Suffering Leads to Glory

- Matthew 16:21-28
- Pastor Jeremy Thomas
- April 13, 2016
- fbgbible.org

Fredericksburg Bible Church 107 East Austin Street Fredericksburg, Texas 78624 (830) 997-8834

Questions from Previous Lessons

Q: What does the Latin Vulgate say on Matt 16:18?

A: The Latin Vulgate is the official bible of the Roman Catholic Church. The question was asked with regard to how that version translates Peter and rock in Matt 16:18 since Rome identifies Peter as the rock. I argued that the original Greek words differentiate Peter from the rock; Peter being a loose stone and the rock upon which Christ would incorporate Peter being the massive bedrock of Himself. The evidence from the Latin does not show that they simply made an error based on the Latin which says "et ego dico tibi quia tu es Petrus et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam et portae inferi non praevalebunt adversum eam." Even here you see that the words differ in the Latin. If we go to The Catholic Study Bible: New American Bible we find the real issue in this note. "The presumed original Aramaic of Jesus' statement would have been in English, "You are the Rock (Kepa) and upon this rock (kepa) I will build my church." There is where you would find the identical word, in the Aramaic. So the idea that the original was spoken in Aramaic and not Greek is the entire edifice upon which the idea that Peter is the rock upon which Christ would build His church. Is this a valid edifice to build this theology on? There is little question that many Jews spoke Aramaic and Jesus almost certainly spoke Aramaic as well as Hebrew and Greek. But the idea that the original Gospels were written in Aramaic is an entirely unproven and unprovable assertion. Daniel Wallace, Senior Professor of New Testament Studies at Dallas Theological Seminary and Executive Director of the Center for the Study of New Testament Manuscripts and whose accomplishments in Greek and translation contributions are far too numerous to list says, "The problems with this view are: (1) There is absolutely no early textual evidence for this theory (i.e., no early Aramaic MS has been produced that could purport to be behind the Greek text of the Gospels, Acts, or Revelation); (2) most of the alleged Semitisms (e.g., word-plays lost in the Greek translation, mistranslations, etc.), though ingenious, are subject to serious objections." Therefore, what the Roman Catholic Church has done is built upon a presumed original Aramaic and yet no original Aramaic MS exists that could purport to be the original. All the evidence is in favor of an original Greek. The Catholic Study Bible continues, "The Greek text probably means the same, for the difference

in gender between the masculine noun petros, the disciples new name, and the feminine noun petra (rock) may be due simply to the unsuitability of using a feminine noun as the proper name of a male. Although the two words were generally used with slightly different nuances, they were also used interchangeably with the same meaning, "rock." And by so many words, which are nothing more than sleight of hand, over a billion people are led to adopt a false religion of popery and blasphemous masses. The words of Henry Thiessen, written in 1934, are time tested and proven when it comes to the importance of the original languages, "Is not an accurate knowledge of the original necessary to the highest type of expository preaching? We thank God for the timehonored Authorized Version; but have not such mistranslations in it as come from the confusion of the Greek words for "world" and "age," for "hades" and "hell," for "devil" and "demon," not to mention those of lesser importance, helped to build up and perpetuate colossal false teachings? It would seem to be "practical" enough to be able to refute the teachings of the restitutionists, second probationists, annihilationists, and other errorists, by direct reference to the original, especially since they so generally pretend to base their interpretations on the original; it would seem to be abundantly worthwhile to get such an accurate knowledge of the Greek text that one can use it in the exposition of the Scriptures and the formulation of his own doctrinal views."3 I couldn't agree more. The Roman Catholic Church has built this idea of Peter being the rock and many other such doctrines on presumptions of an Aramaic original or the inspiration of the apocryphal works and not on the evidence of the Greek original. Yet by many words and slick sounding arguments people are deceived into this complete sham.

