

A Declaration of Those Things Which Are Most Surely Believed Among Us

An Expository Study of **The Gospel According to Luke** **Chapter 20- Luke 20:27-40**

307- What Jesus Believed and Taught about the Resurrection- Part 1

March 20, 2016

Luke 20:27-40

27 Now there came to Him some of the Sadducees (who say that there is no resurrection),

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.*

29 "Now there were seven brothers; and the first took a wife and died childless;

30 and the second

31 and the third married her; and in the same way all seven died, leaving no children.

32 "Finally the woman died also.

33 "In the resurrection therefore, which one's wife will she be? For all seven had married her."

34 Jesus said to them, "**The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage,**

35 but those who are considered worthy to attain to that age and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage;

36 for they cannot even die anymore, because they are like angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.

37 "**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.**"

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.

To the Glory of God

Now, about 950 years before Jesus was born, God raised up a very godly man named Zadok. And Zadok was known for two things:

- ✓ Faithfulness
- ✓ Righteousness

And according to **1 Chronicles 6:4-8**, Zadok was a direct descendant of Eleazar, who was the son of Aaron and the forerunner of the Jewish priesthood.

Now Zadok was faithful to David during the insurrection of David's son, Absalom, and he was instrumental in helping to not only *preserve* David's reign, but also in assisting Solomon to ascend to the throne after David's death. In return, Solomon made Zadok the first High Priest in the Temple that Solomon had built.

Now those who came after Zadok were called "sons of Zadok", or Zadokees, which is where we get the term "Sadducees" from. And so the Sadducees were deemed to be the only *legitimate* heirs of the "righteous" and "faithful" Zadok, and so they were the ones who almost exclusively ministered in the Temple at Jerusalem until 70 AD when God brought a decisive end to their Ministry. After 70 AD, the Sadducees basically disappeared from the earth.

Now there were certain characteristics about the Sadducees that made them unique among the Jews

- ✓ They were aristocratic
- ✓ They were highly educated
- ✓ They were politically connected

So, all of the writings that we have from the Second Century BC until the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD tell us that the Sadducees "ruled" in Israel. So these men were not simply religious *leaders*, but actually held positions of power and authority during that time frame. Now the highest ruling political and judicial body in Israel during its existence was called "the Sanhedrin", which comes from a Greek word

meaning “*to sit together*” or “*to council together*”. So the Sanhedrin was the “Council” or the “Court” that ruled over Israel and decided important matters. It was the supreme theocratic Court of the Jews and reflected the local autonomy which the Greek and Roman powers granted the Jewish nation.

Now the origin of the Sanhedrin can be traced back as far as 200 B.C. The Council had 70 members plus the ruling high priest. Three professional groups composed the Sanhedrin:

1. High Priests (the acting high priest and former high priests) and members of the chief-priestly families
2. Elders (tribal and family heads of the people and the priesthood)
3. Scribes (legal professionals).

Now the Sanhedrin was a derivative from the Elders that God brought about during the Ministry of Moses, and was the primitive forerunner to the “Board of Elders” that the Apostles established in the Christian Church. And the Sadducees dominated the Sanhedrin.

Now all of this background is important because the majority of all religious leaders in Israel during the Days of Jesus were Pharisees—not Sadducees. Because the very things that allowed for the Sadducees to be powerful and “connected” men also made the average Jew of the 1st Century to despise them. And as a result, there were very few Sadducees alive during the days of Jesus.

Now we need to remember that the Sadducees were the professional priests, while the Pharisees were the laymen of that time. And at the height of their influence, there were about 6,000 Pharisees throughout the nation of Israel, while the officially ordained priests along with *all* of the High Priests in Jerusalem were all Sadducees.

So, here in this last week of Jesus’ earthly life, the Pharisees have already made their mind up and are now plotting how to have Jesus taken out of the way, either by completely discrediting Him or by murdering Him. And so now the Sadducees are going to try to take up where the Pharisees left off and trap Jesus. And the issue that they chose to use is The Resurrection.

Now something that we need to understand is that the Sadducees were fastidious about the first five Books of the Hebrew Scriptures, which is called “The Law”, or “the Torah”. These men believed that

these five Books were fully inspired and that all of the other Old Testament Books were simply commentaries that further explained the Law or that gave clarity to the Law. So even though we have many Old Testament Passages that speak about “Life after Death”, and even a Resurrection, there aren’t any specific references in the first five Books. And it was this logic that gave the Sadducees their rationale for denying its existence. And this is *why* Dr. Luke wrote this in **The Acts 23:8**:

For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection, nor an angel, nor a spirit, but the Pharisees acknowledge them all.

