

OpenTheo

Two Pointed Parables (Part 2)



The Life and Teachings of Christ - Steve Gregg

In "Two Pointed Parables (Part 2)", Steve Gregg discusses two parables in the Bible. The first parable is about builders rejecting the cornerstone, leading to the entire building not following the blueprint. The second parable is about Israel being God's field, vineyard and building, with the question being raised about whether the church has put the death sentence on this institution. Gregg emphasizes the importance of truth in the church and warns against the hypocrisy of using religious language, while members lack faith and practice in their daily lives.

Transcript

If the builders reject the cornerstone, then their whole building is going to be not according to the blueprint. And therefore God will build a whole new building around the cornerstone that they rejected. And that stone which the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone.

And that is what the Lord is doing. It's marvelous in our eyes. What he's saying is this.

The leaders of Israel, who are like the tenants, the vine dressers in the parable, they're also like builders, building up their idea of the kingdom of God, like building a building. But Jesus comes along and he is the principal ingredient in the building. He is the principal piece in the project.

And they don't accept him. They reject him. Therefore, they doom their entire building to destruction.

And God will instead replace it with a new building. And that's why Peter quotes this verse and says, We are like living stones built up on Jesus. Jesus says, We're coming to him as unto a living stone, rejected by men, but precious to God.

And you also, as living stones, are built up into a spiritual house. That's 1 Peter 2, verses 4 and 5. Now, what Jesus has just done in this segment is compare Israel with a plantation, a vineyard, and with a building under construction. Seen as a plantation or a vineyard, the leaders of Israel are like vine dressers or tenants.

Seen as a building, the leaders are the builders. They're supposed to be putting it together, assembling things. Paul takes the same two images and uses them of the church and makes himself and Apollos the builders and the caretakers.

In 1 Corinthians 3, verse 9 says, For we, by the way, just so that you know who we are, in verse 5, 1 Corinthians 3, 5, Paul says, Who then is Paul and who is Apollos? But ministers through whom you believed, as the Lord gave to each one. For we, that is Paul and Apollos, are God's fellow workers, but you, the church, are God's field, you are God's building. Now, the metaphor of the church being a field or a plantation or something from which God expects crops, and also of a building, has its precedent in Israel.

Israel was God's field or vineyard or that from which he was seeking crops, fruit, and they were also his building. Now, Paul says in verses 6 through 8, I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So then neither is he who plants anything, nor he who waters, but God who gives the increase.

Now, he who plants and he who waters are one, and each one will receive his own reward according to his own labor. Now, it's obvious that in those verses, Paul is using the metaphor of the church being God's field, which he says in verse 9, you are God's field. But Apollos and Paul are laborers together with God on the field.

And Paul planted the seeds because he got there first, and Apollos came later and watered the seeds, and God gave the increase. So, here he's developing this idea that Israel was a vineyard that produced no fruit, but the church is going to produce the fruit by God giving the increase. As long as there are leaders like Paul and Apollos, planting, watering, and so forth, God is going to make sure that the increase he's seeking comes.

And the church is that field that's going to produce that fruit. But then he goes on in verse 10, according to the grace of God which was given to me as a wise master builder. Now, he's changed to the metaphor of the building, the second metaphor in verse 9. You are God's building, the church is a building.

Paul, who was the sower when he used the imagery of the field, now that the metaphor has changed to a building, he's the one who lays the foundation of the building. According to the grace of God which was given to me as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation. Another, meaning Apollos and no doubt others who would come afterwards, builds on it.

Just like Paul planted and Apollos watered, Paul laid the foundation, Apollos and others build on that foundation. Subsequent teachers would come after Paul's gone. And he says, if anyone, verse 11, oh no, I'm sorry, verse 10.

Another builds on it, but let each one take heed how he builds on it. Now, you see the idea of a field or basically a tract of land that is used to produce agricultural crops. This

is a picture that was used in the Old Testament of Israel and Paul uses it of the church.

It was used in the Old Testament, the building metaphor and Paul uses it of the church. We are the temple of the Holy Spirit, we are the living stones built up on the one who is the chief cornerstone. So, what Jesus has done, he has taken these two images, the vineyard of course corresponds to the field in Paul's teaching there.

Both are images of that which is supposed to produce fruit and also of a building. And he says, Israel was initially the vineyard. Israel was initially the building.

