

Oakley, Hypocrisy, IBS 7, July, 1985.

"Hypocrisy" in Matthew.

Ivor W.J. Oakley.

It is the contention of this paper that the significance of Matthew's ethical teaching can be fully understood only when it is seen against the background of the hypocrisy which Jesus condemns so mercilessly in the Gospel. Hypocrisy is in fact the complete antithesis of righteousness as Jesus interprets that term(1). Matthew's presentation of his teaching on hypocrisy makes clear the distorted ethical outlook of the enemies of Jesus and by his teaching on righteousness provides the corrective to that position. Only through understanding of the negative teaching can the positive quality of true righteousness and the supreme place of love to God and men be adequately appreciated.

The word for "hypocrite" (*hypokrites*) occurs thirteen times in the Gospel of Matthew but only once in Mark and three times in Luke(2). The origin of the word is "actor" - one who plays a part. In the LXX the word describes the godless men while the Psalms of Solomon use the word to describe the Sadducees (3). In the Didache it is the regular term of abuse for the Jew (4) and in the second century A.D. a Jewish rabbi claimed that nine-tenths of the world's hypocrites lived in Jerusalem (5).

The usual interpretation of the word is one who pretends, especially in the practice of religion. In the Gospels the Pharisees are at times portrayed as religious pretenders - though often they act **unconsciously** in this way. Their actions contradicted their teaching and claims because they failed to think through the practical implications of their religious principles (6). But while the idea of pretence is a prominent aspect of the character of the hypocrite, the evidence suggests that it is only

one component, though important in its place, of a larger and more sinister picture.

The word "hypocrite" first arises in Matthew 6 (7) where the practice of alms giving, prayer and fasting are discussed. They were the three fundamental acts of Jewish piety and were representative of all other acts of righteousness (8). These activities were held to go beyond the Law and so they carried a special reward, had power to atone for sin and could even benefit others at the final judgment (9).

The hypocrites who misused these pious practices in the interests of self glorification are almost certainly the scribes and Pharisees. The reference to "righteousness" in Matthew 6 v.1 is a development of the teaching of Matthew 5 v.20 where the righteousness of the disciples must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees (10). Thus the injunction to beware of practising righteousness - or piety - before men in order to be seen by them is in a sense the continuation of the six Antitheses of Matthew 5 vv.21-48. The same idea is taken up in Matthew 23 vv 5-7 where the Pharisees, in the light of the context are clearly in view (11).

In fairness it may be added that not all Pharisees were guilty of this kind of hypocrisy, and many in the first century would have agreed with Jesus' condemnation (12). But the indictment undoubtedly had relevance to some in the Pharisaic party (13).

The failure of the hypocrites is not the practice of alms giving, prayer and fasting as such for Jesus evidently assumes that his disciples will themselves engage in them (14). Rather, the hypocrites fail because of the motive of display and self glorification which underlies their religious practice. Their concern is not to express dedication to God or to care for the needy but to draw men's attention to themselves. As a result they "receive full payment now" and can expect no future

acknowledgement of their works from God. Hypocrites, therefore, forget that the opinion of men is of little consequence compared with the supreme importance of the divine verdict. To confuse the two leads to fatal consequences. (15)

Hypocrisy therefore involves conscious playing at being pious but at the same time is unaware of the religious vanity which underlies the whole procedure (16). Thus Jesus not only rejects appeals to the teaching of the "men of old" (17) when they conflict with the Law, but he also rejects the practice of the Law itself when it is used to win recognition by men rather than to express true love for God and neighbour. (18).

In contrast with the external righteousness condemned here, the disciples are urged to cultivate pure motives in the consciousness of God's reality, aiming to give glory to God and not receive glory from men (19).

