

JESUS' TEACHING AND PHARISAICAL JUDAISM



Steven L. Cox, Ph.D.

*Dr. Cox is Research Professor of New Testament and Greek
at Mid-America Baptist Theological Seminary
Memphis, Tennessee*

New Testament (henceforth NT) scholars often acknowledge Jesus' identity or closeness in theology to Pharisaical Judaism; however, such statements are generalized without any discussion of their mutual theological positions. Yet, Jesus and the Pharisees were constantly at odds with one another. In the first section of this article I will review a variety of sources, both primary and secondary, concerning Jesus, the Pharisees, and first-century Judaism. Sources naturally will include the Old Testament (henceforth OT), the NT, Josephus, and the Mishnah, though these sources are not exhaustive concerning the topic. In the second section I will discuss beliefs and practices that were common to all Jews. Theological issues such as monotheism, nationalism, the law, and other topics will be discussed. In the third section I will discuss Jesus and Pharisaical Judaism's kinship by comparing their similarities and how they differ from other first-century Jewish sects. Theological issues such as the afterlife, resurrection, place of worship, the OT canon, and other topics also will be discussed. In the fourth section I will compare and contrast Jesus' teachings with those of Pharisaical Judaism.

A Collating of Sources

Evidence from Josephus¹

Josephus offered a general description of the Pharisees; however, he did not divulge much information that contributed to a description of their teachings. The references to the Pharisees may be grouped into the following topics:

- (1) the Pharisees were strong supporters of Alexandra (War 1.111; Ant 13.408-411, 415);
- (2) initially they had good relations with Hyrcanus (Ant 13.289);
- (3) Josephus listed the Pharisees as one of the three major schools of Jewish thought (Ant 13.171; 18.11; Life 10);
- (4) they were popular among the masses (Ant 13.298; 18.15);
- (5) the Pharisees were involved in politics and influence (War 1.115-6, Life 39, Ant 13.288-98; 13.401-4);

¹For the sake of space, the books by Josephus will be abbreviated as follows: *Jewish War* as *War*, *Jewish Antiquities* as *Ant*, *Life of Josephus* as *Life*, and *Against Apion* as *Apion*.

- (6) the Pharisees lived a modest lifestyle (Ant 18.12); and
- (7) Salome was associated with the death of some Pharisees (Ant 17.44-5).

Josephus had a few references to the Pharisees that pertain to issues of continuity and conflict between the Pharisees and Jesus:

- (1) the Pharisees refusal of oaths to Caesar (Ant 17.42);
- (2) the doctrines of fate and resurrection (Ant 13.171; 18.13-4);
- (3) the Pharisees' knowledge of the Law (Life 191; Ant 17.42; 18.12); and
- (4) Pharisaical adherence to oral traditions (Life 198; Ant 13.297; 13.408; 17.42; 18.12-3).

Josephus made a few references to Jesus Christ that parallel some Gospel accounts of Jesus (Ant 18.63-4).

Evidence from the Scriptures: The Old Testament and the New Testament

The Gospels, Acts, and Pauline passages offer the most information pertaining to Jesus and Judaism of His time. Much of the data derived from the NT are based on allusions; however, the NT makes direct quotations and statements about issues pertinent to this study. Both Jesus and the Pharisees made quotes or allusions to a plethora of OT texts. Frequently Jesus cited the Torah or the prophets. Likewise, the Pharisees cited Moses by name when they quoted the Law. Acts made direct statements about select doctrines of the Pharisees and the Sadducees that also are pertinent to this study. Paul, formerly a Pharisee, added further details about pharisaical thinking based on his personal experience.

Evidence from Qumran and Rabbinical Literature

The utilization of the Dead Sea Scrolls in this article was limited to the topic of the Essenes' view of Messiahs. Select texts describe Messiah as a prophet/priestly figure; whereas, other texts present Messiah as a royal/kingly figure. Still other texts describe two Messiahs: one prophet/priestly and the other royal/kingly.

The Mishnah offered select and general references to the Pharisees. The general references may be grouped as follows:

- (1) the day of slaughter of animals with reference to the Sabbath and the Feast of Pentecost (Hagigah 2.4)² and
- (2) responsibility of masters who own animals and/or servants that do damage (Yadaim 4.7).

²Herbert Danby, ed., *The Mishnah*, trans. Herbert Danby (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985), Hagigah 2.4; 2.4, n. 8-12. All citations are from this translation unless otherwise stated.

Furthermore, the Mishnah had a few references to the Pharisees that pertain to issues of continuity and conflict between the Pharisees and Jesus:

- (1) ritual purity practiced by the Pharisees (Dema 2.3);³
- (2) loud cries for attention while suffering (Sotah 3.4); and
- (3) the place of the Name (of God) with reference to a/the king (Yadaim 4.8).

The Babylonian Talmud, composed of the Mishnah and the Gemara (a commentary on 36½ tractates of the Mishnah), was completed sometime between the fifth and the beginning of the sixth century AD. The Babylonian Talmud offered one contribution to this study in Sukkah 52a, concerning the idea of two Messiahs: a prophetic/priestly one and a kingly one.⁴

Since rabbinical literature was not composed until the second century of the Common Era and later, the use of such literature is problematic in the study of early Christianity. Though materials dating prior to and during the AD first century were preserved in rabbinical literature, a major problem arises in determining the precise extent of such materials. When we compare rabbinical literature with other sources, we are able to confirm earlier sources and fill in the picture to some degree.

A Brief Overview of Common Beliefs and Practices of the Jewish Sects

Josephus stated, “The Jews, from the most ancient of time, had three philosophies pertaining to their traditions, that of the Essenes, that of the Sadducees, and, thirdly that of the group called the Pharisees.”⁵ As to what Josephus meant by the phrase “from the most ancient of times” probably was a couple of centuries, but not more than four centuries. Josephus added, “As for the fourth of the philosophies [the Zealots], Judas the Galilean set himself up as the leader and master. This school agrees in all other aspects with the opinions of the Pharisees, except that they have a passion for liberty that is almost unconquerable.”⁶ Within Judaism diversity existed, but Judaism also contained points of unity.⁷ The

³Ibid., Dema 2.3; 2.3, n. 2, 3.

⁴*The Talmud of Babylon: An American Translation*, trans. Jacob Neusner (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1984), Tractate Sukkah 52a. All citations are from *The Talmud of Babylon: An American Translation*, trans. Jacob Neusner (Chico, CA: Scholars, 1984), unless otherwise stated.

⁵Josephus, *Ant* 18.11; quoted in G. P. Goold, ed., *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, Loeb Classical Library 433, trans. Louis H. Feldman (London: Harvard University Press, 1965), 9. Cf. Josephus, *War* 2.119, *Ant* 13.171-2.

⁶Josephus, *Ant* 18.23; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 21. Acts 5:37 identifies Judas the Galilean as the leader of an insurrection occasioned by the census of Quirinius in AD 7.

⁷Everett Ferguson, *Background of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 42532.

basic beliefs in which all Jews shared included a belief in only one God. Deut. 4:35 confirms this point, “You were shown these things so that you would know that the LORD is God; there is no other besides Him.”⁸ A second common belief among Jews was a sense of nationalism, from the Zealots (who wanted political independence), to the Pharisees (who wanted religious freedom), to the Sadducees. Each of these sects considered themselves (Israel) to be God’s people, as seen in Ps. 137:1, “By the rivers of Babylon—there we sat down and wept when we remembered Zion” (cf. 2 Sam. 10:12; 1 Kings 11:21; Neh. 2:3; Isa. 66:10). A third common belief in Judaism was a sense of nomism. Douglas Moo held, “The virtual identification of ‘Law’ with ‘Law of Moses’ in the Gospels reflect OT usage and the Jewish milieu in both of which the Law of Moses, the Torah (tôrâ), plays a central role.”⁹ All Jewish people placed an emphasis on the importance of the law. The law was central to all sects, for God gave the law to the Jews. According to C. M. Horne, “Generally νόμος refers to the Pentateuch; however, when combined with οἱ προφῆται it broadens so as to give the phrase the meaning of the whole OT.”¹⁰ The law was a means of expressing one’s relationship with God, as taught in Ps. 40:8: “I delight to do Your will, my God; Your instruction resides within me.”¹¹

All Jewish people participated in a variety of activities. The first of these was an understanding of the temple as God’s house, abode, pavilion, and place of sacrifice. Dan. 5:3 confirms the point: “So they brought in the gold vessels that had been taken from the temple, the house of God in Jerusalem, and the king and his nobles, wives, and concubines drank from them.”¹² Note the discussion concerning the temple below.

⁸All Scripture citations are from the Holman Christian Standard version unless otherwise stated. See Deut. 6:4; 32:32; 2 Sam. 7:22; 1 Chron. 17:20; Pss. 83:18; 86:10; Isa. 43:10; 44:6; 45:18; Mark 12:29; 1 Cor. 8:4; Eph. 4:6; 1 Tim. 2:5; 1 John 5:7.

⁹Douglas J. Moo, “Law,” *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992), 451.

¹⁰C. M. Horne, “Law in the New Testament,” *Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible*, vol. 3, ed. Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 894.

