

## Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin

Session I details the final conflict between Christ and the rabbinical leadership of Second Generation Israel during the last week of Christ's earthly ministry, a conflict initiated by His raising Lazarus from the dead and His (two) subsequent ridings into Jerusalem, reaching its apex with His public assessment and judgment of the Sanhedrin in the open courts of Temple before the huge crowds there in preparation for the Festival, and resulting in the betrayal and crucifixion of Christ. This conflict is ultimately rooted in Christ's loyalty to the Law, Prophets, and Writings, as understood by the normative hermeneutic, His Person as the fulfillment of those passages detailing the coming and suffering of Messiah, and the proper rabbinical role of operating within this Biblical framework. In tracing the final conflict, the last week's chronology is developed from correlating the gospel accounts with each other and with the great prophetic clocks of Feasts, Generations, and Weeks (or Sabbaticals).

### *General Outline of Session I:*

#### I. Sample Of Christ's Earlier Contacts/Conflicts With Sanhedrin

- A. Trained By The Holy Spirit In Nazareth
- B. Evaluates Sanhedrin At Age 12
- C. Teaching Ministry In The Nazareth Synagogue
- D. Sermon In The Synagogue At Nazareth
- E. Sermon Against Unscriptural Rabbinical Traditions
- F. Sermon On His Essential Deity

#### II. Pivotal Miracles Setting Up Final Conflict

- A. Eleazar's Resurrection
- B. Last Healings Of Blind Outside Temple
- C. Sanhedrin's Death Sentence

#### III. Timeline Of Six Days Before Passover

- A. Sixth Day Before Passover
- B. Fifth Day Before Passover
- C. Fourth Day Before Passover
- D. Third Day Before Passover
- E. Second Day Before Passover
- F. First Day Before Passover

#### IV. Progress Of Final Conflict

- A. Sentence Of Death By Sanhedrin
- B. Temple As Sanhedral Sphere Of Authority
- C. Christ's First Entry (Sixth Day Before Passover)
- D. Christ's Second Entry (Fourth Day Before Passover)
- E. Christ's Third Day In Temple (Third Day Before Passover)
- F. Morning Of Fourth Day In Temple (Second Day Before Passover): Great Crescendo and Climax
- G. Sanhedral Account Of The Conflict

#### V. Appendix: Correlation Of Christ's Temple Destruction Prophecies

## I. Sample of Christ's Earlier Contacts/Conflicts With Sanhedrin

- A. Trained By The Holy Spirit In Nazareth (2002 TGF Conference: Session I)
- B. Debates/Evaluates Sanhedrin At Age 12 (2002 TGF Conference: Session I)
- C. Teaching Ministry In The Nazareth Synagogue (2002 TGF Conference: Session I)
- D. Sermon In The Synagogue At Nazareth (Luke 4, 2002 TGF Conference: Session III)
- E. Sermon Against Unscriptural Rabbinical Traditions (Matthew 15 / Mark 7, 2002 TGF Conference: Session III)
- F. Sermon On His Essential Deity (John 8, 2002 TGF Conference: Session III)

## II. Pivotal Miracles Setting Up Final Conflict

- A. Eleazar's Resurrection (John 11:1–44)
  - 1. This miracle took place shortly before the last six days before Passover.
    - a. Immediately after this miracle and the Sanhedrin's death sentence, Christ goes to city of Ephraim, about 12 miles north-northeast of Jerusalem and about 10 northwest from Jericho (John 11:54).
    - b. His walking from Ephraim to Jerusalem through Jericho and Bethany (about 2.5 miles from Jerusalem) appears to be His last travel before the period of the Last Six Days (Luke 19:1–10).
    - c. From rabbinical data—see C below—this miracle was before a 40 day period ending with the crucifixion (Day One before Passover).
  - 2. Eleazar was absolutely viewed as dead according to rabbinical tradition.
    - a. Lazarus was four days in the grave (John 11:17,39).
    - b. The rabbis teach that a person can be regarded as finally dead only after three days, when decomposition begins. This is why Christ delayed going to Bethany.

"They go to the sepulchres and visit the dead for three days." [Massecheth Semacoth, cap. 8, from Lightfoot, Volume 3, p. 367]

"It is a tradition of Ben Kaphra's: the very height of mourning is not till the third day. For three days the spirit wanders about the sepulchre, expecting if it may return into the body. But when it sees that the form or aspect of the face is changed, then it hovers no more, but leaves the body to itself." [Beresh. Rabba, folio 114c, from Lightfoot, Volume 3, p. 367]

"No evidence [of a man's death] may be tendered before his soul has departed. ... Evidence [of identification] may be tendered only within three days [after death]." "A man was once drowned at Karmi and after three days he was hauled up at Be Hedy, and R. Dimi of Nehardea allowed his wife to remarry." "Said R. Meir, 'It once happened that a man fell into a large cistern and rose to the surface after three days [after which his wife was allowed to remarry].'" [Yebamoth, folio 120a, 121b, 121b, quoted in that order]

"They do not certify of the dead 'but within the three days after his decease', for after three days his countenance is changed." [Yebamoth, folio 120a / Maimonides in Gerushin, cap. 13, from Lightfoot, Volume 3, p. 367]

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 3

3. Eleazar's resurrection was most public with many witnesses, sharply divided over the miracle they witnessed
  - a. Christ and 12 there (John 11:15–)
  - b. Mary and Martha there (John 11:19–)
  - c. Many people present in the role of comforters (John 11:19,31)
  - d. Some believe that Jesus is the Christ, others report the miracle to the Sanhedrin—see C below.
- B. Last Healings Of Blind Outside Temple
  1. Christ heals a blind man on His way from Ephraim to Jericho (Luke 19:31,35–19:1)
  2. Christ heals a blind man—Bartimaeus—after He passes through Jericho on His way to Zaccheus' house (Mark 10:46–52, cf. Luke 19:11)
  3. Christ heals two blind men after leaving Zaccheus' house on the morning of Day Six before Passover, but before His first prophetic entry into Jerusalem on Day Six (Matt. 20:29–21:1).
  4. The healings of these four blind men follow these three previous miracles which incurred the wrath of the Sanhedrin finally to passing the sentence of death: healing of the lame man (John 5:1–16), the healing of the blind man (John 9:1–10:39), and the raising of Lazarus from the dead (John 11:1–44), this last miracle being just before the 40 day period ending with the crucifixion (Day One before Passover).
- C. Sanhedrin's Death Sentence
  1. Witnesses to the resurrection of Lazarus report to the Sanhedrin (John 11:46).
  2. Sanhedrin meet formally—one would presume in the Hall of Hewn Stones—and as the official leadership of the Nation pass the death sentence on Christ (John 11:47–57).
  3. Sanhedrin understood that Christ was truly the Messiah—if there was to be such a Messiah—when they passed this sentence of death, and their sentence was an attempt at self-preservation and at saving the Nation in their image.
    - a. They knew Christ was accurately using the Scriptures according to the normative hermeneutic and that He was the fulfillment of these Scriptures (e.g. John 5:39).
    - b. They knew that His miracles testified that He was the Messiah (e.g. Is. 61:1–2a, John 5:19–36; 9:16).
    - c. They knew He was the One whom the Magi had sought as a newborn babe and that His birth was a fulfillment of the timeline and events of the prophets (2002 TGF Conference: Session I). It would seem that some of the Sanhedrin alive then were still alive at this sentence of death.
    - d. They knew He was the One Who had evaluated them in the Hall of Hewn Stones when He was 12 years old—a real bar mitzvah (2002 TGF Conference: Session I). Surely some of them alive at that evaluation were still alive now.
    - e. They knew that if Jesus is the Messiah, then they are condemned and their place in the Nation is destroyed.
    - f. They knew the chronologies of Isaiah and Daniel (Generations and Sabbaticals) and that the end of the 69th week was at hand and that Christ and His miracles were the unique and true fulfillment of these prophets and their chronologies.
    - g. They knew the Scriptures said that when Messiah comes, Jerusalem is subsequently destroyed (Is. 10:34–11:1, Dan. 9:24–27).
    - h. They believed the Romans to be the ones who would destroy both the city and their position in the Nation (John 11:48,51).

- i. They are superfluous if Jesus is proclaimed to be the Messiah, yet they are the protection of the nation against the Romans. To protect the Nation and themselves and their future position in the Nation, they sentenced Christ to death.
  - j. For fear of the multitudes and to protect themselves, they wanted the Romans to carry out this sentence. The Sanhedrin in fact had the power of capital punishment [see Lightfoot, Volume 2, pp. 324–329], but used it only when they felt safe.
4. Formal record of Sanhedrin maintains that in the case of Christ, there was a 40 day period between the passing of the sentence of death and its being carried out. If this be so, then we can place the raising of Lazarus as being just before that 40 day period. From [Sanhedrin, folio 43a]:

MISHNAH: "If then they find him innocent, they discharge him; but if not, he goes forth to be stoned. And a herald precedes him [crying]: so and so, the son of so and so, is going forth to be stoned because he committed such and such an offence, and so and so are his witnesses. Whoever knows anything in his favor, let him come and state it."

GEMARA: "... it was taught: On the Eve of Passover, Yeshu [the Nazarean (M manuscript)] was hanged. For forty days before the execution took place, a herald went forth and cried, 'He is going forth to be stoned he has practiced sorcery and enticed Israel to apostasy. Anyone who can say anything in his favor, let him come forward and plead on his behalf.' But since nothing was brought forward in his favor he was hanged on the Eve of Passover!"

- a. Clearly some proclamation went forth after the death sentence was passed, for the Sanhedrin put out public notice for the whereabouts of Christ so that they could arrest Him (John 11:56–57—**πιázω** (*piázō*) occurs in John 7:30,32,44; 8:20; 10:39; 11:57; 21:3,10, Acts 3:; 12:4, II Cor. 11:32, Rev. 19:20, which in 8 of its 12 occurrences (particularly in context of the Sanhedrin) means **arrest**).
  - b. Christ responds to the death sentence by going to Ephraim as discussed above. This fits with a period of publicity concerning this sentence.
  - c. If the timing of the rabbinical record is true (and it is the least doctrinal aspect of the matter and so the most likely to be true), then we can approximately date where the above miracles fit relative to the six days before Passover.
5. Christ's decision, after 34 days after the sentence was passed, to make His prophetic entries into Jerusalem and publicly evaluate and judge and hold accountable the Sanhedrin in the courts of the Temple where they held Open Court during Passover and Unleavened Bread—recall that He evaluated and held them accountable PRIVATELY in the Hall of Hewn Stones when He was 12—was a decision to be crucified at that time (cf. John 5:21,26, especially John 10:18, Heb. 10:5–10 (Ps. 40:6)).

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 5**

III. **Timeline Of Six Days Before Passover** (cf. E.W. Bullinger's CB Appendix 156, J. Hilston's TGF 2001 Conference: Session III). See TGF 2003 Conference: Session III for *three* independent, irrefutable proofs that crucifixion was on Wednesday, not pagan Good Friday.