Another facet of the hypocrite's character is his placing human tradition higher than God's commandment even though he avows the latter with his lips. As a result God's Law is violated by him and his worship of God becomes empty and vain. This is illustrated in the controversy between Jesus and the scribes and Pharisees who are more concerned with the tradition of the elders which requires men to wash their hands before they eat, than insisting that men observe the commandment to honour father and mother by making adequate provision for them (20). Accordingly the external piety of the "sincere" hypocrite robs him of a true perception of the will of God (21). This preference of human tradition for the plain commandment of God is the result of the alienation of man's heart from God. The

true source of hypocrisy in conduct is the state of a man's inner life (22). When that is put right, there will be a willingness to reject human tradition and to heed God's will as revealed in his Law.

In Matthew 22 v.18 hypocrisy is lined with "wickedness" (*poneria*) (23) which recalls Matthew's penchant for the adjective (*poneros*) (24). While the hypocrites pretended respect for Jesus their real concern was to use the question of tribute money to entangle him in his talk (25). Matthew, more than the other Synoptists, makes it clear that the attempt to trap and destroy Jesus was the result of a deliberate Pharisaic plot and it is aptly described as "wickedness". The total effect of Matthew's description of their conduct is to double the wickedness of the Pharisees(26).

The most sustained attack on the scribes and Pharisees is made in Matthew 23 which forms the climax to all previous controversies. Possibly Matthew has brought together sayings which were uttered on different occasions into a unified whole, which he intends to be an explanation for his church's severance of remaining links with Judaism (27). The core of the chapter is a series of seven woes which act as a counter balance to the Beatitudes (28). In it the failures of the nation's spiritual guides are fully exposed, and their responsibility for the judgment and downfall of Israel is made clear. While the teaching of the scribes and Pharisees is denounced, the brunt of the attack falls on their works and inconsistent lives (29). The ultimate purpose of denunciation is to present Jesus and his teaching as an alternative to Pharisaism (30). The righteousness required of his followers must surpass the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees which is outlined here (31).

Considerable difference of opinion exists about the historicity and significance of Jesus' criticism of the scribes and Pharisees. It is frequently alleged that in other parts of the Gospel but principally here the

the picture of the scribes and Pharisees is not historical since it paints an unfair and unbalanced picture of them in the first century. In fact they would have been as firmly opposed to the hypocrisy denounced here as Jesus is said to be.

The chapter accordingly, should not be treated primarily as a historical description - though it may contain historical elements - but a theological polemic which was directed not only against Jews but also Christians. They are both warned against hypocrisy and are shown that this is the antithesis of the conduct expected from the Christian disciple. (32)

On the other hand the Gospel picture has been defended as true of a considerable portion of the scribes and Pharisees, as even some Jewish scholars themselves concede. While there were improvements after the A.D.70 catastrophe it is dangerous to read back later evidence into the early decades of the first century. The evidence of the Synoptic Gospels should be accepted as reliable contemporary evidence.(33)

But on either understanding of the evidence the relevance to the church as well as the Jews is apparent. Earlier warning about false prophets the uselessness of calling Jesus "Lord" and the claim to do miracles and uttering prophecies in his name but failing to do the will of God (34) reveal the presence of hypocrisy in the church itself.(35)

Before the commencement of the woes and the detailing of the Pharisaic hypocrisy, Matthew describes their failures in general terms. The outstanding feature of their characters is the inconsistency between their teaching and their

actions. (Elsewhere Matthew also highlights failure in their teaching.)(36)

Although the word is not used at this point this inconsistency is one of the various aspects of hypocrisy. (37)

As those who sit on Moses' seat the scribes and Pharisees are to be obeyed but their actions are not to be followed since they preach but do not practise (38). This claim reinforces the earlier accusation that they transgress God's commandment and so are blind guides (39). It is frequently assumed that Matthew understands that "Moses' seat" refers both to the Law itself and the scribal interpretation of it. If this is so then a contradiction is apparent between this chapter and such passages as Matthew 15 vv.1-8 where Jesus is depicted denouncing the tradition of the elders. Accordingly it is concluded that in Matthew 23 he is using a special Jewish source which does not harmonize with the rest of the Gospel (40). But other interpretations see "Moses' seat" to refer to the totality of the Law alone (41) or as a rhetorical or ironical statement made in preparation for the real stress of the passage which is to be located in the subsequent command "practise and observe..... not what they do"(42).