And the leaders of Israel are the tenants who are supposed to make sure that the owner, God, gets his fruit from his vineyard. They are also the builders who are supposed to make sure that the stones of the building are put in their proper places. However, these tenants have not produced the fruit and they are like builders who have refused to follow the blueprint.

Here God provides the most important ingredient of the building, the chief cornerstone, and they reject it. Because they've got their own plans for the vineyard, they've got their own plans for the building. They are not operating in the owner's interest.

They've got their own agendas. When the owner wants the fruit and even sends his son, instead of saying, oh, now we know what the owner wants, we'd better do it. They say, let's kill the son and then we'll be able to get away with our own plans here.

And that's essentially what Jesus said to the Pharisees and scribes and those chief priests. That's what was motivating them, the desire to reject God's purposes, to reject that which God had dictated, and to do their own thing instead. So they reject this stone, but the stone, although they reject it, is still God's chosen stone.

There's another oracle about a stone in the Old Testament, which is frequently quoted in the New Testament. A lot of times it's quoted alongside this psalm, Psalm 118, about the chief cornerstone, in Isaiah chapter 28 and verse 16. Isaiah 28, 16, Therefore thus says the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion a stone for a foundation, a tridestone, a precious cornerstone, a sure foundation.

Whoever believes will not act hastily. Now here it is again, a foundation stone that God lays. It's God's stone.

It's a precious cornerstone. So you can see why this passage in Isaiah 28, 16 is often quoted in the New Testament alongside Psalm 118, verse 22, which talks about the stone the builders rejected has become the head of the corner. The idea is both passages speak of Jesus as a cornerstone for God's building project, the church.

And that the reason Israel is no longer God's building project, they're no longer His workmanship, they're no longer His building, His habitation. They're no longer His house.

He used to dwell in the house of Israel.

Now He dwells in the house, which is the temple of the Holy Spirit, which is the church. The reason for that is because of their rejection of the cornerstone. Okay, let's go on.

Matthew 21, 43, Therefore I say to you, Jesus says, The kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it. Now this is parallel to the answer he got to his question in verse 41, where he said, What do you think He'll do? They said, He will destroy those wicked men miserably and lease His vineyard to other vinedressers who will render to Him the fruits in their seasons. Now particularly, when it says they will render the fruits, that's what he picks up in verse 43.

He's got to find another set of tenants. He's going to invest the same privileges in another group of people. Jesus says, another nation.

And this group will produce the fruit that the first group did not. So the church is destined to produce the fruit, which Israel failed to produce, according to this statement. Now, he doesn't repeat the first part of verse 41, where it says, He will destroy those wicked men miserably.

He could have. He could have said in verse 43, Therefore God's going to destroy you people miserably and take the kingdom from you and give it to some other nation that will produce the fruits. He didn't say that every chance he got, but he said it a lot.

In fact, in the very next chapter, the very next parable, the marriage festival, he did say that very same thing in verse 7. But when the king heard about it, he was furious and sent out his armies and destroyed those murderers. Same idea as chapter 21, 41, where they said, He will destroy those wicked men miserably. That's true.

He will. He doesn't say so and explain this parable, but he does in the next parable in Matthew 22, 7. He'll send out his armies and destroy those murderers and burn up their city. So we can see that these predictions about the doom of Jerusalem come on pretty thick and heavy at this particular point in Jesus' ministry.

Now, in verse 43, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a nation bearing the fruits of it. It couldn't be clearer, it seems to me, that he's saying the kingdom of God, the privileges of the kingdom, are no longer to belong to Israel. They now are given to another people.

Now, I was once listening to a tape by a dispensationalist who was trying to wrestle with this verse. Because, of course, the dispensationalists believe the kingdom is still Israel's kingdom. And it will be given to them visibly at Jesus' second coming for a millennial reign of Christ on this earth for a thousand years.

The kingdom will be theirs again. Israel's. National Israel.

And this verse, obviously, was a hard verse for him. And he was saying, well, what Jesus was saying when he says the kingdom will be taken from you, he means from those particular listeners, the chief priests, the Pharisees, that generation of Jewish leaders. That kingdom was going to be taken from that generation of leaders and given to some other leaders.