Today's Lesson

Last time in Romans 16:13-19 we looked at the Person of Christ. For this teaching Jesus took His disciples 26 miles north of the Sea of Galilee to Caesarea Philippi. He was using the surrounding environs as a visual stimulus to the lesson, for the location was well-known for its massive bedrock, or *petra*, in the background and a cave at the base of that rock that the Jews referred to as the gates of Hades. The place also had a long history associated with pagan worship and so would be fitting for revealing the Church as incorporating pagan Gentiles. As they entered the district verse 13 says Jesus was asking His disciples over and over, "Who do people say that the Son of Man is?" This was a question about His person? Jesus had offered Himself to the nation Israel. What was the nation's response to His person? In 16:14 there were four prevailing opinions. Some said He was John the Baptist. This interpretation came from Herod Antipas who speculated that John had risen from the dead. Others said Elijah. Others Jeremiah. And still others one of the prophets. All identified Him as among the prophets but they are incorrect and therefore rejections of His Person. If they had known the Messianic profile from the OT they would not have misidentified Him. In 16:15 He then said to His disciples, "You, who do say I am? In 16:16 Peter took the lead for the group and answered, "You are the Messiah, the Son of the one true God." This was the

correct identification of His Person. Therefore, in 16:17 Jesus said to him, "Blessed are you, Simon, son of the man Jonah, because no mortal revealed this to you, but My Father who is in heaven." Peter had sufficient understanding of the Messianic profile in the OT to identify Him as the Messiah. In 16:18 Jesus then gave Peter additional revelation that was not revealed in the OT. We would paraphrase saying, "I also say to you that you are a loose, unattached stone, and upon this massive bedrock of Myself I will build My church and death will not overpower it." Christ Himself was the massive bedrock upon which the Church would be built. Peter, as a loose stone, would be one of many stones integrated into the Church beginning on the Day of Pentecost. The petra in the background served to depict the foundation of the Church as immoveable. The gates of Hades at the foot of the bedrock would serve as a visual help in understanding that the Church would ultimately be victorious over death through resurrection. The fact the future Church was revealed at the very pagan place of Caesarea Philippi showed that the Church would include pagan Gentiles as well as Jews. In 16:19, after the Church's victorious resurrection, Peter would be rewarded to serve in a position of authority in the kingdom. The "keys of the kingdom" refer to authority to open and shut in the kingdom. In the kingdom there will be many areas in and around the Messianic Temple that will require access to enter. Peter will be involved in either permitting or forbidding access to these sensitive areas. His decision to permit or forbid will be in perfect accordance with the standards for access that God has given in heaven. This shows that during the millennial kingdom there will still be a distinction between heaven and earth but heaven's rule will be exercised on earth. Thus the millennial phase of the kingdom will fulfill the Lord's prayer, "Thy kingdom come, they will be done, on earth as it is in heaven." That is what is being stated with respect to Peter. He will be rewarded with taking part in exercising heaven's rule on earth during that time. In 16:20, He gave strict orders that His Person should be told to no one. The most likely reason being that the leadership had already rejected Him informally and He was no longer speaking plainly to the nation but only in parables.

So in 16:13-18 Peter had scored a 100 on His Person. Tonight we will see in 16:21-23 how he scored on His Work. To Peter it became painfully evident that one can never separate Christ's Person from His Work. Any attempt to do so is an indication that Satan has been at work on that person. As Wiersbe says, "Having declared His person, Jesus now declared His work; for the two must go together." Who Jesus is and what Jesus did are necessary components of the gospel that one must believe in order to have eternal salvation. By Peter affirming His person but denying His work he wanted a kingdom without a cross, a reign in glory apart from suffering. But we learn that there can be no reign in glory apart from suffering, there can be no kingdom without a cross. To bring this point home, in 16:24-29, Jesus reveals that it is the same way for us. Just as He first suffered in order to qualify to return to reign in glory so we must first suffer in order to qualify to reign in glory.