Now because the Sadducees were aristocratic and wealthy, they had the most to lose with a Man like Jesus. So they were furious at Jesus for what He had just done a matter of hours before this event in cleansing the Temple and throwing out the buyers and the sellers and the overturning the tables of the moneychangers.

The Sadducees saw this as Jesus assaulting them and their entire way of life. So, like Jesus had assaulted the *theology* of the Pharisees, He also assaulted the *economics* of the Sadducees, because they are the ones who had the power over the Temple operation.

Now politically, the Sadducees were eager to cooperate with Rome, and here’s why. Since there was no Resurrection, since there was nothing to be worried about in the life to come, they put all their stock in this life. Since there was no eternal accountability for their actions, the Sadducees went after all the power, all the wealth, all the position, all the control that they could get in this life.

This is the mind-set of the selfish and the self-centered. They cared nothing for God or even other people; they viewed Salvation as giving them the right to do whatever benefitted themselves the most. So they cooperated with Rome because they were an occupied country under Roman power. So, it was Rome, not God, who gave the Sadducees the authority to do what they did. So these men had a *delegated* authority from the Roman conquerors rather than any moral authority that they might have gotten from their godly behavior.

And the result of the Sadducees knowing who “buttered their bread” was that they did everything they could to kowtow to Rome to make sure they curried the favor of Rome to keep their position. And so

the average Jew hated the Sadducees. And that's why there weren't very many of them- it wasn't a popular thing to be.

So the Sadducees pursued policies that pleased Rome, and therefore, they pursued policies that angered the Jews. And their corrupt Temple operation was a continual irritation to the Jewish nation.

Now, when the Romans finally had all they could take from the Jews who were rebelling against them, and came in and destroyed Jerusalem in 70 AD and literally crushed the nation and massacred people finally brought it all down, the Sadducees ceased to exist. Once their priestly position and power was broken, their existence was over.

Now interestingly enough- the Sadducees were very narrow and very strict about most things, like morality. They were "liberal" in the sense that they didn't believe in what the OT Scriptures taught about the Resurrection or angels or demons or anything supernatural. So from that standpoint, they were like the liberal theologians of our day.

But in applying justice in the land and in applying the law, they were conservative to the point of being cruel. So it is correct to look at the Sadducees as being unmerciful and harsh. And this was a calculated move on their part. They held on to their power by being cruel.

The ancient Jewish historian, Josephus, tells us that the Sadducees were more savage than any other group of Jews. The Pharisees were actually lenient in dealing with people compared to the Sadducees. So these men were absolutely brutal in enforcing their will upon the people as they interpreted the Law of God in order to keep their power and position.

So, from that standpoint, the Sadducees were viewed as being "fundamentalists" and "traditionalists" and "conservatives" who refused to accept the "oral law" against the "scribal law". And so they were unmerciful, unloving, cruel, and barbaric all "in the name of" being "pure" as it came to the inspired Word of God in the first five Books of Moses.

The Sadducees looked at the concept of Divine Inspiration as being divided between two aspects:

- Scribal Inspiration
- Oral Inspiration

So these men accepted that the text of the first five Books were fully inspired from a textual perspective but they considered the writings of Samuel, Nehemiah, Ezra, Isaiah, Jeremiah, David, and the rest to be of *lesser* quality than that from Moses because they considered these books to be inspired *orally* rather than *textually*.

And one of the main results of this perversion is that the Sadducees did not accept the supernatural. Now, on the surface, that sounds so strange seeing that the first five Books of Moses speak clearly and repeatedly of supernatural events like:

- Creation
- The Ministry of Angels
- The Receiving of the Law
- The Signs, Wonders, and Miracles of the Judgment of Egypt

But, in spite of being patently contradictory, the main difference between the Sadducees and the Pharisees was in the area of the supernatural. So they did not accept the existence of angels or demons, they rejected signs, wonders, and miracles, and they categorically denied a physical resurrection. In fact, the only thing that they did seem to agree with the Pharisees about was that this itinerate preacher from Galilee had to be stopped.