And for the time being, the privileges of being the people of God was going to be invested in the church and the apostles would be the leaders that would replace those Jewish leaders. Of course, but this dispensational speaker felt like the time would come when the church is no longer relevant after the rapture and God would then restore the kingdom to Israel. Well, it doesn't sound like Jesus is saying that to me.

When he says the kingdom will be taken from you, does he mean you individual guys who happen to be the leaders in this particular generation of Israel? Or does he mean you, the nation of Israel at large, the nation of Israel as a whole? Well, the clue to answering that question would seem to be in his, in the rest of that sentence. It'll be taken from you and given to a nation. In other words, it's taken from one nation and given to another nation.

He didn't say it's going to be taken from you and given to some new leadership. As if he's saying I'm taking it from this group of leaders and giving it to another group of leaders. But rather, I'm taking it from this nation and giving it to another nation.

Now, who is that nation? Well, you know the answer. The answer is the church. Lots of people haven't seen that because we don't commonly think of the church as a nation.

We think of political powers as nations. I actually have read literature by very ridiculous expositors, in my opinion, who thought that nation was Britain or that nation was America. God actually gave the kingdom to America and Columbus discovered it and that's a fulfillment of Jesus' promise.

He's given the kingdom of God to another nation and we're it. We're the new Israel. There are actually, I hate to use abusive language when I speak of such people, but they just seem like such exegetical nincompoops, really.

I mean, to think that there could be anything of that in Jesus' statement, it just, I really shouldn't use that kind of language because Jesus said if you call your brother rock, it's not a good thing. But I just can't understand how people could be so irresponsible in their thinking about the Bible. The nation to whom the kingdom has been given is the church and the church is called by Peter a holy nation in 1 Peter 2.9. He says you are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, 1 Peter 2.9. The church is a nation in a spiritual sense.

It's not associated with any one earthly geographical place, but it is a commonwealth

under one crown. Though it be spread globally around the world, it is still a commonwealth under one crown. It is a state, as it were, a nation under King Jesus.

And the kingdom has been given to the church, a spiritual entity, a new building, a new field. Now, the question may still remain to be answered. Does God intend someday to take the kingdom from this nation to whom he has given it and give it back to Israel again? That is what the dispensational and some premillennial ideas would think.

However, it doesn't sound like it. For one thing, why would he? He never got the fruit out of Israel, which is why he's taken it from them. And now he's going to give it to a nation that will produce the fruit.

You see, dispensationalism teaches that the church is going to fail more miserably than Israel did. It is the official dispensational doctrine that the church is going to lose this battle. The church is going to be totally corrupted.

In the latter days, just before the rapture, the church is going to be practically apostate. And that it will be a nearly apostate church that gets raptured out of here. And a church that's been an utter failure, leaving this world like a whipped dog with its tail between its legs, having failed in its mission.

And then God will pour out his spirit on his favorites again, the Jews. And they will be productive, and they will do what they never did before. And even though they had hundreds of years to do it in times past and weren't able to do it, they'll do all that God ever wanted them to do within seven years' time in the tribulation period.

At least a remnant of them will. Now, this is standard dispensationalism. This is what it teaches.

Now, the problem with this, of course, is that it predicts failure on the part of the church, where Jesus predicted victory and success on the part of the church. The kingdom of God is given to somebody other than Israel. Okay, that's the church.

What does he say more? They will produce the fruit. The church will produce the fruit. Israel did not produce the fruit, but the church will.

Then why should they ever take it away from the church if they're doing a good job? If the church actually does produce the fruit that God's been looking for, why postulate something that Jesus doesn't hint at, namely that the kingdom would later be taken away from the church and given back to Israel? They show themselves to be pretty bad stewards. That's like saying that the owner of this vineyard, after he's gotten some new trustworthy keepers of the vineyard and uses them for a while, decides to give these guys who killed his son and all his servants another chance, kick out the ones that have been producing the fruit, and bring back in the guys who were murderers and thieves. There's not the slightest hint that the kingdom taken from Israel on this occasion would

ever be given back to Israel in the future.

No need to. Once God gets his fruit, he doesn't have to keep looking. He doesn't have to keep searching for someone to produce it anymore.

So there's not a clue about that. Now, let me just ask this question. How are we to understand this prediction that the church will produce the fruit? Can we look at the church for the past 2,000 years and say it has produced the fruit? It's done remarkably better than Israel did during all those centuries.

