 1:23; Rom. 8:29; 1 Co. 11:7; 1 Co. 15:49; 2 Co. 3:18; 2 Co. 4:4; Col. 1:15; Col. 3:10; Heb. 10:1; Rev. 13:14; Rev. 13:15; Rev. 14:9; Rev. 14:11; Rev. 15:2; Rev. 16:2; Rev. 19:20; Rev. 20:4

Inscription (1923) (**epigraphe** from **epí** = on, upon + **grápho** = write. **Epigraphy** = study of inscriptions or epigraphs) means writing upon something and in the NT refers to inscriptions concerning the leader of the world system at that time (Caesar) and the Leader of the Jews (and the world), Jesus. Mark 15:26 has another famous inscription - " The **inscription** of the charge against Him read, "THE KING OF THE JEWS." (cf Luke 23:38+) **All uses**- Matt. 22:20; Mk. 12:16; Mk. 15:26; Lk. 20:24; Lk. 23:38 Not found in the Septuagint.

The Divine Image in the Soul (Bishop Ehrler.)

1. The Divine image ought to be our highest glory.
2. Let the Divine image which we bear be a constant exhortation to serve God.
3. Never defile the Divine image by sin.
4. Endeavour to increase every day the beauty of the Divine image.
5. Respect the Divine image in your neighbour.

Matthew 22:21 They *said to Him, “Caesar’s.” Then He *said to them, “Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s; and to God the things that are God’s.”

KJV Matthew 22:21 They say unto him, Caesar's. Then saith he unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's.

BGT Matthew 22:21 λ γουσιν α τ · Κα σαρος, τ τε λ γει α το ς· π δοτε ο υ τ Κα σαρος Κα σαρι κα τ το θεο τ θε .

NET Matthew 22:21 They replied, "Caesar's." He said to them, "Then give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

CSB Matthew 22:21 "Caesar's," they said to Him. Then He said to them, "Therefore give back to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

ESV Matthew 22:21 They said, "Caesar's." Then he said to them, "Therefore render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."

NIV Matthew 22:21 "Caesar's," they replied. Then he said to them, "Give to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's."

NLT Matthew 22:21 "Caesar's," they replied. "Well, then," he said, "give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, and give to God what belongs to God."

NRS Matthew 22:21 They answered, "The emperor's." Then he said to them, "Give therefore to the emperor the things that are the emperor's, and to God the things that are God's."

NJB Matthew 22:21 They replied, 'Caesar's.' Then he said to them, 'Very well, pay Caesar what belongs to Caesar -- and God what belongs to God.'

NAB Matthew 22:21 They replied, "Caesar's." At that he said to them, "Then repay to Caesar what belongs to Caesar and to God what belongs to God."

YLT Matthew 22:21 they say to him, 'Caesar's; then saith he to them, 'Render therefore the things of Caesar to Caesar, and the things of God to God;'

- **Render:** Mt 17:25-27 Pr 24:21 Lu 23:2 Ro 13:7
- **and:** Mt 22:37 4:10 Da 3:16-18 6:10,11,20-23 Mal 1:6-8 3:8-10 Ac 4:19 5:29 1Pe 2:13-17

Related Passages:

Luke 20:25⁺ And He said to them, “Then **render** to Caesar the things that are Caesar’s, and to God the things that are God’s.” 26 And **they were unable to catch Him** in a saying in the presence of the people; and being amazed at His answer, they became silent.

RENDERING WHAT IS RIGHT

They *said ([historical present tense](#)) to Him, “Caesar’s ([kaisar](#)).” Then He *said ([historical present tense](#)) to them, “Then **render** ([apodidomi](#) - [aorist imperative](#)) to Caesar ([kaisar](#)) the things that are Caesar’s ([kaisar](#)); and to God the things that are **God’s** - The denarius had an image of the reigning Caesar, in this case probably Tiberius Caesar (A.D. 14-37) and included an

inscription which referred to Caesar as divine and as "chief priest." The Caesars were worshiped as gods, so the claim to divinity on the coin itself repulsed the Jews. Thus the coin served as a constant reminder of Israel's subjection to Rome (one that they even had to "pay for!")

MacArthur - Because Jesus had claimed deity, calling Himself God's Son, the disciples of the Pharisees confidently expected Him to denounce as a false god and blasphemer the Caesar whose likeness and inscription He was holding up before them. But instead, Jesus said to them, "Then render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and to God the things that are God's." The profundity of that statement is often missed because of its simplicity. *Apodidōmi* (render) means to pay or give back, implying a debt. It carries the idea of obligation and responsibility for something that is not optional. Jesus' answer to the original question (v. 17) was therefore, "Yes, it is entirely lawful and right to pay the poll-tax to Caesar, because that tax is Caesar's, belonging to the things in his domain." (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

R T France on **render** - "Render generally means 'give back' (whereas the verb they had used in Mt 20:17 was simple 'give'. It is the verb for paying a bill or settling a debt; they owe it to him." (See [The Gospel of Matthew - Page 44](#))

[Guzik](#) points out that "Had the Jews rendered unto God His due, they would have never had to render anything to Caesar. In New Testament times, they would never have endured the occupying oppression of the Roman Empire if they had been obedient to their covenant with God."

[David Guzik](#) has an interesting comment on **Whose image and inscription does it have?** - Essentially, Jesus said "You recognize Caesar's civil authority when you use his coins, therefore you are obliged to pay him the taxes he asks for." "The denarii bore the head of Tiberius and the inscription TI. CAESAR DIVI AVG. F. AVGVSTVS (Tiberius Caesar, son of the divine Augustus, Augustus). The image and inscriptions of ancient coins would have been understood as a property seal; the coins belonged to Caesar." (Pate). A spiritual lesson can be learned from what is inscribed on coins issued in the United States, because each phrase has an important association in the Christian life. - (1) In God we Trust (2) Liberty (3) E. Pluribus Unum (Out of Many, One)

William Barclay - "Every Christian has a double citizenship (**ED**: Php 3:20-21+). He is a citizen of the country in which he happens to live. To it he owes many things. He owes the safety against lawless men which only a settled government can give; he owes all public services."

[ESV Study](#) (borrow page 1868) note sums up this attempt to trip up Jesus - Jesus is not establishing a political kingdom in opposition to Caesar, so his followers should pay taxes and obey civil laws. There are matters that belong to the realm of civil government, and there are other matters that belong to God's realm. Jesus does not here specify which matters belong in which realm, but many Christian ethicists today teach that, in general, *civil government* should allow freedom in matters of religious doctrine, worship, and beliefs about God, and the *church* should not attempt to use the power of government to enforce allegiance to any specific religious viewpoint. All forms of the Christian church throughout the world today support some kind of separation between matters of church and matters of state. By contrast, totalitarian governments usually try to suppress the church and subsume everything under the realm of the state. And some extreme Islamic movements have tried to abolish independent civil government and subsume everything under the control of Islamic religious leaders. Historically, when the church and state have become too closely aligned, the result most often has been the compromise of the church.

TSK - This conclusion is drawn from their own maxims and premises. They held that "wherever the money of any king is current, there the inhabitants acknowledge that king for their lord." Now, by admitting that this was Caesar's coin, and by consenting to receive it as the current coin of their country, they in fact acknowledged their subjection to his government, and of course their obligation to pay the tribute demanded of them. This answer was full of consummate wisdom, and it completely defeated the insidious designs of his enemies. He avoided rendering himself odious to the Jewish people by opposing their notions of liberty, or appearing to pay court to the emperor, without exposing himself to the charge of sedition and disaffection to the Roman government.

NET NOTE - Jesus' answer to give to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's was a both/and, not the questioners' either/or. So he slipped out of their trap.

Steven Cole on "**Render ... to God the things that are God's**" - Jesus' statement implies that just as the Roman coin had Caesar's image stamped on it and thus rightfully fell under his jurisdiction, so every person has God's image stamped on him or her and thus rightfully belongs to God. Just as Caesar had sole authority to issue coins stamped with his image, so God is the only one who creates human beings stamped with His image. We owe God our very existence. He rightfully owns us, our possessions, our money, and our time. If we are not yielding ourselves completely to His sovereign lordship, we are disobeying the supreme authority of the universe! By challenging Jesus, these Pharisees and Herodians were guilty of not rendering to God the things that are God's. They came to Jesus, not to obey Him, but to trap Him. They acted as if they were sincerely interested in His opinion about a moral issue, but they had no intention of obeying what He said. But the only way you can come to Christ is to come honestly, confessing your sins, being willing to obey Him. If you come to contend with Him in order to get your own way, beware! He knows the secret

motives of every heart! One day every knee will bow before Him. So the overarching principle is that we must submit all of our lives to the absolute sovereignty of God, the supreme ruler of the universe. He sets up rulers and takes them down according to His will. As Daniel 4 repeats three times, "The Most High is ruler over the realm of mankind, and bestows it on whom He wishes" ([Da 4:17, 25, 32+](#)). When God's authority confronts our authority to rule our lives, we must submit to Him or face His judgment. We've all got to do business with God who examines our hearts. Don't risk playing games with Him! It always causes great damage to the cause of Christ when a man who has crusaded against pornography gets caught with a prostitute. We need to judge our hypocrisy and live with integrity before God. A few years ago, the late Senate Chaplain Richard Halverson told about a senator who was speaking at a church men's dinner. The senator asked how many men believed in prayer in the public schools. Almost every hand went up. He then asked, "How many of you pray daily with your children in your home?" Only a few hands were raised. Ouch! Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. But above all, render to God the things that are God's. ([Guile, Government, and God](#))

McQuilkin - Christ responded to a trick question from the Herodians. He told them that they should "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's" (Matt. 22:21). Whole theologies of cultural integration have been built on that enigmatic statement. However, it is plain from the context that Jesus was giving an answer in kind to those who would trap Him with an insincere question. Research into the cultural background indicates that "secular" money was not legitimate as an offering in the Temple. That is why there were money changers in the Temple. Temple offerings had to be made in Temple currency, so there were money exchange banks on the premises. The Herodians were trying to trap Jesus into making an unpatriotic statement. Either He would have to oppose the law of the land, the hated Roman taxation, and thus be unlawful; or He would have to favor the taxation and be a traitor to His own people. In the face of that, He sidestepped the question by indicating that if a coin had a man's name and face on it, it must belong to him! Similarly, Temple coins should be put in the Temple offering, not used to pay Roman taxes. By His answer Jesus remained both a law-abiding subject of Rome and a loyal son of Israel. Profound teaching concerning a cultural mandate to be involved in the affairs of this world will have to be sought elsewhere in Scripture. Hence, the cultural background can help considerably in the understanding of a passage. (See [Understanding and Applying the Bible: Revised and Expanded](#))

Render ([aorist imperative](#)) ([591](#)) ([apodidomi](#) from **apó** = from + **didomi** = give and so to "give off" from one's self) literally means to give back, then to put away by giving and then in a more figurative sense to pay back or recompense. To give what is proper and due.

APODIDOMI 46V - Matt. 5:26; Matt. 5:33; Matt. 6:4; Matt. 6:6; Matt. 6:18; Matt. 12:36; Matt. 16:27; Matt. 18:25; Matt. 18:26; Matt. 18:28; Matt. 18:29; Matt. 18:30; Matt. 18:34; Matt. 20:8; Matt. 21:41; Matt. 22:21; Matt. 27:58; Mk. 12:17; Lk. 4:20; Lk. 7:42; Lk. 9:42; Lk. 10:35; Lk. 12:59; Lk. 16:2; Lk. 19:8; Lk. 20:25; Acts 4:33; Acts 5:8; Acts 7:9; Acts 19:40; Rom. 2:6; Rom. 12:17; Rom. 13:7; 1 Co. 7:3; 1 Thess. 5:15; 1 Tim. 5:4; 2 Tim. 4:8; 2 Tim. 4:14; Heb. 12:11; Heb. 12:16; Heb. 13:17; 1 Pet. 3:9; 1 Pet. 4:5; Rev. 18:6; Rev. 22:2; Rev. 22:12

Caesar ([2541](#)) ([kaisar](#) of Latin origin) refers to the emperor of Rome. It was originally a surname of Julius Caesar, later taken as a title by the chief Roman ruler. **Zodhiates** on **Caesar** - The title taken by each of the Roman emperors, e.g., **Augustus Caesar** who reigned when the Lord Jesus was born ([Luke 2:1](#)); his successor **Tiberius Caesar**, who reigned from a.d. 14-37 ([Luke 3:1](#)); **Claudius Caesar**, from a.d. 41-54 ([Acts 11:28; 18:2](#)); **Nero**, under whom Peter and Paul were martyred, a.d. 54-68 ([Phil. 4:22](#)); **Domitian** was Caesar from a.d. 81-96, and under him John was exiled to Patmos. **Caesar** is mentioned by the Lord Jesus in [Luke 20:22-25](#), both literally as referring to [Tiberius Caesar](#) and figuratively as meaning any earthly ruler. The name Caesar came to be used as a symbol of the state in general and is often used in this sense in the NT ([Matt. 22:17, 21; Mark 12:14, 16, 17; Luke 20:22, 24, 25](#)). (Borrow [The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament](#))

Walter Kaiser - Render to Caesar? [Hard Sayings](#)

For many readers of the Gospels this does not seem to be a particularly hard saying. They pay their taxes to the state and give financial support to the church and various forms of religious and charitable action, and consider that this is very much in line with the intention of Jesus' words. There are others, however, who find in these words material for debate, arguing that their meaning is not at all clear, or else, if it is clear, that it is quite different from what it is usually taken to be. Our first business must be to consider the setting in which the words were spoken. When we have done that, we may realize that some of those who heard them felt that here was a hard saying indeed.

Mark, followed by Matthew (Mt 22:15–22) and Luke (Lk 20:19–26), tells how a deputation of Pharisees and Herodians came to Jesus while he was teaching in the temple precincts during his last visit to Jerusalem and, expressing their confidence that he would give them a straight answer, without fear or favor, asked him if it was lawful to pay taxes to Caesar or not. By "lawful" they meant "in accordance with the law of God, the basis of Israel's corporate life." Mark says that the questioners planned "to entrap him in his

talk” (Mk 12:13 RSV); Luke spells this out more explicitly: their purpose, he says, was to “take hold of what he said, so as to deliver him up to the authority and jurisdiction of the governor” (Lk 20:20 RSV). The governor or prefect of Judea was the representative of Caesar, and any discouragement of the payment of taxes to Caesar would incur sharp retribution from him.

It was, indeed, a very delicate question. After Herod the Great, king of the Jews, died in 4 B.C., the Romans divided his kingdom into three parts, giving each to one of his sons. Galilee, where Jesus lived for most of his life, was ruled by Herod Antipas until A.D. 39. Judea, the southern part, with Jerusalem as its capital, was given to Archelaus (compare Mt 2:22). The sons of Herod received taxes from their subjects, as their father Herod had done. The Herods were not popular, but religiously they were Jews, so no religious difficulties stood in the way of paying taxes to them. But Archelaus’s rule in Judea proved to be so oppressive that, after nine years, the Roman emperor removed him to forestall a revolt and reorganized Judea as a Roman province, to be governed by a prefect appointed by himself. From now on the people of Judea were required to pay their taxes to the Roman emperor, Caesar. A census was held in A.D. 6 to determine the amount of tribute the new province was to yield.

The Jews had been subject to Gentile overlords for long periods in their history, but no prophet or religious teacher had ever taught in earlier days that there was anything wrong in paying tribute to those overlords. On the contrary, the prophets taught them that if they fell under Gentile domination, this was by God’s permission, and they should acknowledge the divine will by paying tribute to their foreign rulers. But around the time of the census in A.D. 6 a new teaching was spread abroad, to the effect that God alone was Israel’s king, and therefore it was high treason against him for his people to recognize any Gentile ruler by paying him tribute. The principal teacher of this new doctrine was Judas the Galilean, who led a revolt against the Romans (see Acts 5:37). The revolt was crushed, but its ideals lived on, and the propriety of paying taxes to Caesar continued to be a subject for theological debate. It would be generally agreed that Jews in the lands of the Dispersion, living on Gentile territory, should pay taxes in accordance with the laws of the areas where they lived. But the land of Israel was God’s land; this was recognized by its inhabitants when they handed over one-tenth of its produce to the maintenance of his temple in Jerusalem. But the taxes that the Roman emperor demanded were also derived from the produce of God’s land. Was it right for God’s people, living on God’s land, to give a proportion of its produce to a pagan ruler? When the question was framed in those terms, the obvious answer for many was no.

What would Jesus say? While he stayed in Galilee the question did not arise; taxes in that region were paid to a Jewish tetrarch. But when he visited Judea, he came to a place where it was a burning question. However he answered it, it would be almost impossible to avoid giving offense. If he said that it was unlawful to pay taxes to Caesar, the Roman governor would get to hear of it and he could be charged with sedition. If he said that it was lawful, he would offend those who maintained the ideals of Judas the Galilean, and many would think him unpatriotic. This would lose him much of his following in Judea.

“Bring me a denarius,” said Jesus; “let me look at it.” The denarius was a Roman silver coin; Roman taxes had to be paid in Roman coinage. When a denarius was forthcoming, Jesus asked, “Whose face is this? Whose name is this?” The answer, of course, was “Caesar’s.” Well, said Jesus, the coin which bears Caesar’s face and name is obviously Caesar’s coin; let Caesar have it back. The verb translated “render” has the sense of giving back to someone that which belongs to him.

Did he imply that the use of Caesar’s coinage was a tacit acknowledgment of Caesar’s sovereignty? Perhaps he did. There were some Jews whose orthodoxy was such that they would not look at, let alone handle, a coin which bore a human face. Why? Because it was said to infringe the second commandment of the Decalogue, which forbade the making of “any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth” (Ex 20:4 RSV). Jesus did not necessarily share this attitude—money of any kind was held in little enough regard by him—but there may have been an implication in his words that the Pharisees among his questioners might have appreciated: such coins were unfit for use by people who were so scrupulous about keeping the law of God, and should go back where they came from. Caesar’s coins were best used for paying Caesar’s tribute. If that was what Caesar wanted, let him have it; the claims of God were not transgressed by such use of Caesar’s money. What was really important was to discover what God’s claims were, and see to it that they were met. Once again, he laid primary emphasis on seeking God’s kingdom and righteousness.

Some interpreters have discerned more subtle ambiguities in Jesus’ answer, as though, for example, he included in “the things that are God’s” the produce of God’s land and meant that none of it should go to Caesar, not even when it was converted into Roman coinage. But this kind of interpretation would render the whole business about producing a denarius pointless. Certainly his answer would not satisfy those who believed that for Judeans to pay tribute to Caesar was wrong. If some of the bystanders had been led by the manner of his entry into Jerusalem a few days before to expect a declaration of independence from him, they must have been disappointed. And indeed, there seems to have been less enthusiasm for him in Jerusalem at the end of Holy Week than there had been at the beginning. On the other hand, if his questioners hoped that he would compromise himself by his reply, they too were disappointed. He not only avoided the dilemma on the horns of which they wished to impale him, but turned it so as to insist afresh on the central theme of his ministry. ([Go to page 407 in Hard Sayings](#))

Jesus taught that Christians should render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's. In this passage, Jesus did not elaborate on all the issues related to a Christian citizen's responsibility to the state, but he did indicate a preference for compliance and civil stability. So

...

Choose your battle carefully. No state is perfect. If you refuse to live with moments of unfairness or bureaucratic hassle, you'll need to live by yourself on an island.

Cooperate and support the state as far as faith will take you. Fortunately in democratic countries (unlike Judea in Jesus' time), we can work for peaceful change through speeches, publications, assemblies, boycotts, and media campaigns. There is no need to be a hermit or a rebel.

Be wary of radicals on the left and reactionaries on the right. Militia movements have appealed to worried Christians and caused them to become more worried still. Leftist movements have attracted other Christians, who confuse political change with spiritual growth.

When resistance is required, pray a lot and take counsel from Christian friends. Citizenship requires compromise, but Christians should not compromise Christ or do injustice before God. (See [Matthew](#) - LAC)

GOOD TIMING

The Pharisees and Herodians thought they could trap Jesus by forcing him to choose between two responsibilities. He stunned them by choosing both. He demonstrated that behind many of our conflicts lies a failure to recognize priorities. Should we give time and attention to our families or our work? Can we communicate our relationship with God through the work we do or by setting our work aside and engaging our fellow workers in conversation? Should we support our church or other worthy causes? According to Jesus' handling of this situation, these problems are issues of timing and priority, not right and wrong. The real challenge for most of us concerns whether or not we are doing what we should be doing at the appropriate time.

Citizenship in the kingdom of God doesn't lessen commitments. In fact, it often intensifies them! Marriage duties, parental roles, church involvement, earthly citizenship-all take specific place under God's authority. Make sure your commitment to God stays strong, then all your priorities will be under his authority. (See [Matthew](#) - LAC)

Question - [What did Jesus mean when He said, "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's"?](#)

Answer: "Render to Caesar what is Caesar's" is a well-known quote that appears in Matthew 22:21 and is part of Jesus' response to a joint attempt by the Herodians and Pharisees to make Jesus stumble in front of His own people.

The [Herodians](#) were a non-religious Jewish party who supported the dynasty of Herod and the general policy of the Roman government. They perceived that Christ's pure and spiritual teaching and influence were antagonistic to their interests. The [Pharisees](#), on the other hand, were members of an ancient Jewish sect who believed in the strict observance of oral traditions and the written Law of Moses. They didn't believe that Christ was the Messiah, despite His many miracles during His earthly ministry. Although Herodians and Pharisees were at opposite ends of the political spectrum, their common hatred of Christ was enough for them to join forces to try to destroy Him.

Here is the context of Jesus' command to "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's": in Matthew 22 Jesus had just returned to Jerusalem for the final time and recently finished sharing several parables with the crowd. Jesus' enemies saw an opportunity to put Jesus on the spot in front of His followers. In verse 17, they say to Jesus, "Tell us, then, what you think. Is it lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, or not?" (ESV). It was a trick question, and they knew it. If Jesus answered, "No," the Herodians would charge Him with treason against Rome. If He said, "Yes," the Pharisees would accuse Him of disloyalty to the Jewish nation, and He would lose the support of the crowds. To pay taxes or not to pay taxes? The question was designed as a Catch-22.

Jesus' response is nothing short of brilliant: "But Jesus, aware of their malice, said, 'Why put me to the test, you hypocrites? Show me the coin for the tax.' And they brought him a denarius" (Matthew 22:18-19ESV).

The denarius was a coin used as the tax money at the time. It was made of silver and featured an image of the emperor with an inscription calling him "divine." The Jews considered such images idolatry, forbidden by the second commandment. This was another reason why, if Jesus answered, "Yes," He would be in trouble. His acceptance of the tax as "lawful" could have been seen as a rejection of the second commandment, thus casting doubt on His claim to be the Son of God.

With the coin displayed in front of them, Jesus said, "Whose likeness and inscription is this?" The Herodians and Pharisees, stating the obvious, said, "Caesar's." Then Jesus brought an end to their foolish tricks: "Therefore render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's" (Matthew 22:21ESV). Upon hearing this, Jesus' enemies marveled and went away (verse 22).

When Jesus said, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's," He was drawing a sharp distinction between two kingdoms.

There is a kingdom of this world, and Caesar holds power over it. But there is another kingdom, not of this world, and Jesus is King of that (John 18:36). Christians are part of both kingdoms, at least temporarily. Under Caesar, we have certain obligations that involve material things. Under Christ, we have other obligations that involve things eternal. If Caesar demands money, give it to him—it's only [mammon](#). But make sure you also give God what He demands.

Caesar minted coins, as he had a right to do, and he demanded some coins in return, as was his right. After all, his image was stamped on what he had made. God has “minted” the human soul, and He has stamped His image on every one (Genesis 1:27). So give Caesar his due—the temporary stuff of this world—but make sure to give God His due: “Offer yourselves to God as those who have been brought from death to life; and offer every part of yourself to him as an instrument of righteousness” (Romans 6:13). (Source: [GotQuestions.org](#))

Money And Time

Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. —Mark 12:17

Today's Scripture: Mark 12:13-17,28-31

During a trip to London, I visited the Bank of England Museum, then made my way to The Clockmakers' Museum. At some point, it struck me that both money and time have been very important commodities as far back as anyone can remember. Yet they present one of the great dilemmas of life. We trade our valuable time working for money, and then we spend our money to make the most of our time off. We seldom possess the two with any degree of balance.

In contrast, our Lord never seemed perplexed by money or time. When asked if it was lawful to pay taxes to Caesar, Jesus answered: “Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's” (Mark 12:17). With great demands on His time, Jesus spent early mornings and late nights in prayer, seeking to know and do His Father's will.

Hymnwriter Frances Havergal wrote:

Take my life, and let it be
Consecrated, Lord, to Thee;
Take my moments and my days,
Let them flow in ceaseless praise.
Take my silver and my gold,
Not a mite would I withhold;
Take my intellect and use
Every power as Thou shalt choose.

We can properly balance time and money when we offer ourselves without reservation to God. —David McCasland [Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#)

Spend time and money wisely—they both belong to God.

The Alice Tax

Having food and clothing, with these we shall be content. — 1 Timothy 6:8

Author Calvin Trillin's wife, Alice, held a unique view of income tax. She believed that “after a certain level of income, the government would simply take everything.” She thought there should be a limit on how much money people were allowed to keep for themselves. Writing in The New Yorker, Trillin said of his wife, “She believed in the principle of enoughness.”

In Mark 12, Jesus avoided a carefully laid trap by telling His questioners to “render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's” (v.17). When Jesus watched people making their offerings to the temple treasury, He commended a woman who would have been considered foolish for her extravagance. “This poor widow has put in more than all those who have given to the treasury; for they all put in out of their abundance, but she out of her poverty put in all that she had, her whole livelihood” (vv.43-44).

Jesus placed more importance on wholehearted love for God than on wholesale concern over material needs. His tranquil attitude toward money and possessions was based on trusting His Father to supply each day's needs. “Your Father knows the things you have need of” (Matt. 6:8).

Enoughness. What a concept! By: David C. McCasland [Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#)

He clothes the lilies, feeds the birds;
Would He to you, then, pay less heed?
Look up to Him with prayerful heart,
He will supply your every need.
—Renfrow

Contentment is not getting what we want but being satisfied with what we have.

Related Resources:

- [What does the Bible say about government?](#)
- [What does the Bible say about paying taxes?](#)

Matthew 22:22 And hearing this, they were amazed, and leaving Him, they went away.

KJV Matthew 22:22 When they had heard these words, they marvelled, and left him, and went their way.

BGT Matthew 22:22 καὶ κοίσαντες θαύμασαν, καὶ φεύγοντες ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἠλθον.

NET Matthew 22:22 Now when they heard this they were stunned, and they left him and went away.

CSB Matthew 22:22 When they heard this, they were amazed. So they left Him and went away.

ESV Matthew 22:22 When they heard it, they marveled. And they left him and went away.

NIV Matthew 22:22 When they heard this, they were amazed. So they left him and went away.

NLT Matthew 22:22 His reply amazed them, and they went away.

NRS Matthew 22:22 When they heard this, they were amazed; and they left him and went away.

NJB Matthew 22:22 When they heard this they were amazed; they left him alone and went away.

NAB Matthew 22:22 When they heard this they were amazed, and leaving him they went away.

YLT Matthew 22:22 and having heard they wondered, and having left him they went away.

MIT Matthew 22:22 When they heard that, they experienced such consternation they gave up on him and went away.

- **they were amazed:** Mt 22:33,46 10:16 Pr 26:4,5 Lu 20:25,26 21:15 Ac 6:10 Col 4:6

Related Passages:

Luke 20:26+ And **they were unable to catch** ([epilambano](#) - get a grip on, take possession of) **Him** in a saying in the presence of the people; and being amazed at His answer, they became silent ([sigao](#)).

AMAZED BUT UNMOVED EXCEPT TO RETREAT

And hearing ([akouo](#)) **this, they were amazed** ([thaumazo](#) - marveled), **and leaving** ([aphiemi](#)) **Him, they went away** ([aperchomai](#)) - Strike one—the Herodians are out. The Pharisees, however, will be back for a second beating. Their amazement caused them to be "[dumbstruck](#)" which means to become so shocked or surprised as to be unable to speak. Luke adds that Jesus in effect shut their mouths! Then they left but they were led by Satan who after the wilderness temptations "departed from Him until an opportune time." (Lk 4:13+) These snakes (brood of vipers - Mt 3:7+, Mt 12:34+, Mt 23:33+) would soon slither back on the scene!. They were unable to trap Him. The debate had come to a sudden end for they had no reply for the truth. They were silenced by the truth, for Jesus' wisdom stunned them. These enemies knew they were defeated and they left in order to "[cut their losses](#)." And saddest of all, they were convicted but not converted by Jesus' truth! How many there are who here the truth, are convicted but fail to be converted!

I picture these religious leaders scurrying away like a dog with his tail between his legs! They did not have a clue that God's plan for

fallen mankind was in full swing and on time. One contemporary British' writer has commented, "The problem with humanity is this: humanity stands at the crossroads, and all of the signposts have fallen down." This aptly portrays the religious leaders of Israel in one sense, that they were at the crossroads of the the event which would soon determine the fate of every soul ever born -- the crucifixion. However, the "signposts" had not fallen down, but had been clearly shown for three years. Their problem was that their spiritual blindness made them unable to see the "signposts." What about you dear reader - all of the signposts point to Jesus as the Savior and Redeemer of the world. Have you seen that He alone is the Way, the Truth and the Life and that no one comes to the Father but through Him?

MacArthur comments that these religious leaders "Instead of marveling at Christ's astonishing wisdom and reexamining their obligation to God, the frustrated leaders were amazed, but rather than admit that to Jesus, they became silent. Their attitude toward Him had not changed. Though they had failed to elicit the incriminating response from Him that they had hoped for, they stubbornly persisted in trying to find another way. When they finally managed to bring Jesus before Pilate, they lied and said, "We found this man misleading our nation and forbidding to pay taxes to Caesar" (Luke 23:2). Their sinful stubbornness left them in a hopeless, irremediable, unredeemable situation." (See [Luke Commentary](#))

Brian Bell summarizes this section on the trap set by the Herodian spies - It was a perfect trap! To affirm would alienate him from the Jews who were against this tax. To deny the lawfulness of this tax would bring Roman wrath upon him So Jesus hits them right between the horns of their dilemma. But Jesus did not deal with it as a **political** question. He saw it as a **spiritual** issue! Just as the coin bore the image of Caesar, so man bears the image of God and has a responsibility to Him. But that also means we have a responsibility to human government, because government was instituted by God (Ro 13:1-7) It is not an either/or situation, but a both/and! If you live under a governments rule; If you are protected by your government (police, military, national guard, etc); If you are using your governments money to buy & sell; then you are in debt to the gov under which you live & enjoy its benefits. But whose image & superscription is upon you? The greatest Potentate is stamped upon every human face...God Himself! -- We have been made in the image and likeness of God! The superscription on every human life is that God alone is Pontifex Maximus. Thus He said in effect, "As is the coin to Caesar, so are you to God." Give to Caesar what's his, but don't forget to give to God what is His! So what's God's? Everything I have, everything I am! If you live under a God's rule; If you are protected by your God; If you are using God's power and gifts; then you are in debt to God under which you live & enjoy His benefits. Read - Ro 13:7,8 (our debt to Him is love) Christians must accept the state as ordained by God and render respect and obedience to the governments. When a conflict arises between our allegiance to the state & our allegiance to God, we must be true to God (**ED: JESUS SAID IT THIS WAY** - "No one can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other, or he will be devoted to one and despise the other. You cannot serve God and wealth." Mt 6:24-[+](#) JESUS ALONE IS OUR LORD AND OUR MASTER). ([Commentary](#))

Steven Cole - Jesus' answer stunned the pretenders. In one succinct sentence, He showed that God and Caesar each have legitimate realms of authority with corresponding responsibilities. But if there is a conflict between realms, God is supreme over Caesar. By asking His critics to produce the Roman coin, Jesus underscored the fact that they were enjoying the benefits of Caesar's government. They used his coinage; they enjoyed many civil improvements and benefits that he provided. Thus they were obligated to give him his due. And yet, by His final statement, "to God the things that are God's," Jesus affirmed that it would be wrong to go along with Caesar's blasphemous claim to deity, which was stamped on each coin. One side read, "[Tiberius Caesar, son of the divine Augustus](#)" ("divine Augustus"? Woe!); the other read, "[Pontifex Maximus](#)" ("Chief Priest"). Jesus meant that above Caesar is God. We must never go so far in rendering unto Caesar that we violate our obligation to God, the supreme sovereign who rules over all....By His statement, "**render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's**," Jesus acknowledged that God has ordained civil government and given it a proper sphere of authority. God ordained civil government for the good of society. Paul explains this in Romans 13:1-7, where he commands, "Let every person be in subjection to the governing authorities. For there is no authority except from God, and those which exist are established by God" (Ro 13:1). He goes on to state that the government "is a minister of God to you for good" (Ro 13:4). When Paul wrote this, the godless Nero was emperor. Thus we must conclude that we are not free to disobey or rebel against wicked rulers, unless they command us to violate God's higher law. (See his sermon [Guile, Government, and God](#) for more on the role of government and how Christians should interact).

THOUGHT - Let's apply the truth in this passage - Who's image do you bear? By creation all men bear the image of God (Ge 1:26-27). But only by redemption do men bear the image of Christ. So let me ask "Whose image do you bear?" As Paul says if we bear Christ's image, we "are not our own, for we you have been bought with a price: therefore we are to glorify God in our body." (1 Cor 6:19-20-[note](#)) That is the way we render to God the things that are God's! We "present our bodies a living and holy sacrifice, acceptable to God, which is our spiritual service of worship." (Ro 12:1-[note](#)) Dear Christ follower, are you rendering to God what is due to Him Alone? **Spurgeon** writes on the image of Christ in us "I have heard it said that the good sculptor, whenever he sees a suitable block of marble, firmly believes that there is a statue concealed within it, and that his business is but to take away the superfluous material, and so unveil the "thing of beauty," which shall be "a joy for ever." Believer, you are that block of marble; you have been quarried by divine grace, and set apart for

the Master's service, but we cannot see the **image of Christ** in you yet as we could wish; true, there are some traces of it, some dim outlines of what is to be; it is for you, with the chisel and the mallet, with constant endeavour and holy dependence upon God, to work out that **image of Christ** in yourself, till you shall be discovered to be by all men like unto your Lord and Master., "The life of Jesus will be manifested in your bodies that Christ would be formed in you." (cf [2 Cor 4:10](#))

Amazed (2296) [thaumazo](#) from **thauma** [from **thaomai** = to wonder] = wonder, admiration) means to wonder, marvel, be struck with admiration or astonishment. To be surprised by the unexpected. **Thaumazo** describes the human response when confronted by divine revelation in some form ([Mt 9:33](#)). Be surprised ([Gal 1:6](#)). It denotes incredulous surprise. **Thaumazo** was a rhetorical device used in law courts and politics to attack things done by the opposition party.

NIDNTT on Thaumazo in Classic Greek - The word-group associated with **thauma** is found in Gk. from the 8th and 7th centuries, to designate that which by its appearance arouses astonishment and amazement. The root is cognate with **theaomai**, to look at.

TDNT on Classic Greek uses - The group has first the sense of astonishment, whether critical or inquisitive, then admiration, with a nuance of awe or fear at what is unusual or mysterious, e.g., miracles or oracles in religion, also magical acts or media, and certain phenomena (prior to their explanation) in philosophy.

