

## “Unwanted Guests and Welcomed Family” – Matthew 12:43-50

Brandon Holiski  
Southern Oaks Baptist Church  
August 7, 2022

*[What follows is the transcript of a sermon. It was originally intended to be heard, not read, so the tone is more conversational than academic. It has only been loosely edited, so forgive any grammatical, syntactical, or spelling errors. If you have questions please contact Southern Oaks Baptist Church through their official website, [www.welovethegospel.com](http://www.welovethegospel.com).]*

Grab a Bible and meet me in Matthew 12...

Today we not only will complete our study of Matthew 12, but also our larger sermon series—“Authority Issues”—that took us through Matthew 8 to 12. I hope the series has been helpful, and that this final entry will be as well. Starting next week we will have a few standalone sermons, before beginning a new series from the Old Testament. More on that later. But let’s not get ahead of ourselves. We still have work to do here in Matthew 12. And there is some challenging stuff here. For the sake of context, I’m going to read the final three paragraphs of the chapter, though we have already considered the first one. Follow along as I read, beginning in verse 38...

*“Then some of the scribes and Pharisees answered him, saying, ‘Teacher, we wish to see a sign from you.’<sup>39</sup> But he answered them, ‘An evil and adulterous generation seeks for a sign, but no sign will be given to it except the sign of the prophet Jonah.<sup>40</sup> For just as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the great fish, so will the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth.<sup>41</sup> The men of Nineveh will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for they repented at the preaching of Jonah, and behold, something greater than Jonah is here.<sup>42</sup> The queen of the South will rise up at the judgment with this generation and condemn it, for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon, and behold, something greater than Solomon is here.<sup>43</sup> ‘When the unclean spirit has gone out of a person, it passes through waterless places seeking rest, but finds none.<sup>44</sup> Then it says, ‘I will return to my house from which I came.’ And when it comes, it finds the house empty, swept, and put in order.<sup>45</sup> Then it goes and brings with it seven other spirits more evil than itself, and they enter and dwell there, and the last state of that person is worse than the first. So also will it be with this evil generation.’*

*<sup>46</sup> While he was still speaking to the people, behold, his mother and his brothers stood outside, asking to speak to him.<sup>48</sup> But he replied to the man who told him, ‘Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?’<sup>49</sup> And stretching out his hand toward his disciples, he said, ‘Here are my mother and my brothers!’<sup>50</sup> For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.’”*  
(Matthew 12:38-50)

This is God’s Word...

Since we considered verses 38 to 42 a couple weeks ago, we must focus our attention to verses 43 and following. Both of these paragraphs have proved to be a challenge for interpreters to sort out how they relate (or if they relate) to the previous section. I think there is a relationship between these paragraphs, but as for the nature of that relationship, opinions vary.

Let’s begin with what Jesus says about the demons in verses 43 to 45. You’ll notice there is no narrative break between these words and what comes before. Verses 43 is simply the next thing Jesus says as He corrects the scribes and Pharisees for seeking additional signs. It’s part of the same conversation, so I think we can safely conclude there is a relationship between these paragraphs. So what is it?<sup>1</sup>

Many have wondered if Jesus is trying to issue a warning to the man that was healed in verse 22. This man, after all, had just been set free from a demon, which restored his sight and speech, so perhaps Jesus is trying to

warn him that the healing is not enough. That demon is gone, but could return with friends, if the appropriate precautions are not taken. That's possible, but I don't think that is what Jesus is up to primarily at this point.

Why? Well, first of all, because the text tells us that He is speaking to the scribes and the Pharisees in verse 39. So surely what He says has some direct relevance to them. And on that basis some have argued that perhaps Jesus is offering commentary on the ill-effect of the exorcisms administered by the Pharisees. Remember, back in verse 27, Jesus seems to grant that the Pharisees and their disciples have cast out demons in the past. So perhaps Jesus is suggesting that, though this may be true, the people they have done this for are no better off because the Pharisees have offered nothing to take the place of the demon and prevent further and more severe affliction. Whereas Jesus will offer just that. He is the one who will eventually fill His people with the Holy Spirit. And the Holy Spirit in them is greater than he that is in the world (1 John 4:4). Yet, while there is much truth in these assertions, I'm not convinced that is what Jesus is getting at here. It seems a case of right teaching, wrong text.

