

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis  
**Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary**

---

Master of Sacred Theology Seminar Papers

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

---

5-16-2008

# Finding and Losing One's Life: The Themes of Gain and Loss in Matthew 10:32-42 and 16:21-28

Jeremiah Johnson

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, jeremiahdj@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stmsp>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Johnson, Jeremiah, "Finding and Losing One's Life: The Themes of Gain and Loss in Matthew 10:32-42 and 16:21-28" (2008). *Master of Sacred Theology Seminar Papers*. 12.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stmsp/12>

This Seminar Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Seminar Papers by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact [seitzw@csl.edu](mailto:seitzw@csl.edu).

FINDING AND LOSING ONE'S LIFE: THE THEMES OF GAIN AND LOSS IN MATTHEW  
10.32-42 AND 16.21-28

---

A Seminar Paper Presented to the Faculty of  
Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,  
Department of Exegetical Theology  
in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Sacred Theology

---

By  
Jeremiah Johnson  
January 2008

Approved by Jeffrey Gibbs Advisor

Jeffrey Kloha Reader



## CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS .....	iv
Chapter	
1. PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY .....	1
2. STRUCTURE AND CONTEXT .....	4
Structure of 10.32-42.....	4
Context of 10.32-42.....	6
Structure of 16.21-28.....	9
Context of 16.21-28.....	13
3. DIVISION AS A FOUNDATIONAL THEME .....	17
Division Between Various Groups.....	17
Confession as an Instrument of Division .....	19
4. PRESENT LOSS .....	24
Repudiation of the Twelve .....	24
Every Disciple's Present Loss.....	25
Repudiation of Jesus and Solidarity with Every Disciple .....	29
5. ESCHATOLOGICAL GAIN AND LOSS .....	32
6. THE FINDING/LOSING SAYINGS .....	35
7. CONCLUSIONS .....	38
Excursuses	
1. THE CROSS-BEARING SAYINGS .....	41
2. THE MEANING OF ΨΥΧΗ IN THE FINDING/LOSING SAYINGS .....	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY .....	51

## ABBREVIATIONS

- 1PP First Passion Prediction (Matthew 16.21-28)
- BDAG Bauer, W., F. D. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Chicago, 2000
- BDF Blass, F., A. DeBrunner, and R. W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, 1961
- ED Eschatological Discourse (Matthew 24.1-26.2)
- MD Missionary Discourse (Matthew 9.35-11.1)

## CHAPTER ONE

### PURPOSE AND METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this paper is to explore the themes of gain and loss in Matt 10.32–42 and 16.21–28 and their respective contexts. Gain and loss, however, are closely interrelated to various other themes throughout these texts and as well as the rest of the book of Matthew, and my exploration will reflect this fact. It is the thesis of this paper that the themes of gain and loss (as well as their ancillaries) are not only repeated but developed through these two texts.

To this end, this paper utilizes many of the assumptions and devices of literary/narrative criticism. This paper, however, is not strictly a narrative critical reading of these texts although it does presuppose the tenets of this methodology. Therefore, a brief description of literary criticism is in order.

Literary criticism is the method of reading a particular text as a “story”, a set of characters experiencing various events in particular settings.<sup>1</sup> In Matthew, such a method of reading makes three crucial assumptions.

One, the story that is being read is assumed to be a unified narrative. This means that the most basic level of meaning to be derived from the story is within the story itself, and not in some alternate narrative.<sup>2</sup> This approach is contrary to various other forms of modern criticism, as Rhoads notes,

---

<sup>1</sup> Seymour Chatman, *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Univ. Press, 1978), 19–27.

<sup>2</sup> Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988), 2.

Redaction criticism, form criticism, source criticism, and even composition criticism break up the narrative in order to get at the questions they pursue. Distinctions between redaction and tradition, between history and tradition, naturally fragment the text, a tendency which is reinforced by the designation of chapters, verses, and pericopae. By contrast literary questions about narrative features tend to reveal Mark's Gospel as whole cloth.<sup>3</sup>

Whereas Rhoads is speaking specifically about Mark, his contrast between narrative and other forms of criticism apply to Matthew as well.

Two, the story has both an implied author and a narrator. According to Kingsbury, the implied author is “a literary version of himself [the actual author], a second self, which the reader comes to know through the process of reading the story of the narrative.”<sup>4</sup> The narrator, on the other hand is “the voice, or invisible speaker, the reader hears as he or she moves through the story, the one who tells the reader the story.”<sup>5</sup> In a story, a narrator need not be “reliable”, meaning that he may not provide the reader with accurate information or analysis that is congruent with the perspective of the implied author. In the book of Matthew, however, the narrator is reliable, and thus is virtually interchangeable with the implied author.<sup>6</sup>

Three, the story has an “implied reader”, who is the counterpart to the implied author. The implied reader is “an imaginary person who is to be envisaged, in perusing Matthew's story, as responding to the text at every point with whatever emotion, understanding, or knowledge the text ideally calls for.”<sup>7</sup> In the analysis of the book of Matthew, there is no guarantee that any

---

<sup>3</sup> David Rhoads, 'Narrative Criticism and the Gospel of Mark,' *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* 50 (1982): 412–13. Quoted from Dorothy Jean Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990), 25.

<sup>4</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 31.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> Jeffrey A. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia: Jesus' Eschatological Discourse in Matthew's Gospel* (St. Louis: Concordia Academic, 2000), 16–17. cf. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 31.

<sup>7</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 38.

actual reader would respond predictably to the story. The ideal reader, on the other hand, would respond predictably, and thus becomes an invaluable construct for literary analysis. Powell goes so far as to say: “The goal of narrative criticism is to read the text as the implied reader.”<sup>8</sup>

With its emphasis upon narrative unity as opposed to fragmented passages, literary criticism will to reveal larger thematic connections between Matt 10.32–42 and 16.21–28. For example, as I will later argue, the doublet of 10:38–39 and 16.24–25 is key to interpreting the themes of gain and loss in the two passages under consideration. Source criticism is prone to treat the texts more atomistically, dwelling on what doublets might reveal about the development of Matthew. Literary criticism, however, asks the reader to consider these doublets as coherent parts of the narrative rather than merely signs of redactional activity. Thus towards the goal of this paper, the assumption of narrative unity will better enable us to examine the themes of gain and loss across these two passages.

Furthermore, both of these texts also make heavy use of “inclusive” techniques<sup>9</sup> which make use of generalizing features in order to include not only characters but also the reader. As I will later argue, 10.32–42 and 16.21–28 include many generalized references that expand beyond the scope of the twelve. The implied reader is a valuable construct in reading these inclusive techniques, because he then becomes one of the addressees of the text.

---

<sup>8</sup> Mark Allen Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 20. as quoted in Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 17.

<sup>9</sup> Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 20.



## CHAPTER TWO

### STRUCTURE AND CONTEXT

#### Structure of 10.32–42

As is characteristic of the entire Missionary Discourse (Matt 9.35–11.1, henceforth abbreviated MD), 10.32–42 form a structurally complex unit. It is a section of explicitly didactic material, wherein Jesus differentiates between the disciple and the non-disciple, and how his very coming brings about such a division. The first section (32–33) distinguishes between those who confess Jesus and those who do not. The second section (34–36) describes the result of Jesus' coming. The third section (37–39) describes the fate of the one who denies Jesus. The fourth section (40–42) describes the reward of the one who receives a disciple, and hence Jesus.

This passage may be outlined as follows:

- I. [32–33] [οὖν] The results of confession
  - A. [32] Confession before men—confession before the Father
  - B. [33] [δε'] Denial before men—denial before the Father
- II. [34–36] The result of Jesus' coming
  - A. [34] [μὴ νομίσητε] Jesus brings a sword, not peace.
  - B. [35–36] [γὰρ] Picture/rationale of the sword
- III. [37–39] The fate of those who love others more than Jesus
  - A. [37] Loving family members more than Jesus
  - B. [38] [καί] Failure to take up one's cross and follow Jesus
  - C. [39] Finding/losing one's life
- IV. [40–42] Reception of the disciple
  - A. [40] Transference of reception
  - B. [41] Examples of reception
  - C. [42] [καί] Promise of reception

The first section (32–33) expresses reciprocal confession. Confessing or denying Jesus before men results in the same action by Jesus before his father in heaven. This confession will

ultimately come to pass in the eschaton. (cf. 25.12, 26, 34, 41)

The second section (34–36) fits thematically with the rest of the passage, yet at least one feature distinguishes its form from the others. In the first, third, and fourth sections, a relative, indefinite pronoun (32, 33, 38, 42) or a generic substantive participle (37, 39, 40, 41) is found as the subject to a main clause. The presence of these generalizing markers is suspiciously absent from vv. 34–36. This, however, is quite understandable in light of the fact that Jesus is no longer speaking directly about those who would confess or deny him but about the result of his own coming.<sup>1</sup> Jesus' coming prompts a division that manifests itself (γάρ in v. 35) in the division even of families.

The third section (37–39) ties in closely with the previous, continuing his teaching concerning the divisions within families.<sup>2</sup> While 34–36 deal with the results of his coming, 37–39 deal with the worthiness of the disciple.<sup>3</sup> This section is differentiated, however by the resumption of generic personal statements, which in this case concern the state of affairs he has introduced. Jesus expresses the division that he brings as between members of one's family.

The final section (40–42) is the counterpart to section three, which describes the one who receives Jesus. Sections three and four further expound on the confession/denial pair in the first section (32–33). In section three, the one who denies Jesus is the one who loves others more than him. In section four, the one who confesses Jesus is the one who receives his disciple.

---

<sup>1</sup>“I have come to...” (ἦλθον + inf.) occurs three times in this passage: ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην (34), ἦλθον βαλεῖν εἰρήνην ἀλλὰ μάχαιραν (34), ἦλθον γὰρ διχάσαι (35).

<sup>2</sup> On this ground, most commentators group verses 34–39 together but then further subdivide them between v. 36 and v. 37. Cf. Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13 in Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 33a (Dallas: Word, 1993), 291. These two sections are grouped together, noting their distinction, while I have divided the two noting their unity. Cf. D. A. Carson, *Matthew: Chapters 1–12* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 257. Thus my structuring is actually little different from the cited commentators.

<sup>3</sup> This is evidenced by the repetition of ἄξιός. Cf. Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 8–20* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 2001), 107.

Receiving Jesus is a matter of transference. The one who denies Jesus is the one who loves others more than him. The one who confesses Jesus is the one who receives his disciple. The reception of the prophet and the righteous man are further examples of transference.

