

# DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

## Chapter 1 : Pharisees - Conservapedia

*In fact Jesus continually reinforced his accusations against their unwillingness to maintain a consistency between their tradition and the written law: Matt "They are blind leaders of the blind.*

Jesus had condemned their traditions Matthew The Law was difficult to follow and was seen as a heavy yoke Acts Often they made fine distinctions and endless exceptions Mark 7: These distinctions allowed the teachers to do as they please but offered no relief to the followers. Therefore, they took their religion to the extremes in showiness. Of course, in their mind the bigger the case, the better. They also wore long robes to indicate their status Mark The scribes and Pharisees also sought out prominent seats at dinners and in their religious worship. They wanted to be noticed and respected. Sadly this teaching is mostly ignored among the Christian denominations. See also John 5: Yet in each case we find that Paul is discussing the role he is playing and not giving a title by which he is addressed. Whoever exalts himself has no where to go but down. He will be humbled by God. Whoever humbles himself has no where to go but up. He will be exalted by God Proverbs Woes upon the Scribes and Pharisees Matthew They were keeping people from the kingdom. Using the imagery of a house to represent the kingdom of God, or the church, the scribes and Pharisees are described as a mob gathering in front of the door. This is a charge Jesus has brought against the Pharisees before Luke In their desire to oppose Jesus they were keeping people from serving God. Jesus was charging them with profiting off the poor while simultaneously pretending to be religious by offering up long prayers. This had long been a problem in Israel Isaiah Jesus charges that the scribes and Pharisees with a greater condemnation as promised by God Exodus This charge remains a problem in the church. There are false teachers doing much the same as the scribes and Pharisees II Timothy 3: They pursue converts, but caused them to be condemned. They sought to bring others into their sect, willing to go to extreme lengths to convert even one. It was supposedly for righteousness, but the result is that these converts were worse than their teachers because there is always a natural drift from teacher to student. Likely the scribes and Pharisees focused on numbers, seeking to swell their numbers without giving much thought to teaching after conversion. Thus these converts were left in a worse state, thinking they had righteousness but having no idea how to live righteously. They played games with their promises. This is something Jesus had condemned before in his sermon on the mount Matthew 5: The Jewish tradition limited binding oaths only when the oath was bound by something tangible and could in theory be redeemed if the oath was broken. Binding An oath bound by the gold in the Temple. An oath bound by the Temple. An oath bound by a sacrifice on the altar. An oath bound by the altar. As Jesus points out, the things the scribes and Pharisees and consider non-binding were actually greater things. It is natural for a person to consider a greater thing to be a more important promise. But since the greater sanctifies the lesser, oaths by the lesser are no different than oaths by the greater. A oath by the gold in the Temple was the same as swearing by the Temple, which is the same swearing by God whose presence is in the Temple. And the Old Law taught that vows to God were binding Deuteronomy In other words, all vows or promises are binding Numbers To make an oath which one does not intend to keep is a form of lying. They focused on details while ignoring weightier provisions of the law. The scribes and Pharisees took great pains to fulfill some laws in detail, a charge Jesus had brought against them before Luke The law required tithing of produce Leviticus But laws which have greater impact in their lives, such as those concerning justice, mercy, and faith, are completely ignored. But the small matters of the law should not be done to the exclusion of the greater matters. You cannot make up the lack of doing the weightier provisions of the law by fine keeping of the lighter matters Micah 6: Jesus compares them to a person trying to strain out a gnat an unclean insect from their food while swallowing a camel an unclean animal. They focus on external matters and neglect their souls. The scribes and Pharisees are careful to clean their dishes just in case they may have come in contact with something unclean Mark 7: However, they make no effort to clean up their own lives. Again this is a charge Jesus had brought against the Pharisees before Luke They appear to be good on the outside, but

inwardly are corrupt. Jesus compares the scribes and Pharisees to whitewashed tombs. The whitewashing make the tombs look good, at least temporarily but the tombs are still tombs. Because they are dealing only with temporary external things they never make a permanent change Mark 7: They built monuments to the prophets, claiming they would have treated the prophets better than their ancestors. The emptiness of this claim is seen when we realize that even the wicked Herod the Great built a monument to King David. In their mind by building splendid tomb they were honoring the memory of the prophets. But Jesus points out they are testifying against themselves because they are honoring the fact that the prophets are dead. They are honoring what their ancestors had done to the prophets. They would have opportunity to show the world that they were just like their ancestors. The Consequence of Their Sins Matthew Jesus would send prophets, wise men and teachers among them, whom they will abuse and even kill. As a result God will be justified in holding this generation guilty of the deaths of all the prophets because they prove they are guilty of the same sins as their ancestors. They will have an opportunity to dig their own grave and it would happen within that generation. Some confusion comes from the mention of Zachariah, the son of Berechiah. By the nature of the death and the timing, we are certain Jesus is referring to the death of Zachariah, the son of Jehoiada II Chronicles A third possibility is that Zechariah, the son of Berechiah did perish in a manner similar to Zechariah the son of Jehoiada and this is the man to whom Jesus was referring. An interesting point to note is: Jesus seems to exclude the Apocrypha in his statement in Luke The death of Abel is recorded in Genesis, the first book in the Hebrew canon. The death of Zechariah is included in 2Chronicles, which appears troublesome since Zechariah was not chronologically the last martyr mentioned in the Bible cf. However, Zechariah is the last martyr we read of in the Old Testament according to Jewish canonical order cf. The traditional Jewish canon was divided into three sections Law, Prophets, Writings , and an unusual feature of the last section was the listing of Chronicles out of historical order, placing it after Ezra-Nehemiah and making it the last book of the canon. In light of this, the words of Jesus in Luke As a result their house would be abandoned and left empty. Notice that it is singular and thus a reference to the Temple. God would leave His people and remove His presence as he did in the days of Ezekiel. Jesus, God in the flesh, visited the people in his Temple Malachi 3: But because of their sins Jesus is leaving the temple and they would not see him again there until they acknowledge him as the one to save them Psalm Some read this as a prophesy of a mass conversion of the Jews to Christianity, but this is not what Jesus stated. The contribution boxes were kept in the Court of Women in the temple. There were thirteen boxes, each labeled for various purposes. Two were for the temple tax Exodus The remainder were for items such as money given in connection with a sin offering, money given in connection with a trespass offering, money given to purchase wood for the altar, money to purchase incense ingredients, and the like. Jesus observed wealthy people giving large sums of money, but he also saw a widow putting in two mites. A mite is the smallest coin used in Jewish society. Mark explains to his Roman audience that two mites equals one quadran. There are sixty-four quadrans in a denarius, which is equal to the pay an unskilled laborer would make in a day. Jesus called his disciples over, told them what he had seen, and told them that this woman had given more than all the wealthy people because they gave a portion of their wealth, but she had given everything she had. The value of the contribution is not in the amount given, but in the amount it cost the giver. The widow serves as a contrast to the scribes and Pharisees Jesus had just condemned. Send mail to minister lavistachurchofchrist. Permission is given in advance to use the material and pictures on this site for non-commercial purposes.

# DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

## Chapter 2 : The leaven of the Pharisees - Difficult Sayings- Language Studies - calendrierdelascience.com

*While in Judea, Jesus accepts a meal invitation from a Pharisee. It is likely during the day, rather than an evening meal. (Luke , 38; compare Luke )Before eating, the Pharisees carry out ritual washing of their hands up to the elbow.*

Who Were the Pharisees? Are You a Pharisee? Is this what the Bible says Jesus really taught? What really characterized the Pharisees? What about following human laws and traditions, self-righteous pride, and hypocrisy? What about going through outward motions without proper attitudes, failing to practice in harmony with our preaching, or displeasing God in order to have the praises of men? Click here to listen to this material as a free MP3 recording. Studying what the Bible says about these groups may help us learn lessons useful in our service to God. The purpose of this study is to consider some lessons from the Pharisees. The Pharisees were a prominent sect. They correctly believed in spirits and in the resurrection of the dead, whereas Sadducees did not. However, they also possessed many characteristics that Christians should avoid. Their errors, combined with their zeal and influence, often led them into conflict with Jesus and His disciples. But Jesus often rebuked the Pharisees. So, if we teach that people must obey the Bible, folks often rebuke us as being "a bunch of Pharisees" like the people Jesus rebuked. Jesus often did rebuke the Pharisees. But not everything they believed was wrong: So, we should be careful to condemn the Pharisees only for the things for which Jesus condemned them. Even if history proves that Pharisees believed some idea, that fact alone would not automatically prove that belief was wrong. We want to study exactly what Jesus really said about the Pharisees. Then we want to examine ourselves and consider whether or not we are like the Pharisees. Consider these characteristics of the Pharisees: Strict Observance of Law Acts Is Paul here criticizing or condemning that? If anything, he is speaking favorably here cf. He required them to repent. Amazingly, some people heartily approve the fact that Jesus rebuked the Pharisees and told them they need to change, then they immediately tell us we are un-Christlike if we rebuke others and tell them to change! If Jesus did not believe in telling folks they were wrong, why did He rebuke the Pharisees? And if telling people they are wrong is such a bad thing to do, why do people approve of the fact that Jesus rebuked the Pharisees? Some examples Matthew Jesus was stricter than the Pharisees! In so doing, they rejected the counsel of God. Jesus was stricter than the Pharisees about baptism! Many people today teach salvation by "faith only. But in fact, the Pharisees were the first-century teachers who said that baptism was not necessary. This was another point on which Jesus disagreed with them. People today need to realize that, when we teach baptism is necessary, we are agreeing with Jesus. People who deny the necessity of baptism are the ones who are like the Pharisees! But contrary to popular belief, Jesus was not rebuking the Pharisees here for being too strict. On the contrary, Jesus was seriously rebuking them for not being strict enough! The Pharisees tithed little spices but neglected weightier matters. Jesus was not rebuking the Pharisees for tithing spices. The problem was what they left undone. They had neglected even more important commands. So here - on the very passage where people think Jesus was rebuking strict obedience to the law - the fact is that Jesus was stricter than the Pharisees! He was rebuking them for leaving Divine commands undone! There are other passages where people think Jesus was more lenient than the Pharisees. But this was because the Pharisees were keeping human traditions, or because their motives were evil, not because the Pharisees were strictly obeying God. We will note some of these later. And if we seek to be like Jesus, then we need respond in love and show them their error! These rules were based on "the tradition of the elders" v2. They both bound what God had not bound and released men from what God had bound, all on the basis of man-made rules. Jesus gave examples of technical rules Pharisees made to release people from keeping their commitments. If one swore by the temple or the altar, he could be released from an oath. But if he swore by the gold of the temple or the gift on the altar, he was bound. Jesus taught, if anything, the temple and the altar were greater than the gold and the gift. Christians should be known for always keeping their word Matthew 5: Jesus rebuked them because their human laws freed people from Divine requirements! They condemned acts of mercy on the Sabbath - Luke It never had forbidden

## DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

them. The reason stories like this confuse people is that they assume the Sabbath law forbade all kinds of work. Sin is transgression of the law 1 John 3: If Jesus had violated the Sabbath law, he could not have been sinless. This could be considered work, but everyone agreed it could be done. Nobody thought this was a sin. Because God never intended for the Sabbath law to forbid works of mercy to help people in their need. Even the Jews knew this in other areas, yet they condemned Jesus for healing people on the Sabbath. So everybody knew the Sabbath law did not forbid all kinds of work. For some of us, even getting out of bed in the morning is a lot of work! The Pharisees had endless rules about what kind of work violated the Sabbath law and what work did not violate it. When the Pharisees condemned Jesus and His disciples regarding the Sabbath law, Jesus said they were condemning the "guiltless" Matthew So, Jesus did not violate the Sabbath. Again, the rules He violated were only human traditions bound by the Pharisees, but not by God. But Jesus responded that both He and His Father had been "working. In what sense had Jesus and His Father been working? Obviously, Jesus was talking about working on the Sabbath. His Father in heaven worked on the Sabbath too! He ought to know what happened! If anyone could properly interpret the Sabbath law, it should have been Him. It did not mean that God ceased to do all kinds of work. In fact, God has always continued to work on the Sabbath. He gives every good gift James 1: He upholds all things by the word of His power Colossians 1: If God were to cease working even for a day, the world would cease to exist! The continued existence of the Universe proves that God has worked every Sabbath from creation on. Miracles are "works" of God. So the very fact that Jesus did miracles on the Sabbath of itself proved that God believed in doing some works on the Sabbath. If God did not believe in working on the Sabbath, then no miracle could ever have happened on that day! So to condemn Jesus for doing a miracle on the Sabbath was really to condemn God, since God must be the source of the power. If Jesus taught that miracles could be done on the Sabbath and then He did miracles, that meant God was confirming what Jesus taught, including His teaching that healing did not violate the Sabbath law! It never did forbid all kinds of work. The works He did were permitted by the law. And what the Pharisees should have done when they saw His miracles, instead of condemning Him for violating the law, they should have recognized that the very fact that He could do miracles actually confirmed that He was teaching the truth. Modern Applications Like the Pharisees, many people today participate in religious practices because of human tradition and command rather than Divine command. Instead, they justify them on the grounds of tradition. They appeal to these as their authority for doctrine and practice. I was brought this way. All such views constitute following human tradition. In fact, the people who make this claim are usually themselves members of groups that follow man-made creeds, decrees of councils, tradition, etc.

# DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

## Chapter 3 : Pharisee | Jewish history | calendrierdelascience.com

*The Pharisees appear in the New Testament, engaging in conflicts between themselves and John the Baptist and with Jesus, and because Nicodemus the Pharisee with Joseph of Arimathea entombed Jesus' body at great personal risk.*