The scribes and Pharisees are then accused of binding heavy burdens "hard to bear and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with their finger". (43) These burdens may mean either the scribal rulings which acted as a fence round the Law (44) or attempts to win adulation and to gain honours (45) or else persecutions (46). They stand in sharp contrast to the easy yoke and light burden of Jesus (47). Where they create social tension (48) he, the gentle and lowly one, offers rest(49).

In Matthew 23 vv 5-7, a practical application of Matthew 6 vv 1-18 condemning hypocrisy is made (50).

Their deeds are done to be seen by men, they broaden their phylacteries (51), make their fringes long (52) seek the place of honour at feasts, the best seats in the synagogues, salutations in the market place and the greeting of "Rabbi" by men. This public parade of piety, together with the seeking for positions and titles of eminence, is prompted by the underlying vice of pride (53). By contrast the lives of the disciples are to be marked by service and humility (54).

In Matthew 23 v.13 there occurs the first of seven woes (55). The word "woe" (*ouai*) implies both grief and burning indignation. (56). It expresses the attitude of God to men (57) and on the lips of Jesus it appears as a strong Messianic condemnation(58). The Old Testament pattern for Matthew's term is found in Isaiah 5 vv 8-23(59). In six of the seven woes the word "hypocrite" is used in the formula "Woe to you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites!" while the seventh has "Woe to you, blind guides"(60). Mark does not use the word "woe" but Luke 11 vv39-52 has five woes - albeit in a different order - corresponding to Matthew 13 vv 13-29, though without Matthew's fuller formula which mentions also "hypocrites". (61)

The first "woe" condemns the scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites, for shutting the kingdom of heaven against men. They neither enter themselves nor allow those who would enter to go in (62). Their teaching and casuistry obscured the real issues of belief and conduct and so they failed to respond positively to the teaching of John the Baptist (63) and the teaching and claims of Jesus. As a result men were discouraged from following him and obeying his message. They were, therefore, unable to fulfil

the conditions for entry into the kingdom (64).

The second woe (65) refers to the traversing of land and sea by the scribes and Pharisees to make a single proselyte. When he became such he was made by them twice as much a child of Gehenna as they were. Contemporary writers, especially Jospheus, provide evidence of the excessive zeal of Jewish missionaries (66). The description here reflects the characteristic zeal of the convert (67). The term "child of hell" means "worthy of suffering punishment in the after life" (68) and may have reference to a further privilege or requirement of the proselyte which was not prescribed by the Law. Possibly it was the opportunity to divorce his wife if she did not also become a convert, and so the proselyte was placed above the Law (69).

The third woe is addressed not to the scribes and Pharisees as such but to them as blind guides (70). This description is justified in view of their attempt to argue that any one who swears by the temple is under no obligation but if any one swears by the gold of the temple he is bound by his oath. Similarly it is pointed out that it is futile to say that swearing by the altar is unimportant but if a man swears by the gift on the altar he is bound by his oath. The man who swears by the altar swears by it and everything on it. Similarly whoever swears by the temple swears by it and by him who dwells in it, and he who swears by heaven swears by the throne of God and by him who sits on it (71).

Attempts can be made to draw fine distinctions by the use of casuistry but the Pharisees are blind to the common hermeneutical rule - "If the lesser than the greater" (72). While Matthew 23 vv 16-22 does not go to the length of Matthew 5 vv.33-37 in forbidding the use of oaths, it is a reminder that God is the source of all and when any oath is made his presence, which witnesses it, cannot be evaded (73).