The repeated use of generalized statements is a significant feature in this text. In the text prior to v. 32, Jesus addresses the apostles using the second person. Beginning with v. 32, however, Jesus shifts to speaking in generalized statements, using indefinite relative clauses and generic substantive participles. (ὅστις, ὁ φιλῶν, ὁ εὐρῶν, etc.) Only in v. 40 (“The one who receives you”) and 42 (“I say to you”) does Jesus specifically reference his disciples in the second person. But in v. 40, the disciples are merely the object,<sup>4</sup> and in v. 42, the second person personal pronoun is part of the idiom. With the exception of vv. 34–36, where Jesus is speaking of his own actions, these “generic” addresses are a consistent part of the entire passage.<sup>5</sup>

#### **Context of 10.32–42**

Matthew 10.32–42 is certainly integral the MD, but vv. 32–42 can be recognized as a distinct unit within the discourse. This is not to say, however, that there is no connection between vv. 32–33 and the prior section (24–31). In such a tightly woven and interrelated text such as the MD, one must walk very carefully inside it so as not to overstate his case. To be fair, it is generally admitted that the division markers within vv. 24–42 are not hard and fast, nor do I intend to make them so.<sup>6</sup> This paper is not arguing that there is no connection whatsoever

---

<sup>4</sup> The generic substantive participle (ὁ δεχόμενος) is the subject, so the text has not shifted away from generic statements.

<sup>5</sup> As Gibbs rightly notes, many commentators observe this feature both here and other places in Matthew, but few of them define these generic statements. For a good, brief discussion of this subject, see Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 20.

<sup>6</sup> It must be mentioned, however that this section division between 31 and 32 is idiosyncratic. A large number (probably the majority) of commentators make a division after v. 33 (Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 98; Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 105ff; Warren Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 241ff; Larry Chouinard, *Matthew* (Joplin: College Press, 1997), 195), not after v. 31, but it is also generally admitted (as I also do) that vv. 32–33 do not fit tightly into the triple-

between the discussion of fear in vv. 26–31 and the sayings on confessing Jesus in vv. 32–33. On the contrary, the conclusion to vv. 24–31 is not *limited* to vv. 32–33 but includes all of 32–42 *as a unit*.

Davies and Allison see this text grouped as one part of the larger structure of the MD. They divide the discourse proper of chapter ten into seven sections (5–15, 16–23, 24f, 26–31, 32f, 34–39, 40–42) which form a chiasm A B C D C' B' A'. In this structure, 32–42 are grouped together as the second half of the chiasm<sup>7</sup>, which further supports taking 32–42 as a unit.

Within the MD, Matt. 10.32–42 functions on several levels. First, it further expounds upon the prior section concerning whom not to fear (26, 28a) and whom to fear (28b).<sup>8</sup> Second, Jesus relates the tension and divisiveness of the apostles' mission directly to himself. Third, it provides a broader warning and blessing to every disciple.

The larger, literary context of the MD within the entire book of Matthew is also significant to interpreting 10.32–42. At first glance, the MD seems to create hardly even a ripple in the stream of the narrative in Matthew. Aside from the discourse, no correlating information about their missionary journeys is given. The reader is not told anything about their travels or preaching or miracles. Thus not a few scholars have noted that the MD (specifically 9.37–11.1)

---

prohibition ("do not fear") of verse 26–31. Thus the argument largely hinges upon (1) whether or not the prohibition of v. 34 begins a second sequence parallel to v. 26 and (2) how, if at all, verse 32–33 provide the conclusion to 26–31.

Verse 32 does not fit tightly with prohibition-structure of 26–31. The conjunction οὐ serves as a dividing conjunction, unique from the prior three uses of it. This argument hinges upon the observation that the statements concerning the confession of Jesus do not "obviously" flow from the discussion about fear. Finally, the occurrence of the "generalizing" statements in verse 32–42 are not present *in the same way* as they are in verses 26–31. These two arguments, compounded with the structural argument from Davies and Allison, provide good reason to divide the section after v. 31.

<sup>7</sup> W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Gospel according to Matthew*, vol. 2, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991), 162.

<sup>8</sup> For further comment on the "do not fear" statements, see Chapter Four, Repudiation of the Twelve.

could be removed and the text would read more smoothly for it.<sup>9</sup> Nevertheless, the MD does fit into the Matthean focus on the authority of Jesus and ever-immanent reign of heaven that he brings.<sup>10</sup>

The very first preaching in the book of Matthew is from John the Baptist, "repent, for the reign of heaven has come near." (3.1) The first words from Jesus are identical (4.17), and his message not only proclaims the reign of heaven<sup>11</sup> but also explicates the nature and substance of Jesus' mission. The narrator proceeds by describing his missional activity ("Jesus went throughout Galilee, teaching... preaching... and healing..."). So the content of his preaching and the activity of his mission are inextricably tied together, and are paradigmatically described in 4.17, 23. What follows, then, in chapters five through nine is a more detailed description of the teaching and activity of Jesus.<sup>12</sup>

The whole of the MD is bracketed by 9.35 and 11.1, which again summarize Jesus' ministry in terms of preaching the reign of heaven and healing the sick. This points back to the paradigm established in 4.17, 23 and then described in chapters five through nine. In short, the MD is completely surrounded by the twofold work of Jesus' ministry.

To this point (chapters one through nine), preaching and performing the works of the reign of heaven was relegated only to Jesus. But now the activities of Jesus' mission are entrusted to the Apostles (10.7–8). With the same message and the same miracles, Jesus gives the twelve authority to carry out the activities of the reign of heaven.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 127.

<sup>10</sup> For further discussion on this point, see Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 84, 89, 101, 117-18, 122-123. Cf. Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, 128-130, 158-160.

<sup>11</sup> This is later validated for the reader in 11.3-6.

<sup>12</sup> Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 158-159. Cf. Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 59, 61, 62, 68.

The disciples are drawn into not only the present but also the eschatological dimension of Jesus' in-breaking reign. Matt 10.32–42 expresses the eschatological hope and judgment that are ushered in with the coming of Jesus. The disciple of Jesus is called to make all things, even his own life, to be subject to Jesus and his confession. This ultimate subjection is manifest in the taking up of one's cross and following him. (10.38 cf. 16.24) Those who do not confess Jesus before men (33), however, will find themselves denied by Jesus in the eschatological judgment. (cf. 7.23; 25.12) So Jesus will be divisive for the twelve even in their immediate sending. But this divisiveness is the only the beginning of what will ultimately be manifest in the divisiveness of the final judgment.

It is in light of this eschatological judgment, then, that the disciples are sent out at the end of the book of Matthew (28.20). So the MD anticipates the expanded mission of the disciples. Jesus gives them authority, but now he gives as one who has been given all authority (28.18). His authority, ratified through the resurrection, he gives to the apostles in order to make more disciples.<sup>13</sup> Thus the entire MD is part of the progressive mission of Jesus that extends to the end of the present age.

### **Structure of 16.21–28**

Matthew 16.21–28, sometimes called “the first passion prediction” (henceforth abbreviated 1PP), can be easily broken down into two sections, distinguished by Jesus' addressee. The first section (21–23) is an exchange between Peter and Jesus. Although Jesus' passion prediction is addressed to the disciples, it is Peter who lodges an objection to what Jesus

---

<sup>13</sup> "The evangelist, however, widens the discourse to include material concerning the later, ongoing mission of the Church (cf. esp. v. 18, with its reference to the gentile mission, and the eschatological aspects of the discourse, as in verses 22, 26, etc.). The discourse thus has relevance both for the sending out of the twelve and for the Church of Matthew's day and later." Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 262.

has said, strongly insisting<sup>14</sup> that such a thing will not happen to him. Jesus responds specifically to Peter, indicating that his words are contrary to the will of God. In the second section (24–28), Jesus returns to addressing the disciples, not just Peter. There is no indication of a change in addressee through the end of the chapter. The 1PP can be outlined as follows:

- I. [21–23] [Ἐκ τούτου] Jesus' first passion prediction and Peter's rebuke
  - A. [21] Jesus predicts his suffering, death, and resurrection at the hands of the religious leaders.
  - B. [22] [καί] Peter rebukes Jesus, denying the fulfillment of this prediction.
  - C. [23] [δέ] Jesus rebukes Peter for acting against the will and mind of God.
- II. [24–28] [Τότε] A disciple's gain and loss
  - A. [24] Conditions for following Jesus
    1. [24a] [Ἔ] Protasis: following Jesus
    2. [24b] Apodosis: self-denial and cross-bearing
  - B. [25] [γάρ] Ground of self-denial: gaining and losing one's life
    1. [25a] Desire to gain one's life (A) will result in its loss (B)
    2. [25b] Loss of one's life (B') will result in its gain (A')
  - C. [26] [γάρ] Ground of self-denial : the irreplaceable value of one's life
    1. [26a] Rhetorical question: The world is not greater than one's life
    2. [26b] Rhetorical question: There is no valid exchange for one's life.
  - D. [27] [γάρ] Ground of self-denial: The Parousia of the Son of Man and consequent recompense
  - E. [28] Prediction of the disciples' witnessing of “these things”

The first section (21–23) is a three-part exchange<sup>15</sup> between Jesus and Peter. In v. 21, via indirect discourse, Jesus reveals his suffering and death at the hands of the religious leaders and his subsequent resurrection (22). In response, Peter rebukes Jesus and flatly contradicts his prediction (“this will not happen to you”). Jesus, in turn, rebukes Peter, identifying his response with that of Satan<sup>16</sup> and his thinking with that of the world (“you are not thinking the things of God but the things of men”, 23).

Jesus' passion prediction (21) and Peter's response (22) both use ἤρξατο, indicating the

<sup>14</sup> The double negative with the future indicative rather than a aorist subjunctive makes an even stronger expression. D.A. Carson, *Matthew: Chapters 13–28* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995), 377.

<sup>15</sup> Davies and Allison call this a “standard triadic form of an objection story.” Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 653.

<sup>16</sup> See the argumentation in Chapter Three.

incipient nature of their statements. The use of this verb prompts the reader to anticipate that Jesus will speak further on his passion and resurrection and that this will not be the last instance of Peter's opposition or misunderstanding of Jesus.<sup>17</sup>

In the second section, Jesus instructs his disciples concerning the conditions and consequences of following Jesus.<sup>18</sup> Verse 24 functions as a bridge between these two sections. Although the first section is primarily an exchange between Jesus and Peter, the actual passion prediction is addressed to the disciples (δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ). In v. 24, this address is repeated (εἶπεν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ). Furthermore, both sections begin with a reference or allusion to death. Jesus outright predicts his own death in v. 21 (“it was [is] necessary for him ... to be killed”). In v. 24, he makes reference to the cross, which connotes death by execution.<sup>19</sup> Finally, both of these two sections are fronted by the adverb τότε (21, 24).

This second section can further be divided into four sections: a conditional followed by three ground (γάρ) statements. Verse 24 expresses the main point in a conditional statement, “If someone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me.” Following Jesus demands denial of oneself and one's life.

Verse 25 provides the first ground of Jesus' initial statement in an apparently paradoxical

---

<sup>17</sup> “Ver. 21 ... marks pointedly a new departure in the form of explicit intimation of an approaching final and fatal crisis. ... He then *began* to show, etc., **for this was only the first of several communications of the same kind.**” [Emphasis mine] W. Robertson Nicoll, *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 226. This verb sets the first passion prediction as paradigmatic for all three. This verb is notably missing from the other two passion predictions (17.22–23; 20.17–19). Concerning Peter, the reader will note that this is not his last misunderstanding or opposition to Jesus' messianic mission. Peter misunderstood the meaning of the transfiguration (17.4), and denied knowing Jesus three times in the courtyard of the high priest (26.69–75). [The disciples as a group misunderstand and oppose Jesus' messianic mission (18.1; 19.13–14; 20.21–22; 26.14–16, 51, 56).]