<u>HARMONIZATION OF EVENTS</u>	<u>MATTHEW</u>	<u>MARK</u>	<u>LUKE</u>	<u>JOHN</u>
<b>A. <u>Sixth Day Before Passover</u> 9th</b>				
<i>Nisan (Thursday sunset to Friday sunset)</i>				
1. Christ approaches Jerusalem from Jericho, Zaccheus in tree	---	---	19:1-10	---
2. Christ stays night at Zaccheus' house	---	---	19:5	---
3. Parable of Pounds	---	---	19:11-27	---
4. Christ proceeds toward Jerusalem	---	---	19:28	---
5. Christ sends two disciples to village off road ( <b>'apénanti</b> ( <i>'απέναντι</i> ) for two animals (jenny and her colt)	21:1-7	---	---	---
6. Christ enters Jerusalem from Bethphage	21:8,9	---	---	---
7. People ask, "Who is this?"	21:10,11	---	---	---
8. He cleanses Temple compound (geldwechsel, shops in huge southern gate stairways and Gentile Court)	21:12-13	---	---	---
9. Christ heals blind/lame of Israel in Temple (presumably in the Court of Israel), praised by children (Court of Women), angers Sanhedrin	21:14-16	---	---	---
10. Christ returns to Bethany	21:17	---	---	12:1
<b>B. <u>Fifth Day Before Passover</u> 10th</b>				
<i>Nisan (Friday sunset to Saturday sunset)</i>				
1. Christ spends the sabbath in Bethany, eating at Lazarus' house	---	---	---	12:2
2. Mary anoints Christ's feet (the first of two anointings)	---	---	---	12:3-8
3. People are come to Bethany to see Christ and Lazarus	---	---	---	12:9-11

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 6**

C. Fourth Day Before Passover 11th  
*Nisan (Saturday sunset to Sunday sunset)*

1. Christ sends two disciples to village below ( <b>katénanti</b> (κατέναντι)) road for one animal (colt).	---	11:1-7	19:29-35	12:12
2. Christ enters Jerusalem on this colt from apparently Bethany (closer than Bethphage?), where he just spent night, and is met by multitudes from city anticipating/praising Him.	---	11:8-10	19:36-40	12:12-19
3. Christ weeps over Jerusalem.	---	---	19:41-44	---
4. Christ enters Temple, looks around, and does not cleanse Temple again at this time; from later passages, we infer He spent essentially all day teaching in Temple (presumably in the Court of Israel)	---	11:11	---	---
5. Christ returns to Bethany with the 12 for evening	---	11:11	---	---

D. Third Day Before Passover 12th  
*Nisan (Sunday sunset to Monday sunset)*

1. Christ enters Jerusalem from Bethany (presumably on foot— no mention of an animal)	21:18	11:12	---	---
2. Christ curses fig tree	21:19-22	11:13-14	---	---
3. Christ cleanses Temple second time (huge southern gate stairways plus Court of Gentiles), angers Sanhedrin	---	11:15-18	19:45-46	---
4. Christ teaches in Temple and indirectly answers Greek "proselytes of gate" in Court of Gentiles; the Voice answers Him from heaven	---	---	19:47	12:20-50
5. Christ hated and conspired against by Sanhedrin	---	11:18	19:47-48	---
6. He leaves Jerusalem (presumably to Bethany)	---	11:19	---	---

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 7**

E. Second Day Before Passover *13th Nisan (Monday sunset to Tuesday sunset)*

1. Discussion about fig tree on way to Jerusalem	---	11:20-26	---	---
2. He enters Jerusalem/Temple	21:23	11:27	20:1	---
3. Christ teaches in (Court of Israel of) Temple and Sanhedrin challenges His right to teach in Temple	21:23	11:28	20:2; 21:37,38	---
4. He judges their right to challenge Him if they do not honestly answer concerning the baptism of John	21:24-27	11:29-33	20:3-8	---
5. He continues His judgment of the Sanhedrin by Parable of the Two Sons in defense of John's baptism	21:28-32	---	---	---
6. He judges Sanhedrin's stewardship of Nation by Parable of the Vineyard; Sanhedrin considers physically grabbing Christ after this parable, but are afraid of people	21:33-46	12:1-12	20:9-19	---
7. Christ denies Sanhedrin's place in Israel's future kingdom by the Parable of Kingdom Wedding Supper	22:1-14	---	---	---
8. Sanhedrin sends Pharisee/ Herodian representatives to test/trap Him concerning paying taxes to Caesar <i>vis-a-vis</i> oral tradition of the rabbis	22:15-22	12:13-17	20:20-26	---
9. Sanhedrin sends Sadducean representatives to test/trap him concerning the Law of Levirate and resurrection <i>vis-a-vis</i> oral tradition of the rabbis on former and Sadducees on latter	22:23-33	12:18-27	20:27-38	---
10. The Sanhedrin sends Pharisee legal experts to test/trap Him concerning greatest commandment of Law <i>vis-a-vis</i> oral tradition of Hillel	22:34-40	---	---	---
11. Individual and apparently regenerate sopher (scribe) asks Him concerning the first commandment of the Law and agrees with Christ against Hillel; after this, no one of Sanhedrin dares to challenge Him on any issue	---	12:28-34	cf. 20:39	---

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 8**

12. After rebutting Hillel, Christ challenges and judges Sanhedrin's understanding of Person of Messiah	22:41–46	12:35–37	20:41–44, cf. 20:40	---
13. Christ publicly judges heart and character and reprobate nature of Sanhedrin, that they are indeed reprobate leadership of Israel's Second Generation reprobate	23:1–39	12:38–40	20:45–47	---
14. Christ sits in Court of Women and observes contributions to Temple treasury, with comments on widow	---	12:41–44	21:1–4	---
15. While still within Temple (Court of Women), Christ prophesies openly to Second Generation Israel the end of Third Generation and establishment of Israel's earthly kingdom, including complete destruction of every single structure and contiguity of stone of Temple	---	---	21:5–36	---
16. As Christ is leaving Temple (presumably eastern/Beautiful gate), He prophesies complete destruction of every single structure and contiguity of stone of Temple	---	13:1–2	---	---
17. Just after Christ leaves Temple, He prophesies complete destruction of every single structure and contiguity of stone of Temple	24:1–2	---	---	---
18. Just after Christ leaves Temple, Sanhedrin meets in Caiaphas' palace to plot to kill Christ on day before Unleavened Bread	26:3–5	14:1–2	22:1–2	---
19. Christ and disciples go to Mount Olivet and He sits and prophesies to disciples the end of Third Generation and establishment of Israel's earthly kingdom, illustrated with Parable of Ten Virgins and Parable of Talents, including the consummation of Gentile hopes as part of Israel's future empire	24:3– 25:46	13:3–37	---	---
20. Christ and 12 eat (lunch) at Simon the leper's house in Bethany and woman anoints His Head with ointment	26:6–13	14:3–9	---	---



2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 9**

21. Judas leaves Simon's house to betray Christ to Sanhedrin for 30 pieces of silver	26:14–16	14:10–11	22:3–6	---
F. <u>First Day Before Passover</u> <i>14th Nisan (Tuesday sunset to Wednesday sunset)</i>				
1. At sunset, Christ sends Peter and John to make ready eating Passover (a day early)	26:17–19	14:12–16	22:7–13	---
2. At evening, Christ begins eating of Passover with First Cup followed by the First Food of bitter herbs and sweet sauce and rice (or other side dish) and unleavened bread along along with Second Cup, in accordance with rabbinical precepts	cf. 26:20–21	cf. 14:17–18	22:14–20	cf. 13:2a
3. Judas disrespects Christ with his eating behavior and thereby identifies himself as betrayer as judged by rabbinical table ethics	26:21–24	14:19–21	22:21–23	---
4. Christ and 12 wash their hands in accordance with rabbinical custom, at which point Christ washes their feet	---	---	---	13:3–20
5. Christ identifies Judas explicitly and dismisses him from the last course of the Passover in accordance with rabbinical table ethics	26:25	---	---	13:21–30
6. Christ instructs 11 that they (along with Judas' replacement) constitute Israel's future Sanhedrin and therefore they are to be as servants and not as Gentiles rulers (and implicitly not as reprobate Sanhedrin He judged earlier in open court in Temple)	---	---	22:24–30	---
7. Christ gives first prophecy of Peter's denials	---	---	22:31–34	---
8. Christ and 11 eat Second Food of roast lamb and herbs and side dishes and unleavened bread along with Third Cup in accordance with rabbinical precepts	26:26–29	14:22–25	---	---

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 10**

9. Christ gives second prophecy of Peter's denials	---	---	---	13:36–38
10. Christ teaches 11 at length, including New Jerusalem Temple, charismatic empowerment of Holy Spirit, the Vine and branches, ...	---	---	---	14:1– 16:33
11. Christ makes His high-priestly prayer	---	---	---	17:1–26
12. Christ and 11 drink Fourth Cup and sing psalms in accordance with rabbinical precepts	26:30	14:26	---	---
13. Christ and 11 cross the Kidron to Mount Olivet	26:30	14:26	22:39	18:1a
14. Christ gives third prophecy of Peter's denials	26:31–36	14:27–31	---	---
15. Christ and 11 enter Garden of Gethsemane and His suffering begins—now see Session II of this Conference for the rest of this day	26:36–	14:32–	22:40–	18:1b–

**IV. Progress Of Final Conflict**

A. Sentence Of Death By Sanhedrin (see Section II.C above)

B. Temple As Sanhedral Sphere Of Authority

1. The Temple was the very epicenter of Sanhedral authority, including their official chamber, the Hall of Hewn Stones (2002 TGF Conference: Session I).
2. During Passover and Unleavened Bread, the Sanhedrin held open court in the Temple and taught the people (2002 TGF Conference: Session I). Further, it was required that the people pay special respect to the Sanhedrin as the teachers of the Nation on Festival occasions [Rosh Hashanah, folio 16b, plus footnote 12 of Soncino edition, pp. 62–63]:

"R. Issac further said, 'It is incumbent on a man to go to pay his respects to his teacher on Festivals'."

R. Hananel adds: "If his teacher resides near him, he must go to pay him his respects every Sabbath and New Moon; if he resides at a long distance, he must go to pay him his respects [only] on Festivals."

