

The Law of Murder

📖 Matthew 5:21-26

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 August 20, 2014

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

I want to make some comments on the current Arab-Israeli war. Since Operation Protective Edge anti-Semitism has risen 383%. This is due to the prevailing amount of propaganda stating that Israel is an occupying power and that this is clear in international law. In other words, the land really belongs to the so-called Palestinians and so Israel, as one author put it, is like a person who broke into someone else's house. Israel is therefore the aggressor and Hamas has every right to defend itself against the Jews. That's the way most of the world views the Arab-Israeli conflict. The basis of this claim depends entirely on the land actually belonging to the so-called Palestinians under international law. This claim is patently false. In 2007, Canadian lawyer Jacques Paul Gauthier completed a twenty year thesis titled "Sovereignty Over the Old City of Jerusalem" at the University of Geneva. The thesis is over 1,200 pages long and contains over 3,000 footnotes. His conclusion, "After our examination of the principles of international law pertaining to belligerent occupation, we have concluded that Israel has the right to occupy the territories under its control since 1967, including East Jerusalem and its Old City, until a peace treaty is concluded."¹ Gauthier's thesis is the most authoritative document to date discussing the issue of who, according to international law, has the right to occupy the land. It all began in Great Britain with the issuing of the Balfour Declaration on November 2, 1917. This declaration in the wake of Britain's defeat of the Ottoman Empire set the policy the British government would pursue in the establishment of a future state of Israel granting them self-determination. The declaration was not international law but is important because it was adopted at the San Remo Conference on April 25, 1920 by the Covenant of the League of Nations. It was therefore at San Remo that the Balfour Declaration went from being just a statement of British foreign policy to international law. It was approved and implemented by the Council of the League of Nations on September 22, 1922. When the League of Nations was dissolved in 1946, the United Nations began to deal with the Palestine issue. "The UN General Assembly passed a Partition Resolution (Resolution 181) on November 29, 1947. This UN resolution adopted the necessary legal status from the League of Nations needed for Israel to declare her independence on May 14, 1948."² Under Resolution 181 part of Palestine was to be given to the Arabs and part was to be given to Israel, except Jerusalem which was to be an international city. This

original two-state solution was rejected by the Arabs who chose to simultaneously attack Israel with five armies intent on aborting the nation Israel at its birth. In what Arabs call Nakba, or the day of disaster, the Israeli's defeated the Arabs and took more land than had originally been allotted to them under Resolution 181. Jerusalem did not become an international city. The eastern portion remained in the hands of Jordan and Israel was a divided city until the 1967 six days war when Israel took all of Jerusalem in response to an unprovoked Jordanian attack. Gauthier argues that on no uncertain terms the 1967 borders mark the territory Israel has the right to occupy under international law, including East Jerusalem and its Old City, until a peace treaty is concluded. The Arabs have never maintained their agreements in any of the attempted peace treaties and they have never even recognized Israel. There is no truth to the bogus propaganda that Israel is an occupying power as is clear from international law. What is clear from international law is that Israel has every right to the land within the 1967 borders and that every infringement on that land is an act of aggression against Israel contrary to international law. This means that Hamas is the aggressor and that Israel has the right to defend herself and her citizens against terror. This is not to defend every action, political or military, made by Israel, but simply to set the record straight as to just what international law says regarding the situation.

We are now well into the Discourse on the Mount. Last week we dealt with Matthew 5:17-20, the crux of the entire teaching. Carson says that the repercussions of how you handle this pericope are so numerous that discussion becomes freighted with the intricacies of biblical theology. I take it that, as I found in my research, he means that there are a wide variety of exegetical conclusions on these verses that set in motion many combinations and permutations making any discussion with people about these verses very difficult.