THAUMAZO 43V - am amazed(1), amazed(15), amazement(1), astonished(3), being amazed(1), flattering(1), marvel(4), marveled(5), marveling(2), surprised(2), wonder(2), wondered(4), wondering(2).
Matt. 8:10; Matt. 8:27; Matt. 9:33; Matt. 15:31; Matt. 21:20; Matt. 22:22; Matt. 27:14; Mk. 5:20; Mk. 6:6; Mk. 15:5; Mk. 15:44; Lk. 1:21; Lk. 1:63; Lk. 2:18; Lk. 2:33; Lk. 4:22; Lk. 7:9; Lk. 8:25; Lk. 9:43; Lk. 11:14; Lk. 11:38; Lk. 20:26; Lk. 24:12; Lk. 24:41; Jn. 3:7; Jn. 4:27; Jn. 5:20; Jn. 5:28; Jn. 7:15; Jn. 7:21; Acts 2:7; Acts 3:12; Acts 4:13; Acts 7:31; Acts 13:41; Gal. 1:6; 2 Thess. 1:10; 1 Jn. 3:13; Jude 1:16; Rev. 13:3; Rev. 17:6; Rev. 17:7; Rev. 17:8

Matthew 22:23 On that day some Sadducees (who say there is no resurrection) came to Jesus and questioned Him,

KJV Matthew 22:23 The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him,

BGT Matthew 22:23 ν κε ν τ μ ρ προσ λθον α τ Σαδδουκα οι, λ γοντες μ ε ναι ν στασιν, κα πηρ τησαν α τ ν

NET Matthew 22:23 The same day Sadducees (who say there is no resurrection) came to him and asked him,

CSB Matthew 22:23 The same day some Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came up to Him and questioned Him:

ESV Matthew 22:23 The same day Sadducees came to him, who say that there is no resurrection, and they asked him a question,

NIV Matthew 22:23 That same day the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, came to him with a question.

NLT Matthew 22:23 That same day Jesus was approached by some Sadducees-- religious leaders who say there is no resurrection from the dead. They posed this question:

NRS Matthew 22:23 The same day some Sadducees came to him, saying there is no resurrection; and they asked him a question, saying,

NJB Matthew 22:23 That day some Sadducees -- who deny that there is a resurrection -- approached him and they put this question to him,

NAB Matthew 22:23 On that day Sadducees approached him, saying that there is no resurrection. They put this question to him,

YLT Matthew 22:23 In that day there came near to him Sadducees, who are saying there is not a rising again, and they questioned him, saying,

MIT Matthew 22:23 On that day the Sadducees, who expect no resurrection of the dead, approached him.

GWN Matthew 22:23 On that day some Sadducees, who say that people will never come back to life, came to

Jesus. They asked him,

- **On that day:** Mk 12:18-27 Lu 20:27-40
- **the Sadducees:** Mt 3:7 16:6 Ac 4:1 5:17 23:6-8
- **who say:** 1Co 15:12-14 2Ti 2:18
- Parallel passages in synoptic Gospels - Mt 22:23-33; Mk 12:18-27; Lk 20:27-40

Related Passages:

Acts 23:6-8+ But perceiving that one group were **Sadducees** and the other Pharisees, Paul began crying out in the Council, "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees; I am on trial for the hope and resurrection of the dead!" 7 As he said this, there occurred a dissension between the Pharisees and **Sadducees**, and the assembly was divided. 8 For the **Sadducees** say that there is no resurrection, nor an angel, nor a spirit, but the Pharisees acknowledge them all.

On that day some Sadducees ([saddoukaiois](#)) (**who say there is no resurrection** [[anastasis](#)]) **came to** ([proserchomai](#)) **Jesus and questioned** ([eperotao](#)) **Him** - And as you have likely heard, since they do not believe in a resurrection that is why they were **sad you see!**" (Get it?)

Alan Carr: The Sadducees controlled all the buying and selling that went on at the Temple. Thus, they were angry with Jesus because He had interrupted their business enterprises when He cleansed the Temple, Mark 11:12-19. When the Temple was destroyed in AD 70 so the Sadducees disappeared from history.

NET NOTE - The Sadducees controlled the official political structures of Judaism at this time, being the majority members of the Sanhedrin. They were known as extremely strict on law and order issues (Josephus, J. W. 2.8.2 [2.119], 2.8.14 [2.164-166]; Ant. 13.5.9 [13.171-173], 13.10.6 [13.293-298], 18.1.2 [18.11], 18.1.4 [18.16-17], 20.9.1 [20.199]; Life 2 [10-11]). See also Matt 16:1-12; 22:23-34; Mark 12:18-27; Luke 20:27-38; Acts 5:17; 23:6-8.

Matthew Henry Concise Mt 22:23-33. The doctrines of Christ displeased the infidel Sadducees, as well as the Pharisees and Herodians. He carried the great truths of the resurrection and a future state, further than they had yet been revealed. There is no arguing from the state of things in this world, as to what will take place hereafter. Let truth be set in a clear light, and it appears in full strength. Having thus silenced them, our Lord proceeded to show the truth of the doctrine of the resurrection from the books of Moses. God declared to Moses that he was the God of the patriarchs, who had died long before; this shows that they were then in a state of being, capable of enjoying his favour, and proves that the doctrine of the resurrection is clearly taught in the Old Testament as well as in the New. But this doctrine was kept for a more full revelation, after the resurrection of Christ, who was the first-fruits of them that slept. All errors arise from not knowing the Scriptures and the power of God. In this world death takes away one after another, and so ends all earthly hopes, joys, sorrows, and connexions. How wretched are those who look for nothing better beyond the grave!

Daniel Akin has an interesting (understatement) introduction to this section writing "There is a playful saying that teachers of the Bible will often cite: "If you want to build a big crowd then teach on "sex" or "the end times." And, if you want to build a really big crowd then teach on "sex in the end times!" 2) Interestingly, that very issue was raised by a group of religious leaders who did not even believe in the end times, who rejected outright any doctrine of life after death. They are known in the Bible as the Sadducees. 3) The question of life after death has always fascinated humans, especially the religious. Every religion has some perspective on the issue though they vary widely in what they believe. Recent surveys point out the 80% of Americans believe in some form of life after death, with another 9% saying it may be true but that they were not sure. 4) Christianity has always had a strong doctrine concerning life after death, even if we had to admit to a good bit of mystery on the precise details. There is nothing surprising about this, after all we build our understanding of the future, end times and eternity from the teachings of Jesus, an empty tomb, and a resurrected and living Savior. The Bible tells us a lot but it does not tell us everything. 5) In this passage we will see how Jesus countered the troubling riddle of the Sadducees and demolished their theology and doctrine of annihilation. In the process, we will allow additional scriptures and theological reflection to help us craft a healthy perspective on what we can expect for the future. For those who know and trust Christ for salvation one thing is certain: it is all good! ([Will There Be Sex in Heaven?](#))

The **Sadducees** did not accept the OT passages that teach a future resurrection and a quick scan of the passages reveals the most likely reason they did not accept the following passages. Why not? Because none are taken from the Torah which was their primary authoritative source. Jesus would soon crush their absurd argument with Scripture from the Torah!

Job 19:25-27 (probably the oldest book in the Bible indicating belief in resurrection from ancient times) "As for me, I know that my Redeemer lives, And at the last He will take His stand on the earth. 26 "Even after my skin is destroyed, Yet from my flesh I shall see God; 27 Whom I myself shall behold, And whom my eyes will see

and not another. My heart faints within me!

Comment - A site I respect feels this is not a resurrection passage, but I disagree. Daniel Akin agrees that "The doctrine of resurrection finds Old Testament support in places like Job 19:25-27; Psalm 16:9-11; and Daniel 12:2."

Psalm 16:9-11+ ([A Messianic Psalm](#)) Therefore my heart is glad and my glory rejoices; My flesh also will dwell securely. 10 For You will not abandon my soul to Sheol; Nor will You allow Your Holy One to undergo decay. 11 You will make known to me the path of life; In Your presence is fullness of joy; In Your right hand there are pleasures forever.

Comment: Psalm 16:10 is quoted by Peter in Acts 2:27+ in his first sermon to the Jews after Pentecost as a prophecy that was fulfilled in the resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Peter states clearly that David did not fulfill the promise of this psalm (Acts 2:29+). (Read the full context - Acts 2:22-27+ and compare Acts 13:33-35+)

Gotquestions - The resurrection of the Messiah is strongly implied in another Davidic psalm. Again, this is Psalm 22. In verses 19–21, the suffering Savior prays for deliverance "from the lion's mouth" (a metaphor for Satan). This desperate prayer is then followed immediately in verses 22–24 by a hymn of praise in which the Messiah thanks God for hearing His prayer and delivering Him. The resurrection of the Messiah is clearly implied between the ending of the prayer in verse 21 and the beginning of the praise song in verse 22.

Psalm 49:15+ But God will redeem my soul from the power of Sheol, For He will receive me. Selah.

Isaiah 53:10-11+ But the LORD was pleased To crush Him, putting Him to grief; If He would render Himself as a guilt offering, He will see His offspring (CLEARLY IMPLIES HE WOULD LIVE AFTER BEING RENDERED AS A GUILT OFFERING), He will prolong His days, And the good pleasure of the LORD will prosper in His hand. 11 As a result of the anguish of His soul, He will see it and be satisfied; By His knowledge the Righteous One, My Servant, will justify the many, As He will bear their iniquities.

Comment: And back again to Isaiah 53: after prophesying that the Suffering Servant of God would suffer for the sins of His people, the prophet says He would then be "cut off out of the land of the living." But Isaiah then states that He (Messiah) "will see His offspring" and that God the Father will "prolong His days" (Isaiah 53:5, 8, 10). Isaiah proceeds to reaffirm the promise of the resurrection in different words: "As a result of the anguish of His soul, He will see light and be satisfied" (Isaiah 53:11). ([Scriptures prophesy resurrection of Messiah](#))

Isaiah 26:19 **Your dead will live; Their corpses will rise.** You who lie in the dust, awake and shout for joy, For your dew is as the dew of the dawn, And the earth will give birth to the departed spirits.

Daniel 12:2+ **"Many of those who sleep in the dust of the ground will awake** these to everlasting life, but the others to disgrace and everlasting contempt.

Daniel 12:13+ "But as for you (DANIEL), go your way to the end; **then you will enter into rest and rise again** for your allotted portion (REWARD SURELY ALLUDED TO IN Da 12:3+) at the end of the age."

Comment: When will Daniel be resurrected (and the other OT saints)? This passage says at the end of the age ([see timing of resurrections](#)). We are still in that same age now and it will be brought to an abrupt end when Messiah returns at His Second Coming, defeats all opposition (Gentile and Jew) and sets up His Millennial Kingdom.

Sadducees ([4523](#)) [saddoukaiois](#) is one of the four major sects of Judaism and were in opposition to the Pharisees and Essenes (the Zealots were the fourth sect). **Sadducees** were the religious and political liberals of the day and made up most of priests and their primary concerns were for the operation of the temple and the interpretation of the Law. They were fewer in number than their major rivals, the Pharisees (who had more influence on the people), but they were more influential and all the high priests of that day were from this sect (cf Acts 5:17) and presided over the [Sanhedrin](#) or Jewish "supreme court." The **Sadducees** were men of position and often wealthy landowners (aristocrats). The irony is that while they were the dominant religious force in Israel, they were worldly minded, materialistic secularists with little genuine interest in religion. They generally were against any opposition to Rome for fear that it would jeopardize their political position and wealth. John records "Therefore the **chief priests** (SADDUCEES) and the Pharisees convened a council, and were saying, "What are we doing? For this man is performing many signs. 48" If we let Him go on like this, all men will believe in Him, and the Romans will come and take away both our place and

our nation." (Jn 11:47-48)

The Sadducees were not many in number; but they were the wealthy, the aristocratic, and the governing class." (Barclay)

[Akin's](#) excellent summary of the Sadducees - A small sect of the priestly families. - Wealthy aristocrats with significant political/temple influences. They dominated the Sanhedrin (cf. Acts 5:17). - Sympathetic to [Hellenism](#), the Herods and Rome. - Considered only the books of Moses (Pentateuch) as authoritative. In a sense this made them theological conservatives. - Had a strong doctrine of human free will. - Did not believe in angels and demons (Acts 23:8). - Were not looking for a Messiah-King from David's line. - Did not believe in the immortality of the soul. - Did not believe in a future bodily resurrection. Josephus said, "The doctrine of the Sadducees is this: souls die with bodies." ([Antiquities, 18:1, 4 - INTERESTING NOTE AS HE DISCUSSES PHARISEES IN 18:3](#)). - With the total destruction of Jerusalem and the temple in A.D. 70, their center of power, and political influence came to an end and they vanished from history. ([Will There Be Sex in Heaven?](#))

Wuest adds that "The Pharisees were the ritualists, the Herodians, the political party among the Jews allied with the ruling Roman class, the Sadducees, the rationalists. The latter professed a disbelief in angels or spirits, and in a resurrection. They were closely identified with the priestly aristocracy (Acts 5:7), were relatively few in numbers, and were not held in as much esteem by the people as the Pharisees. These approached Jesus with the question which divided them from the Pharisees." ([Wuest Word Studies](#)- used [by permission](#) -- or Borrow [Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English reader](#))

SADDOUKAIOS - 14V - Matt. 3:7; Matt. 16:1; Matt. 16:6; Matt. 16:11; Matt. 16:12; Matt. 22:23; Matt. 22:34; Mk. 12:18; Lk. 20:27; Acts 4:1; Acts 5:17; Acts 23:6; Acts 23:7; Acts 23:8

WHO WERE THE SADDUCEES?

In Acts 23 Luke records Paul's defense before the Council declaring

But perceiving that one group were **Sadducees** and the other Pharisees, Paul began crying out in the Council, "Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son of Pharisees; I am on trial for the hope and resurrection of the dead!" 7 As he said this, there occurred a dissension between the Pharisees and **Sadducees**, and the assembly was divided. 8 For the **Sadducees** say that there is no resurrection, nor an angel, nor a spirit, but the Pharisees acknowledge them all. (Acts 23:6-8+)

And so we see that the Sadducees scoffed at many of the Pharisees' beliefs in the supernatural. The Sadducees remind me of Thomas Jefferson's so-called "Bible" which "is especially notable for its exclusion of all miracles by Jesus and most mentions of the supernatural, including sections of the four gospels that contain the Resurrection and most other miracles, and passages that portray Jesus as divine!" Amazing! Shocking! ([See Jefferson's Bible](#)). Clearly the Sadducees and Pharisees were bitter rivals, except when it came to opposing Jesus again proving the truth of the ancient proverb that "[The enemy of my enemy is my friend!](#)" (See Jn 11:47 where "chief priests" are the Sadducees) Of the major groups of Jewish religious leaders, the Sadducees were the smallest and yet one of the most influential, because of their wealth, and aristocratic standing in Jewish society. Many of the priests and chief priest were Sadducees as well as most of the Sanhedrin. They held most of the positions of power in the Temple including oversight of the lucrative business operations in the Court of the Gentiles on the Temple grounds, giving them good reason to hate Jesus Who overturned their lucrative business (Lk 19:45-48). Surprisingly they, like the Herodians, were eager to cooperate with the Romans. The Sadducees were religious liberals in their denial of the resurrection, angels, and the age to come. Josephus wrote that the Sadducees believed that the soul and body perish together at death. Since they rejected life after death, the Sadducees focused all their attention on this present life, this world which "is passing away, and also its lusts." (1 Jn 2:17). The Sadducees lived life as if there were no tomorrow. They fastidiously observed the Mosaic Law, but at the same time oppressed the common people, and used their positions of power to indulge themselves at the expense of the common people. If the Sadducees were alive today, their "theme song" might have been the Grassroots "[Let's Live for Today!](#)" especially the **refrain** "Sha la la la la, let's live for today and don't worry about tomorrow"! On the other hand they were fundamentalists who rejected the oral traditions which the Pharisees accepted. The Sadducees only accepted the Torah or Pentateuch as their primary authority and they contended that the resurrection was not taught in the Torah nor in any of the other OT books.

Resurrection ([386](#)) [anastasis](#) from **ana** = up, again + **histemi** = to cause to stand) literally means "to stand again" or "to cause to stand again" and most NT uses refer to a physical body rising from the dead or coming back to life after having once died.

The **resurrection** is distinguished from belief in reincarnation, which usually involves a series of rebirths from which the soul may seek release. Resurrection has primary reference to the body. The resurrection is the central, defining doctrine and claim of the gospel for as Paul wrote "if Christ has not been raised, then our preaching is vain, your faith also is vain." (1Cor 15:14)

ANASTASIS - 42x/40v in **NAS** -Matt. 22:23, 28, 30, 31; Mk. 12:18, 23; Lk. 2:34; 14:14; 20:27, 33, 35, 36; Jn. 5:29; 11:24, 25; Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:2, 33; 17:18, 32; 23:6, 8; 24:15, 21; 26:23; Ro 1:4; 6:5; 1 Co. 15:12, 13, 21, 42; Phil. 3:10; 2Ti 2:18; Heb. 6:2; 11:35; 1Pe 1:3; 3:21; Rev. 20:5, 6)

Related Resources:

- [Why is the truth of the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ so important? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Why is the resurrection of Jesus Christ important? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [When will the Resurrection take place? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Why should I believe in Christ's resurrection? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [What is the first resurrection? What is the second resurrection? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [What is more important, the death of Christ or His resurrection? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Is the resurrection of Jesus Christ true? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Can the various resurrection accounts from the four Gospels be harmonized? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [What did Jesus mean when He said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life" \(John 11:25\)? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Where do the Hebrew Scriptures prophesy the death and resurrection of the Messiah? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [Where was Jesus for the three days between His death and resurrection? | GotQuestions.org](#)
- [How will our resurrection body be different from our current body? | GotQuestions.org](#)

EXAMPLE OF BELIEF IN THE AFTERLIFE - Benjamin Franklin penned the words on his own epitaph, doing so at the young age of 22 and living to age 84.

The Body of B. Franklin, Printer
Like the Cover of an old Book
Its contents torn out,
And stript of its Lettering and Gilding,
Lies here, Food for Worms,
But the Work shall not be wholly lost:
For it will, as he believ'd,
Appear once more
In a new & more perfect Edition,
Corrected and amended by the Author.

This last line is so sad as the 22 yo Franklin assumed that after he died, he would wake up in the presence of the Author (as he calls God). Franklin epitomizes the tragedy that even the wisest of the wise can be spiritually deceived. Six weeks before his death he penned the following words as to his religious beliefs...

"Here is my Creed. I believe in one God, Creator of the Universe. That He governs it by His Providence. That he ought to be worshipped. That the most acceptable Service we render to him, is doing Good to his other Children. That the Soul of Man is immortal, and will be treated with Justice in another Life respecting its Conduct in this ... **As for Jesus of Nazareth ... I think the system of Morals and Religion as he left them to us, the best the World ever saw ... but I have ... some Doubts to his Divinity;** though' it is a Question I do not dogmatism upon, having never studied it, and think it is needless to busy myself with it now, where I expect soon an Opportunity of knowing the Truth with less Trouble." ([Reference](#))

The narrative is classic Franklin, witty and to the point, but sadly mistaken on the truth about Jesus, unless of course he had a change of heart and mind in the intervening 6 weeks before he died (and that is always a possibility!). So in light of his questioning the divinity of Jesus, despite his hope penned in the last line of his epitaph that he would receive a "new and more perfect Edition (referring to his body) corrected and amended by the Author (His reference to God)," he seems to have not believed the critical truth "there is salvation in no one else; for there is no other Name under heaven that has been given among men by which we must be saved." (Acts 4:12+)! Most believe Franklin was a Deist.

Related Resource:

- [What is deism? What do deists believe? | GotQuestions.org](#)

Matthew 22:24 asking, "Teacher, 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.'

KJV Matthew 22:24 Saying, Master, Moses said, If a man die, having no children, his brother shall marry his wife, and raise up seed unto his brother.

BGT Matthew 22:24 λ γοντες· διδ σκαλε, Μωϋς ε πεν· ν τις ποθ ν μ χων τ κνα, πιγαμβρε σει δελφ ς α το τ ν γυνα κα α το κα ναστ σει σπ ρμα τ δελφ α το .

NET Matthew 22:24 "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies without having children, his brother must marry the widow and father children for his brother.'

CSB Matthew 22:24 "Teacher, Moses said, if a man dies, having no children, his brother is to marry his wife and raise up offspring for his brother.

ESV Matthew 22:24 saying, "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies having no children, his brother must marry the widow and raise up offspring for his brother.'

NIV Matthew 22:24 "Teacher," they said, "Moses told us that if a man dies without having children, his brother must marry the widow and have children for him.

NLT Matthew 22:24 "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies without children, his brother should marry the widow and have a child who will carry on the brother's name.'

NRS Matthew 22:24 "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies childless, his brother shall marry the widow, and raise up children for his brother.'

NJB Matthew 22:24 'Master, Moses said that if a man dies childless, his brother is to marry the widow, his sister-in-law, to raise children for his brother.

NAB Matthew 22:24 saying, "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies without children, his brother shall marry his wife and raise up descendants for his brother.'

YLT Matthew 22:24 'Teacher, Moses said, If any one may die not having children, his brother shall marry his wife, and shall raise up seed to his brother.

MIT Matthew 22:24 They interrogated him this way: "Teacher, Moses said, If anyone dies childless, his brother should marry his wife and perpetuate seed for his brother.

GWN Matthew 22:24 "Teacher, Moses said, 'If a man dies childless, his brother should marry his widow and have children for his brother.'

- Master: Mt 22:16,36 7:21 Lu 6:46
- Moses: Ge 38:8,11 De 25:5-10 Ru 1:11 Mk 12:19 Lu 20:28

Related Passages:

Deuteronomy 25:5-10+ "When brothers live together and one of them dies and has no son, the wife of the deceased shall not be married outside the family to a strange man. Her husband's brother shall go in to her and take her to himself as wife and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her. 6 "It shall be that the firstborn whom she bears shall assume the name of his dead brother, so that his name will not be blotted out from Israel. 7 "But if the man does not desire to take his brother's wife, then his brother's wife shall go up to the gate to the elders and say, 'My husband's brother refuses to establish a name for his brother in Israel; he is not willing to perform the duty of a husband's brother to me.' 8 "Then the elders of his city shall summon him and speak to him. And if he persists and says, 'I do not desire to take her,' 9 then his brother's wife shall come to him in the sight of the elders, and pull his sandal off his foot and spit in his face; and she shall declare, 'Thus it is done to the man who does not build up his brother's house.' 10 "In Israel his name shall be called, 'The house of him whose sandal is removed.'

COMMENT - This passage is referring to what is known as the law of [levirate marriage](#) which says if a man died without an heir, any unmarried brother was obliged to marry the man's widow. The purpose of the law is (1) to provide for the widow in a society where a childless widow would be reduced to begging and (2) to preserved the name of the deceased brother, who would be regarded as the legal

father of the first son produced from that marriage, and would allow for the deceased brother's property to be kept in his line. See also Josephus (bottom half of the page) - [Josephus, Ant. 4.8.23](#)

Luke 20:28+ and they questioned Him, saying, "Teacher, Moses wrote for us that IF A MAN'S BROTHER DIES, having a wife, AND HE IS CHILDLESS, HIS BROTHER SHOULD MARRY THE WIFE AND RAISE UP CHILDREN TO HIS BROTHER.

THE SADDUCEES' ABSURD EXAMPLE

Absurd is defined in English dictionaries as contrary to reason or propriety; obviously and flatly opposed to manifest truth; inconsistent with the plain dictates of common sense; logically contradictory; nonsensical; ridiculous; silly. Inconsistent with reason, inviting ridicule; manifestly false, ludicrous. In short as discussed in Lk 20:33 ([see note](#)) the Sadducees were using the argument of [Reductio ad absurdum](#), to show belief in the resurrection was absurd! Their intent was to make the idea of a resurrection a joke!

Asking, "Teacher ([didaskalos](#)) - Teacher ([didaskalos](#)) was generally a respectful greeting, but from the lips of these hypocritical vipers it was undoubtedly tinged with [duplicity](#) (deliberate deceptiveness in behavior and speech). They certainly did not really consider Jesus to be **THEIR** Teacher! As they allude to in their quote, their "Teacher" is Moses (the [Torah](#)). I agree with **Wuest** on "Teacher" writing that "Their purpose was hostile. They address our Lord as **Teacher**, but the use of the title is purely formal. They did not come to learn." No, they came to trap Jesus in a "Resurrection Riddle!"

Stevenson - The question is meant as a trick. It is not a sincere question. It is one of those "can God make a rock so big that He cannot move it" questions. It is a question designed to disprove the doctrine of the resurrection. The question revolves around the laws of the [levirate marriage](#) as set forth in the book of Deuteronomy. Remember, the Sadducees only believed in the books of Moses.

Wuest writes that "Their purpose was hostile. They address our Lord as Teacher, but the use of the title is purely formal. They did not come to learn." No, they came to trap Jesus in a "Resurrection Riddle!" ([Wuest Word Studies - Eerdmann Publishing Company](#) used [by permission](#) -- or Borrow [Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English reader page 234](#))

Moses said, 'IF A MAN DIES HAVING NO CHILDREN, HIS BROTHER AS NEXT OF KIN SHALL MARRY HIS WIFE, AND RAISE UP CHILDREN (lit - raise up seed = idiom of fathering children) **FOR HIS BROTHER** Remember that all caps in the NASB indicates a direct quotation from the Old Testament. In this case the **Sadducees** are quoting from the book of Deuteronomy 25:5-6+ ([see above](#))

As an aside, these men knew the Torah and undoubtedly spoke this passage from memory (cf importance of believers [Memorizing His Word](#); see also [Memory Verses by Topic](#)). Some contend the Sadducees' story was not hypothetical but was an actual occurrence. Whether it was hypothetical or true does not really matter. As a side note several Hollywood stars have each been married eight times - Mickey Rooney, Elizabeth Taylor, and Lana Turner!

Spurgeon - Probably, this was one of the stock stories they were in the habit of telling in order to cast ridicule upon the resurrection.

NET NOTE - A quotation from Deut 25:5. This practice is called levirate marriage (see also Ruth 4:1-12; Mishnah, m. Yevamot; Josephus, Ant. 4.8.23 [4.254-256]). The levirate law is described in Deut 25:5-10. The brother of a man who died without a son had an obligation to marry his brother's widow. This served several purposes: It provided for the widow in a society where a widow with no children to care for her would be reduced to begging, and it preserved the name of the deceased, who would be regarded as the legal father of the first son produced from that marriage.

Daniel Akin has a related note on the background of the Sadducee's question - It was grounded in the issue of "levirate (Latin for "brother-in-law") marriage" mentioned in Genesis 38:8-10 and Ruth, and explained in Deuteronomy 25:5-10 which says, "If brothers dwell together, and one of them dies and has no son, the wife of the dead man shall not be married outside the family to a stranger. Her husband's brother shall go in to her and take her as his wife and perform the duty of a husband's brother to her. And the first son whom she bears shall succeed to the name of his dead brother, that his name may not be blotted out of Israel. And if the man does not wish to take his brother's wife, then his brother's wife shall go up to the gate to the elders and say, 'My husband's brother refuses to perpetuate his brother's name in Israel; he will not perform the duty of a husband's brother to me.' Then the elders of his city shall call him and speak to him, and if he persists, saying, 'I do not wish to take her,' then his brother's wife shall go up to him in the presence of the elders and pull his sandal off his foot and spit in his face. And she shall answer and say, 'So shall it be done to the man who does not build up his brother's house.' And the name of his house shall be called in Israel, 'The house of him who had his sandal pulled off.'" The gist of the issue is therefore this: **God made a provision for a family to be raised up in name and**

property rights for a husband who dies with no male heir. You have to love the way the Bible describes this! The Sadducees took this teaching and created what we call a *reductio ad absurdum* argument, an argument that reduces things to the absurd or the ridiculous. A man marries a woman and he dies. Fortunately (or “unfortunately”) he has 7 brothers who can step in and fulfill the levirate obligation. Tragically, she married each one and each one, all 7, died without bearing a child. Now, since the Pharisees and most rabbis believe the world to come is basically an improved and better one like this world, which therefore would include things like marriage, to whom then will she be married? Assuming monogamy which is a given, which one will have her in marriage with its privileges “in the resurrection” (v. 23), in the world to come? Such a scenario is clearly unthinkable and it shows the foolishness of believing in a future resurrection. Look at all the problems it could potentially cause. No, God is too smart for that and the books of Moses which are the undisputed Word of God make no mention of a future resurrection. Interestingly Jesus has already spoken of his own resurrection 3 times (Mark 8:31; 9:31; 10:34). The Sadducees think they have him, but they are headed toward a big disappointment.

Matthew 22:25 “Now there were seven brothers with us; and the first married and died, and having no children left his wife to his brother;

KJV Matthew 22:25 Now there were with us seven brethren: and the first, when he had married a wife, deceased, and, having no issue, left his wife unto his brother:

BGT Matthew 22:25 σαν δ παρ μ ν πτ δελφο · κα πρ τοσ γ μας τελε τησεν, κα μ χων σπ ρμα φ κεν τ ν γυνα κα α το τ δελφ α το ·

NET Matthew 22:25 Now there were seven brothers among us. The first one married and died, and since he had no children he left his wife to his brother.

CSB Matthew 22:25 Now there were seven brothers among us. The first got married and died. Having no offspring, he left his wife to his brother.

ESV Matthew 22:25 Now there were seven brothers among us. The first married and died, and having no offspring left his wife to his brother.

NIV Matthew 22:25 Now there were seven brothers among us. The first one married and died, and since he had no children, he left his wife to his brother.

NLT Matthew 22:25 Well, suppose there were seven brothers. The oldest one married and then died without children, so his brother married the widow.

NRS Matthew 22:25 Now there were seven brothers among us; the first married, and died childless, leaving the widow to his brother.

NJB Matthew 22:25 Now we had a case involving seven brothers; the first married and then died without children, leaving his wife to his brother;

NAB Matthew 22:25 Now there were seven brothers among us. The first married and died and, having no descendants, left his wife to his brother.

YLT Matthew 22:25 'And there were with us seven brothers, and the first having married did die, and not having seed, he left his wife to his brother;

MIT Matthew 22:25 There were among us seven brothers. The oldest died after he was married. Not having seed (i.e., children), he left his wife to his brother.

GWN Matthew 22:25 There were seven brothers among us. The first married and died. Since he had no children, he left his widow to his brother.

- Mk 12:19-23 Lu 20:29-33 Heb 9:27

Related Passages:

Mark 12:20+ “There were seven brothers; and the first took a wife, and died leaving no children.

Luke 20:29+ “Now there were seven brothers; and the first took a wife and died childless;

Now there were seven brothers with us; and the first married and died, and having no children left his wife to his brother -

This was apparently the "trump card" for the Sadducees against the Pharisees who believed in resurrection and it was one no Pharisee had ever been able to adequately answer. So they knew that now they could throw this curve ball at Jesus and He would be stumped. You can just imagine their sense of "Gotcha Now Jesus" mentality that stirred their prideful hearts as they began this question which takes up six verses (including the Scripture they quoted above) of the inspired Word of God! We know Jesus was filled with the Spirit for He was very patient to let them finish their lengthy question.

Hiebert on having no children - All seven brothers successively fulfilled their duty to marry their brother's wife, but the seven left no seed. This childlessness left none of them with a superior claim to be her husband in the resurrection. ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

Stevenson - The question presupposes a situation in which there are seven brothers. The oldest is married, but before his marriage can produce any children, he dies. According to Jewish Law, it is now the responsibility of the second brother to have a child by that wife and to raise the child as the heir of the first brother (Deuteronomy 25:5-10). And so, he marries her, but dies before there are any children. And so it goes with the third and the fourth and the fifth and the sixth and the seventh. By this time, I think that I would be a bit suspicious of the woman. But she eventually dies, too.

Matthew 22:26 so also the second, and the third, down to the seventh.

KJV Matthew 22:26 Likewise the second also, and the third, unto the seventh.

BGT Matthew 22:26 μο ως κα δε τερος κα τρ τος ως τ ν πτ .

NET Matthew 22:26 The second did the same, and the third, down to the seventh.

CSB Matthew 22:26 The same happened to the second also, and the third, and so to all seven.

ESV Matthew 22:26 So too the second and third, down to the seventh.

NIV Matthew 22:26 The same thing happened to the second and third brother, right on down to the seventh.

NLT Matthew 22:26 But the second brother also died, and the third brother married her. This continued with all seven of them.

NRS Matthew 22:26 The second did the same, so also the third, down to the seventh.

NJB Matthew 22:26 the same thing happened with the second and third and so on to the seventh,

NAB Matthew 22:26 The same happened with the second and the third, through all seven.

YLT Matthew 22:26 in like manner also the second, and the third, unto the seventh,

MIT Matthew 22:26 The same sequence of events transpired with the second brother, the third, and all of them including the seventh.

GWN Matthew 22:26 The second brother also died, as well as the third, and the rest of the seven brothers.

■ seventh: Luke 20:31

so also the second, and the third, down to the seventh- Matthew lumps all the husbands into one verse! One would have thought that after the third had died, all would have viewed her as a consummate [widow maker](#) and avoided her like the plague! But this is just an absurd story (See [Reductio ad absurdum](#))!

Matthew 22:27 "Last of all, the woman died.

KJV Matthew 22:27 And last of all the woman died also.

BGT Matthew 22:27 στερον δ π ντων π θανεν γυν .

NET Matthew 22:27 Last of all, the woman died.

CSB Matthew 22:27 Then last of all the woman died.

ESV Matthew 22:27 After them all, the woman died.

NIV Matthew 22:27 Finally, the woman died.

NLT Matthew 22:27 Last of all, the woman also died.

NRS Matthew 22:27 Last of all, the woman herself died.

NJB Matthew 22:27 and then last of all the woman herself died.

NAB Matthew 22:27 Finally the woman died.

YLT Matthew 22:27 and last of all died also the woman;

MIT Matthew 22:27 Last of all the woman died.

THE WIDOW IS DEAD

Last of all, the woman died - And everyone took a deep breath, thanking God that the "[widow maker](#)" has passed!

Matthew 22:28 “In the resurrection, therefore, whose wife of the seven will she be? For they all had married her.”

KJV Matthew 22:28 Therefore in the resurrection whose wife shall she be of the seven? for they all had her.

BGT Matthew 22:28 ν τ ν α σ τ σ ε ι ο ν τ ν ο ς τ ν π τ σ τ α ι γ υ ν ; π ν τ ε ς γ ρ σ χ ο ν α τ ν ·

NET Matthew 22:28 In the resurrection, therefore, whose wife of the seven will she be? For they all had married her."

CSB Matthew 22:28 In the resurrection, therefore, whose wife will she be of the seven? For they all had married her."

ESV Matthew 22:28 In the resurrection, therefore, of the seven, whose wife will she be? For they all had her."

NIV Matthew 22:28 Now then, at the resurrection, whose wife will she be of the seven, since all of them were married to her?"

NLT Matthew 22:28 So tell us, whose wife will she be in the resurrection? For all seven were married to her."

NRS Matthew 22:28 In the resurrection, then, whose wife of the seven will she be? For all of them had married her."

NJB Matthew 22:28 Now at the resurrection, whose wife among the seven will she be, since she had been married to them all?"

NAB Matthew 22:28 Now at the resurrection, of the seven, whose wife will she be? For they all had been married to her."

YLT Matthew 22:28 therefore in the rising again, of which of the seven shall she be wife -- for all had her?"

MIT Matthew 22:28 Therefore, in the resurrection whose wife of the seven will she be, for they all had her?"