3. Jews crowded the Temple for pre-Festival purification.
  - a. This was the case for the Six Days before this Passover / Unleavened Bread (John 11:55–57).
  - b. It was required by the sages that celebrants of the Feasts pre-purify themselves [Rosh Hashanah, folio 16b]:

"R. Isaac further said, 'A man should purify himself for the Festival, ... ' "

- C. Christ's First Entry (Sixth Day Before Passover) Cf. Section III above.
1. Fulfillment of first part of Zech. 9:9 (two animals): the Sanhedrin KNOWS that this coincides precisely with the end of the 69th sabbatical (Dan. 9), further proving that Christ's fulfillment of Zechariah's prophesy shows He is the Messiah and that the Sanhedrin is in peril. They know that they have sentenced Him to death and that after the 69th sabbatical, Messiah is cut off.
  2. Christ takes ownership of Temple
    - a. First cleansing of Temple—this was in defiance of the Sanhedrin
      - i. Various aspects of Temple economy existed by explicit sanction of the Sanhedrin and under the protection of the Temple guard.
      - ii. In defiance, Christ claims the Temple is HIS house and not the Sanhedrin's house (Matt. 21:12–13).
    - b. Christ heals in the Court of Israel in the Temple (Matt. 21:14–16) and again shows His Messiahship through miracles.
  3. Christ declares His Messiahship in Temple
    - a. He claims the Temple for Himself, works miracles in the Temple, AND accepts the title "Son of David" in the Court of Women from children.
    - b. His purpose is that the Sanhedrin carry out their sentence at the appointed time.
- D. Christ's Second Entry (Fourth Day Before Passover) Cf. Section III above.
1. Fulfillment of second part of Zech. 9:9 (one animal): Christ again makes sure that the Sanhedrin understands the end of the 69 sabbatical has fully taken place and that He is the One.
  2. Christ teaches in Court of Israel in the Temple in defiance of the Sanhedrin.
- E. Christ's Third Day In Temple (Third Day Before Passover) Cf. Section III above.
1. Second cleansing of Temple—the various shops, markets, money handlers are back, clearly under the authority of the Sanhedrin and the protection of the Temple guard—reaffirms Christ's claim that the Temple is HIS house. The Sanhedrin's resolve is further strengthened to find a way to carry out their death sentence (Mark 11:15–18, Luke 19:45–46).
  2. Dealing with Greek proselytes of the gate in the Court of Gentiles in the Temple.
    - a. Christ has taken from the Sanhedrin the entire Temple in general and the Court of Israel and the Court of Women in particular.
    - b. He deals indirectly, through the 12, with the Greek proselytes and thereby openly takes away from the Sanhedrin:
      - i. the Court of Gentiles in particular
      - ii. the ministry to the proselytes of the gate, so long prized by the Pharisees (Matt. 23:15, also many places in Talmud).
  3. Father's Voice (the Logos) answers Christ from heaven. The witness of the Godhead that the Temple and all its courts belong to Christ and are taken from the Sanhedrin.
  4. Sanhedrin seek a way to implement their sentence of death against Christ (Mark 11:18, Luke 19:47–48), but seemingly cannot yet do it. This is remarkable since the Temple guard, under the authority of the Sanhedrin, has control of the Temple mount area. So apparently the Temple guard is afraid of the ever-swelling pre-Feast purification crowds who had heard of the resurrection of Lazarus. By the beginning of the Feast, the crowds will number in the hundreds of thousands.

F. Morning Of Fourth Day In Temple (Second Day Before Passover): Great Crescendo and Climax Cf. Section III above.

1. There has never been a day, let alone a morning, like this day, and there will never be another exactly like it. *Christ knowingly says and does those things that guarantee Second Generation Sanhedrin implements their sentence of death against Him (spurred by Lazarus' resurrection) at the proper time* (cf. Is. 50:7).

*PART ONE: CHRIST ASSERTS HIS AUTHORITY*

2. *Issue: Christ's Ownership Of Temple And Nation* (Matt. 21:23, Mark 11:27, Luke 20:1). Christ enters into (presumably) the Court of Israel of the Temple, as He has done each day of this six day period (save the sabbath), and teaches the people, the very place where the Sanhedrin teaches the people especially during this upcoming Festival, the very place where many tens of thousands are thronging during the pre-Festival purification. Such an action is an action of ownership of the Temple and a direct challenge to the Sanhedrin.

*PART TWO: SANHEDRIN COUNTERATTACKS*

3. *Issue: Sanhedrin Disputes Ownership Of Temple* (Matt. 21:23, Mark 11:28, Luke 20:2; 21:37–38). This day the Sanhedrin has had enough—they publicly challenge Christ's authority to teach in the Temple without their formal training and their express permission. This is the first time they have done this publicly.

*PART THREE: CHRIST PUBLICLY CONDEMNS SANHEDRIN BY PARABLES*

4. Christ responds by publicly judging and evaluating and damning them:
  - a. *Issue: Second Generation Sanhedrin's Dishonesty On John's Baptism* (Matt. 21:24–27, 28–32, Mark 11:29–33, Luke 20:3–8). Christ publicly judges their right to challenge Him—their dishonesty and insincerity concerning the baptism of John's disqualifies them. He then defends John's baptism using the Parable of the Two Sons, giving a complete rebuttal of the Sanhedrin on this matter according to Solomon's template for answering fools (Prov. 26:4–5), except that Christ reverses Solomon's order. Their public humiliation is complete on this matter even in their own eyes.
  - b. *Issue: Second Generation Sanhedrin's Corrupt Rulership Over Nation* (Matt. 21:33–46, Mark 12:1–12, Luke 20:9–19). Christ publicly judges their right to rule Israel even in spiritual matters by the Parable of the Vineyard. In other words, in this life their stewardship of the Nation is finished. More precisely, their stewardship is finished with the Second Generation.
  - c. *Issue: Second Generation Sanhedrin's Eternal Damnation* (Matt. 22:1–14). Christ publicly denies this Sanhedrin any place in Israel's future kingdom, and thereby publicly announces their eternal damnation, with the Parable of the Wedding Supper.

*PART FOUR: SANHEDRIN ATTEMPTS TO PUBLICLY HUMILIATE CHRIST*

5. The Sanhedrin responds, not rationally with repentance, but by sending waves of various factions and legal experts to debate Him and trap Him. Christ uses each such attempt to further demonstrate to the crowd their corruption, dishonesty, incompetence, systematic disloyalty to Scripture, and complete unworthiness to guide/teach the Nation. In this way, Christ uses their attempts to humiliate Him to demonstrate to the Temple crowds that His eternal damnation of the Sanhedrin is JUST.
6. *Issue: Paying Taxes To Caesar* (Matt. 22:15–22, Mark 12:13–17, Luke 20:20–26). This is a totally insincere issue from every angle.
  - a. The rabbis decreed that coins with images were a violation of Moses, and the Temple compound has its own currency, the Temple shekel. Celebrants of the Festivals came with coinage of the realm—denarii, drachmas, etc—and their first stop was the money-changers where they used these coins to buy Temple shekels, which they then used to buy animals and supplies for the Feasts. Once in the Court of Israel, there should only be Temple shekels.
  - b. When in this debate Christ asks the Sanhedrin hit squad for a coin, they produce a *forbidden coin*, a Roman coin with Caesar's image and inscription. Christ's answer clearly implies that they were to pay their taxes—as He also had paid taxes and was known for paying His taxes, even miraculously (Matt. 17:24–27).
  - c. The Sanhedrin's strategy appears to be one of getting Christ to speak of paying taxes to Rome in such a way that crowds jamming the Temple courts, particularly the zealots, will be provoked into killing Christ. Christ's answer is deft, but honest.
  - d. When the Sanhedrin bring Christ before Pilate, they charge Christ with teaching that Jews should NOT pay taxes to Rome, proving themselves to be liars of the first order.
7. *Issue: Law Of Levirate* (Matt. 22:23–33, Mark 12:18–27, Luke 20:27–38).
  - a. Sanhedrin next tag-teams in the Sadduceans (perhaps even the priests who tended to be of this sect, cf. Acts 23:1,7).
  - b. The lie is the following: most of the Sanhedrin are not Sadducean, the Nasi (president) is not Sadducean, the Pharisees are not Sadducean, the rabbis are not Sadducean. So they do not subscribe to the position and example brought by the Sadduceans to test Christ. The rabbinical tradition says [Berakoth, folio 17a]:

“A favorite saying of Rab was: ‘[The future world is not like this world.] In the future world there is no eating nor drinking nor propagation nor business nor jealousy nor hatred nor competition, but the righteous sit with crowns on their heads feasting on the brightness of Shekhinah, as it says, *And they beheld God, and did eat and drink.*’ ”
  - c. If the Sanhedrin really thinks their differences with the Sadduceans are important, would they sacrifice them just to try to catch Christ? So they are double liars.
  - d. Note that Christ's answer follows the template (and order) of Prov. 26:4–5, so that He has completely rebutted them.

8. *Issue: Greatest Commandment Of The Law (Matt. 22:34–40)*
  - a. This, plain and simple, is an attempt to test Christ publicly before the people as to whether He stands with Hillel the Great, who was Nasi at the time of Christ's birth AND at the time of Christ's sitting with the Sanhedrin at age 12 as the Evaluator. He would have clearly stated His differences with Hillel when He was 12, but that was behind closed doors in the Hall of Hewn Stones.
  - b. The Nasi on this Day Two before Passover is Gamaliel the Elder (Paul's master), who was the rabbinical grandson of Hillel the Great. Indeed, Hillel's rabbinical descendents dominated Sanhedrin.
  - c. The question of the greatest commandment of the Law had been plainly settled by Hillel and reiterated later by Akiba, with the result being what must be called man-centered—hence atheistic and anti-Scriptural—humanism.

Hillel says [Shabbath, folio 31a]:

“When he [Gentile inquiring about Torah] went before Hillel, he said to him, ‘What is hateful to you, do not to your neighbor: that is the whole Torah, while the rest [of Torah] is commentary thereof: go and learn it [this greatest commandment].’”

- i. Restated in the terms of the conflict on Day Two before Passover, Hillel is saying that the greatest commandment of the Law is to love one's neighbor as oneself, and on this commandment hang all the Law and Prophets. Therefore the Gentile must be sure to master this greatest commandment.
- ii. Similarly, Akiba taught Leviticus 19:18 was the principle rule and essentially chief summary of the Law [Yalkut I, folio 174a / Bereshith Rabba, folio 24; both from Edersheim, *The Life and ...*, Book ii, p. 236].
- iii. The glaring contradiction, literally, is that they spouted this stuff while wearing Deut. 6:5 (see (d) below) on their foreheads [Lightfoot, Volume 2, p. 291].
- d. Christ completely sets aside, condemns, the rabbinical tradition and gives a proper humanism having a theistic, Biblical base. The greatest commandment of the rabbis is only Number Two; Number One is to love God with all one's thinking and self and mind (Deut. 6:5), and within THAT compass, love one's neighbor as oneself. Christ demonstrates before all the enormous crowds of the Temple that Israel's most distinguished rabbis, past and (then) current, had forsaken Moses and the Prophets. Indeed Hillel himself had denied that there would be an actual Messiah:

"R. Hillel said, 'There shall be no Messiah for Israel, because they have already enjoyed him in the days of Hezekiah.'" [Sanhedrin, folio 99a].

- e. An apparently regenerate scribe stands with Christ against Hillel (Mark 12:28–34, cf. Luke 20:39)
- f. Following this, the Sanhedrin dared not to test Him any more, for every attempt had resulted in further public judgment and further unmasking before the people as anit-Biblical frauds and further justification of their eternal damnation.