This kind of passage will require understanding the ideas involved and not so much the kind of miracle that Jesus might do. Here our study will be helped a good deal by getting behind the text to learn more about the culture in which Jesus ministered. As will be obvious from a straight reading of the passage, the controversy between Jesus and the leaders of his day are becoming sharper and sharper with each conflict. Thus you nullify the word of God for the sake of your tradition. Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you: If a blind man leads a blind man, both will fall into a pit. First there is the challenge by the teachers and the response to them by Jesus. Then there is the report that Jesus turned to teach the crowd on the real source of uncleanness. Third, the disciples ask about offending the Pharisees, and Jesus answered them with a parable that then had to be explained. In effect, then, the teachers raise the question, and Jesus answers them, explains his answer to the crowds, and explains his dealings with the teachers to the disciples. There was one occasion, but Jesus has three separate audiences to address, with separate issues. In the study it will be important to learn about the traditions of the elders on the subject of washing or purifying the hands. For this you may start with a good book on the backgrounds to the Gospel, but may in fact go to the primary source, the Mishnah. A second important issue to be studied in this passage concerns the citation from Isaiah. The meaning of the passage is clear, and certainly appropriate here. But in what way did Isaiah prophesy about them, and not his own generation? This will open up your thinking on the way prophecy was used. Was he making a radical break here from the laws of the Bible, or was he looking at the spirit of the law and not just the letter? Once again, though, you will see that some of the main principles of Bible study will be brought forward and used in this passage as well. Here we will not see so much interplay between story and speech, since this is mostly speech. But the content of the speeches will show how they relate to the story line, and the speeches reflect the culture and teaching of that century, as well as the message of the Old Testament. There will be some key words that will need clarification here: Of course the words for the different sins should not be too hard to study at this point. The Parallel with Mark 7: Matthew omits the material that we have in Mark 7: In general, it looks like according to Matthew Jesus disagrees with one Jewish teaching about the Law, whereas in Mark it appears that he is annulling the Law. These issues will be best discussed as they come up in the passage. The Old Testament Background The two issues from the Old Testament that will need some clarification will be the laws on cleanness and uncleanness from Leviticus, and the citation from Isaiah about hypocrites. These too will be best treated in the context as they come up. The Analysis of the Passage I. For easier study purposes, it can be further broken down into sections: First, the accusation 1, 2. The men who bring the accusation are from Jerusalem, meaning that they were the best trained and most highly respected teachers in the land. They also had a good deal of zeal to be this far away from home. Their appearance here must be a deputation or mission of some kind. Whatever the reason for their presence, they were the source of the most direct confrontation and personal attack that Jesus had to endure. Their attack came because of the activities of the disciples but see, the disciples were doing what Jesus did [Luke The whole section is abbreviated, more so than in Mark, because Matthew is a Jew writing to a Jewish audience. They know what all this means. Matthew does not list all the array of Pharisaical traditions see Mark 7: The point of their accusation is telling: What this means is that the traditions of men had been elevated to the status of Scripture, so that one could be guilty of violating them. But some of those views are applications and not what the Bible actually teaches. Second, the Rebuke of Jesus The reply of Jesus is more a counterattack than a reply to their question. He first accuses them of breaking the commands of God in order to keep their traditions. To press his point he reminds them of their tradition of getting around the law of God. Thus, they could use their traditions to get out of taking care of their father and mother which the Law required. Then, they might find a

## DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

way of nullifying the vow so they ended up keeping the money. A clever tradition of swearing or taking oaths had grown up as a way around a clear cut teaching of the word of God. This, Jesus says, is hypocritical, and thus they fulfill the prophecy of Isaiah. Here is the first place that He called them hypocrites. Here he quotes Isaiah In both contexts, Isaiah and Matthew, the people spoken to are Jews from Jerusalem who had a religion that was characterized by externals that often crowded out truths. They said all the right things, giving the impression they were pious; but their hearts and wills were not obedient at all they would not honor father and mother, for one example. They had a religious form, but not the reality that goes with it. The quotation from Isaiah generally follows the shorter form of the verse found in the Greek Old Testament, the Septuagint. The point is very clear: Jesus was saying to his audience what Isaiah said to his, that their worship was vain because they were far from God in their hearts. The Old Testament had a lot to say about clean and unclean for which see the discussions in commentaries or in word study books. Everything was classified as either clean or unclean, and what was unclean was not allowed in the temple. So defilements, diseases, sins, contaminations, discharges and the like made a person unclean. The Pharisees were rigid in observing the laws of cleanness as well as the sabbath observances and the tithes. In the process they were so concerned with the outward observance of these defilements and contacts with things unclean that they failed to realize that the real defilement was sin. The diseases, discharges, and defilements that made a person unclean were things in life that were the result of the presence of sin and death. To observe the outward rituals and miss the connection with sin was a waste of time. The real source of uncleanness was the human heart, as Jesus will say shortly. To harbor sin such as hatred and murder for Jesus and wash hands with ritual washing was hypocritical. The ceremonial laws, including the dietary laws, were given to keep Israel distinct from the nations, but in the coming of the Messiah the believers from the nations would be united with believing Israel in the new covenant. Here Jesus would address the real source of uncleanness, which got to the heart of the matter. They were holding to externals and missed the real spirit of the law and the reason for the washing. The question of the disciples showed that the Pharisees must have understood what Jesus had said and taken offence at it. The people held these teachers in high regard, and so the disciples were worried that Jesus was too hard on them. The basic issue was their misunderstanding of the Law—they dwelt on the externals as the source of uncleanness and did not realize that the source of the defilements was sin in the world, so uncleanness originated in the human heart. God legislated rituals to deal with the defilements and the death as a way of reminding Israel of the fact that they were defiled by sin. And Jesus often healed people as a way of showing that He could deal with the cause of the sickness, sin, as well as the results. To answer the disciples Jesus used a couple of images. The first was that any plant that the Father had not planted would be rooted up v. Jesus was not saying that false teaching would be rooted out, but false teachers. This is a theme that gets clearer and clearer in the book. The second image is that the teachers of Israel saw themselves as guides for the blind as Isaiah described the ignorant people of the land; Isa. The leaders were blind because they failed to understand the Scriptures that they taught, and so majored on externals and missed the reality. And, since they were so weak in spiritual understanding, they also failed to perceive who Jesus was and failed to follow Him—that is the ultimate spiritual blindness see John 5: Therefore, as leaders they will lead people away from Christ, because they do not rightly discern the Scriptures. The disciples have faith in Jesus, but are still weak in their understanding of all that Jesus taught. So Jesus explains in some detail what it is that defiles a person. What someone eats goes in the mouth and is cast out into a latrine eventually. That in one sense is eventually unclean, either the wrong foods being eaten, or what is excreted. But Jesus is saying that the real issue is not what enters the mouth but what comes out, because that comes from the heart. And what are the products of the heart or will? The point that Jesus is making is that it is what a person actually is that brings defilement. The external laws of cleanness and uncleanness if properly understood to reflect the effects of sin in the world were helpful for a devout Israelite to avoid the impurities as a way of following a life of purity. But as is so often the case, it was easier to focus on the external rituals and forget the spiritual reality behind them. Jesus is teaching that true religion must deal with the true nature of men and women, not just the outer

## DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

performances. The teachers would have known this if they had been concerned about inner purity. Jesus finally ends this teaching by saying that eating with unwashed hands does not make a man unclean, but what comes from the heart does. This is a radical departure from not only the traditions of the elders but also the details of the Law. But Jesus has already made it clear see Matt. Not only had Jesus rejected the Pharisees and the teachers of the Law as the authentic teachers of his day, but he had assumed that role for himself—he is the teacher.

## Chapter 4 : JESUS AND TRADITION

*The rise of the Pharisees was a reaction and protest against this tendency among their fellow kinsmen. Their aim was to preserve their national integrity and strict conformity to Mosaic law. They later developed into self-righteous and hypocritical formalists.*