Now the Sadducees took great pride in being the only group committed to the “pure faith”, the writings of Moses. So they interpreted Mosaic Law more *literally* than any other group,⁰ and were fastidious beyond all others in the matters of Levitical purity.

So the Sadducees denied any future life of blessing or reward at all. Josephus tells us:

“They [the Sadducees] believed that the soul and the body perish together at death.”

So the Sadducees rejected any punishment from God in a life after death. And this logic eventually caused them to disbelieve in any rewards after death. And, of course, if there are no rewards or punishment, then there is no accountability, and eventually you come to the point where you think that you are free to do whatever you want to

do in this life. So, from that standpoint, the Sadducees were like the modern Jehovah's Witnesses, who also deny any after-life.

Now many of us scratch our heads in confusion about how these guys could call themselves "literalists", and "fundamentalists", and "traditionalists", or "purists" or "conservatives", and not accept the many OT Scriptures that speak about a Resurrection. And the answer is they denied anything that was not specifically spelled out in the first five Books of Moses, and everything else written in the Jewish Scriptures was *subordinated* to the books of Moses.

So that's how the Sadducees defined themselves. They lived a very confusing and contradictory life. On the one hand, they lived life as though there were no tomorrow, with no concern about either Divine Punishment or Divine Blessings in heaven, while on the other hand, they were pounding people in a cruel and brutal way with the law, as though their eternal destiny depended on it.

Now, as bad as the Pharisees were, they believed in the Resurrection. The Pharisees accepted all of the Books of the Bible, even though they didn't understand any of them correctly. And the reason we know that the Pharisees were completely wrong about everything they understood about the OT was because they rejected Jesus.

Any understanding of the OT that allows anyone to reject Jesus Christ as being fully God and fully Man, and as the only Savior of the world, is a wrong understanding. Any religion or belief that lays claim to being in adherence to the OT Scriptures and yet denies the Deity of Jesus Christ, or that denies Justification by Grace through Faith alone, is not a religion or belief that has been Authored by God. Any sect that makes its boast supposedly in being true to the Old Testament and that does not lead its followers to Salvation in Jesus Christ is an ungodly sect and a product of demons. We must understand that all 66 Books of the entire Holy Bible have a single focus, and that is the Lord Jesus Christ, in both His Person and in His Work. And so any belief system that denies Jesus or that minimizes His Personal Attributes or Work is deceiving people because it puts forth tenets that are not true and that don't work. And, therefore, any such belief system is evil and not of God.

So the Sadducees were wrong because they left out part of the inspired Record of God's Revelation and denied the Resurrection. But the Pharisees were equally wrong because they added to the inspired

Record and went way beyond what the Old Testament taught and made up things about a future Resurrection that the OT never said.

So, for example, the Pharisees went into great detail about how a person would be raised the same way he died, and they went into lengthy discussions about whether you would have clothes or be naked in the Resurrection.

But the Pharisees' legalistic morality just couldn't bring themselves to support a Teaching that said that everybody in the Resurrection would be naked, so they came to the conclusion that everybody would have clothes. But then the debate became from where we would get those clothes? And then the debate was about whether the clothes would be new and supernaturally provided, or whether they would be the same clothes we wore on earth. And then the question they loved to discuss was if you have defects in this life, physical deformities or mental impairments, will you have those same defects in the Resurrection?

And many of the Pharisees believed that we would rise in the very same clothes we died in, and we would rise with the very same defects we had in this life. Then the debate shifted to arguing about whether or not all Jews who died throughout all of history would all rise in the land of Israel.

So they invented a doctrine that said that beneath the earth there was a massive network of tunnels under the earth, and they were all slanted so that whenever a Jew would die in another country and go into the ground, he would roll down the tunnel until he came to Israel. And so when they raise up in the Resurrection, the Jew would be home, in the Promised land, and not raised up in some pagan Gentile nation.

Now the Pharisees loved to discuss things like this, and occasionally they even discussed them with the Sadducees. And, in their self-righteous arrogance, the Sadducees thought any talk like this was ridiculous, not because they were trying to be Biblical, but because they didn't believe the Bible in the first place and thought that *any* discussion about supernatural events were ridiculous on their surface.

So as time went on, the Sadducees came to not only disbelieve in the Resurrection, but to actually scorn it and mock it as being patently ridiculous. So by the 1st Century, the Sadducees were known as religious men who made fun of the Resurrection. So by the time Jesus walked the earth, the Sadducees had mastered the art of not merely

disagreeing with other views, but of infuriating the rest of the people with their arguments.