*PART FIVE: CHRIST PUBLICLY CONDEMNS THEIR UNDERSTANDING/HEARTS*

9. *Issue:* Nature Of Messiah (Matt. 22:41–46, Mark 12:35–37, Luke 20:41–44, cf. 20:40). Once the Sanhedrin has been put to silence, Christ shows the Nation—by this day there were upwards of 250,000 coursing in and out of the courts of the Temple—that the Sanhedrin was Scripturally incompetent on the matter of Messiah’s nature.
- The Sanhedrin agrees that Messiah is to be the Son of David.
  - How does David by inspiration call Him his Lord? The only answer is that Messiah is the Memra incarnate (Ps. 110:1) and the Son of David is also the Son of God, and that David knew this.
  - The rabbis know that Christ’s exegesis is correct. See the citations in TGF Conference 2002: Session I: Appendix 1 concerning the long tradition of trinitarian rabbis before the time of Christ. Further, the Sanhedrin themselves acknowledge this at the “trial” the next day—Mark’s record (Mark 14:61) is very faithful to the rabbinical manner of speaking: “Art Thou the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?”
  - The rabbis know that Christ is the Messiah, that He fulfills the prophetic clocks with respect to His birth, His miracles, and the very events in front of them. But they have the liberal view of Scripture due to Hillel, their position over the Nation to protect.
10. *Issue:* Hearts And Inner Character Of Second Generation Sanhedrin (Matt. 23:1–39, Mark 12:38–40, Luke 20:45–47). Now Christ applies His Moral Law for the Nation, given in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Sermon on the Plain, to assess openly before hundreds of thousands the heart and thinking of Israel’s Second Generation Sanhedrin. There is so much in this evaluation (especially Matt. 23) that we can but sample.
- Subissue: *Moses’ seat*. Sanhedrin sits in Moses’ seat and therefore has the legitimate right to legislate for, and rule over, the Nation—see more on this matter in TGF Conference 2002: Session III: Section III.
    - The first Sanhedrin was convened by Christ Himself as the Memra in Ex. 24:1–11, Who called the 70 with Moses as the Nasi (or president), and these were righteous men, humbled before God.
    - But Second Generation Sanhedrin abandoned Moses and the Prophets. Indeed they see themselves as superior to, even superceding, Moses and the Prophets. Note the following citations from [Lightfoot, Volume 2, pp. 222–223]:

"The words of the scribes are lovely above the words of the Law: for the words of the Law are weighty and light; but the words of the scribes are all weighty."

"He that shall say, 'There are no phylacteries', transgressing the words of the Law [cf. Deut. 11:18], is not guilty; but he that shall say, 'There are five Totaphoth', adding to the words of the scribes, he is guilty."

"The words of the elders are weightier than the words of the Prophets."

"A Prophet and an elder, to what are they likened? To a king sending two of his servants into a province. Of one, he writes thus, 'Unless he shew you my

seal, believe him not'; but of the other thus, 'Although he shews you not my seal, yet believe him'. Thus it is written of the prophet, 'He shall shew thee a sign or miracle'; but of the elders thus, 'According to the Law which they shall teach thee!'"

Hence they corrupted Moses' seat and disqualified themselves by their example. The rabbis fall back to this irrational position [Maimonides, Mamrim, chapter 1, from Lightfoot, Volume 2, p. 290]:

"The Great Council of Jerusalem was the ground—of traditional law—and the pillar—of doctrine, whence proceeded statutes and judgments for all Israel. And concerning them, the law asserts this very thing, saying, 'According to the sentence of the law which they shall teach thee.' Whosoever, therefore, believes Moses our master and our law, is bound to rely upon them for these things."

The rabbis do not permit one to think through the Scriptures for oneself, for they say [Berakoth, folio 27b]:

"One who ... says something which he has not heard from his master causes the Shekhinah to depart from Israel."

This is in defiance of Ps. 1 and Ps. 119:97–104. It is not possible to believe Moses and the Prophets and abandon them as had the Second Generation Sanhedrin, amply demonstrated by Christ in this last day in the Temple.

- b. Subissue: *heavy burdens*. The rabbis say [Maimonides, Mamrim, chapter 1, from Lightfoot, Volume 2, pp. 290–291]:

"Let him follow him that imposeth heavy things. There are reckoned up four and twenty things of the weighty things of the school of Hillel and the light things of the school of Shammai."

- c. Subissue: *phylacteries and garments*. These were done for show, ultimately out of contempt for the very words of the text worn on the forehead (since they abandoned the normative hermeneutic): Ex. 13:3–10; 13:11–16, Deut. 6:5–9; 11:13–21. Note, for example, the sons of Hillel wear Deut. 6:5 on their foreheads, even while claiming Lev. 19:18 is the greatest commandment of the Law.
- d. Subissue: *title of "Rabbi"*. Calling someone "Rabbi" is a practice that began in the Second Generation(!) and continued on into this dispensation with those claiming to be sons of the Second Generation. Anyone who calls another person "Rabbi" or who wants to be called "Rabbi" has identified themselves with Second Generation Sanhedrin and the crucifixion of Christ and the persecution of the Kingdom Saints and the persecution of Paul and the Body.
- i. The term "rabbi" is a contraction of the Aramaic "rabboni" or "rabbani", itself a compound of "rab" + "ani", "rab" meaning *guide, teacher, master* and "ani" being the first person pronoun (*I, my, me*). Here "rabbi" means my teacher, my master.



- ii. Christ condemns the use of the title “rabbi” because it is rebellion against the fact that He alone is the Rabbi and Master of Israel (Matt. 23:8–10).
- iii. The title “rabbi” came into existence during the Second Generation. Hear Aruch from [Lightfoot, Volume 2, pp. 292–293]:

“The elder times, which were more worthy, had no need of the title either of *Rabban*, or *Rabbi*, or *Rabh*, to adorn either the wise men of Babylon or the wise men of the land of Israel: for behold, Hillel comes up out of Babylon, and the title of *Rabbi* is not added to his name: and thus it was with those that were noble among the prophets; for he saith, Haggai the prophet [not *Rabbi* Haggai]. Ezra did not come up out of Babylon, &c [not *Rabbi* Ezra]; whom they did not honour with the titles of *Rabbi* when they spoke their names. And we heard that this had its beginning only in the presidents [of the council] from Rabban Gamaliel the old man, and Rabban Simeon his son, who perished in the destruction of the second Temple: and from Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai, who were all presidents. And the title also of *Rabbi* began from those that were promoted [to be elders] from that time, *Rabbi* Zadok, and R. Eliezer Ben Jacob: and the thing went forth from the disciples of Rabban Jochanan Ben Zaccai, and onwards. Now the order, as all men see it, is this: *Rabbi* is greater than *Rabh*, and *Rabban* is greater than *Rabbi*; and he is greater who is called by his own (single) name, than he who is called *Rabban*.”

- iv. To the above quote, I add the observation that indeed Hillel is called R. Hillel in places and some dispute that it is the same Hillel; but his doctrine is the same (see [Sanhedrin, folio 99a] cited above concerning the “Messiah-idea” en lieu of the real Messiah). Still these observations taken together indicate that the practice came about in the Second Generation. Hillel was the Nasi of Sanhedrin when Christ was born and when Christ was the Evaluator at age 12; and Gamaliel the Elder was of the Sanhedrin when Christ was 12 and the Nasi when Christ was on trial. Lightfoot’s summary of the matter is that the title is not found “before the times of Hillel” [Lightfoot, Volume 2, p. 293]. Please note that Hillel + Gamaliel the Elder almost exactly span Israel’s Second Generation!
- v. Note that the practice generated from the Second Generation continues into our dispensation/generation with a vengeance. The Body dispensation really is the aorist dispensation, the point generation, as if certain conditions have been frozen until the resolution of all these things in the Third Generation after the Rapture.

- vi. Compare the accusation of Christ (Matt. 23:7) of the Sanhedrin constantly soliciting their being called “Rabbi” with the following rabbinic drivel [Berakoth, folio 27a–27b] followed by [Berakoth, folio 19a]:

“One who prays behind his master, and one who gives [an ordinary] greeting to his master [without saying “Rabbi”], and one who returns a[(n) ordinary] greeting to his master [without saying “Rabbi”], and one who joins issue with [the teaching of] the Academy of his master, and one who says something which he has not heard from his master causes the Shekhinah to depart from Israel.” [The Soncino footnote (p. 164) adds that the ordinary greeting is “Shalom” and the proper greeting for his master is “Shalom, Rabbi”.]

“R. Joshua b. Levi further said, ‘In twenty-four places we find that the Beth din [i.e. Sanhedrin] inflicted excommunication for an insult for a teacher, and they are all recorded in the Mishnah.’”

- vii. By condemning the use of “Rabbi” as a title, Christ is plainly urging the Festival hundreds of thousands to forsake the Sanhedrin.

- e. Subissue: *long prayers for show*. Christ accuses them of making self-righteous long prayers for show. See for yourself [Berakoth, folio 32b]:

“Our Rabbis taught: The pious men of old used to wait [meditate] for an hour [before prayer] and pray for an hour and then wait [meditate] for an hour [after prayer]. But seeing that they spend nine hours a day over prayer [presumably in connection with the third, sixth, and ninth hours of the day, cf. Dan. 6:10], how is their knowledge of Torah preserved and how is their work done? [The answer is] that because they are pious, their Torah is preserved and their work is blessed.”

- f. Subissue: *proselytes of the gate*. Christ accuses them of making proselytes (a good thing in itself) to the ruination of those proselytes. This is because the rabbis generally despised Gentiles and subjected them to their distorted, anti-Biblical views. See for yourself the following:

- i. The sages say, but I cannot presently locate the reference, “Thank God I was not born a dog, a Gentile, or a woman.”
- ii. The sages at times are extremely negative concerning proselytes, whether of the gate or of righteousness, and call them “scabs” and “sores” who hinder the coming of Messiah [Bab. Middah, folio 13b, from Lightfoot, Volume 2, p.292; Yebamoth, folio 47b; Yebamoth, folio 109b; quoted in this order]:

“Our Rabbins teach that proselytes and Sodomites hinder the coming of Messiah. Proselytes are a scab to Israel.”