<sup>18</sup> Although these two sections can be differentiated, they are unified by their subject matter. Suffering is the ongoing thread of Jesus' discourse, either by him or by his disciples. Luz notes, “It is best to take vv. 21–28 together, although in v. 24 Jesus begins anew and speaks now to all the disciples, not simply to Peter. In terms of content they are a unit. A single arch extends from the suffering of Jesus through the suffering of the disciples who follow him to the final coming of the Son of Man. The section outlines a perspective of the totality of discipleship.” Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 380.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Excursus One.



form.

ὅς γὰρ ἐὰν θέλῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ σῶσαι ἀπολέσει αὐτήν.  
ὅς δ' ἂν ἀπολέσῃ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν.

Encapsulated within a conditional statement, the verse has an A B B' A' verbal parallelism, where A concerns saving/finding<sup>20</sup> one's life and B concerns losing it. Verse 26 contains a set of rhetorical questions that express the impossible exchange for one's life.<sup>21</sup> Verse 27 describes the recompense that every person will receive at the coming of the Son of Man.

This second section (24–28) fits together both logically and thematically. Whereas the conjunction γὰρ provides logical coherence, repetition of “catch phrases”<sup>22</sup> stitch these verses together.

θέλω : vv. 24–25  
ψυχή: vv. 25–26  
ἄνθρωπος ... ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: vv. 26–27  
δίδωμι ... ἀποδίδωμι: vv. 26–27  
ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου: vv. 27–28

Although Jesus specifically addresses the disciples (21, 24), the implied reader is included by the use of generalized references, much like in the MD. Verses 24–27 in particular use generalized references: τις (24), ὅς ἐὰν ... ὅς ἂν (25), ἄνθρωπος<sup>23</sup> (26), rhetorical questions<sup>24</sup> (26), and ἐκάστῳ<sup>25</sup> (27).

---

<sup>20</sup> In this verse, σῶζω and εὐρίσκω should be taken as synonyms for two reasons: one, on account of the verbal parallelism of ἀπόλλυμι, and two, on account of the double use of the verb εὐρίσκω in the doublet verse in 10.39.

<sup>21</sup> Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 379.

<sup>22</sup> Davies and Allison note that although Matthew prefers thematic connections, here is a strong instance of catchword links. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 668.

<sup>23</sup> “Practically equiv. to the indef. pron., w. the basic mng. of ἄ.” BDAG, s.v. ἄνθρωπος, 4.

<sup>24</sup> Although he does not cite this passage, Gibbs includes rhetorical questions in his list of “inclusive” techniques. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 20.

<sup>25</sup> BDAG indicates that as a substantive, it means “each one” or “every one”. This word is commonly followed by a partitive genitive (e.g. Lk 13.15; Ac 2.38; Rom 14.12; 1 Cor 15.38; 16.2; Heb 11.21; Rev 21.21) which further specifies the larger whole or group being specified. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 85. The partitive

Verse 28 is difficult in terms of both structure and meaning. This paper will not argue for a particular interpretation of this verse,<sup>26</sup> but we would do well to consider its place in the structure of 16.24–28. On the one hand, both 27 and 28 make clear reference to the coming of the son of man, repeating the “catch phrase”, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Verse 28, however, shifts from the rest of the passage in several ways. First, it is not joined by the conjunction γάρ. Second, the flow of the passage is disrupted by the phrase, “truly I say to you”. Third, it does not use any generalizing features.<sup>27</sup> For these reasons, v. 28 does not fit with the tight structure of 24–27 but links more loosely by subject and catch-phrase.

### Context of 16.21–28

Kingsbury divides the book of Matthew into three parts, segmented by the repeated formula, Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς (4.17 and 16.21).<sup>28</sup> He argues that this unique Matthean formula “strongly denotes the beginning of a new phase in the ‘life of Jesus.’”<sup>29</sup> Carson, however, questions how strongly the two instances of this formula divide Matthew. He argues that this

---

genitive, however, is absent from Mt 16.27 as well as Jn 6.7; Ac 4.35; Rom 2.6; 12.3 BDAG, s.v. ἕκαστος, b. In three of these cases, Jn 6.7; Ac 4.35; Rom 12.3, the group to which “each” belongs is found in the near context. For the remaining two instances, Mt 16.27 and Rom 2.6, the group to which “each” belongs is all mankind. In the case of Rom 2.6, two of the preceding verses (2.1, 3) use the vocative of ἄνθρωπος in a generalizing way. Cf. BDAG, s.v. ἄνθρωπος, 4. In Mt 16.27, the recurrent use of the generalizing features in the preceding context leads the reader to also take this instance of ἕκαστω as a generalizing feature.

<sup>26</sup> One of the key difficulties with 16.28 is what it means to see “the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.” Many interpretations take this to refer to events during or shortly after Jesus' life, including Jesus' entire ministry, the transfiguration, the Resurrection, or Pentecost. Some take this to refer to the parousia, which may or may not have proved Jesus to be in error. For an excellent summary of many of these interpretations, see Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 380–382.

<sup>27</sup> Although Jesus does use an indefinite pronoun, τινες (28), the genitive phrase that follows it, τῶν ᾧδε ἐστῶτων οἳ τινες, essentially acts as a demonstrative, specifying the people of which he is speaking.

<sup>28</sup> Kingsbury, however, does not stand alone. His work relies upon Lohmeyer, Stonehouse, Krentz, Klostermann, and others. For a more complete discussion, see Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*, (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1975), 7–17.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, 8.

expression does not so much divide but strongly links the texts to either side of this formula.<sup>30</sup>

The function of this Matthean formula bears significantly upon our analysis of the 1PP. The classification of 16.21 as a major break, will affect how the implied reader will consider the previous section in interpreting the 1PP. If 16.13–20 and 16.21–28 are a continuous passage, Peter's confession in 16.16 (“you are the Christ”) contrasts sharply with his objection in 16.22 (“this will not happen to you”). If, however, these two sections are divided by a major break in 16.21, then Peter's confession and objection are not so starkly juxtaposed.

Kingsbury's use of the phrase, Ἀπὸ τότε ἦρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς, as a division marker seems to be counterintuitive to the flow of the narrative in chapter sixteen. Aside from this phrase, there is no indication of any break in the conversation that began in 16.13. Jesus' audience, the disciples (and specifically Peter), does not change (16.13, 20, 21, 24). Neither does the location, Caesarea Philippi (16.13), change until 17.1. Finally, the thought progression in 16.13–28 seems continuous, concerned with Jesus' identity and the ramifications of such identity not only for himself but also for his disciples. On these observations, one would doubt Kingsbury's proposal that 16.21 could mark a new major section.<sup>31</sup>

Kingsbury's proposal, however, does not necessarily preclude strong contextual ties bridging over this Matthean phrase. “[T]hese three parts comprising Matthew's story are not to be conceived of in static terms as large blocks of material separate from one another.”<sup>32</sup> So with respect to chapter sixteen, v. 21 can be understood as the beginning of a new phase in Jesus' life, yet it does not necessarily divide the text in such a way that the reader would not make textual connections between the two sides of that divide (16.13–20 and 16.21–28). Thus even with

---

<sup>30</sup> Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 376.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Carson, *Matthew 1–12*, 50. also Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 380.

<sup>32</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 40. contra. Carson, *Matthew 1–12*, 50.

Kingsbury's structure, the 1PP can still be read closely with the preceding section, 16.13–20.

On this account, the preceding section, 16.13–20, is strongly juxtaposed with the 16.21–28. In 16.13–20, Peter is commended (“Blessed are you, Simon”) for his confession of Christ as the Son of God (16.17). In the latter section, Peter is rebuffed (“Get behind me, Satan”) for his objection to Christ's prediction of his suffering and death<sup>33</sup> (16.23). The reader is left to conclude that Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection must therefore be a necessary part to confessing Jesus.<sup>34</sup>

After Peter is rebuked for his objection (16.23), his prior confession (“You are the Christ”) is re-affirmed in the very next chapter. After the 1PP, Jesus takes Peter, James, and John up to a mount and is transfigured. A voice from the clouds says of Jesus, “This is my Son, whom I love; with him I am well pleased. Listen to him!” This divine confession echoes Peter's confession, even if Peter has proven that he does not understand the full import of what the Father has revealed to him (16.17).<sup>35</sup>

Between the MD and the 1PP, Jesus suffers repudiation in his ministry. The commissioning of the twelve takes place at the height of Jesus' apparent popularity. In 4:23–9:35, Jesus has encountered little resistance to his ministry of preaching, teaching, and healing. But as he sends out the twelve, Jesus warns them, even incipiently, of the resistance and repudiation that they themselves will suffer. This aspect of the MD only introduces the repudiation that Jesus himself will suffer in 11.2–16.20. This motif of repudiation reaches a climax in his first passion

---

<sup>33</sup> With the simple demonstrative, “*this* shall never happen to you” (16.22), Peter does not specify his objection. Does Peter object to Jesus' journey, suffering, death, or resurrection? It is difficult to imagine that Peter would be objecting to Christ's resurrection but only the suffering and death that precedes it.

<sup>34</sup> This contrast provides a crucial backdrop to Jesus' explanation of the paradoxical consequences of following Jesus (16.24–28). If the successful mission of Jesus includes his suffering and death, then those who follow him should not be surprised to find self-denial, suffering, or even death as part of “successful” discipleship.

<sup>35</sup> Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 79.

prediction. What was first introduced as rejection of the disciples will ultimately manifest itself in a rejection of the Son of Man upon the cross.<sup>36</sup>

Until this point, the disciples have been largely ignorant of the intended goal of Jesus' ministry. They witnessed Jesus' preaching and miracles. They themselves were even commissioned to do these same works. (10.7–8) The repudiation that Jesus predicts for the disciples in the MD he himself also suffers (11.2–16.20). Nevertheless, Jesus has not yet indicated that this repudiation will manifest itself in the central purpose of his ministry. In the 1PP, Jesus reveals that his suffering, death, and resurrection is the divinely established goal of his ministry.<sup>37</sup> The centrality of this goal is further reiterated in the other two passion predictions (17.22–23; 20.17–29). The implied reader has already been tipped off to this repetition with the use of ἡρξάτο in 16.21.

By the end of Matthew, the passion predictions come to fruition. Jesus journeys to Jerusalem and enters the city (21.1–11) to the acclamation of the crowds who, consistent with the report of the disciples (16.14), confess him to be a prophet (21.11). But at the initiation of the religious leaders, Jesus is arrested (26.47–56), beaten (26.67; 27.26–31), crucified, and dies (27.50). Yet Jesus and his divinely ordained mission are vindicated in his resurrection<sup>38</sup>, which is just as he had predicted it. In light of the entire narrative, the implied reader understands that Jesus' mission hangs on his suffering, death, and resurrection. Therefore, contrary to Peter's objection (16.22), any right confession of Christ must hold his passion and death as central.