So here we are in the middle of the last week of Jesus' earthly Life, and as the Pharisees are retreating from any further public debate with Jesus, it is the Sadducees' turn to try to trap the incarnate God. And so Dr. Luke records that these men came to Jesus with a question concerning the Resurrection.

Now the English word "Resurrection" comes from two Latin words:

- ✓ **Resurrectio**- which means: *to make straight*
- ✓ **Surgo**- which means: *under again*

So "Resurrection" literally means:

A straightening under again

... and refers to something that is dead- living again. Now throughout human history there have been *two* concepts of dead people living again:

1. Resurrection
2. Re-incarnation

... and you need to know that the two are not the same. Resurrection is taught in Scripture and Re-incarnation is not. Re-incarnation originated as demons came to the various Eastern peoples and deceived them with false concepts of both life and death, as well as great confusion about Salvation and Sin.

Reincarnation puts forth a completely *different* understanding of both the soul and the spirit than what the Holy Bible teaches. From its word form you can tell that that the concept of "Re-Incarnation" is based on "*Incarnation*", which is when a spirit takes on flesh. So, in the Bible, when God took on flesh and became Man, we say that is "the Incarnation". It was the "fleshing" of God. And the Holy Bible teaches that this "Incarnation" happened only one time, with only one Man, Jesus Christ.

But the Eastern religions teach that since the soul or spirit is eternal, that *all* humans are deity, and so they exist prior to their birth. And at birth, these spirit gods “take on flesh” or become “incarnate” as babies. So in the Eastern false religions, birth is merely the “putting on flesh” over the already existing souls of every individual, who are gods themselves.

Now the goal of every person who is deceived by these Eastern religions is not to be forgiven from sin and saved from God’s Wrath through the shed Blood of Jesus Christ, but to become “one” with the universe by divesting themselves of all human desires. This is a condition, or “state of being”, called “Nirvana”. But, sadly, at the point of death, everybody falls short of that goal. Everybody, of course, except the Buddha.

But this means that the individual, who himself is a god and whose soul is immortal, has to “take on flesh” again. So he has been “incarnated” the *first* time at birth, but because he came short of total Nirvana, he has to do it all over again. And so he is “re-incarnated”, or he is incarnated all over again, and he puts on flesh, all over again.

Only this time, the flesh that he puts on is determined by his progress at reaching Nirvana. So if he was close, the flesh he might put on is the flesh of a flower, since flowers are as about close as you can get to having no human desires. But if he didn’t do such a good job last time, the re-incarnated person might have to come back as a mosquito or a cow or even a rat.

And this explains why people who have been deceived by these false religions will allow cows to eat their crops and will not stop them so they can feed their babies. India has some of the most fertile ground anywhere on earth, and yet they have been plagued for centuries with mass starvation. And this is true because their false religion teaches them that the cows and rats are their relatives who have been re-incarnated from their previous life. And, so, if they stop the cow from eating, it will die and they will be preventing Uncle Bob from reaching Nirvana. So in their twisted scale, a baby has only been incarnated one time while a cow or a rat has already been a human before and is on his way to Nirvana. So a cow or a rat is closer to the spiritual goal of these false religions than a baby is, and so the baby loses. So people who are deceived by the false religions of Hinduism or Buddhism allow their

own children to starve to death so the rats and cows and bugs can eat their food.

So in re-incarnation a person may go through thousands of “fleshings” as bugs or animals until he can reach complete Nirvana. So we need to understand the false concept of re-incarnation through the words of my High School football coach, who said:

“You run that play until you get it right”

Re-incarnation deceives people by telling them that they will not face Judgment after this life but will go through thousands of incarnations as various different life forms until they can arrive at spiritual Nirvana.

Now this is all very different from what the Holy Scriptures teach. Christianity teaches that the souls/spirits of people did not exist before they were created by God, and that the “essence” of a person is a soul and spirit being united with a body. The Bible teaches that when a person dies their soul/spirit is separated from their body. But this is temporary state, and so they will return to their proper embodied state, in the Resurrection, in which they will remain forever after.