Let's take a closer look at 16:21-23. In 16:21 we read, From that time Jesus began to show His disciples that He must go to Jerusalem, and suffer many things from the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised up on the third day. The phrase From that time ($\alpha\pi\sigma$ $\tau\sigma\tau\epsilon$ $\eta\rho\xi\alpha\tau\sigma$) refers to the beginning of something new in Jesus' ministry. It is only used twice in Matthew; once in Matt 4:17 when John was arrested

signaling Jesus to begin proclaiming the message, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" and here in Matt 16:21 when Jesus began to show His disciples some new things. The new things are essentially that He must be killed and raised. Wiersbe says, "This was His first clear statement of His death, though He had hinted at this before (Matt. 12:39–40; 16:4; John 2:19; 3:14; 6:51)." The previous hints are things like the sign of Jonah, the Son of Man had to be lifted up and if they destroyed this temple He would raise it again in three days. These did reveal His death and resurrection but not in a clear way. The parallel in Mark 8:32 says that now He was stating the matter plainly. So this was an advance and it was designed to instruct His disciples for what was most assuredly coming and they would need to be prepared for.

Notice in 16:21 all the details that He revealed. First, He **began to show His disciples** these things. The verb **show** is δεικνυω and means "to prove or make clear by evidence or reasoning." What Jesus was doing was reasoning on the basis of the OT that if He was who they said He was, the Messiah, the Son of the living God, then He had to be killed and raised. This, evidently, was not a part of their theology. The theology they had learned from the scribes and Pharisees in the synagogue was that Messiah would come and reign in glory. Suffering was not a part of their exposition of the OT Scriptures. So what it appears Jesus began to do was prove that the OT Scriptures taught that Messiah had to suffer before He could reign in glory. Second, note that He says **He must go.** The word **must** is $\delta \varepsilon l$ and is a verb of necessity. In this case it is of divine necessity that He **go** to Jerusalem. Why Jerusalem? Because Jerusalem was the appointed place of sacrifice! It was fitting that if God only approved of sacrifices done in Jerusalem that Jesus be sacrificed in Jerusalem (albeit outside the city walls). The mention of Jerusalem at this juncture is significant. From this time forward the movement will be toward Jerusalem. The next time Jerusalem is mentioned is Matt 20:17 and Jesus states these same details again to His disciples. Evidently they needed to be prepared for what was coming. They needed to be instructed on His death and resurrection multiple times. Third, not only must He go to Jerusalem but He must suffer many things there. The many things refer to the arrest in Gethsemane, the false trials before Herod and Antipas and the beatings that occurred at the Praetorium. All these many things He would suffer at the hands of the elders and chief priests and scribes. One definite article binds these three groups into a single body with a definite purpose, to kill Him. The single body is the Sanhedrin, these men were a part of that group. Toussaint says, "The Messiah was to suffer many things and be killed at the hands of the elders, the chief priests, and scribes. This includes the whole Sanhedrin and indicates a formal trial will be held. The highest judicial body of the land was going to condemn Him. The King is going to be rejected formally and officially by Israel." So the rejection in Matt 12 we define as informal and the rejection later we define as formal. The first set in motion the second. Fourth, after these sufferings He **must...be killed.** The verb **be killed** is in the passive voice implying outside agency. Jesus, of course, gave up His spirit so they would kill Him in the sense of assigning Him to death and carrying out the crucifixion. Fifth, He must... be raised up on the third day. Note on the third day and not "on the fourth." If the expression "three days and three nights" elsewhere refers to a literal 72 hours then He would have been raised up on the fourth day and not the third day. But the truth is that in Jewish thought and in the OT, any part

of a day was considered a whole day. Therefore, a Friday crucifixion, Friday He's buried for part of a day, Friday is day one, Saturday He spent all day in the tomb, Saturday is day two, Sunday He was in the tomb for a part of the day, then raised, Sunday is day three. Just as Jesus said, He **must...be raised up on the third day.**