The scribes and Pharisees displayed intense zeal

in studying the Law but their hypocrisy led them in practice into venting it. Scribal casuistry sought to establish the validity of the Law in every way and to provide a fence for it. But their efforts led to the Law's real demands being evaded (74).

This theme occurs also in the fourth woe in which the hypocrites are accused of tithing, mint, dill and cummin but neglecting the weightier matters of the Law - justice, mercy and faith. They should have observed these more important principles "without neglecting the others." Their action reveals their blindness as they strain out a gnat and swallow a camel(75). The parallel statement in Luke says "You tithe mint and rue and every herb, and neglect justice and the love of God (76).

The principle of tithing which was an expression of devotion to God (77) was clearly taught in the Mosaic Law (78) but the practice of tithing all vegetables, herbs and spices was over and above what was strictly required by the Law. However, to the legalistically minded scribes this extended form of tithing was essential (79). Evidence from the Mishnah proves that dill and cummin were liable to tithing but there is no mention of mint (80). All these herbs were used in cooking, and dill and cummin were used for medical purposes (81).

The great failure of the scribes and Pharisees was that concentration on the minutiae led to the neglect of the weightier matters of the Law. They were unable to distinguish the relative importance of the commandments. A Rabbinic saying stated "Be heedful of a light precept as of a weightier one, for thou knowest not the recompense of the reward of each precept." In practice the

Oakley, Hypocrisy, IBS 7, July 1985.

obsession with minutiae led to the neglect of the more important commandments(82).

The command of Jesus is "These (the weightier matters) you ought to have done without neglecting the others." The latter statement is frequently felt to suggest an acceptance by Jesus of scribal tradition which in effect is a contradiction of statements elsewhere in the Gospel (83). Consequently its origin is traced to Jewish Christianity prior to A.D. 70 (84). However, the interpretation perhaps is that even scribal minutiae is not in principle objectionable to Jesus as long as there is no conflict with the fundamental principles of the Law (85). Alternatively these words may be viewed as a rhetorical over statement and not an acceptance by either Jesus or Matthew of the validity of scribal teaching. In the light of the polemical context the reference is merely to the less important demands or the less significant requirements of the Law (86).

The weightier matters are Judgment, Mercy and Faith. The terms are reminiscent of the classical statement of prophetic religion "He has showed you O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice and to love kindness and to walk humbly with your God (87). These are described as weightier, not because they are necessarily more difficult to practise, but more important in the eyes of God (88). "Judgment" here does not refer to condemnation (89) or the final judgment (90) or to justice in general. Its real meaning is the Old Testament concept of respect for the rights of every man, just judgment and a fair verdict for the weak (91).

"Mercy" means merciful deeds and almsgiving. Luke at this point has "love for God" (92). Matthew elsewhere makes neighbourly love equal in importance to loving God (92) and so he sees love for God expressed through showing mercy to men (94). Both justice and mercy are virtues which imitate the character of God himself and constitute

a response to his approach to men (95). Mercy is a theme which runs right through the Gospels (96).

"Faithfulness" is essentially faithfulness which can be expressed in both loyalty to God and his will made known in the Law and the prophets and also in faithfulness and integrity in relationship to men (97). It is also possible, if the whole phrase is based on Micah and also in the light of Matthew's Gospel as a whole, that faith in God is also to be included in the meaning. This would be meant as trust in God's care and help (98). There could also be a further reference to faith in Jesus himself since that is a prominent theme in the Gospel (99).

Matthew presents justice, mercy and faithfulness/faith as the essentials of the Law. They constitute also the better righteousness described by Jesus which represents both the fulfilment of the Law and the standard which is superior to that of the scribes and Pharisees (100). It may be added that though justice, mercy and faithfulness/faith may not be direct enunciations of the love commandments (101), they are nevertheless closely related and should be understood as practical outworkings of these commandments (102).