GWN Matthew 22:28 Now, when the dead come back to life, whose wife will she be? All seven brothers had been married to her."

Related Passages:

Mark 12:23+ "In the resurrection, when they rise again, which one's wife will she be? For all seven had married her."

Luke 20:33+ "In the resurrection therefore, which one's wife will she be? For all seven had married her."

WHOSE WIFE WILL SHE BE?

In the resurrection ([anastasis](#)), therefore, whose wife of the seven will she be? For they all had married her - Matthew lumps all seven husbands into one verse. Of course, Jesus immediately proceeds (Mt 22:29-30) to correct their erroneous presupposition

by pointing out that there is a marked distinction between life in **this age** and life in **that age** which is to come (resurrection life).

[Stevenson](#) - Do you see what the Sadducees are doing? They are not asking this question because they are actually worried about this situation. They are asking it because they think that the question shows a flaw in the whole teaching about the resurrection. They expect Jesus to stutter and stammer and get red in the face so that they can laugh at Him. But he does nothing of the sort.

D A Carson makes a good point that the Sadducees question was based on their presupposition "that resurrection life is an exact counterpart to earthly life; and if so, the resurrected woman must be guilty of incestuous marriages or arbitrarily designated the wife of one of the brothers. And if so, which one? Or—and this is the answer the Sadducees pressed for—the whole notion of resurrection is absurd." (Borrow [The Expositor's Bible Commentary](#) - 1994 edition - Abridged - New Testament)

The argument that the Sadducees are employing is what is commonly known as [Reductio ad absurdum](#), which is "Latin for **"reduction to absurdity"** "a form of argument which attempts either to disprove a statement by showing it inevitably leads to a ridiculous, absurd, or impractical conclusion, or to prove one by showing that if it were not true, the result would be absurd or impossible." In the present context the goal of the Sadducees is the former, that is, to disprove the resurrection by showing that this belief inevitably would lead one to come to an absurd, even impossible conclusion. In other words they are attempting to show that the resurrection cannot be true because the implications of that belief are absurd or ridiculous in the case of the woman with seven former husbands! Imagine the scene in heaven! Whose wife is she going to be? And remember also that since none of them would die (it's heaven), the scene would be utter [chaos](#) (a state of extreme confusion and disorder in a place that was supposed to be just the opposite! Just imagine all these people wandering around heaven trying to discover who their wife is or who their husband is!). This would be absolutely absurd! It simply could not occur they reason. And then the logical conclusion is that there is not such a thing as the **resurrection** because there was no way the Law of Levirate marriage in Deuteronomy 25:5-10 could be fulfilled! And so the Sadducees thought they had Jesus this time, for this argument had never failed when they had used it to stump their rivals the Pharisees who believed in the resurrection.

As an aside, although the story of the Sadducees seems a bit ridiculous, their question is not merely theoretical for there will be many in heaven who have had more than one spouse, for any number of reasons. But as Jesus will go on to explain, multiple spouses, bitter divorces, jealousies, etc will (thank God), not be relevant in the life to come! That's good news!

Matthew 22:29 But Jesus answered and said to them, "You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God.

KJV Matthew 22:29 Jesus answered and said unto them, Ye do err, not knowing the scriptures, nor the power of God.

BGT Matthew 22:29 αποκριθε ς δ ησο ς επεν α το ς· πλαν σθε μ ε δ τε ς τ ς γραφ ς μηδ τ ν δ ναμιν το θεο ·

NET Matthew 22:29 Jesus answered them, "You are deceived, because you don't know the scriptures or the power of God.

CSB Matthew 22:29 Jesus answered them, "You are deceived, because you don't know the Scriptures or the power of God.

ESV Matthew 22:29 But Jesus answered them, "You are wrong, because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God.

NIV Matthew 22:29 Jesus replied, "You are in error because you do not know the Scriptures or the power of God.

NLT Matthew 22:29 Jesus replied, "Your mistake is that you don't know the Scriptures, and you don't know the power of God.

NRS Matthew 22:29 Jesus answered them, "You are wrong, because you know neither the scriptures nor the power of God.

NJB Matthew 22:29 Jesus answered them, 'You are wrong, because you understand neither the scriptures nor the power of God.

NAB Matthew 22:29 Jesus said to them in reply, "You are misled because you do not know the scriptures or the power of God.

YLT Matthew 22:29 And Jesus answering said to them, 'Ye go astray, not knowing the Writings, nor the power of God;

MIT Matthew 22:29 Jesus replied to them: "Your error derives from your neither knowing the Scriptures nor God's power.

GWN Matthew 22:29 Jesus answered, "You're mistaken because you don't know the Scriptures or God's power.

- not: Job 19:25-27 Ps 16:9-11 17:15 49:14,15 73:25,26 Isa 25:8 26:19 Isa 57:1,2 Da 12:2,3 Ho 13:14 Lu 24:44-47 Jn 20:9 Ro 15:4
- nor: Ge 18:14 Jer 32:17 Lu 1:37 Ac 26:8 Php 3:21

Related Passages:

Luke 20:34+ Jesus said to them, "The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage,

JESUS EXPOSES THE ERRORS OF THE SADDUCEES

But Jesus answered and said to them - And so Jesus first points out that the Sadducees have made a major mistake in assuming that (future) **that age** (Lk 20:35+) is simply a continuation of **this age**. He proceeds to describe how they differ, especially regarding marriage. In Luke 20, Jesus deals with their not understanding God's power in verses Lu 20:34-36+ and with their not understanding the Scriptures in verses Lu 20:37-38. "Theological error must be confronted quickly and clearly. That is exactly what Jesus does with the skeptical and cynical Sadducees." (Akin)

You are mistaken ([planao](#) - present tense - continually) - Jesus gives two reasons their question is absurd and non-Scriptural.

Steven Cole - Jesus shows us that the source of sound doctrine is not human reason, but Scripture properly interpreted. Both the Sadducees and Jesus held to the authority of Scripture. They begin by quoting Moses and Jesus answers them by quoting Moses. But these men gave undue emphasis to human reason, which led them to disregard certain Scriptures; and they underestimated the power of God to raise the dead and give them a whole different existence in heaven. Mk 12:24 quotes Jesus, "Is this not the reason you are mistaken, that you do not understand the Scriptures, or the power of God?" ([Why You Should Care About Doctrine](#))

Not understanding ("knowing" - eidotes = perfect tense of [eido](#)) **the Scriptures** ([graphe](#)) - **Not understanding** (eidotes = perfect tense of [eido](#)) means that they had failed to come to a perception or realization of the truth of the Scriptures! Imagine their reaction when Jesus made this cutting statement to these pride filled men! Note that **Scriptures** ([graphe](#)) is used 51x in NT and almost all refer to the Old Testament.

THOUGHT - Not knowing (understanding) the Scriptures: It is possible for a person to have much Bible knowledge, yet not fundamentally know the Scriptures. Paul later told Timothy to hold fast the pattern of sound words which you have heard from me (2 Timothy 1:13+). This suggests that Biblical truth has a pattern to it, a pattern that can be detected by the discerning heart. It also suggests that one can lose this pattern (thus the command to hold fast). The Sadducees had Bible knowledge, but they did not hold fast the pattern of sound words; many today are like them in this respect. ([Guzik](#))

Nor the power ([dunamis](#)) **of God** ([theos](#)) - Their second major error was they lacked a true perception of the [dunamis](#) of **God** ([theos](#)) which would have also **rubbed them the wrong way!** **Power** is the great Greek word [dunamis](#) which refers to the intrinsic power and inherent ability of the omnipotent God to carry out some function, in this context to bring the dead back to life! It is therefore not surprising that [dunamis](#) is translated *miracle* some 20x in the NT. In short these religious leaders do not know God (revealed in the Scriptures) nor the power of God! That's about as blunt as one can get! As we would say today "[In your face!](#)"

Dwight Edwards makes an excellent point - There is a vital balance in knowing both of these essential ingredients for radiant godliness. In evangelical circles today there is a tendency to know one OR the other, but too seldom are they both entwined significantly in the same life. Many focus on knowing the **Scriptures**, but fail to appropriate the **power of God** which is so necessary for the Word to be properly applied and obeyed. Others are preeminently concerned with the **power of God** but lack the stability and cutting edge which only the Word of God can provide (Eph 6:17+). Like Stephen, we must (ED: CONTINUALLY) seek to "be full of the Holy Spirit and wisdom (Acts 6:3+). ([Mark Commentary](#))

Geddert - Jesus' response critiques the Sadducees on two points. They misconceive the nature of the resurrection life. They also erroneously reject a (properly understood) resurrection life. Those of us who wish we knew more about that resurrection life might

wish this text were considerably longer. What are their misguided images of a resurrection life? What will it really be like? Jesus critiques a conception of a resurrection life that assumes the following:

- That the resurrection life is a simple continuation of this life, with all its relationships intact.
- That offspring would still be needed as designated heirs of men who die childless.

I think it is going beyond the evidence of this text to insist (as some do) that in the resurrection life these things happen:

- Gender distinctions will disappear.
- There will be nothing corresponding to intimate relationships.
- None of the conditions of our prior earthly life will be remembered or be relevant.

We are told too little to insist on any of these. What seems clear is that those raised will not enter into marriages as we know them in this life. Producing offspring to solve inheritance problems will no longer be necessary. That is likely the point on which we will be like the angels. The Sadducees would not be persuaded by Jesus' clarification that we will be like angels; they do not believe that angels exist. Jesus' only clear statement about the nature of the future resurrection life is that God is powerful enough to design it. Jesus critiques their doubts that God can work out the logistics of a resurrection life. When asked about the nature of the resurrection life, I would rather say, "God will find a way of working that out!" That is better than advancing a series of options and dilemmas each option would create. ([Believers Church Bible Commentary](#))

In summary, notice that in the mold of the Master Rabbi that Jesus is, He answers their question by **beginning with a question** of His own (**Jesus answered....**). And what a question it is! First he flat out tells the Sadducees that they **are mistaken**. Now pause a moment and imagine you were a fly on the Temple wall. Can you see their faces? Their posturing? Their leaning over to one another? etc. What a question to begin answering what they thought was a "water tight" argument that they could not lose! In effect, from the very beginning, Jesus is saying in essence "You lose!" You Sadducees are **sad you see** because you don't even understand your own Scriptures. Woe! Are their faces flushed yet? Their nostrils are beginning to flare! And then Jesus tops it off with the accusation that they did not even understand **the power of God!** They must have been thinking "*Does God have power to somehow resolve the absurd riddle of one wife and seven husbands in heaven?*" They are beginning to worry that their water tight argument is beginning to leak and for good reason. They do not have a clue that they have just confronted the Wisdom of the Cosmos, the One Who is infinitely wise. And He is about to respond with that infinite wisdom which will slam shut their mouths in utter dismay!

THOUGHT - Let's apply this - Jesus is saying you don't understand Who God is and what He is capable of! You haven't been reading your Bibles! Now this is what happens often when people challenge our Christian faith, but often they do so out of ignorance of God and/or ignorance of His Word. Some people do this sincerely. But others are like the Sadducees and are trying to trap us in some obscure Biblical doctrine, some supposed inconsistency of the Scriptures, etc. They have made a profession of knowledge of God but, as is often the case, these individuals know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God! Which means that we as followers of Christ must know our Bibles and be convinced of the power of God. Peter says it this way "**Sanctify** (aorist imperative - This is imperative! see [our need to depend on the Holy Spirit to obey](#)) Christ as Lord in your **hearts** (NOT JUST YOUR HEAD!), always being ready to make a defense ([apologia](#)) to everyone who asks you to give an account for the hope that is in you, yet with gentleness and reverence." (1 Peter 3:15+). If you were confronted today by an individual skeptical about the resurrection from the dead, would you be able to give an accurate, Biblically saturated account for the hope (not hope so, but hope sure) you have firmly founded in the truth of the resurrection (cf Acts 23:6NLT+, Acts 24:15+)?"

Are mistaken (4105)([planao](#) from **plane** which describes "a wandering" and gives us our English word "planet") means literally made to wander and so to go (active sense) or be led (passive sense as of sheep in Mt 18:12-13) astray. In spiritual terms, **planao** means to be made to err from the right way, the highway of truth and holiness. Straying in the spiritual sense occurs when one **does not adhere to the truth** (James 5:19+) and/or **forsakes the right way** (see 2 Peter 2:15+) In this passage **planao** is in the **passive voice** which indicates an outside force or influence causes the deception. In this case it is their unregenerate heart that causes the deception that leads one down the wrong path. The **present tense** indicates the sad truth that these religious men are unsaved and are continually being led astray from God and ultimately being led into eternal separation from His presence.

MacArthur: The verb **mistaken** is **planao** from which we get the word planet, wandering bodies. The verb means to cause to wander, to lead astray. You are leading yourselves astray by your biblical ignorance. You're mentally wandering. You've been cut loose from reality. You've been cut loose from reason. You've been cut loose from truth. That is why false teachers in Jude 13 are called wandering star

PLANAO - 37V- Matt. 18:12; Matt. 18:13; Matt. 22:29; Matt. 24:4; Matt. 24:5; Matt. 24:11; Matt. 24:24; Mk. 12:24; Mk. 12:27; Mk. 13:5; Mk. 13:6; Lk. 21:8; Jn. 7:12; Jn. 7:47; 1 Co. 6:9; 1 Co. 15:33; Gal. 6:7; 2 Tim. 3:13; Tit. 3:3; Heb. 3:10; Heb. 5:2; Heb. 11:38; Jas. 1:16; Jas. 5:19; 1 Pet. 2:25; 2 Pet. 2:15; 1 Jn. 1:8; 1 Jn. 2:26; 1 Jn. 3:7; Rev. 2:20; Rev. 12:9; Rev. 13:14; Rev. 18:23; Rev. 19:20; Rev. 20:3; Rev. 20:8; Rev. 20:10

Some Unanswered Questions - The Scriptures leave many questions about the hereafter unanswered. Do children grow up in heaven? What about the saints with the Lord who do not yet have their resurrection bodies? What is a spiritual body? And of course through the ages bereaved hearts have asked, "Shall we know each other over there?"

Of course it has been said many times that surely we shall have as much sense there as we have here! The Sadducees asked our Lord about the woman who had been married seven times: whose wife would she be in the resurrection? He replied; "Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not the scriptures, neither the power of God"? (Mark 12:24). When we know not God's Word nor His power we fall into all kinds of error. Error is grounded in ignorance. Jesus went on to say that in the resurrection we neither marry nor are given in marriage but are as the angels. He was not covering the whole subject of our status in the hereafter and we can read too much into or out of these words. He simply said that angels do not marry and in this respect we shall be like the angels, for earthly relationships do not obtain in the hereafter.

This does not necessarily mean that we shall feel exactly the same way toward everybody, a stranger or our dearest loved one. I do not know how God will work it all out and I may be speculating, but I cannot feel that I will react just the same when I see my mother or wife over there as to somebody I never saw before. I know that we shall have new bodies and that old emotions will have been displaced by a new personality appropriate to our heavenly life. But I cannot think that there will be one general uniformity of thought and feeling with no degrees of delight as we meet again those we have loved long since and lost awhile. Our Father will grant us fullest joy, and I am not going to let the problem of one woman with seven husbands spoil my anticipation when I walk the golden streets with the one I loved above all others on earth.

Nor do I think that all the residents of that fair city will have the same capacity for enjoyment. The Scriptures teach that some will be beaten with few stripes and some with many and some shall rule over five cities and some over ten. By the same token I cannot believe that heaven will mean no more to faithful saints who walked close to God on earth than to some poor disciple who barely got into heaven saved as by fire with his life gone up in smoke.

Just how the Father will do it I do not know, but my joy will not be less there than here and it will be intensified, not toned down to one unvarying pattern. Even this poor world abounds in color and variety and my eternal home will be no monolithic set-up. I still feel that the dearest here will be dearer there in a way I could never know in this world. But I approach it with no trepidation. My Father knows how to do it and five seconds after I arrive all my questions will have disappeared in ecstasy as I take up my abode in the house of the Lord forever (Vance Havner)

Matthew 22:30 "For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven."

KJV Matthew 22:30 For in the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven.

BGT Matthew 22:30 ν γ ρ τ ν α σ τ σ ε ι ο τ ε γ α μ ο σ ι ν ο τ ε γ α μ ζ ο ν τ α ι , λ λ ς γ γ ε λ ο ι ν τ ο ρ α ν ε σ ι ν .

NET Matthew 22:30 For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.

CSB Matthew 22:30 For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like angels in heaven.

ESV Matthew 22:30 For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.

NIV Matthew 22:30 At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven.

NLT Matthew 22:30 For when the dead rise, they will neither marry nor be given in marriage. In this respect they will be like the angels in heaven.

NRS Matthew 22:30 For in the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven.

NJB Matthew 22:30 For at the resurrection men and women do not marry; no, they are like the angels in heaven.

NAB Matthew 22:30 At the resurrection they neither marry nor are given in marriage but are like the angels in heaven.

YLT Matthew 22:30 for in the rising again they do not marry, nor are they given in marriage, but are as messengers of God in heaven.

MIT Matthew 22:30 For in the resurrection epoch no male marries nor is a woman given in marriage, but everyone resembles the angels of heaven [as singles].

GWN Matthew 22:30 When people come back to life, they don't marry. Rather, they are like the angels in heaven.

- **in the resurrection:** Mk 12:24,25 Lu 20:34-36 Jn 5:28,29 1Co 7:29-31 1Jn 3:1,2
- **but are like angels:** Mt 13:43 18:10 Ps 103:20 Zec 3:7 1Jn 3:2 Rev 5:9-11 19:10

THE STATE IN THE FIRST RESURRECTION

For ([gar](#)) - Term of Explanation. Jesus will explain their error.

In the resurrection ([anastasis](#)) - **In the resurrection** refers to the future resurrection of believers (known as the '[First Resurrection](#)') not the '[Second Resurrection](#)' which is the resurrection that will occur at the [Great White Throne](#) judgment when all unbelievers of all time will be resurrected and will stand before Jesus the Righteous Judge (Rev 20:11-15+). In this passage Jesus is referring to the "**First Resurrection**," the resurrection that will occur in several stages ([as summarized in the table below](#)).

They neither marry ([gameo](#)) **nor are given in marriage, but** (term of contrast) **are like angels** ([aggelos/angelos](#) - of God - [note](#)) **in heaven** ([ouranos](#)) - Note "**like**" (term of comparison - simile) angels. Glorified men and women will BE angels. Here Jesus deals with their failure to understand the Scriptures which they mistakenly thought taught marriage in the afterlife (even though they did not believe in an afterlife)! Why will they be like the angels? They will be eternal beings. There is no death in heaven, so there is no longer need for procreation to continue the race of mankind!

THOUGHT - Jesus gives the Biblical truth about marital relationships in heaven which is dramatically different from the more sensual depictions of heaven as propounded in [Islamic theology](#) (INCLUDING 72 VIRGINS!) and Mormon theology (cf "[Celestial Marriage](#)").

Luke's parallel adds "but those who are considered worthy ([kataxioo](#)) to attain to that age ("To share in heaven" "To take part in that future age") and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage." (Lk 20:35+)

Summary - Jesus responds to the Sadducees explaining where they are mistaken

1. There will be a resurrection.
2. There will be no marriage relationship as we know it in this life.
3. In some sense we will become like the angels - no procreation, no death

Steven Cole explains that "The Sadducees' error was based on some wrong assumptions. They wrongly assumed that life after death would necessarily be just like life now. Thus they took the Mosaic allowance for a brother marrying his deceased brother's widow to raise up offspring for him, and wrongly applied it to life in the resurrected state. They wrongly assumed that people will marry monogamously in heaven, just as they do now. Based on their assumptions, the idea of a woman having seven husbands in heaven was logically absurd. But their assumptions were wrong." ([Why You Should Care About Doctrine](#))

Wuest - Angels were originally created. There are the same number of **angels** in existence today as when they were created. They do not propagate their kind. They will be like **angels** in this respect, that they will not propagate their kind. Thus, the hypothetical case of the Sadducees has no relation to the future life. ([Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English reader](#))

Alan Carr: While the relationship of marriage is a wonderful and divinely ordained institution, it is an absolutely earthly institution. Marriage was designed for companionship, Gen. 2:18, continuation of the species, Gen. 1:22, and for the fulfillment of legitimate sexual needs, 1 Cor. 7:2. When we get to Heaven, we will be like the angels, only in the sense that we will be spiritual beings that will have no need for the physical necessities of this earthly life. In heaven, like the angels, we will be deathless, sinless, sexless, glorified and eternal. But, unlike the angels, we will be like Jesus, 1 John 3:2. Life will be different when we get there. There will be

no need for reproduction and childbirth because there will be no death. There will be no exclusive physical relationships like there are here, because in Heaven everyone will be perfectly and intimately related to everyone else, including God. ([A Marriage Made In Paradise](#))

Grant Osborne - In another sense, we will not need to marry because we will know our current spouses (and everyone else) infinitely better than we know them now. (See [Mark Teach the Text Commentary Series](#))

Leon Morris adds that "Jesus' questioners had failed to realize that the life to come will be essentially different from this life. Where the doctrine of resurrection was held among the Jews it was usually envisaged as an indefinite prolongation of this life, though no doubt with modifications and improvements. ...Jesus rejects all this. Life in heaven will be significantly different from anything on earth. **Human relationships are largely a matter of place and time: they are bound to be different when neither of these applies.** (ED: HEAVEN IS A DIFFERENT PLACE AND TIME NO LONGER EXISTS AS WE KNOW IT!) (See [Luke: An Introduction and Commentary - Page 308](#))

Danny Akin - The world of resurrection, the world to come, is different than the world we live in. There is continuity to be sure. I will be I and you will be you, but we will exist and live for all of eternity in an entirely new dimension and reality. So, the billion dollar question, "will there be sex in heaven?" Here is what I think we can biblically and safely say:

1. We will exist as glorified bodies in heaven.
2. We will maintain our present and unique identity in heaven.
3. There will be, in one sense, sex in heaven because sex identifies us as male and female in terms of gender.
4. Whatever physical, sensual and sexual pleasure we enjoy in this life will be greatly transcended and magnified beyond our imagination in the life to come. ([Mark 12:18-27 Will There Be Sex in Heaven?](#))

Stevenson - The resurrection does not constitute a continuation of life as it is on earth. The old physical laws will no longer apply. And the old physical and social relationships will pale to insignificance in the presence of our relationship with the Lord.

Darrell Bock adds that "Since marriage is no longer necessary in the resurrection, the dilemma posed by multiple husbands disappears. The question is an absurdity, not because resurrection is a problem, but because the Sadducean understanding of resurrection is grounded too much in life as it is now. The afterlife is a different and much greater kind of existence. In the next life God the Father is the "parent," so other parental relationships are unnecessary." ([Luke: 9:51-24:53 - Page 1624](#))

NET NOTE - Angels do not die, nor do they eat according to Jewish tradition (1 En. 15:6; 51:4; Wis 5:5; 2 Bar. 51:10; 1QH 3.21–23).

NET NOTE - TECHNICAL NOTE - Most witnesses have "of God" after "angels," although some MSS read γγελoi θεo (angeloi theou; x L f13 {28} 33 892 1241 1424 al) while others have γγελoi το θεo (angeloi tou theou; W 0102 0161). Whether with or without the article, the reading "of God" appears to be motivated as a natural expansion. A few important witnesses lack the adjunct (B D Θ {0233} f1 700 {sa}); this coupled with strong internal evidence argues for the shorter reading.

QUESTION - [Will there be marriage in heaven?](#) [WATCH VIDEO](#)

ANSWER - The Bible tells us, "At the resurrection people will neither marry nor be given in marriage; they will be like the angels in heaven" (Matthew 22:30). This was Jesus' answer in response to a question concerning a woman who had been married multiple times in her life —whom would she be married to in heaven (Matthew 22:23-28)? Evidently, there will be no such thing as marriage in heaven. **This does not mean that a husband and wife will no longer know each other in heaven. This also does not mean that a husband and wife could not still have a close relationship in heaven.** What it does seem to indicate, though, is that a husband and wife will no longer be married in heaven. Most likely, there will be no marriage in heaven simply because there will be no need for it. When God established marriage, He did so to fill certain needs. First, He saw that Adam was in need of a companion. "The LORD God said, 'It is not good for the man to be alone. I will make a helper suitable for him'" (Genesis 2:18). Eve was the solution to the problem of Adam's loneliness, as well as his need for a "helper," someone to come alongside him as his companion and go through life by his side. In heaven, however, there will be no loneliness, nor will there be any need for helpers. We will be surrounded by multitudes of believers and angels (Revelation 7:9), and all our needs will be met, including the need for companionship.

Second, God created marriage as a means of procreation and the filling of the earth with human beings. Heaven, however, will not be populated by procreation. Those who go to heaven will get there by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; they will not be created there by means of reproduction. Therefore, there is no purpose for marriage in heaven since there is no procreation or loneliness. [GotQuestions.org](#)

Spurgeon - The angelic life Matthew 22:30 (full sermon [The Angelic Life](#))

We shall be like the angels in heavenliness. Here we come to the vital meaning of the text. They are not married or given in marriage; they have other things to think of, and they have other cares and other enjoyments; they mind not earthly things, but are of a heavenly spirit. So is it with the blessed spirits before the throne. To eat and drink, to be clothed—these are things which fret their minds no more. To keep the house, to maintain the children, to thrust the wolf from the door—such anxieties never trouble celestial spirits. Brethren, this is one of the things which makes the great change so desirable to us, that after death our thoughts, our cares, our position, our desires and our joys will all be in God. Here we want externals, here we seek after carnal things; for we must eat and drink, and be clothed and housed. Here we must be somewhat hampered by the grosser elements of this poor materialism, but up yonder they have no needs like our own; they consequently have no desires of an earthly kind; their desires are all concerning their God. No creature drags them downward. They are free to bow before the Creator and to think alone of him, to ‘Plunge into the Godhead’s deepest sea, And bathe in his immensity.’

What a deliverance that must be! If now for a minute or two we soar to sublimer things and climb as upon the top of Pisgah to look down upon the world, we are called to descend again into the valley amid the noise and dust of the battle; but there for ever and ever we shall abide in the loftiness of heavenly things, absorbed with the glory which shall then be revealed.

Norman Geisler - [When Critics Ask](#) - MATTHEW 22:30—Will we be like angels (spirits) in heaven, beings without physical bodies?

PROBLEM: Jesus said that in the resurrection we will be “like the angels of God” (Matt. 22:30). But angels have no physical bodies—they are spirits (Heb. 1:14). Thus, it is argued that we will have no physical bodies in the resurrection. This, however, is contradictory to those verses that claim there will be a resurrection of the physical body from the grave (John 5:28–29; Luke 24:39).

SOLUTION: Jesus did not say that we would be like angels in that they are spirits, but like them in that they do not marry. Two observations are relevant here.

First of all, the context is not talking about the nature of the resurrection body, but whether or not there will be marriage in heaven. The question Jesus answered with this statement was, “In the resurrection, whose wife of the seven [husbands she had] will she be, for they all had her?” (22:28) Jesus’ reply was that, like angels, there will be no marriage in heaven. So the woman will not be married to any of these seven husbands in heaven. But Jesus said nothing here about having immaterial bodies in heaven. Such a conclusion is totally unwarranted by the context.

Second, when Jesus said “in the resurrection ... [they] are like angels of God,” He obviously meant like angels in that they will “neither marry nor are given in marriage” (v. 30). He did not say they would be like angels in that they would have no physical bodies. Rather, they would be like angels in that they would be without sexual propagation.

David Thompson: What do other religions say about the afterlife? -

- Mormons: say you go to 1 of 3 kingdoms based on approval of Joseph Smith -
- Hindus: Reincarnated based on your works -
- Muslims, Islam -- Die and go to a pleasure palace; if you die a martyr you get 72 virgins -
- Indians: you need to be buried with your bow and arrows as you go to your Happy and Holy Hunting Ground -
- Egyptians: be buried with things you can take with you into eternity -
- Some Greeks: bury with a coin in mouth so you can pay the fee to cross into the land of the afterlife Religious people just make it up as they go and people believe it; bunch of crazy views
- Important to understand what the Scriptures teach about the afterlife.

Henrietta Mears - There is an old hymn that says, “[I want to be an angel and with the angels stand.](#)” (Here is the [vocal version](#)) Do you want to be an angel when you die? If you do, I am afraid you are never going to make it. God has something much better for you than being an angel. God’s children will reign with Him; angels serve Him. Statements like the words of the hymn quoted above have given a very wrong idea of just what angels are. **People have an idea that those who have died have been given a pair of wings and a harp and now are angels.** This is a common mistake and it is not what the Scriptures teach. It is true that all Christians who die trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ as Savior are in His presence in heaven, but they are not angels. The Bible teaches that angels are a distinct class of beings who have never been human beings. They are ministering spirits (see Heb. 1:14+). Our Lord said that human beings after they die and rise from the dead “are like angels of God in heaven” (Mt 22:30) in the matter of marriage and

giving in marriage. This shows that human beings in heaven are like angels in this respect, but they are not angels. **Know this: Christians will no more become angels when they die than they will become birds or fish. Believers in Christ are called saints; they are never called angels in the Bible.** (God's Plan: Finding Yourself in His Grand Design)

Marriage In Heaven

When they rise from the dead, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven. —Mark 12:25

Today's Scripture: Mark 12:18-27

When I was a student at a Christian high school, I knew a professor whose wife had died. Later he married the widow of his best friend. One day a student asked him,“Will your first wife know about your second marriage when you see her in heaven, and if so, how do you think she’ll react?”The professor smiled and said,“ Of course she will, and because she will be perfect she will not be jealous. Even though we will not live as marriage partners, I believe we will know each other. We will all be the best of friends forever.”

In Mark 12, we read about some enemies of Jesus who invented a story about a woman whose husband died and left no son. Under Jewish law, the brother of the deceased had to marry the widow for the purpose of having a son (Deuteronomy 25:5). According to their story, this happened with seven brothers. Jesus’ detractors asked,“When they rise, whose wife will she be?”He said they neither understood the Scriptures nor God’s power to raise the dead to a glorious new existence without marriage.

I believe that in heaven we will have special feelings for one another. We will love perfectly and enjoy complete healing from all the hurts of our earthly relationships. That will be more fulfilling than any marriage. By: Herbert Vander Lugt ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

The love we’ve known while here below
In heaven will find its highest joy,
For we will know Christ’s perfect love
That memories cannot destroy.
—D. De Haan

The pleasures of earth cannot compare to the joys of heaven.

THOUGHT - Do you really believe this? What difference should it make in your ongoing battle with lust? Be motivated to press on the power of the Spirit, for the glory of the Lamb, by pondering the following quote from one of America's greatest theologians. **Jonathan Edwards** wrote that in heaven "the glorified spiritual bodies of the saints shall be filled with pleasures of the most exquisite kind that such refined bodies are capable of....The sweetness and pleasure that shall be in the mind, shall put the spirits of the body into such a motion as shall cause a sweet sensation throughout the body, infinitely excelling any sensual pleasure here."

Excursus:
The Order of Resurrections

There are several resurrection “events” which transpire in history, each of which falls into one of two categories. All but the last resurrection event make up the **FIRST RESURRECTION**. **The point is that you want to participate in the FIRST RESURRECTION! The SECOND RESURRECTION is at the Great White Throne where all will be thrown into the Lake of Fire** [Click here for more explanation of this table from Tony Garland](#) See related discussion on [the two Resurrections - "First" and "Second" - charted out](#).

Order	Which	Timing	Who	Description	Scriptures
1	First	The Third Day	Jesus Christ	The resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, the “firstfruits of those who have fallen asleep.”	Mt. 28:1-7; Mk 16:1-11; Lk 24:1-12; Jn 20:1-18; 1 Cor. 15:20

2	First	Shortly after Christ's Resurrection.	A Few OT Saints	At the earthquake attending the crucifixion, graves were opened. Shortly after the resurrection of Christ, these saints were raised	Mt. 27:50-53
3	First	Before the Tribulation.	Church	The resurrection of Church-age believers at the Rapture .	Jn 14:3; 1Th. 4:13-18; 1Cor. 15:50-53
4	First	Middle of the Tribulation	Two Witnesses	God's two witnesses will be raised after being killed by The Beast .	Rev. 11:11-12
5	First	After Jacob's Trouble or Great Tribulation	OT Saints	Old Testament saints will be resurrected to enter the Millennial Kingdom	Da 12:1-2 Isa 26:19; Ezek 37:13-14
6	First	Beginning of Millennial Kingdom.	Tribulation Martyrs	The Tribulation martyrs will be resurrected so that they can rule and reign with Christ.	Rev. 20:4-6
7	Second	End of Millennial Kingdom	Unbelieving Dead	At the end of the millennial reign of Christ, the final resurrection will consist of all of the unbelieving, wicked dead. They will be found guilty at the Great White Throne Judgment and cast into the Lake of Fire.	Rev. 20:11-15

Matthew 22:31 "But regarding the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was spoken to you by God:

KJV Matthew 22:31 But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying,

BGT Matthew 22:31 περ ὁ τς ναστ σεως τ ν νεκρ ν ο κ ν γνωτε τ ηθ ν μ ν π το θεο λ γοντος:

NET Matthew 22:31 Now as for the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was spoken to you by God,

CSB Matthew 22:31 Now concerning the resurrection of the dead, haven't you read what was spoken to you by God:

ESV Matthew 22:31 And as for the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was said to you by God:

NIV Matthew 22:31 But about the resurrection of the dead--have you not read what God said to you,

NLT Matthew 22:31 "But now, as to whether there will be a resurrection of the dead-- haven't you ever read about this in the Scriptures? Long after Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob had died, God said,

NRS Matthew 22:31 And as for the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was said to you by God,

NJB Matthew 22:31 And as for the resurrection of the dead, have you never read what God himself said to you:

NAB Matthew 22:31 And concerning the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what was said to you by God,

YLT Matthew 22:31 'And concerning the rising again of the dead, did ye not read that which was spoken to you by God, saying,

MIT Matthew 22:31 Now as far as the resurrection of the dead, have you not read what God says to you? —

GWN Matthew 22:31 Haven't you read what God told you about the dead coming back to life? He said,

- **have:** Mt 9:13 12:3,7 21:16,42

But regarding the resurrection ([anastasis](#)) of the dead ([nekros](#)), have you not read ([anaginosko](#)) what was spoken to you by

God - Jesus questions these religious experts again using the Scripture, showing us a good pattern to imitate when dealing with skeptics. Notice Jesus emphasizes that the Scripture is the actual words **spoken...by God**.

David Guzik - Jesus demonstrated the reality of the resurrection using only the Torah; the five books of Moses, which were the only books the Sadducees accepted as authoritative. If Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not live on in resurrection, then God would say that He was the God of Abraham, instead of saying "I am the God of Abraham."

Matthew 22:32 '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."

KJV Matthew 22:32 I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living.

BGT Matthew 22:32 γ ε μι θε ς βρα μ κα θε ς σα κ κα θε ς ακ β; ο κ στιν [] θε ς νεκρ ν λλ ζ ντων.

NET Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not the God of the dead but of the living!"

CSB Matthew 22:32 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."

ESV Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not God of the dead, but of the living."

NIV Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not the God of the dead but of the living."

NLT Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' So he is the God of the living, not the dead."

NRS Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is God not of the dead, but of the living."

NJB Matthew 22:32 I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob? He is God, not of the dead, but of the living.'

NAB Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob'? He is not the God of the dead but of the living."

YLT Matthew 22:32 I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not a God of dead men, but of living.'

MIT Matthew 22:32 I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob. He is not God of the dead, but God of the living!"