Now the Christian Church has believed and taught and confessed a literal and physical Resurrection for 2,000 consecutive years. It is a serious and essential Doctrine. One of the longest standing Creeds of the Church, the Apostle’s Creed, that dates from the earliest days of our Faith says in part:

I believe:

... The third day He [Christ] rose again from the dead

and

I believe in:

the Holy Spirit,

the Holy Catholic Church,

the Communion of saints,

the Forgiveness of sins,

the Resurrection of the body,

and the Life everlasting. Amen.

So we see that the Resurrection is divided between two different concepts:

1. The historical fact of Jesus Christ rising from the dead after His Crucifixion
2. The future Resurrection of all genuine believers

... and according to **Romans 10:9-10**, belief in the *physical* and *literal* Resurrection of Jesus Christ is a *requirement* for Salvation. Please go there with me- **Romans 10:9-10**:

⁹ that if you confess with your mouth Jesus *as* Lord, and believe in your heart that God raised Him from the dead, you will be saved;

¹⁰ for with the heart a person believes, resulting in righteousness, and with the mouth he confesses, resulting in salvation.

Now there is simply no honest way that you can read this Passage and then understand the Resurrection of Jesus to be some kind of *symbolism* or some *mystical concept* and not a real, literal, bodily and physical raising of Jesus from the dead. And, what is even more important is that there is no honest way you can separate belief in the Resurrection of Jesus from the faith that it takes to receive the imputation of Righteousness.

As we have studied, the New Testament declares that we are *not* made Righteous by what we can do for ourselves. So we are not made Righteous through good works, not even good and noble *religious* works. Therefore, no one is made righteous through their participation in the Sacraments or by attending the Mass or by going through the Rite of Penance. So the Roman religious organization is wrong about this. The Scriptures are crystal clear; we are made righteous, God *imputes* or *credits* the very Righteousness of Jesus Christ to us, by the agency of faith alone. So, like Abraham, we *believe*, and that *belief* is counted to us for Righteousness. So the Reformed concept of "Sola Fide", which was the "Material Cause" of the Protestant Reformation, is that we are made Righteous:

By Faith Alone

But, it is also true that this faith, this belief, has components to it that are *non-negotiable*. So it matters what we believe. We are not made righteous by works, but we are also not made righteous by faith in *anything*. So, it is not generic faith, in and of itself, that allows the Righteousness of Jesus Christ to be imputed to us, but faith in very specific things. For example, there is no righteousness to be imputed through belief in centrifugal force or by believing in gravity or by trusting in the democratic ideal or by faith in the tooth fairy.

No, we must have faith in the right things, in the Biblical Truths, in the historical claims that the Scriptures make. And right here in the first part of **Romans 10:10**- we see that the Apostle was moved along by God the Holy Spirit to say:

for with the heart a person believes, resulting in righteousness

And so we see here that the belief that is the catalyst for the imputation of Righteousness is tied in with the physical and literal Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. And that means that there is no imputation of Righteousness for those who *reject* the Resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead. And that means that those who deny or reject the Resurrection of Jesus Christ remain *unrighteous*. And they remain unrighteous because they have *denied* the Faith and are *not* saved. They are *not* Christians, they are *not* our brothers and sisters in Christ, and they are not going to heaven.

So the Resurrection is not window dressing. It is not a *secondary* or an *optional* or a *peripheral* or an *unimportant* Teaching. The Resurrection is *not* debatable. It isn't that *some* Christians believe in the Resurrection while others, who are "equally" saved, do not. No, belief in the Biblical Truth that says Life from God entered back into a fully dead Savior is prime. It is fundamental and a basic and essential requirement of being a Christian. Here is how the Apostle Paul put it in **1 Corinthians 15:17b**

... if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.

Now this is a profound statement! And let me show you what this means. Paul is saying here that if everything else about Jesus was true

except the Resurrection, you would still be lost. So, if Jesus was born of a virgin, if He lived a perfectly sinless life, if He taught perfect Truth, and if He died on the Cross, if all that was true, including Him shedding His Blood on Calvary, but if He did not rise from the dead, Paul said:

... your faith is worthless; you are still in your sins.

And that means that without the Resurrection there is no value at all in Christianity. None. The word **“worthless”** means: *possessing no worth or value*. So without the Resurrection there is absolutely *no* value and *no* worth in Christianity, and Salvation doesn't exist for anybody. *That* is how important the Resurrection is.