“... for R. Khelbo said, ‘Proselytes are as hard for Israel [to endure] as a sore, because it is written in Scripture, And the proselyte shall join himself with them, and they shall cleave [from same root as “sore”] to the house of Jacob.’ ”

“For R. Isaac said, ‘What is meant by the Scriptural text, *He that is surety for a stranger [Gentile] shall smart for it?* Evil after evil comes upon those who receive proselytes ...’ ... in accordance with R. Khelbo. For R. Khelbo said, ‘Proselytes are as hard for Israel [to endure] as a sore upon the skin.’ ”

- iii. Shammai is nasty to Gentiles and Hillel is condescending to Gentiles, unless they subordinate themselves completely to the rabbinical tradition [Shabbath, folio 31a]:

“Our Rabbis taught: ‘A certain heathen [Gentile] once came before Shammai and asked him, “How many Torah have you?” “Two”, he replied, “the Written Torah and the Oral [= rabbinical] Torah.” “I believe you with respect to the Written, but not with respect to the Oral Torah; make me a proselyte on condition that you teach me the Written Torah [only].” [But] he [Shammai] scolded and repulsed him in anger. When he [the Gentile] went before Hillel, he accepted him as a proselyte [presumably under the same conditions]. On the first day he taught him, *Alef, beth, gimmel, daleth*; the following day he [Hillel] reversed [the alphabet] to him. “But yesterday you did not teach them to me thus,” he protested. [Hillel said,] “Must you then not rely upon me? Then rely upon me with respect to the Oral [Torah] too.” ’ ”

- g. Subissue: *Sandredral guilt for murdering all the righteous prophets.*  
i. Sanhedrin are as whited sepulchres (Matt. 23:27–28, cf. Acts 23:3). Cf. [Shekalim, chapter I, hal. I; Maasar Sheni, chapter I, hal. I; Jerusalem Gemara; quoted in order from Lightfoot, Volume 2, p. 299]:

“In the fifteenth day of the month Adar [a month before Passover] they mend the ways and the streets and the the common sewers and perform those things that concern the public and they paint the sepulchres.”

“They paint the sepulchres with chalk, tempered and infused with water.”

“For what cause do they paint them so? That this matter may be like the case of the leper [who turns white]. The leprous man crieth out, ‘Unclean, unclean’; and here, in like manner, uncleanness cries out to you and saith, ‘Come not near.’ ”

- ii. Hypocrites were known in that day as like whited sepulchres and were referred to as “painted men” [Sotah, folio 22b; Josephus, Antiquities XIII:XV:5; Yoma, folio 72b; Yoma 9b; quoted in this order]:

“King Jannai [Alexander Jannaeus] said to his wife [Salome], ‘Fear not the Pharisees and non-Pharisees, but the painted men who pretend to be Pharisees: because their deeds are the deeds of Zimri, but they expect a reward like Phineas.’ ”

“But he [Jannaeus] gave her [Salome] the following advice: ... she should go in triumph, as upon a victory, to Jerusalem, and put some of her authority in to the hands of the Pharisees; for that they would commend her for the honor she had done them, and would reconcile the Nation to her; for he told her they had great authority among the Jews, both to do hurt to such as they hated, and to bring advantages to those to whom they were friendly disposed; for that they were believed best of all by the multitude when they speak any severe thing against others, though it be only out of envy at them.”

“Any scholar whose inside is not like his outside is no scholar.”

“Why was the First Sanctuary destroyed? Because of three [evil] things which prevailed there: idolatry, immorality, bloodshed. ... But why was the Second Sanctuary destroyed, seeing that in its time they were occupying themselves with Torah, [observance of] precepts, and the practice of charity? Because therein prevailed hatred without cause. That teaches you that groundless hatred is considered as of even gravity with the three sins of idolatry, immorality, and bloodshed together. ... To those that were under the First Sanctuary their end was revealed because their iniquity was revealed, but to those that were under the Second their end was not revealed because their iniquity was not revealed.”

- iii. Sanhedral decorating of the tombs of the prophets (Matt. 23:29) was in fact an insult to the prophets [Jerusalem Gemara, folio 47a, from Lightfoot, Volume 2, p. 301]:

“They do not adorn the sepulchres of the righteous, for their own sayings are their memorial.”

Thus decorating the prophets’ tombs meant that the Sanhedrin did NOT respect the words of the prophets, a point made repeatedly earlier. This is why Christ pronounces judgment upon them for this practice.

- iv. This decoration shows that in fact the Sanhedrin stands with those, and are the children of those, that killed the prophets (Matt. 23:30–33); and in fact, such decoration is the completion and finishing and filling up of the sins of those that killed the prophets. This sanctimonious building and decorating of tombs for prophets, whose Scriptures are not honored with the normative hermeneutic followed by obedience, but rather desecrated by such decoration, results in Christ again pronouncing eternal damnation upon the Sanhedrin. Cf. His earlier such pronouncement in the Parable of the Wedding Supper (Matt. 22:2–14). He pronounces them to be the generation of vipers (cf. Matt. 3:7; 12:34), a fitting epitaph for the Second Generation.
- v. Not only do the Sanhedrin dishonor the Prophets with the decoration of their tombs, but they will—and in fact did—kill and persecute the prophets and wise men and sopherim which Christ will commission as His apostles to the Nation, so that upon the Sanhedrin and the Second Generation is placed the guilt of the murder of ALL the assassinated prophets of Elect Israel and the Righteous Gentiles, from Abel to Zechariah (Matt. 23:34–39, cf. Acts 7:51–53).

- G. Sanhedral Account Of The Conflict As Ralph Manheim, translator of the standard American edition of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, puts it in explaining his translation, "Seeing is believing." So here, seeing is believing when viewing the Sanhedrin's own account, as preserved in Talmud, of Christ's final conflict (and possibly including the confrontation of 12) with Second Generation Sanhedrin. From [Sanhedrin, folio 43a]:

"On the eve of Passover Yeshu [the Nazarean (Manuscript M)] was hanged. '... he has practised sorcery and enticed Israel to apostasy.' "

"Our Rabbis taught: Yeshu had five disciples, Matthai, Nakhai, Nezer, Buni, and Todah. When Matthai was brought [before Sanhedrin], he said to them, 'Shall Matthai be executed? Is it not written, *Matthai [when] shall I come and appear before God?*' Thereupon they retorted, 'Yes. Matthai shall be executed, since it is written, *When Matthai [when] he die and his name perish.*' "

"When Nakhai was brought in he said to them, 'Shall Nakhai be executed? Is it not written, *Nakhai [the innocent] and the righteous slay thou not?*' 'Yes' was the answer, 'Nakhai shall be executed, since it is written, *In secret places does Nakhai slay.*' "

"When Nezer was brought in, he said, 'Shall Nezer be executed? Is it not written, *And Nezer [a twig] shall grow forth out of his roots.*' 'Yes', they said, 'Nezer shall be executed, since it is written, *But thou are cast forth away from thy grave like Nezer [an abhorred offshoot].*' "

"When Buni was brought in, he said, 'Shall Buni be executed? Is it not written, *Beni [my son], my first born.*' 'Yes', they said, 'Buni shall be executed, since it is written, *Behold I will slay Bine-ka [thy son], thy first born.*' "

"And when Todah was brought in, he said to them, 'Shall Todah be executed? Is it not written, *A psalm for Todah [thanksgiving]?*' 'Yes', they answered, 'Todah shall be executed, since it is written, *Whoso offereth the sacrifice of Todah [thanksgiving] honoured me.*' "

That's it. We have the Biblical account and we have the above account from Tractate Sanhedrin. Which one is accurate—or even *rational*; which one reports and which one covers up? Is it not obvious?

## V. Appendix: Correlation Of Christ's Temple Destruction Prophecies

“TEMPLE” PROPHECIES OF MATTHEW 24, MARK 13, LUKE 21 (revised from April 2001 posting to T-DOG e-group)

Have the “temple” prophecies of Matthew 24, Mark 13, Luke 21 been fulfilled by the Romans (under Titus the general in 70 A.D.) or later (135 A.D.).

The purpose of this outline is to rigorously apply the normative hermeneutic to these passages and document evidence relevant for testing whether these prophecies have in fact been fulfilled; we also sketch a purely Biblical argument regarding their fulfillment needing no archaeological evidence at all.

By thorough application of the proper Biblical hermeneutic we prove the following Proposition:

PROPOSITION. The following statements hold:

(1) Christ’s prophecies repeatedly concern the entirety of the temple compound/precinct, including all its walls and structures.

(2) Christ’s prophecies repeatedly mandate that absolutely no structures be left intact in any sense for any of these structures, absolutely not one single, solitary stone be left on top of another stone.

(3) The archaeological evidence, even today, shows the structures included in Christ’s prophecies, including walls and stairs, with many stones still on top of each other, remain from the temple compound of Christ’s day.

(4) The remaining structures—with stones one upon another—and the veracity of Christ’s prophecies show that fulfillment of Christ’s prophecies await a future time of God’s dealing with ethnic Israel and the remaining stones are therefore silent witnesses to Israel’s future as the chief, priestly, temple nation whose righteous, ethnic empire will fill the earth.

(5) The structures of the temple that were utterly destroyed (including the Holy Place, the Holy of Holies, middle wall of partition) are silent witnesses to Paul’s Gospel and Law in which there is no Israel distinct from the Gentiles, no priesthood, no religious symbols (so no choir robes, no WWJD bracelets) , no holydays (no Christmas nor Easter nor Sabbath), and no rituals (no Mithraic/Hindu-like communion).

(6) Statements (4) and (5) together confirm not only Paul’s gospel, but that Paul’s gospel is UNIQUE from ALL the rest of Scripture.

(7) Statements (4) and (5) together confirm that the remaining stones are REMNANT stones. These stones, along with the destruction of the interior of the Temple compound, simultaneously testify to the fact that today there is neither Jew nor Gentile and to the fact that in the future there will be Jew and Gentile and ethnic Israel will yet fulfill all her prophecies. Hence these stones in this dispensation are exactly like a REMNANT (Rom. 11:5) in the Body of Christ who are of Jewish stock and who testify both to the neither-Jew-nor-Gentile Pauline gospel as well to the security of Israel’s yet-to-be-fulfilled prophecies.

We shall not prove all of this proposition in equal detail in this outline, but shall focus primarily on P(1), P(2), P(3). These statements roughly determine the outline of the comments below.

It behooves us to repeat that the normative hermeneutic, the hermeneutic for interpreting communication conveying information, requires that we interpret words, phrases, grammar, idioms consistent with their predominant or normative usage by the original audience unless the context of the passage in question, or the context of a passage parallel to the passage in question, should require us to do otherwise. The burden of proof is upon those claiming a minority or exceptional meaning; and this burden can only be met by compelling proof from context. A “complacent context” means that the normative or customary meaning must be adhered to. In brief,

customary/normative usage rules unless context overrules

The normative hermeneutic simply reflects the fact that the Holy Spirit created language for communication and that He wrote to His original audience in a way THEY could understand, that is, in a way based on their customary

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 23

usage and ability to recognize the shaping by context. It is our obligation to submit to the meaning intended for the original audience for this is the Holy Spirit's meaning.

Hence the normative hermeneutic is the only hermeneutic which respects Scripture—so today it is necessarily communicated at the indwelling; i.e. Pauline regeneration drives saints of the present dispensation to deal with the text in order to get correct information from it, deal with the text honestly, deal with the text using the normative hermeneutic, and hence to uncover Paul's gospel with its distinctive hope and calling for these saints.