Has the church been paramount in this world as a bastion for truth and righteousness and justice? It depends on how you define church. There have been at least half of the last 2,000 years, at least 1,000 during the Dark Ages, during which that which was called the church was about the most cruel and ruthless and resistant to truth and resistant to righteousness, about as bad as Israel ever was. I mean, all you have to do is read the history from about 500 to 1500 A.D., and that's approximately half of the church age so far, 1,000 of the last 2,000 years.

And the church is pretty bad. I'd say not measurably better than Israel. In some respects, possibly worse.

The question is, is that the church? Or was the church the people that were being put to death by that institution? The nonconformists. You know, the Spanish Inquisition was there to wipe out people who were reading their Bibles in private settings outside of the church buildings and having private home Bible studies. Nonconformists, I mean, guys like Tyndale and Wycliffe and those guys.

I mean, John Huss was burned at the stake. Why? Because he wanted to read his Bible. And he wanted ordinary people to read their Bible.

And he didn't feel like the church was the only place people should be able to read the Bible, and church meaning the Catholic Church. So they burned him. Now, I dare say that if one looks at the institution that has historically been called the church, then Jesus' prediction has certainly not come true.

The church has not done any better than Israel did. And by the way, the Protestant churches haven't always been better either. I do feel that the best fruit of all has come from Protestant circles, but it hasn't been universal in Protestant circles.

I mean, there's been a lot of murder, a lot of warfare, a lot of depravity, a lot of injustice, a lot of sexual immorality in Protestant leadership too. So I guess what I'd have to say is this should warn us off interpreting the church as that which is recognized as an institution by that name. The church has always been made up of those people who are of his flesh and of his bones, the members of his body.

And how does one identify someone as a member of the body of Christ but that they're under the head? The members of the body obey the head. And they are animated by the same spirit. The spirit that gives my human spirit, you know, is shared by my head and my body alike.

We who are the body of Christ have his spirit. The spirit that was resident in the head of the church, Jesus, also is the power and the animator and the giver of life to us. So the person who is a true member of God's church, of the body of Christ, is one who has the spirit of Christ and who obeys Christ, who obeys the head.

Like a member of a body obeys the head, does what it wants. And that certainly goes along with everything Jesus has taught about what a true disciple is. Now, if we say Jesus was referring to the true church as that nation, then we can say, yes, true Christians have brought forth the fruit.

Throughout history, there have always been some Christians. Some of them paid for it with their lives because there was a lot of oppression and an attempt to wipe them out by the existing institution calling itself the church. But there have always been true Christians.

And they always have been characterized by the spirit of Christ, which produces the fruit of the spirit. And the fruit of the spirit is the fruit God's always been looking for. It's sometimes been almost underground at times in history, but it's been produced.

And it still is by those who are members of his body. It's possible, and some perhaps would lean this way, that Jesus would, that his meaning that this nation would produce the fruit that God's been looking for, they'd say, well, it hasn't happened yet, but it's still eschatologically true, that in the future, the church will get its act together. The church that has been apostate and divisive and compromised in sin and so forth, all that's going to change.

God's going to just send an outpouring of his spirit, and all the visible church is going to get its act together. And there will be unity and holiness and obedience and love of truth and so forth, which has been characteristically absent for so long in many institutions that call themselves churches. And so they would say that the fruit that Jesus predicts is yet to come.

Well, again, that is a possibility. But I would just say it doesn't look like it's the trend. The church does not look like it's moving more toward holiness and more toward unity.

Of course, if the coming of the Lord is still a thousand or two thousand years off from now, there may be plenty of time for the change to come. I don't want to interpret eschatology in view of our own little bubble in which we live, our own little tunnel vision idea of what's going on in the world and in history, because we see our own times with

20-20 vision, but the previous and future times we don't see so well. But I will say this.

If Jesus predicted that the visible church, that the institutional church, will produce this fruit, and if that's to be expected before he comes back, then his coming probably isn't very soon unless some radical revival takes place all of a sudden that just turns everything around. And I'd be happy for it if it does. I'd be extremely happy if that happened.

I don't know if that's going to happen or not. Some people predict it, but I don't know. I don't know if it will or not.