For our purposes it's enough to set out here the theological freight that is attached to the *soteriological approach*. In the soteriological approach Jesus is here proclaiming the gospel and how to go to heaven. You must have a kind of faith that produces righteous works that surpass that of the scribes and the Pharisees. That approach is the Lordship approach to soteriology that will catapult through the rest of the NT. Lordship is the idea that there are different kinds of faith; true faith, temporary faith, spurious faith, et al. True faith they say is always identifiable by good works that are necessarily and inevitably produced; if you don't have those good works then you don't have true faith and you're not saved to begin with. Assurance of salvation in this view comes from evaluating our good works. That's one direction commentators take on 5:17-20 and the Sermon on the Mount as a whole and I think it is a terrible approach but one that many teachers and laymen in the dispensational camp are lured into.³

Why do we think that is the wrong approach? Because it runs roughshod over the context. What is the context? The kingdom was 'at hand'. What defines the kingdom? The covenant plan of God for Israel. This is the *covenant approach*. Matthew is writing out of an OT context and what are the big covenants

in view? In Matt 1:1 the covenants in view are that with David and Abraham. In Matt 3:1ff the covenant in view is that with Moses and the nation. The Davidic and Abrahamic covenants are unilateral, God obligating Himself to ultimately bless Israel. The Mosaic covenant is bilateral; enjoyment of the blessing was conditional on obedience. The question is how do these relate? Understanding this covenant background is the key to the discourse. So what's the relationship? What did the covenants of David and Abraham do? They defined the kingdom to come as Jewish, earthly, centered in Jerusalem, ruled by a Jewish king of David's house and bringing global blessing. What did the covenant of Moses do? It defined the conditions one generation of Israel must meet for the kingdom to ultimately come. What did that generation need to do for the kingdom to come? Come into obedience to the Mosaic covenant. What was the problem? The problem was that the scribes and the Pharisees were the official leadership of the nation. They dominated the scene and they propagated oral tradition which was a distortion of the true intention of the written Law of Moses. They taught this oral tradition in the synagogues and the common man equated what he heard with the Law of Moses itself. But was it? By no means! It produced a self-righteousness, not the kind of righteousness that was necessary for that generation to see the kingdom come. So as long as they followed the scribes and the Pharisees that generation would not be in a position for the kingdom to come. They would miss their opportunity at the kingdom! So what is Jesus doing? Coming to proclaim the true intent of the Law of Moses so that the nation could see the distinction between His teaching and the scribes and the Pharisees. You have to see that there is a difference before you can decide which teaching you want to follow. Jesus is radically setting Himself and His disciples off from the scribes and the Pharisees. The contrast is so radical that the official leadership is irreparable and Jesus' disciples are commissioned as the new leadership. Jesus is training His disciples to extend His ministry so that the people will have an opportunity to repent, have a change of mind about the kind of righteousness necessary for the kingdom to come. The time was momentous; the opportunity was momentous. Because the kingdom was 'at hand,' if they decided to repent and follow Jesus and His disciples then the kingdom would come; if they decided to continue to follow the scribes and Pharisees then the kingdom would be postponed until a generation of Israel came along that repented and returned to the true intent of the Law of Moses. This is huge stuff.

Let's look particularly at Matt 5:17. What is Jesus doing in 5:17? He's giving preliminary remarks so that when he starts the contrast in vv 21-48 His disciples know exactly what He is not doing and what He is doing. Note how He begins "Do not think that I came to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I did not come to abolish but to fulfill." See how that's a statement of what He did not come to do versus what he did come to do? Okay, He's not abolishing the Law; He's fulfilling the Law. What do these terms mean? Abolish means to dismantle so as to destroy. Could it appear that Jesus was dismantling the Law in vv 21-22, 27-28, 31-32, et al. Sure, "you have heard it said...but I say to you..." It could appear He was