I would argue instead that the truth of what Jesus is up to is hinted at by the repeated reference to this "*evil generation*" in verses 39 and 45. By bookending the section with this repetition, the text signals that what is being said in between relates to this generation opposed to Jesus, embodied especially in these Pharisees. Therefore, what Jesus says about the demons and their activity is not meant to be read as a detailed account of how demons operate. It's meant as a parabolic account of how this "*evil generation*" operates, which Jesus makes clear at the end of verse 45. So to attempt to develop a whole demonology on the basis of these verses is to miss the point entirely. He's not dealing with the tendencies of demons per se. He's dealing with the tendency of this generation of Jews, increasingly marked by their rejection of the Messiah. Jesus wants them to understand the results of their rejection. That's the point of the parable. It's a call to repentance.

With that in mind, let's look at it more closely. Jesus imagines, in verse 43, an "*unclean spirit*" voluntarily departing from a possessed individual. We're told that this demon "*passes through waterless places seeking rest, but finds none.*" While the Bible doesn't have a lot to say about demons and their typical behaviors, certain comments in the Old Testament led many Jews to associate them with dry places, like the desert, so this would not have been surprising behavior for these Jewish listeners.<sup>2</sup>

What's most interesting to me is the restlessness that this demon exhibits. It reminds me a great deal of the restlessness seen in fallen humanity. One of the most famous quotes attributed to Augustine is his prayer in the *Confessions*: "You made us for yourself, O Lord, and our hearts are restless until they rest in You." What's the point? One commentator explains it like this:

"He was making a profound observation about unconverted human beings. A person may be successful, powerful, attractive, and exceedingly rich, having all of the goods that this world offers, but if he is outside of Christ he is tormented by a sense of emptiness and restlessness in his soul. Most people go through life in this state of restlessness."<sup>3</sup>

One book in the Bible that really proves this point is Ecclesiastes. It is basically an account of a man who had everything of whatever it is that you think would satisfy you if you could only attain—he had it all, and more of it than anyone—and yet it proved empty. He was restless. And the ultimate conclusion of the author, not disclosed until the very end, is that only God can provide what his heart was longing for. That being the case, it should surprise no one that restlessness and discontent is the mark of an age that does not seek the Lord. And it should come as no surprise that this demon—who likewise wanted nothing to do with God—would experience a similar and unquenchable restlessness. He too is alienated from his Creator. As R. C. Sproul once remarked, "How horrible it is to contemplate that unsaved human beings are in the same condition as demons."<sup>4</sup>

But as the parable continues, the homeless demon utters a brief soliloquy, expressing its desire to "*return to my house from which I came,*" meaning, of course, the person it used to inhabit. But when the demon returns it finds the person "*empty, swept, and put in order,*" which leads the demon to bring seven other squatters to

cohabit in the person, leading Jesus to conclude that “*the last state of the person is worse than the first*” (12:44-45). The number seven connotes completeness. “This is a full contingent of demons.”<sup>5</sup> Then comes the punchline at the end of verse 45: “*So also will it be with this evil generation.*”

So the question we must ask is: “In what way does Jesus see this parable as analogous to the generation, and perhaps the Pharisees in particular?” Many have concluded, I believe rightly, that the imagery of sweeping and putting things in order is meant to picture the futile attempts of the Pharisees (and their generation) to engage in “pleasant, moral reformation.”<sup>6</sup> For all their attempts to tidy themselves up spiritually, they remain empty of the Spirit of God and vulnerable. Their “self-reformation” cannot save them. So Jesus is essentially saying to them, as Sproul puts it: “You men are dedicated to the achievement of holiness and righteousness, but you think you can be righteous on your own. If you have a bad habit, you can confess it and break it. But you’ve never come to Me. You are resting on your own righteousness, your own performance. You’re like this man who had a demon. The demon left, so he cleaned up his house. But he had no way to keep the demon from returning. That’s you. You’re empty inside.”<sup>7</sup>

And that emptiness, it would seem, leaves them vulnerable to greater problems. Until they receive Him, they will have nothing to fill their house, so to speak, to keep the devils at bay. But the Christian—who is not only forgiven of sin, but counted righteous in Christ—is also filled with the Spirit of God. He has taken up residence within. No amount of self-reformation—tidying up and putting things in order—can take the place of what the Spirit of God does in us when He takes up residence. And one cannot receive the Spirit, without receiving Christ, the very thing these religious leaders and their generation, by and large, refused to do.