GWN Matthew 22:32 'I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.' He's not the God of the dead but of the living."

- am: Ex 3:6,15,16 Ac 7:32 Heb 11:16
- God is: Mk 12:26,27 Lu 20:37,38

Related Passages:

Exodus 3:6; 15; 16+ (He said also, "**I am** (Lxx = [ego eimi](#) - present tense - continually) **the God of your father, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.**" Then Moses hid his face, for he was afraid to look at God. (3:15) God, furthermore, said to Moses, "Thus you shall say to the sons of Israel, 'The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob, has sent me to you.' This is My name forever, and this is My memorial-name to all generations. (3:16) "Go and gather the elders of Israel together and say to them, 'The LORD, the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, has appeared to me, saying, "I am indeed concerned about you and what has been done to you in Egypt.

Luke 20:37-38+ "But that the dead are raised, even Moses showed, in the passage about the burning bush,

where he calls the Lord THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, AND THE GOD OF ISAAC, AND THE GOD OF JACOB. 38 "Now He is not the God of the dead but of the living; for all live to Him."

Mark 12:26-27+ "But regarding the fact that the dead rise again, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the passage about the burning bush, how God spoke to him, saying, '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; you are greatly mistaken."

ONCE AGAIN JESUS APPEALS TO THE AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE

The Sadducees did not believe in the resurrection because they did not see it taught in the Pentateuch. Jesus is about to take them to school, so to speak!

There is a remarkable passage in Josephus, which proves that the best informed among the Jews believed in the immateriality and immortality of the soul, and that the souls of righteous men were in the presence of God in a state of happiness. **"They who lose their lives for the sake of God, live unto God, as do Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the rest of the patriarchs."** Not less remarkable is a passage in Shemoth Rabba, **"Why doth Moses say, Remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?"** (Ex 32:13)

Here is another "rabbinical writing" documenting that the Jews believed in resurrection based on writings in the Torah -

R. Abin saith, The Lord said unto Moses, I look for ten men from thee, as I looked for that number in Sodom. Find me out ten righteous persons among the people, and I will not destroy thy people. Then saith Moses, Behold, here am I, and Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar, Phinehas, and Caleb, and Joshua; but, saith God, there are but seven: where are the other three? When Moses knew not what to do, he saith, O Eternal God, [hayim hem ha-metim] do those live who are dead? Yes, saith God. Then saith Moses, If those that are dead do live, remember Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob."

Bock adds that "The argument advances further. Jesus has dealt with the Sadducees' question, but there is still one issue that needs to be addressed. Jesus wants to make sure that the Sadducees understand that resurrection is a scriptural teaching. Though he could have appealed to a prophetic passage like Dan. 12:2, Jesus opts for a text from the Pentateuch because the Sadducees held the Torah in highest regard. A text from that portion of Scripture would be most persuasive for them. Working with their presuppositions he makes his argument. Jesus begins his elaboration with the direct statement that the dead are raised, which he says Moses revealed." (Ibid)

I AM ([ego eimi](#) - present tense - continually) **THE GOD OF ABRAHAM, AND THE GOD OF ISAAC, AND THE GOD OF JACOB'** (Ex 3:6)? Appealing to the **authority of Scripture** ([see excellent article](#)) Jesus quotes from the book of Exodus (He quoted because He had memorized! See [Memorizing His Word](#)), Jesus makes the point was that if God could identify Himself as God of the three old patriarchs, then they must still be alive when God spoke to Moses; and then logically they must be raised from the dead.

Luke 20:37 adds the phrase **in the passage about the burning bush** - Why didn't He say "Now turn to Exodus 3:6 (Ex 3:2-6) which is on page 100 of your pew Bibles?" The answer of course is that the Scriptures were not assigned chapter/verse designations until the mid-1500's (See [versification](#)). Jesus choose a Scripture that surely both the Sadducees and the Jews in the crowd were very familiar with, many most likely having committed these great passages to memory. So not only does Jesus quote from Moses, He even uses Moses as a direct example of His point! And in referencing this passage Jesus affirms the inspiration of what Moses wrote when He recorded

He is not the God of the dead([nekros](#)) **but of the living** ([zao](#) in the present tense) God had said "I am" not "I was" indicating these men were alive. Note that the verb **"IS"** is present tense which corresponds perfectly to the present tense of "ego eimi" in the Septuagint of Ex 3:6+. To reiterate, the point the present tense makes is that if Abraham, Isaac and Jacob did not continue to live, God would not say that He **IS** continually their God, speaking in the present tense. He would have to say that He **WAS** their God, speaking in the past tense. In other words Jesus is affirming that God is continually the God of the **living**. The patriarchs are **"living"**. Hence by deduction, the patriarchs were brought back to life from the dead. The resurrection is real!

Mark 12:27 adds salt to the Sadducees' wound for Jesus declared **You are greatly mistaken** - Notice also how Jesus had begun in Mk 12:24+ and now ends by pointing out to the Sadducees that they were **mistaken** (same verb [planao](#) but now Jesus' adds [greatly](#) mistaken!) "Their self-confident assumption that they were discrediting the teaching of the resurrection was an open error. "The Sadducees are reckoning without their God." Their error was great and had far-reaching implications (cf. 1 Cor. 15:13–

Hiebert has an interesting comment on **greatly mistaken** - "Jesus ends his knockdown argument with a final blow: You are quite wrong (lit., much deceived)! " (Geddert) They had drawn a wrong deduction because they failed to understand the true nature of God and His relations to men. Jesus held that God's describing Himself to Moses as Abraham's God, Jacob's God, and Isaac's God referred not merely to a past relationship which no longer existed. By His very nature God is the God not **of the dead but of the living**. In calling these patriarchs into covenant relations with Himself, He had established a relationship with them that was not terminated with physical death. Death did not break the spiritual relationship into which they had been brought. The patriarchs were dead to the visible world, but they were still alive unto God in the invisible world. "Death is a change of relation to the world and to men; it does not change our relation to God." As the unchanging living God, He is the God of the living, of men who are characterized as having life because of their relationship with Him. ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

Spurgeon - "The living God is the God of living men; and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are still alive and identified as the same persons who lived on earth."

Luke's version records the reaction to Jesus' reply to the Sadducees...

Luke 20:39+ Some of the scribes answered and said, "Teacher, You have spoken well." 40 For they did not have courage to question Him any longer about anything.

John MacArthur explains - Jesus' excellent exegetical argument is based on the emphatic present tense of the I am ([ego eimi](#)) used in that passage from the Pentateuch. After **Abraham** and **Isaac** and **Jacob** were long dead, the Lord was still their God every bit as much as when they were alive (ED: ON EARTH)—in fact, in many ways even more so, because they had become perfectly sinless and their souls were experiencing the fellowship of His eternal presence. These three patriarchs are singled out, and each is specifically related to God, suggesting His unique personal intimacy with each one. Whether the genitive preposition "**OF**" refers to God's belonging to the patriarchs or to their belonging to God, both meanings are true. The present tense is used because God is not the God of the dead but of the living, and if He is presently the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, then those men obviously are still alive in another realm. They would also still have to be living so that God could fulfill His promises to them which were not fulfilled during their lifetimes. (SEE Heb. 11:13–16) Jesus had accomplished what the wisest Pharisee or scribe had never been able to do: unequivocally prove the resurrection even from the Pentateuch. And in so doing, "He had put the Sadducees to silence" (Matt. 22:34). (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

Lawrence Richards - This is a fascinating passage for any who are uncertain about the integrity and full authority of Scripture. It's popular with some scholars to assume that the books attributed to Moses are a much later fiction: the name of a mythical Jewish hero, Moses, was attached in the 600 B.C.'s to give the editors' invention credibility. With scissors and paste many modern scholars romp through the Old Testament, cut up the Pentateuch and Prophets, and assign this verse to one supposed set of authors, and that to another. How different from the way Jesus viewed the Scriptures. **According to Christ, it was Moses who spoke what is recorded in Exodus, and even a seemingly minor thing like the tense of a verb is authoritative.** Do the dead really live again? They live now! The God of the Old Testament is the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, long after their biological deaths. On this issue of Scripture, I suspect it's wiser to trust Jesus' pronouncement than to trust the theories of the self-proclaimed wise men of our day. When we do so, we rejoice in the confidence that we too will live forever with Abraham's and our God. (Borrow [365 Day Devotional Commentary](#) page 750)

Related Resources:

- [The New Testament Use of the Old Testament](#) - Robert Thomas
- [What does it mean that the Bible is inspired?](#)

Steven Cole - Jesus taught that there is such a thing as doctrinal truth and doctrinal error, and that truth matters. He didn't say, "Hey, it really doesn't matter what you guys believe, just as long as you're sincere." He didn't say, "I love you guys! You're my brothers, even if we disagree over this little matter of the resurrection!" He didn't say, "I respect your views. Everyone is entitled to his own opinion." He told them authoritatively that **they were greatly mistaken** and He set forth the reasons why. As Allan Bloom pointed out a few years ago in his best seller, [The Closing of the American Mind](#) ([Simon and Schuster], p. 28), the intellectual community has relegated religion to the realm of opinion as opposed to knowledge. It is simply a matter of one subjective and uncertain opinion versus another. Undergirding this is the view that all truth is relative and that tolerance the chief virtue (pp. 25-27). He said, "**The point is not to correct the mistakes and really be right; rather it is not to think you are right at all**" (p. 26). **The result of this is that you can have two people holding to opposite views in the spiritual realm and they both can be right, since religious**

“truth” is simply one’s subjective ideas or experience of it.

Vance Havner - God of the Living

When the Sadducees asked our Lord about the woman who had had seven husbands and wanted to know whose wife would she be in the resurrection, He answered by analyzing their trouble as error born of ignorance—ignorance of the Scriptures and the power of God. He declared that in the resurrection we neither marry nor are given in marriage but are as the angels in heaven. Then He gave them God's own word, "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" and ended with the declaration, "God is not the God of the dead, but of the living" (see Matthew 22:32).

God did not say, "I WAS the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob but "I AM...." Always the great I AM whose infinitudes never put Him in the past tense, in His sight nobody WAS but everybody IS. Nobody is dead and everybody who has ever lived is still living.

We are so accustomed to think of the dead as corpses lying in graveyards. But those bodies are only the remains, the temporary vehicles of their earthly stay. They themselves are still in existence somewhere. Moses and Elijah came back to the Mount of Transfiguration and the disciples recognized them. That raises questions as to what we will be like after death and before the resurrection but settles one major issue, we will still be living somewhere. God is not the God of the dead but of the living.

I found a dirt road behind the motel where I am staying this week in Michigan. I've been walking in the glorious September sunshine meditating on the God of the living. He does not deal in dead things. My loved ones are all alive on the other side. One of these days the trumpet will sound and their spirits will be joined to their new resurrection bodies and death will be swallowed up in victory. What a big swallow that will be! Corpses and funerals and cemeteries will be a thing of the past and we shall gather around the throne of the living God, the God of the living. He is the Author of life and there never would have been any death had not the devil invaded creation. But on that day Satan and his cohorts will be where they belong and we shall meet at the river of life around the tree of life to enjoy life everlasting.

But I need not wait for that day for my eternal life to begin. It started when I trusted my Saviour and I have it as surely as I will ever have it, though not as completely as when I see my Lord on that "Great Getting-up Morning." But now I have the promise of my inheritance and the foretaste of glory divine and if this be the first installment, what will it be like when I am paid in full! Until then I shall taste the powers of the age to come and work up an appetite for the Supper of the Lamb where the celebration never ends.

I worship the God of the living. My soul is not dwelling in the macabre realm of tombs and ghosts. Everybody past and present is alive. All who died in Christ are more alive than ever, they are but on His other side. We need to "come alive" in our thinking and walk with God in His Everlasting Now. (Though I Walk Through the Valley)

Mark 12:27 He is not the God of the dead, but the God of the living.

Since God spoke of Himself as the God of the patriarchs, centuries after they had been borne to their graves, it stood to reason that they were yet living; and on this ground our Lord met the allegation that there is no life beyond death.

Death is not a state or condition, but an act. — We speak of the dead; but in point of fact there are none such. We should speak of those who have died. They were living up to the moment of death; but they were living quite as much afterwards. Death is like birth, an act, a transition, a passage into a freer life. Never think of a death as a state, but as resembling a bridge which, for a moment, casts its shadow on the express train, which flashes beneath, but does not stay.

All our dear ones are living. — As vividly, as keenly, as intensely as ever: with all the love and faith and intelligence with which we were wont to associate their beloved personality. It may be that they think of us as only half alive, compared with their own intense and vivid experience of the life which draws its breath from the manifested presence of God. Oh, do not fear that they will cease to recognize, know, or love you! Always it remains true, "Without us they cannot be made perfect."

Those who live on either side of death may meet in God. — Those who are present in the body, and those who are absent from it, meet in proportion as they approach God. When we count near Him in thought, and prayer, and love, we are come to the spirits of the just made perfect. God is the glorious center of all the lines that radiate into all worlds. "Ye are come to God, the Judge of all,... and to the spirits of the just made perfect." Meyer, F. B. Our Daily Homily

G Campbell Morgan - living. Matt. 22.32

These words were spoken to the Sadducees who denied the resurrection; and they were intended to constitute one argument for resurrection, and that a final and conclusive one. That argument is that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are not dead, but alive. The words of God which Jesus quoted were uttered long after the three men named had died (see Ex 6:3). To Moses, God made the

declaration; and now our Lord declared that though dead in the ordinary sense that is as to their earthly bodies' and experience, they were not dead in the sense of having ceased to be. This was our Lord's consistent interpretation of death. Of Jairus' daughter, and of Lazarus He said that they slept, when as to bodily life they certainly were dead. Thus we must ever remember that the Christian doctrine of death is not that it is in any sense cessation of being. It is rather separation. Physical death is the separation of the spirit from the body. Spiritual death is separation of the spirit from God. The spirits of the just made perfect are more alive than they ever were, because they are more consciously with God. For them, being absent from the body is being at home with the Lord, and that is life indeed. He is indeed the God of our loved ones who as to this earth have fallen on sleep, and that means that they are alive. By-and-by, in resurrection, they will awake, even in bodily form, in His likeness, and that will be their final perfecting. And this is, as we have said, a final and conclusive argument for resurrection. Man is not perfect as a disembodied spirit. He needs a body for perfect expression. Thus the perfecting of the saints will come in the moment of resurrection.

Matthew 22:33 When the crowds heard this, they were astonished at His teaching.

KJV Matthew 22:33 And when the multitude heard this, they were astonished at his doctrine.

BGT Matthew 22:33 καὶ κοῦσαντες οἱ ὄχλοι ἐξεπλάσσοντο πρὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτοῦ.

NET Matthew 22:33 When the crowds heard this, they were amazed at his teaching.

CSB Matthew 22:33 And when the crowds heard this, they were astonished at His teaching.

ESV Matthew 22:33 And when the crowd heard it, they were astonished at his teaching.

NIV Matthew 22:33 When the crowds heard this, they were astonished at his teaching.

NLT Matthew 22:33 When the crowds heard him, they were astounded at his teaching.

NRS Matthew 22:33 And when the crowd heard it, they were astounded at his teaching.

NJB Matthew 22:33 And his teaching made a deep impression on the people who heard it.

NAB Matthew 22:33 When the crowds heard this, they were astonished at his teaching.

YLT Matthew 22:33 And having heard, the multitudes were astonished at his teaching;

MIT Matthew 22:33 The crowds who listened to him were astounded by his teaching.

GWN Matthew 22:33 He amazed the crowds who heard his teaching.

- they: Mt 22:22 7:28,29 Mk 6:2 Mk 12:17 Lu 2:47 4:22 Lk 20:39,40 Jn 7:46

Related Passages:

Luke 20:39-40+ Some of the scribes answered and said, "Teacher, You have spoken well." 40 For they did not have courage to question Him any longer about anything.

JESUS' TEACHING IS ASTONISHING

When the crowds heard ([akouo](#)) this, they were astonished ([ekplesso](#)) at His teaching ([didache](#)) - The crowds were (literal meaning) utterly "struck out of their senses," amazed and overwhelmed by such Spirit filled, Word centered **teaching**. in answering a thorny theological question from the Sadducees using Scripture with divine insight and authority. Jesus teaching cut through confusion and exposed false understandings, while affirming resurrection hope. Sadly for the crowds, astonishment does not necessary produce faith and while many were amazed, in a few days many would be calling out "Crucify Him!"

As an aside it is amazing that the reaction of astonishment was seen as often to His **teaching** as to His miracles! 7/13 uses of [ekplesso](#) refer to astonishment at His **teaching**...

- Mt 7:28 = "amazed at His teaching."
- Mt 13:54 = "teaching them in their synagogue, so that they were astonished"
- Mt 22:33 = they were astonished at His teaching.
- Mark 1:22 They were amazed at His teaching;
- Mark 6:2 He began to teach in the synagogue; and the many listeners were astonished,

- Mark 11:18 the whole crowd was astonished at His teaching.
- Luke 4:32 and they were amazed at His teaching, for His message was with authority.

Astonished (1605) **ekplesso** from **ek** = out + **plesso** = strike) ([imperfect tense](#)) means strike out, expel by a blow, drive out or away, force out or cast off by a blow. Figuratively **ekplesso** means to drive out of one's senses by a sudden shock or strong feeling, or "to be exceedingly struck in mind". It means to cause to be filled with amazement to the point of being overwhelmed (struck out of one's senses). It encompasses the ideas of wonder, astonishment or amazement. Ekplesso expresses a stunned amazement that leaves the subject unable to grasp what is happening.

EKPLESSO - 13V - amazed(5), astonished(8). Matt. 7:28; Matt. 13:54; Matt. 19:25; Matt. 22:33; Mk. 1:22; Mk. 6:2; Mk. 7:37; Mk. 10:26; Mk. 11:18; Lk. 2:48; Lk. 4:32; Lk. 9:43; Acts 13:12

Matthew 22:34 But when the Pharisees heard that Jesus had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered themselves together.

KJV Matthew 22:34 But when the Pharisees had heard that he had put the Sadducees to silence, they were gathered together.

BGT Matthew 22:34 Ο δ Φαρισαῖοι κοσάντες τι φμωσεν το ς Σαδδουκαοὺς συν χθησαν π τ α τ ,

NET Matthew 22:34 Now when the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they assembled together.

CSB Matthew 22:34 When the Pharisees heard that He had silenced the Sadducees, they came together in the same place.

ESV Matthew 22:34 But when the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together.

NIV Matthew 22:34 Hearing that Jesus had silenced the Sadducees, the Pharisees got together.

NLT Matthew 22:34 But when the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees with his reply, they met together to question him again.

NRS Matthew 22:34 When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together,

NJB Matthew 22:34 But when the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees they got together

NAB Matthew 22:34 When the Pharisees heard that he had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together,

YLT Matthew 22:34 and the Pharisees, having heard that he did silence the Sadducees, were gathered together unto him;

MIT Matthew 22:34 The Pharisees, hearing that the Sadducees were dumbfounded, congregated at the same place.

GWN Matthew 22:34 When the Pharisees heard that Jesus had silenced the Sadducees, they gathered together.

- **when the Pharisees** : Mk 12:28
- **they**: Mt 12:14 25:3-5 Isa 41:5-7 Jn 11:47-50 Ac 5:24-28 19:23-28 Ac 21:28-30

Related Passages:

Matthew 22:15+ Then the Pharisees went and plotted together how they might trap Him in what He said.

BROOD OF VIPERS SLITHER TOGETHER AGAIN

So for the the third time a futile attempt was made to coerce Jesus into an indefensible position either with the people or with the authorities. MacArthur adds "The first test of Jesus by the Pharisees, made through their disciples and the Herodians, was political, dealing with the payment of the despised poll-tax (Mt 22:17). The second test, by the Sadducees, was theological, pertaining to the reality of the resurrection, which they denied (Mt 22:23, 28). Now the Pharisees were about to test Him again in the area of theology. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 336](#))" Perhaps they were hoping the old adage would prove true that the **third time is the**

[charm!](#)"

But when the Pharisees ([pharisaiois](#)) heard that Jesus had silenced ([phimoo](#) - "muzzled" [see English definition](#)) the Sadducees ([saddoukaiois](#)) - The prideful pretenders reconvened seeking a new strategy. Previously Jesus had left the Pharisees marveling, silenced by His wisdom on the poll-tax test, causing them to quietly slither away (Mt 22:21-22+). But now they soon [got wind of](#) Jesus' dismantling of the Sadducees' resurrection argument, in effect making them speechless. It is interesting to note that 3/7 NT uses of [phimoo](#) were describing rebuking of demon possessed men!

They gathered themselves together ([sunago](#)) - Recall the Pharisees had plotted together (not verb [sunago](#)) in Matthew 22:15+. Here they gathered together ([sunago](#)) to plot against Jesus. The irony is that [sunago](#) gives us our English word *synagogue* a place where Jews would gather to pray and worship. In this context the Pharisees are clearly **gathered together** to determine how they can trap and ultimately murder Jesus. Mark Moore says "They went out and regrouped, deciding to send one of their "hot-shot" legal professors rather than a novice this time."

John MacArthur on gathered themselves together - In doing so, they unintentionally and unknowingly fulfilled prophecy by plotting together "against the Lord, and against His Christ" (Acts 4:26-28+). Out of that conclave came the third and final question to test Jesus. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 336](#))

Matthew Henry Concise Mt 22:34-40. An interpreter of the law asked our Lord a question, to try, not so much his knowledge, as his judgment. The love of God is the first and great commandment, and the sum of all the commands of the first table. Our love of God must be sincere, not in word and tongue only. All our love is too little to bestow upon him, therefore all the powers of the soul must be engaged for him, and carried out toward him. To love our neighbour as ourselves, is the second great commandment. There is a self-love which is corrupt, and the root of the greatest sins, and it must be put off and mortified; but there is a self-love which is the rule of the greatest duty: we must have a due concern for the welfare of our own souls and bodies. And we must love our neighbour as truly and sincerely as we love ourselves; in many cases we must deny ourselves for the good of others. By these two commandments let our hearts be formed as by a mould.

Silenced (5392) [phimoo](#) from [phimós](#) = [muzzle for a beast's mouth](#)) means to close the mouth with a muzzle, to muzzle, gag, restrain as an ox (1 Co 9:9; 1 Ti 5:18). Figuratively, [phimoo](#) means to stop one's mouth in order make speechless or reduce to silence (Mt 22:34; 1 Pe 2:15) **Phimoo** is a more vigorous word than just "Be Quiet" The picture is "Be muzzled" like an ox.

PHIMOO - 7V- muzzle(1), quiet(2), silence(1), silenced(1), speechless(1), still(1). Matt. 22:12; Matt. 22:34; Mk. 1:25; Mk. 4:39; Lk. 4:35; 1 Tim. 5:18; 1 Pet. 2:15

Gathered...together (4863) [sunago](#) from [sun](#) = with + [ago](#) = to lead,) means literally to lead together. To gather (in) or gather (up) (Mt 13:47; 25:24, 26; Lk 3:17; 15:13; Jn 6:12f; 15:6). To bring or call together, gather (Mt 22:10; 25:32; Mk 2:2; 7:1; Jn 11:47; 18:2; Acts 13:44; 14:27; 1 Cor 5:4). To invite or receive as a guest (Mt 25:35, 38, 43). This verb gives us our English word *synagogue* a place where Jews pray and worship. We see a gathering for judgment similar to Lk 3:17 in Joel 3:11+ where God is commanding a gathering of unholy Gentiles, not for the purpose of worship, but for wrath! In the Valley of Jehoshaphat, the Valley of Decision, for it is judgment time for the nations of the world is "ripe!"

SUNAGO - 59V - NOTE CONCENTRATION IN THE LAST WEEK OF JESUS' LIFE! - Matt. 2:4; Matt. 3:12; Matt. 6:26; Matt. 12:30; Matt. 13:2; Matt. 13:30; Matt. 13:47; Matt. 18:20; Matt. 22:10; Matt. 22:34; Matt. 22:41; Matt. 24:28; Matt. 25:24; Matt. 25:26; Matt. 25:32; Matt. 25:35; Matt. 25:38; Matt. 25:43; Matt. 26:3; Matt. 26:57; Matt. 27:17; Matt. 27:27; Matt. 27:62; Matt. 28:12; Mk. 2:2; Mk. 4:1; Mk. 5:21; Mk. 6:30; Mk. 7:1; Lk. 3:17; Lk. 11:23; Lk. 12:17; Lk. 12:18; Lk. 15:13; Lk. 22:66; Jn. 4:36; Jn. 6:12; Jn. 6:13; Jn. 11:47; Jn. 11:52; Jn. 15:6; Jn. 18:2; Acts 4:5; Acts 4:26; Acts 4:27; Acts 4:31; Acts 11:26; Acts 13:44; Acts 14:27; Acts 15:6; Acts 15:30; Acts 20:7; Acts 20:8; 1 Co. 5:4; Rev. 16:14; Rev. 16:16; Rev. 19:17; Rev. 19:19; Rev. 20:8

Henry Blackaby - [Borrow The Experience](#) - The Greatest Commandment Matthew 22:34-39

The Pharisee had a question for Jesus: "Which is the greatest commandment in the Law?" It was a loaded question, designed to trap Jesus and discredit him. No doubt the Pharisee expected Jesus would have to choose one of the Ten Commandments over the other nine, opening the door for debate. Then he'd have this unschooled carpenter's son right where he wanted him. The Pharisee was an expert in the Law; he had scrutinized the Scriptures for years and had memorized many passages. The Law was his life. This uneducated carpenter would be no match for his expertise. It was going to be an easy victory.

Jesus showed who the expert really was. He condensed all ten commandments into one statement that targeted the Pharisees' most vulnerable spot. The Pharisees were adept at keeping the letter of the law but fell pitifully short in following the spirit of the law, which was love. The Pharisees were doing the right thing for the wrong reasons. In God's eyes, this was still sin. God expected

them to obey his commands because they loved him, not because they were trying to be perfect. God was more concerned with their hearts than with their actions.

Sometimes we're like the Pharisees. We make Christianity too complicated. Although God has the right to demand anything he wants, he asks one thing of us: love. If we devote our hearts, minds, and souls to God, we will fulfill the law as it was meant to be followed, and everything else will fall into place.

Matthew 22:35 One of them, a lawyer, asked Him a question, testing Him,

KJV Matthew 22:35 Then one of them, which was a lawyer, asked him a question, tempting him, and saying,

BGT Matthew 22:35 καὶ πῆρ πῆσεν εἰς ἑαυτὸν [νομικὸς] πειρῶν αὐτόν·

NET Matthew 22:35 And one of them, an expert in religious law, asked him a question to test him:

CSB Matthew 22:35 And one of them, an expert in the law, asked a question to test Him:

ESV Matthew 22:35 And one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question to test him.

NIV Matthew 22:35 One of them, an expert in the law, tested him with this question:

NLT Matthew 22:35 One of them, an expert in religious law, tried to trap him with this question:

NRS Matthew 22:35 and one of them, a lawyer, asked him a question to test him.

NJB Matthew 22:35 and, to put him to the test, one of them put a further question,

NAB Matthew 22:35 and one of them (a scholar of the law) tested him by asking,

YLT Matthew 22:35 and one of them, a lawyer, did question, tempting him, and saying,

MIT Matthew 22:35 One of them, trying to provoke him into saying something they could put a spin on, questioned him:

GWN Matthew 22:35 One of them, an expert in Moses' Teachings, tested Jesus by asking,

- a lawyer: Lu 7:30 10:25-37 11:45,46,52 14:3 Titus 3:13
- tempting: Mt 22:18 Mk 10:2

Related Passages:

Mark 12:28+ One of the scribes came and heard them arguing, and recognizing that He had answered them well, asked Him, "What commandment is the foremost of all?"

PHARISEES SEND A LEGAL EXPERT

One of them - One of who? Who is **them**? One of the Pharisees (Mt 22:34) who is called a scribe in Mk 12:28+. Earlier they had sent their disciples (Mt 22:16+), but that attempt to trap Jesus had failed.

A lawyer ([nomikos](#)) - Matthew calls him a "**lawyer**," an expert in the Mosaic Law (NLT - "expert in religious law"). Mark 12:28 calls him a "scribe" ([grammateus](#)), a title for someone who studies, teaches, and interprets the Law. In 1st-century Jewish culture, a lawyer ([nomikos](#)) was often a **scribe** ([grammateus](#)) by function. They are different terms, but describe overlapping roles. The Pharisees wanted a man who had unusual expertise in the Mosaic law. He was probably their "rising star," their "best shot" to match wits with Jesus. They just do not grasp that they are dealing with God in the flesh, the Human personification of divine wisdom and all their attempts would be futile.

Asked Him a question, testing ([peirazo](#) - present tense) **Him** - Earlier the Pharisees had sent their disciples to test Jesus (Mt 22:17-18). Now we have a lawyer an expert in the interpretation of the Mosaic law. The related (cognate) verb for **test** ([ekpeirazo](#)) had been described the devil's attempt to tempt in Lk 4:12+, so in a sense, this Jewish lawyer was serving as a pawn for Satan his father (Jn 8:44+). Like his father, the lawyer was a liar for He was not really seeking truth but laying a trap. He thought he had eternal life by virtue of his self-righteous works. As Wiersbe said "It was a good question asked with a bad motive!"

[The Wycliffe Bible Commentary](#) (online) - The ulterior purpose of the lawyer is not fully evident, and it must be noticed that Jesus

treated the question forthrightly and then commended the astuteness of the lawyer's response (Mk 12:34). It is often suggested that he wanted to draw Jesus into argument regarding the rabbis' computation of 613 commandments.

Leon Morris: The restless attempts to trick Jesus into an answer that would discredit him either with the authorities or with the general public continued. His opponents never learned that they were on a futile quest. (See [The Gospel According To Matthew](#))

Broadus adds the lawyer was "Putting him to the test, with the hope that he would say something unpopular, or perhaps that he might be drawn into a bitter and wrangling discussion."

POSB - The lawyer was not seeking the truth. He was not really trying to discover the way to God. His purpose was to trip Jesus, to lead Jesus to discredit Himself by giving some unusual answer that would arouse the people against Him. (Borrow [Commentary](#) The Preacher's Outline & Sermon Bible)

MacArthur says "The purpose of this approach is to get Jesus to say something they're positive will not be in the writings of Moses because they all have concluded that He's against Moses, He's anti-Judaism, He's anti-Moses. He is setting Himself up as some supreme authority. He is saying things that are not like what we hear, what we teach and what we believe. And if they can get Him to elevate Himself above Moses, then the people will be more likely to turn from Him." ([Loving God](#))

It is interesting to compare the narrative differences between Matthew and Mark. Matthew notes that the question from the lawyer was meant to test Jesus. Mark presents the scribe in a more favorable light — thoughtful and impressed by Jesus' answer. Mark even includes Jesus telling him, "You are not far from the kingdom of God" (Mark 12:34). Mark's version of Jesus' interaction with a religious leader seems different from the previous 3 if we read only Mark's version. However Mt 22:34 makes it clear that that the lawyer "asked Him a questions, **testing** ([peirazo](#) cf Mk 12:15+) Him." Notice in Mt 22:34 it speaks of the group of Pharisees and then **one** which Matthew singles out and calls a **lawyer** (nomikos) who asks Jesus the question. Mark calls him a scribe. Zodhiates explains that "It may be inferred that "**scribes**" is a generic name, and the nomikoí, **lawyers**, are the specialized ones skilled in law and jurisprudence of the Law of Moses."

Lawyer ([3544](#)) **nomikos** from **nomos** - law) means related to the law and generally refers to a legal scholar, an expert in the Mosaic law, in interpreting Jewish law. The lawyers were, for the most part, the same as the scribes. Some of them were charged with copying the Scriptures. Mostly, however, they were the official interpreters of the more than six hundred commandments in the Torah, as well as teachers of the law and judges of law breakers. These "lawyers" were usually scribes, men who dedicated their lives to meticulously copying the Hebrew Scriptures to preserve them from decay or corruption. Consequently, their constant contact with God's Word made them extremely knowledgeable, and they would be called upon to explain and apply the Law.

Vincent on lawyer - "Not *legal practioners*, but interpreters and doctors of the Mosaic law."

Augustus Neander - "He was one of the nomikoi (lawyers), who, as we have said,... differed from the Pharisees in occupying themselves more with the original writings of Scripture than with the traditions." teachers of the law

POSB - Lawyer (nomikos): a profession of laymen who studied, taught, interpreted, and dealt with the practical questions of Jewish law. They were a special group within the profession commonly called Scribes (see Mark 12:28). They functioned both in the court and synagogues (see Lu. 7:30; 10:25; 11:45, 46, 52; 14:3; Tit. 3:13). They apparently dealt more with the study and interpretation of the law. (Borrow [Luke Commentary](#) The Preacher's Outline & Sermon Bible)

Zodhiates - Lawyers appear together with the Pharisees in Luke 7:30 and 14:3. Apparently they were from among the Pharisees (Matt. 22:35) and with the scribes (Mark 12:28; Luke 10:25; 11:45, 46, 52) and were experts in the Mosaic law. In all places where the word is employed and legal questions come into consideration, the scribes appear as authorities in questions concerning prophecy (Matt. 2:4; 13:52). It may be inferred that "scribes" is a generic name, and the nomikoí, lawyers, are the specialized ones skilled in law and jurisprudence of the Law of Moses. (Borrow [The Complete Word Study Dictionary: New Testament](#))

NOMIKOS - 9V - Matt. 22:35; Lk. 7:30; Lk. 10:25; Lk. 11:45; Lk. 11:46; Lk. 11:52; Lk. 14:3; Tit. 3:9; Tit. 3:13

Loving God with Your Mind By Michael Duduit

Scripture: Luke 2:17 with Matthew 22:35–37: But Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart.

Introduction: This is the season of jingling bells and jangled nerves. The rush and expense of the holidays often leave us with little time to do what Mary did—to ponder these things in our hearts. We become too preoccupied to think. But thinking is a very God-

ordained activity. Jesus said we should love the Lord our God with all our . . . minds. So this morning, at the onset of this great season, let's get a grip on our perspectives by looking at the Lord's great commandment as recorded in Matthew 22:35–37. Elsewhere in Scripture Jesus quoted the “Shema” as it appears in Deuteronomy 6:5. But here He altered it slightly to say we should love God with our minds. Maybe the particular Pharisee to whom He was speaking was proud of his mental agility, and he needed to understand that his mind was meant for devotion to God. What, then, does it mean to love God with your mind? The word translated “mind” was a common Greek term, *dianoia*, conveying several ideas:

1. Loving God with Your Mind Involves Your Intellect. A common meaning of this word involves human thought or intellect. The ability to reason is a gift of God, and using that gift is an act of worship, as we see through Mary's example. If God deserves our best—our greatest love, our deepest commitment, our highest service—that is no less true of our minds. Sometimes we're tempted to produce less than the best our minds can deliver. For example, there's the young person in school who feels pressure not to be “the brain” in class. Some kids say it's not cool to be academic achievers. Then there are those who expect God to directly reveal everything, and they don't use their minds to adequately process His Word. Others fear intellectual pursuits because they're afraid they might learn something damaging to their faith. Real education, however, doesn't harm a person's faith because all truth is God's truth. What can damage young people are the secular, materialistic presuppositions of many university faculties. It's possible to use our minds to try to create thrones for ourselves, bowing before the altar of ego. That's why it's essential to let Scripture be our guide; The Bible is our judge, not the other way around. God calls us to use our intellect to His glory.