¹¹Cf. Josephus, *Against Apion* 1.43; 1.60; 1.212; 2.82; 2.149-50; 2.178; and 2.271. Cf. 1 Chron. 22:12; Ps. 37:31; Prov. 28:7; Jer. 31:33; 32:40; Rom. 2:15; 7:22; 2 Cor. 3:3; Heb. 8:10; 10:16.

¹²Cf. “house of Lord/God” with reference to the tabernacle: Exod 23:19; 34:26; Deut. 23:18; Josh. 9:23; Judg. 18:31; 2 Sam. 7:2; 1 Chron. 6:48; 9:11, 13, 26, 27; 23:28; 24:19; 25:6; 26:20; Pss. 42:4; 52:8; 55:14; 84:10; 92:13; 122:9; 135:2; Matt. 12:4; Mark 2:26; Luke 6:4; “house of Lord/God” with reference to the temple 1 Kings 8:17, 20; 2 Kings. 20:5; 1 Chron. 22:1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 19; 28:3, 4, 12, 20, 21; 29:2, 3, 7; 2 Chron. 2:4, 12; 3:3; 4:11, 19; 5:1, 14; 6:7, 10; 7:5; 15:18; 22:12; 23:3, 9; 24:5, 7, 13, 16, 18, 27; 25:24; 28:24; 29:5; 30:1; 31:13, 21; 33:7; 34:8, 9; 35:3, 8; 36:18, 19, 23; Ezra 1:2, 3, 4, 5; 2:68; 3:8; 4:3, 24; 5:2, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17; 6:3, 5, 7, 8, 12, 16, 22; 7:16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 24, 27; 8:17, 25, 30, 33, 36; 9:9; 10:1, 6, 9; Neh. 6:10; 8:16; 10:32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39; 11:11, 16, 22; 12:40; 13:4, 7, 9, 11, 14; Eccles. 5:1; Isa 2:3; Jer 27:21; 35:4; Ezek. 10:19; Dan. 1:2; 5:23; Hosea 9:8; Joel 1:13, 14, 16; Mic. 4:2; Hag. 1:14; Luke 11:51; Heb. 10:21.

Circumcision was a common Jewish practice. According to George Foot Moore, “To the Jews it was a divine institution, given by God to Abraham for himself and his prosperity, and so inseparably connected with the covenant promises that it is not only the sign of the covenant (Gen. 17:11) but is itself called the covenant.”¹³ Thomas Lewis described circumcision as “a precondition of the enjoyment of certain political and religious privileges (Exod. 12:48; Ezek. 44:9) and in view of the fact that in the ancient world religion played such an important role in life, it may be assumed that circumcision, like many other strange customs whose original significance is no longer known, originated in connection with religion.”¹⁴ Gen. 17:10 offers the earliest biblical reference to circumcision, “This is My covenant, which you are to keep, between Me and you and your offspring after you: Every one of your males must be circumcised.”¹⁵

Prayer was emphasized in Jewish corporate worship and personal devotion. J. C. Lambert defined prayer as “an act of worship which covers all soul in its approach to God. Supplication is at the heart of it, for prayer always springs out of a sense of need and a belief that God is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him (Heb 11:6). But adoration and confession and thanksgiving also find a place, so that the suppliant becomes a worshipper.”¹⁶ Moore verified, “The public and private prayers of the Jews thus show not only what they esteemed the best and most satisfying goods, but their beliefs about God and his relation with them, and their responsive feelings toward him.”¹⁷ The design of prayer appears to be under a reverent—even worshipful—condition: “Prayer should always be offered in a serious frame of mind. Men should not go straight to prayer from states or surroundings that make it impossible to collect themselves—from grief or indolent vacuity or laughter or light talk or frivolity or idle pastimes; they should bring to it the joy of the commandments.”¹⁸

Sabbath laws were important to all Jews, though these laws were observed in a variety of ways by the different sects. According to Frank E. Hirsh and J. K. Grinder, “As the Hebrew Sabbath was regarded as a day of rest, all acts absolutely unnecessary were considered a violation, a “breaking” of the Sabbath, which appears sufficiently from the commandment (Exod. 20:8–

¹³George Foot Moore, *Judaism*, vol. 2 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997), 18.

¹⁴Thomas Lewis, “Circumcision,” *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 756.

¹⁵Cf. Gen. 17:11-13, 23-27; 21:4; 34:15, 17, 22, 24; Exod. 12:44, 48; Lev. 12:3; Josh. 5:3, 4, 5, 7; Luke 1:59; 2:21; John 7:22-23; Acts 7:8; 15:1, 5; 16:3; Rom. 2:25-29; 4:11-12; Gal. 2:3; Phil. 3:5. Cf. The Mishnah, Arakhin 2.2; Kerithoth 1.1; Negaim 7.5.

¹⁶J. C. Lambert, “Prayer,” *ISBE*, vol. 4, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 2430.

¹⁷Moore, 2.12.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, 2.24.

11); and the head of the household was held responsible for the keeping of this commandment by all sojourners under his roof.”¹⁹ Generally, the Sabbath was a day free from work for both man and beast, master and slave, Jew and Gentile. Moore summarized from the Mishnah:

The thirty-nine principal species of prohibited acts in an attempt to bring them under one head with a biblical warrant for the whole. This was found in Exodus 35, where in immediate sequence upon the prohibition of ‘work’ on the Sabbath, the same word (*mal’akah*), is repeatedly used in the directions for the construction and furnishing of the tabernacle, the vestments of priests, etc. By cataloguing the various occupations specified or implied in the making of the tabernacle, the acts forbidden under the infinite name ‘work’ in the Sabbath law could be defined.²⁰

Ex 20:8-10 connects the Sabbath with God resting on the seventh day after six days of creative work; whereas, Deut 5:15 associates the Sabbath as a reminder of God freeing the Hebrew people from Egypt: “Remember that you were a slave in the land of Egypt, and the LORD your God brought you out of there with a strong hand and an outstretched arm. That is why the LORD your God has commanded you to keep the Sabbath day.”²¹

Dietary regulations were observed by most Jewish people. One example of this is in Lev. 11:7, “the pig, though it has divided hooves, does not chew the cud—it is unclean for you” (note Isa. 65:4; 66:3, 17; 1 Macc. 1:47; 2:23; 2 Macc. 6:18-31). According to Moore, “Numerous other species were similarly prohibited in the Law, but, inasmuch as most of them were creatures that no civilized man would eat anyhow, these restrictions on diet belonged to learning rather than to life.”²² Lev. 17:14 also prohibited Jews from eating any meat with blood in it.²³

¹⁹Frank E. Hirsh and J. K. Grinder, “Crime, Crimes,” *ISBE*, vol. 1, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 817.

²⁰Moore, 2.27-8. Cf. Mishnah, M. Shabbat 7.2; Melika, Wayyakhel 1; Shabbat 49b; Baba Kamma 2a.

²¹See these passages with reference to the Sabbath day: Exod. 16:23, 25, 26, 29; 20:8, 10, 11; 31:13-16; 35:2-3; Lev. 16:31; 19:3, 30; 23:3, 11, 15-16, 32, 38; 24:8; 26:2, 34-35, 43; Num. 15:32; 28:9-10; Deut. 5:12, 14-15; 2 Kings 4:23; 11:5, 7, 9; 16:18; 1 Chron. 9:32; 23:4, 8, 31; 36:21; 2 Chron. 2:4; 8:13; 31:3; 36:21; Neh. 9:14; 10:31, 33; 13:15-19, 21-22; Isa. 1:13; 56:2, 4, 6; 58:13; 66:23; Jer. 17:21-22, 24, 27; Lam. 2:6; Ezek. 20:12-13, 16, 20-21, 24; 22:8, 26; 23:38; 44:24; 45:17; 46:1, 3, 4, 12; Hosea 2:11; Amos 8:5; Matt. 12:1-2, 5, 8, 10-12; Mark 2:23-24, 27-28; 3:2, 4; 15:42; 6:1-2, 5-7, 9; 13:14-16; 14:1, 3, 5; 23:54, 56; John 5:9-10, 16, 18; 7:22-23; 9:14, 16; 19:31; Acts 1:12; 13:27; 15:21; 16:13; Col. 2:16; Heb. 4:9. See Lev. 25:2, 4-6, 8 with reference to the Sabbath year.

²²Moore, 2.21.

²³Cf. Gen. 7:2, 8; 9:4; Exod. 23:19; Lev. 7:19-21; 10:10; 11:4-8, 27-47, 36; 17:12, 26; 39; 19:23; 20:5; 22:7, 11, 13, 25, 28; 25:6, 35-37, 26:5; 15:19; 27:11; Num. 25:2; Deut. 2:6, 8:9-10; 12:15, 22; 14:7-11, 19-21; 15:22-23; 22:6; 23:19; Judg. 13:4-7, 14; Pss. 106: 28-29; Dan. 1:5-16; Ezek. 4:13-14; Hosea 9:3; Hag. 2:12; Mal. 1:6-12; Mark 7:4, 19; Acts 10:15; 11:9; 15:20, 29; 21:25; 1 Cor. 5:7; 8:7-8, 13; 1 Tim. 4:3.

A Continuity of Beliefs of Jesus and the Pharisees Compared to Other Major Jewish Sects

The teachings of Jesus and the beliefs of the Pharisees agree on several doctrinal views; whereas, the Sadducees were radically in disagreement on most of these points.