And it was *this* issue, the issue of the Resurrection that the Sadducees, the supposed “sons of Zadok”, the heirs of the “faithful” and “righteous” first High Priest of Solomon's Temple, categorically rejected. And look how they tried to set this all up. They used a ridiculous example to try to trap Jesus about one of the central themes of the first five Books of Moses. These religious frauds put forth a really goofy example as we read in **Luke 20:28-33**:

28 ...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.

**29 Now there were seven brothers; and the first took a wife and died childless;
30 and the second**

31 and the third married her; and in the same way all seven died, leaving no children.

32 Finally the woman died also.

33 In the resurrection therefore, which one's wife will she be? For all seven had married her.

Now, this is what is called “stacking the deck”, and is a tactic that is used to try to illustrate how silly and ridiculous a particular teaching is. So, right off the bat, we need to understand that there was no honest desire to understand Divine Truth here. These men are *not* trying to understand the Resurrection so they can worship God better. No, they already think the concept of dead people living again is so patently silly that they use this example to try to underscore just how foolish it is.

And the way these Sadducees framed their questions shows us that not only did they *not* understand the Resurrection itself, but they also didn't understand several other issues that God's Word in the Old taught, such as:

- ✓ Marriage
- ✓ Women
- ✓ Children
- ✓ Angels

Now the Old Testament reference the Sadducees used here in **Luke 20:28** is what Moses himself wrote almost 1500 years earlier in **Deuteronomy 25:5** that says:

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.

Now this part of God's Word was given at the time when Israel is on the edge of going into the Promised Land. And God has told them that the land before them is going to be apportioned by Families and Tribes. So it is very important for those tribes to have offspring, to continue God's Covenant Promise. And the Covenant Promise of God is in the giving of the land to those tribes.

So what happens if somebody has a wife who never gives birth to a son? A brother in the same family then takes that woman as his own wife to raise up the seed to keep the family moving, because that was God's Covenant Promise and Purpose. That was a way of protecting and preserving the nation of Israel and the distinct identity of the Jews. And it is called "Levirate Marriage" from the Latin meaning "brother."

And it first appears in the Old Testament back in **Genesis 38** in the household of Judah, who was the son of Joseph. Onan refused to comply and raise up a child to his dead brother's wife, and it resulted in God taking the life of Onan in **Genesis 38**. And God wanted to protect and preserve His people and the tribes of His people for the fulfillment of His Plan and Prophecy, and this is the way God did it.

Now, the Sadducees know the first five Books and so they are fully aware of this. And so they bring it up to Jesus not because they are trying to be Biblically accurate, but to underscore how ridiculous a belief in a Resurrection is on a practical level

Another notable illustration of this is Ruth. Elimelech died without ever leaving an heir, and so when Ruth went back to Israel, Elimelech's relative Boaz came along, and took Ruth as his wife, and raised up a child named Obed. And out of Obed came Jesse, out of Jesse came David, out of David- ultimately- came the Lord Jesus Christ. So we see that God had a Purpose for this Law in the early years of Jewish history.

And so these Sadducees give this kind of weird example with seven brothers all having the same wife. And then comes the punchline in **Luke 20:33**:

In the resurrection therefore, which one's wife will she be? For all seven had married her.

Now you can just see the smirk on their face. They really think they have trapped Jesus here. We have to understand that the Sadducees hadn't just made up this question five minutes ago. They had *developed* this question after many years of dealing with the Pharisees. And through all the arguments and the many jokes they had made out of the practical absurdity of the Resurrection, they had developed this argument.

So this scenario they give Jesus here was actually designed to frustrate the Pharisees, because they were the ones who said the next life will be just like this life. The Pharisees were the ones who taught that it would be the same person, with the same features, wearing the same clothes, having the same weakness and strengths while attached to the same relationships. So they saw this as an opportunity to discredit Jesus, so they threw it out.

Now in the sister Passage over in **Matthew 22** we need to read something that will help us understand this exchange that Dr. Luke gives us. So turn to **Matthew 22** for just a minute. At the end of their scenario, we see that Jesus began His reply with this Statement:

Matthew 22:29

But Jesus answered and said to them, "You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures nor the power of God.

Now you have to remember that these guys prided themselves at being great interpreters of Scripture. And so when Jesus says,

... You are mistaken, not understanding the Scriptures... nor the power of God.

He was attacking them at what was supposedly their strongest point, the point at which they took the most pride, the understanding of the Word of God. So Jesus is insulting these men to their face by telling them that they do not understand the Scriptures correctly.