This included an expansion of culture, including an appreciation of Greek theater, and admiration of the human body. After the death of Alexander in BCE, his generals divided the empire among themselves and for the next 30 years, they fought for control of the empire. Judea was first controlled by the Ptolemies of Egypt. King Antiochus Epiphanes of Syria, a Seleucid, disrupted whatever peace there had been in Judea when he desecrated the temple in Jerusalem and forced Jews to violate the Torah. Most prominent of the rebel groups were the Maccabees, led by Mattathias the Hasmonean and his son Judah the Maccabee. Cooperation between the Romans and the Jews was strongest during the reigns of Herod and his grandson, Herod Agrippa I. However, the Romans moved power out of the hands of vassal kings and into the hands of Roman administrators, beginning with the Census of Quirinius in 6 CE. After a few years of conflict, the Romans retook Jerusalem and destroyed the temple, bringing an end to the Second Temple Period in 70 CE. It makes sense, then, that priests held important positions as official leaders outside of the Temple. The democratizing forces of the Hellenistic period lessened and shifted the focus of Judaism away from the Temple and in the 3rd century BCE, a scribal class began to emerge. New organizations and "social elites," according to Shaye Cohen, appeared. Questions about the legitimacy of the Second Temple and its Sadducaic leadership freely circulated within Judean society. Sects began to form during the Maccabean reign see Jewish Sectarianism below. In the beginnings of Karaism, the followers of Anan ben David were called "Sadducees" and set a claim of the former being a historical continuity from the latter. The Sadducee concept of the mortality of the soul is reflected on by Uriel Acosta, who mentions them in his writings. Role of the Sadducees[ edit ] Religious[ edit ] The religious responsibilities of the Sadducees included the maintenance of the Temple in Jerusalem. Their high social status was reinforced by their priestly responsibilities, as mandated in the Torah. The priests were responsible for performing sacrifices at the Temple, the primary method of worship in ancient Israel. This included presiding over sacrifices during the three festivals of pilgrimage to Jerusalem. Their religious beliefs and social status were mutually reinforcing, as the priesthood often represented the highest class in Judean society. However, Sadducees and the priests were not completely synonymous. Cohen points out that "not all priests, high priests, and aristocrats were Sadducees; many were Pharisees, and many were not members of any group at all. Administered the state domestically Represented the state internationally Participated in the Sanhedrin, and often encountered the Pharisees there. These also came in the form of international tribute from Jews in the Diaspora. Equipped and led the army Regulated relations with the Romans Mediated domestic grievances. Rather, they saw the written Torah as the sole source of divine authority. According to Josephus, the Sadducees believed that: There is no fate. God does not commit evil. Man has free will; "man has the free choice of good or evil". The soul is not immortal; there is no afterlife. There are no rewards or penalties after death. The Sadducees did not believe in resurrection of the dead, but believed in the traditional Jewish concept of Sheol for those who had died. Disputes with the Pharisees[ edit ] According to the Pharisees, spilt water became impure through its pouring. Sadducees denied that this is sufficient grounds for Tumah impurity. According to Jewish law, daughters inherit when there are no sons; otherwise, the sons inherit. The Pharisees posited that if a deceased son left only one daughter, then she shares the inheritance with the sons of her grandfather. The Sadducees suggested that it is impossible for the granddaughter to have a more favorable relationship to her grandfather than his own daughter does, and thus rejected this ruling. The Sadducees demanded that the master pay for damages caused by his slave. The Pharisees imposed no such obligation, as the slave may intentionally cause damage in order to see the liability for it brought on his master. The Sadducees argued that false witnesses should be executed only if the death

penalty has already been carried out on the falsely accused. In Acts , Paul chose this point of division to gain the protection of the Pharisees. Josephus , in Antiquities, contextualizes the Sadducees as opposed to the Pharisees and the Essenes. The Sadducees are also notably distinguishable from the growing Jesus movement, which later evolved into Christianity. These groups differed in their beliefs, social statuses, and sacred texts. Though the Sadducees produced no primary works themselves, their attributes can be derived from other contemporaneous texts, namely, the New Testament , the Dead Sea Scrolls , and later, the Mishnah and Talmud. Overall, the Sadducees represented an aristocratic, wealthy, and traditional elite within the hierarchy. As opposed to the Essenes[ edit ] The Dead Sea Scrolls , which are often attributed to the Essenes , suggest clashing ideologies and social positions between the Essenes and the Sadducees. In fact, some scholars suggest that the Essenes began as a group of renegade Zadokites, which would indicate that the group itself had priestly, and thus Sadducaic origins. The scrolls suggest that the Sadducees Manasseh and the Pharisees Ephraim became religious communities that were distinct from the Essenes, the true Judah. Clashes between the Essenes and the Sadducees are depicted in the Peshar on Nahum, which states "They [Manasseh] are the wicked ones His warriors and his honored ones [will perish] by the sword. Furthermore, it suggests that the Essenes challenged the authenticity of the rule of the Sadducees, blaming the downfall of ancient Israel and the siege of Jerusalem on their impiety. The Dead Sea Scrolls brand the Sadducaic elite as those who broke the covenant with God in their rule of the Judean state, and thus became targets of divine revenge. As opposed to the Early Christian Church[ edit ] See also: Early Christianity The New Testament , specifically the books of Mark and Matthew , describe anecdotes which hint at hostility between the early Christians and the Sadducaic establishment. These disputes manifest themselves on both theological and social levels. Jesus subsequently defends his belief in resurrection against Sadducaic resistance, stating, "and as for the dead being raised, have you not read in the book of Moses, in the story about the bush, how God said to him "I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? The Sadducees address the issue of resurrection through the lens of marriage, which "hinted at their real agenda: As opposed to the Pharisees[ edit ] The Pharisees and the Sadducees are historically seen as antitheses of one another. Josephus, the author of the most extensive historical account of the Second Temple Period, gives a lengthy account of Jewish sectarianism in both Jewish War and Antiquities. In Antiquities, he describes "the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the law of Moses, and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them and say that we are to esteem those observance to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers. The Rabbis, who are traditionally seen as the descendants of the Pharisees, describe the similarities and differences between the two sects in Mishnah Yadaim. The Mishnah explains that the Sadducees state, "So too, regarding the Holy Scriptures, their impurity is according to our love for them. But the books of Homer, which are not beloved, do not defile the hands.

# DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

## Chapter 5 : Jesus And The Traditions Of The Elders (Matthew ) | calendrierdelascience.com

*The point of their accusation is telling: Jesus and his disciples had violated the "traditions of the elders" (Mark: "tradition of men"), as if those traditions were now authoritative and could be sinned against.*

Jesus warns His disciples against false prophets. Matthew 5:27; Matthew 23:2 We can use the same technique today as we examine the Talmud. The entire gospel of Matthew is a book about conflict. This conflict centers on the religious leaders. These three Scriptures are cited very loosely against believers today who do not always concur with other believers over a so-called pattern for a public worship service. When Jesus appeared on the scene, He confronted over one hundred and fifty years of traditions from the Pharisees. It is this control that John the Baptist and Jesus encountered in the beginning of their ministries. There are three basic sources that individuals rely upon for their information concerning the Pharisees: These oral traditions were later codified about C. The Pharisees built up a body of tradition that was as binding as the written Torah. Josephus in his Antiquities of the Jews, written ca. What I would now explain is this, that the Pharisees have delivered to the people a great many observances by succession from their fathers, which are not written in the law of Moses; and for that reason it is that the Sadducees reject them and say that we are to esteem those observances to be obligatory which are in the written word, but are not to observe what are derived from the tradition of our forefathers. The oral law was for the Pharisee equal to the written law. This tradition probably corresponds to the later rabbinic idea of oral Torah. For the rabbis oral Torah was an integral part of the Torah given to Moses on Sinai, but it was passed on orally through the generations. Thus you nullify the word of God for the sake of your tradition. Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you: They worship me in vain; their teachings are but rules taught by men. In the time of Christ, the Pharisees numbered about six thousand. Josephus wrote about an incidence that occurred during the time of Herod the Great 37 BCE to 4 CE , which states the approximate number of Pharisees during this time: These are those that are called the sect of the Pharisees, who were in a capacity of greatly opposing kings. A cunning sect they were, and soon elevated to a pitch of open fighting and doing mischief. Another group that was sometimes in opposition to the Hasmonians was the Pharisees. They seem originally to have been non-priests who were eager to observe a strict rule of ritual purity and religious probity, and who therefore sometimes came into conflict with the authorities. By the first century C. To grasp Pharisaic history, one must not study Phariseism in isolation from its historical roots and the strong political power this group yielded during the time of John Hyrcanus, the ministry of Jesus, and the academy established in Jamnia following the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Jesus questioned their authority and this act got Him into trouble with the religious leaders. Jesus, in the Sermon on the Mount, dealt with the oral Torah of the Pharisees. This now-famous Sermon set the stage for the controversies that followed Jesus throughout His ministry. In the first citation Jesus, in the conclusion of the Sermon on the Mount, warned His disciples about false prophets 7: Prior to this admonition, Jesus went right to the heart of oral traditions. This analysis and condemnation of the oral Torah of the Pharisees by Jesus is conceded by many modern day scholars. North also states the matter firmly: Six times in the next few verses he will challenge their oral traditions. North illustrates through citations from the Mishnah and the Gemarah, which is the codification of the oral Torah, that there are contradictions between the written Torah and the oral Torah. Pilkington comments on the origin of the oral Torah: This melting together of the two laws caused Jesus to issue a scathing rebuke against the teachers of the law and the Pharisees. Matthew succinctly captures one such confrontation between Jesus and the Pharisees: Woe to you, teachers of the law and Pharisees, you hypocrites! You travel over land and sea to win a single convert, and when he becomes one, you make him twice as much a son of hell as you are. Therefore, he who swears by the altar swears by it and by everything on it. And he who swears by the temple swears by it and by the one who dwells in it. You give a tenth of your spices—mint, dill and cummin. But you have neglected the more important matters of the law—justice, mercy and faithfulness. You should have practiced the latter, without neglecting the former. You strain out a

