

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ??****" Where The Pharisee's Saved " ?? - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2007/3/23 4:45**

This question does pop up from time to time - and can be seen to be discussed on Christian message boards around the world.

What would your first answer be to this question ?

That is: if it were a straight of the top of your head ( and off the cuff answer ) without the advantage of having time ... to think it through -and that before giving your answer ?

Some cite Nicodemus as being a good man who even helped wrap the body of Jesus to support the view - that the pharisee's weren't half bad people

A bit mixed up perhaps - a bit deceived, but hey i don't think they were all bad ~~ many exclaim and retort.

Was not though Paul "formerly" a Pharisee of Pharisee's, and a Hebrew of Hebrews - who upon falling to the ground on the road to Damascus on that one historical day ...was not this however a huge turning point in his own life ? and subsequently then seen to be leaving the pharisee movement behind him.

Who then brethren gave Christ the most trouble and pretty much constant opposition ~~ throughout his entire ministry (S I) ?

Would it be a fair call to say that the Scribes and the pharisee's did ? but along with them also their counterparts and along with them the Senior priests -and elders of the people.

Plus as a whole: The religion of the Jews, but that said only (2) chief name tags existed at that time - and that being the ( Pharisee and Saduccee ) do your own research see if it be true.

So basically and primarily ~ there were only two name tags at the time of CHRIST.

A) THE PHARISEE

And

B) THE SADUCCEE

AND PRIMARILY YOU EITHER BELONGED TO THE ONE OR TO THE OTHER CAMP ( AT THAT TIME )

It is my belief that for the most part the saduccees at some stage - broke away from the pharisee's due to doctrinal dissent and various dis-agreements - and consequently saw themselves as the rival and alternative group - and offering an alternative to what their counterpart ( the pharisee ) was offering to the people.

The pharisee's had their senior priests, along with the saduccees's having their chief priests also - And further to this both parties then had contenders for the job and role of

Some contend they were alright people - just a little deceived at times, but that is as far as they will personally go ...when it comes to the personal censuring of the pharisee's.

But again if it's so innocent ~~ why did Paul forsake it ~~ counting it as dung - that he may win Christ instead ? ( leaving it all behind him )

Jesus told them plainly if you don't believe that is the sent one of God from above ~~ then you will all "die in your sins" !!

Nicodemus came to him in the cloak of darkness ( night time) and why ?? perhaps he was afraid of being found out by his fellow compatriot pharisee - but that said he couldn't resist approaching him personally and having many questions for him, hence though day time was not seen by nicodemus - as a good option. ( in case he was spotted -talking- to the Nazarene )

You see It was very much a stigma to confess Jesus as the CHRIST BACK THEN - AS IT IS ALSO - EVEN NOW.

IF YOU DON'T BELIEVE ME -- THEN TELL ALL YOUR WORK MATES AND PEERS, THAT YOU BELIEVE IN JESUS AND that you are BORN AGAIN CHRISTIAN .... AND SEE HOW WARM - A RECEPTION YOU GET.

We read in John's gospel that the Jews had joined a pact " that if any did confess him ( THAT IS JESUS ) then they were - TO BE put out of the synagogues.

So many of the Jews did not name him or openly - for fear of being dis-fellowshipped and put out of the synagogues. They loving the praise and approval of man, more than the approval of God ( it's called peer pressure ) and IT'S ALSO CALLED - the fear of man.

And it's also called: the Fear of -- so that they durst hardly confess him publicly at all.

Hence i believe Nicodemus came privately and that under the cloak of darkness -- for he feared the reproof of his peers - and the loss of - one's own reputation.

But if they were not all as many contend (and i speak now of the movement as such and not that of individual fruit ) Why then did he Jesus - bade his own disciples and that often - to beware of the doctrine of the saduccee's and the pharisee's ?

And to beware of the leaven -- that comes from them ?