destroying the whole Law so He clarifies up front, don't think that I came to do that. I did not, I came to fulfill the Law. What does fulfill mean? To establish. In other words, He's actually come to re-establish or restore the Law. Why did it need restoring? Because the scribes and Pharisees had hidden its true intent from the people! What does verse 18 do? Verse 18 points out that the Law would remain intact until its aims were accomplished. What was the aim of the Mosaic Law? Righteousness! It was to separate a generation of Israel unto God as a righteous nation. So if it's to remain until it has accomplished that goal then when will it be accomplished? It wasn't accomplished in the 1st century! The tribulation time, when heaven and earth pass away by fiery judgments, then it will have accomplished its purpose for the nation Israel and the kingdom will come! What does that mean as far as the Mosaic Law's relationship to us? We're the Church and we exist before the Tribulation when the Mosaic Law will pass away, so what is the relationship of the Mosaic Law to the Church? There is no relationship. Why do I say that? Because the Church is a parenthesis in God's plan for Israel. The Church is completely unrevealed at this point in time. The only thing they can see is the kingdom. The Church is a mystery. So you have to look at the Church as a parenthesis in God's plan for Israel and we are under the Law of Christ not the Law of Moses. Once the Church is complete then God's plan for Israel will be back on center stage and the Law of Moses will be intact until it has accomplished its purpose for Israel which is for that generation to return to its righteous principles such that they can be in a spiritually prepared position to receive Jesus as their Messiah. That's verse 18. The Law of Moses must remain intact until its aims are accomplished which is the unique righteousness of one generation of Israel for the kingdom to come. Verse 19 logically follows. "Whoever then annuls one of the least of these commandments, and teaches others to do the same, shall be called least in the kingdom of heaven; but whoever keeps and teaches them, he shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." What's clear then is that verse 19 is addressing that there will be rank in the kingdom and rank will be determined on the basis of their teaching and obedience to the Law of Moses. He's challenging His disciples to remain true to the teaching and remain obedient to the true intent of the Law so that in the kingdom they will be greatly rewarded. What is verse 20 teaching? That unless that generation's righteousness surpassed that of the scribes and the Pharisees, they would not enter the kingdom at that time. A generation of Israel must have a righteousness in keeping with the Law of Moses or else no kingdom. So if they continued to follow the scribes and Pharisees there would be no kingdom because, as we will see tonight, scribe and Pharisee righteousness was totally insufficient.

Alright, what is Jesus going to do now in verse 21ff? He's going to expand upon verse 20 by giving a sketch of the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees as engrained in oral tradition versus the kind of righteousness God was really interested in seeing. Why? Everyone in the nation at that time needed to know that if they continued to follow the scribes and Pharisees then they would not be walking in obedience to the Law of Moses and they would not be eligible for ultimate blessing in the land. They

needed to follow Jesus and His disciples. So the nation would have a choice to make; they could continue to follow what they heard in synagogue for centuries or repent and follow what Jesus and His disciples were teaching.

Let's look at this first law in 5:21. This is the law forbidding murder. Where does this law come from? The Ten Commandments! Were the Ten Commandments important? What was their relationship to the rest of the Law? They were the foundation of the law. Every other law stemmed ultimately from one of the Ten. The rabbi's had divided the laws into 613 laws and they ranked them. There were things you were obligated to follow and things they said you weren't really obligated to follow. That's what Jesus meant back in verse 19 by whoever annuls the least of these commandments. He meant whoever does what the scribes and Pharisees do and rank the commandments so that some of them are not really obligatory. In any case the law of murder was one of the Ten that were foundational to the remaining 603. How many tablets could the Ten Commandments be divided into? Two tablets. What's the first tablet include? The first three commandments. What do the first three commandments all teach? The nation Israel's vertical responsibility to God. "You shall have no other gods before Me...You shall not take the name of the LORD your God in vain...You shall observe the Sabbath..." they were all given to reveal the nation Israel's vertical responsibility to God. What did the second tablet include? Seven commandments. What do they teach? The Jews horizontal responsibility to his fellow Jew. "Honor your father and your mother...You shall not murder...You shall not commit adultery...et al." they were designed to show the Jews horizontal relationship to one another. So there were these two tablets of the Law and this distinction is important to remember. Later Jesus sums them up in the dialogue where He was asked, "What is the first and greatest commandment?" How did He answer? Love the Lord your God with all your heart, mind, soul and strength; that's a summary of the first tablet. Then what did Jesus say, "And the second is like it, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself..." a summary of the second tablet. So you have these two tablets of the Ten Commandments.

What was the relationship of these two tablets to one another? Can you fulfill the first tablet if you are not fulfilling the second tablet? In other words, as an example, can you be loving the Lord your God if you are murdering your fellow Jew? No. So that will explain in part vv 23-26 where a Jew is trying to go to God and be reconciled without having gone to his brother first. You can't bypass the second tablet and just get right with God. That won't work. That's what Christians want to do all the time; get right with God but not the person they offended. Sorry, you can't get right with God without getting right with the person you offended first! I'm making secondary application there but that's in the letter of 1 John.