gnat but swallow a camel. You clean the outside of the cup and dish, but inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence. First clean the inside of the cup and dish, and then the outside also will be clean. Jesus not only concludes His ministry with a scathing rebuke of the religious leaders, but He also began His ministry with a brief analysis of their rejection of the written Torah for their oral Torah. What is meant by the Scriptural text, This is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh? This teaches that Adam had intercourse with every beast and animal but found no satisfaction until he cohabited with Eve. The Pharisees with their oral Torah exercised tremendous political power before, during, and after the ministry of Christ. It is in this regard to political power that Rosenberg draws attention to the domination that the Pharisees had even over the Sadducees: Since the Sadducees were for the most part Temple priests and wealthy aristocrats, their influence over the people as a whole was rather limited, and during much of their existence they had to abide by the rulings and interpretations of the Pharisees This extended even to the procedures of the Temple sacrifices, although the chief priests were themselves Sadducees. With the destruction of the Temple the Sadducees ceased to exist as a sect. Their power extended even to the control of the synagogues. This control also existed even in the time of Jesus. Even when many of the leaders of Israel believed on Jesus, still they would not confess Him for fear of being thrown out of the synagogues by the Pharisees. John, an apostle of Jesus, writes about the tremendous influence exercised by the Pharisees: But because of the Pharisees they would not confess their faith for fear they would be put out of the synagogue; for they loved praise from men more than praise from God Paul, a Pharisee, sets an example of the hatred of the Pharisees against Christians. In the Philippian letter, he describes his ancestry and earlier behavior toward the church: Luke calls attention, in his book to Theophilus, to the hatred exercised by some Pharisees against the followers of Jesus. After the conversion of Paul, he, too, had to warn against the circumcision group Titus 1: Paul tells Titus that They must be silenced, because they are ruining whole households by teaching things they ought not to teach and that for the sake of dishonest gain. Therefore, rebuke them sharply, so that they will be sound in the faith and will pay no attention to Jewish myths or to the commands of those who reject the truth. To the pure, all things are pure, but to those who are corrupted and do not believe, nothing is pure. In fact, both their minds and consciences are corrupted. They claim to know God, but by their actions they deny him. They are detestable, disobedient and unfit for doing anything good 1: The Pharisees were a part of this circumcision group. When some men from Judea went to Antioch, they created problems by insisting that unless one was circumcised according to the Law of Moses, then one could not be saved Acts As a result of this controversy, a council met at Jerusalem During the meeting of the church, which included the apostles and elders, Luke reports: The influence of the Pharisees remained a viable force throughout the ministry of Paul. The Pharisees were so strong that they managed to survive the destruction of Jerusalem and establish a school in Jamnia in Galilee. The priesthood, the sacrifices, and the temple worship ceased as a result of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Johanan ben Zakkai, who opposed the war, managed to escape the city by letting it be understood that he was dead. The Romans allowed those in the city to carry out their dead in coffins and bury them outside the city. Once he was on the outside, he went to Vespasian who granted him the right to establish a school in Jamnia. The religious leadership passed from the priesthood to the rabbis. Scheindlin calls attention to the important roll that Johanan ben Zakkai played in establishing rabbinic Judaism following the destruction of Jerusalem. He writes, What had to be guaranteed was the religious tradition embodied in the Torah and in the ever-proliferating body of religious laws. Johanan ben Zakkai and his colleagues thus took an important step in reorganizing Judaism into rabbinic Judaism, the form of the religion most widespread until the present. Rabbinic Judaism centers on the constant study of the torah and the oral traditions associated with it and involves the meticulous observance of religious regulations, which are understood as constituting a legal system. By placing the study of the Torah at the center of Jewish religious life, the rabbis incidentally laid the foundation for the preoccupation of later Jewish culture with intellectual activities of all kinds. Even before the destruction of the temple, the interpretive tradition was well developed. Since the largest portion of the people looked to the Pharisaic sages for guidance, the end of the sacrificial system in the Jerusalem temple could be

## DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

accepted, for the Pharisees mandated other forms of religious expression that could take its place. This date is given in conjunction with the events that transpired in Jamnia ca. But Carson approaches the purpose and early date with caution: But in this identity, Matthew records many of the encounters between Jesus and the religious leaders. The Gospel is not so much anti-Jewish as it is anti-Jewish leaders in their conflict with Jesus the Messiah. Murphy asserts that Matthew rewrote the traditions to make the Pharisees look worse. One cannot but be respectful to the suggestion, but difficulties remain with his presuppositions. He correctly assesses the events that surrounded Jamnia when he writes about the Pharisees and Jamnia, but when he asserts that this Gospel was written to combat rabbinic Judaism in Jamnia, he cites no concrete evidence to substantiate his allegations: After the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans in 70 CE, a group of Pharisees, scribes, and others gathered at Jamnia to restructure Jewish society in the absence of the Temple and its establishment. They confirmed the Torah as the center of the life of the Jewish people, and made Pharisaic interpretation normative for all.

# DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

## Chapter 6 : Sermons and Essays\*The Political Power of the Pharisees and Their Oral Traditions

*In many places, Jesus corrected and railed against the Sadducees, the scribes, and the Pharisees. He said directly that they had rejected God's commandments in order to keep their own traditions. He said directly that they had rejected God's commandments in order to keep their own traditions.*