2. Loving God with Your Mind Involves Your Attitudes. Another common use of *dianoia* involved a “way of thought” or “disposition”—a person's attitudes and perspectives about life. Hugh Downs observed, “A happy person is not a person in a certain set of circumstances, but rather a person with a certain set of attitudes.” Much of what we accomplish in life is determined by our attitudes. When we come to faith in Christ, we receive a new mind, new thoughts, new attitudes. In fact, the Greek word for repentance, *metanoia*, literally means “a change of mind.” As Christians, we think differently about life and have a new attitude because Christ lives in us. Our attitudes are reflected in things we say and do. Can you imagine saying, “Sure he's flunking all his classes, but he has such a good attitude about school!” That makes as much sense as Linus telling Charlie Brown, “I love humanity. It's people I can't stand!” What is on the inside—the kind of person we truly are—will inevitably surface in our words and actions. Are you loving God with your attitudes? Do you have an attitude of loving concern toward others?

3. Loving God with Your Mind Involves Your Will. Several ancient writers used the word *dianoia* to describe the will. Loving God with your mind means placing your will under His control. It doesn't mean you won't have to make any decisions; but it does mean you'll seek to make decisions that honor God. No decision has greater consequences than how we'll respond to Christ's call. Surrendering your life to His lordship means accepting His authority over your life. We accept His rule and agree to submit ourselves in obedience to His will.

Conclusion: In Matthew 27:22, Pilate asked, “What shall I do with Jesus who is called Christ?” That may be the most important question posed in the entire Bible, and it is a question which can only be answered with a decision. If you've never given your life to Christ, you can make that decision right now and propel your life forward in a new direction.

Matthew 22:36 “Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?”

KJV Matthew 22:36 Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

BGT Matthew 22:36 διδ σκαλε, πο α ντολ μεγ λη ν τ ν μ ;

NET Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?"

CSB Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which command in the law is the greatest?"

ESV Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?"

NIV Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which is the greatest commandment in the Law?"

NLT Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which is the most important commandment in the law of Moses?"

NRS Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?"

NJB Matthew 22:36 'Master, which is the greatest commandment of the Law?'

NAB Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?"

YLT Matthew 22:36 'Teacher, which is the great command in the Law?'

MIT Matthew 22:36 "Teacher, which is the greatest commandment in the law?"

- Mt 5:19,20 15:6 23:23,24 Ho 8:12 Mk 12:28-33 Lu 11:42

Related Passages:

Mark 12:28+ One of the scribes came and heard them arguing, and **recognizing that He had answered them well**, asked Him, "What commandment is the foremost of all?"

Luke 10:25-28+ (A DIFFERENT ENCOUNTER BUT SAME SUBJECT) And a lawyer stood up and put Him to the test, saying, "Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" 26 And He said to him, "What is written in the Law? How does it read to you?" 27 And he answered, "YOU SHALL LOVE THE LORD YOUR GOD WITH ALL YOUR HEART, AND WITH ALL YOUR SOUL, AND WITH ALL YOUR STRENGTH, AND WITH ALL YOUR MIND; AND YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF." 28 And He said to him, "You have answered correctly; DO THIS AND YOU WILL LIVE."

THE FIRST AND THE GREATEST

Teacher ([didaskalos](#)), which is the great commandment in the Law- While "Teacher" was normally spoken as an honorable title reserved for distinguished rabbis, this lawyer came not to be taught but to test. The Talmud said, "The one who teaches the law shall gain a seat in the academy on high." And if we compare the parallel in Mark 12:28+ it appears this lawyer had at least some component of respect for Jesus.

Twice Jesus calls Himself Teacher (Mt 26:18, Jn 13:13-14). He is referred to as Teacher by His disciples (Mk 4:38; 9:38; 13:1; Lk 7:40; 21:7), by the Pharisees (Mt 8:19, 12:38), by Pharisees and Herodians (Mt 22:16); Sadducees (Mk 12:19), a teacher of the law (Mk 12:32), Jewish deceivers (Lk 20:21); the rich young ruler (Lk 18:18), tax collectors (Lk 3:12) and His friend Martha (Jn 11:28). As an aside someone has said our great Teacher writes many of His best lessons on the blackboard of affliction.

The Jews were fond of classifying the commandments as great and small, or weighty and light. (cf Mt 23:23.) In Mark the word **Foremost** signifies "First in rank and importance." (Robertson) In regard to Matthew's version **Robertson** says "'First" (foremost) and "great" in Greek do not differ essentially here."

William MacDonald adds "It was an honest question, and, in some ways, life's most basic question. He was really asking for a concise statement of the chief aim of man's existence." (Borrow [Believer's Bible Commentary](#))

Warren Wiersbe on this question - This was not a new question, for the scribes had been debating it for centuries. They had documented 613 commandments in the law, 248 positive and 365 negative. No person could ever hope to know and fully obey all of these commandments. So, to make it easier, the experts divided the commandments into "heavy" (important) and "light" (unimportant). A person could major on the "heavy commandments" and not worry about the trivial ones. The fallacy behind this approach is obvious: you need only break one law, heavy or light, to be guilty before God. "For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all" (James 2:10+). ([Bible Exposition Commentary](#))

Grassmick agrees "He came with no apparent hostile or hidden motive to appraise Jesus' skill in answering a much-debated subject in scribal circles" (See [Bible Knowledge Commentary](#))

Geddert - The question is not about chronology (which was given first?) and not strictly about priority (which is more important than the others?). It has more to do with centrality. Which commandment is at the heart of the law? Which commandment makes the keeping of all the others both possible and meaningful? Which commandment determines the proper application of all the others? ([Mark Believers Church Bible Commentary](#))

John MacArthur explains why the lawyer would have asked such a relatively simple question - Over the years, the rabbis had supposedly determined that, just as there were 613 separate letters in the Hebrew text of the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, in the book of Numbers, there were also 613 separate laws in the Pentateuch, the five books of Moses. Such letterism, as it is sometimes called, was extremely popular and was considered to be a valuable exegetical tool for interpreting Scripture. The rabbis had divided those 613 laws into affirmative and negative groups, holding that there were 248 affirmative laws, one for every part of the human body, as they supposed, and 365 negative laws, one for each day of the year. The laws were also divided into heavy and light, the heavy ones being absolutely binding and the light ones less binding. There had never been unanimity, however, as to which laws were heavy and which were light, and the rabbis and scribes spent countless hours proudly debating the merits of their

particular divisions and the ranking of laws within the divisions. It was doubtlessly that superficial and fanciful orientation to the law that led them to think Jesus had his own scheme. Because He considered Himself to be the Messiah, they assumed that surely Jesus had devised a system to display His erudition in the law just as they were accustomed to doing. And judging by the lawyer's single and extremely simple question, they assumed that His naming the one great commandment in the Law would be sufficiently unorthodox to condemn Him. (See [Matthew Commentary](#))

Teacher(1320)(**didaskalos** from **didasko** = teach to shape will of one being taught by content of what is taught <> cp **didaskalía**) is one who provides instruction or systematically imparts truth. The **teacher** teaches in such a way as to shape will of one being taught by content of what is taught. Someone else has said that "The great teacher is the one who turns our ears into eyes so that we can see the truth." Henry Brooks added that "A (Bible) teacher affects eternity; he can never tell where his influence stops!" **Didaskalos** refers to **Jesus** (the Master Teacher) in 41 of 58 NT uses.

Richards writes that "Jesus' teaching focused on shaping the hearers' perception of God and God's kingdom, and thus it dealt with the implications of a personal relationship with God. In John's Gospel, much of Jesus' public instruction focused on himself and his own place as Son of God." ([Expository Dictionary of Bible Words](#))

Mounce makes the point that when the Jewish leaders called Jesus "**Teacher**", they may not have been sincere "For instance, in Lk 10:25 an expert in the law comes to test Jesus and calls him didaskalos. However, attempts to expose him as a pretender to the title of teacher are unsuccessful and therefore serve to endorse his status as rabbi (Mt 22:46; Mk 12:34; Lk 20:39). (Mounce's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old & New Testament Words)

Power Of Simplicity

Then one of the scribes came, and . . . asked Him, "Which is the first commandment of all?" —Mark 12:28

Today's Scripture & Insight: Mark 12:28-34

Few people take time to study the US Internal Revenue Service income tax regulations—and for good reason. According to Forbes magazine, in 2013 tax codes surpassed the four million-word mark. In fact, the tax laws have become so complex that even the experts have a hard time processing all the regulations. It's burdensome in its complexity.

The religious leaders in ancient Israel did the same thing in their relationship with God. They made it too complex with laws. The growing burden of religious regulations had increased to the point where even an expert in Moses' law struggled to understand its core. When one such leader asked Jesus what mattered most in the Commandments, Jesus responded, "'You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength.' This is the first commandment. And the second, like it, is this: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12:30-31).

The law of Moses was burdensome, but faith in Christ is simple and His "burden is light" (Matt. 11:30). It's light because God was willing to forgive us and love us. Now He enables us to love Him and our neighbor. By: Bill Crowder ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

My Jesus, I love thee, I know thou art mine;

for thee all the follies of sin I resign;
my gracious Redeemer, my Savior art thou;
if ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now.

I love thee because thou hast first loved me
and purchased my pardon on Calvary's tree;
I love thee for wearing the thorns on thy brow;
if ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now.

I'll love thee in life, I will love thee in death,
and praise thee as long as thou lendest me breath,
and say when the deathdew lies cold on my brow:
If ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now.

In mansions of glory and endless delight,
I'll ever adore thee in heaven so bright;
I'll sing with the glittering crown on my brow:
If ever I loved thee, my Jesus, 'tis now.

—Featherstone

God's love in our heart gives us a heart for Him and others.

No Greater Love

Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends. — John 15:13

Today's Scripture: Mark 12:28-34

You can't show a greater love for people than James Harrison demonstrated. And he did it for people he didn't even know.

Harrison, a member of the Ouachita Baptist University choir, was returning home from Europe with his fellow singers. As their plane was landing in Little Rock, Arkansas, it was hit by heavy rains and high winds. The jet skidded off the runway and hit a bank of lights, ripping open the fuselage.

As chaos reigned and flames broke out in the mangled plane, Harrison began to help others. Over and over, he pulled passengers to safety and ran back to the plane for more. On his last trip into the burning wreckage, he was overcome with smoke. He didn't make it out alive.

At his funeral, the choir director quoted John 15:13, "Greater love has no one than this, than to lay down one's life for his friends." Jesus was really speaking of His own death on our behalf, and the choir leader pointed out the value of this ultimate sacrifice.

We may never be called upon to make the kind of sacrifice James made during that horrible tragedy. Yet every day we have opportunities to set aside our comfort to love our neighbors (Mk. 12:31). How much love do we show? By: Dave Branon ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

The more Christ's love within us grows,
The more His graciousness outflows;
And when we face a fiery test,
His love we then will manifest.
—Hess

In a world that "couldn't care less," Christians should care more.

Matthew 22:37 And He said to him, " 'YOU SHALL LOVE THE LORD YOUR GOD WITH ALL YOUR HEART, AND WITH ALL YOUR SOUL, AND WITH ALL YOUR MIND.'

KJV Matthew 22:37 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

BGT Matthew 22:37 ὁ φηατ· γαπ σεις κριον τν θεν σου ν λ τ καρδ σου κα ν λ τ ψυχ σου κα ν λ τ διανο σου·

NET Matthew 22:37 Jesus said to him, "'Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.'

CSB Matthew 22:37 He said to him, "Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.

ESV Matthew 22:37 And he said to him, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.

NIV Matthew 22:37 Jesus replied: " 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.'

NLT Matthew 22:37 Jesus replied, " 'You must love the Lord your God with all your heart, all your soul, and all your mind.'

NRS Matthew 22:37 He said to him, "'You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind.'

NJB Matthew 22:37 Jesus said to him, 'You must love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul,

and with all your mind.

NAB Matthew 22:37 He said to him, "You shall love the Lord, your God, with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.

YLT Matthew 22:37 And Jesus said to him, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thine understanding --

MIT Matthew 22:37 He replied to him: "Love Yahveh your God completely in your heart, with all your vitality, and in all your thinking.

GWN Matthew 22:37 Jesus answered him, " 'Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind.'

- Dt 6:5 Dt 10:12 Dt 30:6 Mk 12:29,30,33 Lu 10:27 Ro 8:7 Heb 10:16,17 1Jn 5:2-5

Related Passages:

Deuteronomy 6:4-5+ "Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God, the LORD is one! "You shall love the LORD your God with all your **heart** ([ahab/ahab](#)) and with all your soul and with all your might.

MacArthur on Hebrew word for love ([ahab/ahab](#)) - Ahab, the Hebrew word for love used in Deuteronomy 6:5, refers primarily to an act of mind and will, the determined care for the welfare of something or someone. It might well include strong emotion, but its distinguishing characteristics were the dedication and commitment of choice. It is the love that recognizes and chooses to follow that which is righteous, noble, and true, regardless of what one's feelings in a matter might be. It is the Hebrew equivalent of the Greek agapaō in the New Testament, the verb of intelligent, purposeful, and committed love that is an act of the will. This love is in contrast to the emotion and tender affection of phileō and the physical, sensual love of eros (which is not used in the New Testament). (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 339](#))

Deuteronomy 10:12 "Now, Israel, what does the LORD your God require from you, but to fear the LORD your God, to walk in all His ways and love Him, and to serve the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul,

Deuteronomy 30:6 "Moreover the LORD your God will circumcise your heart and the heart of your descendants, to love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul, so that you may live.

Mark 12:30+ Jesus answered, "The foremost is, 'HEAR, O ISRAEL! THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD; 30 AND YOU SHALL LOVE THE LORD YOUR GOD WITH ALL YOUR HEART, AND WITH ALL YOUR SOUL, AND WITH ALL YOUR MIND, AND WITH ALL YOUR STRENGTH.'

THE HEART - THE HEART OF THE COMMANDMENTS

And He said to him - If we compare with Mark's version, in Matthew Jesus leaves out the famous Jewish "**Shema**" (Dt 6:4+) 'HEAR, O ISRAEL! THE LORD OUR GOD IS ONE LORD. This is surprising in light of the fact that Matthew tends to be slanted more to a Jewish audience.

YOU SHALL LOVE ([agapao](#) - carries force of a command) **THE LORD** ([kurios](#)) **YOUR GOD WITH ALL YOUR HEART** ([kardia](#)), **AND WITH ALL YOUR SOUL** ([psuche](#)), **AND WITH ALL YOUR MIND** ([dianoia](#)) - Jesus gives the one commandment that shapes all others, the heart of the commandments that sums up the Law, that fulfills the Law. What's repeated? "**Your**" (4x)! "**All**" (3x)! In short Jesus says "Love God with all you are." God is to be loved with all our powers and faculties, and nothing is to be loved more than God. **Heart, soul and mind** calls for "holistic" love of God, with one's whole being! This is love which flows from one's entire being toward the Eternal Being. Note He is "**your**" God which speaks of possession. Yes ultimately He possesses us but in an act of amazing grace, we possess Him as our "summum bonum," our highest good. This call to love God calls for a supernaturally enabled unconditional commitment to God from a whole heart. Ultimately the only way a fallen creature can love God like this is by depending on the Holy Spirit to energize that quality of love. This love is not "natural" but is "supernatural."

MacArthur - The heart in the Hebrew understanding is the core of a person's identity; it is the source of all thoughts, words, and actions. For that reason Proverbs 4:23 commands, "Watch over your heart with all diligence, for from it flow the springs of life." Love for God must flow from the deepest part of a person's being. Soul adds the emotions. In Matthew 26:38 Jesus said, "My soul is deeply grieved, to the point of death," speaking of His soul as the seat of emotion. Mind embraces the will, the intentions, and purposes. Strength refers to physical energy and function. The intellectual, emotional, volitional, and physical elements of

personhood are all involved in loving God. Genuine love for God is an intelligent love, an emotional love, a willing love, and an active love. In short, it is a comprehensive, all-consuming love and singular adoration. God's wholehearted love for believers must not be reciprocated with half-hearted devotion. (See [Mark 9:16 MacArthur New Testament Commentary](#))

Hiebert - Love to God must possess the whole heart, the seat of personality, the whole soul, the self-conscious life, the whole mind, the rational faculties, and the whole strength, the entire active powers of man. ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expository Commentary](#))

MacArthur on **soul** ([psuche](#)) and **Mind** ([dianoia](#)) - The term **soul** is closest to what we would call emotion and is the word Jesus used when He cried out in the Garden of Gethsemane the night He was arrested: "My soul is deeply grieved, to the point of death" (Matt. 26:38)....**Mind** ([dianoia](#)) is used here in the sense of intellectual, willful vigor and determination, carrying both the meaning of mental endeavor and of strength. Genuine love of the Lord is intelligent, feeling, willing, and serving. It involves thought, sensitivity, intent, and even action where that is possible and appropriate.... I believe that the transforming new creation that takes place at salvation produces a new will, desire, and attitude deep within the person that can best be described as love for God....The person who truly loves the Lord with all his heart and soul and mind is the person who trusts Him and obeys Him. (See [Matthew Commentary - Page 339](#))

Grassmick describes this love as a "a volitional commitment to God that is personal, comprehensive, and wholehearted. This is emphasized by the repeated words with (ex, "out of," denoting source), all (holēs, "the whole of"), your (sing.), and the various terms relating to the human personality—heart (control center; cf. Mark 7:19), soul (self-conscious life; cf. 8:35–36), mind (thought capacity), and strength (bodily powers)." (See [The Bible Knowledge Commentary](#))

Daniel Akin - What is called for is a total response of love and devotion to our Great God. Indeed the four-fold use of heart, soul, mind and strength is not intended as a "psychological analysis of human personality", but a call to love God wholly and completely. Kent Hughes says it so well, "It does not take much of a man to be a believer, but it takes all there is of him!" (Mark, vol. 2, 115) Heart speaks to our emotions, the real me on the inside (See Ex. 20:3). - Soul speaks to the spirit, the self-conscious life (See Ps. 42:1-2). - Mind speaks to our intelligence and thought life (See 2 Cor 10:3-5). - Strength speaks to our bodily powers, perhaps even the will (See Rom 12:1). - It is easy to see there is overlap in these categories of human personality.

Sinclair Ferguson says, "God is never satisfied with anything less than the devotion of our whole life for the whole duration of our lives" (Mark, 200).

Geddert - Jesus responds by accepting the scribe's assumption that there is a center to the law. But he also modifies it by clarifying that two commandments are located at the center. The commandments to love God (Deut. 6:4–5) and neighbor (Lev. 19:18) stand together at the heart of the Torah.Thus Jesus says, "The center of the law is not some hidden key to be discovered by intricate exegetical maneuvers. The center of the law is the love command(s) repeated regularly in worship." ([Believers Church Bible Commentary](#))

Matthew Henry - That the great commandment of all, which is indeed inclusive of all, is, that of loving God with all our hearts. (1.) Where there is a commanding principle in the soul, there is a disposition to every other duty. Love is the leading affection of the soul; the love of God is the leading grace in the renewed soul. (2.) Where this is not, nothing else that is good is done, or done aright, or accepted, or done long. Loving God with all our heart, will effectually take us off from, and arm us against, all those things that are rivals with him for the throne in our souls, and will engage us to every thing by which he may be honoured, and with which he will be pleased; and no commandment will be grievous where this principle commands, and has the ascendant. ([Commentary](#))

Love ([25](#)) [agapao](#) see related study of noun [agape](#)) means to love unconditionally and sacrificially (selflessly) as God Himself loves sinful men (John 3:16), the way He loves the Son (John 3:35, 15:9, 17:23, 24). Note that [agapao](#) is a verb and by its verbal nature calls for action. It follows that this quality of love is not so much an emotion as it is an action initiated by a volitional choice, a choice of our wills, indeed a choice or "fruit" supernaturally initiated and enabled by the Holy Spirit (Gal 5:22+).

[SEE 9 page article on AGAPAO in the NIDNTT, PAGE 538](#)

MacArthur writes that [agapao](#) "expresses the purest, noblest form of love, which is volitionally driven, not motivated by superficial appearance, emotional attraction, or sentimental relationship. (SEE [1 & 2 Thessalonians MacArthur New Testament Commentary](#))

Wuest writes that "Agapao speaks of a love which is awakened by a sense of value in an object which causes one to prize it. It springs from an apprehension of the preciousness of an object. It is a love of esteem and approbation. The quality of this love is determined by the character of the one who loves, and that of the object loved. ([Eerdmans Publishing](#) - used by permission)

Vine - Love can be known only from the actions it prompts. God's love is seen in the gift of His Son, 1 John

4:9, 10. But obviously this is not the love of complacency, or affection, that is, it was not drawn out by any excellency in its objects, Ro 5:8 ([note](#)). It was an exercise of the divine will in deliberate choice, made without assignable cause save that which lies in the nature of God Himself, cp. Deuteronomy 7:7, 8. Love had its perfect expression among men in the Lord Jesus Christ, 2Co 5:14; Ep 2:4 ([note](#)); Ep 3:19 ([note](#)); Ep 5:2 ([note](#)); Christian love is the fruit of His Spirit in the Christian, Galatians 5:22 ([note](#)). Christian love has God for its primary object, and expresses itself first of all in implicit obedience to His commandments, John 14:15, 21, 23; 15:10; 1Jn 2:5; 5:3; 2Jn 6. Self-will, that is, self-pleasing, is the negation of love to God. ([Vine's Expository Dictionary of Old Testament and New Testament Words](#))

AGAPAO - 110V - Matt. 5:43; Matt. 5:44; Matt. 5:46; Matt. 6:24; Matt. 19:19; Matt. 22:37; Matt. 22:39; Mk. 10:21; Mk. 12:30; Mk. 12:31; Mk. 12:33; Lk. 6:27; Lk. 6:32; Lk. 6:35; Lk. 7:5; Lk. 7:42; Lk. 7:47; Lk. 10:27; Lk. 11:43; Lk. 16:13; Jn. 3:16; Jn. 3:19; Jn. 3:35; Jn. 8:42; Jn. 10:17; Jn. 11:5; Jn. 12:43; Jn. 13:1; Jn. 13:23; Jn. 13:34; Jn. 14:15; Jn. 14:21; Jn. 14:23; Jn. 14:24; Jn. 14:28; Jn. 14:31; Jn. 15:9; Jn. 15:12; Jn. 15:17; Jn. 17:23; Jn. 17:24; Jn. 17:26; Jn. 19:26; Jn. 21:7; Jn. 21:15; Jn. 21:16; Jn. 21:20; Rom. 8:28; Rom. 8:37; Rom. 9:13; Rom. 9:25; Rom. 13:8; Rom. 13:9; 1 Co. 2:9; 1 Co. 8:3; 2 Co. 9:7; 2 Co. 11:11; 2 Co. 12:15; Gal. 2:20; Gal. 5:14; Eph. 1:6; Eph. 2:4; Eph. 5:2; Eph. 5:25; Eph. 5:28; Eph. 5:33; Eph. 6:24; Col. 3:12; Col. 3:19; 1 Thess. 1:4; 1 Thess. 4:9; 2 Thess. 2:13; 2 Thess. 2:16; 2 Tim. 4:8; 2 Tim. 4:10; Heb. 1:9; Heb. 12:6; Jas. 1:12; Jas. 2:5; Jas. 2:8; 1 Pet. 1:8; 1 Pet. 1:22; 1 Pet. 2:17; 1 Pet. 3:10; 2 Pet. 2:15; 1 Jn. 2:10; 1 Jn. 2:15; 1 Jn. 3:10; 1 Jn. 3:11; 1 Jn. 3:14; 1 Jn. 3:18; 1 Jn. 3:23; 1 Jn. 4:7; 1 Jn. 4:8; 1 Jn. 4:10; 1 Jn. 4:11; 1 Jn. 4:12; 1 Jn. 4:19; 1 Jn. 4:20; 1 Jn. 4:21; 1 Jn. 5:1; 1 Jn. 5:2; 2 Jn. 1:1; 2 Jn. 1:5; 3 Jn. 1:1; Jude 1:1; Rev. 1:5; Rev. 3:9; Rev. 12:11; Rev. 20:9

Heart (2588) [kardia](#) does not refer to the physical organ but is always used figuratively in Scripture to refer to the seat and center of human life. The heart is the center of the personality, and it controls the intellect, emotions, and will. No outward obedience is of the slightest value unless the heart turns to God.

Kardia as stated above refers not to the physical organ (over 800 mentions and none refer to the physical organ!), but is always used figuratively to center of our personality, to so to speak to our "**control center**" (to make a play on the "[air traffic control center](#)" at the airport which carefully guards and guides what flies in and what flies out. How applicable to our "hearts" which are so prone to wander!). In short **kardia** refers to the the [affective](#) center of our being wherein lies the capacity of moral preference and volitional desire. The **kardia** generates thoughts that make the decisions which the mind works out. In other words, our logic flows out of our heart-decisions and not vice versa. Gleason Archer called the **kardia**, the "desire-producer that makes us tick" for it is the place where our "desire-decisions" occur, and which establish who we really are. WHO ARE YOU? HAVE YOU HAD A HEART CHECK UP RECENTLY? We are assiduous to do this medically, but woefully lax in doing it spiritually (beloved, I speak from experience!). At regeneration God reverses the spiritual atherosclerosis of our old sinful heart by giving us a total heart transplant! Daily confession and repentance are thereafter necessary to avoid "spiritual atherosclerosis" and gradual, subtle hardening (and becoming cold to the things of God) of our heart! (Read and practice daily "preventative maintenance" = 1 Jn 1:9+, Pr 28:13+).

Gary Hill rightly reminds us that "Life is a continuous contest, waged and won in the **heart**. As the **heart** goes, so goes the rest of us. This is true in "both directions": *negatively* ([Jn 14:1](#), [27](#); [Acts 7:51](#), [8:21](#); [Ro 1:21](#)) and *positively* ([Acts 16:14](#); [Ro 2:29](#); [Heb 10:22](#)). The heart, as the seat of decision-making, also involves emotions (desires) that are key to making choices....Cognition (the use of the "mind") is vital, but the **heart** "steers our being" as the primary organ of decision-making. The **heart** forges our personality ("soul"), intellect ("mind"), and actions ("strength"). Accordingly, the **heart** is the primary (driving) force in preferring good ([Mt 5:28](#); [Ro 6:17](#)), or evil ([Mt 5:28](#)). The mind (reasoning) reacts to (works out) heart-choices ("internal persuasions"), but making choices (core-decisions) comes from the **heart**." ([Discovery Bible](#))

QUESTION - [What does it mean to love the Lord with all your heart, soul, mind, and strength?](#)

ANSWER - "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God, the LORD is one. Love the LORD your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength" (Deuteronomy 6:4–5). This is known as the *Shema*, taken from the first word "hear" in Hebrew. Modern Jews consider the recital of the *Shema* both evening and morning to be one of their most sacred duties. It was cited by Jesus as the "greatest commandment in the Law" (Matthew 22:36–37).

This command seems to be impossible to obey. That's because, in the natural state of man, it is impossible. There is no greater evidence of the inability of man to obey God's Law than this one commandment. No human being with a fallen nature can possibly

love God with *all* his heart, soul, and strength 24 hours a day. It's humanly impossible. But to disobey any commandment of God is sin. Therefore, even without considering the sins we commit daily, we are all condemned by our inability to fulfill this one commandment. This is the reason Jesus continually reminded the Pharisees of their inability to keep the Law of God. He was trying to get them to see their utter spiritual bankruptcy and their need for a Savior. Without the cleansing of sin that He provides, and the empowering presence of the Holy Spirit who lives in the hearts of the redeemed, loving God to any degree is impossible.

But, as Christians, we have been cleansed from sin and we do have the Spirit. So how do we begin to love God the way we should? Just as the man in Mark 9:24 asked God to help his unbelief, so too we can ask God to help us in areas where we don't love Him with all our heart, soul, mind, and strength. It is His power that we need to do the impossible, and we begin by seeking and appropriating that power.

In most cases, our love and affection for God grows more intense as time goes by. Certainly, young Christians newly saved are very much aware of the love of God and their love for Him. But it is through the witness of God's faithfulness during times of struggle and trial that a deep love for God grows and grows. Over time, we witness His compassion, mercy, grace, and love for us, as well as His hatred for sin, His holiness, and His righteousness. We cannot love someone we don't know, so knowing Him should be our first priority. Those who pursue God and His righteousness, who take seriously the command to love Him above all else, are those who are consumed with the things of God. They are eager to study God's Word, eager to pray, eager to obey and honor God in all things, and eager to share Jesus Christ with others. It is through these spiritual disciplines that the love for God grows and matures to the glory of God. GotQuestions.org

F B Meyer - Matthew 22:37 Thou shalt love the Lord thy God ... with all thy mind.

This was Adam's blessed privilege in Eden; but he missed it. The love of self took the place of the love of God. It is the aim of our blessed Lord to bring us back to that position. Perfect love is the sunlit peak to which his whole redemption tends. And perfect love would be perfect holiness. If a man were to love God and his neighbor as his first and chief and all-absorbing passion, there would be no room for sin to establish itself in his heart.

But does not this command seem altogether impracticable? It does; and it is impracticable to our mortal flesh. It is high; we cannot attain to it. Yet the very sublimity of the demand is intended to drive us to the Holy Ghost. He sheds abroad the love of God in hearts which are fully yielded to Him. If you desire that this love should be your privilege, lie down low before the flow of the River of Life, and it will fill every gully and inlet of your nature.

But, perhaps you are not of an emotional nature; you cannot gleam and flash, and shed tears, and light up with smiles. You cannot love God with your heart! Then see, the Lord says that you can love Him with your mind, i.e., with your intellect, your choice, your will. Probably this is where you have to begin. Give your mind, your will, your power of choice to God. Make Him first. Ask Him to take the helm of your life, and to control, inspire, and direct its every movement. Crown Him King. And when the will, which is the high priest of your nature, has put its crown of life on the head of Christ, who is God Incarnate, all the emotions and affections and faculties of heart and Life will come in to swell the court with their homage and acclaim.

[Daniel Akin](#) proposes a series of questions helps evaluate our "love life" when it comes to rightly loving God and

1. Is the Lord the all-consuming passion of my life?
2. Do I have a deep, intense and abiding affection for my Lord?
3. Am I loyal to my God with an exclusive love?
4. Do I resist and even oppose anything or anyone that seeks to do my Lord harm?
5. Am I zealous to, with grace, defend my Lord's name and honor?
6. Do I enjoy spending time with my Lord?
7. Do I do things that please my Lord and increase His joy?
8. Do I brag on my Lord to others?
9. Do I tell my Lord that I love him?
10. Do I talk with my Lord as much as I can?

Akin goes on to emphasize that "these are not things I do to get God to love me. They are things I do because I am loved by Him and because I love Him. I never lose sight of the fact that I do not love Him to get Him to love me. I love Him because He first loved me (1 John 4:10+) ([Mark 12:28-34 Two Great Commandments, Two Great Loves](#))

Norman Geisler - [When Cultists Ask](#) - MATTHEW 22:37-39—Does obedience to the "greatest commandments" bring about a unity of religions?

MISINTERPRETATION: In Matthew 22:37–39 Jesus described the first and second greatest commandments as loving God and loving one’s neighbor. According to New Agers, these commandments “describe the process by means of which the barrier of separation is broken down, by which microcosm (man) and macrocosm (God) can be one and synthesis and unity be expressed within the relative universe of I and thou, me and you.” By being obedient to these commandments people “will build the most enduring bridges between creeds, paths, teachings, and philosophies” (Spangler, 1981, 30).

CORRECTING THE MISINTERPRETATION: First, the commandment about loving God takes priority over loving people. God is to be loved with all of one’s heart; the neighbor is to be loved only as one loves oneself. The clear implication here is that God should be loved supremely but humankind only finitely. In light of this distinction, it is clear that the first priority is expression of love to the one true God—not to Buddha, or Krishna, or any idols set up by New Agers.

A serious flaw in New Age thinking is the assumption that loving God and loving one’s neighbor automatically does away with all discrimination and separation (between religions, for example). However, such is clearly not the case. Jesus recognized the importance of love, exhorting his followers to “love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you” (Matt. 5:43–44). Yet, this same Jesus (at the Judgment) will say to unbelievers: “I never knew you; depart from me, you who practice lawlessness” (Matt. 7:23 NASB). God loves the world (John 3:16), but eternal torment nevertheless awaits those who reject his provision for salvation in Jesus Christ (Rev. 20:14).

The Little Evangelist

Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. —
Mark 12:30

Today’s Scripture: Mark 12:28-34

My 6-year-old neighbor Michael and I were talking in my front yard when two new neighbor kids stopped by. After I asked them their names, Michael’s first question to them was: “Do you love God?” Sugar, a 5-year-old boy, quickly responded, “No!” Michael gave him a look of disapproval and concern. When 4-year-old Nana noticed he wasn’t pleased with that answer, she said, “Yes!”

Michael’s “witnessing strategy” may not be the most effective, but he does have an important question for the people he meets (and I’ve heard him ask it of several others as well).

Jesus was asked, “Which is the first commandment of all?” (Mark 12:28). He answered, “The Lord is one. ‘And you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength’” (vv.29-30).

Jesus was referring to Old Testament times, when God had told the Israelites to place Him as the one and only God in their lives and nation. The pagan nations around them had many gods they loved and worshiped, but God’s people were to be different.

Loving God is to be our top priority too. So, Michael wants to know, “Do you love God?” By: Anne Cetas [Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#)

For Further Thought

Have you trusted in Jesus as your Savior?

What evidence is there in your life that you love God?

How are you showing God’s love to others?

If you truly love the Lord, you’ll want others to love Him too.

An Important Command

You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. — Mark 12:30

Today’s Scripture & Insight: Mark 12:28-34

When asked by a lawyer to identify the most important rule in life, Jesus replied, “You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength” (Mark 12:30). In those words, Jesus summed up what God most desires from us.

I wonder how I can possibly learn to love God with all my heart, soul, and mind. Neal Plantinga remarks on a subtle change in this commandment as recorded in the New Testament. Deuteronomy charges us to love God with all our heart, soul, and strength (Dt 6:5). Jesus added the word mind. Plantinga explains, “You shall love God with everything you have and everything you are.

Everything.”

That helps us change our perspective. As we learn to love God with everything, we begin to see our difficulties as “our light and momentary troubles”—just as the apostle Paul described his grueling ordeals. He had in mind a “far more exceeding and eternal . . . glory” (2 Cor. 4:17).

In the advanced school of prayer, where one loves God with the entire soul, doubts and struggles do not disappear, but their effect on us diminishes. “We love Him because He first loved us” (1 John 4:19), and our urgent questions recede as we learn to trust His ultimate goodness. By: Philip Yancey ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

Once earthly joy I craved, sought peace and rest;
Now Thee alone I seek; give what is best.
This all my prayer shall be:
More love, O Christ, to Thee.
—Prentiss

The most treasured gift we can give to God is one that He can never force us to give—our love.

A Web Of Relationships

You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind. —Mark 12:30

Today's Scripture: John 15:1-14

Several years ago, a Harvard Business School professor wrote an open letter to the nation's graduates. He told them that in one sense they needed to forget what they had learned in school. He said that schools tend to put too much emphasis on the idea that success comes as a result of passing tests and is based on individual performance rather than on group effort and cooperation. The professor pointed out, though, that in the workplace doing well depends largely on learning to succeed in what he called a “web of relationships.”

This truth also applies to living the Christian life. We often think that spiritual maturity and success result from how much we know about biblical facts and principles. Christ showed us, however, that it comes from something else—from loving one another in the same way He loved us. He made it clear that we can do this only if we “abide” in Him (Jn. 15:7). This means we must stay close to Him through prayer, and that we will obey His commands (v.10). Our web of relationships must extend to God and then to others.