Further details may be found at

<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/topical/nherm.htm>

## PART I. ANALYSIS OF "TEMPLE" AND RELATED WORDS OF MATTHEW, MARK, LUKE

There is no single Greek word for temple, either in LXX canon or apochrypha, Greek NT, or in any other ancient Greek literature. Two primary words referring to "temple structures" are HIERON and NAOS. Both are generally rendered "temple" in most English translations, which is neither very accurate nor helpful, since we tend to associate "temple" with a specific kind of building. It is imperative that we properly understand these words and their differences accurately. It is also relevant to consider other words used to refer to areas associated with ceremonial worship, namely HAGION, HAGIA, HAGIASMA. This allows us to fully appreciate Matthew's, Mark's, Luke's choice of words in Matthew 24:1, Mark 13:1, Luke 21:5, resp.

### A. HIERON: PRIEST-PLACE / SACRED COMPOUND

1. HIERON is the neuter noun of the "priest" word group—HIERUS (priest), HIERATEUO (to function as a priest, HIERATEUMA (priesthood), etc. Being neuter, it means "priest-thing" or "priest-place" or "sacred compound", i.e. that area of the Land under the direct control of the priesthood and for the activities of the priesthood—this is the root meaning. The lexicons consistently render it as "temple" in the broadest possible sense, namely as the temple compound or temple precinct, including the enclosure housing the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, rooms of hospitality, living quarters, sheds for supplies, walls with gates, various courts, etc. Clearly the root/lexical meaning includes all these structures. But the acid test is not what a lexicon says, but the actual usage of the word.

2. Greek N.T. HIERON occurs 71 times in the Greek N.T. and its usage there shows that the lexicon got it right. Here are some sample usages, all in the context of the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON.

Matthew 4:5 / Luke 4:9. "Wing of the HIERON." Apparently refers to a high point of the outermost wall. The AV renders it "pinnacle of the HIERON" but PTERUGION comes from PTERUX (wing), so the interlinears are correct to call it "wing". This confirms the root/lexical meaning.

Matthew 24:1. "Buildings of the HIERON." This shows that the whole compound is intended and refers to ALL the structures of the HIERON, especially its walls, gates, sheds. The Herodian walls were walls in the ancient semitic sense, extremely thick on top of which were plazas, cedar-roofed porticos, elaborate decorations. The network of walls were the conspicuous part of the HIERON, save for the enclosure containing the Holy Place and Holy of Holies. The gates were also elaborate structures including special rooms and special decorations. "Buildings" translates OIKODOMAS (homestead buildings) of which these special walls—featuring huge granite blocks, one upon another—were an integral part.

Mark 13:1–2. Cf. Matt. 24:1.

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 24

Luke 21:5. Cf. Matt. 24:1.

John 2:14. “He drove all [oxen, sheep, doves, moneychangers] out of the HIERON.” This activity took place in the compound, indeed the outer court of the Gentiles, in fact much of it on the stairs of the gate of the southern wall (see TIME article discussed below for citation). Note that “house” in the context is not translated by OKIA (actual dwelling place) but rather OIKOS (household, entirety of property). This confirms the root/lexical meaning of HIERON and confirms that the walls/gates/stairs are an integral part of the HIERON since they delineate the entire property (OIKOS) of the priests.

Acts 3:2. “Gate of the HIERON.” This refers to a gate in the outermost wall of the compound, and it implies that the outermost wall is part of the HIERON.

Acts 3:10. “Beautiful Gate of the HIERON.” This refers to a specific gate of the outermost wall of the compound, —namely the Eastern Wall— and it implies that the outermost wall and gates are part of the HIERON.

I know of no contrary usages in the Greek N. T. for HIERON—all walls and structures overseen by the priests are intended, always. Search and see (Rom. 14:5).

3. LXX (Greek O.T. and Apochrypha). There are 7 occurrences in LXX canon:

I Chron. 9:27; 29:4, II Chron.6:13, Exek. 27:6; 28:18; 45:19,  
Dan. 9:27

All of these confirm the root/lexical meaning. An example is:

Dan. 9:27. “And upon the HIERON the abomination of desolation.” But in the parallel passage of Ezek. 8:3–5 (either Hebrew canon or LXX) the abomination is at the north gate of the compound, implying that the north gate is part of the HIERON.

Additionally, there are usages in the LXX apochrypha, but these are not as accessible—the Hatch-Redpath listing for HIERON is part of the listing of HIEROS (a masculine adjective meaning PRIESTLY or SACRED) and this requires the separation of the HIERON usage by hand. None of the usages I have checked is at variance with the root/lexical meaning given above, including those referring to pagan structures and compounds.

4. Josephus. Josephus is cited in [M. F. Unger, Unger’s Bible Dictionary, p.1081] as referring to the outermost wall of the Herodian-Zerubbabel compound as TO DEUTERION HIERON, literally “the second HIERON”, or more loosely, “the second PRIEST-PLACE”. This confirms the root/lexical meaning.

5. Papyri, Engravings, Pottery Fragments. Moulton & Milligan refer to the “inner courts of the Temple” in reference to the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON in a citation warning Gentiles from going into these inner courts [Moulton & Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament, p. 300]. Generally, their citations of HIERON (and of HIEROS for that matter) are consistent with the root/lexical meaning given above.

CONCLUSION REGARDING HEIRON. All the pertinent and available evidence has been considered. We can safely say that we understand the Holy Spirit’s usage of HIERON. In the case of the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON, it means



2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 25

ALL THE STRUCTURES OF THE COMPOUND  
OF THE TEMPLE PRECINCT, INCLUDING ALL  
WALLS, GATES, STAIRS.

Indeed, the language of Matthew 24:1, ΤΑΣ ΟΙΚΟΔΟΜΑΣ ΤΟΥ ΗΙΕΡΟΥ, means precisely ALL THE STRUCTURES OF THE SACRED COMPOUND—including all walls, gates, stairs—unless the context compels otherwise, and where is such compelling, contrary evidence?

It appears that the normative hermeneutic, via straightly plowing (II Tim. 2:15 ORTHOTIMEO), has spoken, and we are therefore required to submit to this meaning.

B. NAOS: SHRINE / ENCLOSURE OF HOLY PLACE AND HOLY OF HOLIES

1. NAOS is associated with ΝΑΙΟ (to dwell) and means SHRINE in the sense of where the deity meets with the faithful or priests representing the faithful. The lexicons generally agree with this meaning. Again, the acid test is usage, and we shall see that in the case of Israel's religion, NAOS refers to the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies and the physical aspects of such, including the actual building and enclosure of such, or even just the Holy of Holies. Thus NAOS is a proper subset of ΗΙΕΡΟΝ: NAOS refers specifically to the structure at the center of the sacred compound and ΗΙΕΡΟΝ refers to the compound and all its structures as a whole—see [J. H. Thayer, Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon, pp. 299,422 under both words, respectively] and [W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, F. W. Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, pp. 372, 533]. One of the claims of [BAGD, p. 533] concerning NAOS (that it can equal ΗΙΕΡΟΝ) is flatly contradicted by usage in the very passages they adduce (we consider one example in Matt. 23:35 below)—Thayer is much more careful and accurate regarding NAOS. Usage and context rule!

2. Greek N.T. NAOS occurs 46 times in the Greek N.T. and its usage shows that the lexicons got it right, including its counterdistinction with ΗΙΕΡΟΝ. Here are some sample usages, the first two in the context of the Herodian-Zerubbabel NAOS.

Matt. 23:35. “Between the NAOS and the altar.”

Here the NAOS is pinned down to be the enclosure of the Holy Place and Holy of Holies, or “temple proper”, for the altar is just outside this enclosure. Since both the altar and this enclosure are part of the sacred compound, this shows the distinction between ΗΙΕΡΟΝ and NAOS. It is a contradiction to claim, as [BAGD, op.cit., p. 533] does, that NAOS is the temple precinct in this passage, since this would put the altar outside the entire compound!! This is why usage, concordances, evaluation for oneself are more important than the official lexicons(!).

Matt. 27:51 / Mark 14:38 / Luke 23:45. “The veil of the NAOS was rent.” The veil separated the Holy Place from the Holy of Holies. This veil was therefore in the enclosure housing such. Although the veil is ultimately part of the ΗΙΕΡΟΝ as the sacred compound, it is more precisely part of this enclosure or shrine. This passage favors NAOS as this shrine and shows how it may be distinguished from ΗΙΕΡΟΝ.

Eph. 2:21–22. “Is-growing into an holy NAOS ... for an absolute-at-home-ment of the God in Spirit.” In the second phrase, the second member of an extended hypocatastasis, Paul is saying that the Body of Christ is the absolute dwelling

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 26**

place of the Holy Spirit, i.e. the Body of Christ is the Holy of Holies amongst God's Elect, and by a parallelism in this hypocatastasis, calls the Body a NAOS in the first member of this hypocatastasis. This shows that people of both Jewish background (Paul) and Gentile background (recipients of Ephesian letter—namely Laodecia (but that's another issue)) understood that NAOS meant shrine in this restricted sense. Note that here NAOS is precisely restricted to the Holy of Holies.

Rev. 11:19. "There was seen in His NAOS the ark of the covenant." This shows immediately that NAOS means the shrine of the heavenly court.

Rev. 16:1,17. "A great voice out of the NAOS. In context this is the shrine of heaven."

I know of no contrary usage in the Greek N.T. for NAOS—it consistently means the building/shrine at the very center of the HIERON.

3. LXX (Greek O.T. and Apochrypha). There are about 69 occurrences of NAOS in LXX canon (depending slightly on which underlying manuscript is being followed). I am not aware of any significant deviation from what has been observed in the Greek N.T. Here is the first occurrence in LXX

I Sam. 1:9. "Now Heli the priest was upon a seat by the threshold of the NAOS (Greek) of the Lord." This is consistent with the root/lexical meaning given above, referring to the doorway of the enclosure of the Holy Place and Holy of Holies. The underlying Hebrew text speaks that Eli sat on a seat by a post of the temple of the Lord, which means he was located at the doorway of the shrine proper.

4. Papyri, Engravings, Pottery Fragments. The evidence of [Moulton & Milligan, op. cit., p. 422] confirms the root/lexical meaning given above. They adduce several pagan examples in the support of the view that NAOS is the shrine, in the sense of dwelling place, of the deity in question. They also quote the German scholar Wilcken's analysis of one example ["Der NAOS in Allerheiligsten ist der Schrein, in dem das Bild der Goettin steht"], which roughly translates as "The NAOS in the most-holy [sense] is the shrine in which the icon of the goddess stands." This is fully in keeping with root/lexical sense of NAOS—in the Herodian-Zerubbabel case there was simply the the unseen presence of Jehovah in the holiest place, and in the Solomonic case there was the ark of the covenant with the unseen presence of Jehovah over the Mercy Seat and under the Tallith of the Cherubim wings in the holiest place. So this fits perfectly.