The leaven of the Pharisees Matthew They have a semi-deserved reputation which they even accepted themselves with the rabbis making jokes about the seven types of Pharisee including the satirically described "bloody nosed Pharisee", who in his desire to avoid sinning and just looking at a woman improperly Matthew 5: Each sect, like our modern day denominations, was characterised by distinct doctrines and alternate attitudes to Scripture. The views on Scripture varied on both its extent, whether only the Law Sadducees or also the Prophets and Writings Essenes or additionally the oral law and traditions Pharisees , and its interpretation, whether literal Sadducees , allegorical Philo and Greek Jews , practical Pharisees or eschatological Essenes. Jesus probably lay in between the Pharisees and the Essenes in his theology, although in practice he also exhibited powers like Jewish healers and exorcists. Leaven such as yeast or baking soda is used to puff up or produce fermentation, causing dough to rise. The important point being that only a little is necessary for a great effect. Was Jesus saying that the Pharisees themselves were like leaven? Matthew refers the leaven to their didache or doctrine and teaching. So, Jesus criticised their doctrine, or did he? The Pharisees believed in the immortality of souls, in a literal eternal hell and judgement, F2 they were midway between freewill and predestination. With regard to hell, punishment and resurrection they are virtually identical to early Christianity. F4 They believed in the priesthood of all believers by applying priestly purity to all people. They were essentially a house group fellowship, sharing common meal tables amongst their own as an opportunity for table fellowship, not unlike the early believers of Acts 2: They, like the Essenes, were renowned for brotherly love, whereas the Sadducees had a reputation for infighting and barbaric behaviour towards one another. Also, like the Essenes they expected a Messiah and were into a simple lifestyle shunning luxuries. They taught without pay and relied upon gifts from their disciples to support them, just the same approach that Paul had when he wrote to the Galatians that disciples should share in all good things with the one who teaches them Galatians 6: The Pharisees were rightly anti-Hellenistic and tried to avoid Jewish dilution through assimilation with Greek thinking and practice, hence they strongly adhered to Jewish biblical teaching. In these areas of doctrine we hear no criticism from Jesus. However, we do have the following: Well did Isaiah prophesy about you, saying: Perhaps, rather than doctrine as a defined body of knowledge, Jesus was referring to their applied and additional teaching, then. He certainly criticised their stringent application of Sabbath laws and punishment of sinners, Jesus erred on the side of grace, life and forgiveness. Of the then 24 sects within Judaism these were the closest to true sons, albeit in need of correction. Hebrews 12 tells us that God corrects those sons whom He loves, and who are true sons, not illegitimate. The older son in the Parable of the Prodigal Son is pictured as the Pharisee, ungracious to his wayward brother but nonetheless still an obedient son whom the father had no intention of disinheriting. Furthermore, Paul continued to call himself a Pharisee Acts Do what they say " Matthew Jesus positively encourages us to follow their Pharisaical edicts, now that is a contradiction! He adds, though, that we are only to obey their words not their deeds. Their teaching was correct on the whole, but their emphasis and their practice were out. Furthermore, their motives were sometimes questionable. They rightly sought to bring the people closer to God through obedience rather than only through a corrupt priesthood but they sometimes did works for the praise of men Matthew To spend this much time and energy on them clearly did not mean that Jesus had no time for the Pharisees. According to Josephus, out of a 1st century Palestinian Jewish population of circa 1 million, million total Jews including the Diaspora there were just or so Pharisees. So they themselves were a small group but one whose reputation and effect both positive and negative has been like leaven to the whole Jewish population. Jesus wanted this effect to be positive and for his disciples to be as effective in their teaching and to exceed them in righteousness but

## **DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION**

paired with non-hypocritical practice of what they taught. Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, Josephus, Jewish War, 2. Enter your email address below, click "Go! Follow the instructions in the email to confirm your addition to this list. The "Biblical Hebrew made easy" course can be found at [www. BMSsoftware](http://www.BMSsoftware.com), founded by KJ, offer a wide range of biblical , Hebrew , Greek and multilingual software for theological use. To report dead links, typos, or html errors or suggestions about making these resources more useful use our convenient contact form Powered by Lightspeed Technology.

## Chapter 7 : The Traditions of the Pharisees (Bible History Online)

*THE DELEGATION AND THE DIRTY HANDS* The Pharisees and some of the scribes gathered around Him when they had come from Jerusalem, and had seen that some of His disciples were eating their bread with impure hands, that is, unwashed.

The Sin of the Pharisees Matthew You give a tenth of mint, dill, and cumin, yet you neglect what is more important in the law — justice, mercy, and faithfulness! You should have done these things without neglecting the others. You strain out a gnat yet swallow a camel! You clean the outside of the cup and the dish, but inside they are full of greed and self-indulgence. First clean the inside of the cup, so that the outside may become clean too! You are like whitewashed tombs that look beautiful on the outside but inside are full of the bones of the dead and of everything unclean. You build tombs for the prophets and decorate the graves of the righteous. The issue is important, since the consequences were dire, and are still being felt. If you read all of Matthew 23, it appears that the Pharisees were being set up to kill Jesus and have his blood on their hands because of these other iniquities. Many a nominally Christian anti Semite use this and similar passages to justify hatred of the Jews. I think they are making a huge error. Jesus was criticizing a particular type of Judaism. Moreover, the Pharisees were in a sense obeying the commandments when they crucified Jesus. Deuteronomy foretells of future false prophets being able to perform wonders. Such false prophets were supposed to be killed. If the Pharisees killed Jesus because they thought Jesus was such a false prophet they were following the Great Commandment. Note the language of verse 3! I have not come to abolish these things but to fulfill them. What he did question were Jewish traditions added to the Law of Moses. Such oral traditions have since been written down in the Talmud. If you do follow them, you will indeed be within the actual commandments. But doing so is an unnecessary burden. Many a Christian has failed to understand this and claimed that the old commandments were done away with, that we should merely follow the Spirit or some such. But do not do what they do, for they do not practice what they teach. The additions were not arbitrary; they were based on the Law. The Pharisees were mandating extra measures to ensure the Law was not broken. Jesus did something similar by equating hatred with murder and sexual lust with adultery. And Jesus even endorsed following the rulings by the same Pharisee law experts he was denouncing [Matthew One difference, however, was that Jesus called for these extra measures as a matter of internal discipline. He gave no mandate to prosecute people for such slipping. If the Pharisees were punishing others for not doing their extra measures, then the Pharisees were guilty of injustice. But was this the sin in question? Making a huge show of being ultra strict in Sabbath observance, tithing, etc. One part explicitly mentioned is taking care of parents in their old age. And you do many things like this. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! King James Version We need to be careful using this passage, as it is not found in all ancient manuscripts. If this verse is valid, it can be tied to the many Gospel passages referring to neglect of the poor. It is safe to say that the Pharisees were found wanting in their treatment of the poor and downtrodden. Note that this was a requirement under the Law of Moses: However, note that there is no enforcement provision for this lending requirement other than divine wrath. But does failing to loan constitute robbing the poor? He unrolled the scroll and found the place where it was written, 18 "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to proclaim good news to the poor. The proclamation of jubilee is certainly good news to the poor! I cannot say for certain that this the passage above refers to the jubilee year, but it definitely fits. It also meshes with the criticisms of the rich. In an agrarian society the surest way to riches was to accumulate land. Once the fortunate have enough land to generate a surplus, they can reinvest in more land. Over generations you end up with a plantation system or feudal system. The jubilee law and inheritance laws that forbid primogeniture prevent this. This means that he probably inherited his wealth. Were these possessions land? Were the Pharisees keeping this law? Do modern Jews keep this law? I did see references to Sabbath years when reading Maccabees recently, so that law had come back with the Jews when they returned from

## **DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION**

Babylon “ at least the parts about letting the land rest. Lest any Christians feel smug, how many Christians obey the jubilee law?

# DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

## Chapter 8 : The Sin of the Pharisees

*So once again, in opposing Jesus' miracles, the Pharisees were not standing for strict observance of God's law, but rather were defending their own human traditions. B. Modern Applications Like the Pharisees, many people today participate in religious practices because of human tradition and command rather than Divine command.*