I will say this. It's not going to just evolve into that because the evolution of the church is going the other direction. There is less and less concern about truth in the church, at least in this part of the world right now.

There is less and less concern about true holiness and righteousness. There is less and less unity. Divisions are the principal means of church planting in this part of the world.

America has a lot of new churches, but it's not new Christians. It's people who split from other Christians in existing churches, so there's another church now. And that's not exactly the direction that things are supposed to be going.

Jesus prayed that his people would be one so that the world might know that God sent him. Well, his true people always have been one. The people who have the Spirit of God always love one another, but the institutions don't reflect that.

Now, either the institutions are going to turn around or else we're just going to have to define church in terms other than institutionally. And I think Jesus never did intend to start an institution such as we now have today. That does not mean, by the way, and I always have to say this because people wonder how I feel about this, it does not mean there's anything wrong with participating in an institutional fellowship.

I mean, fellowship's a good thing. If you have to go to one of these institutions to get it, then there's nothing wrong with going there and getting it. But to identify the church with these institutions rather than with the people of God is a mistake that many make, unfortunately.

And in any institution that calls itself a church, you will no doubt find the people of God, but you'll also find people there who aren't the people of God. It's a mixed multitude. And that's not an argument against going to church.

I go to church myself and I believe in going to church. I just believe in going there for the fellowship with the saints, not because there's some kind of political or symbolic requirement upon us to do it. But we are called to gather with Christians to not forsake the assembling of ourselves together.

Now, verse 44, Matthew 21, 44. Whoever falls on this stone will be broken, but on whomever it falls, it will grind him to powder. Now, I'm not sure why the addition of the New King James that I'm holding in my hands does not notify us that that's not found in the Alexandrian text.

But it's not. Who has the New American Standard here? Is that verse in there? What part of it has brackets? Read the part. Oh, okay.

How about the NIV? Does it have this verse? Interesting. Okay, well, I guess some of the Alexandrian manuscripts have it and some don't. I've read for years that this verse is of questionable authenticity because of the manuscript evidence.

But I didn't realize that some of the manuscripts of the Alexandrian text apparently have it because the NASV and the NIV both have it and they go by the Alexandrian. So, I guess I was making too sweeping a statement and saying that the Alexandrian text omits it. Only some manuscripts do.

What does he mean here? Whoever falls on this stone will be broken. But on whomever it falls, it will grind him to powder. Well, the stone must certainly be a reference back to the cornerstone, the one that the builders rejected.

That seems clear enough just from the context. But what does it mean to fall on this stone and be broken? I'll tell you, I have heard various things preached about this. And when I was younger, I myself thought perhaps he was giving two different options.

Here is a stone, a huge stone, representing Jesus Christ. You can either fall on the stone or have the stone fall on you. And that if you fall on the stone, you'll be broken.

And being broken is a good thing. The sacrifices of God are a broken and a contrite spirit. And to be broken by God is a good thing.

And therefore, you should fall upon Christ and allow yourself to be broken against Him and so forth. That's what I was formerly taught. But the other option is if you don't fall on Him, if you don't allow yourself to be broken, then it's going to fall on you like a giant millstone is going to crush you into fine powder.

And obviously, it's better to be broken than to be ground into powder. So I always saw this as presenting two options. It's possible that that's the correct meaning.

I've heard it preached that way too. However, I have some doubts about that simply because if you compare that with Isaiah chapter... What? I think it's Isaiah chapter... Oh, my goodness. Eight.

Let me find it here. Yeah. Yeah.

Isaiah 8, 14, and 15. It says, He, that is God, will be a sanctuary, but a stone of stumbling

and a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel as a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many among them shall stumble, and they shall fall and be broken, be snared and taken.

Now, fall and be broken over a stone means they'll trip and fall. And broken is not a positive thing in this picture. It's part of being snared and taken into captivity.

It's part of being judged because they stumble over Christ. Now, the reason I say that this raises questions about the interpretation of Matthew 21, 44 is because the language is so similar. Part of one of the negative things that happens to people who stumble over Christ is that they fall and are broken.

That's bad. That's not desirable. And those are the very words Jesus uses here in verse 44.

He says, Whoever falls on this stone will be broken. Sounds like he's alluding to this very passage in Isaiah. In which case, it kind of dashes our hopes of finding a positive meaning in that.