Scripture

Jesus and the Pharisees held to a high view of the OT Scriptures. Jesus' view of the OT is displayed by His quotations or allusions to specific texts.

According to J. E. H. Thomson, the Pharisees²⁴

were close students of the sacred text. On the turn of a sentence they suspended many decisions. So much so, that it is said of them later the Text of that they suspended mountains from hairs. This is especially the case with regard to the Sabbath law with its burdensome minutiae. At the same time there was care as to the actual wording of the text of the Law; this has a bearing on textual criticism, even to the present day.²⁵

The Pharisees' view of the OT, though their references are limited in the NT, is displayed in their quotations or allusions to specific texts.²⁶

²⁴Gen. 1:27; 2:24; 3:1, 6, 15; 4:8; 5:2; 6:3, 5; 7:1; 8:21; 12:2, 3; 17:10; 18:18; 19:26; 22:18; 28:12,14; Exod. 3:6, 14, 16; 4:12; 8:19; 20:12-17; 21:17; 23:4-5; 24:4, 8; 25:30; 29:23, 32-33, 37; 32:32; 49:10; Lev. 2:13; 5:17; 12:3; 13:1-2; 14:2-4; 17:11; 18:5; 19:3, 17-18; 19:2, 12, 18; 20:9; 24:20; 25:8, 35; 26:31-34; Num. 15:30, 38; 21:9; 28:9; 30:2; Deut. 1:16; 4:12; 5:6, 16-19; 6:4-5, 13, 16; 8:3, 34; 9:6; 10:12, 20; 13:3, 16; 15:7-8, 11; 17:6-7; 18:5, 15, 19; 19:15; 22:4, 12; 23:23; 24:1; 25:16; 27:16; 28:15; 30:6; 31:15; 32:6, 39; 33:9; 1 Sam. 2:2; 15:22; 16:7; 21:6; 2 Sam. 23:2; 1 Kings 8:13; 9:7; 10:1; 18:26; 2 Kings 4:29, 42-43; 5:1-27; 17:29; 2 Chron. 6:2; 9:1; 20:20; 38:15-16; Neh. 8:8, 10-12; 9:29-30; Job 1:7; 8:20; 12:24-25; 13:6; 22:3, 29; 31:24-28; 34:11; 38:15, 41; Pss. 5:9; 6:1, 8; 8:2; 11:4; 16:8; 18:27; 19:11; 22:1, 22, 27; 23:1, 5; 31:5; 34:9; 35:19; 39:6; 41:9; 49:7-8; 51:1-2, 7; 52:7; 58:11; 62:12; 69:4, 28; 72:13; 79:12; 82:6; 86:15; 91:1; 97:11; 102:26-27; 103:3, 13; 109:8; 110:1; 111:4; 118:22, 26; 119:50, 105, 130; 147:9; Prov 3:27; 4:18; 6:23; 8:17; 11:18; 13:9; 14:31; 19:17; 20:20; 21:3; 23:22; 24:10, 23, 27; 25:6-8, 21; 29:23; 30:4; Eccles. 5:13; Song of Sol. 8:13-14; Isa. 1:7; 2:3, 19; 5:2, 20; 6:3, 9; 7:14; 8:1, 14, 20; 9:1, 6; 11:1; 12:3; 13:10; 19:2; 28:16; 29:3-4; 13, 18; 35:5; 40:3, 8, 11; 42:1, 6-7, 21; 43:13; 45:19; 49:1-6, 22, 24-25; 50:6; 51:6; 52:10; 53:1-12; 54:13; 55:1, 4; 56:7-8; 57:3, 15; 58:7; 61:1, 3, 10; 63:16; 66:24; Jer. 3:11; 5:10, 21; 6:16; 11:20; 13:16; 14:13-14; 17:10; 23:1, 16, 21; 25:29; 26:18; 29:8; 31:34; 32:17; 33:25-26; 42:10; 50:2, 6; Lam. 4:20; Ezek. 3:7; 16:51; 18:7; 20:11, 47; 22:25; 26:20; 32:7, 18; 33:31; 34:17, 23; 36:25; 43:24; Dan. 2:34-35; 44; 7:10, 13-14; 9:23-24, 26-27; 12:1-3, 11-12; Hos 2:23; 4:14, 17; 5:6; 6:2-3, 6; 8:2; 10:8; 14:8; Amos 6:1; 9:9; Joel 2:2; 3:13; Jon. 1:17; 2:10; 3:5, 8; Mic. 3:12; 4:2; 5:2; 6:8; 7:6; Hab. 2:11; Zeph. 1:15; Zech. 9:9; 11:16; 12:12; 13:7; 14:2-5; Mal. 1:11; 3:1; 4:5-6.

²⁵J. E. H. Thomson, "Pharisees," *ISBE*, vol. 4, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 2363.

²⁶See Ex 20:14; Lev 18:20; 20:10; Deut 5:18; 9:6; 22:22; 24:1; Job 31:9; Prov 6:29, 32; Mal 3:5.

One should note Josephus's claim, "I began to govern my life by the rules of the Pharisees, a sect having points of resemblance to that which the Greeks call the Stoic school."²⁷ If one understands that Josephus was a Pharisee or at least reflected Pharisaical thought on issues, then one might be able to determine with some precision the OT books which the Pharisees considered authoritative. Josephus's statement, "Our books, those which are justly accredited, are but two and twenty, and contain the record of all time"²⁸ is somewhat ambiguous, yet can be deciphered. Josephus categorized the OT books in three manners. With reference to the above mentioned "two and twenty" books, Josephus categorized the Pentateuch as one book: "Of these, five are the books of Moses, comprising the laws and the traditional history from the birth of man down to the death of the lawgiver."²⁹ Josephus's second category consisted of "the prophets subsequent to Moses [who] wrote the history of the events of their own times in thirteen books."³⁰ These thirteen books are best understood as: "Probably (1) Joshua, (2) Ju + Ruth, (3) Sam., (4) Kings, (5) Chron., (6) Ezra + Neh., (7) Esther, (8) Job, (9) Isaiah, (10) Jeremiah + Lam., (11) Ezekiel, (12) Minor Prophets, (13) Daniel."³¹ Josephus's third category contains "four books [that] contain hymns to God and precepts for the conduct of human life."³² These four books are probably: "(1) Psalms, (2) Song of Songs, (3) Proverbs, (4) Ecclesiastes."³³ Josephus's categorization accounts for all thirty-nine canonical books of the OT.

Resurrection and Afterlife

Jesus and the Pharisees agreed on a bodily resurrection at the end of the world. A general description of resurrection reveals:

Resurrection of the body was the form immortality took, in accord with the religious premises. As the saint was to find his happiness in the nation, he must be restored to the nation; and the older views did not point toward pure soul-immortality. The "shades" led a wretched existence at the best; and Paul himself shudders at the thought of "nakedness" (2 Cor. 5:3). The *nephesh* and *Heb: ruah* were uncertain quantities, and even the NT has no consistent terminology for the immortal

²⁷Josephus, *Life* 12; quoted in E. Capps, T. E. Page, W. H. D. House, eds., *Josephus, The Life, Against Apion*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1926), 7.

²⁸Josephus, *Apion* 1.39; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 179.

²⁹*Ibid.*, 1.39-40; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 179.

³⁰*Ibid.*, 1.40; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 179.

³¹Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 179, n. b.

³²*Ibid.*, 1.40; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 179.

³³Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 179, n. c.

part of man (“soul,” Rev. 6:9; 20:4; “spirit,” Heb. 12:23; 1 Pet. 3:19; Paul avoids any term in 1 Cor. 15, and in 2 Cor. 5 says: “I”). In the Talmud a common view is that the old bodies will receive new souls (Ber. R. 2 7; 6 7; Vayy. R. 12 2; 15 1, etc.; compare Sib Or 4:187).³⁴

Moore asserted that “the resurrection of the dead was a party issue between the Pharisees and the Sadducees.”³⁵ The Sadducees did not accept the idea of the resurrection of the dead (μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν), for it was not stated in the Pentateuch. Instead, they held to annihilationism. Acts 23:8 confirms the Sadducees’ view: “For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection” (see Matt. 22:23; Mark 12:18; Luke 20:27).³⁶ Moore held, “The Pharisees made dogma of the resurrection of the dead, and thus the Sadducees became heretics: the Israelite who denies that the resurrection is revealed in the Torah has no lot in the World to Come.”³⁷ Though “only the Sadducees denied the resurrection, . . . Hellenistic Judaism substituted for it the immortality of the soul.”³⁸ The concept of immortality of the soul was not foreign in apocryphal literature, as seen in Wisdom 6:17-19 (RSV): “The beginning of wisdom is the most sincere desire for instruction, and concern for instruction is love of her, and love of her is the keeping of her laws, and giving heed to her laws is assurance of immortality, and immortality brings one near to God” (cf. Wisdom 3:1-9; 4:7; 5:15f., RSV). Josephus stated that the Essenes “regard the soul as immortal.”³⁹ Josephus further identified immortality from the perspective that the soul “suffers both when being implanted in bodies, and again when severed from them by death.”⁴⁰ Based on Josephus’s statement, the Essenes’ concept of a bodily resurrection differed from that of Jesus and the Pharisees, in that it had more to do with that of Hellenistic Judaism’s view of immortality of the soul.