---

<sup>36</sup> Ibid., 50–51

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., 78–79.

<sup>38</sup> “God resolves Jesus' conflict with Israel by showing that Jesus is in the right. Within the world of Matthew's story, however, Israel as such will not see God's vindication until the Parousia and the final judgment.” For a fuller treatment, see Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 90–92.

## CHAPTER THREE

### DIVISION AS A FOUNDATIONAL THEME

#### Division Between Various Groups

Divisiveness is characteristic of Matt 10:32–42. These divisions can be categorized in three ways: division by confession, division between personal and familial ties, and division between life and loss. These three types of division correspond to the first three sections of the text (32–33, 34–46, 37–39).

In the first section, 10.32–33, the implied reader is confronted with division as a function of confession. Those who confess Jesus publicly (ὅστις ὁμολογήσει ἐν ἐμοὶ ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων) are distinguished from those who deny Jesus publicly (ὅστις δ' ἂν ἀρνήσηται με ἔμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων). The already noted parallelism<sup>1</sup> bolsters the contrast between the two groups: those who confess Jesus versus those who deny him. Not only are these two groups divided in respect to their action, but they are also divided with respect to outcome. Those who confess Jesus are confessed by him before the Father. Those who deny Jesus are denied by him before the Father.

Next, Jesus divides between family members<sup>2</sup>. The implied reader is included once again by the generalizing noun, ἄνθρωπον. The division is explicit, with the use of διχάζω and the repeated use of the preposition κατά (“a man against his father ... daughter against his mother ...

---

<sup>1</sup> See Chapter Two.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 217.

daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law”). Verse 36 goes so far as to call family members enemies. They are set against one another, and the divisive factor is precedence of Jesus. With a strongly parallel statement, v. 37 reveals that the one who loves family members more than Jesus is found unworthy.<sup>3</sup>

Finally, 10.39 (“whoever finds his life will lose it...”) divides between those who would find their lives versus those who would lose them. The antithetic parallelism highlights the mutual exclusivity of these two generalized groups.

The division first indicated in 32–33 is extended to family members and even oneself.<sup>4</sup> As this theme of division progresses, the implied reader is expected to identify with one group or the other. There is no place for the casual observer. No one lies outside of the text. One either publicly confesses or denies Jesus (32–33). One's love is either supremely for Jesus or for family (37). One either finds his life or loses it (39).

The theme of division in 10:32–42 is maintained and even expanded in 16.21–28. Just prior to the passion prediction (16.21), Jesus has already effected a division of confession between the people (16.13) and the disciples (16.15), evidenced by their contrasting confessions. This division is borne out in the actual passion prediction and the resultant exchange between Peter and Jesus (16.21–23). Finally, Jesus divides between those who lose and save their lives (16.25), echoing the same distinction made in the MD (10.39). The progression of division in the 1PP is explained further in the next section.

---

<sup>3</sup> “The verse is not an attack on family relationships and natural attachments, but is a clear insistence that following Jesus is more important than family ties; if it is necessary to choose between the two loyalties, then a man ought to choose to follow Jesus.” David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew*, (London: Oliphants, 1972), 195.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Jeffery A. Gibbs, *Matthew 1:1–11:1*, (St. Louis.: Concordia Publishing House, 2006), 539.

## Confession as an Instrument of Division

Confession and denial play a central role in the theme of division, so we focus on division in the last portion of the MD (10.32–42). Confession or denial of Jesus is divisive, public, reciprocal, and has eschatological ramifications.

The divisive confession of Jesus is highlighted by the very structure of 32–33. These two verses form a clean, A B A' B' parallelism. This section describes two generalized groups: those who confess Jesus and those who deny Jesus. The verses are, in fact, identical except whereas v32 has ὁμολογέω, v33 replaces it with ἀρνέομαι.<sup>5</sup> Thus the point of individual division is also the point of linguistic distinction: confession or denial of Jesus.

Confession or denial of Jesus is both public and reciprocal. In 10.16–20 the disciples were specifically warned about their fate in confessing Jesus before men. But the promise and warning in vv. 32–33 are generalized statements which relate directly to Jesus and extend beyond the twelve to the implied reader. Jesus' *public* confession before the Father (ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ πατρὸς μου) is the promise given to those who *publicly* confess Jesus before men (ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων). On the other hand, those who *publicly* deny him will be thus denied in turn by Jesus before the Father. Thus one's public confession of Jesus is reciprocated before the Father.

This public, reciprocal confession has eschatological ramifications. These two verses (32–33) connote a legal environment<sup>6</sup>, making Jesus a witness either for or against the implied reader.

---

<sup>5</sup> Ὁμολογέω typically takes the accusative for its object (Jn 9.22, Ac 23.8, Rom 10.9 (uses ἐν + dat to express means, but there is an accusative), 1 Tim 6.12, 1 Jn 1.9, 1 Jn 2.23, 1 Jn 4.2f, 2 Jn 1.7, Rev 3.5), whereas this verse uses ἐν + dat (cf. Luke 12.8). BDAG argues that this is an Aramaism. BDAG, s.v. ὁμολογέω, 4.b cf. BDF, §220.2. The LXX uses ὁμολογέω fewer than 10 times, and it is never used with ἐν + dat. Whereas the parallel in Luke 12.8 uses the same construction, 2 Clem 3.2, uses the accusative in this saying. BDAG, s.v. ὁμολογέω, 4.b cf. Carson, *Matthew 1–12*, 256.

<sup>6</sup> Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 215.



Jesus is portrayed in a similar judicial role in the ED, where he divides between the sheep and the goats. The fate of every man depends entirely upon Jesus' testimony before the Father. "Jesus is thus not just a revealer but the focus of God's eschatological saving action and the criterion of judgment."<sup>7</sup> One's confession of Jesus is ultimately decisive, not only presently but also eschatologically.

As confession is an instrument of division in 10.32–42, it is also an instrument of division in the 1PP and its surrounding context. While the reciprocal confession of 10.32–33 is generalized and “theoretical”, the theme of reciprocal confession and denial is “played out” in the exchange between Jesus and Peter in chapter sixteen.

As Jesus speaks of public confession in 10:32–33 (ἐμπροσθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων), he also inquires about public confession prior to the 1PP. First, Jesus asks for the confession *of men*<sup>8</sup>, Τίνα λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (16.13). The connection between Jesus' inquiry and his statement in 10.32 is made all the stronger by the repeated use of the noun, ἄνθρωπος. After the confession “of men” is established, Jesus then provides his disciples the opportunity to declare their confession as well by means of a similar question, “Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι” (16.15). The second person pronoun is redundant, thus emphasizing the subject—the disciples. This emphasis draws the division between men (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) and the disciples (ὕμεῖς) into clearer focus. These two groups are contrasted based upon their confession. This contrast is at first only implied by the repetition of the question to the disciples. If “men” had made the correct confession, why would Jesus have poised the question again to his own disciples? This contrast between the confession “of men” and the confession of the disciples then

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

<sup>8</sup> See footnote 31.

becomes explicit in the affirmation of Peter's own confession.

Peter's confession, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God" (16.16), is met with a threefold affirmation<sup>9</sup>, whereas the confession "of men" (v14) is unaffirmed. This indicates to the implied reader that the confession "of men" is false while Peter's confession is true. Whereas in 10:32–33 the contrast is between confession or denial, in 16:13–20, the contrast is between the *source* of that confession: either men or the Father. Peter's confession is acceptable on account of the fact that it was revealed to him by the Father, not by "flesh and blood."<sup>10</sup> Μακάριος εἶ, Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα οὐκ ἀπεκάλυψέν σοι ἀλλ' ὁ πατήρ μου ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

If Peter's confession is thus confirmed then the implied reader will matrix this with Jesus' earlier statements on reciprocal confession (10:32–33) and understand that Peter's confession will be reciprocated in the eschaton. Thus Peter has "played out" the role of public confessor (10.32), but ironically, Peter will likewise "play out" the role of the public denier (10.33) in the verses that follow.

After Peter's confession and subsequent affirmations (16.16–19), Jesus plainly reveals to the disciples the necessity (δεῖ) of his suffering, death, and resurrection (16.21). But Peter contradicts this prediction and expresses his desire that Jesus would not need to undergo such things (οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο). If, however, Jesus' suffering, crucifixion, and resurrection was a necessary part to his messianic mission<sup>11</sup>, then Peter's response indicates not merely a

---

<sup>9</sup> The first affirmation, "Blessed are you..." (16.17), indicated that Peter's confession was a product of divine (not human) revelation. With the second affirmation, "I also say to you..." (16.18), Jesus declared Peter's confession to be the foundation-stone of the church ("on this rock..."). The third affirmation (16.19) is the bestowal of the "keys to the kingdom".

<sup>10</sup> "Refers to a *human being* in contrast to God and other transcendent beings" BDAG, s.v. σὰρξ, 3.a.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 656.

misunderstanding of Jesus' messiahship, but a flat-out denial of it<sup>12</sup>.

Peter's denial of Jesus and his messiahship is further evidenced by Jesus' response to Peter in v23 ("Ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, Σατανᾶ). This response resembles Jesus' final response to Satan in 4.10, "Ὑπαγε, Σατανᾶ. Jesus repeats the same verb and uses the vocative of Σατανᾶς, leading the implied reader to infer a connection between Satan's temptation and Peter's response. As Satan sought to deter Jesus from his mission as the true Son of God<sup>13</sup>, likewise, Peter, by his response, would deter Jesus from his messianic goal. Jesus equates Peter's opposition to his suffering, death, and resurrection to a stumbling stone that is in line with the will of Satan and is contrary to the mind of God.

Jesus' rebuke of Peter indicates more than mere ignorance of God's messianic plan. Jesus has already indicated that in the eschaton, the Son of Man will gather together all stumbling stones and workers of wrongdoing (πάντα τὰ σκάνδαλα καὶ τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὴν ἀνομίαν) (13.41), and will cast them out of the Kingdom and punish them. Thus Jesus' identification of Peter (and by extension, his faulty confession) as a stumbling stone (16.23) implies the eschatological consequences of just such a denial of Jesus' messianic work.

Peter has confessed and denied Jesus in the same scene. The reciprocal confession and denial which Jesus explains in 10:32–33 is played out by Peter. He publicly confesses Jesus and is affirmed as having a revelation from the Father. When Peter publicly rebukes Jesus, he is identified as a stumbling stone, which is bound for eschatological judgment, which can be understood as denial before the Father in heaven. Yet whereas the reciprocal confession and

---

<sup>12</sup> Ἰλεώς σοι does not express a benign wish for God's grace as Jesus endures suffering and crucifixion, but a desire that such things *would not happen*. BAGD, 474.