CONCLUSION REGARDING NAOS. Again, all the pertinent and available evidence has been considered. We can safely say that we understand the Holy Spirit's usage of NAOS. In the case of the Herodian-Zerubbabel NAOS, it means at least

THAT SPECIFIC STRUCTURE HOUSING THE  
HOLY PLACE AND THE HOLY OF HOLIES.

and in some usages, in a more narrow sense, it means precisely

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 27

THE HOLY OF HOLIES.

C. HAGION, HAGIA, HAGIASMA

HAGION, HAGIA, HAGIASMA are of the HAGIOS (holy, set-apart) word group and roughly mean SANCTUARY. The plural HAGIA (holies) as the plural of majesty narrows to the Holy of Holies or Most Holy Place. HAGION, HAGIA occur in the Greek N.T., and HAGION, HAGIASMA in LXX, for the sanctuary. For all intents and purposes, these words are synonymous with NAOS and refer to the enclosure of the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies, or in a somewhat more narrow sense, to the Holy of Holies.

We let the reader run these down using the standard aids (for the Greek N.T., it can be done with Strong's or the Online Bible or ...).

This word group links us back to NAOS, for NAOS and HAGIA—Shrine and Holiest Place—are identified by parallelism in Eph. 2:19,21, further confirming what was said in B(2, Conclusion) above.

EPH. 2:19,21–22. “So then you are absolutely-no-more truly-sojourning strangers, but-rather you are joint-citizens OF the Holiest-Place [the choice for the genitive plural form TON HAGION is between “the saints” if masculine and “the Holiest-Place” if neuter, and “citizens of saints” is absurd; and those insisting on corrupting this genitive by the unheard-of “with” are under the curse of Deut. 4:2 as applied to Pauline Law] ... all the building being-jointly-fitted-together grows into [a] Holy Shrine in [the] Lord ... being-jointly-built-together into absolute-at-home-ment of the God in Spirit.”

D. PROOF OF P(1).

We now wrap up the proof of P(1): Christ's prophecies concern the entirety of the temple compound/precinct, including all its walls and structures. Incidentally, these prophecies were given three times on three different occasions (but regarding the same subject, as we shall see).

First, Matthew (24:1), Mark (13:1–2), Luke (21:5) are inspired in representing in Greek whatever Christ said in Hebrew/Aramaic.

Second, Matthew, Mark, Luke had available FIVE words to convey what Christ intended, four of these words focusing on the sanctuary proper. They all willfully chose HIERON, the one word of the five available which ALWAYS conveys the notion of the sacred compound and all its structures and walls.

Third, by the normative hermeneutic, we must so interpret Christ's prophecies. The prophecies recorded in Matthew and Mark are the more emphatic of the three, Matthew, for example, indicating the OIKODOMAS TOU HIEROU, namely all the structures of the property of the sacred compound, including gates, walls, stairs (remember, the HIERON is said to have GATES, including the BEAUTIFUL, and only walls have gates; therefore, HIERON as a word includes the walls!). But all these structures are also referred to, though more implicitly, in Luke as well.

This concludes the proof of P(1).

PART II. EXTENT OF DEVASTATION: ABSOLUTE NEGATIVES AND DOUBLE NEGATIVES (in Greek)

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 28

ABSTRACT. The Matthew, Mark, Luke prophecies concerning the HIERON occurred on three different occasions on the same day. The point is that Christ said it thrice, and Luke gives the first occasion: in the context of the end of Luke 20 and 21:1–4, He is still in the HIERON, i.e. still within some court of the sacred complex; in Mark 13, He is in process of leaving the HIERON, making Mark the middle prophecy; and in Matthew 24, He leaves the HIERON before making His HIERON prophecy, so Matthew gives the third HIERON prophecy. There are other points of comparison, but this should suffice for now. (And we note, that in the harmony between Matthew and Luke, it seems Luke goes first and Matthew and Mark later: Luke 4 gives the first round of temptation and Matthew 4 the second round (yes, Satan tried it twice before giving up); Luke 22 gives the first course of the Last Passover and Matthew 26 and Mark 14 give the second course of this Passover (with John 13 at the midpoint between the courses; etc.)

A. LUKAN HIERON PROPHECY (Luke 21:1–4,5–6)

1. Occurs BEFORE Christ leaves the HIERON, while He is still WITHIN the HIERON—Verses 1–4.

2. Verse 5.

a. “Some [of the disciples] are saying (LEGO) about the HIERON.” We know from our comparative word study that this refers to the entirety of the Priest-Place or Sacred Compound (including the walls).

b. “That with beautiful stones and gifts it has been decorated.” This must include the walls. According to Josephus [M.F. Unger, loc. cit], the outer wall had porticos on which were marble pillars 25 cubits, with cedar roofs, and these walls were decorated with mosaics. The eastern part of the outer wall featured the gate called Beautiful, which was made of Corinthian brass and richly decorated with precious metals [M. F. Unger, loc. cit.]. Thus we know that even the outermost walls are intended in this discussion of the HIERON.

3. Verse 6

a. “Days will come in which ABSOLUTELY-NOT (OUK) will be left a stone upon another which will ABSOLUTELY-NOT (OU) be overthrown.” The Greek has two negatives: ME, the general negative, and OUK or OU, the absolute negative. The absolute negative insists on no exceptions: this is the pattern of its usage. Therefore, we must so interpret OUK/OU in this passage unless the context should compel us otherwise—this is the mandate of the normative hermeneutic.

b. Christ repeats the absolute negative. This means the context must REALLY be compelling to interpret OUK/OU otherwise.

c. Christ’s prophecy in Luke requires for its fulfillment that EVERY SINGLE STONE be cast down of the ENTIRE TEMPLE PRECINCT. This is the necessary consequence of the normative hermeneutic. This is how the original audience would understand this, therefore that is His meaning.

4. VERIFICATION OF P(2) ABOVE. P(2) above asserted that

Christ’s prophecies mandate that absolutely no structures be left intact in any sense, absolutely not one single stone be left on top of another stone.

P(2) has now been verified in the case of the Lukan prophecy. But there is much more in Mark and Matthew!

B. MARKAN PROPHECY (Mark 13:1–3).

This occurs WHILE Christ is leaving the HIERON (Verse 1). Apparently, Christ and the 12 are leaving the HIERON via the Beautiful Gate on the east wall, since they are going to Mount Olivette (Verse 3) which is on the east.

This implies their discussion must include the walls, gates, and their all-important stairways where much of HIERON culture flourished (see the TIME article cited below). The main points are identical with Matthew (C. below), including the same extremely intense PAIR OF DOUBLE NEGATIVES, and with the rhetorical POTAPOS (“what manner of?”) playing the same role in Mark as PAS in Matthew.

It must follow that P(2) is verified in the case of Mark also.

C. MATTHEW PROPHECY (Matt. 24:1–3)

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 29**

1. Occurs AFTER Christ leaves the HIERON. This means that He and the disciples are OUTSIDE the outer walls looking at the HIERON compound.

a. Apparently, Christ and the 12 are looking back at the HIERON from the east, having exited the Beautiful Gate on the east wall on their way to Mount Olivette (Verse 3) which is on the east.

b. This prophecy and Mark's are more intense and even more emphatic than the earlier one recorded by Luke.

2. Verse 1.

a. "Show Him the OIKODOMAS TOU HIERON." From the OUTSIDE of the HIERON, they are pointing to all the property-structures / homestead-structures of the sacred compound. This must include the outermost wall (among the other structures) with all its piazzas, porticos, decorations by mosaics and precious metals, marble pillars, cedar roofs, etc. It especially includes the Beautiful Gate of the east wall.

b. This correlates perfectly with the expression of Luke concerning decorations and beautiful stones.

3. Verse 2.

a. "Do you absolutely-not see ALL-MANNER-OF (PANTA) these?" A rhetorical question using the absolute negative. Now, John Owen forever established, by the normative hermeneutic, in Volume 10 of his works (The Death of Death in the Death of Christ), even by considering some 500(!) occurrences of the Greek PAS, that the basic sense of PAS is ALL MANNER OF. So Christ acknowledges their showing Him the OIKODOMAS and responds by asking them to ABSOLUTELY consider ALL MANNER OF these structures. This implies the WALLS of the HIERON are being considered, otherwise there is a kind or species of structure not being considered, and this violates the combination of OU and PAS. This is a necessary consequence of the normative hermeneutic!

b. "Truly, I say to you". Again, a more emphatic record than in Luke.

c. "ABSOLUTELY-NOT-NOT (OU ME) will be left here stone upon stone which shall ABSOLUTELY-NOT-NOT (OU ME) be overthrown." Spectacular! A PAIR of DOUBLE NEGATIVES. This Greek usage represents an extremely intense negation. In English, we view it as bad grammar to put two negatives together, but here Matthew, to convey the intensity of the prophecy of Christ, intensifies the already absolute negative with the general negative. THIS LEAVES NO POSSIBLE WIGGLE ROOM (as if the Lukan prophecy were not already sufficiently explicit):

ABSOLUTELY NOT ONE SOLITARY, SINGLE STONE  
WILL BE LEFT ON TOP ON ANY OTHER STONE

d. The fulfillment of Christ's prophecy as recorded in Matthew requires that EVERY SINGLE STONE OF EVERY STRUCTURE OF THE SACRED COMPOUND, including its sanctuary (NAOS), the court of Gentiles, the court of women, all sheds, all walls inner and outer, EVERYTHING OF EVERY KIND, be overthrown, NOT ONE STONE OF ANYTHING LEFT ON TOP OF ANY OTHER STONE.

4. VERIFICATION OF P(2) ABOVE. P(2) above asserted that

Christ's prophecies mandate that absolutely no  
structures be left intact in any sense, absolutely not  
one single stone be left on top of another stone.

P(2) has now been verified in the case of the Matthew prophecy.

D. REINFORCEMENT. These three parallel passages reinforce each other and therefore intensify each other—there is to be left not one single stone of any structure of the Herodian-Zerubbabel complex when these prophecies are fulfilled. Christ is repeatedly teaching this over and over: within the compound, on the way out of the compound, and outside the compound.

P(2) has been verified indeed.

**PART III. TEMPLE PROPHECIES N-O-T FULFILLED—THE LESSER ARGUMENT: PHYSICAL EVIDENCE TODAY.**

An absolutely striking article, which everyone should go right out and purchase or at least photocopy at your library (or even download, if possible, from their website), appeared in TIME magazine very recently. Please consider:

David van Bienen, "Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus",

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 30

TIME 157:15(16 April 2001) 46–56.

The scale models based on the latest archaeology shows the extensive way in which the walls were very much structures (OIKODOMAS) of the HIERON—chambers, stairways, extensive windows, storerooms (confirming [M. F. Unger, loc. cit]); see [van Biena, op. cit., p. 54] of this article.