Judgment Day

Both Jesus and the Pharisees held to a judgment day for both good and evil people. According

³⁴Burton Scott Easton, “Resurrection,” *ISBE*, vol. 4, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 2563. See “Bodily Resurrection”: “Pharisees belief”: “Acts 23:6-8”; “Jesus’ teachings”: Matt. 22:28-31; Mark 12:23-25; Luke 14:14; 20:33-36; John 5:29; 11:24-25; 1 Pet. 1:3; 3:21; “Jesus’ resurrection”: Matt. 27:53; Acts 1:22; 2:31; 4:2, 33; 17:18; Rom. 1:4; 6:5; 1 Cor. 15:12-13; Phil 3:10; “General Teaching on Resurrection”: Acts 17:32; 24:15-21; 1 Cor. 15:21; 2 Tim. 2:18; Heb. 6:2; 11:35; Rev. 20:5-6.

³⁵Moore, 2.317.

³⁶Cf. Josephus, *Ant* 18.16; *War* 2.165.

³⁷Moore, 1.86.

³⁸Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People*, vol. 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1979), 540.

³⁹Josephus, *Ant* 18.18; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 21.

⁴⁰Idem, *Apion* 2.203; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Josephus, Life, Apion*, 375.

to Josephus, “They believe that souls have power to survive death and that there are rewards and punishments under the earth for those who have led lives of virtue or vice: eternal imprisonment is the lot of evil souls, while the good souls receive an easy passage to a new life.”⁴¹

The Sadducees had no system or theology of eschatology, which coincided with their lack of a theology of the resurrection (see above the section on the resurrection). Josephus stated, “The Sadducees hold that the soul perishes along with the body.”⁴² Moore confirmed, “The Sadducees found nothing in the Scriptures, as they read them in their plain sense, about the resurrection of the dead; . . . [therefore, they did not hold to] retribution after death.”⁴³ Shürer added, “They [the Sadducees] deny the continued existence of the soul and the punishments and rewards in the underworld.”⁴⁴

Based on the concept of judgment for good and evil, the Essenes believed “that they ought to strive especially to draw near to righteousness.”⁴⁵ According to Schürer, “To the good (souls), a life is destined beyond the ocean where they will be troubled by neither rain nor snow nor heat, but where a gentle zephyr will constantly blow. But to the wicked (souls), a darker and colder corner is allotted, full of unceasing torment.”⁴⁶

Angels

Both Jesus and the Pharisees held to a developed system of angels. According to John MaCartney Wilson:

Everywhere in the Old Testament the existence of angels is assumed. The creation of angels is referred to in Ps. 148:2, 5 (compare Col. 1:16). They were present at the creation of the world, and were so filled with wonder and gladness that they “shouted for joy” (Job 38:7). Of their nature we are told nothing. In general they are simply regarded as embodiments of their mission. Though presumably the holiest of created beings, they are charged by God with folly (Job 4:18), and we are told that He “puts no trust in his holy ones” (Job 15:15).⁴⁷

⁴¹Josephus, *Ant* 18.14; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 13.

⁴²*Ibid.*, 18.16; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 13.

⁴³Moore, 1.68.

⁴⁴Schürer, 391.

⁴⁵Josephus, *Ant* 18.18; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 15.

⁴⁶Schürer, 574; cf. 1QS 3:13-4:26; 1QH 1:21f.

⁴⁷John MaCartney Wilson, “Angel,” *ISBE*, vol. 1, ed. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans,

The Sadducees, whose canon of Scripture was the Pentateuch, had no system or theology of angels (see Acts 23:8). This was in contradiction to the thirty-two references to angels in the Pentateuch.) According to Moore:

That they consistently rationalized the biblical appearance of angels into men acting as the messengers of God is unlikely; but it is in accord with their whole attitude that they should repudiate as vulgar superstition the exuberant angelology and demonology which flourished in that age and was cultivated in apocalyptic circles. With it would fall the belief in the individual guardian angel (Acts 12, 15; Matt. 18, 10) as well as in ghosts, the spirits of dead men (Luke 24, 37, 39).⁴⁸

The Essenes attached a great emphasis on angelology in their doctrine. According to Josephus, the Essene “swears, moreover, to transmit their rules exactly as he himself received them: to abstain from robbery; and in like manner carefully to preserve the books of the sect and the names of angels. Such are the oaths by which they secure their proselytes.”⁴⁹

Centers of Worship

Jesus’ and Pharisaic worship centered in the synagogue, though participation in various temple festivals was required of all Jews. The synagogue was where the law was taught. The synagogue was an institution made up primarily of lower to middle class people. According to Paul Levertoff:

Synagogue, . . . was the name applied to the Jewish place of worship in later Judaism in and outside of Palestine Grk: Proseuchē, “a place of prayer” (Acts 16:13), was probably more of the nature of an enclosure, marking off the sacred spot from the profane foot, than of a roofed building like a synagogue. Grk: Sabbateion in Ant, XV, i, 6, 2, most probably also meant synagogue. In the Mishna we find for synagogue

1988), 124. (See “Pharisees belief”: “Acts 23:8-9”; “Jesus’ reference to and teachings on”: Matt. 13:39, 41, 49; 16:27; 18:10; 22:30-31, 36; 25:31, 41; 26:53; Mark 8:38; 12:25; 13:27, 32; Luke 9:26; 12:8-9; 15:10; 16:22; 20:36; John 1:51; “General references”: Gen. 16:7, 9-11; 19:1, 15; 21:17; 22:11, 15; 24:7, 40; 28:12; 31:11; 32:1; 48:16; Exod. 3:2; 14:19; 22:22-27, 31-32, 34-35; 23:20, 23; 32:34; 33:2; 20:16; Judg. 2:1, 4; 5:23; 6:11-12, 20-22; 13:3, 6, 9, 13, 15-18; 20-21; 1 Sam. 29:9; 2 Sam. 14:17, 20, 19:27; 24:6-7; 1 Kings 13:18; 19:5, 7; 2 Kings 1:3, 15; 19:35; 1 Chron. 21:12, 15-16, 18, 20, 27, 30; 32:21; Job 4:18; 33:23; Pss. 34:7; 35:5-6; 78:25, 49; 91:11; 103:20; 148:2; Isa. 37:36; 63:9; Dan. 3:28; 4:13, 17, 23; 6:22; Hosea 12:4; Zech 1:9, 11-14, 19; 2:3; 3:1, 3, 5-6; 4:1, 4-5; 5:5, 10; 6:4-5; 12:8; Matt. 1:20, 24; 2:13, 19; 28:2, 5; Mark 1:13; Luke 1:11, 13, 18-19, 26, 30, 34-35, 38; 2:9-10, 13, 15, 21; 22:43; 23:24; John 5:4; 12:29; 20:12; Acts 5:19; 6:15; 7:30, 35, 38, 53; 8:26; 10:3, 7, 22; 11:13; 12:7-11, 23; 27:23; Rom. 8:38; 1 Cor. 4:9; 6:3; 11:10; 13:1; 2 Cor. 11:14; Gal. 1:8; 3:10; 4:14; Col. 2:18; 2 Thess. 1:7; 1 Tim. 3:16; 5:21; Heb. 1:4-7, 13; 2:2, 5, 7, 9, 16; 12:22; 13:2; 1 Pet. 1:12; 3:22; 2 Pet. 2:4, 10-11; Jude 6, 8; Rev. 1:1, 20; 2:1, 8, 12, 18, 3:1, 5, 7, 14; 5:2, 11; 7:1-2, 11; 8:2-3-6, 8, 10, 12, 13; 9:1, 11, 13-15; 10:1, 5, 7-10; 11:15; 12:7, 9; 14:6, 8-10, 15, 17-19; 16:1-8, 10, 12, 17; 17:1, 7; 18:1, 21; 19:17; 20:1; 21:9, 12, 17; 22:2, 8, 16; “Satanic Acknowledgment”: Matt. 4:6, 11; Luke 4:10).

⁴⁸Moore, 1.68.

⁴⁹Josephus, *War* 2.142; quoted in E. Capps, T. E. Page, W. H. D. House, eds., *Josephus, The Jewish War, Book XVIII-XIX*, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, Loeb Classical Library (London: William Heinemann, 1927), 377.