<sup>13</sup> Gibbs, *Matthew*, 191–192.

denial that Jesus describes in 10.32–33 is eschatologically oriented, Peter's reciprocal confession and denial are in the *present*, although they certainly do not preclude eschatological ramifications.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### PRESENT LOSS

The divisions forged by confession or denial of Jesus manifest themselves in present and eschatological gain and loss. In the MD, the structure of 10:32–42 displays this manifestation nicely. The first section (32–33) sets gain and loss as an eschatological function of confessing Jesus. The second and third sections (34–39) describe the present loss that will be experienced on account of Jesus by anyone who follows him. The fourth section (40–42), however, describes the eschatological gain that will be experienced by those who confess him.

As far as divisions that manifest themselves in gain and loss, the 1PP functions similarly to 10:32–42. In the 1PP, gain and loss are also set as a function of confessing Jesus. Although the 1PP does not have an explicit statement about reciprocal confession like 10:32–33, Peter “plays out” both the parts of reciprocal confession and denial in 16:13–23. The cross-bearing saying and the finding/losing saying (16:24–25) indicate the loss that the follower of Jesus would suffer. The final two verses of the 1PP (16:27–28) have a similar eschatological orientation to 10:40–42. But whereas 10:40–42 only describes the eschatological reward for receiving Jesus, 16:27–28 is broader, describing the eschatological fate of *all* at the hands of the Son of Man.

Both of these passages entail both present and eschatological gain and loss. This chapter will take up the subject of present loss in the MD and the 1PP. (There is no corresponding present gain in these passages.) Chapter five will take up the subject of eschatological gain and loss.

## **Repudiation of the Twelve**

In 4:23–9:35, Jesus has encountered little resistance to his ministry of preaching, teaching, and healing. But as he sends out the twelve, Jesus warns them, even incipiently, of the resistance and repudiation that they themselves will suffer. (10.16–23) The twelve will be arrested (10.19), beaten (10.17), and betrayed unto death, even by their own families (10.21). Furthermore, this repudiation is purely on account of their association with Jesus (10.22). The twelve will lose freedom, health, familial ties, and even their own lives on account of Jesus.

This loss is underscored by the shift from the disciples' active role (10.5b–15) to a passive role (10.16–23).<sup>1</sup> Not only are the twelve repudiated, but they lose their status as initiators. “10.16b signals a corresponding shift in the substance of Jesus' directives. Here Jesus no longer instructs his disciples what initiatives to take in their ministry but rather what responses to make to the persecution which that ministry will arouse: 'Therefore, be wise as serpents and innocent as doves.’”<sup>2</sup> Therefore the twelve suffer their loss passively, even willingly. Jesus instructs the disciples not to worry about their witness in the midst of their persecution. (10.19) Jesus also tells them not to fear their fate at the hands of persecutors (10.26, 28, 31).

## **Every Disciple's Present Loss**

In the latter portion of the MD (10.32–42), Jesus shifts from addressing the twelve to addressing every disciple. The loss which every disciple will face is on account of the division which Jesus inevitably brings.

In v. 34 with “do not think”, Jesus curbs present or potential expectations of his coming. This verse can be pictured in an A B B C progression, where the prohibition (“do not think”) is

---

<sup>1</sup> Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 90–91.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 92.

A, the saying about peace (“I came to bring peace”) is B, and the saying about the sword (“but a sword”) is C. Note that A and B are both in the negative while C, in contrast, is in the positive. Verses 34 and 35 link together by the triple use of ἦλθον<sup>3</sup>, and focus in on the implicit question: what does Jesus' coming bring? First, it does not bring peace. Second, Jesus' coming does bring a sword. Third, what follows in v. 35 is the description of the results of Jesus coming, what the "sword" and "not peace" looks like. Three syntactically parallel pairs (“a man against his father”, “a daughter against her mother”, “a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law”)<sup>4</sup> describe the division within a family. Verse 36 (“A man's enemies will be his own household”) then is merely a generalizing summary of the pairs in v. 35.

Thus the division that results from the confession of Jesus is, for one thing, a loss of familial relationships. This severing of family ties is no unhappy coincidence but the direct result of Jesus' coming.<sup>5</sup>

While 34–36 deal with the results of Jesus coming, 37–39 deal with the worthiness of the disciple.<sup>6</sup> This section is differentiated, however by the resumption of generic personal statements, which include the implied reader in the state of affairs he has introduced. The three parallel pairs form a “crescendo of denial” which culminates in the cross-bearing saying (38).<sup>7</sup> Priority of family or self above Jesus makes one unworthy to be a disciple of Jesus.

The progression of the parallelism in vv. 37–39 leads the implied reader to understand that the disciple will not only lose close family relationships on account of Jesus (34–36), but the

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Chapter Two, Structure of 10.32–42

<sup>4</sup> Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 291.

<sup>5</sup> The infinitive, διχάσαι, is best taken as indicating result. cf. Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 114.

<sup>6</sup> Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 107.

<sup>7</sup> See Excursus One.

disciple can ultimately expect to lose his own life. This loss of life entails such self-denial that may even include death.<sup>8</sup>

Now we transition to the 1PP, where we will find the same theme of temporal loss. 16.24–26, like the latter part of the MD, uses generalizing statements that extend the addressee beyond the twelve to any potential disciple. Although Jesus is speaking to his disciples (“Jesus said to his disciples”, 24), the protasis of the cross-bearing statement does not use the second person plural but the indefinite pronoun, “if *someone* (τις) wishes to come after me...” (24), including any would-be disciple, not the least of which is the implied reader. This generalized reference is reinforced again<sup>9</sup> with the double use of the relative pronoun (“*whoever* wants to save his life ... *whoever* loses his life”) in v. 25 and the double use of ἄνθρωπος<sup>10</sup> (“What does it profit a man ... what can a man give”) in v. 26. So what these verses may have to say about loss not only apply to the twelve but also apply to any would-be disciple. What, then, do these verses have to say about present loss?

Whereas the cross-bearing saying in the MD served as the apex of a “crescendo of denial”, the cross bearing saying in the 1PP is the main point of its second section (16.24–28). Although the two cross sayings serve different structural functions, their meaning is essentially the same. Those who desire to follow Jesus must be prepared to take up their cross, that is, to submit themselves to self-denial and the possibility of death.<sup>11</sup> Such is the present loss of the disciple.

The finding/losing saying in 16.25 (“whoever wants to save his life...”) has an A B B' A'

---

<sup>8</sup> See Excursus One.

<sup>9</sup> Since the structure of 16.24–27 ties 24 together with 25–27, it is best to understand the generalizing features to function similarly throughout.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. footnote 31.

<sup>11</sup> See Excursus One.



structure. The AB pair refer to a different generalized person than the B'A' pair. The inclusion of the verb, θέλη in the first half of the verse further differentiates the first and the second generalized person. The inclusion of θέλη implies that the person who ultimately loses their life had only *desired* to save it, but could not, whereas one who ultimately finds their life is the one who had *in actuality* lost it first.<sup>12</sup> If this implication is correct, then it is only the second person (described by the B'A' pair) who gains his life. The first person (described by the AB) pair is never said to have actually saved his but only to have desired to save it. In either case, life is lost, even if it is later to be gained.

16.26 follows with two rhetorical questions<sup>13</sup> that point out the futility in the non-disciple's quest. The first question (τί γὰρ ὠφελήσεται ἄνθρωπος ἔαν τὸν κόσμον ὅλον κερδήσῃ τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῆ;) evaluates the exchange of the world for a man's life. This first question is reminiscent of Satan's offer to Jesus to deliver up to him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory, πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν (4.8). In light of this connection to Satan's offer, the answer is obvious. The implied reader will understand that since Jesus rebuffed just such an offer from Satan (4.10), then a man does not profit to gain the world and yet lose his life. The second question, is nearly a restatement of the first<sup>14</sup> (τί δώσει ἄνθρωπος ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ;). The conclusion derived from both these rhetorical question is plain: there is nothing anyone can give in exchange for his life.

When 16.25 is matrixed with 16.26, the reader derives a conclusion concerning life and

---

<sup>12</sup> See Excursus Two.

<sup>13</sup> Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 379.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 379. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Matthew*, 672. Luz, *Matthew 8–20*, 385.

loss. If only the person who loses his life ends up finding it, and there is nothing anyone can give in exchange for his life, then it is inevitable: any would-be follower of Jesus can expect nothing other than the loss of his life.

### **Repudiation of Jesus and Solidarity with Every Disciple**

Between the MD and the 1PP, Jesus suffers repudiation in his ministry. While in the MD the commissioning of the twelve takes place at the height of Jesus' apparent popularity, Jesus nevertheless warns that discipleship will inevitably result in division and hardship. This dour news only introduces the repudiation that Jesus himself will suffer in 11:2–16:20 primarily at the hands of the religious leaders. The conflict is relentless in the text. The religious leaders object when the disciples pick grain on the Sabbath (12.1–8). Jesus questions the religious leaders about healing on the Sabbath (12.9–13), after which the leaders determine to kill him (12.14). The Pharisees accuse Jesus of demon possession (12.24), but Jesus sharply rebukes them (12.34, 39). Even the citizens of his own hometown were offended at him (13.57). The religious leaders clash with Jesus again in chapter fifteen, when they accuse him of violating the tradition of the elders (15.2). Finally, in chapter sixteen, the religious leaders ask for another sign (cf. 12.38), but Jesus meets their request with the same answer: they will only receive the sign of the prophet Jonah (cf. 12.39). This motif of repudiation reaches a climax in his first passion prediction. Not only has Jesus been wrongly confessed by the people (16.14), but his rejection will be made complete by his suffering and death at the hands of the religious leaders (16.20).<sup>15</sup>

This development of repudiation should not surprise the implied reader. This shared repudiation echoes the work shared between Jesus and his disciples. In the MD, the disciples

---

<sup>15</sup> Kingsbury speaks more extensively on the repudiation of Jesus. Kingsbury, *Matthew*, 50–51.

were commissioned to preach the same message and do the same works as Jesus, thereby expressing Jesus' solidarity with them. But also in the MD, Jesus warns not only the twelve but all disciples of the repudiation they will face on account of him and their confession of him. In the text between the MD and the 1PP (11.2–16.20), the conflict with the religious leaders escalates, and it comes to a head when Jesus explicitly predicts his own rejection—his suffering and death. Thus the repudiation of the disciples described in the MD and the repudiation of Jesus in the 1PP bracket this larger section of repudiation<sup>16</sup>. Furthermore, this shared common rejection expresses Jesus' solidarity with his disciples. Thus the solidarity between Jesus and his disciples is exhibited on two separate levels: messianic activity and repudiation. This two-level solidarity may be diagrammed as follows:

4.17–9.34	9.35–11.1 (MD)	11.2–16.28
Jesus messianic activity	The twelve commissioned for messianic activity Disciples repudiated	Jesus repudiated

These two levels of solidarity merge in Jesus' passion and crucifixion. The disciples' suffering in the MD functions to anticipate Jesus' own suffering. As the disciples would be handed over to the authorities and flogged (10.17), Jesus was handed over to the Sanhedrin (26.57) and abused there (26.67–68). As the disciples would stand trial before governors and rulers and bear witness (10.18), Jesus stood before Pilate and confessed himself to be king (27.11). As the disciples would bear their cross (10.38), Jesus was crucified (27.35) as he had predicted (16.21). But Jesus' suffering and death, which epitomizes the solidarity with his

---

<sup>16</sup> This is further evidenced on a more fine-grain level by the repetition of both the cross-bearing sayings (10.38; 16.24) and the finding/losing sayings (10.39; 16.25). In the MD, both of these sayings have only the backdrop of the disciples' suffering and rejection. In the 1PP, however, these sayings are further informed by Jesus' own repudiation and the prediction of his suffering and death.

disciples through his repudiation, is also the locus of his messianic activity<sup>17</sup>. In other words, Jesus is most closely united to his disciples in his suffering, death, and resurrection (cf. 16.21). Thus the loss that the disciple will experience is linked directly to Jesus' own loss through the image of the cross.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> See Chapter Two, Context of 16.21–28.