The secret of spiritual success is not just in acquiring individual knowledge—it's in coupling that knowledge with love in all our relationships. By: Mart DeHaan ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

Lord, help us learn from what You did
When You lived on this earth;
You spread Your love to all You met—
You gave each one true worth.
—JDB

When Christians draw close to Christ, they draw closer to one another.

Private Property

Love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength. —
Mk. 12:30

Today's Scripture: Mark 12:28-34

An editorial cartoon depicted the first nativity scene, but with a modern twist. As the shepherds were paying homage to the baby, one said, “This had better be happening on private property or we're in trouble!”

The cartoon pokes fun at laws banning the display of religious symbols on public property, but the phrase can be seen in another light. If we aren't worshipping the Christ of Christmas in the “private property” of our hearts, we are truly in trouble. The citadel of heart, soul, and mind is the ultimate in private property. No one can legislate what happens there. And love for others is the demonstration of God's presence in our lives. No law can banish that from public display.

When Jesus was questioned about the greatest commandment, He answered, “‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your mind, and with all your strength.’ This is the first commandment. And the second, like it, is this: ‘You shall love your neighbor as yourself’” (Mk. 12:30-31).

Whether we live under democracy or despotism, we are free to enthrone Jesus Christ in our hearts and express Him through our love. What is happening on your “private property”? Can others see Christ’s presence in your life? By: David C. McCasland ([Our Daily Bread](#), Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved)

Ah, dearest Jesus, Holy child!
Make Thee a bed, soft, undefiled,
Within my heart, that it may be
A quiet chamber kept for Thee.
—Luther

If you honor Christ in your heart, He will be honored by your life.

Matthew 22:38 “This is the great and foremost commandment.

KJV Matthew 22:38 This is the first and great commandment.

BGT Matthew 22:38 α τη σ τ ν μεγ λη κα πρ τη ντολ .

NET Matthew 22:38 This is the first and greatest commandment.

CSB Matthew 22:38 This is the greatest and most important command.

ESV Matthew 22:38 This is the great and first commandment.

NIV Matthew 22:38 This is the first and greatest commandment.

NLT Matthew 22:38 This is the first and greatest commandment.

NRS Matthew 22:38 This is the greatest and first commandment.

NJB Matthew 22:38 This is the greatest and the first commandment.

NAB Matthew 22:38 This is the greatest and the first commandment.

YLT Matthew 22:38 this is a first and great command;

MIT Matthew 22:38 This commandment is paramount and primary.

GWN Matthew 22:38 This is the greatest and most important commandment.

Related Passages:

Mark 12:31+ “The second is this, ‘YOU SHALL LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF.’ There is no other commandment greater than these.”

THE GREATEST AND THE FOREMOST

This is the great and foremost ([protos](#) - most important) **commandment** ([entole](#)) - **Great** (megale) means most important, preeminent, overarching and surpassing all others in weight and significance. **Foremost** speaks of rank, priority, or foundation and as such is the starting point and source from which all other commands should flow. It defines the essence of what God desires: a relationship grounded in total love, not mere ritual or rule-keeping and is the foundation for fulfilling all other laws (Mt 22:40). Stated another way loving God is not just the first commandment — it is the core of every commandment. All genuine obedience begins with love for God (Jn 14:15+). Love of God is the chief duty of man and is superior to every other obligation.

Stanley Saunders: This answer allows Jesus to affirm the two commandments as “**great**” and “**first**” without suggesting that they trump or diminish the rest. There is not one great commandment, nor even two, and then many subordinate commandments, but an integral whole that encompasses the law and the prophets. The greatness of these two commandments lies not in their distinction from the others, but in their capacity to articulate the root and foundation of the whole tradition.

While **love** in both Mt 22:37 and Mt 22:39 is in the future tense, from this verse clearly both are to be seen as commandments.

THOUGHT - On a scale of 1 to 10 (not judging you because I am looking in the mirror as I write) how would you "grade" your love for God today? If you are faltering (as I often do) in your love for God, read (memorize and meditate on) David's (cf Acts 13:22b+) words in Ps 18:1-2+ "I love You, O LORD, my strength." The LORD is my rock and my fortress and my deliverer, My God, my rock, in whom I take refuge; My shield and the horn of my salvation, my stronghold." If you have never read J I Packer's classic work [Knowing God](#) (borrow) in which love of God is a central theme.

Matthew 22:39 "The second is like it, 'YOU SHALL LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF.'

KJV Matthew 22:39 And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.

BGT Matthew 22:39 δευτ ρα ὁ μὲν ἄλλος γὰρ σεῖς τὴν πλησὸν σου σεαυτὴν.

NET Matthew 22:39 The second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'

CSB Matthew 22:39 The second is like it: Love your neighbor as yourself.

ESV Matthew 22:39 And a second is like it: You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

NIV Matthew 22:39 And the second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'

NLT Matthew 22:39 A second is equally important: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.'

NRS Matthew 22:39 And a second is like it: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.'

NJB Matthew 22:39 The second resembles it: You must love your neighbour as yourself.

NAB Matthew 22:39 The second is like it: You shall love your neighbor as yourself.

YLT Matthew 22:39 and the second is like to it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself;

MIT Matthew 22:39 The second is similar: Love your fellow human being as you love yourself.

GWN Matthew 22:39 The second is like it: 'Love your neighbor as you love yourself.'

- Thou: Mt 19:19 Lev 19:18 Mk 12:31 Lu 10:27,28 Ro 13:9,10 Ga 5:14 Jas 2:8
- neighbour: Lu 10:29-37 Ro 15:2 Ga 6:10

Related Passages:

Mark 12:31+ "The second is this, 'YOU SHALL LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF.' There is no other commandment greater than these."

Leviticus 19:18+. 'You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the sons of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself; I am the LORD.

1 John 4:19-21+ We love, because He first loved us. 20 If someone says, "I love God," and hates his brother, he is a liar; for the one who does not love his brother whom he has seen, cannot love God whom he has not seen. 21 And this commandment we have from Him, that **the one who loves God should love his brother also.**

The second is like it, 'YOU SHALL LOVE ([agapao](#) - carries force of a command) **YOUR NEIGHBOR** ([plesion](#)) **AS YOURSELF** - It is ironic that this command to love as we love ourselves actually calls for total commitment to **selfless** love (meaning of [agapao](#) the highest kind of love). Jesus quotes from the [Septuagint](#) of Leviticus 19:18+. Note the phrase "as yourself" which in contrast to some modern interpretations of this passage, is not commanding that a person love himself or herself. To the contrary it is assumed each person already does love himself or herself. **Your neighbor** is literally "one who is nearby" and thus describes our fellow man, whoever and wherever we encounter them. It means anyone and everyone we have opportunity to meet in any way! This word ([plesion](#)) is "all inclusive."

[Utley](#) - It is impossible to love God and hate those made in His image (cf. 1 John 2:9–11; 3:15; 4:20).

Love your neighbor as yourself is the crucial means of evaluating our love for our neighbor because few of us have any difficulty loving ourselves, so that is a perfect measure of our love for others. The dynamic in this passage is interesting -- we have no

trouble (usually) loving ourselves, but this passage calls on us to love others with the same quality of love! Are you as convicted as I am? Jesus ratcheted this up in Mt 5:43-47+ calling for love of our enemies! If you are not convicted now than you are deceiving yourself! And as Jesus often had taught this love was based on deeds not words. Furthermore, it should be noted that these two commandments are integrally related so that if we say we love God but don't show love (deeds not just words) to man, we really do not love God! As John says "Little children, let us not love with word or with tongue, but in deed and truth." (1Jn 3:18+)

MacArthur points out that "The arrogant, prideful scribes, Pharisees, and Sadducees did neither; they failed to love either God or their neighbor (as illustrated by Jesus in the Good Samaritan parable). This command must not be twisted into a call for self-love, which is natural; such is not its intent. The Lord's point is that we are to have the same love and care for neighbors, strangers, and enemies that we possess for ourselves." (See [MacArthur Commentary](#))

*Love for one's neighbor means acting toward others with their good,
their well-being, their fulfillment, as the primary motivation and goal of our deeds*

Donald Hagner: The two love commandments belong together, covering the **vertical** (relationship with God) and the **horizontal** (relationship with others) dimensions. The first entails the second; the second presupposes and depends on the first. It is obvious, however, that the use of the verb ἀγαπήσεις (lemma - [agapao](#)), "you shall love," does not mean the same thing in both places. In neither case is love construed as an emotion. Love for one's neighbor means acting toward others with their good, their well-being, their fulfillment, as the primary motivation and goal of our deeds. Such love is constant and takes no regard of the perceived merit or worth of the other person. **Love of God**, on the other hand, is to be understood as a matter of reverence, commitment, and obedience. It is at once an acknowledgment of his identity as Creator and Redeemer and a reflection of that reality in the ordering of our lives. With this orientation toward God and others, the law and the prophets have reached their ultimate goal. Further concern with commandments, further elaboration of ethical stipulations—these all depend upon the real manifestation of the love commandments for their legitimacy. (See [Matthew 14-28, Volume 33B - Page 648](#)) (bold added)

Joseph Parker - "Love of God means love of man. Religion is the divine side of philanthropy; philanthropy is the practical side of religion. We must first be right with God, or we never can be right with man. If we begin by endeavouring to get right with our neighbour, we shall fail. But if we begin by establishing right relations with God, according to the conditions which he himself has laid down, we shall find that being right with God our whole life is elevated and all social relationships are redeemed from error, and our neighbour is loved with a lofty and pure charity." ([Inheriting Eternal Life](#))

Gilbrant - The first commandment actually guarantees the second; they cannot be separated. Note that Jesus did not command us to love ourselves. It is assumed throughout the Bible that men love themselves. Love for self caused the fall of both Lucifer and man. Since the Fall, all men love themselves more than anything else until they are born of the Spirit and are filled with the love of God (Romans 5:5). One of the signs of the end times is that men will be "lovers of themselves" to an unusual degree (2 Timothy 3:2)....The fact that these are "thou shalt's" shows that "love" is more than "feelings." It involves one's will (ED: both uses of "shall love" are in [active voice](#) = choice of one's will - and I submit we need the Spirit's enablement - see "will" in Php 2:13 and nicely paraphrased in Php 2:13NLT+), shown in acts of kindness and mercy. To love is to will the highest eternal good for a person, and to demonstrate it in action. ([Complete Biblical Library](#))

Daniel Akin - Some hear the phrase "**you shall love your neighbor as yourself**" and wrongly think how narcissistic. Jesus, the unselfish one, actually tells me to selfishly love myself. How do we make sense of this? First, there is a healthy kind of self love that is cognizant of the truth that we are the objects both of the "creating" and "redeeming" love of our God. To hate myself is actually an offense to God and calls into question His wisdom and goodness. Second, the love a person naturally has for himself is now "turned out" toward others. The object of my affection and concern moves from me to others (cf. Phil 2:3-5). Third, the fact that this is a command makes clear that the primary focus is on our actions and not our feelings or emotions. Fourth, there is certainly a mysterious paradox in all this, for the same Jesus who tells us to love ourselves also tells us to deny ourselves and die to ourselves (Mark 8:34). In other words the more I truly love myself the more I will deny myself and love others. To love my neighbor as myself means I will serve the needs of others with all the energy, passion and zeal with which I serve and attempt to meet my own needs. However, only by loving my God supremely will I be able to love others, "all others," genuinely. And, as I love others genuinely I demonstrate that I love my God supremely. No wonder Jesus said, "There is no greater commandment than these."

Akin adds that "Don Carson preached a wonderful sermon at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Feb. 2012 at a large college conference that really helped us see what it means to love others genuinely. He also taught all of us a good lesson in hermeneutics or biblical interpretation. He encouraged us to examine the context in which Lev. 19:18 was located. There you discover that loving your neighbor as yourself means a lot! Among other things it means that you will 1) care for the poor (Lev 19:10), 2) not steal (Lev 19:11), 3) not lie (Lev 19:11), 4) be fair in business dealings (Lev 19:14), 5) care for the deaf (Lev 19:14), 6) care for the blind (Lev 19:14), 7) deal justly with all (Lev 19:15), 8) avoid slander (Lev 19:16), 9) not "jeopardize" (HCSB) the life of your neighbor (Lev 19:16), 10) not "hate your brother in your heart" (Lev 19:17), 11) rebuke your neighbor when necessary for his and

your good (Lev 19:17), and 12) not 8 take revenge or bear a grudge against others (Lev 19:18). Wow! God does not leave it to our imaginations as to what He means when He tells us to love our neighbors as yourself.

In short, Jesus' two commands summed up the Ten Commandments, the first half of which describes how to love God, while the second half describes how to love one's neighbor.

As noted in John's first letter, clearly love of God (v30) is intimately intertwined with love of man (neighbor) (see 1 Jn 4:20 above). **Your neighbor** is literally "one who is nearby" and thus describes our fellow man, whoever and wherever we encounter them. It means anyone and everyone we have opportunity to meet in any way! This word ([plesion](#)) is "all inclusive." As stated the dynamic in this passage is interesting -- we have no trouble (usually) loving ourselves, but this passage calls on us to love others with the same quality of love! Are you as convicted as I am? Jesus ratcheted this up in Mt 5:43-47 calling for love of our enemies! If you are not convicted now than you are deceiving yourself!

Neighbor (Near) ([4139](#))([plesion](#) from **pélas** = near, near to or from **plesios** = close by) literally means near (literal use only in Jn 4:5), quite near, nearby = position quite close to another position. Figuratively, **plesion** means to be near someone and thus be a neighbor. Generally, **plesion** refers to a fellow man, any other member of the human family. **TDNT** explains that "Ho plesion" is the "neighbor," the person next to one" then more generally the "fellow human being." Eight of 17 uses of **plesion** occur in a citation of or allusion to Leviticus 19:18: "You shall love your **neighbor** (Hebrew translated in [Septuagint](#) with plēsion) as yourself" (Mt 5:43; 19:19; 22:39; Mk 12:31; Luke 10:27; Ro 13:9; Gal 5:14; Jas 2:8). It should be noted that the TDNT entry states that "there is allusion to Lev. 19:18 in 12 instances." All uses of plesion - Matt. 5:43; Matt. 19:19; Matt. 22:39; Mk. 12:31; Mk. 12:33; Lk. 10:27; Lk. 10:29; Lk. 10:36; Jn. 4:5; Acts 7:27; Rom. 13:9; Rom. 13:10; Rom. 15:2; Gal. 5:14; Eph. 4:25; Jas. 2:8; Jas. 4:12

Henry Blackaby - [Borrow The Experience](#) - Love Those Neighbors Matthew 22:39–40

When you consider Jesus' audience, his message was revolutionary! The Old Testament Law was everything to the Pharisees; they devoted their entire lives to following the Law to the letter. Now Jesus was telling them that all their efforts were futile unless they loved their neighbors. The Pharisees weren't in the habit of loving their neighbors; they were actually in the habit of criticizing them, judging them, even pitying them. After all, their neighborhood included some pretty unsavory characters. How could they love prostitutes, beggars, or tax collectors—those traitorous Jews who'd sold out to the Roman government? These were nasty, sinful people. The Pharisees had their standards.

God has standards too—high standards. He expects us to treat others exactly as we want to be treated. It's tempting to avoid those we find hard to love and to stick with people who are more like us. That way we can still be loving, but it doesn't really put us out. That's not what Jesus was talking about; he said anyone can do that. God expects us to show love to our neighbors, no matter who they are.

Do you find some people impossible to love? Jesus used the word love as a verb—an action word. We like to think of it as a noun—something we have (or don't have), not something we do. Don't waste your time considering whether someone is worthy of your love; that's not your concern. Instead, ask God to help you act lovingly today toward everyone you encounter, even when it's difficult.

John MacArthur- WHO IS YOUR NEIGHBOR? MATTHEW 22:39 [Truth for Today: A Daily Touch of God's Grace - Page 231](#)

Jesus answered the Jewish lawyer's question, "Who is my neighbor?" with the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:30–37). In this familiar story, a Jewish man is beaten and left for dead on the road. A compassionate Samaritan rescues the man, even though Samaritans and Jews normally hated one another.

The point of the story is that your neighbor is whoever comes across your path with a need. Would you have reacted the way the Samaritan did if you had encountered the injured man along the side of the road? Hopefully you would not have passed him by, as the priest and Levite did in the story.

The lesson of the parable is not that you must stop and help everyone who has a flat tire, or that you have to give money to every panhandler you meet. But God wants you to be sensitive to such situations and willing to help if you think your assistance is the only aid the person is likely to receive. In other words, follow the Golden Rule: "Therefore, whatever you want men to do to you, do also to them" (Matt. 7:12).

Question: [What does it mean to love your neighbor as you love yourself? | GotQuestions.org](#)

Answer: An expert in the law tried to test the Lord Jesus by asking Him to declare what was the greatest commandment in the Law of Moses. In one masterful statement, Jesus condensed the entire law that God had given Moses: "You shall love the LORD your

God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like it: 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' On these two commandments hang all the Law and the Prophets" (Matthew 22:37–40).

When we read the Ten Commandments in Exodus 20, we are struck with the realization that they focus on these two issues. Certainly we are to love God supremely. But what does it mean to love our neighbor as ourselves?

Jesus is quoting here from Leviticus 19. Let's look at its context:

"When you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not wholly reap the corners of your field, nor shall you gather the gleanings of your harvest. And you shall not glean your vineyard, nor shall you gather every grape of your vineyard; you shall leave them for the poor and the stranger: I am the LORD your God. You shall not steal, nor deal falsely, nor lie to one another. And you shall not swear by My name falsely, nor shall you profane the name of your God: I am the LORD. You shall not cheat your neighbor, nor rob him. The wages of him who is hired shall not remain with you all night until morning. You shall not curse the deaf, nor put a stumbling block before the blind, but shall fear your God: I am the LORD. You shall do no injustice in judgment. You shall not be partial to the poor, nor honor the person of the mighty. In righteousness you shall judge your neighbor. You shall not go about as a talebearer among your people; nor shall you take a stand against the life of your neighbor: I am the LORD. You shall not hate your brother in your heart. You shall surely rebuke your neighbor, and not bear sin because of him. You shall not take vengeance, nor bear any grudge against the children of your people, but you shall love your neighbor as yourself: I am the LORD" (Leviticus 19:9–18).

Notice that loving our neighbor would include sharing with the poor and the alien; compassion and absolute honesty and justice in our relationships with others; impartiality; a refusal to be a party to gossip or slander; an absence of malice toward anyone and a refusal to bear a grudge; taking care never to put another's life at risk and never taking private vengeance upon another. It is also interesting to note that when we have an issue with anyone, we should strive to make it right by going to him or her directly. James calls this the "royal law" (James 2:8). Our Lord taught that we should do to others as we would have them do to us (Matthew 7:12).

It is a fact that anyone who does not have a personal relationship with God through the Lord Jesus Christ will die in his sins and face eternity in hell. Therefore, we owe it to our neighbors to lovingly share with them the good news of the gospel. True believers have been forgiven, possess eternal life, and have blessings forever as the result of others who have shared the gospel with them. God's love is evidenced in us as we communicate this precious gospel and love others as we have been loved.

Question - [What does the Bible say about self-love, loving self?](https://www.gotquestions.org/What-does-the-Bible-say-about-self-love-loving-self/) | [GotQuestions.org](https://www.gotquestions.org/)

Answer: Love as described in the Bible is quite different from the love as espoused by the world. Biblical love is selfless and unconditional, whereas the world's love is characterized by selfishness. In the following passages, we see that love does not exist apart from God and that true love can only be experienced by one who has experienced God's own love firsthand:

Romans 13:9–10, "The commandments, 'Do not commit adultery,' 'Do not murder,' 'Do not steal,' 'Do not covet,' and whatever other commandment there may be, are summed up in this one rule: 'Love your neighbor as yourself.' Love does no harm to its neighbor. Therefore love is the fulfillment of the law."

John 13:34–35, "A new command I give you: Love one another. As I have loved you, so you must love one another. By this all men will know that you are my disciples, if you love one another."

1 John 4:16–19, "And so we know and rely on the love God has for us. God is love. Whoever lives in love lives in God, and God in him. In this way, love is made complete among us so that we will have confidence on the day of judgment, because in this world we are like him. There is no fear in love. But perfect love drives out fear, because fear has to do with punishment. The one who fears is not made perfect in love. We love because he first loved us."

The statement "love your neighbor as yourself" is not a command to love yourself. It is natural and normal to love yourself—it is our default position. There is no lack of self-love in our world. The command to "love your neighbor as yourself" is essentially telling us to treat other people as well as we treat ourselves. **Scripture never commands us to love ourselves; it assumes we already do.** In fact, people in their unregenerate condition love themselves too much—that is our problem. (ED: compare 2 Ti 3:2+).

In Jesus' parable of the Good Samaritan, there was only one who showed himself to be a true neighbor to the man in need: the Samaritan (Luke 10:30–37). There were two others, a priest and a Levite, who refused to help the man in need. Their failure to show love to the injured man was not the result of loving themselves too little; it was the result of loving themselves too much and therefore putting their interests first. The Samaritan showed true love—he gave of his time, resources, and money with no regard for himself. His focus was outward, not inward. Jesus presented this story as an illustration of what it means to love one's neighbor as one's self (verse 27).

We are to take our eyes off ourselves and care for others. Christian maturity demands it. “Do nothing out of selfish ambition or vain conceit. Rather, in humility value others above yourselves, not looking to your own interests but each of you to the interests of the others” (Philippians 2:3–4). According to this passage, loving others requires humility, a valuing of others, and a conscious effort to put others’ interests first. Anything less than this is selfish and vain—and falls short of the standard of Christ.

None of this should be taken to mean that we should see ourselves as “worthless.” The Bible teaches that we are created in the image of God, and that fact alone gives us great worth (see Luke 12:7). The balanced, biblical view is that we are God’s unique creation, loved by God in spite of our sin, and redeemed by Christ. In His love, we can love others.

We love others based on God’s abiding love for us in Christ. In response to this love, we share it with all whom we come in contact with—our “neighbors.” Someone who is worried that he doesn’t love himself enough has the wrong focus. His concern, biblically, should be his love for God and his love for his neighbor. “Self” is something we want out of the way so that we can love outwardly as we ought.

Related Resources:

- [How should a Christian view self-esteem?](#)
- [What does the Bible say about self-worth?](#)
- [What does the Bible say about self-image?](#)

Norman Geisler - [When Critics Ask](#) - MATTHEW 22:39—Does Jesus want us to love ourself first or others?

PROBLEM: Jesus says in Matthew that we are to love our neighbor as ourselves. But, if we love ourselves first, before we love our neighbor, then this would be putting self before neighbor. Is Jesus teaching that we should be selfish?

SOLUTION: Loving others as we love ourselves can be understood in different ways, but in no way is Jesus implying that we should be selfish. The Bible condemns “lovers of themselves” (2 Tim. 3:2). It exhorts us not to consider only our own interests, but also the interest of others (Phil. 2:4). There are three ways to understand the phrase, “love others as yourself.”

First, some believe that Jesus is saying that we ought to love others as we ought to love ourselves, namely, unselfishly. This, however, seems far too subtle and dialectical for Jesus’ normally straight-forward moral assertions. It would have been more forthright to simply say do not be selfish than the tangled command of loving oneself unselfishly.

Second, Jesus could have meant that we should love others as we ought to love ourselves, namely, properly. There is a legitimate self-respect or self-love. Ephesians tells us to care for our own bodies, “for no one ever hated his own flesh, but nourishes and cherishes it” (5:28–29). There is nothing wrong with a legitimate self-care and self-respect. The Bible condemns someone for “thinking of himself more highly than he ought,” but urges him to think “soberly” (Rom. 12:3). In this sense, Jesus may be saying love others as you ought to love yourselves.

Third, Jesus could have meant that we should love others as much as we do love ourselves. That is, He might have been saying that we should measure how we ought to love others by how we actually do love ourselves without implying that the way we love ourselves is correct. Rather, God may be simply pointing to love for self as the standard by which we should judge how much to love others. In this way, there would be an automatic check on our selfish love, since we would have to love others this much too.

The Good Atheist

You shall love your neighbor as yourself. —Romans 13:9

When a man learned that an elderly woman could no longer buy her medicine and pay her rent, he came to her rescue. He took her into his home and treated her as if she were his mother. He gave her a bedroom, prepared the food for her meals, bought her medicine, and transported her whenever she needed medical attention. He continued to care for her when she could no longer do much for herself. I was amazed when I learned that this good man was a zealous atheist!

The Jews were shocked by Jesus’ parable of the Good Samaritan, because He put him in a positive light. They despised the Samaritans the way I tend to look down on atheists.

A lawyer had tested Jesus by asking how he could inherit eternal life. Jesus asked him what the law said. The man answered that he must love the Lord with all his heart and his neighbor as himself (Luke 10:25-27). He asked Jesus, “Who is my neighbor?” (v.29). In Jesus’ story, the Samaritan was the neighbor who showed kindness to the wounded man.

Jesus wanted this parable to challenge His listeners. The stories of the Good Samaritan and the good atheist remind us of this high

standard of God's Word: "Love your neighbor as yourself" (Romans 13:9). By Herbert Vander Lugt ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

To love my neighbor as myself
Is not an easy task,
But God will show His love through me
If only I will ask.
—Sper

Needy people need our helping hand.

Matthew 22:40 "On these two commandments depend the whole Law and the Prophets."

KJV Matthew 22:40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.

BGT Matthew 22:40 ν τα ταις τα ς δυς ν ντολα ς λος ν μο ς κρ μαται κα ο προφ ται.

NET Matthew 22:40 All the law and the prophets depend on these two commandments."

CSB Matthew 22:40 All the Law and the Prophets depend on these two commands."

ESV Matthew 22:40 On these two commandments depend all the Law and the Prophets."

NIV Matthew 22:40 All the Law and the Prophets hang on these two commandments."

NLT Matthew 22:40 The entire law and all the demands of the prophets are based on these two commandments."

NRS Matthew 22:40 On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

NJB Matthew 22:40 On these two commandments hang the whole Law, and the Prophets too.'

NAB Matthew 22:40 The whole law and the prophets depend on these two commandments."

YLT Matthew 22:40 on these -- the two commands -- all the law and the prophets do hang.'

MIT Matthew 22:40 The full application of the law and prophets derives from these two commands!"

GWN Matthew 22:40 All of Moses' Teachings and the Prophets depend on these two commandments."

BBE Matthew 22:40 On these two rules all the law and the prophets are based.

RSV Matthew 22:40 On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets."

- Mt 7:12 Jn 1:17 Ro 3:19-21 13:9 1Ti 1:5 1Jn 4:7-11,19-21 Jas 2:8

Related Passages:

Mark 12:31+ "The second is this, 'YOU SHALL LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF.' There is no other commandment greater than these."

Romans 13:8-10+ Owe nothing to anyone except to love one another; for he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the law. 9 For this, "YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT ADULTERY, YOU SHALL NOT MURDER, YOU SHALL NOT STEAL, YOU SHALL NOT COVET," and if there is any other commandment, it is summed up in this saying, "YOU SHALL LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOR AS YOURSELF." 10 Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore **love is the fulfillment of the law.**

LOVE THE HEART OF THE LAW

On these two commandments depend (hang - [kremannumi](#)) **the whole Law and the Prophets** (refers to entire OT) - The **Law** referred to the the Torah (Genesis–Deuteronomy) while the **Prophets** referred to the prophetic and historical writings (e.g., Isaiah, Jeremiah, Samuel, Kings). In other words these designations in effect refer to all of God's revealed will in the Hebrew Scriptures. The picture of the verb depend is of a door that swings on two hinges, or a structure hanging from a central beam. These two commandments are like hooks — everything else hangs on them. All the laws in Scripture flow from love -- Laws about worship,

justice, mercy, purity, honesty, and community all express love for God or neighbor. You can't fulfill the Law without love. Even perfect obedience (clearly impossible) to rules without love misses the heart of God's commandments. On the other hand, love is not a replacement for the Law — it is its fulfillment (cf. Romans 13:8–10).

*Love for God and others isn't just part of obedience —
it is the essence of it.*

These two commandments are intimately related to each other. In short, the inevitable proof of our love for God is our love for men (especially fellow believers) (1 John 2:9-10; 3:17; 4:8, 12). Together, these two commandments essentially are a summation of all Ten Commandments, because the first four commandments are all related to love for God while the last six describe features of love for man.

*Without these two commandments,
the Bible is sterile.*

D. A. Carson: There is no question here of the priority of love over law—i.e., one system over another—but of the priority of love within the law. These two commandments are the greatest because all Scripture “hangs” on them; i.e., nothing in Scripture can cohere or be truly obeyed unless these two are observed. Love is “the primary hermeneutical principle for interpreting and applying the law” (Mohrlang, Matthew and Paul, 95). The entire biblical revelation demands heart religion marked by total allegiance to God, loving him and loving one's neighbor. Without these two commandments, the Bible is sterile. This pericope prepares the way for the denunciations of Mt 23:1–36 and conforms fully to Jesus' teaching elsewhere. (See [The Expositor's Bible Commentary](#))

To fulfill these commands is to fulfill all others.
--Grassmick

Paul writes "Love does no wrong to a neighbor; therefore love is the fulfillment of the law." (Ro 13:10)

Hiebert adds that "All other commands will be fulfilled to the measure that these two are fulfilled. The first commandment summarizes the first table of the Decalogue (Exod. 20:2–11+), a man's duties to God, while the second summarizes the second table (Exod. 20:12–17+), man's duties to his fellow man. Matthew recorded that Jesus went on to say, “On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets” (22:40). The prophetic as well as the legal Scriptures find their inspiration in love. This double love comprehends all righteousness. Thus the essence of the believer's duty, both godward and manward, is moral and not ceremonial. ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expository Commentary](#))

Wiersbe - Jesus made love the most important thing in life, because “love is the fulfilling of the Law” (Rom. 13:8–10). If we love God, we will experience His love within and will express that love to others. We do not live by rules but by relationships, a loving relationship to God that enables us to have a loving relationship with others. ([Bible Exposition Commentary](#)).

One's love for people reveals the degree of his love for God
-- Gilbrant

Dwight Edwards - As we pursue our relationship with God in whole-hearted devotion, the immediate spill over of the fullness of that relationship will be into the lives of other men and women. Note also the significance of the order: first God, second people. We cannot give to others out of spiritual and emotional bankruptcy, thus our relationship with God must be the top priority of our life. ([Commentary](#))

THOUGHT - If your horizontal relationships are "messed up," don't pretend to be in communion and fellowship with God (vertical relationship. John said it this way "If we say that we have fellowship with Him (VERTICAL) and yet walk in the darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth; 7 but if we walk in the Light as He Himself is in the Light, we have fellowship with one another (HORIZONTAL), and the blood of Jesus His Son cleanses us from all sin." (1 John 1:6-7+)

Note that the parallel passage in Mark gives additional information not found in Matthew's account...

Mark 12:32-34 (See commentary on these verses) The scribe said to Him, “Right, Teacher; You have truly stated that HE IS ONE, AND THERE IS NO ONE ELSE BESIDES HIM; 33 AND TO LOVE HIM WITH ALL THE HEART AND WITH ALL THE UNDERSTANDING AND WITH ALL THE STRENGTH, AND TO LOVE ONE'S NEIGHBOR AS HIMSELF, is much more than all burnt offerings and sacrifices.” 34 When Jesus saw that he had answered intelligently, He said to him, “You are not far from the kingdom of God.” After that, no one would venture to ask Him any more questions.

stated in Acts 10:39, also Lk 23:39+). In Mt 18:6 Jesus describes a "heavy millstone...hung around his neck," referring to anyone who cause one of the little ones who believe in Him to stumble. Used to describe the poisonous viper "hanging from" Paul's hand (Acts 28:4). **Paul** used this verb in his famous explanation in Galatians 3:13+ "Christ redeemed us from the curse of the Law, having become a curse for us—for it is written, "CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO **HANGS** ON A TREE" (Dt 21:22, 23).

Kremannumi - 7x in 7v - depend(1), hanged(1), hanging(3), hangs(1), hung(1). - Mt 18:6 Mt 22:40 Luke 23:39 Acts 5:30 Acts 10:39 Acts 28:4 Gal 3:13

Driving Lessons

There is no other commandment greater than these. — Mark 12:31

Today's Scripture: Mark 12:28-34

One morning on my way to work, I began to wonder, Why should I obey God's laws? The answer played out as I approached a traffic light that had just turned yellow. A driver at the intersection waited to make sure I had fully stopped. Why did I stop? I asked myself. I could have made it.

Two reasons came to mind—survival and surveillance. I could be injured or killed. Or a police officer might see me and give me a ticket. Good reasons, don't you think? But are these the highest motives? Am I concerned about other drivers?

Obedying God's commands out of fear would reduce much of the wreckage strewn along life's highway due to adultery, murder, lying, stealing, and coveting. But there is a higher motive. When Jesus was asked, "Which is the first commandment of all?" He answered, "Love the Lord your God with all your heart," and second, "Love your neighbor as yourself." Then He said, "There is no other commandment greater than these" (Mark 12:30-31).

Once we put our faith in Christ as our Savior and experience God's love, our motivation for obeying His commands changes. That means we slow down at God's "yellow lights," stop at His "red lights," and proceed at His "green lights" for the highest reason—love. By: Dennis J. DeHaan ([Our Daily Bread, Copyright RBC Ministries, Grand Rapids, MI. — Reprinted by permission. All rights reserved](#))

"We love You, Lord Jesus," we often may say,
But are we as ready His will to obey?
Let's heed what God's Spirit would have us to do,
That's how we can show Him a love that is true.
—DJD

To love God is to obey God.

Matthew 22:41 Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question:

KJV Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them,

BGT Matthew 22:41 Συνηγμῶν δὲ τῶν Φαρισαίων πηρὶ τήσεν αὐτοῦ ἠσοῦς

NET Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were assembled, Jesus asked them a question:

CSB Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were together, Jesus questioned them,

ESV Matthew 22:41 Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question,

NIV Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them,

NLT Matthew 22:41 Then, surrounded by the Pharisees, Jesus asked them a question:

NRS Matthew 22:41 Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them this question:

NJB Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were gathered round, Jesus put to them this question,

NAB Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus questioned them,

YLT Matthew 22:41 And the Pharisees having been gathered together, Jesus did question them,

MIT Matthew 22:41 Because the Pharisees were gathered around, Jesus raised a question for them:

GWN Matthew 22:41 While the Pharisees were still gathered, Jesus asked them,


- Mt 22:15,34 Mk 12:35-37 Lu 20:41-44

Related Passages:

Mark 12:35+ **And Jesus began to say, as He taught in the temple,** "How is it that the scribes say that the Christ is the [Son of David](#)?"

Herod's Temple

King Herod the Great began renovations on the Second Temple approximately 20-19 BC. The entire temple wasn't completed until approximately 62-64 AD, only to be destroyed by the Romans in 70 AD.



(Copyright 2014 Faithlife / Logos Bible Software)

MY TURN: JESUS COUNTERATTACKS!

Now while the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them a question - It is almost like Jesus said "Now it's My turn to ask you a question!" In this section we see that now it is Jesus asking the question to His questioners and it is not surprising, His hearers are left speechless (see Mt 22:46). Those listening include the Pharisees (Mt 22:41) and a **large crowd** (Mk 12:37) which would place Him in the large Court of the Gentiles in the Temple Complex (click picture above).

