

Jewish law, his brother was supposed to raise up a child for him to keep his name alive). Thus they said, Supposing this man dies and had seven brothers and one of them tried to raise up seed for him with his widow and he died, and the next did, and the next, etc. All seven died. Finally the woman died. At the resurrection, Whose wife will she be of the seven? Since all of them had been married to her? A subtle undermining argument. If we cannot understand the details of the resurrection therefore how can we believe in it? We find that sort of argument very widespread today!

Speaking piously, claiming to stand for the truth but undermining it at one point or another. Jesus did not give them any full explanation of the situation. I do not have time for it now. Sometime I would like to speak of the way He handled their objection. The principal thing he brought out was that we cannot expect to know everything. When God has given a truth we can stand on it. We can know it's true even if we cannot fully understand it. When the Bible ~~ess~~ tells us that God has established all things that come to pass, He controls everything, we can believe and know it's true. When the Bible also shows us that it's tremendously important what we do, and that we have a responsibility individually to receive Jesus Christ as Saviour and if we do not we are lost, and that there's a responsibility upon us as Christians to serve Him and carry on His purposes and if we do not we are guilty.

We cannot understand how these truths fit together. Some day we will understand. But they are both taught in the Scripture and if we put so much stress on either one of them that we neglect the other, we are not truly following the Word of God. At so many points people make guesses that go beyond the Scripture on matters that God has not revealed.

This is typical of the Sadducees who try to undermine the teaching of the truth. And the second aspect: the violent opposition of the Sadducees to God's truth is more apparent in the NT than we would realize at first sight. For instance, Caiaphas the high priest--you're all familiar with his opposition to the Lord, and Caiaphas and his associates were Sadducees. They were interested in the political situation and ready to sacrifice Jesus Christ in order to get political advantages for themselves.

The opposition, the direct opposition resulting in Jesus' death was not from the Pharisees; it was from the Sadducees. And when we come to the book of Acts, it is the Sadducees who would == who sought to destroy Christianity. In ch. 4:1, the priests and the captain of the temple guard and the Sadducees came up to Peter and John while they were speaking to the people. They seized Peter and John and put them in ~~the~~ jail. They brought them before the Sanhedrin, and then when they brought them before the Sanhedrin it was a Pharisee who prevented them from giving him serious injury.