So Jesus is impressing upon them, first, that the absence of evil spirits or obvious filth in our lives does not equate to the presence of redemption and security. And, second, He is making known the truth that their “self-reformation was not enough” because they “needed a reformation from above, a conversion, a new birth.”<sup>8</sup> They can tidy the house all they want, but that’s not enough to ensure a future free from torment. As David Platt states,

“We do not need an empty religion consumed with outer reformation....Jesus is still addressing these Pharisees who...have sought to get their house in order, who have sought to follow God’s laws, in addition to a variety of other rules and regulations. They have tried to sweep evil out of their lives and put things in order on their own. But their religious devotion has ultimately left their hearts empty. They were so focused on outer reformation when their greatest need was a new heart....They were classic moralists, thinking that could reform their own lives, and that kind of self-righteous moralism is empty. It only drives you further away from God, making you worse off than you were before, more susceptible to the evil one.”<sup>9</sup>

Demons love legalism. They can work with that. That being the case, these Pharisees (and their generation) needed to repent and receive Christ as Lord. For it is not enough to even profit from Jesus’ message or healings, as many have to this day, if one refuses Jesus as the Lord of their life. Without Jesus, we are no better off than the man in the parable, who may have had some temporary reprieve, but ended up worse for it despite all his efforts. They remain a house for devils. And remember how they accused Jesus as being in league with “Beelzebul,” an expression used to call to mind the devil, but literally meaning the “lord/baal of the house.” Do you see the irony? Despite their accusations against Jesus, it turns out that it is their lives that seem to suggest that Beelzebul is “lord of [their] house.”<sup>10</sup> But there is an alternative—they could repent and receive Christ, becoming part of God’s household instead.

Consider the fact that this text may be a fitting parable for our generation as well. We too have many people who seem to be content to fix themselves up in hopes that they will make themselves worthy of acceptance before the world and the whoever they will encounter in the world to come. It’s always been this way. It’s the way of religion. It’s the way of legalism. But it’s not the way of Jesus. Jesus would have us understand that it is

possible for people to “reform their habits and morals without touching the heart,”<sup>11</sup> without addressing, in other words, what really matters from God’s perspective. This is also true of reforming our beliefs.

One relatively recent example of this can be drawn from the life of the late Antony Flew, who passed away in 2010. Antony Flew was, for the majority of his life, one of the most famous atheistic philosophers of our day. Though he didn’t create it, he was the one who further developed and popularized “the parable of the invisible gardener.” It went something like this:

“Once two explorers came upon a clearing in the jungle. In the clearing were growing many flowers and many weeds. One explorer says, ‘Some gardener must tend this plot.’ The other disagrees, ‘There is no gardener.’ So they pitch their tents and set a watch. No gardener is ever seen.

‘But perhaps he is an invisible gardener,’ says the believer. To test this possibility, they set up a barbed-wire fence and electrify it. They patrol it with bloodhounds. But no shrieks ever suggest that some intruder has received a shock. No movements of the wire ever betray an invisible climber. The bloodhounds never give cry. Yet still the believer is not convinced. ‘There is a gardener, invisible, intangible ... [he] has no scent and makes no sound ... but comes secretly to look after the garden....’

The skeptic despairs, ‘But what remains of your original assertion? Just how does what you call an invisible, intangible, eternally elusive gardener differ from an imaginary gardener or even from no gardener at all?’<sup>12</sup>

There are problems with this line of reasoning, and many have pointed them out over the years. For example, John Frame offers a counter parable:

“Once upon a time two explorers came upon a clearing in the jungle. A man was there, pulling weeds, applying fertilizer, trimming branches. The man turned to the explorers and introduced himself as the royal gardener. One explorer shook his hand and exchanged pleasantries. The other ignored the gardener and turned away: ‘There can be no gardener in this part of the jungle,’ he said; ‘this must be some trick.’