Charles Swindoll: The Pharisees had asked Jesus about politics; the Sadducees had asked about the afterlife; the lawyer had asked about the Law. Now Jesus took a dive into the waters of deep theology. He asked the Pharisees what they believed about the identity of the Messiah: "Whose son is He?" (Mt 22:42). (See [Insights on Matthew 16--28 - Page 184](#))

So Mark says He was teaching and here are a group of Pharisees, His avowed enemies and He is still teaching them! Not only is He teaching but as we will discuss below, He teaching them truth about Himself which if grasped could set them free from their legalism and eternal death. One might say, "I thought we were not supposed to cast our pearls before swine." (Mt 7:6+) True enough. But Jesus sees hearts and has just stated in Mk 12:34 **"You are not far from the kingdom of God"**. Jesus knew there were men like Joseph of Arimathea who would eventually believe in Him (Mt 27:57+) and provide His burial tomb (Mt 27:59-60+). Mark 15:43+ describes Joseph of Arimathea as "a prominent member of the Council, who himself was waiting for the kingdom of God (cf others "waiting" - Lk 2:38+)." Of course the other side of coin is that for those who reject what amounts to an evangelistic question regarding the meaning of Psalm 110:1 will be held even more accountable for their rejection (this principle of a greater degree of judgment for rejection of greater light is found in Lk 10:12-15+).

Deffinbaugh on resolving how Matthew's passage fits with Luke's passage (Lu 20:41-44) - In Matthew's account, Jesus is reported as having asked the Pharisees directly about whose son the Christ was (Mt 22:41-42). In Mark and Luke, Jesus seems to be speaking to others about the teaching of the Pharisees. I see no contradiction. Jesus was daily in the temple, teaching the people. It was also here that our Lord was confronted and challenged by the leadership of the nation. I believe that Jesus asked the Pharisees directly, at this time of confrontation, and then referred to it in His subsequent teaching (Lk 20:41). They had all heard the question posed to the Pharisees by Jesus, and the answer that was given (ED: BUT IN FACT NO ANSWER BY JESUS IS ACTUALLY RECORDED IN ALL THREE SYNOPTIC ACCOUNTS!). Now, Jesus would challenge the crowd to think about what they had heard, and to come to their own conclusions.

If we compare the parallel passage in Matthew, Matthew 22:42 seems to be where Jesus begins His conversation with the Pharisees (but [see Deffinbaugh's analysis](#)), asking them a direct question **"What do you think about the Christ, whose son is He?"** They respond **"David."** (the phrase *"son of"* is added but is not in the Greek) (Mt 22:42) They say Messiah had to be a [Son of David](#), where **"son of..."** is a Hebraism which simply means a descendant of and in this context a "descendant of David".

Hiebert refers to Mark 12:35-40 as "Counterattack by Jesus explaining "Having brought the enemy attacks to a halt, Jesus now took the offensive against the religious leaders. With His question concerning Messiah's Sonship, He exposed the inadequacy of the

scribes as teachers (vv. 35–37) and then uttered His solemn condemnation of their conduct (vv. 38–40). ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

*Jesus turns the tables and questions the Pharisees,
not to trap them or even to win a debate but to win their hearts*

David Turner: In this passage Jesus turns the tables and questions the Pharisees, not to trap them or even to win a debate but to win their hearts (cf. Mt 23:37). This is not a mere counterattack (contra Schnackenburg 2002:224). The paramount considerations at this decisive point in Israel's history are Jesus's identity and the source of his authority (Mt 21:23).....The questions of the religious leaders attempt to trap Jesus and to discredit his teaching. All hope of rapprochement between Jesus and the religious leaders is dashed. His final question to them is unanswerable; the only way that David can call his messianic son "Lord" is if his son is divine. The Pharisees who wished to trap Jesus are now trapped by Jesus. But all dialogue has ceased, with ominous implications. This final confrontation leaves Jesus and the Jewish leaders at a hopeless impasse and leads inevitably to the woes of Matt. 23. (See [Matthew Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament](#))

Matthew Henry Concise Mt 22:41-46. When Christ baffled his enemies, he asked what thoughts they had of the promised Messiah? How he could be the [Son of David](#) and yet his Lord? He quotes Psalms 110:1. If the Christ was to be a mere man, who would not exist till many ages after David's death, how could his forefather call him Lord? The Pharisees could not answer it. Nor can any solve the difficulty except he allows the Messiah to be the Son of God, and David's Lord equally with the Father. He took upon him human nature, and so became God manifested in the flesh; in this sense he is the Son of man and the Son of David. It behoves us above all things seriously to inquire, "What think we of Christ?" Is he altogether glorious in our eyes, and precious to our hearts? May Christ be our joy, our confidence, our all. May we daily be made more like to him, and more devoted to his service.

What Think Ye of Christ? Matthew 22:41–45. - Burris Butler

Introduction Two questions all must answer are "What think ye of Christ?" and "What will you do with Jesus?"

I. The Answer of a Closed Mind.

If He is the Son of David, how then (by inference) is He the Son of God?

- A. There are always questions the closed mind cannot answer.
- B. Let us not be satisfied with a half-Christ.

II. Answer of an Eager Disciple.

"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God" (Matthew 16:16).

- A. The eager disciple quoted above later said, "Be it far from thee, Lord."
- B. Many today accept Him as Lord, but are unwilling to go the way of the cross.

III. Answer of an Honest Doubter.

"Except I shall see ... I will not believe" (John 20:25).

- A. There is a place for honest skepticism.
- B. The doubter later said, "My Lord and my God" (John 20:28). This statement was the sure foundation of the testimony of the apostles.

IV. Answer of Demons.

"I know thee who thou art, the Holy One of God" (Mark 1:24).
(Their testimony should be worth something.)

V. Answer of the Angels.

- A. At His birth.
- B. At Gethsemane.
- C. At the tomb.
- D. At the ascension.

VI. Answer of Our Generation.

Indifference: We don't care who He is!

Indifference

When Jesus came to Golgotha they hanged Him on a tree,
They drove great nails through His hands and feet, and made a Calvary;
They crowned Him with a crown of thorns, red were His wounds and deep.
For those were crude and cruel days and human life was cheap.

But when Jesus came to Birmingham they simply passed Him by,
They never hurt a hair of Him, they only let Him die;
For men had grown more tender, and they would not give Him pain,
They only just passed down the street, and left Him in the rain.

Still Jesus cried, "Forgive them for they know not what they do,"
And still it rained the winter rain that drenched Him through and through;
The crowds went home and left the streets without a soul to see,
And Jesus crouched against a wall and cried for Calvary.

—G. A. Studdert-Kennedy

VII. Answer of God the Father.

- A. At the baptism of Jesus.
- B. At the transfiguration.
- C. At the resurrection.

Conclusion Answer the question, "What think ye of the Christ?"

Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the Christ, whose son is He?" They *said to Him, "The [Son of David](#)."

KJV Matthew 22:42 Saying, What think ye of Christ? whose son is he? They say unto him, The Son of David.

BGT Matthew 22:42 λ γων· τ μ ν δοκε περ το χριστο ; τ νος υ ς στιν; λ γουσιν α τ · το Δαυ δ.

NET Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" They said, "The son of David."

CSB Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the Messiah? Whose Son is He?" "David's," they told Him.

ESV Matthew 22:42 saying, "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" They said to him, "The son of David."

NIV Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the Christ? Whose son is he?" "The son of David," they replied.

NLT Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the Messiah? Whose son is he?" They replied, "He is the son of David."

NRS Matthew 22:42 "What do you think of the Messiah? Whose son is he?" They said to him, "The son of David."

NJB Matthew 22:42 'What is your opinion about the Christ? Whose son is he?' They told him, 'David's.'

NAB Matthew 22:42 saying, "What is your opinion about the Messiah? Whose son is he?" They replied, "David's."

YLT Matthew 22:42 saying, 'What do ye think concerning the Christ? of whom is he son?' They say to him, 'Of David.'

MIT Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the messiah—specifically, whose son is he?" They said, "David's son."

GWN Matthew 22:42 "What do you think about the Messiah? Whose son is he?" They answered him, "David's."

- **What:** Mt 2:4-6 14:33 16:13-17 Jn 1:49 6:68,69 20:28 Php 2:9-11 3:7-10 Col 3:11 1Pe 2:4-7 Rev 5:12-14
- **The Son:** Mt 1:1 21:9 Isa 7:13,14 9:6,7 11:1-4 Jer 23:5,6 Eze 34:23,24 Am 9:11 Lu 1:69,70 Jn 7:41,42 Ac 13:22,23

Related Passages:

Mark 12:35+ And Jesus began to say, as He taught in the temple, "How is it that the scribes ([grammateus](#)) say that the Christ is the [Son of David](#)?

Luke 20:41+ Then He said to them, "How is it that they say the Christ is David's son?




Chart From [Bible Knowledge Commentary](#)

WHAT THINK YE OF THE MESSIAH?

What do you think about the Christ ([Christos](#) - MESSIAH), whose son ([huios](#)) is He?" They *said ([historical present tense](#)) to Him, "The son of David - The first clause could have brought many answers but Jesus immediately narrows it down asking a question about Messiah's ancestry. The religious leaders dare not question Jesus any longer. In Matthew 22 each of the groups of religious leaders had struck attempting to entrap Jesus. They have nothing left they can say and they know it. And Luke 20:40+ (cf Mt 22:46+ "nor did anyone dare") says they don't have the courage to ask anything else. So now it is Jesus' turn to initiate the questions.

"Who is the great man
from whom the Messiah is descended?"
-- Leon Morris



Scribe in Long Robe

Mark 12:35+ adds "And Jesus began to say, as He taught in the temple," **How is it that the scribes ([grammateus](#)) say that the Christ is the [Son of David](#)?** - Amazing! Jesus knows He will soon die in just a few day and yet He is still **TEACHING!** What does that say about how important it is that we continue teaching (**THOUGHT** - and that includes us older guys out there -- If you are 70+ and you are not teaching, let me say it gently "Shame on you!" We called to imitate our Lord (1Jn 2:6+, etc). We know when we are 70+ that we are in the last part of our race and we should ask God to enable us by His Spirit to be able to quote 2 Ti 4:7+ on our deathbed.) The **scribes** were the recognized experts in the law. It was the firm teaching of the scribes that the Christ is the [Son of David](#). Jesus' used the name Christ in the sense of "Messiah." Some translations render it with that meaning, as in the CSB "How can the scribes say that the **Messiah** is the [Son of David](#)?" (Mk 12:35CSB).

Geddert - Jesus has not usually taken the initiative in his debates with his opponents. They have posed the questions (Mk 11:28; 12:14–15; 12:23; 12:28), and he has responded. This time Jesus takes the initiative. Jesus' question implies a critique against the scribes. They claim that the Messiah is the son of David. ([Mark Believers Church Bible Commentary](#))

Hiebert makes an interesting comment - That no questions were raised on this point against Jesus as Messiah proves that **His Davidic descent was unassailable**. Only two days before, the crowd had acclaimed Him as "the son of David" (ED: CLEARLY A MESSIANIC TITLE!) (Matt. 21:9; Luke 19:38). But the Jewish masses, following the lead of the scribes, understood the term to

mean a human being who would be a triumphant warrior-king (ED: THEY WERE NOT LOOKING FOR A SAVIOR FROM SINS BUT A CONQUEROR OF THE ROMANS!). ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

One final evangelistic effort

John MacArthur characterizes Jesus' question regarding Ps 110:1 as His "one final evangelistic effort. Even after all the hatred expressed by these leaders, the superficial interest of the fickle, indecisive crowd, Jesus in spite of all of the rejection is still the compassionate evangelist. He is still (evangelizing) even in His very last conversation, inviting sinners who otherwise are headed to hell, to know Him for Who He truly is, to cease their rejection and indecision....He still manifests enough concern to speak one more time the truth for He as God has no pleasure in the death of the wicked (Ezek 33:11, cf Ezek 18:23, 2Pe 3:9+). His joy is in the salvation of sinners. His sadness is in their destruction.(cf Lk 19:41+ where Jesus wept over Jerusalem)....So, once more, the Lord Jesus affirms and asserts His divine nature as God, and thus offers Himself even to those who despised Him."

NET NOTE - Christ - The term χριστός ([Christos](#)) was originally an adjective ("anointed"), developing in LXX into a substantive ("an anointed one"), then developing still further into a technical generic term ("the anointed one"). In the intertestamental period it developed further into a technical term referring to the hoped-for ANOINTED ONE, that is, a specific individual. In the NT the development starts there (technical-specific), is so used in the gospels, and then develops in Paul to mean virtually Jesus' last name. **It was a common belief in Judaism that Messiah would be the son of David** in that he would come from the **lineage of David**. On this point the Pharisees agreed and were correct. But their understanding was nonetheless incomplete, for Messiah is also **David's Lord**. With this statement Jesus was affirming that, as the Messiah, He is both God and Man.

Akin - The Davidic sonship of the Messiah was a common and almost universally accepted belief in Israel in Jesus' day. It is still a popular belief today among orthodox Jews. For example in John 7:42 we read, "Has not the Scripture said that the Christ comes from the offspring of David, and comes from Bethlehem, the village where David was?" Indeed the Davidic sonship of the Messiah is firmly and widely established in Old Testament scripture: - 2 Sam 7:1-17 - Jere. 23:5-6 -Hosea 3:5 - Ps. 89:3-4 - Jere. 30:9 - Amos 9:11 - Isa. 9:1-7 - Jere. 33:15-17, 22 - Micah 5:2-5 3 - Isa. 11:1-9 - Ezk. 34:23-24 The Messiah, the Christ, the Anointed One of God, will be a human descendant of David. This was expected. This was a long hoped for reality among the Jewish people. On this they could all agree.

Wuest - Before considering the implication of our Lord's words here, we need to define certain terms. The word **'Christ'** is the transliteration of the Greek word christos, which means "the Anointed One," and this Greek word is the translation of the Hebrew word transliterated into English in the word **"Messiah."** The latter word has a definite connotation, namely, the future King of Israel who will someday reign on the throne of David. The word **"son"** as used here is a Hebraism speaking of a descendant. The word **"Lord"** is the translation of the Greek word kurios which in itself means "master, one who has power over another," and is the translation in the LXX of the august title of God in the Hebrew Old Testament, Jehovah. It has implications of deity. ([Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English reader](#))

William Barclay: The most common title of the Messiah was [Son of David](#). Behind it lay the expectation that there would one day come a great prince of the line of David who would shatter Israel's enemies and lead the people to the conquest of all nations. The Messiah was most commonly thought of in nationalistic, political, military terms of power and glory. This is another attempt by Jesus to alter that conception. . . The clear result of the argument is that it is not adequate to call the Messiah [Son of David](#). He is not David's son; he is David's lord. When Jesus healed the blind men, they called him [Son of David](#) (Matthew 20:30). When he entered Jerusalem, the crowds hailed him as [Son of David](#) (Matthew 21:9). Jesus is here saying: 'It is not enough to call the Messiah [Son of David](#). It is not enough to think of him as a prince of David's line and an earthly conqueror. You must go beyond that, for the Messiah is David's lord.' What did Jesus mean? He can have meant only one thing – that the true description of him is Son of God. [Son of David](#) is not an adequate title; only Son of God will do. And, if that is so, Messiahship is not to be thought of in terms of Davidic conquest, but in terms of divine and sacrificial love. Here, then, Jesus makes his greatest claim. In him, there came not the earthly conqueror who would repeat the military triumphs of David, but the Son of God who would demonstrate the love of God upon his cross. (See [The Gospel of Matthew - volume 2](#))

Christ (5547) [Christos](#) from [chrio](#) = to rub or anoint, consecrate to an office) describes one who has been anointed with oil, one who has been consecrated. The majority of the NT uses refer to Jesus (exceptions = "false Christs" - Mt 24:24, Mk 13:22). Christos describes one who has been anointed, symbolizing appointment to a task. It is used here as the title "Anointed One" and is the Greek synonym for "Messiah." Christos is used in the [Septuagint](#) describing everyone anointed with the holy oil, especially the priesthood (Lev. 4:5+, Lev 4:16+) and it is also a name applied to those who were acting as redeemers like Cyrus. **Gilbrant** writes that "Hamilton suggests a fourfold significance to such anointing ("māshach," Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament, 1:530): (1) separation unto God, (2) authorization by God, (3) divine enablement, and (4) the coming Deliverer.

CHRISTOS IN MATTHEW - Matt. 1:1; Matt. 1:16; Matt. 1:17; Matt. 1:18; Matt. 2:4; Matt. 11:2; Matt. 16:16;

Related Resource:

- See [Messiah - Anointed One](#)

BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW - As will be discussed Psalm 110:1 when properly interpreted shows that the Messiah would be a man (David's son) and would also be God (David's Lord). The Jews then believed Messiah would be human but not God. The Jews of Jesus' day believed Messiah would descend from the line of David. However, because all Jewish genealogy records were destroyed in 70 AD, there is no way a Jew today could even determine if a supposed Messiah was actually a descendant of David! So while Jesus was alive the Jews still had the ability to validate that His lineage was from David on both His father's and mother's side. While there is no Biblical record that His lineage was studied by the religious leaders, there is little doubt that they meticulously reviewed the Temple genealogy records. If they could have proven definitively from these records that Jesus did not fulfill the criterion of origin from the line of David, then they would have used that as evidence to demonstrate He could not possibly have been the Messiah. And not only is there no record of their refutation of His origin from the line of David, there is also not one Biblical record that the religious leaders ever questioned the authenticity of any of Jesus' miraculous works. It would have been difficult, for example, for them to question the miraculous resurrection of Lazarus because everywhere he went he was dramatic proof that Jesus had the power to raise the dead from the grave! Keep these background thoughts in mind as you study Jesus "exposition" on Psalm 110:1 which all the Jews of Jesus' day recognized and fully accepted as being a prophecy of the coming Messiah! Also for reference below is a quote from the Jewish website **Judaism 101** which summarizes the belief of modern Jews regarding the idea of the coming Messiah (they do not accept that he has come but that he will come in the future) and note especially that while they mention the Messiah is ""mashiach ben David" (mashiach, [Son of David](#))" they have no genealogy records to prove any future Messiah candidate is actually from David's line! And this is not a minor but a major deficiency, because the Old Testament repeatedly testifies that the Messiah **MUST COME FROM THE LINE OF DAVID!** Thus you can see the major fallacy inherent in modern Jewish thinking regarding the identity of any prospective Messiah!

Quote from Judaism 101 on Identity of the Messiah (this view is apparently generally held by modern orthodox Jews) - The **mashiach** will be a great political leader descended from King David (Jeremiah 23:5). The mashiach is often referred to as "mashiach ben David" (mashiach, son of David). He will be well-versed in Jewish law, and observant of its commandments (Isaiah 11:2-5-my note). He will be a charismatic leader, inspiring others to follow his example. He will be a great military leader, who will win battles for Israel. He will be a great judge, who makes righteous decisions (Jeremiah 33:15-my note). **But above all, he will be a human being, not a god, demi-god or other supernatural being.** It has been said that in every generation, a person is born with the potential to be the mashiach. If the time is right for the messianic age within that person's lifetime, then that person will be the **mashiach**. But if that person dies before he completes the mission of the **mashiach**, then that person is not the **mashiach**....Jews do not believe that Jesus was the **mashiach**. Assuming that he existed, and assuming that the Christian scriptures are accurate in describing him (both matters that are debatable), he simply did not fulfill the mission of the **mashiach** as it is described in the biblical passages cited above. **Jesus did not do any of the things that the Scriptures said the messiah would do** (Source: [Judaism 101](#)) (**Bold font added for emphasis**)

Comment: That **last line in bold** above is absolutely amazing, ignorant and arrogant! May God's Spirit open the eyes of the blind writers of these words to see that in contrary to their false statement Yeshua fulfilled **EVERY Messianic prophecy perfectly** including Psalm 110:1 regarding which His first century Jewish hearers made no reply and no refutation (as far as the Biblical record testifies). As an aside, while I am not Jewish, I can personally testify that the Spirit of the Living God used the many truths of [Messianic Prophecy](#) in the Old Testament (I was saved in the BSF study of the Minor Prophets!) to clarify in my mind the identity of the NT Jesus and ultimately to cause me to be born again (cf 1 Peter 1:3+).

Related Resources:

- [The Jewish Tradition Of Two Messiahs](#)
- [Messianic Prophecies](#)
- [Signs and Wonders - The miracles of Jesus](#)
- [The Miracles Of Jesus](#)
- [The Passion Of Christ: Reflecting On History's Darkest Hour](#)
- [The Amazing Names of the Messiah](#)

Norman Geisler - [When Cultists Ask](#) - MATTHEW 22:42—Does this verse support the doctrine of reincarnation, as the Unity

School of Christianity argues?

MISINTERPRETATION: In Matthew 22:42 Jesus asked the Pharisees, "What do you think about the Christ, whose son is He?" The Pharisees responded, "The son of David." The Unity School of Christianity says this verse indicates that Jesus was a reincarnation of David.

CORRECTING THE MISINTERPRETATION: "Son of" in Hebrew thinking meant "descendent of" (see Matt. 1:1–17), not "reincarnation of." This verse indicates that Jesus came from the lineage of David, not that Jesus was a reincarnation of David. Jesus' birth in the line of David was important, for the Old Testament Scriptures taught that the Messiah had to come from the line of David (2 Sam. 7:12–16; Isa. 9:6–7; 11:1).

Reincarnation goes against the whole of Scripture. For example, while the doctrine of reincarnation teaches that people die over and over again until they reach perfection (Nirvana), the Bible teaches that "it is appointed for men to die once, and after this comes judgment" (Heb. 9:27 NASB). Each human being lives once as a mortal on earth, dies once, and then faces judgment. Jesus taught that people decide their eternal destiny in a single lifetime (Matt. 25:46). This is precisely why the apostle Paul emphasized that "now is the day of salvation" (2 Cor. 6:2). Scripture indicates that at the moment of death believers go into the presence of the Lord (2 Cor. 5:8) and unbelievers go to a place of suffering (Luke 16:19–31), not into another body.

From a practical perspective, if the purpose of karma is to rid humanity of its selfish desires, then why has there not been a noticeable improvement in human nature after all the millennia of reincarnations? And how do reincarnationists explain the immense and ever-worsening social and economic problems in India (including widespread poverty, starvation, disease, and horrible suffering), where reincarnation has been systematically taught throughout its history?

J J Knapp - What Think Ye of Christ? Mat. 22:42

Observe here a most earnest personal question of great importance, because once we will be judged according to the attitude we have taken in this life concerning that Christ. There is barely anything of any importance or we have a personal opinion about it. The word "I think" lies almost permanently upon our lips. The rumour that comes to us cannot be so strange or we are ready with our judgement. How is it possible that so many withdraw themselves from a positive answer upon the question that concerns our eternal well-being: "What think ye of Christ?"

What is our answer upon this soul piercing question? There are many in our times who praise Him as a Teacher in spiritual things, whose wisdom far exceeds that of other people. Certainly, He speaks in the gospel of wonderful things that no eye has seen, no ear heard, and that have not come up in the heart of man. However, if we have no greater expectation of Him, we shall not inherit the salvation despite our respect for His wisdom. There are others who dote upon Him as a heavenly example that we should follow. Certainly, He calls us in His gospel to walk in His footsteps. However, if He is not more to us than this, we face with all our doting love a certain condemnation. What are we to do with a Teacher or an example in the need of our soul when we have need of a Mediator who in His blood redeems us with the holy God? Of a Surety who has paid our debt? Of a Priest who brought the sacrifice of His life to save us from death? Of a King and God who rules us from on high and who leads us in the paths of righteousness? Only if we have this esteem of Christ, oh, not because we were prompted by others, but because the grace of God gave us enlightened eyes to see Him as such a One and to worship Him accordingly, are we safe for time and eternity and do we even have nothing to fear of the judgement.

The question: "What think ye of Christ?" can only be answered if this other question is placed beside it: "What think ye of yourself?" Everyone of us turn to himself with this question. What think ye of your heart? If it is pure, you do not need a Christ who washes you in His blood. If, however, it is spotted, you cannot do without this Christ. What think ye of your debt? If you have no debt, a Surety is superfluous. However, if you are burdened with it yourself, you cannot do without Christ. The less you think of yourself, the more you esteem Christ, before whom you kneel down as before the Son of the living God.

James Smith - WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? MATTHEW 22:42

1. As a Teacher
 2. As a Worker
 3. As a Sufferer.
 4. As a Saviour
 5. As a Master
 6. As a Friend
 7. As a Judge.
-

Robert Morgan - [Saved by His Own Sermon](#) borrow [From This Verse](#)

Quaint, bizarre, eccentric, peculiar—those words describe a little, wiry coal miner named Billy Bray, of Cornwell, England. Before his conversion in November, 1832, Billy lived a vile life. After finding Christ, he became a flaming evangelist and lay preacher.

On a mountain near his home lived a cluster of non-Christian families. Billy, after working underground all day, would emerge from the mines and set out for the mountain, where he visited door-to-door, evangelizing the families. Soon every inhabitant was converted, and a church house was built.

The Church of England sent Rev. W. Haslam to shepherd the families, but when Billy heard the new parson preach, he was upset. Haslam didn't seem to know the gospel. Billy felt the pastor wasn't truly a Christian himself, and he told him so.

Haslam was shaken. The next Sunday as he stood to preach, he announced his text, Matthew 22:42: "What think ye of Christ?" As he began delivering his message, he felt himself trusting Christ as Savior. He was converted while preaching his own sermon.

Billy heard of it and came for a visit. When Haslam came to the door, Billy asked, "Converted, kind sir?" The man said, "Yes, thank God, I am." Billy was so happy, he threw his arms around him, lifted him up, and carried him around the room shouting, "Glory, glory, the parson's converted! Glory be to God."

Mrs. Haslam, hearing the commotion, entered the room, and Billy cried, "Be the missis converted?" She replied, "Yes, thank God." Billy started toward her, but instead of picking her up, he just grinned ear to ear and said, "Oh, I be so happy I can hardly live. Glory! Glory be to God!"

Spurgeon - Morning and Evening - "What think ye of Christ?" —Matthew 22:42

The great test of your soul's health is, What think you of Christ? Is he to you "fairer than the children of men"—"the chief among ten thousand"—the "altogether lovely"? Wherever Christ is thus esteemed, all the faculties of the spiritual man exercise themselves with energy. I will judge of your piety by this barometer: does Christ stand high or low with you? If you have thought little of Christ, if you have been content to live without his presence, if you have cared little for his honour, if you have been neglectful of his laws, then I know that your soul is sick—God grant that it may not be sick unto death! But if the first thought of your spirit has been, how can I honour Jesus? If the daily desire of your soul has been, "O that I knew where I might find him!" I tell you that you may have a thousand infirmities, and even scarcely know whether you are a child of God at all, and yet I am persuaded, beyond a doubt, that you are safe, since Jesus is great in your esteem. I care not for thy rags, what thinkest thou of his royal apparel? I care not for thy wounds, though they bleed in torrents, what thinkest thou of his wounds? are they like glittering rubies in thine esteem? I think none the less of thee, though thou liest like Lazarus on the dunghill, and the dogs do lick thee—I judge thee not by thy poverty: what thinkest thou of the King in his beauty? Has he a glorious high throne in thy heart? Wouldest thou set him higher if thou couldest? Wouldest thou be willing to die if thou couldest but add another trumpet to the strain which proclaims his praise? Ah! then it is well with thee. Whatever thou mayest think of thyself, if Christ be great to thee, thou shalt be with him ere long.

"Though all the world my choice deride,
Yet Jesus shall my portion be;
For I am pleased with none beside,
The fairest of the fair is he"

C H Spurgeon - Questions of the day and the question of the day(Full sermon [Questions of the Day and the Question of the Day](#))

'What think ye of Christ?' Matthew 22:42

'Unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's;' to maintain order, to repress crime, to preserve individual liberty, to protect each man's rights, this is Caesar's business. To teach us religion? Is Caesar to do that? God forbid, for what religion will Caesar teach us? Is he a Pagan? He will enforce idolatry. Is he a Papist? He will ordain Popery. Is he an atheist? He will establish infidelity. Remember the days of Queen Mary and see what Caesar is capable of when he meddles with religion. It is none of Caesar's business to deal with our consciences, neither will we ever obey Caesar in any matter which touches conscience. He may make what laws he will about religion, but by our loyalty to God we pour contempt on Caesar when he usurps the place of God. He is no more to us than the meanest beggar in the street if he goes beyond his legitimate authority. To Caesar, Caesar's; politics to politicians; obedience, cheerful and prompt, to civil rulers: to God, and to God only, the things that are God's; and what are these? Our hearts, our souls, our consciences. Man himself is the coin upon which God has stamped his image and superscription (though, alas, both are sadly marred), and we must render to God our manhood, our wills, our thoughts, our judgments, our minds, our hearts. Consciencs are for God. Any law that touches a conscience is null and void ipso facto, for the simple reason that kings and parliaments have no

right to interfere in the realm of conscience. Conscience is under law to none but God. We do not believe in liberty of conscience towards God. We are bound towards him to believe what he tells us and to do what he bids us; but liberty of conscience in respect to all mankind is the natural right of every man of woman born, and it ought to be tenderly respected.

D L Moody - WHAT THINK YE OF CHRIST? What think ye of Christ?—Matt. 22:42.

I SUPPOSE there is no one here who has not thought more or less about Christ. You have heard about Him, and read about Him, and heard men preach about Him. For eighteen hundred years men have been talking about Him and thinking about Him; and some have their minds made up about who He is, and doubtless some have not. And altho all these years have rolled away, this question comes up, addresst to each of us, to-day, "What think ye of Christ?"

I do not know why it should not be thought a proper question for one man to put to another. If I were to ask you what you think of any of your prominent men, you would already have your mind made up about him. If I were to ask you what you thought of your noble queen, you would speak right out and tell me your opinion in a minute.

If I were to ask about your prime minister, you would tell me freely what you had for or against him. And why should not people make up their minds about the Lord Jesus Christ, and take their stand for or against Him? If you think well of Him, why not speak well of Him and range yourselves on His side? And if you think ill of Him, and believe Him to be an impostor, and that He did not die to save the world, why not lift up your voice and say you are against Him? It would be a happy day for Christianity if men would just take sides—if we could know positively who is really for Him and who is against Him.

It is of very little importance what the world thinks of any one else. The queen and the statesman, the peers and the princes, must soon be gone. Yes; it matters little, comparatively, what we think of them. Their lives can only interest a few; but every living soul on the face of the earth is concerned with this Man. The question for the world is, "What think ye of Christ?"

I do not ask you what you think of the Established Church, or of the Presbyterians, or the Baptists, or the Roman Catholics; I do not ask you what you think of this minister-or that, of this doctrine or that; but I want to ask you what you think of the living person of Christ?

I should like to ask, Was He really the Son of God—the great God-Man? Did He leave heaven and come down to this world for a purpose? Was it really to seek and to save? I should like to begin with the manger, and to follow Him up through the thirty-three years He was here upon earth. I should ask you what you think of His coming into this world and being born in a manger when it might have been a palace; why He left the grandeur and the glory of heaven, and the royal retinue of angels; why He passed by palaces and crowns and dominion and came down here alone.

I should like to ask you what you think of Him as a teacher. He spake as never man spake. I should like to take Him up as a preacher. I should like to bring you to that mountain-side, that we might listen to the words as they fall from His gentle lips. Talk about the preachers of the present day! I would rather a thousand times be five minutes at the feet of Christ than listen a lifetime to all the wise men in the world. He used just to hang truth upon anything. Yonder is a sower, a fox, a bird, and He just gathers the truth around them, so that you cannot see a fox, a sower, or a bird, without thinking what Jesus said. Yonder is a lily of the valley; you cannot see it without thinking of His words, "They toil not, neither do they spin."

He makes the little sparrow chirping in the air preach to us. How fresh those wonderful sermons are, how they live to-day! How we love to tell them to our children, how the children love to hear! "Tell me a story about Jesus," how often we hear it; how the little ones love His sermons! No story-book in the world will ever interest them like the stories that He told. And yet how profound He was; how He puzzled the wise men; how the scribes and the Pharisees would never fathom Him! Oh, do you not think He was a wonderful preacher?

I should like to ask you what you think of Him as a physician. A man would soon have a reputation as a doctor if he could cure as Christ did. No case was ever brought to Him but what He was a match for. He had but to speak the word, and disease fled before Him. Here comes a man covered with leprosy.

"Lord, if thou wilt thou canst make me clean," he cried.

"I will," says the Great Physician, and in an instant the leprosy is gone. The world has hospitals for incurable diseases; but there were no incurable diseases with Him.

Now, see Him in the little home at Bethany, binding up the wounded hearts of Martha and Mary, and tell me what you think of Him as a comforter. He is a husband to the widow and a father to the fatherless. The weary may find a resting-place upon that breast, and the friendless may reckon Him their friend. He never varies, He never fails, He never dies. His sympathy is ever fresh, His love is ever free. Oh, widow and orphans, oh, sorrowing and mourning, will you not thank God for Christ the comforter?

But these are not the points I wish to take up. Let us go to those who knew Christ, and ask what they thought of Him. If you want to find out what a man is nowadays, you inquire about him from those who know him best. I do not wish to be partial; we will go to His enemies, and to His friends. We will ask them, What think ye of Christ? We will ask His friends and His enemies. If we only went to those who liked Him, you would say:

“Oh, he is so blind; he thinks so much of the man that he can't see His faults. You can't get anything out of him unless it be in His favor; it is a one-sided affair altogether.”

So we shall go in the first place to His enemies, to those who hated Him, persecuted Him, cursed and slew Him. I shall put you in the jury-box, and call upon them to tell us what they think of Him.

First, among the witnesses, let us call upon the Pharisees. We know how they hated Him. Let us put a few questions to them. “Come, Pharisees, tell us what you have against the Son of God, What do you think of Christ?” Hear what they say! “This man receiveth sinners.” What an argument to bring against Him! Why, it is the very thing that makes us love Him. It is the glory of the gospel. He receives sinners. If He had not, what would have become of us? Have you nothing more to bring against Him than this? Why, it is one of the greatest compliments that was ever paid Him. Once more: when He was hanging on the tree, you had this to say to Him, “He saved others, but He could not save Himself and save us too.” So He laid down His own life for yours and mine. Yes, Pharisees, you have told the truth for once in your lives! He saved others. He died for others. He was a ransom for many; so it is quite true what you think of Him—He saved others, Himself He cannot save.

Now, let us call upon Caiaphas. Let him stand up here in his flowing robes; let us ask him for his evidence. “Caiaphas, you were chief priest when Christ was tried; you were president of the Sanhedrin; you were in the council-chamber when they found Him guilty; you yourself condemned Him. Tell us; what did the witnesses say? On what grounds did you judge Him? What testimony was brought against Him?” “He hath spoken blasphemy,” says Caiaphas. “He said, ‘Hereafter you shall see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.’ When I heard that, I found Him guilty of blasphemy; I rent my mantle and condemned Him to death.” Yes, all that they had against Him was that He was the Son of God; and they slew Him for the promise of His coming for His bride!

Now let us summon Pilate. Let him enter the witness-box.

“Pilate, this man was brought before you; you examined Him; you talked with Him face to face; what think you of Christ?”

“I find no fault in him,” says Pilate. “He said he was the King of the Jews [just as He wrote it over the cross]; but I find no fault in him.” Such is the testimony of the man who examined Him! And, as He stands there, the center of a Jewish mob, there comes along a man elbowing his way in haste. He rushes up to Pilate, and, thrusting out his hand, gives him a message. He tears it open; his face turns pale as he reads—“Have thou nothing to do with this just man, for I have suffered many things this day in a dream because of him.” It is from Pilate's wife—her testimony to Christ. You want to know what His enemies thought of Him? You want to know what a heathen thought? Well, here it is, “no fault in him”; and the wife of a heathen, “this just man.”