Now the word that Jesus used here does not merely mean a "mistake" in the classic sense of that word like we use every day. It has a deeper meaning that actually refers to:

An error that causes a person to wander or an error that leads someone astray.

In other words, Jesus is telling these men, *"You are ignorant interpreters of Scripture. You've gotten it all wrong. You have misled yourselves. You are deceived. You have wandered from the Truth because you do not understand the Scriptures."*

And then Jesus adds insult injury and says:

... nor the power of God.

So their blind eyes had deceived them into believing wrongly about two things:

- ✓ A correct understanding of Scripture
- ✓ The Power of God

Had these Sadducees really known the Scriptures, they would have known that God promised a Resurrection. So, right off the bat, Jesus is saying that their theological effort at staying faithful to the first five Books of Moses at the expense of all the other Books was real

bad theology. That method had deceived them and robbed them of a correct understanding of the Scriptures.

And it won't help people any better in our day, either. The notion that many people espouse today that says the so-called "red letter" Words of Jesus recorded in the four Gospel Records are somehow of a higher inspiration than the rest of the Bible is nonsense. But believing this is actually worse than nonsense because believing this will deceive you and it will rob you of having a Biblical understanding of the important and eternal issues. So we need to know what God the Holy Spirit moved the Apostles Peter and Paul and John to write down as well as the writer of the Book of Hebrews and Jude, or we will be off in our understanding of New Testament Truth.

And that is why we need to comprehend what God gave Daniel and David and Samuel and Isaiah and Ezra and Jeremiah and the other Prophets, because the *entirety* of sacred Scripture is fully inspired, all 66 books have been breathed out by God and is therefore:

- ✓ Inerrant
- ✓ Infallible
- ✓ Authoritative
- ✓ Relevant

And all of this put together is what is called "The Sufficiency of Scripture". And that is why God moved upon the Apostle Paul to say:

2 Timothy 3:16&17

16 All Scripture is inspired by God and profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for training in righteousness;

17 so that the man of God may be adequate, equipped for every good work.

Now the Reformers of the 16th Century developed a concept about Scripture that reinforces what Paul said here. And that concept says that all Church Doctrine, all Teaching in the Church, all Correction and all training in Righteousness, and all Counselling must be from the Scriptures and from the Scriptures alone. And this concept is defined by the Latin phrase:

Sola Scriptura

So, for example, suggesting that you can read and understand the Old Testament correctly and still not believe in the full Deity of Jesus Christ, or that sinners are justified by Grace alone through Faith alone in the finished Work of Christ alone and not through human works, or through obedience to the Law or by keeping the Sacraments is ridiculous.

A correct reading and understanding of what God inspired to be in the 39 Books of the Old Testament will always, and in all cases, bring the individual to a saving Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. And if it doesn't, then you have *misread* the Old Testament and you are deceived.

So Judaism as we know it today, as well as these Messianic cults that spring up everywhere, are wrong about the Old Testament. And that causes these people to deny three fundamental things:

- ✓ The Deity of Jesus Christ
- ✓ The full Inspiration of the New Testament
- ✓ Justification by Grace through Faith alone

... which eliminates any possibility of any of these people being saved.

So Jesus said that these Sadducees did not know the Scriptures correctly. And had they known the Power of God, they would have understood that God is able to raise people in a state where all their supposed absurdities are absent. So these Sadducees were spiritually blind. They were not following God and they were not saved.

And so, Jesus begins, then, to unfold just what the Resurrection is and is not, and what elements are contained in it. And Lord willing, we will get into that next week.

Amen. Let's pray

© 2008- 2016 by The Covenant of Peace Church. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America

The Covenant of Peace Church 13600 John Clark Road Gulfport, Mississippi 39503 228.832.7729 www.covenantofpeace.net

Scripture quotations, except those noted otherwise, are from *The New American Standard Bible* © 1996 by The Lockmann Foundation. Used by permission.

This is a single transcript in a larger series of teachings taken from a verse by verse study of **The Gospel According to Luke**. You are free to reproduce it and distribute it as the Lord leads you- without cost or reimbursement to us with the stipulation that you may not add anything or take anything away from this transcript without the express written permission of The Covenant of Peace Church and that this complete copyright statement be at the end of all copies.

The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with your spirit. Amen. Be watchful and quicken your pace. Soli Deo Gloria. For the Glory of God alone.