They pitch camp. Every day the gardener arrives, tends the plot. Soon the plot is bursting with perfectly arranged blooms. ‘He’s only doing it because we’re here—to fool us into thinking this is a royal garden.’ The gardener takes them to a royal palace, introduces the explorers to a score of officials who verify the gardener’s status. Then the skeptic tries a last resort: ‘Our senses are deceiving us. There is no gardener, no blooms, no palace, no officials. It’s still a hoax!’

Finally the believer despairs: ‘But what remains of your original assertion? Just how does this mirage, as you call it, differ from a real gardener?’<sup>13</sup>

My point at this juncture is not get into a drawn out discussion about the problem with Flew’s “invisible gardener” parable. Suffice it to say that Flew himself eventually came to acknowledge the logical shortfalls of his own parable and the worldview it represented, for at the age of 81 he very publicly confessed that he was abandoning his atheism because he had come to believe that there must be a god, some wise and powerful designer of all that exists. Naturally, when such a prominent and proselytizing atheist legend becomes a theist, the world takes notice.<sup>14</sup>

But it should be noted that Flew went from atheism to deism, not to biblical Christianity. He became a deist, like several of America’s founding fathers, who believed “in a powerful, purposeful, and intelligent deity, but not a god who takes interest in human affairs.”<sup>15</sup> It was the cosmic clockmaker god. Not the personal God of Christianity. The one true God. So in the end, was Flew any better off in his final state than he was in his atheistic career? We are tempted to say yes, but I think the answer is probably no. As one author put it, “[he] moved from one form of unbelief to another.” You might say, in view of our text today, “one demon left, but the house remained unoccupied, so that more demons could return.”<sup>16</sup>

You can move from atheism to theism, without heart change. You can hear the teaching of Jesus and make some changes in your life, without genuinely being born again. You can pour yourself into reforming your way

of life so that you look godly on the outside, without having the Spirit of God applying salvation on the inside. You can go the way of moralism and merely prep the house for the evil one. None of those efforts are going to leave you better off. What will? Entering the household of God through faith. Recognizing your inability to save or fix yourself up, and trusting instead in Jesus alone to do that in you. His work—when he died for our sins and rose to life three days later—secured for every believer the cleansing of sin and the crediting of His perfect righteousness to our account. And His Spirit, who indwells His people, fills us up and ensures that the state of our lives will be better in the end than it was at the start. Jesus looks at the believer and says, “that one’s mine.” And that’s the point of Jesus’ response to the interruption in the next verses. Look at verses 46 and following:

*“While he was still speaking to the people, behold, his mother and his brothers stood outside, asking to speak to him. <sup>48</sup> But he replied to the man who told him, ‘Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?’ <sup>49</sup> And stretching out his hand toward his disciples, he said, ‘Here are my mother and my brothers! <sup>50</sup> For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother.’”* (Matthew 12:46-50)

Before we see what Jesus is saying here, let address a couple controversies that relate to these verses. First of all, you’ll notice that the ESV, which I just read, doesn’t have a verse 47. Instead, what you will find is a footnote that reads: “Some manuscripts insert verse 47: *Someone told him, ‘Your mother and your brothers are standing outside, asking to speak to you’*” Other English translations include verse 47 in the body of the text, but include a footnote that indicates that there is some question about whether the verse was original to the text. The NASB includes the verse in brackets to indicate the same uncertainty. What’s up with all that? Is the ESV, for example, trying to cut away some of God’s Word?

No, it’s actually, the opposite. The translators, based on the many manuscripts we have, believed that verse 47 was an addition to the text, not original to Matthew, but perhaps introduced to clarify who this random “*man*” is that Jesus replies to in verse 48. There are strong grounds for making the case that the verse is not original as it does not show up in some very strong manuscripts we have access to. Indeed, the weight and diversity of the manuscript evidence in isolation would seem to favor its omission. However, I tend to think the ESV got this one wrong, because there is an easier explanation.