Heb: beth ha-keneceth, in the Targums and Talmud Heb: bē-hakenīshṭā, or simply Heb: kenīshṭā. The oldest Christian meetings and meeting-places were modeled on the pattern of the synagogues, and, in Christian-Palestinian Aramaic the word Heb: kenīshṭā is used for the Christian church.⁵⁰

The temple was the center of the Sadducees' activities (worship, banking, and commerce). Though the Essenes did "send votive offerings to the temple, . . . [they] perform[ed] their sacrifices employing a different ritual of purification. For this reason they [we]re barred from those precincts of the temple."⁵¹

Messianic Hope

Moore confirmed that "the 'name of the Messiah' was in the mind of God before the creation of the world, but He had not revealed it [Gen. 49:10; Ps. 72:17; Jer. 16:13]."⁵² He continued, "There is no trace in the Tannaite sources of any idea that the Messiah himself was an antemundane creation, or that he was regarded otherwise than as a man of human kind."⁵³ J. Jocz stated: "The Messianic hope was born from the recognition that no human king is able to fulfill the high ideal [that Israel's kings were to be shepherds of their people and to act in God's stead]. The ideal king must be more than an ordinary mortal"⁵⁴ (see 1 Sam. 7:1-17). Schurer offered a broad perspective of Messianic hope among the Jewish people:

Pre-Christian Judaism—in so far as its messianic expectations can be conclusively documented—regarded the Messiah as a fully human individual, a royal figure descended from the house of David. This is no less true of the priestly Messiah expected, along with the royal Messiah or Prince of the Congregation, by the Qumran sect, as well as of the other messianic figure of the Prophet.⁵⁵

From an eschatological perspective, there cannot be a Messianic kingdom without a Messianic

⁵⁰Paul Levertoff, "Synagogue," *ISBE*, vol. 5, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), 2877-8. (See "Jesus' References and Presence": Matt. 4:23; 9:35; 12:9; 13:54; 23:1-6; Mark 1:21-29, 39; 3:1; 6:2; 12:38-44; 13:9; Luke 4:15-28; 4:33-38, 44; 6:6; 11:43; 12:11; 13:10; 20:46-47; 21:12; John 6:59; 18:20; 12:38-44; "Pharisaical References": Matt. 6:2, 5; 23:1-6; Mark 5:22; 5:35-38; 12:38-44; Luke 8:41-49; 11:43; 13:14; 20:46-47; John 9:18-23; 12:42; 16:2; "General References": Matt. 9:8; 10:17; 23:34; Luke 7:5; Acts 6:9; 9:2, 20; 13:5, 14-15, 43; 14:1; 17:1, 10, 17; 15:21; 18:4-8, 17-19, 26; 19:8; 22:19; 24:12; 26:11; Rev. 2:9; 3:9.)

⁵¹Josephus, *Ant* 18.18-9; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 17.

⁵²Moore, vol. 2, and 3.348.

⁵³*Ibid.*, 3.349.

⁵⁴J. Jocz, "Messiah," *ZPEB*, vol. 4, ed. Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 200.

⁵⁵Schürer, 518-9.

King. With King David, “history and eschatology bec[a]me strangely intertwined; the Messiah’s pedigree goes back to the promise to David.”⁵⁶

Pharisaical Judaism held that Messiah would be kingly (as David). Jesus reflected the terminology of a kingly Messiah in His teachings.⁵⁷ Luke 19:38 refers to an eschatological reference to “the King who comes in the name of the Lord.” Luke 23:2 offers the “assembly” (Sanhedrin’s) charge that Jesus “saying that He Himself is Christ, a King.” Mark 15:2, 9, 12; Luke 23:3, and John 18:33, 37 record Pilate’s questions to Jesus with reference to Jesus as “King of Israel.” John 18:39 offers Pilate’s question, “You have a custom that I should release one prisoner to you at the Passover. So, do you want me to release to you the King of the Jews?” John 19:12 has the crowd’s response to Pilate’s question and their disdain for Jesus, “If you release this man, you are not Caesar’s friend. Anyone who makes himself a king opposes Caesar!” Matt. 27:29, Mark 15:18, and John 19:3 are accounts of a sarcastic remark by the Roman soldiers hailing Jesus as “King.” John 19:19 describes the inscription on a plaque placed on the cross, “THE KING OF THE JEWS” (see Mark 15:26 and Luke 23:38). John 19:21 offers the crowd’s response to Pilate’s inscription, “Don’t write, ‘The King of the Jews,’ but that He said, ‘I am the King of the Jews.’” Mark 15:32 is an account of a sarcastic remark by the chief priests, scribes, and elders, “Let the Messiah the King of Israel, come down now from the cross, so that we may see and believe” (see Matt 27:37, 42 and Luke 23:37).

Messianic hope was common among most Jewish sects “and was present far beyond the boundaries of that sect. Rare was the Jew who was not grasped to some extent by this hope. With the possible exception of the Sadducees, it was the common possession of all Israel.”⁵⁸ Since the Sadducees have no eschatology, this would eliminate the concept of a Messianic king. Furthermore, the concept of a Messianic king would violate their political status quo mentality.

Some scholars maintained that the Essenes held to a diarchy of Messiahs based on the concept of a prophet/priestly Messiah and a royal/kingly Messiah.⁵⁹ Stephen R. Miller correctly stated,

⁵⁶Ibid.; cf. Isa. 11:10; Jer. 23:5; 33:15; Zech. 3:8; 6:12.

⁵⁷See Matt. 2:2; 21:5; 27:11; Luke 22:30; 24:21; John 1:49; 6:15; 12:13, 15.

⁵⁸Marcel Simeon, *Jewish Sects at the Time of Jesus*, trans. James E. Farley (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 42-3.

⁵⁹Cf. Ralph P. Martin, “Messiah,” *Holman Illustrated Bible Dictionary*, ed. Chad Brand, Charles Draper, and Archie England (Nashville: Holman, 2003), 1115; R. Dennis Cole and E. Ray Clendenen, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” *HIBD*, 404, 347; Chris Church, “Religious Background of the New Testament,” in *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation: A Complete Library of Tools and Exegesis*, ed. David S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Matthews, and Robert S. Sloan (Nashville: B&H, 1994), 511; James C. VanderKam, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 92, 106; and Philip R. Davies, “Judaisms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Case of the Messiah,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls in their Historical Context*, ed. Timothy H. Lim, Larry W. Hurtado, A. Graeme Auld, and Alison Jack (New York: T & T Clark, 2000), 220.

“The two Messiah theory . . . explained how Messiah could perform both roles of priest and king.”⁶⁰ Evidence from Qumran include: the royal/kingly Messiah concept (4Q161 7-10; 4Q174 1-3.i.11; 4Q246; 4Q252 1.v.3-4; 4Q285 5.3,4; 4Q521) and the prophet/priestly Messiah concept (1QM; 1Q28a ii.20-21; 4Q254 4.2; 4Q375 1.i.9; 4Q376 1.i.1; 11Q13). According to Craig A. Evans,

the story of the simultaneous anointing of Solomon, the son of David, and of Zadok the high priest (1 Chr. 29.22), combined with Zechariah’s vision of the two “sons of oil” (Zec. 4.14; cf. 4Q254 4.2), that is, the priest and the political ruler (cf. Zec. 3-4), probably informed the Damascus Document’s expectation of the eventual appearance of the anointed of Aaron and of Israel (see also 1 Sm. 2:35).⁶¹

1QS ix.11; 1QS 9:11; 1QSa 2:14, 20; CD 20:1; 4QPBless 2:4; 4QFlor 1:11-13; 4Q285 5.1-6 offered strong evidence of the separate royal and priestly Messiahs as held by the Essenes. According to PHEME PERKINS, “Parallels between the conduct of the ‘messianic meal’ eaten by the community with the ‘messiahs’ (1QSa 2:11-22), and the meal celebrated by the sect (1QS 6:4) suggest that what is said of the future ‘messiahs’ can also be experienced as part of the daily life of the community.”⁶² Likewise, the Babylonian Talmud referred to a diarchy of Messiahs: “When [the Messiah, son of David] sees the Messiah, son of Joseph, killed, he will say before [God], ‘Lord of the Age, I ask of you only life’”⁶³ (cf. 4 Ezra 7:28-29 and Targum Pseudo-Jonathan to Exod. 40:11.)

Though Jesus’ view of His Messiahship was based on the concept of a spiritual kingdom and a sacrifice, the apostolic church presented the concept of His Messiahship based on “(1) the truth of Christ’s Divine Sonship [and] (2) . . . the truth of His Messiah-ship, or of His being the anointed prophet, priest and king of the new age.”⁶⁴ The Gospels include

episodes in which Jesus arouses expectations that he is to be identified with a future ‘deliverer’

⁶⁰Stephen R. Miller, *Nahum-Malachi* in *Holman Old Testament Commentary*, ed. Max Anders (Nashville: B&H, 2004), 213. Cf. Eugene H. Merrill, *An Exegetical Commentary - Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi; Minor Prophets Exegetical Commentary Series: Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi* (Richardson, TX: Biblical Studies, 2003), 171 and K. L. Barker, “Zechariah,” in *The Expositor’s Bible Commentary, Daniel and the Minor Prophets*, vol. 7, ed. F. E. Gaebelin (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986), 639.

⁶¹Craig A. Evans, “Messiahs,” the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, vol. 1, ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 539.

⁶²PHEME PERKINS, “Messiah,” *Harper’s Bible Dictionary*, ed. Paul J. Achtemeier (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1985), 630.

⁶³*The Talmud of Babylon*, Sukkah 52a.

⁶⁴James Orr, “Jesus Christ,” *ISBE*, vol. 3, ed. James Orr (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), 1648.

of the people are the entry into Jerusalem (Mark 11:1-10 and parallels) and the cleansing of the Temple (Mark 11:15-19 and parallels). In the Gospel tradition both episodes have been explicated as the fulfillment of prophecies (cf. Matt. 21:4; John 12:15-16; Matt. 21:10-17; John 2:13-22). Matt. 21:10-11 links the two episodes with the crowd's identification of Jesus as 'the prophet from Galilee.' Such 'prophetic' actions may have provided the foundation for some to refer to Jesus as 'anointed of God' without presuming that Jesus, himself, sought a political revolution in which he would be established as the 'anointed' Davidic 'king of Israel.'⁶⁵

Likewise, Hebrews presents Jesus as the Christian's High Priest (cf., Heb. 3:1; 4:14-15; 5:5, 10; 6:20; 7:26-28; 8:1, 3; 9:7, 11, 25; 12:24).