These basic virtues were neglected by the scribes and Pharisees in all their scrupulous legalism(103). Hypocrisy leads men to use lesser commandments in order to escape the weightier. Thus they seek protection in the Law itself to evade God's unconditional demands on the whole man. (104).

The next two woes trace the source of hypocrisy to the inner life and thereby stress the need for inner cleansing. Scribes and Pharisees cleansed the outside of the cup and the plate but

inside they are full of extortion and rapacity. Only when the inside of the cup and plate has been made clean will the outside also be truly clean. Ritual purification of utensils is of no use if they continue to contain the results of extortion and greed (100). Similarly the internal life of a man must be made clean from sin and be committed to God and to whole-hearted obedience to his commandments. Only then will his outward actions be truly pure and therefore acceptable to God because then they will be consistent with his inward state. Inner righteousness is fundamental and to it attention must be primarily addressed (167). It is here that true cleansing begins and that the seeds of true righteousness are sown (108).

This theme is continued in the description of whitewashed tombs which appear outwardly beautifully but are inwardly full of dead man's bones and all uncleanness. Similarly the scribes and Pharisees appear outwardly righteous but are inwardly full of hypocrisy and iniquity. Appearance and underlying reality do not harmonize (109). It is ironic that those who displayed such anxiety to observe the Law are themselves accused of "uncleanness" (akatharsia) - a word specifying the nature of the uncleanness (110) in Matthew 23 v.27. It is the mark of the hypocrite that, despite his outwardly righteous appearance, he rejects in his heart the Law which is an expression of the Father's will (111). It is quite possible to maintain a pious appearance and yet be totally rebellious in the inner life against the Law of God. Therefore external righteousness is not a sure guide to the state of the heart (112).

The close association of hypocrisy (hupokrisis) lawlessness (anomia) in Matthew 23 v.28 throws further light on the nature of "hypocrisy" (113). The association was made earlier, in the LXX where the terms for "act the hypocrite" (hupokrinomai), "hypocrisy" and "hypocrite" are used in connection with the Law.

"Hypocrite" is used to translate the Hebrew word (*haneph*) He is the godless person who by his life and actions has fallen away from God. Significantly the LXX translators restrict the word "Hypocrite" to the godless man and do not use it of the pretender who tries to maintain a righteous appearance. The essence of "hypocrisy" in the LXX is the refusal to fear God and falling away from his Law. The link between "hypocrisy" and "lawlessness" is very evident particularly in the book of Ecclesiasticus where the hypocrite stumbles at the Law and twists it for his own purposes (114)

Among the Gospel writers Matthew alone uses the word "lawlessness" (*anomia*) (115). The word means rejection of the Law and is the opposite of righteousness (116). In three of the four cases the allusion is to the Law as reinterpreted in the commands of Jesus (117), whereas in Matthew 23 v.28 the reference is evidently to the standards of the Mosaic Law (118). The danger of professing disciples being guilty of "lawlessness" is particularly evident in Matthew 7 vv 15-23. Many on "that day" will claim that they have professed the Lordship of Jesus, prophesied and done miracles in his name. But they failed to do God's will. Hence they are told by Jesus "I never knew you" and are driven from his presence as "workers of lawlessness" Where "lawlessness" has particular reference to disobedience to the teaching of Jesus it has a special bearing on his teaching about love. This is evident in the statement referring to the events marking the end of time "and because "lawlessness" is multiplied most men's love will grow cold" (119). Thus lawlessness and lowliness are reciprocal (120). At the end, those practising lawlessness will be gathered out of the kingdom of the Son of Man by his angels (121).

While the use of the term for "lawlessness" in Matthew 24 v.12 may not be absolutely identical

with that in Matthew 23 v.28, it is clear that in both cases an inward condition expressed in attitudes to God and men is meant. Thus in both cases it does not mean rejecting the approach of Pharisaic literalism in its attempt to interpret the Law of Moses (122).