So here we are in verse 21, the law of murder, which tablet of the Law does it come from? The second tablet. Love your neighbor as yourself, don't murder your fellow Jew. Jesus says, **You have heard that**

the ancients were told. Who are **the ancients**? Moses and that generation that was at Mt Sinai to whom the Law was given. Who is Jesus talking to here? At least the disciples and perhaps the crowds have moved in by this time, but at least the disciples. And he's saying to the disciples **you have heard that** Moses and that generation were told this by God. Where did they hear what Moses and that generation were told by God? In the synagogue. Plumer says, "Christ is addressing an illiterate crowd, most of whom can neither read nor write, consequently their knowledge of the Law comes from public instruction in the synagogues, where the letter of the Law was faithfully read, but the spirit of it frequently missed or obscured."⁴ Is the Law here quoted accurately? Yes. **YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT MURDER.** What was the penalty? **And 'Whoever commits murder shall be liable to the court.'** This was a local **court.** There were local courts in cities throughout the land and these were valid. The Law of Moses established the need for local courts. So is there anything wrong with what they had heard in synagogue? Essentially, no. As Pentecost says, "...the Pharisees knew what the law required; they could quote the law. The Pharisaic rule was an orthodox statement of the law concerning the demands of God's holiness. But the Pharisees interpreted the law to mean that as long as one did not take another man's life, the person was innocent of breaking the law; consequently, the person was acceptable to God. The Pharisees were concerned only with the physical act of murder."⁵ So what was the problem? They didn't go far enough. They took the Law as only referring to the external act of murder. Plumer says, "It was quite right that whoever committed murder should be liable to prosecution; but they ought to have been taught more than this. The command, "Thou shalt not kill," is based on the principle, "Thou shalt not hate," and that again on the principle, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. Xix. 18)...Christ leaves the old commandment standing; but on His own authority He adds what is equally binding with it and ought to be regarded as included in the spirit of it."⁶ What Plumer is saying is that they didn't go far enough; and by not going far enough they didn't get to the heart of the matter. They proclaimed the letter of the Law but not the spirit of the Law.

In verse 22 this is where Jesus comes in to give the true spirit of the Law. By doing this He is setting Himself and His teaching apart from the scribes and Pharisees and saying this is what the Law really intended and this is what is required for this generation to be righteous enough to enter the kingdom, that they live this way. **But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be guilty before the court; and whoever says to his brother, 'You good-for-nothing,' shall be guilty before the supreme court; and whoever says, 'You fool,' shall be guilty enough to go into the fiery hell.** Jesus is clearly condemning internal anger against a brother, external speech of calling a brother a good-for-nothing and calling a brother a fool. Yet Jesus Himself calls someone a fool who does not hear His words and act on them in Matt 7:26 and He calls the scribes and Pharisees fools when they led others away from the word of God in Matt 23:17. This has led to some arguing that Jesus broke His own standards. However, Jesus did not say that the Law condemned one for calling someone a fool who

rejected God's truth or who led others away from God. He only says that the Law condemned one for calling a brother a fool out of a heart of vicious hatred. That Jesus never did.

Having briefly dealt with the supposed problem here I want to get to the heart of Jesus' statement. To do so let's make several observations in verse 22. First, note that Jesus makes three statements to clarify the true spirit of the law against murder. One is anger, two is calling a brother a good-for-nothing, three is calling a brother a fool. What do you observe about those three? Did you observe that each is an escalation of the former? Anger is "unexpressed hatred," calling a brother good-for-nothing is "expressed contempt," and calling a brother fool is "expressed abuse." What else do we observe that confirms this? Someone might argue that calling someone a good-for-nothing is just as bad as calling someone a fool. But how do we know that is not correct? The penalty for calling someone a fool is greater than for calling someone a good-for-nothing. So the second observation is that each of the three not only is an escalation of the former but the penalties are each an escalation of the former. Those who are angry are liable to "the local court," those who call their brother good-for-nothing are liable to "the supreme court at Jerusalem (the Sanhedrin)," and those who call their brother fool are liable to "God's final judgment."