And, you know, here's your two choices. Either fall on Jesus and be broken, or have him fall on you and you get crushed to powder. Makes for good preaching, but apparently it's not what he's saying.

I think what he's saying is he's giving two Old Testament images. Both of which involve a stone which is him. And both of them involve the destruction of certain persons wrongly related to him.

The first of them, as I pointed out just now, is Isaiah 8, 14 and 15. In that passage, Jesus is likened to a stone that is a stumbling stone, a stumbling block. And those who stumble over him fall and are broken.

Now, changing the imagery to a different Old Testament image, which also involves a stone. And that's in Daniel chapter 2. In Daniel chapter 2, in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, he had a vision of a stone that had an image in the feet. And it says in verse 34, Isaiah 2, 34.

Daniel's explaining the dream to Nebuchadnezzar. He says, Now, in this picture, there is a stone which apparently is, we don't know what size it is when it starts out. I've always had the impression of a fairly small stone, but it starts out small.

But it hits this image in the feet and then it grows into a great mountain on the earth. And as it does, it grinds up all of its opposition. It just grinds all these metals into fine powder that blows away like chaff from the summer threshing floor.

That is a reference to the Messiah's kingdom, the Messiah himself establishing his

kingdom. So it looks like maybe the second half of Matthew 21, 44 is borrowing its imagery from Daniel 2. Where he says, And on whomever it falls, it will grind him to powder. That's basically what the stone did in the dream that Nebuchadnezzar had it ground into powder, its opposition.

So that what Matthew 21, 44 may be understood to be is Jesus just taking two different images from the Old Testament. In addition to the one from Psalm 118, which he quotes in verse 42. He now alludes to two other Old Testament passages, both of which depict Jesus as a stone.

The Isaiah passage depicts him as a stumbling stone and some trip over him and fall and they break their necks. The other one pictures him as a stone that grows to grind its opposition into powder. And he says both of these images are applicable.

I am this stone. If you builders reject me, you're stumbling over me and you're going to be broken. Or to put it another way, you're going to be crushed by me into fine powder and there'll be nothing left of you.

So rather than seeing Jesus here in verse 44 giving two options, one positive, one negative. He's just given two different negative pictures of what happens to people who relate negatively or wrongly to the stone. Both of them borrowed from Old Testament passages.

Now verse 45. Now when the chief priests and Pharisees heard his parables, they perceived that he was speaking of them. But when they sought to lay hands on him, they feared the multitudes because they took him for a prophet.

So already they were trying to capture Jesus, to lay hands on him, to get rid of him. But they were intimidated by the crowds. Now we know that it was within probably two or three days of this telling, of this parable, probably three days from this time, that they actually did capture him.

But they had to do so when the crowds weren't around. That's why they needed Judas. They needed Judas or somebody to let them in on Jesus' secret haunts.

The places that Jesus liked to go when no one else was around. So they could catch him without the multitudes around. And they could condemn him in a kangaroo court in the middle of the night when the crowds weren't there to get upset.

How they hoped to get away with it the next day is not exactly explained. But the fact is they wanted to avoid a popular uprising against themselves. And they did want to take him.

They were looking for a way to do so but without bringing the wrath of the crowds upon them. And they finally did so by catching him at Gethsemane. But on this occasion they

weren't able to do so.

It was too public and there were too many supporters. Though Jesus had just slapped him right across the face with his words. He said, you guys are the wicked tenants who have killed all of God's messengers sent to you.

And you're going to kill me too. And you're going to be destroyed. And the kingdom is going to be taken from you and given to someone else.

He did say those words in another way in Matthew 23. We won't look at that now. We looked at it actually the other day.

But in Matthew 23 verses 34 through 37 he talks about Jerusalem and its people as ones who always killed the prophets. And the blood of the prophets would be required of them in that generation. Okay, we'll stop there.

There's some more parables. No, not more parables but some more interaction with the religious leaders. Starting in the next chapter we have a parable.

The parable of the wedding feast. And then in the next chapter, in chapter 22 of Matthew and its parallels, we're going to find times where his enemies confront him trying to nail him on certain issues. And we get to see Jesus shine his superior wisdom against his enemies as they brought the best things they could against him to trap him.

He made them look like idiots every time. So, that's where we'll stop today.