And why do we read this from Matthew chapter 23 ~ JESUS PRONOUNCEING AND DENOUNCING (8) WOES UPON THEM.

AND WHY DO WE READ THAT WHEN THE SCRIBES AND PHARISEE'S SHOWED UP TO THE BAPTISM OF JOHN HE JOHN CHIDED THEM - CALLING THEM A BROOD OF VIPERS AND SNAKES. ( DON'T THINK I'LL BAPTIZE YOU JOHN SAID -- TRY BRING FORTH FRUITS OF REPENTANCE AND THEN COME BACK - AND WE WILL TALK ABOUT SOME MORE !!

You see the scriptures Inform us later - that the pharisee' ULTIMATELY rejected the counsel of God against themselves -- having rejected the " baptism of John " as being from heaven. !!

So they stood back and questioned -- saying amongst themselves " no thanks John " this is not for us -- and we don't believe in this honey and wild locusts eating MAN -- AND THIS camel apparelled man.

Nor do we believe in all this you be water baptized in order to be confirmed - and all this "nonsense" AND TALK about purifying.

You see - others who defend the pharisee establishment cite matthew 23 claiming that Jesus told his disciples: all that they bid you, that observe, that observe and DO.

BUT A CLOSER LOOK REVEALS: that all's Jesus was saying is - when someone sits in Moses seat and teaches us from the law -- then if his quotes are directly from the law itself -- then you are still obligated to the scripture he quotes to you. In other words: just because it's a pharisee quoting you the law -- then that does not proclude or exempt you - from obeying the scripture quotation. ( not at all )

and it is no different to today No different to today - for example of what i speak -- if say for instance now a quotes you the verse from Hebrews twelve " Without holiness no man shall see the Lord " you can't then turn around and say - well it's coming from you - and you are involved in a highly questionable cult, therefore im going to dismiss what you have to say to me - and im gonna flat out reject it.

But at the end of the day -- if all's he has done is quote the passage - you can't then say " hey don't give me that - or hey im not going to listen to that " ?? ( can we - after all ) all's he has done at the end of the day - is quote you from the ... bible.

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ??**

The verse is still - and must be adhered to -- and yes in spite of whose lips it proceed from ~~ so then just because it came from a Jehovah's witness, this then brethren does not negate it's validity or it's truthfulness. Even though they the Jehovah's witness were in essence as teachers -- just as the scribes use to love to sitting in Moses seat, as teachers and loved to dispense the to the people.

So this then deals with the popular argument from that of Matthew 23 which many use to try and persuade us ( Jesus ) was endorsing the pharisee's to the people - and where people cite the passage "we are to observe and to do - all that the pharisee's say - and command us.

But don't stop with the reading of that one passage ( keep reading into the chapter ) for we see that Jesus went on to say " don't do after their works, for they say, and don't do. ( it's called double standards (or) the mind-set of "do as i say - and not as i do " !

THOUGHTS ON THIS BROTHERS ~ ARE WELCOME ?? :-o

**Re: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ?? - posted by enid, on: 2007/3/23 6:35**

Quote: What would your first answer be to this question?

Mine would be no.

Luke 7v30 says 'But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the will of God for themselves, not having been baptized by him

Some might have got saved, but the majority seemed to have rejected John's baptism and the Lord Jesus Christ.

God bless.

**Re: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ?? - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/23 6:52**

Quote:  
-----It is my belief that for the most part the Sadducees at some stage - broke away from the pharisee's due to doctrinal dissent and various dis-agreements - and consequently saw themselves as the rival and alternative group - and offering an alternative to what their counterpart ( the pharisee ) was offering to the people.  
-----

It may be what you 'believe' but it is not historically true.

The Sadducees were the party of government and compliance with Rome. They represented the status quo and the priests were mostly Sadducee. They were the rationalists of their day following the Greek way of thought; they rejected the metaphysical ie angels and resurrection.