Fate/Providence

Messianic expectation dominated the life and literature of most Jewish people, with the exception of the Sadducees as discussed above. Throughout Jewish literature, in particular the OT, the Jewish people considered themselves as the chosen people of God (2 Chron. 7:16; 33:7; Isa. 43:20; 44:1; 45:4; Amos 3:2). Within the framework of Jewish identity as "chosen of God," the concept of fate/providence and its responsibility was considered in diverse ways among the three major Jewish sects.

Jesus, as did the Pharisees, placed some emphasis on the importance of the individual with relation to divine providence (Matt. 6:25-34; 10:29-31). Concerning Matt. 11:20-30, Craig Blomberg stated: "The language of these verses . . . is incontrovertibly predestinarian in nature, but the language of free will appears equally in vv. 20-24, in which people are judged for their rejection of Jesus, and in vv. 28-30, in which Jesus offers salvation to those whom will respond more positively."⁶⁶ Some OT passages reflect the themes of providence and human responsibility (see Gen 50:19-20; Lev 20:7-8; Jer. 29:10-14; Joel 2:32).

Of the sources listed in section one of this paper, Josephus offered the best evaluation of the three major Jewish sects' views concerning fate/providence and free will. According to Josephus, "the Pharisees, who are considered the most accurate interpreters of the laws, and hold the position of the leading sect, attribute everything to Fate and to God; they hold that to act rightly or otherwise rests, indeed for the most part with men, but that in each action Fate co-operates."⁶⁷ Josephus added that the Pharisees "postulate that everything is brought about by fate, still they do not deprive the human will of the pursuit of what is man's power, since it was God's good pleasure that there should be a fusion and that the will of men with his virtue and vice should be

⁶⁵Perkins, "Messiah," 631.

⁶⁶Craig L. Blomberg, *Matthew, The New American Commentary*, vol. 22, ed David S. Dockery (Nashville: B&H, 1992), 192-3.

⁶⁷Josephus, *War* 2.162-3; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Jewish War*, 385.

admitted to the council chamber of fate.”⁶⁸

The Essenes and the Sadducees held diametrically opposed positions with regard to the concept of fate/providence. The Essenes held “that Fate is mistress of all things, and that nothing befalls men unless it be in accordance with her decree.”⁶⁹ On the other hand, Josephus declared, “The Sadducees . . . do away with Fate altogether, and remove God beyond, not merely the commission, but the very sight of evil.”⁷⁰

The survey of select doctrines of Judaism revealed Jesus’ affinity with the Pharisaical views on these issues. The fact remains, Jesus was probably an *am ha arets*. As did the Pharisees, the *am ha arets* worshipped in the synagogue. The *am ha arets* were the common and unlearned people of the land. They were decent people and were not concerned with legalism, for they were more concerned with issues of daily life, such as death, disease, paying taxes, and making a living. They respected religious leaders, especially the Pharisees.

Though Jesus agreed with the Pharisees on the above stated doctrinal issues, the Pharisees’ viewed Jesus, one of the *am ha arets*, with great suspicion.

Contrast between Jesus and Parisaical Judaism

Thomson argued, the Pharisees “seem to have regarded it as possible that He [Jesus] might unite Himself with them, although, as we think, His affinities rather lay with the Essenes.”⁷¹ Thomson’s view that Jesus had closer affinities with the Essenes is in error, for section three of this article refuted this point and drew the conclusion that Jesus and the Pharisees were closer in their theological positions than any other Jewish groups. The division between Jesus and the Pharisees was more pragmatic than theological.

Jack Dean Kingsbury contended that the religious authorities, primarily the Pharisees, “continued to respect Jesus as a teacher and accepted him as their social equal.”⁷² Kingsbury’s point is not valid, for Jesus was not a trained rabbi; therefore, the Pharisees along with others questioned His right to teach and to have the following that He had: “When He entered the temple complex, the chief priests and the elders of the people came up to Him as He was teaching and said, ‘By what authority are You doing these things? Who gave You this authority?’”

⁶⁸Josephus, *Ant* 18.13; quoted in Goold, *Jewish Antiquities: Book XVIII-XIX*, 11-13. Cf. Idem, *Ant* 13.172.

⁶⁹Josephus, *Ant* 13.171; quoted in G. P. Goold, ed., *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities: Book XII-XIII*, Loeb Classical Library 365, trans. Ralph Marcus (London: Harvard University Press, 1943), 313.

⁷⁰Josephus, *War* 2.164-5; quoted in Capps, et. al., *Jewish War*, 387.

⁷¹Thomson, “Pharisees,” 2365.

⁷²Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Conflict in Luke: Jesus, Authorities, Disciples* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 91.

(Matt. 21:23; cf. Mark 1:22, 27; 11:28; Luke 4:32; 20:2).⁷³ Though the Pharisees may have had a suspicious attitude toward Jesus, as they had with John the Baptist (Matt. 3:1-12; 21:23-27; Mark 11:27-33; Luke 3:2-20; 7:30; 20:1-6; John 1:19-24; 4:1; 5:33), they could not do anything to Him simply because He taught the crowds and had a following. The Pharisees, therefore, sent representatives to watch His actions, to hear His sayings, and to report back to them (Mark 3:2; Luke 6:7; 14:1; 20:20; John 4:1; 7:32; 11:46, 57).

Jesus denounced the Pharisees more than any other class of people (Matt. 5:20; 12:38-39; 15:1-12; 16:6-12; 19:3-10; 21:45; 23:2-7; 23:13-17, 23-29; Mark 8:15; Luke 11:42-43; 12:1; John 9:40-41). This is ironic since the teachings of Jesus and the Pharisees had strong external resemblances. Yet it was these external resemblances, united with an intense spiritual difference, which made it necessary for Jesus to differentiate Himself from them. Pharisaic righteousness was an external concept, for it rested in meats and drinks, and a variety of washings, in tithing “of mint, dill, and cumin” (Matt. 23:23). Gradually the Pharisees intensified in their criticism of Jesus because He disregarded their interpretations of the Law, external purity, traditions, hypocrisy, and their arrogance.

Their Scrupulosity

One of the ways in which the ceremonial sanctity of the Pharisees was exhibited was in tithes and offerings, hence the reference to their tithing “mint, dill, and cumin” (Matt. 23:23; Mark 12:33; Luke 2:24; 11:42; 18:12; 21:1-4). According to Blomberg, “Tithing was commanded under the Old Testament. So as long as the age of the law remained in force, God’s faithful had to tithe.”⁷⁴ Furthermore, the Pharisees elevated almsgiving to an equivalence of righteousness. Jesus criticized this concept which gave poor people little hope of attaining righteousness:

Be careful not to practice your righteousness in front of people, to be seen by them. Otherwise, you will have no reward from your Father in heaven. So whenever you give to the poor, don’t sound a trumpet before you, as the hypocrites do in the synagogues and on the streets, to be applauded by people. I assure you: They’ve got their reward! But when you give to the poor, don’t let your left hand know what your right hand is doing, so that your giving may be in secret. And your Father who sees in secret will reward you.” (Matt. 6:1-4).

In the parable of the Pharisee and the Tax Collector (Luke 18:9-14), one of the things that the Pharisee prided himself in is that he gave tithes of all he possessed: “I fast twice a week; I give a tenth of everything I get” (Luke 18:12). The Pharisee is an example of the arrogance of those who trusted in themselves that they were righteous and set all others at naught; whereas, “But the tax collector, standing far off, would not even raise his eyes to heaven but kept striking his chest

⁷³These references of authority do not include the Gospel writers’ statements about Jesus’ authority from a perspective of His divinity.

⁷⁴Blomberg, *Matthew*, 32. This author does not use this as an excuse to refrain from tithing.

and saying, ‘God, turn Your wrath from me—a sinner!’” (Luke 18:13). Pharisees “love the place of honor at banquets, the front seats in the synagogues, greetings in the marketplaces, and to be called Rabbi” by people (Matt. 23:6-7) was evidence of the same spirit.