"Lawlessness" is failure to obey from the heart the will of God and it is a failure of which both scribes and Pharisees and also some in the Christian community may be guilty (123). Men fall into this condition when they are under the power of Satan who is the personification of all lawlessness (124).

In the final woe (125) the scribes and Pharisees are seen to show their hypocrisy by pretending to venerate the prophets and the righteous men of the past and in disowning murders committed by their ancestors. But they confess not only that they are sons of those murderers - and so in some sense share their guilt (126) but also that they continue to perpetrate their deeds by persecuting contemporary prophets wise men and scribes (i.e. probably present day religious teachers) (127) sent by God. They always in fact oppose true messengers of God. They champion causes which no longer need championing and welcome former "heresies" as orthodoxy, but still resolutely oppose any contemporary who tries to develop the work of those to whom they pay lip service (128). In bringing to completion the evil work begun by their persecuting ancestors their generation will know the fulness of divine judgment (129). Their hypocrisy is therefore again revealed in the glaring discrepancy between their sayings and doings (130).

The final reference to "hypocrite" mentions their punishment which consists of weeping and gnashing of teeth - a punishment which will also be endured by the servant who did not prepare for his master's return (131). (It should be noted, however, that this does not specifically state in the context that the "hypocrites" are scribes and Pharisees. It is a moot point whether Matthew has changed the "unfaithful" of Luke 12v.46 or vice versa.) Thus the ultimate fate of the hypocrite is damnation at

the last judgment (132). If the language used here reflects the terminology of church discipline in Matthew's church, it is possible that discipline was in fact influenced by excommunication practice in the Qumran community (133).

This review of the evidence indicates that the hypocrite is essentially someone who in heart has fallen away from God and has no true inward regard for his Law. While claiming to obey the Law he does not understand its true meaning and function. In claiming that he obeys God's will he is actually maintaining its anti-thesis. Inwardly he is full of moral corruption which is a sharp contradiction to his external appearance of piety. His is the wickedness of the godless man. It is this concept of hypocrisy which lies at the heart of Jesus' indictment of the Pharisees and from it envy other aspects of hypocrisy flow.

Lacking any true love of God he seeks to cultivate the honour and glory which belong to God alone by drawing attention to himself through parading in his role as an actor, his goodworks and through his seeking prominence among men. This recognition and admiration will be the only reward he will get for there is no reward to be given to him by God at the end. The hypocrite with his external piety lacks a true righteousness and a piety which has its source in the heart, and a true love for men for their own sake.

The distorted ethical perspective has other baneful effects in addition. The hypocrite lives a life of pretence and he prevents others from entering the kingdom as well as excluding himself. He turns others into being sons of Gehenna twice as much as he is in himself. He does not practise the basic precepts of the Law

Oakley, Hypocrisy, IBS 7, July 1985.

in his relationship with others and makes serious errors of judgment as he imagines he is better than his fathers, though in fact he shares their guilt. Finally in his spiritual blindness he even seeks to ensnare Jesus himself - a teacher whose ministry rests on divine authority.

He is quite blind to the significance of Jesus. While he can interpret the appearance of the sky but cannot interpret the signs of the time (133) Matthew's statement is addressed to Pharisees and Sadducees. The parallel statement in Luke 12 v.56 is addressed to the multitudes (134).

Behind this moral condition, there lies a fundamental misunderstanding of the relationship between God and men, and the place of the Law in that relationship.