Textual critics—which are basically those experts that pour through manuscripts to reconstruct readings from ancient historical documents—will sometimes speak of mistakes that copyists make when reproducing manuscripts. One of those mistakes is related to a phenomenon called homoeoteleuton (or homoioteleuton), which happens when either words are repeated or words have similar endings that tricks a copyist. In this case, verses 46 and 47 end with the exact same word (*λαλῆσαι*), so you can easily imagine that a copyist would have glanced at the page he was copying, wrote out verse 46, and then glanced back at the source material, found the last word he just wrote, but not realizing that he found it in verse 47 and, therefore, jumped from verse 46 to 48 inadvertently. We’ve all done it. And I think that is probably the best explanation for this variant reading. We can’t say for sure, but it seems pretty likely. That there is some question, shouldn’t trouble you because while there are some debated instances like this in the New Testament, there is not a single doctrine that hangs on an textual variant. And either reading doesn’t really change anything here since we can pretty much infer the content of verse 47 from verse 48 itself.

A second controversy that these verses raise relates to a point of distinction between Protestants and Roman Catholics when it comes to Mary, the mother of Jesus. One belief that Roman Catholics hold is “the perpetual virginity” of Mary. Vatican II refers to Mary as *Aeiparthenos*, the “ever-virgin.”<sup>17</sup> Protestants and Catholics both agree, and the Scriptures clearly teach, that Mary was a virgin when Jesus was conceived in her womb. So, for instance, in Matthew we read, “*When his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, before they came together she was found to be with child from the Holy Spirit*” (Matt. 1:18). A bit later it states clearly that Joseph “*knew her not until she had given birth to a son. And he called his name Jesus*” (1:25). But Catholics have gone one step further and argued that she remained a virgin her whole life, meaning childbirth did not

remove this state,<sup>18</sup> nor any other subsequent intercourse. So the Catechism of the Catholic Church maintains “Mary’s real and perpetual virginity.”<sup>19</sup>

Yet, historically, Protestants have rejected this because it doesn’t seem to accord with what we find in Scripture, and it has the feeling of special pleading. The Scriptures present Mary’s childbirth experience as rather ordinary (with the exception of its location), hardly evidencing the claims at Vatican II. And while her virginity is something that we should affirm in the case of her pregnancy with Christ, Matthew does go out of his way to specify that Joseph avoided intimate contact with Mary “*until she had given birth to a son*” (1:25), which is almost certainly his way of preparing the readers for the introduction of Jesus’ brothers and sisters later in the narrative, including in this text.<sup>20</sup> Claiming that these “brothers” here were actually cousins or that people elsewhere in Scripture called “the brothers of Jesus,” like James, were actually the sons of a different Mary (as CCC [500] claims) or sons of Joseph from a previous marriage, lacks biblical basis. It’s a conclusion read into the text, not drawn from the text. It’s *eisegesis* not *exegesis*.

Setting aside all these controversies though, what are we left with? Jesus gets word that his mom and brothers are looking for Him, so He takes the opportunity to make a point about those who are part of His true and ultimate household. He asks, in verse 48, “*Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?*” Does that seem harsh? I don’t think it was intended to be. But it reminds us that “Jesus was about His Father’s business” and sometimes that put Him in conflict with his earthly family. In fact, in the parallel passage in Mark, we learn that His family had recently tried to seize Him, claiming “*He is out of his mind*” (Mark 3:21), before causing this interruption to His teaching (3:31). They didn’t quite get it yet. Fortunately, at least some of them would eventually.

But Jesus takes the opportunity to say something amazing. After asking, “*Who is my mother, and who are my brothers?*” He waves His hand toward His disciples and said, “*Here are my mother and my brothers! For whoever does the will of my Father in heaven is my brother and sister and mother*” (Matt. 12:49-50). Sproul points out, rightly, that...

“...these statements in no way lessen the importance of family relationships, but they show once again that Jesus regarded love for Him as more important than love for family members. Earlier, we saw that Jesus said: ‘He who loves father or mother more than Me is not worthy of Me. And he who loves son or daughter more than Me is not worthy of Me’ (10:37). He was making a similar point in identifying His disciples as His brothers, sisters, and mother.”<sup>21</sup>