And now, look—in comes Judas. He ought to make a good witness. Let us address him. “Come, tell us, Judas, what think ye of Christ? You knew the Master well; you sold Him for thirty pieces of silver; you betrayed Him with a kiss; you saw Him perform those miracles; you were with Him in Jerusalem. In Bethany, when He summoned up Lazarus, you were there. What think you of Him? I can see him as he comes into the presence of the chief priests; I can hear the money ring as he dashes it upon the table, “I have betrayed innocent blood!” Here is the man who betrayed Him, and this is what he thinks of Him! Yes, those who were guilty of His death put their testimony on record that He was an innocent man.

Let us take the centurion who was present at the execution. He had charge of the Roman soldiers. He told them to make Him carry His cross; he had given orders for the nails to be driven into His feet and hands, for the spear to be thrust in His side. Let the centurion come forward. “Centurion, you had charge of the executioners; you saw that the order for His death was carried out; you saw Him die; you heard Him speak upon the cross. Tell us, what think you of Christ?” Hark! Look at him; he is smiting his breast as he cries, “Truly, this was the son of God!”

I might go to the thief upon the cross, and ask what he thought of Him. At first he railed upon Him and reviled Him. But then he thought better of it: “This man hath done nothing amiss,” he says.

I might go further. I might summon the very devils themselves and ask them for their testimony. Have they anything to say of Him? Why, the very devils called Him the Son of God! In Mark we have the unclean spirit crying, “Jesus, thou Son of the most high God.” Men say, “Oh, I believe Christ to be the Son of God, and because I believe it intellectually I shall be saved.” I tell you the devils did that. And they did more than that, they trembled.

Let us bring in His friends. We want you to hear their evidence. Let us call that prince of preachers. Let us hear the forerunner; none ever preached like this man—this man who drew all Jerusalem and all Judea into the wilderness to hear him; this man who burst

upon the nations like the flash of a meteor. Let John the Baptist come with his leathern girdle and his hairy coat, and let him tell us what he thinks of Christ. His words, tho they were echoed in the wilderness of Palestine, are written in the Book forever, "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" This is what John the Baptist thought of him. "I bear record that He is the Son of God." No wonder he drew all Jerusalem and Judea to him, because he preached Christ. And whenever men preach Christ, they are sure to have plenty of followers.

Let us bring in Peter, who was with Him on the mount of transfiguration, who was with Him the night He was betrayed. Come, Peter, tell us what you think of Christ. Stand in this witness-box and testify of Him. You denied Him once. You said, with a curse, you did not know Him. Was it true, Peter? Don't you know Him? "Know Him!" I can imagine Peter saying: "It was a lie I told then. I did know Him." Afterward I can hear him charging home their guilt upon these Jerusalem sinners. He calls Him "both Lord and Christ." Such was the testimony on the day of Pentecost. "God had made that same Jesus both Lord and Christ." And tradition tells us that when they came to execute Peter he felt he was not worthy to die in the way his Master died, and he requested to be crucified with the head downward. So much did Peter think of Him!

Now let us hear from the beloved disciple John. He knew more about Christ than any other man. He had laid his head on his Savior's bosom. He had heard the throbbing of that loving heart. Look into his Gospel if you wish to know what he thought of Him.

Matthew writes of Him as the royal king come from His throne. Mark writes of Him as the servant, and Luke of the Son of Man. John takes up his pen, and, with one stroke, forever settles the question of Unitarianism. He goes right back before the time of Adam. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." Look into Revelation. He calls him "the bright and the morning star." So John thought well of Him—because he knew Him well.

We might bring in Thomas, the doubting disciple. You doubted Him, Thomas? You would not believe He had risen, and you put your fingers into the wound in His side. What do you think of Him?

"My Lord and my God!" says Thomas.

Then go over to Decapolis and you will find Christ has been there casting out devils. Let us call the men of that country and ask what they think of Him. "He hath done all things well," they say.

But we have other witnesses to bring in. Take the persecuting Saul, once one of the worst of his enemies. Breathing out threatenings he meets Him. "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" says Christ. He might have added, "What have I done to you? Have I injured you in any way? Did I not come to bless you? Why do you treat Me thus, Saul?" And then Saul asks, "Who art thou, Lord?"

"I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest." You see, He was not ashamed of His name, altho He had been in heaven; "I am Jesus of Nazareth." What a change did that one interview make to Saul! A few years afterward we hear him say, "I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but dross that I may win Christ." Such a testimony to the Savior!

But I shall go still further. I shall go away from earth into the other world. I shall summon the angels and ask what they think of Christ. They saw Him in the bosom of the Father before the world was. Before the dawn of creation, before the morning stars sang together, He was there. They saw Him leave the throne and come down to the manger. What a scene for them to witness! Ask these heavenly beings what they thought of Him then. For once they are permitted to speak; for once the silence of heaven is broken. Listen to their song on the plains of Bethlehem, "Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Savior, which is Christ the Lord." He leaves the throne to save the world. Is it a wonder the angels thought well of Him?

Then there are the redeemed saints—they that see Him face to face. Here on earth He was never known, no one seemed really to be acquainted with Him; but He was known in that world where He had been from the foundation. What do they think of Him there? If we could hear from heaven we should hear a shout which would glorify and magnify His name. We are told that when John was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day, and being caught up, he heard a shout around him, ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands and thousands of voices, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing!" Yes, He is worthy of all this. Heaven cannot speak too well of Him. Oh, that earth would take up the echo and join with heaven in singing, "Worthy to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing!"

But there is still another witness, a higher still. Some think that the God of the Old Testament is the Christ of the New. But when Jesus came out to Jordan, baptized by John, there came a voice from heaven. God the Father spoke. It was His testimony to Christ: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Ah, yes! God the Father thinks well of the Son. And if God is well pleased with Him, so ought we to be. If the sinner and God are well pleased with Christ, then the sinner and God can meet. The moment you say, as the Father said, "I am well pleased with Him," and accept Him, you are wedded to God. Will you not believe the testimony? Will

you not believe this witness, this last of all, the Lord of hosts, the King of kings himself? Once more he repeats it, so that all may know it. With Peter and James and John, on the mount of transfiguration, He cries again, "This is my beloved Son; hear him." And that voice went echoing and re-echoing through Palestine, through all the earth from sea to sea; yes, that voice is echoing still, Hear Him! Hear Him!

My friend will you hear Him to-day? Hark! what is He saying to you? "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart; and ye shall find rest unto your souls. For my yoke is easy, and my burden is light." Will you not think well of such a Savior? Will you not believe in Him? Will you not trust in Him with all your heart and mind? Will you not live for Him? If He laid down His life for us, is it not the least we can do to lay down ours for Him? If He bore the cross and died on it for me, ought I not to be willing to take it up for Him? Oh, have we not reason to think well of Him? Do you think it is right and noble to lift up your voice against such a Savior? Do you think it is just to cry, "Crucify Him! crucify Him!" Oh, may God help all of us to glorify the Father, by thinking well of His only-begotten Son.

Matthew 22:43 He *said to them, "Then how does David in the Spirit call Him 'Lord,' saying,

KJV Matthew 22:43 He saith unto them, How then doth David in spirit call him Lord, saying,

BGT Matthew 22:43 λ γει α το ς· π ς ο ν Δαυ δ ν πνε ματι καλε α τ ν κ ριον λ γων·

NET Matthew 22:43 He said to them, "How then does David by the Spirit call him 'Lord,' saying,

CSB Matthew 22:43 He asked them, "How is it then that David, inspired by the Spirit, calls Him 'Lord':

ESV Matthew 22:43 He said to them, "How is it then that David, in the Spirit, calls him Lord, saying,

NIV Matthew 22:43 He said to them, "How is it then that David, speaking by the Spirit, calls him 'Lord'? For he says,

NLT Matthew 22:43 Jesus responded, "Then why does David, speaking under the inspiration of the Spirit, call the Messiah 'my Lord'? For David said,

NRS Matthew 22:43 He said to them, "How is it then that David by the Spirit calls him Lord, saying,

NJB Matthew 22:43 He said to them, 'Then how is it that David, moved by the Spirit, calls him Lord, where he says:

NAB Matthew 22:43 He said to them, "How, then, does David, inspired by the Spirit, call him 'lord,' saying:

YLT Matthew 22:43 He saith to them, 'How then doth David in the Spirit call him lord, saying,

MIT Matthew 22:43 "How is it," he said, "that David was spiritually inspired to call him Lord ? David said:

GWN Matthew 22:43 He said to them, "Then how can David, guided by the Spirit, call him Lord? David says,

BBE Matthew 22:43 He says to them, How then does David in the Spirit give him the name of Lord, saying,

- **in the Spirit** 2Sa 23:2 Mk 12:36 Lu 2:26,27 Ac 1:16 2:30,31 Heb 3:7 2Pe 1:21 Rev 4:2

Related Passages:

Mark 12:36-37+ "David himself said in the Holy Spirit, 'THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD, "SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, UNTIL I PUT YOUR ENEMIES BENEATH YOUR FEET.'" 37 "David himself calls Him 'Lord'; so in what sense is He his son?" And the large crowd enjoyed listening to Him.

Luke 20:42+ "For David himself says in the book of Psalms, 'THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD, "SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, 43 UNTIL I MAKE YOUR ENEMIES A FOOTSTOOL FOR YOUR FEET.'" 44 "Therefore David calls Him 'Lord,' and how is He his son?"

DAVID'S SON AND DAVID'S SOVEREIGN!

He *said ([historical present tense](#)) to them - The historical present is a vivid, dramatic mode of storytelling, pulling the reader into the living moment.

“Then how does David in the Spirit ([pneuma](#)) call Him ‘Lord ([kurios](#)),’ saying - Don't miss the important implication that Jesus affirms that David's words in Psalm 110:1 were spoken by inspiration of the Holy Spirit, underscoring the **divine authority** of Scripture. Clearly David acknowledged the Messiah as superior and not just as a descendant (which He of course was).

As an aside, it is worth noting that the Holy([hagios](#)) Spirit ([pneuma](#)) spoke in many passages in the New Testament

- Hebrews 9:8+ = "The Holy Spirit is signifying this"
- Hebrews 10:15+ = "the Holy Spirit also testifies to us; for after saying"
- Matthew 10:20+ = "but it is the Spirit of your Father who speaks in you"
- Matthew 22:43+ = "Then how does David in the Spirit call Him 'Lord';
- Mark 12:36+ = "David himself said in the Holy Spirit"
- Acts 1:16+ = "the Holy Spirit foretold by the mouth of David concerning Judas";
- Acts 28:25+ = "The Holy Spirit rightly spoke through Isaiah the prophet to your fathers"
- 1 Timothy 4:1+ = "But the Spirit explicitly says that in later times..."
- Revelation 2:7+ = "let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches"
- Also in Rev 2:11 Rev 2:17 Rev 2:29 Rev 3:6 Rev 3:13 Rev 3:22
- (IN THE OT) 2 Sa 23:2+ = "The Spirit of the LORD spoke by me"

Grant Osborne: It was a common rabbinic ploy to harmonize two seemingly contradictory texts; here Jesus harmonizes two seemingly contradictory messianic ideas: Given that the Messiah is David's "son" (v. 42), how then can the great king David address him as "Lord"? In other words, how can his son at the same time be his Lord? (See [Matthew - Page 828](#))

*Jesus is not just David's Son —
He is David's Sovereign.*

MacArthur comments on **David's Son and David's Lord** - No Middle Eastern father would ever under any circumstances call his son "Lord." That would be to honor and respect on its head. And yet **David's Son** is also **David's Lord**....This is Jesus' last time to engage the religious leaders of Israel...You would assume that if His conversation with them is the last one, He is going to discuss what is the most important matter, and He does. ([David's Son and Lord](#))

Matthew 22:44 'THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD, "SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, UNTIL I PUT YOUR ENEMIES BENEATH YOUR FEET"?"

KJV Matthew 22:44 The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool?

BGT Matthew 22:44 ε πεν κ ριος τ κυρ μου· κ θου κ δεξι ν μου, ως ν θ το ς χθρο ς σου ποκ τω τ ν ποδ ν σου;

NET Matthew 22:44 'The Lord said to my lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet"?"

CSB Matthew 22:44 The Lord declared to my Lord, 'Sit at My right hand until I put Your enemies under Your feet'?

ESV Matthew 22:44 "'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet"?"

NIV Matthew 22:44 " 'The Lord said to my Lord: "Sit at my right hand until I put your enemies under your feet."

NLT Matthew 22:44 'The Lord said to my Lord, Sit in the place of honor at my right hand until I humble your enemies beneath your feet.'

NRS Matthew 22:44 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand, until I put your enemies under your feet" '?

NJB Matthew 22:44 The Lord declared to my Lord, take your seat at my right hand, till I have made your enemies your footstool?

NAB Matthew 22:44 'The Lord said to my lord, "Sit at my right hand until I place your enemies under your

feet"?"

YLT Matthew 22:44 The Lord said to my lord, Sit at my right hand, till I may make thine enemies thy footstool?

MIT Matthew 22:44 Yahveh said to my Lord, Sit at my right hand, until I relegate your enemies under your control.

GWN Matthew 22:44 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Take the highest position in heaven until I put your enemies under your control."

- The Lord: Ps 110:1 Ac 2:34,35 1Co 15:25 Heb 1:3,13 10:12,13 12:2
- my Lord: Jn 20:28 1Co 1:2 Php 3:8
- till: Ge 3:15 Ps 2:8,9 21:9 Isa 63:1-6 Lu 19:27 Rev 19:19-21 Rev 20:1-3,11-15

Related Passages:

Psalm 110:1+ A Psalm of David. The LORD says to my Lord: "Sit at My right hand Until I make Your enemies a footstool for Your feet."

Mark 12:36 "David himself said in the Holy Spirit, 'THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD, "SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, UNTIL I PUT YOUR ENEMIES BENEATH YOUR FEET.'"

Luke 20:42 "For David himself says in the book of Psalms, 'THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD, "SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, 43 UNTIL I MAKE YOUR ENEMIES A FOOTSTOOL FOR YOUR FEET.'"

DAVID'S LORD THE EXALTED MESSIAH


THE LORD ([kurios](#)) SAID TO MY LORD ([kurios](#)) - Mark 12:36 adds a note on the inspiration of this quote beginning with "David himself said in the Holy Spirit." Luke 20:42+ emphasizes the human author "'For David himself says in the book of Psalms."

Jesus is as we might say in a law court, "leading the witnesses," extending the question so that the inevitable answer one must arrive at from a logical look at Psalm 110. In this psalm in Hebrew it transliterates as "**YHWH** said to **Adonai**" — God the Father speaks to David's Lord (the Messiah). Jesus points out that David calls the Messiah "Lord," showing the Messiah is greater than David. Then the phrase sit at my right hand describes a place of honor, authority, and divine rule (cf. Acts 2:33, Hebrews 1:3). Put your enemies beneath your feet which is a picture of complete victory and subjugation of all opposition — often used of a king's enemies being humiliated or defeated (cf. 1 Cor 15:25). In short, Jesus is not just David's son — He is David's Sovereign. The verse testifies to His deity, exaltation, and ultimate victory. "

Akin notes that "Psalm 110 is the most quoted psalm in the New Testament. Verse 1, which Jesus cites here, is quoted or alluded to 33 times in the New Testament. Luther so loved the psalm he wrote 120 pages of commentary on it." ([Mark 12:28-34 Two Great Commandments, Two Great Loves](#))

Hiebert on **Lord...my Lord** -- It is clear that both names refer to Persons of the Godhead. It is obvious that the scribes accepted the pictures as messianic; otherwise they would immediately have repudiated the argument of Jesus. While there is no evidence for this interpretation in rabbinic literature until two hundred years later, "the silence is due to anti-Christian polemic stimulated by the freedom with which the Psalm was quoted in the primitive Church." Aside from this event, the Psalm is quoted directly five times in the New Testament (Acts 2:34–35; Heb. 1:13; 5:6; 7:17, 21), and numerous allusions to the thought contained in it reveal the profound influence it had upon the teaching of the Christian church (cf. 1 Cor. 15:25; Eph. 1:20–22; Phil. 2:9–11; Col. 3:1; Heb. 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pet. 3:22). The Christian church accepted the exaltation and enthronement of the risen Christ as the fulfillment of this prophetic invitation to the Messiah by Jehovah: "Sit thou on my right hand," assume the place of honor and authority. Till I make thine enemies thy footstool indicates that the enthronement in heaven would follow Messiah's rejection by His enemies. The Jewish leaders had clearly shown themselves the enemies of Jesus through their efforts during the day. ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

"SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, UNTIL I PUT YOUR ENEMIES BENEATH YOUR FEET- The Father decrees that the Son first will sit at His right hand which clearly indicates His deity. The word "until" indicates that the Son will sit for a period unspecified, but after that period is fulfilled (the "until") the Son will conquer His enemies, which is the picture of "enemies beneath" His feet ("YOUR FEET" is the Son's feet).



Near and far fulfillment schematic

UNTIL - See discussion of this important expression of time. The preposition **UNTIL** can indicate the time before an event takes place (Ezek 33:22), the time until it takes place (Ps 104:23), or occasionally the time during which an event takes place (2 KI 9:22). It can also "mark a relative limit beyond which the activity of the main clause still continues" as it does in Psalm 112:8. In Psalm 110 **UNTIL** signifies the time until an event occurs. Stated another way, **UNTIL** indicates enemies will be active up to a point and then it will not happen. The point that it will not happen is when Jesus reigns over and subjugates all His enemies. **Deffinbaugh** elaborates on another aspect of **UNTIL** - "While the Messiah was to share in the power and prestige of Yahweh's reign, there was a **GAP OF TIME** indicated **between the time of His exaltation ("Sit ...") and His triumph ("UNTIL")**. There is both a present and a future dimension to the prophetic oracle of Yahweh. The enemies of the Messiah will, at a later time, be subjected to Him, but not immediately. To make someone "**the footstool for their feet**" (v. 1c) was to completely subject him (cf. Ps. 8:6; 18:39), an expression probably based upon the practice of military conquerors who placed their feet on the necks of their defeated foes (cf. Josh. 10:24-25). Messiah was elevated to a position of equality with Yahweh, yet the outworking of His power was yet viewed as future." ([Ref](#)) (Bold font added)

It is interesting to note that Jesus answered the high priest shortly before He went to the Cross - And Jesus said, "I am; and you shall see **THE SON OF MAN SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF POWER**, and COMING WITH THE CLOUDS OF HEAVEN." (Mark 14:62+)

We see an allusion to this prophecy in Psalm 2:7-9⁺

"But as for Me, I have installed My King Upon Zion, My holy mountain." 7 "I will surely tell of the decree of the LORD: He said to Me, 'You are My Son, Today I have begotten You. 8'Ask of Me, and I will surely give the nations as Your inheritance, And the very ends of the earth as Your possession. 9 'You shall break them with a rod of iron, You shall shatter them like earthenware.'"

Peter reiterates this truth in his great evangelistic sermon

Acts 2:34-36+ "For it was not David who ascended into heaven, but he himself says: 'THE LORD SAID TO MY LORD, "SIT AT MY RIGHT HAND, 35 UNTIL I MAKE YOUR ENEMIES A FOOTSTOOL FOR YOUR FEET."' 36 "Therefore let all the house of Israel know for certain that God has made Him both **Lord** and **Christ** (MESSIAH)—this Jesus whom you crucified."

Paul writes

1 Corinthians 15:24-27+ then comes the end, when He hands over the kingdom to the God and Father, when He has abolished all rule and all authority and power. 25 For He must reign until **He has put all His enemies under His feet**. 26 The last enemy that will be abolished is death. 27 For HE HAS PUT ALL THINGS IN SUBJECTION UNDER HIS FEET. But when He says, "All things are put in subjection," it is evident that He is excepted who put all things in subjection to Him.

The writer of Hebrews also affirms this truth

Hebrews 10:12; 13+ but He, having offered one sacrifice for sins for all time, SAT DOWN AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD, 13 waiting from that time onward UNTIL HIS ENEMIES BE MADE A FOOTSTOOL FOR HIS FEET.

TSK - This passage is expressly referred to the Messiah by several of the Jews. Rabbi Joden says, "In the world to come, the Holy Blessed God shall cause the king Messiah to sit at his right hand, as it is written, The Lord said to my Lord," etc. So Rabbi Moses Hadarson; and Saadiah Gaon says, "This is Messiah our righteousness, as it is written, The Lord said to my Lord," etc.

NET NOTE - The Lord said to my Lord. With David being the speaker, this indicates his respect for his descendant (referred to as my Lord). Jesus was arguing, as the ancient exposition assumed, that the passage is about the Lord's anointed. The passage looks at an enthronement of this figure and a declaration of honor for him as he takes his place at the side of God. In Jerusalem, the king's palace was located to the right of the temple to indicate this kind of relationship. Jesus was pressing the language here to get

his opponents to reflect on how great Messiah is.

Wuest - Both the scribes and the people believed that the Jewish Messiah would come from the royal line of David. **David was human, so would the Messiah be human.** Thus, He would be David's son. Our Lord reminds His hearers that David calls the Messiah his **Lord** ([kurios](#))(Ps. 110:1). That is, David recognizes Him as Deity, the Jehovah of the Old Testament. ([Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English reader](#))

All glory, laud and honor,
To Thee, Redeemer, King,
To Whom the lips of children
Made sweet hosannas ring.

Thou art the King of Israel,
Thou David's royal Son,
Who in the Lord's Name comest,
The King and Blessèd One.

Matthew 22:45 "If David then calls Him 'Lord,' how is He his son?"

KJV Matthew 22:45 If David then call him Lord, how is he his son?

BGT Matthew 22:45 ε ο υ Δαυ δ καλε α τ υ κ ρ ι ο ν, π ς υ ς α τ ο σ τ ι ν;

NET Matthew 22:45 If David then calls him 'Lord,' how can he be his son?"

CSB Matthew 22:45 "If David calls Him 'Lord,' how then can the Messiah be his Son?"

ESV Matthew 22:45 If then David calls him Lord, how is he his son?"

NIV Matthew 22:45 If then David calls him 'Lord,' how can he be his son?"

NLT Matthew 22:45 Since David called the Messiah 'my Lord,' how can the Messiah be his son?"

NRS Matthew 22:45 If David thus calls him Lord, how can he be his son?"

NJB Matthew 22:45 'If David calls him Lord, how then can he be his son?'

NAB Matthew 22:45 If David calls him 'lord,' how can he be his son?"

YLT Matthew 22:45 If then David doth call him lord, how is he his son?'

MIT Matthew 22:45 If then David called him Lord, how can he be David's son?"

GWN Matthew 22:45 If David calls him Lord, how can he be his son?"

- how: Jn 8:58 Ro 1:3,4 9:5 Php 2:6-8 1Ti 3:16 Heb 2:14 Rev 22:16

Related Passages:

Psalms 110:1 A Psalm of David. The LORD says to my Lord: "Sit at My right hand Until I make Your enemies a footstool for Your feet."

Mark 12:37 "David himself calls Him 'Lord'; so in what sense is He his son?" And the large crowd enjoyed listening to Him.

Luke 20:44 "Therefore David calls Him 'Lord,' and how is He his son?"

THE SIXTY-FOUR DOLLAR QUESTION

If David then calls Him 'Lord,' how is He his son Jesus makes a restatement of the unassailable fact which the scribes did not dare try to contradict. They knew that is what Psalm 110:1 clearly stated! This is the "[Sixty Four Dollar Question](#)!" This is almost like a parabolic statement, a sacred riddle.

[Sixty Four Dollar Question](#) - A question that is very important and difficult or complex to answer. Taken from the title of the 1940s

radio program Take It or Leave It, in which the big prize was 64 silver dollars. James Edwards says He puts before them "the question of the day" while Akin calls it "the question of the ages" As [Akin](#) says "It is the question of the identity of the Messiah. What our Lord had raised privately with the disciples at Caesarea Philippi (8:27) He now takes public. He knows this raises the stakes. He also knows the cross is just 3 days away. Again, a moment of truth has arrived."

One could also refer to this as a "radical riddle" It is radical because the answer is that the son of David is not just a Man but He is God, God in the flesh, the mystery of mysteries which is hidden in David's Spirit inspired words of Psalm 110:1. It is a riddle because it makes no sense to the human mind which tries to reason out how any person could be 100% Man and 100% God. It is a riddle for the natural mind, and its solution can only be provided by the Spirit of Christ opening the eyes of one's heart to see the truth of Messiah, Son of David, fully God and fully Man, and then to receive that incredible truth by grace through faith. Tragically it will remain a "radical riddle" to the natural, unbelieving mind for as Paul explains "a natural man does not accept the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him; and he cannot understand them, because they are spiritually appraised." (1 Cor 2:14+)

Akin - The Messiah is not simply David's son, he is David's sovereign. He is not just David's son, 4 he is God's Son who reigns as King seated at His Father's, His heavenly Father's, right hand. David's words will not work if Messiah is just a human being. He must be more. This is where Jesus is trying to take them. This is what they had failed to see. Tragically, they still don't see it. ([Mark 12:28-34 Two Great Commandments, Two Great Loves](#))

Henry Morris - With a single word ("Lord") Christ silenced the Pharisees, just as He had used a single word ("am") to refute the Sadducees (Matthew 22:32). Again this illustrates Christ's affirmation of verbal inspiration of Scripture and also His own claim to deity. Citing Psalm 110:1 (Matthew 22:44), written by David and acknowledged by the Jews to be prophetic of the coming Messiah, He pointed out that David had spoken of Him as "my LORD." Yet it was also acknowledged by all that the Messiah would be of the seed of David (2 Samuel 7:12-16). The only way such prophecies as these and others could be fulfilled was for God to become man. The Messiah must be God incarnate. Noting His frequent quoting of the Old Testament, it is clear that for the Lord Jesus Christ, the Scriptures were God's Word, having full and final authority.

David Turner: The initial question in Matt. 22:43 seems to assume the humanity of the Messiah as David's descendant. If the Messiah is the human descendant of David, how does David call him Lord in Ps. 110:1? The follow-up question in Matt. 22:45 puts it the opposite way: if the Messiah is David's Lord, how can he be David's descendant? In Matthew's narrative Jesus's humble Davidic roots (Mt 1:1, 16–17, 20; cf. Luke 1:27, 32, 69; 2:4, 11) are not the whole story. Jesus is also the miraculously born, divinely attested Son of God (Matt. 1:23; 3:17; 16:16; 17:5; 21:37; 22:2; 26:63–64). That Jesus is greater than David is already clear (Mt 12:1–4; cf. 12:6, 8, 41), but now Matthew explains why: the Messiah is the son of David and the Son of God. But the Pharisees will not accept a Messiah who, as David's Lord, is greater than David. (See [Matthew \(Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament\)](#))

Geddert - Jesus' argument depends on clearly separating between the two appearances of the word **my** in the verse he quotes. The first refers to David, the author, who speaks of **my** Lord. The second refers to God, whom David is quoting: Sit at **my** right hand. It also depends on clearly separating between two occurrences of the word **Lord**. The first refers to God (Yahweh). The second refers to the Messiah (the one who sits at God's right hand). Jesus interprets the verse, The LORD [= Yahweh, God] says to **my** lord [= David's lord, the Messiah], "Sit at **my** (God's) right hand until I make your enemies your footstool." (Ps. 110:1) The **Messiah** is thus **David's Lord**, sitting at God's right hand until God wins the victory over all the enemies of the Messiah. This much seems clear. But why does Mark include this incident? Is he denying that the Messiah is also David's son? Probably not, for Son of David is an acceptable designation for the Messiah (cf. Mark 10:47–48). More likely he is critiquing the view that the Messiah is merely David's son and not also David's Lord. The Messiah far surpasses David's greatness, reigning as king over an entirely different order (cf. Mark 14:61–62; 15:2, 18, 26, 32). In this text, Jesus is not directly claiming to be the Messiah.

Deffinbaugh - Psalm 110 confronts the Israelite with a very perplexing problem, a problem which is central and foundational to the Israelite leaders' rejection of Jesus as the Christ. The Psalm clearly teaches both the **humanity** of Messiah (**a son of David**) and His **deity** (**David's Lord**). This was the fundamental problem which the leaders of Israel had with Jesus. If you could sum up the grievance of the Jewish leaders with Jesus, I believe it would be this: ALTHOUGH JESUS WAS MERELY A MAN (in the eyes of the Jews who rejected Him), HE HAD THE AUDACITY TO ACT LIKE GOD

Wuest - The difficulty our Lord puts before His listeners and at the same time tosses into the lap of the Pharisees, is as to how, since Messiah is Jehovah, **deity**, He can also be **human**. At once the **incarnation** is brought before them. One of the charges brought against the Lord Jesus was that He called God His (His private, unique) Father, making Himself equal with God, thus deity (John 5:18). Thus, the Jewish leaders rejected the teaching of the incarnation, and Jesus' claim to deity. It is well to notice our Lord's testimony to the **divine inspiration of David**, also the recognition by David of the two other Persons of the Trinity, the **Father** saying to the **Son**, "Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool." Thus, we have the Trinity mentioned in an Old Testament setting in verse 36. ([Mark in the Greek New Testament for the English reader](#))

Hiebert adds "The purpose of Jesus in raising this question was not merely to confound the scribes, but to show that to be accepted as reliable interpreters of their own Scriptures, they must have a higher view of the true nature of the Messiah. **Their view that the Messiah was simply a human being, the descendant of David, though a conquering king, did not do justice to the teaching of Scripture. For the Messiah to be David's Lord, He must be more than a man** "Jesus is more than Son of David; He is Son of Man, i.e., the representative of all humanity and not just the Jews, who had to suffer and then be exalted at God's right hand. Still more important He is Son of God!" Christianity saw that the solution lay in the reality of the incarnation. **While Jesus made no attempt to explain to them that the solution lay in the recognition of the divine-human nature of the Messiah, His question pointed His enemies in that direction.** In rejecting His claims to be more than just a man, they were blinding themselves to the true solution to the problem. Their own Scripture condemned their rejection of the view. The question of Caiaphas in Mark 14:61 suggests that the Jewish leaders understood what Jesus intended to teach." ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

Brian Bell adds that "Jesus is both "the **root** and **offspring** of David" (Rev 22:16-[note](#)). As the "root of David," He brought David into existence; but As the "offspring of David," David brought Him into the world. He is David's son, thus affirming his humanity. He is David's Lord, thus affirming his deity. ([Commentary](#))

Matthew 22:46 No one was able to answer Him a word, nor did anyone dare from that day on to ask Him another question.

KJV Matthew 22:46 And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions.

BGT Matthew 22:46 κα ο δε ς δ νατο ποκριθ ναι α τ λ γον ο δ τ λμησ ν τις π κε νης τ ς μ ρας περωτσαι α τ ν ο κ τι.

NET Matthew 22:46 No one was able to answer him a word, and from that day on no one dared to question him any longer.

CSB Matthew 22:46 No one was able to answer Him at all, and from that day no one dared to question Him anymore.

ESV Matthew 22:46 And no one was able to answer him a word, nor from that day did anyone dare to ask him any more questions.

NIV Matthew 22:46 No one could say a word in reply, and from that day on no one dared to ask him any more questions.

NLT Matthew 22:46 No one could answer him. And after that, no one dared to ask him any more questions.

NRS Matthew 22:46 No one was able to give him an answer, nor from that day did anyone dare to ask him any more questions.

NJB Matthew 22:46 No one could think of anything to say in reply, and from that day no one dared to ask him any further questions.

NAB Matthew 22:46 No one was able to answer him a word, nor from that day on did anyone dare to ask him any more questions.

YLT Matthew 22:46 And no one was able to answer him a word, nor durst any from that day question him any more.

MIT Matthew 22:46 No one was able to answer him a word. Neither did anyone dare to interrogate him any more from that day forward.

GWN Matthew 22:46 No one could answer him, and from that time on no one dared to ask him another question.

- **no one:** Mt 21:27 Job 32:15,16 Isa 50:2-9 Lu 13:17 14:6 Jn 8:7-9 Ac 4:14
- **nor did anyone dare:** Mk 12:34 Lu 20:40

Mark 12:37b+ adds And the large crowd enjoyed listening to Him. - While the great multitude of "regular folks"**enjoyed listening to** Jesus, we doubt the religious leaders **enjoyed listening to Him**. D A Carson says "The teacher who never attended the right schools (John 7:15-18) confounds the greatest theologians in the land." (Borrow [The Expositor's Bible Commentary](#) - 1994 edition - Abridged - New Testament)

[Utley](#) makes a good point that "The people of the land, who were often ridiculed and overlooked by the religious elite (cf. Mk 12:38–40), enjoyed seeing Jesus turn the tables on the arrogant religionists using their very method."

Hiebert says enjoyed "indicates the keen relish and delight with which they received His teaching. They appreciated the intelligence and power of His answers and the freshness of His method in dealing with these problems. **Heard** is imperfect tense, indicating their continued pleasure in the teaching which He was giving. It was a sustained favorable response." ([The Gospel of Mark: An Expositional Commentary](#))

ALL QUESTIONS ARE NOW TABLED

No one ([oudeis](#) - absolutely no one) **was able** ([dunamai](#)) **to answer Him a word, nor did anyone dare** ([tolmao](#)) **from that day on to ask Him another question** ([eperotao](#)) The critics are now silenced! Their silence reveals the inability of human wisdom to stand against Truth incarnate. Their hesitancy in asking Him questions is not just fear of being outwitted again but it's fear of exposure. They recognized that continuing to confront Jesus would only further expose their ignorance and spiritual blindness. And so it marks the end of public questioning. His enemies shift from questioning to conspiring. changing their tactics to secret plotting and preparation for His arrest and murder (cf. Mt 26:3–5). As someone has said Their silence is not reverence — it is the stunned defeat of religious pride before divine truth. "

David Turner: The silence of the religious leaders does not mean that they have come to agree with Jesus but that they have abandoned hope of publicly refuting him. (See [Matthew Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament](#))

Leon Morris: That finished the questioning session. The Pharisees, the Herodians, and the Sadducees had all tried to put questions to Jesus that would embarrass him and put him into disfavor with the people or the governing bodies or both, and while it could not be said that he had failed to answer, it could be said that he had produced answers that left him unscathed and caused the people to marvel at him. He was more admired when they finished than when they started on this exercise. So it is no surprise that, finding they could not answer the question he had put to them, none of them dared any more to question him. This was a game in which they thought they held all the advantages (how could a layman from rural Galilee compete with the professionals who had been through the schools in Jerusalem?). But in the end they had been defeated. (See [The Gospel According To Matthew](#))

SUMMARY OF THE CONFRONTATIONS

Passage	Group Involved	Question or Challenge	Jesus' Response	Result
Matthew 22:15–22	Pharisees & Herodians	"Is it lawful to pay the poll-tax to Caesar or not?"	"Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's."	They were amazed and left Him (Mt 22:22)
Matthew 22:23–33	Sadducees	"In the resurrection, whose wife will she be?" (hypothetical marriage case)	"You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God... God is not the God of the dead."	The crowd was astonished (Mt 22:33); Sadducees were silenced
Matthew 22:34–40	A Pharisaic Lawyer	"Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?"	"Love the Lord your God... and love your neighbor... On these two depend the whole Law and the Prophets."	The lawyer was impressed (cf. Mark 12:32–34)
Matthew 22:41–45	Jesus Asks the Pharisees	"Whose son is the Christ? If David calls Him 'Lord,' how is He his son?"	Quotes Psalm 110:1, showing the Messiah is more than David's son — He is David's Lord	They were unable to answer (Mt 22:46)
Matthew 22:46	All groups	—	—	<i>No one dared ask Him another question.</i>