But the most pertinent evidence from this article, which is simply overwhelming, are the before-drawing and after-photograph of [van Biena, op. cit., pp. 48–49] of the HIERON overall and the photograph of [van Biena, op. cit., p. 50] of the remaining steps of the stairway of the southern wall (parentheses of caption). From these evidences it is established that:

- (1) The Wailing Wall is indeed part of the original western wall of the HIERON, and as my daughter Rachel (William Penn Fellow in Archaeology and Egyptology at Penn starting Fall 2001) can testify from having just been there in June 2000 (and the videotape of her visit further documents this), there are MANY stones left on top of each other at the level of the Wailing Wall which corresponds to the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON. The upper stones of the Wailing Wall, she reports, are roughly 1000 years ago from Muslim times, but the lower stones are from the time of Christ as an intact, stone-upon-stone foundation for later additions (as the videotape makes plain).
- (2) The original eastern wall, with the now-blocked Beautiful Gate, is still there with MANY stones upon each other in an intact structure. The Scripture explicitly states (Acts 3:10) that this gate and its wall are part of the HEIRON. BUT THEY ARE STILL THERE.
- (3) Stairways were a fundamental part of the OIKODOMAS of the HIERON, and one can still see MANY stones on top of one another in the ruins of the southern steps, stairways being a critical part of Herodian HIERON life and culture [van Biena, op. cit., p. 55].
- (4) The written text of the TIME article states [van Biena, op. cit., p. 55]:

“Physical remains of Herod’s masterpiece are scarce. But they tend to support descriptions in the four surviving written sources from from approximately the same period [Gospels, Acts, Josephus, Talmud]. ... The Western Wall where Jews pray today is a small slice of the [Herodian] platform’s 16-ft.-thick side. SOME OF THE STONES ARE 30 FEET LONG AND WEIGH UP TO 50 TONS.”

(Note that “scarce” does not mean “non-existent”, indeed it implies “existent”, as van Biena’s article itself shows repeatedly.)

The conclusion is unavoidable: Christ’s prophecy is true, Christ’s prophecy concerns every single stone of the temple precinct—walls, gates, stairs especially included, and the evidence is stark that this prophecy has not been fulfilled.

It follows that P(3) and the first sentence of P(4) have been verified:

The physical evidence, even today, shows that structures included in Christ’s prophecies, with stones still on top of each other, remain from the temple compound of Christ’s day.

The fulfillment of Christ’s prophecies await a future time of God’s dealing with ethnic Israel.

The logic of the above is made more explicit in the next point.

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 31

(5) LOGICAL APPENDIX. Christ has emphatically prophesied a complete destruction, a destruction which may be expressed in the form of a universally quantified statement where A is the set of all stones in the whole sacred compound (walls especially included) and P be the predicate “shall not be left on top of another stone but shall be overturned”:

[for each x in A, P(x)]

i.e.

[for each stone in the compound,  
that stone will not be left on top of  
another stone and shall be overturned]

Now the negation of a universally quantified statement uses the existential quantifier and the inference rule known as Quantifier Exchange (QE):

not [for each x in A, P(x)]  $\iff$   
[there is x in A, not P(x)]

or a little more idiomatically:

not [for each x in A, P(x)]  $\iff$   
[for some x in A, not P(x)]

Before we consider the negation of Christ's statement, let's try an example. Let A be a basketball team and P be the predicate of tall. Then [for each x in A, P(x)] means “each person on the team is tall”. How would we deny or negate such a statement? The negation (NOT the logical “opposite”) would insist that at least one person on the team was not tall, i.e. would insist that someone on the team is not tall (be careful, not tall need not be the same as short).

So the negation of Christ's statement is of the form:

[there is x in A, not P(x)]

Restated, the negation is of the form:

at least one stone in the compound is still on  
top of another stone or has not been overturned)

where

“not [will not be left on top of  
another stone and shall be overturned]”

is the same as

“is not on top of another stone or has not  
been overturned”

(I have used double negation on the left conjunct, changed the conjunction to disjunction (another form of Quantifier Exchange known as deMorgan Laws), and negated the right conjunct. I have also played fast and loose with the issue of tense, which negation does not regard; but it should be clear that it does not matter.)

We are ready to logically frame sure tests for whether Christ's temple prophecies have come to pass or not.

2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 32**

LOGICAL TEST FOR THE PROPHECIES HAVING COME TO PASS. IF we find that every single stone of the Herodian-Zerubbabel compound has been overturned and every single stone fails to sit on top of another stone, THEN the prophecies have indeed come to pass.

LOGICAL TEST FOR THE PROPHECIES NOT HAVING COME TO PASS. IF we find AT LEAST ONE STONE still on top of another stone or which has not been overturned, THEN the prophecies have NOT yet come to pass.

Which test is satisfied? Is there any doubt? There are MANY stones in the western wall, the eastern wall, and the southern steps that are on top of other stones or which have not been overturned.

This should logically settle the matter from a Biblical and evidential point of view. Again, P(3) and the first sentence of P(4) are verified and the logic should be plain.

(As a footnote, van Bienen claims that the Romans fulfilled Christ's temple prophecies in A.D. 135 [van Bienen, op. cit. , p.56], but his own article, sound logic, and a rigorous exegesis of the text mandate otherwise as each of you can see for yourselves. Thus either his logic is unsound or his exegesis is unsound, possible both, probably the latter.)

**PART IV. TEMPLE PROPHECIES NOT FULFILLED—THE GREATER ARGUMENT: PAUL'S UNIQUE/DISTINCTIVE GOSPEL**

We sketch a greater and better argument, but refer to online studies for details of proof.

The gospel of salvation concerning the Body of Christ was revealed by Christ TO Paul and the Pauline apostleship (Titus, Timothy, Silas, Sosthenes, etc) and ONLY TO Paul and the Pauline apostleship, directly by Christ to Paul and by the Spirit of Christ to both Paul and the other Pauline apostles. Further, that gospel describes that Body as being neither Jew nor Gentile.

This is a necessary consequence of a rigorous application of the normative hermeneutic to all of Scripture. This has been demonstrated sufficiently by many able students of the Word. Many demonstrations are found at the TGF websites recently collated for this e-group. I list these again:

<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/index.htm>  
<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/tgfidx.htm>  
<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/bootcamp/pbidx.htm>  
<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/topical/sevenones.htm>  
<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/tgfconf/1999/tgf99conf.htm>  
<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/tgfconf/2000/tgf00conf.htm>  
<http://www.icubed.com/~hilston/TGF/topical/nherm.htm>

The 3rd–6th sites listed are directly relevant to this particular point.

The GREATER and BETTER argument is as follows: IF the gospel of salvation concerning the Body of Christ was revealed by Christ TO and ONLY TO Paul and the Pauline apostleship, and if that gospel describes that Body as being neither Jew nor Gentile, THEN, during the time that this Body is being dealt with in this life, i.e. until the Rapture/Ascension of that Body, God cannot deal with men on the basis of ethnic identity and distinction. But Christ's prophecy concerns the nation Israel ipse facto: Christ in His earthly ministry is a minister to the circumcision (Rom. 15:8) to confirm the promises made to the fathers, His Temple prophecies concern the HIERON which is a feature of Israel as the Priest-Nation, we know that Zion is purified in the Third Generation (by the 144k as the saviors of the Land—Obadiah 21 and Rev. 14:1 in that order) as a preparation for building Ezekiel's Millennial Temple, hence that the Herodian-Zerubbabel HIERON must be completely gone, every single stone, as a preparation for that new HIERON, etc. Thus the fulfillment of these Temple prophecies is connected with Israel's future ethnic empire. Therefore they cannot be fulfilled in a dispensation in which there is neither Jew nor Gentile.



2003 TGF BIBLE CONFERENCE: DEATH, BURIAL, AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST  
**Session I: Final Conflict With Second Generation Sanhedrin, Page 33**

Here is another tack. The fulfillment of the temple prophecies in Matthew 24, Mark 13, Luke 21 are in the context of the Israel's last days, as both Christ and the disciples make clear. Paul has explicitly stated that the day of the Body precedes the night in which comes the Day of the Lord as a thief in the night (I Thess. 5—use your study aids!). If the temple prophecies are in the Day of the Lord, then they cannot have been fulfilled during the day of the Body of Christ (which began with Paul's ministry before he wrote his first epistle and is still in place because I have not been raptured yet—and each member of the Body can say the same). Thus they have not been fulfilled yet.

These and other arguments rest only on developing from the Scriptures a theology in accordance with the normative hermeneutic and hence are superior to the partially archaeological argument; that is, they are more purely presuppositional in nature.

What happened with the Romans in A.D. 70 and 135 (Gregorian calendar) is that the Romans vindicated Paul's gospel AND the surety of God restoring Israel in the future as the Priest-Nation and ruler of the planet in accordance with all the Hebrew and non-Pauline prophets. The existence of those stones on top of each other in the walls and steps say that Christ's prophecy is yet future and that it will come to pass along with all the other prophecies, including the future HIERON which necessitates the complete removal of all the stones of the old HIERON of Israel's Second Generation. At the same time, the fact that the NAOS, and the middle wall of partition in the inner court of the HIERON were destroyed testifies to Paul's gospel of NO ETHNICITY, NO SYMBOLS, NO HOLYDAYS, NO EARTHLY PROSPECT/HOPE, NO RITUAL BAPTISM, NO RITUAL MEALS, etc.

As pointed out earlier, these remaining stones are REMNANT stones. These stones, along with the destruction of the interior of the Temple compound, simultaneously testify to the fact that today there is neither Jew nor Gentile and to the fact that in the future there will be Jew and Gentile and ethnic Israel will yet fulfill all her prophecies. Hence these stones in this dispensation are exactly like a REMNANT (Rom. 11:5) in the Body of Christ who are of Jewish stock and who testify both to the neither-Jew-nor-Gentile Pauline gospel as well to the security of Israel's yet-to-be-fulfilled prophecies.

In terms of the atonement which Christ made for Israel, the stones still remaining testify to the fact that Christ redeemed Israel to be the Holy Nation, the Chosen Genetic-Race, the Royal Priesthood (I Peter 2:9; Rev. 5:9–10) in the future; and in terms of the atonement which Christ made for the Body of Christ, the NAOS and middle wall of partition being broken down testify to Christ having nailed all such ceremonial and ritual and symbolic and ethnic issues to the cross for the Body of Christ (Eph. 2:11–17, Col. 2:8–23 (especially 15 in context)).

This is just a sketch of the better argument; there is much more in the online studies and other studies available from TGF.

A final comment: the better argument allows us on purely Biblical and presuppositional grounds to postdict what archaeological evidence we should find in the field, namely the existence of at least one such stone, and such evidence is in fact found, and this logically proves the lesser argument and vindicates the greater argument.

#### PART V. REBUTTALS TO THIS OUTLINE

Since the normative hermeneutic, or grammatico-historical method, is one of the ground rules of this e-group, then we can only consider rebuttals to this outline based upon a good-faith attempt to apply this hermeneutic to the Scriptures. We must honor the Scriptures and this is the only way to do it.