The Pharisees were the 'pure' party. The traditionalists. In the 'either/or' mentality of the day Jesus was a Pharisee. Bible believing, tradition honouring.. unless that tradition got in the way of truth. The Pharisees were almost certainly the smaller group intellectually but most peasants would have instinctively supported the Pharisees view point on most things. "Then Jesus spoke to the multitudes and to His disciples, saying: "The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. Therefore whatever they tell you to observe, that observe and do, but do not do according to their works; for they say, and do not do." (Matt 23:1-3 NKJV)

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ??**

**Re: - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2007/3/23 7:11**

Acts 23:6 " when paul perceived the pharisee's and the other saducee's - he cried out in the council.

verse 8 " for the sadducee's say that there is neither angel, spirit, or resurrection: but the pharisee's had confessed "BOTH"

Hence they had quarrels and dissent ... over the validity of the scriptures.

It's like today you have the charismatics and the pentecostals - and you have those today...who are the "anti charismatic groups" - and those who likewise reject the supernatural ( the gifts and tongues etc ) as valid.

and you have those who are pro the "supernatural -but very much have distorted it's message with much error - and this then has led to the anti-charismatic groups and the apologetics - as such

History is repeating itself  
friends  
all over again !!

But which one is true and which one has the truth ?? or does neither approach have the correct answer ?? hmmm :-o

**Yes---to Your Question - posted by dohzman (), on: 2007/3/23 7:31**

Act 15:5 But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.

The Lord is never without a remnant.

**Re: Yes---to Your Question - posted by philologos (), on: 2007/3/23 12:58**

Quote:  
-----dohzman on 2007/3/23 12:31:25  
Act 15:5 But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses.  
-----

“And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.” (Acts 6:7 KJVS)

As most priestly families seem to have been associated with the Sadducees, it seems that converts came from both Pharisee and Sadducee backgrounds.

**Re: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ?? - posted by Pilgrimsway (), on: 2007/3/23 14:22**

I'm not sure if I am understanding the question fully, but this is my take on it:

1. "It doesn't matter about them. It matters about YOU. Are YOU going to be saved?" (Sorry to be so nit-picky, but in my experience these kinds of questions are attempts to change the subject away from the individual's own spiritual state.)
2. "The Pharisees" cannot be saved, because salvation is individual, not group. Its like saying, "Will Episcopalians be saved?" It doesn't exactly make sense.

Salvation, we will all agree on, is by faith. That faith is individual, not corporate. Is it possible that individual Pharisees were saved based on their faith in Christ? Sure. Paul was one of them, as was pointed out. In order to receive salvation, it has to be in the way that God has directed, which is through faith in His Son Jesus. Each individual has to make his or her own decision.

3. All events in the Bible must be understood in their historical context. We have a bad impression of the Pharisees bec

**Scriptures and Doctrine :: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ??**

ause we have had thousands of years of re-interpreting. Historically, however, the Pharisee group started out as a good thing. As I recall my studies in this, this party began as a reaction to one of the captivities. They were intelligent and figured out that the reason they were banished from the land was due to thier lack of following the law of Moses as prescribed. So, they came up with a system of rules and practices to make sure that they would not break the law and would never be banished from their homeland again.

They weren't "bad guys" per se. They were the fundamentalists of their time. They wanted spiritual and doctrinal purity. Unfortunately, as always happens, as time goes on, the original intent was lost, and what remained was legalism.

We see this exact same phenomena today. Christians don't "smoke, drink or chew." Where is that in the Bible? (A: Its not.) But in many churches, that has become a standard. Where does it say in the Bible that men have to wear suits and ties to church, and women wear dresses? (A: It doesn't. This is a cultural tradition.)

We really do have to be on our guard against teaching the traditions of men for the laws of God. We like to think we are immune, but we aren't. It is more than possible that in our zeal to be doctrinally correct, we can get it wrong, and become modern day Pharisees ourselves.