<sup>18</sup> See Excursus One.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### ESCHATOLOGICAL GAIN AND LOSS

The tone of 10.32–42 is, according to Hagner, "unmistakably eschatological."<sup>1</sup> This character of this text is highlighted by the use of the futures in 32–33: ὁμολογήσει, ὁμολογήσω, ἀρνήσομαι. Jesus promises to those who publicly confess him in the present that he will publicly them before the Father. Jesus' eschatological judgment is tied to the Father.<sup>2</sup> This eschatological tone is even more unmistakable in 16.27. Jesus, the Son of Man, comes in the glory of his Father (cf. 25.31) and judges each person.<sup>3</sup> The present confession or denial of Jesus results in the eschatological acceptance or denial before the Father. Let us first turn our attention to 10.40–42.

The fourth section of our passage from the MD (10.40–42) reiterates the correlation between present confession/denial and future acceptance (cf. 10.32–33). Verses 40–42 consist of four generalized sayings that center around receiving. The first three sayings all begin with the same generic substantive participle: ὁ δεχόμενος. The first saying ("The one who receives you receives me, and the one who receives me receives the one who sent me.") presents the logical thrust of the whole section. It is a parallel of transference (A B B C), where the reception of Jesus becomes the middle term. The sayings in 41 vary only slightly from one another, exchanging "prophet" for "righteous one". The second half of the fourth saying ("because he is a

---

<sup>1</sup> Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 288.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. 25.34.

<sup>3</sup> Considering the similar images of the Son of Man coming in glory, compare ἐκάστῳ (16.27) with πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (25.32), which indicates all the people of the world. Cf. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 217.

disciple") ties together with the second half of the second and third sayings, which refer to "a prophet" and "a righteous man" respectively. This leads one to suspect that giving one of the "little ones" a cup of cold water is roughly equivalent to receiving them. Thus reception of Jesus is a matter of transference. To receive a disciple is to receive Jesus.

In vv. 40–42, the present and the eschatological become inextricably tied in the reception of the disciple. One's present reception of a disciple, because it is also the reception of Jesus, is an assurance of the eschatological reward. This is the counterpart to 32–33, only whereas 32–33 indicate the eschatological gain and loss that results from confession or denial of Jesus, 40–42 provides encouragement for the implied reader<sup>4</sup> by focusing solely upon the eschatological gain

In the 1PP, 16.27–28 is the most overtly eschatological. This description of the Son of Man's Parousia is only one of several in the book of Matthew that bear strong resemblance to the "one like a son of man" in Daniel 7. These accounts in Matthew bear at least three similarities. One, the coming of the Son of Man is a glorious one. The Son of Man comes on the clouds with glory (24.30; 25.31) and sits on a glorious throne (19.28; 25.31). Verse 27 ("the Son of Man will come in the glory of his father") affirms that this glory is actually the Father's glory (cf. 26.64). Two, the Son of Man's coming involves angels (24.31; 25.31).<sup>5</sup> Three, the coming of the Son of Man involves judgment or recompense (25.34–36; 25.41–43). Jesus' use of the title, "Son of Man" indicates his divine authority and role as judge in his Parousia.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Gibbs, *Jerusalem and Parousia*, 220.

<sup>5</sup> The angels "both enhance his glory and serve as his agents for the eschatological ingathering (13:41; 24:21; 25:31–32; Luke 9:26)." Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 379.

<sup>6</sup> In a much broader study of Jesus' use of "the Son of Man", Kingsbury says, "The purpose for which Jesus employs "the Son of man" is multiple: to assert his divine authority in the face of opposition; to tell his disciples what the "public," or "world" (Jews and Gentiles), is about to do to him; and to predict that he whom the world puts to death God will raise and that, exalted to universal rule, he will return in splendor as Judge and consequently be seen by all as having been vindicated by God." Kingsbury, *Matthew as Story*, 103.

Unlike 10.40–42, where Jesus promises an eschatological reward, the Son of Man's Parousia in 16.27 expands to include both eschatological gain and loss. Jesus will return and “give to each person according to his work<sup>7</sup>” (ἀποδώσει ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν αὐτοῦ). At his Parousia, Jesus will judge for some and against other. Division becomes manifest eschatologically, and at the Parousia there will be both gain and loss.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> “On the singular, [πραξιν], Bengel, *ad loc.*, appropriately remarked: ‘in the singular, for the whole life of man is one doing’ (cf. Schweizer, *Matthew*, p. 347).” Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 646. cf. Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 379.

<sup>8</sup> Although 16.27 does not explicitly indicate that Jesus' eschatological judgment is divisive, it is certainly open to such interpretation. This is evidenced by the ambivalence of ἀποδίδομι, “to recompense, *whether in a good or bad sense.*” [emphasis mine] BDAG, s.v. ἀποδίδομι, 4. Furthermore, considering the already noted parallels between this verse and the ED (specifically 25.31–46), the implied reader will matrix this passage with the ED and understand that in the Parousia, Jesus will mete out eternal life to some and eternal punishment to others (25.46). Thus “give to each person according to his work” becomes shorthand for the divisive judgment described in 25.31–46.

## CHAPTER SIX

### THE FINDING/LOSING SAYINGS

The themes of gain and loss are most clearly present in the doublet of the finding/losing sayings (10.39 and 16.25). I have eschewed any extensive treatment of these sayings until now because they serve as both the summary and organizational foci of the themes of gain and loss in both 10.32–42 and 16.21–28. I will first argue how each of the finding/losing sayings play a structurally focal role and fit thematically within these passages.

In the MD, the structure of v39 is reminiscent of vv. 32–33, having two sets of parallel phrases. But whereas vv. 32–33 replicate the structure but change the verbs (A B A' B'), v39 swaps the verbs (A B B' A'), creating a paradox. This verse pulls the text back into the strong eschatological perspective of 32–33 with the use of the futures. Yet this verse does not leave behind the sense of present divisiveness and corresponding loss.

With the parallelism in vv. 37–39, those described by the generic substantive pronouns (“the one who loves...”) are those who uphold members of their family higher than Jesus. The division within a family, then, is not one member against another but the division between those whose ultimate allegiance lies with Jesus and those whose ultimate allegiance lies with their own household. This question of allegiance is extended even to oneself. Those who deny Jesus (33) are those who love others or self more than him. Those who love others or self more than him are the ones in v. 39 who are seeking their lives, only to lose them. But in contrast, those who lose their lives, namely those who love Jesus above others and self, will be the ones to ultimately find



their lives.

What it means to find one's life is further fleshed out in 10.40–42. As established previously, the reception of a disciple, transferred to Christ, ensures the eschatological reward. Verse 42 ensures the reader of this fact with a strong negative, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. The repetition of ἀπόλλυμι gives the reader good reason to link the “reward” with the life which will be found in v39b (καὶ ὁ ἀπολέσας τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ εὐρήσει αὐτήν).

Thus v. 39 serves as a bridge where 39a fits with 10.37–38 and 39b fits with 10.40–42. Those who love others or self more than Jesus in the present will lose their lives, while those who loves Jesus above all others will gain their lives—the eschatological reward given to all disciples.

Moving on to the 1PP, the finding/losing saying (16.25) also plays a structurally focal role in this passage as well. In the second half of the 1PP (16.24–28), the saying on cross-bearing is primary point of the section. Following Jesus entails not only self-denial but even death, which is connoted by the cross. Thus the implied reader will link the cross (24) to the idea of losing one's life in (25). Yet this idiom is vague enough that one cannot create a one-to-one correspondence between losing one's life (25) and death by crucifixion (24).

Verses 25 and 26 are linked by the repetition of ψυχή. Furthermore, v26 echoes the theme of gain and loss with κερδαίνω<sup>1</sup> and ζημιόω.<sup>2</sup> In addition to the verbal parallels, there are also structural parallels between 25 and 26. The finding/losing saying in 16.25 has A B B' A' structure (cf. 10.39). The apodosis of the conditional part of the question in 16.26 (“but forfeits his life”) is

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. BDAG, s.v. κερδαίνω, 1.a.

<sup>2</sup> ἀπόλλυμι and ζημιόω are near synonyms, expressing the idea of loss. In the parallel passage, Luke uses them as a pair, ἀπολέσας ἢ ζημιωθείς. (Lk. 9:25).

nearly synonymous with B in 16.25 (“[he] will lose it”). If this is the case, that would make the protasis, “if he gains the whole world”, to be parallel to the protasis of the previous verse, “if a man wishes to save his life.” Thus both of these verses indicate a loss of life.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to these verbal and structural similarities, vv. 25 and 26 also serve similar functions. As evidenced by the conjunction γάρ, both of these verses provide the ground for the cross-bearing saying (24). The present loss of life that both these verses express is the ground for a disciples' self-denial, which is typified by the cross. Given its close proximity, the implied reader will link this mention of the cross and the death it portrays with the passion prediction in 16.21. The disciple follows the loss of his own life like a trail of breadcrumbs that leads back to the suffering and death of Jesus.

Paradoxically, however, the disciple also stands to gain his life on the very same account. The prepositional phrase, ἕνεκεν ἐμοῦ (16.25), indicates that the disciple will not find his life by just any means, but he will only find his life by losing it on account of his association with Jesus. The “trail of breadcrumbs” leads the disciple not only to lose his life but also to find it.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the section on Every Disciple's Present Loss in Chapter 4.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### CONCLUSIONS

The stated purpose of this paper at the outset was to explore the themes of gain and loss in Matt 10.32–42 and 16.21–28. As should be evident from this paper, an isolated analysis of these themes would do great injustice to these texts. The themes of gain and loss are inextricably tied to other themes in these passages, most notably the themes of division and confession.

Furthermore, there is not only a repetition but a development of all these themes between the two texts. Here I offer a brief explanation and summary of how these themes interrelate.

Division is perhaps one of the most ubiquitous themes in the book of Matthew, and is certainly prevalent in both of the texts under analysis. In 10.32–33 one's public confession or denial of Jesus divides between those who are eschatologically confessed or denied before the Father. The allegiance denoted by one's confession of Jesus also brings division within families. Confession of Jesus either directly or indirectly causes division.