Alright, let's look at the first one, **anger. But I say to you that everyone who is angry with his brother shall be guilty before the court.** Anger is "unexpressed hatred." When you're angry it's internal. The law was to be internalized. There are two words for anger in the Greek, *θυμιζω* and *οργιζω*. *θυμιζω* is an "outburst of anger" and *οργιζω* is a "deliberated wrath." The word used here is *οργιζω* and refers to a "deliberated wrath" which is befitting the context of murder. People don't just suddenly murder, they deliberate murder. Although both kinds of anger are condemned the one being condemned here is the kind of anger that results in mental deliberation of how you would like to get rid of someone, whether or not you ever act on it. Jesus indicates this is sinful by saying that it makes him liable before the local court. To get angry in this way was to violate the law **YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT MURDER.**

The second one is calling your brother **good-for-nothing. And whoever says to his brother, 'You good-for-nothing,' shall be guilty before the supreme court.** The Greek word for **good-for-nothing** is *ρακα* and means "to put down because of lack of intelligence." It would be in our terminology to call someone a numskull. In the context it is calling someone a numskull out of the anger in your heart. This one was liable to stand before the Supreme Court, which was the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem. To call your brother a numskull was therefore a violation of the law **YOU SHALL NOT COMMIT MURDER** because it was coming out of a heart of anger which underlies murder.

The third one is calling your brother a **fool. And whoever says, 'You fool,' shall be guilty enough to go into the fiery hell.** The Greek word **fool** is *μορος* and probably refers to an obstinate godless person, someone who is a rebellious apostate. To call someone this made them liable to stand before God and

be cast into **fiery hell**.⁷ In any case it is arising out of a heart of anger and thus violated the law **You SHALL NOT COMMIT MURDER**.

Having looked at all of them I do not think that Jesus' point is to grade the three things that underlie murder. "Possibly Christ is ironically imitating the casuistical distinctions drawn by the Rabbis, and at the same time is teaching that all degrees of hatred and contempt, whether expressed or not, are sinful and are liable to...condemnation by man and by God, who alone can judge of the feeling and malevolent intention of the heart."⁸ The real issue is the spirit that underlies murder is sinful. The scribes and the Pharisees only condemned the physical act itself. Under Pharisaism one could be angry or slur abuse at another and not be out of favor with God. Jesus denies that point of view. Plumer is dead on when he says, "It was quite right that whoever committed murder should be liable to prosecution; but they ought to have been taught more than this. The command, "Thou shalt not kill," is based on the principle, "Thou shalt not hate," and that again on the principle, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (Lev. Xix. 18)...Christ leaves the old commandment standing; but on His own authority He adds what is equally binding with it and ought to be regarded as included in the spirit of it."⁹ The scribes and Pharisees didn't go far enough; they didn't get to the heart of the matter. Pentecost agrees saying, "Our Lord was not denying that the law prohibited murder. He was saying that the law also required one to refrain from anger. Jesus knew that anger, hatred, and malice are roots with the capacity to produce the terrible fruit of murder. He showed that if the root was present, a person has violated the law even though the root has not yet produced its fruit."¹⁰ The bottom line is that if you have been angry with a brother then you are a murderer because anger is the spirit of murder. If the people had been taught this in the synagogue they would have realized that the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees was not even close to what God required for kingdom entrance. Jesus' disciples, as the newly commissioned leadership, should both keep this intent and teach it to others also in order to be great in the kingdom (5:19) and to prepare the nation for kingdom entrance (5:21).

Now if there was a situation in which two Jews had a conflict and there was a rupture how should it be dealt with? That is the subject of verse 23-26. The core of Jesus' teaching is that of reconciliation. What is reconciliation? Two at enmity becoming friends again. So reconciliation is necessary to avoid the anger that leads to murder. Is time a cure? Will time make it go away? No, the offender must go to the offended and make reconciliation. Note that it is not the responsibility of the offended to approach the offender; but the responsibility of the offender to approach the offended and make things right. If this is not done then all further worship of God by the offender is totally worthless. As Glasscock says, "He seems to have been making the point that worship of God is not accepted until reconciliation has been achieved with brothers with whom some offense has broken a relationship. What value is an offering to God if anger and division exists with a brother who also is God's child? God is more concerned with brotherly love than with ritualistic offerings."¹¹ If one was in violation of the second tablet of the Law

could he fulfill the first tablet of the Law? No. Is it possible to love God while hating your brother? No. John in his first epistle makes this same application to us. What does he say there? If one hates his brother he is walking in the darkness. There's no fellowship with God if you hate your brother. And so you can't just get back in fellowship with God and leave that situation unattended. First you have to get back in fellowship with this brother; reconcile with your brother first, then your worship of God will be accepted!