**Re: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ?? - posted by rowdy2 (), on: 2007/3/23 14:39**

RE- Sonofthunder

Both sects taught self-righteousness so you could call them both hypocrites right off.

They both were cut out of the true vine and were taken out of the way. Did some repent and except the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world? Yes, we know from scripture that some Pharisees did repent, and leave the religion of self-righteousness and except the salvation of grace.  
////////////////////////////////////

Pharisee - Self-righteous hypocrite  
KJV

The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican.  
I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess.

That Self-righteous prayer is typical of their attitude toward God and most could not see their need for the Great Physician.  
////////////////////////////////////

Sadducee- Dead Spiritually and a Self-righteous hypocrite  
KJV

The same day came to him the Sadducees, which say that there is no resurrection, and asked him,

How could a person that does not believe in the death, burial and resurrection repent and except His Lord? All things are possible with God.  
////////////////////////////////////

Sinners  
KJV

And the publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner

KJV  
For scarcely for a righteous man will one die: yet peradventure for a good man some would even dare to die. But God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

Eddie

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2007/3/23 17:30**

Acts 6:7--- I missed that reference, that's a good one! I'll have to pen that one in my bible :-)

**Re: - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2007/3/26 20:32**

I think the significant issue here is - though you get accused of nit-picking ( on the personal level ).

In acts the sect that that rose up - where trying to bring the gentiles UNDER mosaic jewish law, AND who being gentiles were never under LAW AT ANY STAGE !!

But were insisting the gentiles be circumcised and to keep the law after the manner of Moses.

Otherwise your not saved - they taught

Is not the whole point of the book of Galations that the religion of the jews - sought to bring the new gentile converts under ( law ) ??

And did not this legalism instigated by the SECT of the pharisee's in acts lead to much dissension among the gentiles ??

It's amazing how people read and interpret scripture....never ceases to amaze me - how people can read things around the wrong way.

Too many people reading too many books and listening to - way too many ....leading to much confusion and error ( is th e problem )

and wrong interpretations of holy scripture.

The significant thing is - Yes paul was a former pharisee....and yes he got saved

But did he remain a Pharisee ??

Answer is no !!

He forsook it and walked away

Jesus constantly warned of bad leaven emanating from where ??

2 camps ( the saduccee and the pharisee )

And their lawyers - took away "missing links" from those who sought to enter into the kingdom of God - instead opening up the scriptures that people might fully understand they became roadblocks and hindrances to people !!

It's like missing that last piece of the jig saw puzzle - without it, then the puzzle remains unsolved.

Well in allegorical fashion this is used to describe the lawyers who take away the " key of knowledge "

The Lord is coming at you ( that is error itself and those who hide behind scripture ) as imposters and deceivers who lie i n wait.

God's people have been waiting a long time for a clear trumpet sound - that sets people free and expounds truth in a wa y that opens up the peoples understanding. ( that they might see )

:o :-o :-(

Scriptures and Doctrine :: " Where The Pharisee's Saved " ??

**Re: - posted by sonofthunder (), on: 2007/3/26 20:35**

Go FIGURE !!!

**Re: - posted by dohzman (), on: 2007/3/26 21:11**

and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.Â” (Acts 6:7 KJVS)

Act 15:5 But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed

I won't make a doctrine out of these, however in order for Paul to enter the synagogue and stand up and speak, "as was his custom", he had to be recognized as a pharisee. He never gave that up, he just didn't lay any stock to it. The Lord is never without a remnant, read the word of God, the prophets speak of it.

I am disappointed in the demeanor of your post, and also your criticism which amounts to a personal attack. That specific scripture came to me after a period of prayer and fasting which I had done over the vast amount of pharisecal type ministers I was seeing in the church. So it came to me as a ream word from God letting me know that I wasn't to judge another mans servant. I just wonder how much grace you would be willing to extend to these men who believed and were walking in the light, as imperfect as thier walk may have been, but than again the NT wasn't written yet.