The correlation between confession and division is further developed in chapter sixteen. Confession and division in 10.32–42 remain “theoretical” in the sense that Jesus is using generic statements which includes any disciple. In chapter sixteen, however, Jesus becomes “concrete”, asking for the confession “of men” and the corresponding confession of the twelve. Ironically, Peter plays the role of both confessor and denier in the same passage. Jesus initially commends Peter for his confession, “You are the Christ”. When Jesus, however, amends his confession to include his own suffering, death, and resurrection, Peter then denies this confession of Jesus, for

which he is strongly rebuked. Confession or denial of Jesus not only causes division between “men” and the disciples, but it even causes division within Peter himself.

This division caused by confession or denial ultimately results in gain and loss. Put another way, gain and loss fall along the dividing lines that are established by confessing or denying Jesus. In the MD, Jesus clearly describes the loss that not only the twelve but all disciples will suffer on account of him. The division between family members that results from the confession of Jesus ultimately results in the loss of those familial ties. Furthermore, not only does a “Jesus confessor” stand to lose familial ties, but he also stands to lose his own life, which entails self-denial and potentially even physical death.

Yet the MD makes clear that present confession indicates future acceptance. Present confession of Jesus is eschatologically reciprocated, and those who receive a disciple (and by transference, receive Jesus) are assured of eschatological reward. Those who deny Jesus, however, are assured of their eschatological denial before the Father. Jesus and one's confession of him is the hinge upon which eschatological gain or loss is determined.

The gain and loss described in the MD is further underscored and developed in the 1PP. The repudiation of the disciples on account of Jesus is mirrored by Jesus himself. The present loss that the disciples are bound to face is epitomized in the suffering and death of Jesus. Since the fate of Jesus and the disciple are bound together, the disciple may expect to, in some sense, lose his life, even as his master will lose his own.

The eschatological ramifications of following Jesus are expanded in the 1PP. While in the MD, Jesus focuses primarily on the eschatological reward that awaits the disciple who receives him, the 1PP “zooms out”, considering the gain and loss experienced at the Son of Man's

Parousia. Jesus, the end-time judge, will judge for some but against others. His coming will bring to light the division already created by confessing or denying him.

## EXCURSUS ONE

### THE CROSS-BEARING SAYINGS

Immediately preceding the finding/losing sayings in both the MD (10.39) and the 1PP (16.25) are two similar statements on cross-bearing (10.38 and 16.24). The saying in the MD is a generalizing statement, phrased in the negative, that whoever does not bear his cross, following Jesus, is unworthy of him. In the 1PP, however, Jesus uses the saying on cross-bearing in the positive as a condition for discipleship. Here the saying is linked asyndentically with self-denial.

This pair, however, are neither morphologically nor syntactically identical. In 10.38, the verbs, λαμβάνει and ἀκολουθεί, are indicative whereas in 16.24, ἀράτω and ἀκολουθείτω, are subjunctive. Nevertheless, the parallelism is still evident, especially with the repetition of τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, ἀκολουθέω, and ὀπίσω μου.

	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>
10.38	λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ	ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου
16.24	ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ	ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν ἀκολουθείτω μοι

While the similarities between the cross-bearing sayings are apparent, their meaning is not. Studies on these sayings, in both Matthew and the synoptics as a whole, have resulted in a myriad of distinct, albeit often related, interpretations of the cross bearing sayings. Michael Green counts more than thirteen distinct interpretations of these sayings.<sup>1</sup> It is not my intention to address all of these interpretations but only to point out the considerable latitude in reading these

---

<sup>1</sup> Green only covers the various interpretations of Mark 8:34b, but most, if not all, of these interpretations could also be applied to Matthew's cross-bearing statements. He categorizes these views based upon their initial assumption of the text (e.g. literal or figurative). Green, "The Meaning of Cross-Bearing", *Bibliotheca Sacra*, April-June (1983) 117-128.

sayings. Nevertheless, something less specific may be said about these sayings that will find general consensus. I propose that the cross-bearing sayings encompasses at least these three things: (1) denial of self/submission to Christ, (2) the general image of death by crucifixion, and (3) the specific suffering and crucifixion of Christ.

In the MD, the cross-bearing saying comes at the end of a parallel triad of phrases. 10.37–38 are structured in an A B A B A B pattern. The structure can be diagrammed as follows:

	<i>A</i>			<i>B</i>
37a	Ὁ φιλῶν	πατέρα ἢ μητέρα	ὑπὲρ ἐμέ	οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος
37b	ὁ φιλῶν	υἶδον ἢ θυγατέρα	ὑπὲρ ἐμέ	οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος·
38	ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει	τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ	καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου	οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.

The first two phrases are almost identical, changing only the family members listed. In the third phrase (v38), B is identical to the two previous phrases, but A does not seem to make a clean parallel. Instead of ὁ φιλῶν, v. 38 has ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει. However, the relative pronoun here functions essentially the same way as the generic substantive participles.<sup>2</sup> The taking up of one's cross is the denial of oneself, even unto death.<sup>3</sup> This is the opposite of loving oneself. So the positive 'A' statements in v. 37 becomes a negative statement of roughly the same sense in v. 38.

Thus these three phrases in 10.37–38 form a “crescendo of denial.” The would-be disciple

<sup>2</sup> A substantive participle of λαμβάνω would be quite unusual. Substantive participles comprise more than twenty percent (1436 of the 6490) of the participles in the NT. One would then expect that the ratio for substantive participles for any given verb of any significant frequency would be similar. Λαμβάνω is used 77 times as a participle in the NT, about one-third of which (26) are found in Matthew. None of them, however, are used as substantives. In fact, only two out of the 77 in the NT are used substantively, and both of those uses are in the gospel of John. So it can be said that the substantive participle of λαμβάνω is never used in the book of Matthew. It also seems reasonable to say that considering the very low substantive percentage, that ὃς + finite verb is the expected usage.

<sup>3</sup> Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 221. cf. Hagner, *Matthew 1–13*, 293.

can give neither family members nor even self precedence over Jesus. Ultimate allegiance belongs to Christ, to the exclusion of all others, including self. Such submission is expressed in the act of following.<sup>4</sup>

The 1PP further reinforces this understanding of the cross-bearing saying to include self-denial and submission to Christ. Whereas the MD was implicit about self-denial, the 1PP is explicit. Jesus wraps the saying in a conditional, “If anyone wants to follow me,” setting up the three hortatory subjunctives as extension<sup>5</sup> of such discipleship. The action described in the protasis, ὀπίσω μου ἔλθεῖν (A), is reiterated in the apodosis with the verb, ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι (A'). These are describing one and the same action.<sup>6</sup> But the apodosis contains three third person aorist singular imperatives (C' B' A'), each joined by καί. Considering this parallelism, they are best understood as three closely related actions, if not all part of the same action. Since A' correlates with A, and C' and B' are describing actions parallel to A', then B' and C' are an expansion of A. Thus self-denial and following Jesus is part of the cross-bearing “package.” Although it is unclear as to precisely what image Jesus intended to conjure when he mentioned the cross<sup>7</sup>, we may at least say that the cross sayings encompass the exhortation to self-denial and submission

---

<sup>4</sup> Weaver argues that the cross-bearing sayings in the MD is specifically in reference to the deadly persecution described in 10.17–23. I believe this is too narrow an interpretation of the cross-bearing saying. Such persecution is predicted only specifically for the twelve. Since 10.38 is in more generalized context, the cross-bearing saying should likewise be broadened to include “utter self abnegation,” and not exclusively a willingness “to assume an active role in accepting the death-dealing violence directed at him.” Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 115. Contrast Carson, *Matthew*.

<sup>5</sup> “Death to self is not so much a prerequisite of discipleship to Jesus as a continuing characteristic of it.” Carson, *Matthew 13–28*, 379.

<sup>6</sup> Aside from simply being lexically similar ideas (i.e. going after is essentially synonymous with following), the verb, ἀκολουθεῖτω, and the prepositional phrase, ὀπίσω μου, are used together in 10.38, further bolstering their connection. Thus it is reasonable to take these actions synonymously.

<sup>7</sup> Much of the scholarly discussion surrounding the cross-bearing sayings are concerned with this point. Sources for interpreting the image of the cross include: proverbs, Jewish Zealotism, Pauline theology, Roman executionary practices, and various others. Green, “The Meaning of Cross-Bearing”, 117–129



to Jesus. “Whatever the original meaning of 10.38, and whether or not it goes back to Jesus himself, Matthew's intention is plain enough. 10.38 is interpreted by its context. 'Cross' is in the first instance a vivid metaphor which stands for utter self abnegation.”<sup>8</sup>

Being that a cross was a common implement of execution at the time of Matthew, the image of death by crucifixion factors into nearly every interpretation of the cross-bearing sayings. Green notes that the majority of interpretations begin with the image of crucifixion.<sup>9</sup> Fletcher argues that whether or not the disciple suffers martyrdom, the cross-bearing sayings induces him to think of himself as one who is condemned to die.<sup>10</sup> Weaver takes the cross to indicate “the death dealing-violence directed against *the individual disciple himself*. [emphasis original]”<sup>11</sup> Even between different interpretations of the cross-bearing sayings, the underlying image of death by execution emerges.<sup>12</sup>

The cross-bearing sayings are also informed by Christ's own crucifixion. In the 1PP, Jesus delivers the cross-bearing saying (16.24) shortly after he has predicted his own crucifixion (16.21). As mentioned earlier, Peter's rebuke of Jesus (16.22) is tantamount to a denial of his messianic mission. In contrast to Peter's denial of Jesus' messianic mission by his objection to the cross, the disciple is called to self-denial in conjunction with his own cross-bearing.

In summation, for all the varied interpretations of the cross-bearing sayings, a good argument can be made that these sayings encompass the idea of (1) self-denial unto Christ, (2)

---

<sup>8</sup> Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 223

<sup>9</sup> Green, “The Meaning of Cross-Bearing”, 118.

<sup>10</sup> Fletcher, “Condemned to Die: The Logion on Cross-Bearing: What Does It Mean?”, Interpretation 18 (1964), 164.

<sup>11</sup> Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 115.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 222–223. Carson, *Matthew 1–12*, 257.

the image of physical death by crucifixion, and (3) Jesus' own suffering and death on the cross.

## EXCURSUS TWO

### THE MEANING OF ΨΥΧΗ IN THE FINDING/LOSING SAYINGS

There is a great amount of debate regarding the finding/losing sayings (10.39; 16.25), specifically with reference to the meaning of “life” (ψυχή). BDAG highlights this difficulty: “It is oft. impossible to draw hard and fast lines in the use of this multivalent word. Gen. it is used in ref. to dematerialized existence or being, but, apart fr. other data, the fact that ψ is also a dog's name suggests that the primary component is not metaphysical, ... Without ψ a being, whether human or animal, consists merely of flesh and bones and without functioning capability”.<sup>1</sup> Since both of the finding/losing sayings (10.39 and 16.25) use ψυχή let us consider its possible meaning.

The word ψυχή is already multivalent, and it appears that Jesus is making some sort of implicit distinction with this word. This conclusion stands on three observations. One, the finding/losing sayings are logically incoherent without some sort of distinction. Two, Jesus has already established a distinction between two different kinds of death (and implicitly, life) earlier in the MD. Three, Jesus makes reference to *one* kind of death in the cross-bearing sayings.