But there is also a point being made here about our adoption into the family of God through faith in Christ Jesus. In the larger argument we are being taught that it is not enough to be delivered from Satan’s kingdom, we must be brought into God’s Kingdom. It’s not enough to not be a house for demons, we must be part of the household of God. And remarkably, this text reminds us, that inclusion in the family of God is open to all. Whoever does the Father’s will is Jesus’ family. But wait, does that not amount to a salvation by works? We do this in order to be saved? No, it doesn’t. As Daniel Doriani explains, “Jesus does not say, ‘Whoever does the Father’s will *enters* my family.’ But obedience to God, beginning with the call to love and trust him, is the mark of God’s family.” Obedience to the will of the Father is evidence of that we are His family, not the cause of becoming family. Big difference. “And the core of that will is not ‘Follow these commands’ but ‘Follow *me*’ (Matt. 4:19; 8:22; 9:9; 10:38; 16:24; 19:21; Luke 18:22; John 1:43; 10:27; 12:26; 21:19–22).”<sup>22</sup> As Jesus said elsewhere:

“*For this is the will of my Father, that everyone who looks on the Son and believes in him should have eternal life, and I will raise him up on the last day.*” (John 6:40).

What an amazing thought! And now having come to the end of Matthew 12 (and this sermon series through this section in Matthew) we should be overwhelmed by the incredible authority and grace of Jesus. Even just this

last chapter has presented us with so many incredible invitations. Platt captures several of them we have encountered her in Matthew 12, which seem an appropriate way to close.

“For all who have worked hard to try to be righteous, rest in the Lord of the Sabbath who is righteous for you. To all who are bruised and broken, whose light is struggling to find life, humble yourself before the One who brings hope to the hurting and ask Him to heal you. To all who are struggling under the weight of sin, come to the One who is the Power of God—the One who is stronger than your enemy. To all who fear death, come to the greater Prophet who conquers death. To all who seek wisdom, come to the only wise King. And to all who long to be loved, come to your Elder Brother, who brings you into the family where God is Father.”<sup>23</sup>

To which I say, “Amen,” and “What a Savior!”

Let’s pray...

---

<sup>1</sup> For more detailed analysis of the interpretive options, see W. D. Davies and D. C. Allison, *Matthew*, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 2004).

<sup>2</sup> For examples, see Grant Osborne, *Matthew*, ZECNT (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 487; R. C. Sproul, *Matthew*, SAEC (Wheaton: Crossway, 2013), 403.

<sup>3</sup> Sproul, *Matthew*, 403.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

<sup>5</sup> Osborne, *Matthew*, 488.

<sup>6</sup> Leon Morris, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, PNTC (Grand Rapids: InterVarsity Press, 1992), 329.

<sup>7</sup> Sproul, *Matthew*, 404.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> David Platt, “Will Your Heart Be Hardened or Humbled by This King?,” in *David Platt Sermon Archive* (Birmingham, AL: David Platt, 2012), 3387.

<sup>10</sup> Rodney Reeves, *Matthew*, SGBC (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017), 257.

<sup>11</sup> Daniel M. Doriani, *Matthew*, Vol 1, REC (Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 2008), 532.

<sup>12</sup> Antony Flew, “Theology and Falsification,” in *New Essays in Philosophical Theology*, ed. Antony Flew and Alasdair MacIntyre (London: SCM Press, 1955), 96–99 (also cited in Doriani, *Matthew*, 232–233). Cf.

<sup>13</sup> John M. Frame, “God and Biblical Language: Transcendence and Immanence,” *God’s Inerrant Word*, ed. J. W. Montgomery (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1974), 171.

<sup>14</sup> For a discussion on Flew’s “conversion,” see James A. Beverly, “Thinking Straighter,” in *Christianity Today* (April 2005).

<sup>15</sup> Doriani, *Matthew*, 533.

<sup>16</sup> Ibid.

<sup>17</sup> Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*, 52.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. “[Christ’s birth] did not diminish his mother’s virginal integrity but sanctified it” (Vatican Council II, *Lumen Gentium*, 57).

<sup>19</sup> CCC, 499.

<sup>20</sup> Matt. 12:46 (par. Mark 3:31–35; Luke 8:19); 13:55–56 (par. Mark 6:3); Acts 1:14; 1 Cor. 9:5; Gal. 1:19).

<sup>21</sup> Sproul, *Matthew*, 406.

<sup>22</sup> Daniel M. Doriani, “Matthew” in *Matthew-Luke*, ESVEC (Wheaton: Crossway, 2021), 204–205.

<sup>23</sup> David Platt, *Exalting Jesus in Matthew*, CCE (Nashville: B&H Academic, 2018), 168–169.