Pharisaical Legalism and External Purity

Moo confirmed, “Jesus’ stance on the Law and his disputes with his Jewish contemporaries about this stance, are so integral to his mission and message that none of the Evangelists can avoid the topic; [however,] . . . Matthew shows more interest in Jesus and the Law than do the other Evangelists.”⁷⁵ One of the major characteristics of the Pharisees was “they maintained a punctilious legalism, while in doctrinal matters [as seen above] they had a quite open and receptive spirit.”⁷⁶ Simeon added, “Pharisees of all stripes were linked by their conception of a religion more concerned with practice than with pure theological speculation, and by an equal respect for the doctor of the law, the expounder of the Torah and the medium of the transmission of tradition.”⁷⁷

There existed an arrogance on the part of some of the Pharisees that must have been galling to those who, though Jews as much as the Pharisees, were not considered ritually pure like them. The Mishnah prohibited the Pharisee from activities that would cause ritual impurity. Pharisees were prohibited from eating at the table of a man whose wife was of the *`am ha-'arets*, though her husband might be a Pharisee or receive the *`am ha-'arets* as a guest.⁷⁸ It is amazing to ponder, if it was taboo for one Pharisee to eat with a man whose wife was of the *`am ha-'arets*, why would it be acceptable for a Pharisee to marry or to host one? According to Dema 3.3, “He that undertakes to be an Associate may not sale to an Am-haaretz [foodstuff that is] wet [susceptible to uncleanness] or dry, or buy from him [foodstuff that is] wet.”⁷⁹ Tohoroth 7:2, in a section describing “clean and unclean” added, “But the Sages say: Only that part is unclean which they [*`am ha-'arets*] touch by stretching out his hand.”⁸⁰ If a woman of the *`am ha-'arets* was left alone in a room, all that she could touch without moving from her place was unclean. Though the Mishnah was compiled in the early AD second century, one must assume that it does include traditions that were common in Jesus’ day (see the next section).

⁷⁵Moo, “Law,” 458.

⁷⁶Simeon, 28.

⁷⁷Ibid., 41.

⁷⁸Mishnah, Dema 2.3, 2.3, n. 2, 3.

⁷⁹Ibid., Dema 2.3.

⁸⁰Ibid., Tohoroth 7:2.

The Gospels list examples where “tax collectors” (considered as guilty of treason against the Jews) and “sinners” (legalistic and ritually impure people) invited Jesus to their tables, which was going far beyond the part of a Pharisee toward one not a Hebrew: “Why do you eat and drink with the tax collectors and sinners?” (Luke 5:30; cf. Matt. 9:11-14; Mark 2:16-18; Luke 5:30-33; 15:2). Another example of Pharisaical ritual purity lies in Matt 15:2, “Why do Your disciples break the tradition of the elders? For they don’t wash their hands when they eat!” (cf. Matt. 15:1-8; Mark 7:1-6). Luke 11:39 also adds an account of ritual purity and legalism as practiced by the Pharisees, “Now you Pharisees clean the outside of the cup and dish, but inside you are full of greed and evil” (see Luke 11:39-41). As evidenced in Mark 2:27, to Jesus, human need took priority over a legalistic observance of the Sabbath: “The Sabbath was made for man and not man for the Sabbath.”

Other issues that the Gospels discuss are Sabbath laws. According to Mark 2:23-24 Jesus and His disciples “[were] going through the grainfields, and His disciples began to make their way picking some heads of grain. The Pharisees said to Him, ‘Look, why are they doing what is not lawful on the Sabbath?’” (cf. Matt. 12:1-5; Mark 2:23-27; Luke 6:2-5). In Luke 14:3 the Pharisees asked Jesus, “Is it lawful to heal on the Sabbath or not?” (cf. Luke 14:1-4).

On a few occasions in the Gospels, some of the Pharisees asked Jesus about the consequences of breaking select laws: whether it was lawful for a man to divorce a wife (Matt. 19:3-10; Mark 10:2-9) or the question concerning the fate of the woman caught in adultery (John 8:1-11). In Matt. 22:36 the lawyer asked Jesus, “Teacher, which commandment in the law is the greatest?” Matt. 5:18-19 notes Jesus’ endorsement of the Law: “For I assure you: Until heaven and earth pass away, not the smallest letter or one stroke of a letter will pass from the law until all things are accomplished. Therefore, whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches people to do so will be called least in the kingdom of heaven. But whoever practices and teaches these commandments will be called great in the kingdom of heaven” (cf. Matt. 5:23-24; 6:1-4, 16-18; 8:4; 19:17; 23:23; Mark 1:44; Luke 5:14).

Jesus was not concerned about what was clean or unclean ritually; however, He was concerned about the spiritual condition of people’s hearts. Nowhere do the Gospels portray Jesus ignoring the consequences of breaking the Law; however, Jesus’ emphasis on the Law is within the context of people needing a remedy for the sins they commit. D. A. Hagner was correct in his assessment, “That even if they [the Pharisees or anyone else] had accomplished what they theoretically set out to do in successfully living according to a reformed oral tradition, they had no claim upon God.”⁸¹ Luke 17:10 concurs with the point: “In the same way, when you have done all that you were commanded, you should say, ‘We are good-for-nothing slaves; we’ve only done our duty.’”

Moo argued, “There is a strong emphasis on love or concern for others as the embodiment

⁸¹D. A. Hagner, “Pharisees,” *ZPEB*, vol. 4, ed. Merrill C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1976), 751.

of the Law ([Matt.] 7:12; 22:40).⁸² The purpose of the Law, as Jesus taught it, was to point to humanity's shortcomings; whereas, the Pharisees used the Law to point to their righteousness as compared to the unrighteousness of other people. Hagner added, "Merit before God on the basis of righteous works is a non-entity, and thus the whole Pharisaic outlook was vitiated by this basic deception"⁸³ (see Rom. 5:12-21). Moo correctly assessed, "The relationship of the Law to Jesus, . . . is, then, only one segment of his salvation-historical promise-fulfillment scheme. Through it . . . [is the] stress on the continuity of the Law—for the Law looks ahead to, and is incorporated into, the teachings of Jesus—and on its discontinuity—for Jesus, not the Law is now the locus of God's word to his people."⁸⁴

Tradition

Jesus also criticized the Pharisees concerning the traditions they added to the Law. Isa. 29:13 makes reference to such traditions: "The Lord said: Because these people approach Me with their mouths to honor Me with lip-service—yet their hearts are far from Me, and their worship consists of man-made rules learned by rote." Blomberg confirmed: "The Scribes and Pharisees were religious authorities, but their right to speak was always based on their ability to quote Scripture or subsequent Jewish teachers and tradition. Strikingly, Jesus quotes Scripture in his sermon only to reinterpret it, he cites no human authorities or tradition."⁸⁵

Though the Gospels refer to the existence of these traditions, only select references are offered in the Gospels that enable the reader to grasp their nature and extent (see Matt. 15:2-6; Mark 7:5-13). Thomson concluded, "The evangelists only recorded these traditional glosses when they conflicted with the teaching of Christ and were therefore denounced by Him."⁸⁶

Several of these oral traditions are found in the Mishnah. The Pharisaic basis of tradition is found in Pirke Abhoth, "Moses received the Law from Sinai and committed it to Joshua, and Joshua to the elders, and the elders to the Prophets; and the Prophets committed it to the men of the Great Synagogue."⁸⁷ Additions to these traditions were made by prophets by direct inspiration, according to the Pharisaical theory, or by interpretation of the words of the written Law.

⁸²Moo, "Law," 459.

⁸³Hagner, "Pharisees," 751.

⁸⁴Moo, "Law," 459.

⁸⁵Blomberg, *Matthew*, 134.

⁸⁶Thomson, "Pharisees," 2363.

⁸⁷The Mishnah, trans. Jacob Neusner (London: Yale University Press, 1988), Abhoth 1:1.

The great error of Pharisaism was that it viewed sin as purely external. An act was considered as right or wrong, based on some external condition was present or absent. An example is found with regard to almsgiving on the Sabbath:

[If on the Sabbath] the beggar stands outside and the householder inside, [and] the beggar stuck his hand inside and put [a beggar's bowl] into the hand of the householder, or if he took [something] from inside it and brought it out, the beggar is liable, the householder is exempt. [If] the householder stuck his hand outside and put [something] into the hand of the beggar, or if he took [something] from it and brought it inside, the householder is liable, and the beggar is exempt. [If] the beggar stuck his hand inside, and the householder took [something] from it, or if [the householder] put something in it and he [the beggar] removed it, both of them are exempt.⁸⁸

These restrictions appear to have indicted the Pharisee rather than the beggar.

In some cases it appears that some of the traditions, adhered to by the Pharisees, sought to lighten the burden of Sabbath Laws. Judaism devised a tradition, erub, which is "a technical term for the joining together or fusion of portions of territories, boundaries, periods of time which serve for the preparation of the Sabbath, or Scriptural portions."⁸⁹ Arcadius Kahan specified,

The rabbis placed no restrictions on freedom of movement within one's town, but they prohibited any walking outside the town beyond a distance of 2,000 cubits (a little more than a half mile). The boundary is known as the *tehum Shabbat* (Sabbath limit). It is, however, permitted to place, before the Sabbath, sufficient food for two meals at the limits of the 2,000 cubits; then, by a legal fiction known as *eruv* [erub], this place becomes one's "abode" for the duration of the Sabbath, so that the 2,000 cubits may then be walked from there.⁹⁰

Another example was cited by Thomson, "A man did not break the Sabbath rest of his ass, though he rode on it, and hence did not break the Sabbath Law, but if he carried a switch with which to expedite the pace of the beast he was guilty, because he had laid a burden upon it."⁹¹

Hypocrisy

The Pharisees adherence to the Law and traditions caused them to have a sense of superiority over the *'am ha-'arets* and others who were less careful of the ceremonial precepts of the Law. This

⁸⁸*The Mishnah*, Shabbat 1:1.

⁸⁹Robert Gordis, "Erub," *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, vol. 4, ed. Isaac Landman (New York: KTAV, 1969), 158.

⁹⁰Arcadius Kahan, "Sabbath," *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 14, ed. Cecil Roth (Jerusalem: Encyclopedia Judaica, 1972), 566.