These were the two dominant religious bodies during the latter times of the Second Temple, from about B. Probably, the institution arose in the period of Seleucid rule ca. It had come in Roman times, to co-opt into its membership, a rising number of Pharisees and a few professional Scribes. Even orthodox Jews everywhere acknowledged it. They could pass sentence of death upon Jews in Judea for religious offenses, but could not execute it without confirmation by the civil power. Most of the upper clergy and upper classes belonged to the Sadducees: Zadokim, so named after their founder Zadok. They were nationalistic in politics and orthodox in religion. They stood for enforcement of The Law or Written Law, but rejected the additional ordinances of the oral tradition and the liberalizing interpretations of the Pharisees. They doubted immortality and were content to possess the good things of the earth. Perushim, Separatists were so named by the Sadducees, as meaning: They were a continuation of the Chasidim or Devotees of the Maccabean age, who had upheld the strictest application of The Law. For this purpose, they added unto The Written Law of The Pentateuch, the oral tradition of interpretations and decisions made by recognized teachers of The Law. These interpretations were necessary, in the judgements of the Pharisees, to clarify the obscurities of The Mosaic Code, for the purpose of specifying its application in particular cases, and to modify its letter, occasionally, in adaptation to the changed needs and conditions of life. In addition, in the Mishnah itself, which is the book of the Jewish Oral Law, we read of this sheer effrontery and chutzpah of the Jewish rabbinical leadership. What a strange, weird, bizarre state of affairs. The cement held the Jews together. After the rebellion of the Jews, under Bar Kochba in A. Hadrian forbade not only circumcision, but also the observance of The Sabbath or any Jewish holy day, and the public performance of any Hebrew ritual. The Council at Jamnia was dissolved and outlawed. A minor and powerless council was permitted at Lydda, but public instruction in The Law was prohibited on pain of death. During the centuries following the time of Jesus: It had been the main point of contention between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, whether this oral law was also, of Holy Origin and a binding set of commands. The oral law was added to The Pentateuch to constitute The Law in how they lived, and in which, quite literally, they had their being. While being scattered and during the Diaspora, the very existence of the Jewish people was threatened seemingly on a daily basis. They became like the Jews of the Diaspora. Moreover, they went into increasing apostasy and idolatry. The apostasy began, even during the days of The Apostles, Themselves. Evidently some people are throwing you into confusion, and are attempting to pervert The Law of Jesus: Will Durant says in *The Rise of Civilization*: The Greek way of life was put to death, at first, by the teaching of The Law. Then eventually it came to be a transmigrated life in the theology and liturgy of the Roman [Gentile] Christian church. The Greek mysteries passed down into the impressive mystery of the Mass. Other pagan cultures contributed to the syncretistic result. From Egypt came the idea of a divine trinity. From Phrygia came the worship of the Great Mother. From Syria came the resurrection drama of Adonis, known as [Easter celebration]. Since, the Mithraic ritual, so closely, resembled the Eucharistic sacrifice of the Mass, the Christian fathers charged the Devil with inventing these similarities for the purpose of misleading frail minds. Modern Gentile Christian religions, as the world knows and recognizes them, strayed from The Original Doctrine of Jesus: Modern Gentile Christian doctrines stem from Roman Catholicism. The Catholic organizations are worldwide bastions of paganism. The Gentile Christian religions, in effect, rejected all of the Law, which is written in the scriptures. The Gentile Christian grace is a divine influence upon the heart to do away with the Law. The oral law, which was supposed to be a blessing, in effect, became a curse to the Jews. Originally, no doubt, many of its aspects were right and useful, interpreting the rules of sacrifices, rituals, offerings, temple duties of priests, and the like according to The Law. This oral tradition or oral law was

## DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

delivered from generation to generation, and its precepts caused the Jewish leadership to grow even more increasingly distant from the word of YaHuWaH ALaHiYM. Wrote Will Durant of this problem: During the middle ages, the Jews of Germany and France studied the Talmud far more than the Scriptures. They were well sincere and well intentioned, as far as their oral law goes. Rise of the Karaites In the centuries following, the Jews became very numerous in the lands of Persia, Babylon, and Syria. They were allowed to be ruled in their internal affairs by their own Exilarch and the masters of their religious academies. The leader took the title of Excellency and ruled Jewry from the seventh to the eleventh centuries. Then a fascinating event occurred. However, the heads of Sura and Pumbeditha discarded the hereditary principle, and installed his younger brother Chananyah. Being bypassed and rejected, Anan fled to Palestine and rebelled against the established system. Anan went further, and reexamined The Pentateuch in a commentary, which marked a bold advancement in the critical study of the Biblical text. He protested against the changes, which the Talmudic Rabbis had made, concerning their oral law, which they established by their adaptive interpretations of the Law of ALaHiYM. He insisted on the strict fulfillment of The Pentateuch Decrees; Hence, his followers received the name Karaites: Adherents Of The Text. When the Muslims swept through the Middle East in the seventh century, they gave the Jews, within their empire, a measure of autonomy and self-rule, under a system known as the Exilarchate. Overnight, as it were, the Rabbinate turned, from a more or less local Babylonian phenomenon, into a widespread monolithic political power, among Jews throughout the Middle East. From the 3rd to the 5th centuries, they had developed a body of religious law, known as the Babylonian Talmud, which was now imposed on Jews throughout the Muslim empire. Resistance especially in the east was severe and fierce. In the eighth century, Anan Ben David Hanassi rose and fed the fuel of the fires of resistance. He organized Jews to resist the Rabbinate, and also lobbied the Caliphate of the Muslim empire, to establish a second Exilarchate, for those Jews, who disagreed with the Rabbis and their authority, that is, those many Jews, who rejected the Talmud. They trace their beliefs and practices back to the original Sadducees of the second temple period. Moreover, they visually sight the New Moon Crescent, every month, from the region of Jerusalem, and reject the modern Jewish calendar inaugurated by Hillel II. However, the modern Karaites are thoroughly Jewish, like their predecessors, the Sadducees. Moreover, they count Pentecost from the wrong day: One finds great differences of opinion on many subjects among different Karaites. This is looked upon as strength, rather than a weakness, preventing Karaism from becoming bogged down with a given interpretation despite the obviousness of its error. They all believe in One Father, as do other Jews. They all believe in the Authority of the 24 books of the Tanakh, somewhat, but they reject the Apocrypha, the New Testament, and the Koran. All Karaites reject Jesus: Therefore again, as in Bible times, we have the scene of two Jewish religious groups: To Which Of The Jews? Much in every way. What are These Oracles? Only those, who remained as servants being like-minded as Jesus: The traditions of the Jews should be abolished. Should we follow the traditional Jewish calendar, even when we have proved, it is in egregious error, based on tradition, rather than the word of YaHuWaH? MaSHiYCH, and all the Apostles, and the early believers observed, before the detestable and hateful postponements and changes were made to the Calendar, which occurred in A. The Apostle Jude wrote: For certain men, whose condemnation was written about long ago, have secretly slipped in among you. Anytime we come to see that we have been in error in the past, should we cover it up, deny it, and go on as if nothing had occurred? Let us understand this. If they do not speak according to this word, they have no truth in them. How should we handle them? Apostle Paul wrote unto the Called: Invited, to come out of sin, to receive salvation, like it was during the days of the Apostles. Today, a person can study the scriptures by applying precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little, and there a little. Why is this true? Because that same person does Not have a moral conviction to uphold the whole Law. Therefore, that person is NOT able to walk in the righteousness of the Law. Then you will know the Truth, and the Truth will set you free. The majority of people prefer lies over sound doctrine:

## Chapter 9 : Men Against Jesus

*One of the great battle cries of the Protestant Reformation was "sola scriptura!" Many thought that the Catholic Church had cluttered up the simple Christian faith by adding all sorts of practices, customs and doctrines over the centuries. They thought the Church in their day was guilty of.*