The Pharisees' focus was not on God but on themselves and so the Law was practised in their own self interest and not in the service of God. The misuse was not an occasional lapse from high ideals but was a total misuse of the Law in every way. The Law was not something to which they submitted out of obedience to God but was something to be manipulated for their own advantage. Its 613 commandments together with the fence created by their casuistic stipulations which had the same authority, as the Law itself, formed a completely performable list of commandments and prohibitions. Furthermore no distinction was drawn between the relative value of moral and ritualistic requirements, and human traditions were permitted to deny the very commandments of God. Absorption in minutiae led to the neglect of central principles. Scant regard was given to inner motives and the priority of basic character above external conduct was ignored. Adherence to the Law as they understood it earned merit and determined men's acceptance by God. God's love and grace were not the inspiration of morality and they were not seen as the means whereby it would be practised. By religious pursuits the claims

Oakley, Hypocrisy, IBS 7, July 1985.

of God to complete commitment to him were evaded. Since it was an end in itself the Law was no longer a guide to the will of God, and the divine purpose behind the Law, e.g., in giving the Sabbath, was overlooked. As the central place which God should occupy was overlooked human achievement and human approval were now of supreme importance. In the practice of religion they had lost the heart of religion. They were the representatives of practical atheism masquerading as piety. Of the teaching of the Pharisees and Sadducees the disciples must beware(135).

Matthew's rejoinder to this situation is found in his positive teaching about true righteousness and the primacy of the love commandments. He places his ethical teaching in the wider context of the Gospel. It is applicable to those who are delivered from Satan's power and who are now in God's kingdom, whose sins are forgiven and who are now the sons of God. In other words it represents the conduct of those who are the true disciples of Jesus (136). Henceforth man's relationship to God depends on his response to Jesus and so the Law is deposed from its position of mediation (137).

The disciples are to obey the Law as established and reinterpreted by Jesus. In the process Jesus not only rejects the oral tradition and reaffirms the authority of the Old Testament but he goes on to develop its deeper meaning. This reinterpretation is done in the light of the primary of the commandments of love. The result is the rejection of legalistic requirements of an external code devised by casuists as a means of obtaining merit. It is not concerned even with external actions which are good in themselves. The supreme concern is with the inner condition, the state of the heart and the purity of the motive, for character is of more significance than activity (138).

Notes:

1. U. Wilckens, hupokrisis, TDNT, Vol 8, p568.
2. Matthew, 6.2,5,16; 7.5 etc; the noun hupokrisis is found on one occasion (23.27).
3. Psalms of Solomon, 4.7,25
4. Didache 8.1
5. S. Johnson, Interpreter's Bible, Vol 7, 306
6. P. Bonnard, L'Evangile selon saint Mathieu, (Neuchâtel 1970), p78
7. Matt 6.2,5,16
8. Tobit 12.8
9. E. Schweizer, Matthew (ET), (London 1976), pp142f
10. W. Tilborg, The Jewish Leaders in Matthew, (Leiden 1972), p8
11. Tilborg, op.cit.
12. T.W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus, (London 1954) pp164-166
13. D. Hill, Matthew, London 1972, p133
14. Hill, op.cit., 132f
15. Tilborg, op.cit. pp11,13
16. Bonnard, op.cit. p78
17. Matthew 5.21 etc
18. W. Gutbrod, TDNT, Vol 4 p1063 (on nomos)
19. Matt 5.16
20. Matt 15.1-8
21. Bonnard, op.cit. p228
22. F. Filson, Matthew, (London 1960), p177
23. Luke links hypocrisy with panourgia in the parallel account (20.23)
24. Gundry, op.cit. p443
25. Matt 22.15
26. Wilckens, op.cit. p.565
27. Bonnard, op.cit. p333
28. Gundry, op.cit. p453
29. Bonnard, op.cit. p333
30. Hill, op.cit. pp309f
31. B. Green, Matthew, (Oxford 1975), p189
32. Tilborg, op.cit. pp25f
33. A.H. McNeille, Matthew, (London, 1915), p60
34. Matt 7.15-23
35. Hill, op.cit. pp150-153

Notes:

36. Matt 12.11; 15.3f etc.
37. TIM p24
38. Matt 23.3
39. W.D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount, Cambridge 1964, p106
40. E. Schweizer, op.cit. pp430,437
41. Davies, op.cit. p106
42. R. Banks, Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition, (Cambridge 1975),p176
43. Matt 23.4
44. Johnson, op.cit.,p529
45. Gundry, op.cit.,p456
46. J. Fenton, Matthew (Pelican 1963),p369
47. Matt 11.30
48. Hill, op.cit. p310
49. Matt 11.28f
50. Tilborg, op.cit.p17
51. Manson, op.cit. p230
52. ibid 231
53. E. Schweizer, op.cit.p431
54. Matt 23.8-12
55. Matt 23.13,15,16 etc.
56. Filson, op.cit.,p244
57. Fenton, op.cit.368
58. Filson, op.cit.p244
59. Cf Bonnard, op.cit.p337
60. Matt 23.16
61. For a discussion of origins, see Bonnard, op.cit. pp337f
62. Matt 23.13
63. Matt 21.32
64. Hill, op.cit. p311
65. Matt 23.15
66. Josephus, Ant 20.2,4
67. T.W. Manson, Sayings, pp233f
68. Gundry, op.cit. p461.
69. Hill, op.cit. p312.
70. Matt 23.16-21
71. Matt 23.18-22
72. Hill, op.cit. p312.
73. Filson, op.cit. p246
74. Goppelt, op.cit. Vol 1, p85.

75. Matt 23.23f
76. Luke 11.42
77. Bonnard, op.cit. p339
78. Lev 27.30; Num 18.21 etc.
79. Hill, op.cit. pp312f
80. Banks, op.cit. p178
81. W. Allen, Matthew, ICC, (Edinburgh 1957³) p247.
82. Fenton, op.cit. p372
83. eg Matt 15.1-8
84. Schweizer, op.cit. p434
85. McNeile, op.cit. p335
86. Banks. op.cit. p180
87. Micah 6.8; see also Zecj 7.9-10
88. Bonnard, op.cit. p339
89. Cf Matt 5.21
90. Cf Matt 10.15
91. Bonnard, op.cit. p339
92. Luke 11.42
93. Matt 22.39
94. Gundry, op.cit. p464
95. Manson, Sayings, p236
96. Matt 5.7; 6.12,14; 9.13 etc.
97. Filson, op.cit. p246
98. Matt 6.25-34; 17.20;21.20f etc.
99. Matt 8.10,13; 9.2,22,28f etc.
100. Matt 5.18,20
101. Banks, op.cit. p178
102. B. Gerhardsson, Ethos, p43
103. Schweizer, op.cit. p442
104. Gutbrod, op.cit. p1064
105. Matt 23.25-28
106. Bonnard, op.cit. p341
107. Green, op.cit. p92
108. Cf quotations from Schniewind in Bonnard, op.cit. p341
109. Hill, op.cit. p313
110. McNeile, op.cit. p336
111. Tilborg, op.cit. p21
112. Bonnard, op.cit. p341
113. Schweizer, op.cit. p442
114. Sirach 32,15; 33.2
115. Matt 7.23; 13.41; 23.28

Notes:

116. J.D.G. Dunn, Unity and Diversity in the NT, London, 1977, pp245f
117. Matt 7.23; 12.31
118. Banks op.cit. p221
119. Matt 24.12; Green op.cit. p199
120. Gutbrod, op.cit. p1063
121. Matt 13.41
122. Schweizer, op.cit. p451
123. Davies, op.cit.p205
124. Kingsbury, op.cit.p56
125. Matt 23.29-36
126. Fenton, op.cit. p376
127. Manson, op.cit. p239
128. ibid p238
129. Matt 23.35-36
130. cf Matt 23.3
131. cf Matt 24.51
132. Schweizer, op.cit. p463
133. Matt 16.3
134. Tilborg, op.cit. p16,22-25
135. Matt 15.22; Gutbrod, op.cit. pp1063 f
136. J. Jeremias, The Sermon on the Mount, London, 1972, p29
137. Gutbrod, op.cit. pp1060f
138. Dunn, op.cit. pp246-299