Our first observation is that the finding/losing sayings are logically incoherent without some sort of distinction in the word, ψυχή. Let us assume for the sake of argument that Jesus *is* referring to the same thing when he uses the word ψυχή and the two pronouns for which it is their antecedent. If all four of these words make reference to the same “life”, then there is a seeming

---

<sup>1</sup> BDAG, s.v. ψυχή.

logical impossibility in Jesus' statement. If the one who finds his life loses it and the one who loses his life finds it, then finding and losing one's life become caught up in a hopelessly circular relationship. As soon as one claims to have found his life, it is lost, while as soon as one loses it, it is found.

For this reason, I propose that Jesus is speaking of two different kinds of life, and consequently, two different kinds of death. If this is the case, then the logical contradiction disappears. To illustrate this point, consider two different lives, L1 and L2. Jesus' statement could be rewritten as follows: The one who finds L1 loses L2, and the one who loses L1 finds L2. If this is the case, then these two lives become mutually exclusive of one another, but they do not form a logical contradiction.

Our second observation is that Jesus has already established a distinction between two different kinds of death (and implicitly, life) earlier in the MD. The prior section of the MD (10.26–31) is structured around three “fear” statements. Jesus instructs his disciples not to fear those who persecute them (26), not to fear those who can kill the σῶμα (“body”) but not the ψυχή (“soul”) (28), and not to fear because of their worth to the Father (28). The second fear statement is of particular importance.

Jesus asserts that a group exists that is able to kill the body, τῶν ἀποκτεννόντων τὸ σῶμα, but is unable to kill the soul. The referent of the plural substantive participle, τῶν ἀποκτεννόντων, is most likely the collective of those who stand opposed to the disciples and persecute them.<sup>2</sup> Their opposition, however, stops at the destruction of the body. These “men”

---

<sup>2</sup> The likely referent in the most immediate context is the third person plural pronoun in verse 26. But the antecedent of this pronoun goes all the way back to verse 17, where Jesus first warns the disciples about their rejection by men, τῶν ἀνθρώπων. These “men” will oppose (17–18) and hate (22) and persecute (23) the disciples. Seeing as these are the only men who have been designated who would seek the death of the disciples,

are unable to kill the soul, τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν μὴ δυναμένων ἀποκτείνει. Here there is a clear distinction between body and soul. Within this context, σῶμα seems to indicate the physical component of one's being. On the other hand, ψυχὴ seems to indicate the metaphysical component of one's being.<sup>3</sup> This distinction is further clarified by the remainder of the verse.

It is *crucial* to recognize that Jesus is indicating that physical death (ἀποκτείνω) results in the destruction of the σῶμα, but not the ψυχὴ. Eschatological death (again, ἀποκτείνω), which is through the Son of Man's authority, results in the destruction of both body and soul<sup>4</sup>.

Although those who persecute the disciples, “men”, are unable to damage one's ψυχὴ, one does exist who is able to kill both σῶμα and ψυχὴ, and that is the one whom the disciples are to fear. Thus Jesus is already operating with a distinction between the physical and the spiritual (or metaphysical), expressed by the words σῶμα and ψυχὴ. But more importantly, Jesus distinguishes between two groups and what they are able to kill. On the one hand, men are able to kill one's σῶμα, but on the other hand there is one who is able to kill both σῶμα and ψυχὴ. Thus the lexical distinction between σῶμα and ψυχὴ, is not the primary distinction, but **it is the type of death that the two groups are able to afflict.**

But who is this one who is able to kill both σῶμα and ψυχὴ? If this excludes men, then the two most likely candidates are Son of Man and Satan. Of these two, the Son of Man is the one who is able to kill both σῶμα and ψυχὴ in hell.<sup>5</sup> In the ED, it is the Son of Man who divides and judges between the sheep and the goats. He and not Satan sends those on his left to the fire

---

these same men must be the referent of the plural substantive participle.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 206.

<sup>4</sup> Jesus is not espousing dualism here.

<sup>5</sup> The Gospels designate Gehenna as the place of eschatological punishment, hell. BDAG, s.v. γέεννα.

of hell. Hell is not only the punishment of the unrighteous but also of Satan and his demons as well (25.41). The Son of Man is the one who can destroy both body and soul in hell at the last judgment.<sup>6</sup> Therefore the death of both σῶμα and ψυχή is an *eschatological death*.

Furthermore, there is also good reason that the one who can kill both body and soul in hell is *not* Satan. Within the immediate context of the MD, there are two reasons for this conclusion. One, the disciples are given power over the demonic realm, casting out Satan's demons just as Jesus had done. (10.8) With such authority over Satan and his minions, it would seem to be contrary to Jesus' commission to then instruct them to fear Satan. Two, the disciples are told not to fear those who malign them (10.26) and associate them with Satan (25), just as they did to Jesus. If Satan is to be feared, then why would Jesus tell them not to fear those men who would maliciously align them with Beelzebul?

Our third observation is that Jesus makes reference to one kind of death in the cross-bearing sayings. The cross-bearing sayings connote physical death by crucifixion and more specifically, Christ's own death on the cross.<sup>7</sup> Although the cross-bearing sayings do not use the word ψυχή, their close structural and thematic connection to the finding/losing sayings make this observation significant. Since these sayings make reference to physical death, the reader has good reason to matrix this with "losing one's life" in the very next verse (10.39 and 16.25).

These three observations support the assertion that Jesus is making an implicit distinction with the use of ψυχή in the finding/losing sayings. But what is this distinction? If there are two different "lives" to be found or lost, then what are these lives?

If such a distinction exists in the use of ψυχή, then it seems most reasonable to utilize the

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 207. Carson, *Matthew 1–12*, 254.

<sup>7</sup> See Excursus One.

distinction Jesus has already made in 10.28. Admittedly, Jesus distinguishes between a present and an eschatological death earlier in the MD by utilizing *two* words: σῶμα and ψυχή. As we have argued, however, the lexical distinction is not the primary distinction. It is the type of death that is the primary distinction. If this distinction is operative in 10.39, then it utilizes the multivalence of ψυχή to indicate two different kinds of life: one present and one eschatological.<sup>8</sup>

Thus the finding/losing saying in 10.39 could be expanded to read, “The one who finds his present life will lose his eschatological life, and the one who loses his present life will find his eschatological life.”

But if Jesus speaks of physical life and physical death, he likewise speaks of eschatological consequences which follow for those who 'find' their physical life and those who 'lose' it. The references in the future tense to 'losing' and 'finding' life respectively point to an eschatological 'losing' and 'finding' which will take place on the 'day of judgment' (10.15) and for which God is ultimately responsible (cf. 10.15, 22, 28, 32–33). Accordingly, the purpose of the two antithetically parallel statements of 10.39 is to link the present situation of the disciple of Jesus with his future situation on the 'day of judgment.'<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Davies and Allison express this distinction as “life” versus “eternal life.” “The emphasis in v. 39 is not upon literally losing one's life (martyrdom) but upon rigorous self-denial. Yet given the broader context, martyrdom is not, for Matthew, altogether out of view... Certainly 10.39 could be fittingly applied to such a situation: those who save their lives by dissociating themselves from Jesus will lose eternal life while those who lose their lives for Jesus' sake will find eternal life.” Davies and Allison, *The Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, 224.

<sup>9</sup> Weaver, *Matthew's Missionary Discourse*, 116.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, Dale C. "Matthew 10:26-31 and the Problem of Evil," *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 32 (1988): 293-308.
- Black, M. "'Not peace but a sword': Matt. 10:34ff; Luke 12:51" in E. Bammel and C. Moule (eds.) *Jesus and the Politics of His Day*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.
- Blomberg, Craig. *Matthew*. Nashville: Broadman Press. 1992.
- Buchanan, M. *The Gospel of Matthew*. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen. 1996.
- Burton, Ernest. *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 1923.
- Carson, D. A. *Matthew: Chapters 1-12*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. 1995.
- Carter, Warren. *Households and Discipleship: A Study of Matthew 19-20*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 1994.
- Carter, Warren. *Matthew and the Margins: A Socio-Political and Religious Reading*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press. 2000.
- Chouinard, Larry. *Matthew*. Joplin: College Press. 1997.
- Combrink, H. J. B. "Structural analysis of Mt 9.35-11.1" *Neotestamentica* 11(1977): 98-114.
- Dana, H.E., and Mantey, Julius R. *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1947.
- Davies, W. D. And Allison, Dale C. *The Gospel according to Matthew*. Vol. 2. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 1991.
- France, R. T. *Matthew: Evangelist and Teacher*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan. 1989.
- Fletcher, Donald R. "Condemned to Die: The Logion on Cross-Bearing: What Does It Mean?" *Interpretation* 18 (1964): 156-164.
- Hare, Douglas R. A. *Matthew*. Louisville: John Knox Press. 1993.
- Hendricksen, William. *Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House. 1973.
- Garrow, Alan J. P. *The Gospel of Matthew's Dependence on the Didache*. London: T & T Clark. 2004.



- Gibbs, Jeffery A. *Jerusalem and Parousia: Jesus' Eschatological Discourse in Matthew's Gospel*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew 1:1-11:1*. St. Louis.: Concordia Publishing House. 2006.
- Green, Michael P. "The Meaning of Cross-Bearing," *Bibliotheca Sacra* April-June (1983): 117-129.
- Goulder, M. D. *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK. 1974.
- Gundry, Robert H. *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1982.
- Hagner, Donald A. *Matthew 1-13*. in *Word Biblical Commentary*, Vol. 33a. Word: Dallas. 1993.
- Hiers, Richard H. "'Binding' and 'Loosing': The Matthean Authorizations," *JBL* 104/2 (1985): 233-250.
- Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew*. London: Oliphants. 1972.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. *Matthew*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Nappanee, Indiana: Evangel Publishing House. 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom*. Minneapolis: Fortress. 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew as Story*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Philadelphia: Fortress. 1988.
- Luz, Ulrich. *Matthew 8-20*. Philadelphia: Fortress. 2001.
- Marcus, Joel. "The Gates of Hades and the Keys of the Kingdom (Matt 16:18-19)," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 50 (1988): 443-455.
- Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1959.
- Moulton, James Hope. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 4 Vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, various dates.
- Nicoll, W. Robertson., ed. *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, Vol 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans. 1961.
- Ridgway, John K. *"Let Your Peace Come Upon It": Healing and Peace in Matthew 10:1-15*. New York: Peter Lang. 1999.
- Robertson, A. T. *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville. 1923.
- Sanders, E. P. *Judaism: Practice and Belief*. London: SCM Press. 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. London: SCM Press. 1977.

- Scaer, David P. *Discourses in Matthew*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House. 2004.
- Sim, David C. *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. 1998.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament*. Zondervan. 1996.
- Weaver, Dorothy Jean. *Matthew's Missionary Discourse: A Literary Critical Analysis*. Sheffield: JSOT Press. 1990.