The Sadducees One of the major difficulties in describing the Sadducees is that all that we know about them comes from their opponents. They themselves left no written records of their history, their organization, or their views. They appear on the scene just before the great schism between the Hellenizers and the Hasidim, and they disappear as a group in the great destruction of 70 A. But judging from the comments in the New Testament, the Mishnah, and Josephus, they do form a formidable group. The Name "Sadducees" There is no doubt that the name "Sadducees" is related to the Hebrew verbal form sadaq tsahdak , "to be righteous. The most common suggestion is to associate it with the personal name Zadok; but if it is connected to this name, whether the Zadok of the Solomonic times, or a later Zadok, the doubling of the second consonant is difficult to explain etymologically. At present there is no satisfactory analysis available for the name. The Origin of the Sadducees The meaning of the name is related to theories about the origin of the sect. Besides, not all the Sadducees were priests, and some of the members of the community at Qumran were priests of the Zadokite line. Moreover, the Hasmoneans brought an end to the Zadokite priesthood as well as the Hellenizers. That would leave the use of the name Sadducees as a title without actual substance. A second view is that they were named after Zadok, a disciple of Antigonus of Socho. Antigonus taught Boethus and Zadok; his teaching stressed that they should serve God with no thought of reward; 2 because of this, the theory goes, they concluded that he did not believe in resurrection or life after death. The other disciple, Zadok, would have been one of the early leaders in the party that took his name. A third view is that the name is simply related to saddiq, "righteous ones" saddiqim for the plural. These are the possible meanings of the name of the sect. And so without any convincing solution to the problem of the name of the Sadducees, we must be satisfied to turn our attention to the few brief descriptions of the sect. Here too these descriptions raise additional questions about their beliefs. Josephus only once refers to an individual Sadducee, Ananus the High Priest. The Sadducean party was generally the party of the wealthy aristocrats. This is not actually stated in the sources; but it is a reasonable conclusion given the fact that they lived near the Temple and saw more of their needs fully satisfied by having their lives intertwine with the nobility. The party may have originally developed out of the conservative members of the aristocracy, the supporters of Onias III. Many priests belonged to the Sadducees according to Josephus, 11 but not all priests were Sadducees. While it is probable that the members of the priestly aristocracy were Sadducees, many priests were Pharisees. It was the priests of the Pharisees who were sent to question John Jn. And according to Acts 23, both Sadducees and Pharisees made up the Sanhedrin because Paul rallied the members who were Pharisees to his side. The Sadducees held more of the leadership positions, but most frequently had to submit to the demands of the Pharisees. This they did not wish to do; they preferred to be unconstrained by customs and deal with the written law only. Written laws left uninterpreted were vague, which would mean that they were free to decide what they meant. According to Yoma 1: According to Yoma 19b, one Sadducee explained that they complied because they were afraid of the Pharisees. The descriptions from the literature paint the Sadducees as nasty and arrogant because they had power and competed with others for it; 14 they were called boorish, rude to their peers as aliens, and quick to dispute with the teachers of the path they follow. The Sadducees had what has been called a conservative attitude toward Scripture--they restricted authority to the written law interpreted literally, and were not open to change. We know from Josephus that they hated the traditions of the Pharisees, accepting only the written law. When Josephus says that they rejected all but the written law, he probably meant that they did not permit legal or doctrinal deductions from the prophets. He most likely meant that they opposed unwritten traditions. According to the Talmud, in the debates the Sadducees were attacked from other books of the Bible and used

them themselves in their arguments. This strongly suggests that they viewed them as Scripture as well. The Pharisees had a large body of oral interpretation that had become binding. It was this that the Sadducees opposed. But the idea that the Sadducees took the Scripture literally and rejected oral law is not accurate; all the Jewish groups began with the literal text and added their understanding of it to justify their way of life. And if the interpretations of the Pharisees were not binding, then others could decide for themselves what it meant. In this the Sadducees would not be viewed as conservatives by the Pharisees, for in their opinion the Sadducees were not safeguarding the traditional faith. The Sadducees like all Jews believed that the Torah, the Law of Moses, was on a much higher plane than the rest of the Scriptures. Apocalyptic material, or any Greek syncretism, they rejected outright. It may be that the Sadducees believed that only the Torah was canonical, or that the Torah was vastly more important than other Scripture, but there is simply no evidence for this. However, their major complaint that the Pharisees extended the "canon" with their interpretations can be demonstrated. The Sadducees rightly rejected the oral law of the Pharisees, but perhaps because they wanted the freedom to follow their own. One of the areas of debate between the Sadducees and the Pharisees concerned the calendar. But the Pharisees ruled that "Sabbath" was the first day of Passover, whatever that day was, and so the feast of Weeks could actually come on any day. According to Josephus, 23 the three major sects disagree on the human will: The question here is whether or not Josephus is making the distinctions too fine in order to harmonize the ideas with Greek philosophy. The evidence is clear that the Sadducees denied the doctrine of the resurrection. It is probably because the resurrection was so critical for Christianity that the New Testament focuses on this point. Josephus confirms that the Sadducees denied the resurrection, the immortality of the soul, eternal rewards, or the "world to come. There are some of references in the Mishnah that also convey this tradition about their beliefs. According to Beracoth 9: It then lists those who do not, and the Sadducees are listed because they do not believe there is such. The doctrine of the resurrection is hinted at in the earlier Old Testament, but clearly taught in Daniel. Gowan thinks that it was late and not available to them in their formative thinking; 27 but surely, even if a late date is taken for Daniel, the ideas it reflects were in the air long before these debates. And if Daniel was actually written earlier, then there was sufficient time for the teaching to be part of the Jewish faith. Saldarini, reflecting the common view, does not like the idea that belief in the afterlife was established in Judaism by the second century. But the Sadducees were conservative; they probably would not have accepted anything that came from apocalyptic literature or that might not have been clearly formulated in the earliest times. Yet, the main issue is more likely whether or not it was clearly taught in the Law—that was the issue for any Jew. It is interesting to note that according to Sanhedrin 90b, the Pharisees proved resurrection from Exodus We shall return to this point later. The doctrine of angelology is more difficult. Gowan thinks there is something missing in this statement, because angels are clearly revealed in the Old Testament, especially the Pentateuch, and since the Sadducees accepted that they would have believed in angels. But this argument is not convincing, since it is possible not to believe in things clearly revealed. Rather, he thinks that the two clauses go together, and that the doctrine of angels that the Sadducees rejected refers to the idea that the dead were changed into angels. Rewards for righteousness were in this life, and hence they were keen on wealth and influence as evidence of divine blessing. Concluding Observations The reaction to the Sadducees was predictable. If they were not actually despised by the Pharisees and by the people, they were merely tolerated. In the Mishnah the Sadducees are listed with the ignorant of the laws, the deaf mute, imbecile, and minor, because they would not admit to the legality of the ruling about the erub. In fact, the Sadducees are grouped together with the Samaritans and the Sectarious minim, or "infidels," a term used for the Jewish Christians; see Beracoth 9: In the later Rabbinic literature they are painted in more lurid colors, as if they were heretics, not even Jews; Saldarini concludes that this is not accurate, but that the statements form a strong defense against the Sadducees. They frequently held high offices in the Temple, and with them a good bit of influence. They objected to unwritten traditions, because they preferred to have the freedom to interpret the Scriptures as they wished. They denied resurrection, immortality of the soul, rewards in the life to come, and angels in some sense. Their influence diminished until

## DOWNLOAD PDF JESUS AGAINST THE PHARISEES AND THEIR GREAT TRADITION

they disappeared by 70 A. Saldarini adds that to outsiders the differences between Pharisees and Sadducees may appear to be minor; but "within the community such differences typically produce fierce conflicts over control and influence". Although they claim to be Christian, they do not actually believe in the resurrection, especially the resurrection of Jesus. And to them, doctrines of angels and demons are mythical expressions from a primitive mentality. Their form of Christianity has been submitted to modern reason, with the result that a host of biblical teachings from miracles to rules for purity have been severed from the conservative interpretations and applications and given new focus. Of course, many conservatives view such "Christians" as unbelievers, followers of another faith entirely. But it is often difficult to know what the modern liberal actually believes. The problem is that many who believe like this are in positions of leadership in the churches, seminaries, and denominations. Their education and their position has probably created stumbling blocks for their faith; but unfortunately it has also impressed many others and gained for them a following. Their claim to be able to retrieve the true core of Christianity may simply be a foil for rejecting what they are unable to believe or unwilling to practice.