⁹¹Thomson, "Pharisees," 2363.

would include all who were not Pharisees; however, note that the Essenes may have been accepted by the Pharisees because of their more astute observance of the Law. Thomson confirmed, “Because the ideal of the Pharisees was high, and they revered learning and character above wealth and civil rank they had a tendency to despise those who did not agree with them.”⁹² Joel B. Green understood that Jesus regarded the Pharisees “as misdirected in their fundamental understanding of God’s purpose and, therefore, incapable of discerning the authentic meaning of the Scriptures and, therefore, unable to present anything other than the impression of piety.”⁹³ It is ironic that the Pharisees’ power lay in the reputation of piety they had with the people (i.e., the ‘am ha-arets). The popularity of the Pharisees diminished based on Jesus pronouncing them hypocrites (see Matt. 15:7; 22:18; 23:13-15; 23:23, 25, 27-29; Mark 12:15; Luke 12:1, 56; 13:15). As a result, Jesus had secured a greater popularity than the Pharisees: “However, many from the crowd believed in Him and said, ‘When the Messiah comes, He won’t perform more signs than this man has done, will He?’ The Pharisees heard the crowd muttering these things about Him, so the chief priests and the Pharisees sent temple police to arrest Him” (John 7:31-32).

When one calls Pharisees “hypocrites,” one must go back to the primary meaning of the word in that a hypocrite was essentially an actor or pretender. Based on the Gospels, Pharisaic Judaism mimicked, “Heathenism, which lay in sacrifices and ceremonies by which the gods could be bribed, or cajoled into favors, . . . [and] its worship was entirely a thing of externals, of acting, posing”⁹⁴ (see Matt. 6:7). Hypocrisy is a sin only possible in a spiritual religion, a religion in which morality and worship were closely related. Though Matthew 6 does not name the Pharisees specifically, the description seems appropriate to some (cf. Matt. 6:2, 5, 16).

Jewish literature denounced hypocrisy. Sotah 22b described a Jewish condemnation on hypocrites, which exhibited many of the same flaws as the Pharisees Jesus condemned:

There are seven types of Pharisees: the shikmi Pharisee, the nikpi Pharisee, the kizai Pharisee, the ‘pestle’ Pharisee, the Pharisee [who constantly exclaims] ‘What is my duty that I may perform it?’, the Pharisee from love [of God] and the Pharisee from fear. The shikmi Pharisee—he is one who performs the action of Shechem. The nikpi Pharisee—he is one who knocks his feet together. The kizai Pharisee—R. Nahman b. Isaac said: He is one who makes his blood to flow against walls. The ‘pestle’ Pharisee—Rabbah b. Shila said: [His head] is bowed like [a pestle in] a mortar. The Pharisee [who constantly exclaims] ‘What is my duty that I may perform it?’—but that is a virtue!—Nay, what he says is, ‘What further duty is for me that I may perform it?’ The Pharisee from love and the Pharisee from fear—Abaye and Raba said to the tanna [who was reciting this passage], Do not mention ‘the Pharisee from love and the Pharisee from fear,’ for Rab Judah has said in the name of

⁹²Ibid.

⁹³Joel B. Green, *Luke, The New International Commentary on the New Testament*, ed. Ned B. Stonehouse, F. F. Bruce, and Gordon D. Fee (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 481.

⁹⁴Ibid.

Rab: A man should always engage himself in Torah and the commandments even though it be not for their own sake, because from [engaging in them] not for their own sake, he will come [to engage in them] for their own sake. R. Nahman b. Isaac said: What is hidden is hidden, and what is revealed is revealed; the Great Tribunal will exact punishment from those who rub themselves against the walls.⁹⁵

The fact that the Pharisees gained credit by acts they did in public, and would have lost credit with the people had they not done so, was not recognized by them as lessening the moral worth of the action. Consequently, a person did not produce any presumption in favor of his trustworthiness, by the most careful attention to the ceremonies of religion, no matter what religion he held, including Christianity. In Judaism, while “looking for the true fruits of OT piety—justice, mercy, and humility (Mic. 6:8)—Jesus found instead the worst of all sins: hypocrisy.”⁹⁶

Conclusion

If the Pharisees originally attempted to have Jesus to side with them,⁹⁷ which is questionable, it is obvious that some of them sought to destroy His teachings (Matt 7:28-29; 13:54-58; 21:23; 22:33-40; Mark 11:27-33; 12:38-40; Luke 6:6-7; 19:47; 20:1-8; 23:4-7; John 7:16-17; John 9:1-41). Likewise, if these Pharisees were seeking an alliance with Jesus, the aftermath of the raising of Lazarus would have been a perfect opportunity (see John 11). Instead, some of the Pharisees joined the Sadducees, who were theologically opposed to both the Pharisees and Jesus, to fight a common enemy (Jesus). According to Thomson, some of the Pharisees may have never given up on the hope that Jesus was the Messiah: “Even when He hung on the cross, the taunt with which they greeted Him may have had something of longing, lingering hope in it. . . . If He would only give them that sign, then they would acknowledge Him to be the Messiah.”⁹⁸

The survey of sources, in section one above, appears to place the NT and Josephus against other Jewish sources concerning reliability as well as points of views concerning the Pharisees. Hagner contended that a sense of anti-Semitism has led some to neglect rabbinical literature and ignore “that the contradiction [with the NT] might be only an apparent one and not a real one.”⁹⁹ Note in section four above, the similarity of Jesus’ condemnation of the Pharisees concerning their hypocrisy and the Talmud’s injunctions against hypocrisy (Babylonian Talmud, Sotah 22b).

⁹⁵I. Epstein, *Sotah, Hebrew-English Edition of the Babylonian Talmud*, trans. A. Cohen (London: Soncino, 1985), 22b.

⁹⁶Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, NAC, vol. 24, ed. David S. Dockery (Nashville: B&H, 1992), 375.

⁹⁷*Ibid.*

⁹⁸Thomson, “Pharisees,” 2365.

⁹⁹Hagner, “Pharisees,” 750.

The NT confirms that not every Pharisee was like those described and condemned in Matthew 23 as hypocrites. Nicodemus is an example of what a Pharisee should have been. He sought truth and counsel with Jesus (John 3:1-18); he spoke out for justice on behalf of Jesus (John 7:50-51); and he appeared to have remained a secret follower of Jesus when Jesus' disciples had abandoned Him (John 19:38-42). The Gospels list a second Pharisee, Joseph of Arimathea, who was a member of the Sanhedrin. Joseph looked for the kingdom of God (Mark 15:43); he did not consent with the Sanhedrin plot to do away with Jesus (Luke 23:51); and he was a secret disciple who made final arrangements for the body of Jesus (John 19:38-42). Luke 13:31 states, "At that time some Pharisees came and told Him, 'Go, get out of here! Herod wants to kill You'" and other Pharisees displayed hospitality toward Jesus (See Luke 7:36; 11:37; 14:1). There may have been other Pharisees who "secretly" followed Jesus; however, the Gospels do not confirm or deny this point. Though Gamaliel was a Pharisee and a member of the Sanhedrin, he was fair minded and tolerant toward the apostles, who preached the resurrection of Jesus, when the rest of the Sanhedrin was ready to execute them (Acts 5:34-41).

One primary point that separated Jesus from the legalistic Pharisees was the issue of grace. Grace is the means of the salvation that Jesus offers to us (Eph. 2:8-9), not by works of the Law that we are unable to keep.¹⁰⁰ Robert H. Stein added: "There is no legalism here, for people come to salvation by grace through faith (Acts 16:31), but saving faith seeks to know how a person can live to the glory of the God who by grace has granted the sinner salvation. This knowledge is found in the commandments and regulations of Scripture. It is clear that Luke in no way disparaged the ethical teachings of the OT."¹⁰¹ Nor is salvation obtained from traditions that exempt us from keeping the Law. Thomson stated it well: "With Him [Jesus] it [salvation] was the heart that must be right with God, not merely the external actions; not only the outside of the cup and platter was to be cleansed, but the inside first of all."¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰Timothy George, *Galatians*, NAC, vol. 30, ed. David S. Dockery (Nashville: B&H, 1994), 252. According to George (252), "The law of Moses, which was "added" 430 years after the Abrahamic covenant, . . . [was not added] as a codicil is appended to a will in order to alter its provisions but [was] added in order to accomplish some other subordinate and supplementary purpose. This meaning is further clarified when we look at the parallel verse in Rom 5:20: 'The law was added so that the trespass might increase.' In Romans the word for 'added' (*pareisēlthen*) means literally 'came in by a side road.' The main road is the covenant of promise—inviolable, irrevocable. The law has the character of something additional, a side road intended to carry extra traffic and excess baggage and, if we may anticipate Paul's argument, designed not to lead to a separate destination but to point its travelers back to the main road."

¹⁰¹Stein, *Luke*, 79.

¹⁰²Thomson, "Pharisees," 2365. Kingsbury concurred with Thomson, "He [Jesus] condemns them [the Pharisees] for paying diligent attention in the practice of religion to what is peripheral while disregarding what is central: Concerned to tithe the most insignificant of the garden herbs, they neglect justice and love of God (11:42). See Kingsbury, *Luke*, 92.