Note how this works in verse 23, **Therefore if you are presenting your offering at the altar, and there remember that your brother has something against you, leave your offering there before the altar and go; first be reconciled to your brother, and then come and present your offering.**

Was the offering going to be acceptable to God as long as there was enmity between the Jew and his brother? No. Jesus is saying if you go down to the temple for an act of religious devotion to God of offering sacrifice and you remember you've offended a brother then don't offer the sacrifice because that's RITUAL, that's nothing but going through a lot of religious motion and God doesn't accept religious motion. So what was the only recourse in that situation? Leave the offering right there and go to the brother and make every attempt to reconcile with your brother. Once that process has been exhausted, then come and present your offering. This will quell the anger and head off the desire to murder as well as the physical act of murder itself. The scribes and Pharisees saw no need to leave the offering and go make reconciliation if they had offended someone. They felt their worship would be accepted by God. They were wrong! And Christians are wrong today if they think they can offend other Christians and just continue to have their worship accepted before God. Baloney. That's religious RITUAL; going through religious motion, doing just what the Pharisees did. True spirituality is taking steps as the offender to make reconciliation with your Christian brothers.

Verse 25 gives an example that goes one step further than vv 23-24. There it was making reconciliation with your brother; here it is making reconciliation with your enemy! It's a situation where it is assumed that you had broken the law by taking on "an honest debt which must be cared for"¹² lest you be taken to civil court and imprisoned until you paid every last cent. In this case Jesus advises, **Make friends quickly with your opponent at law while you are with him on the way, so that your opponent may not hand you over to the judge, and the judge to the officer, and you be thrown into prison. 26 Truly I say to you, you will not come out of there until you have paid up the last cent.** There was enmity because there was an issue of theft...borrow but not pay back... Jesus is very practical when he says **Make friends quickly...while you are with him on the way** to court. In other words, seek a settlement. Otherwise you are going to be imprisoned until you pay every last penny! But what's the big idea? The big idea isn't theft or debt or paying back. The big idea is having a spirit of reconciliation. If you have offended an enemy it is your responsibility to pursue reconciliation. This is how the spirit of murder is deterred.

“Both illustrations serve to make one point: an individual’s relationship with God is connected with his/her relationship with fellow human beings, whether brothers or enemies.” Another way of saying this is to say that the first tablet of the Law, which was directed toward God, was intimately connected to the second tablet, which was directed toward fellow man. If a Jew would not reconcile with his fellow man he could not be living in harmony with God. Ultimately what did God require of His people? Go all the way back to the Beatitudes, verse 9. What did God want them to be? Peacemaker’s (cf 5:9). “Blessed are the peacemakers,” He said, “for they shall be called sons of God.” A peacemaker pursues peace by confessing wrongdoing to others. He takes the initiative of admitting he is in the wrong and making amends for that wrong. Then he or she is quelling the anger that leads to murder and can offer worship to God that is accepted. That is what God required by this Law.

In conclusion, Jesus in 5:21 begins to give specific illustrations to show that the scribes and Pharisees did not go far enough with the true intent of the Law. They were perfectly orthodox in their reading of the law of murder but they interpreted the law to refer only to the physical act of murder. Jesus did not deny that the physical act of murder was sinful but added that anger, bitterness and malice were the sinful roots of murder. If these roots were present then they had already violated the law. Their worship was not being received by God. To be received they needed to come into conformity to the law by going to those they had offended and making reconciliation. They should do this quickly before the offer of the kingdom was past and the kingdom postponed. The message is clear; the external religious activity and self-righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees was not sufficient to admit that generation into the kingdom.

¹ Jacques Paul Gauthier, “Sovereignty Over The Old City of Jerusalem: A Study of the Historical, Religious, Political and Legal Aspects of the Question of the Old City,” PhD Thesis, University of Geneva International Law School, 2007), p 848

² <http://www.pre-trib.org/data/pdf/lce-InternationalLawandJ2.pdf>

³ See <http://www.gty.org/resources/study-guides/40-5201/happiness-is> for an example of this approach, especially in the “Pondering the Principles” section at the end of the page.

⁴ Plummer, *Matthew*, p 58.

⁵ J Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 177.

⁶ Plummer, *Matthew*, p 58.

⁷ The expression is likely brachylogy, a shortened form of a common expression.

⁸ *Ibid.*, Plummer,

⁹ Plummer, *Matthew*, p 58.

¹⁰ Ibid., Pentecost, p 178.

¹¹ Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 122.

¹² John F Walvoord, *Matthew: Thy Kingdom Come*, p 49.