So four things **must** happen. He must go to Jerusalem, He must suffer many things at the hands of the Sanhedrin, He must be killed and He must be raised. Why must these four things happen? Because the OT prophets predicted they would happen Toussaint says, "It was an imperative because the Messiah must suffer to fulfill prophecy; He must be raised again for the same reason." The death and resurrection are the subject of OT Messianic prophecy. If He did not die and raise He is not the Messiah. The bigger picture for why He came was to fulfill Messianic prophecy. This includes the death and resurrection but is larger than the death and resurrection. In fact, when Jesus said, "It is finished!" in John 19:30 He was not referring to His work on the cross. He was referring to all OT prophecy related to His first coming. If you look at the context and read it for yourself you'll see that there are a series of prophecies that He is fulfilling and then He says, "knowing that all things had already been accomplished, to fulfill the Scripture," the last thing he had to do was fulfill Ps 69:21, the taking of the gall and so He said, "I am thirsty." Then they gave him the sour wine and when He drank it He said what? "It is finished!" What He meant was not that His work of redemption was finished but that OT Messianic prophecy was finished, only then could He die and that is when He gave up His spirit. If He had given up His spirit before that He would not have fulfilled all the OT Messianic prophecy and the whole thing would be caput. He had to fulfill the Scripture and that is what 16:21 is all about.

In 16:22, Peter took Him aside. This was not done in front of the group. Peter took Him aside and began to rebuke Him. Peter had a lot of gall. It may have been because Jesus had just commended him for his great confession and it went straight to his head. It wouldn't be the first time a human allowed a commendation to go to his head, or the last. So Peter thinks he needs to correct the Messiah. Walvoord said, "Peter, having risen to great heights of faith in the preceding context, then demonstrated his lack of understanding by rebuking Jesus."9 Pentecost said, "The word translated "rebuked" is very strong (Matt 16:22). It means to reprove, censure, or warn in order to prevent an action from happening, or bring one that is in process to an end."10 Peter was trying to prevent Jesus from going to the cross. McGee says, "The cross was not in the thinking of the apostles at all, as you can see."11 Not only was it not in their thinking, Peter goes so far as to say, "God forbid it, Lord! This shall never happen to You." Peter was going to make sure Jesus did not die. The words translated God forbid it are more exactly, "may God in mercy spare you this." And the words This shall never happen are a double negative ou $\mu\eta$ in the Greek which is a very strong denial, something like "may it never be" or "by no means." Pentecost said, "Peter evidently was willing to use physical restraint if necessary on Christ." And in fact, despite Jesus' rebuke in the next verse Peter did use physical restraint later when he took his sword and struck off the right ear of the high priest's slave in order to prevent His arrest (John 18:10). So it is abundantly clear that Peter did not have a complete understanding of OT Messianic prophecy. He understood His person but not His work.

In 16:23, But He turned and said to Peter, "Get behind Me, Satan! You are a stumbling block to Me; for you are not setting your mind on God's interests, but man's." So if we thought Peter's rebuke was strong Jesus' is stronger. If you think about it, in one sense the words Get behind Me, Satan! seem to be directed at Satan himself, as if Jesus is looking through Peter and seeing Satan. Satan means "adversary." Jesus addressed Peter as His adversary. None of this means that Peter is Satan or that Peter wasn't saved but that the saved Peter had been influenced by Satan to express his adversarial purpose. Satan's purpose was to thwart God's purpose revealed in Messianic prophecy. This prophecy required that Christ first go to the cross to pay for the sins of the world and then to establish the kingdom and reign in glory. Both Satan and Peter presented a kingdom without a cross. Remember in the temptations how Satan offered the kingdoms of the world to Christ without a cross? Now Peter under Satan's influence was tempting Him to establish the kingdom without the cross. Pentecost said, "In his temptation of Christ, Satan had offered Christ a throne without a cross, asking that He worship him. Christ rejected this offer. Now Peter had acknowledged that Jesus was the Messiah; in Peter's mind there was no reason why He should not exert His messianic authority and mount Messiah's throne immediately. The death of Christ did not seem necessary to Peter. Peter seems to have been oblivious to the fact that, according to prophetic Scripture, Messiah must not only reign but by His death He must also provide for the redemption of sinners." It is for this reason that Jesus said to Peter, You are a stumbling block to Me. Since a stumbling block was usually a rock or stone that caused one to stumble Jesus may be continuing to play off the idea of Peter as a "rock," but now he has become a rock of stumbling. The reason stated, for you are not setting your mind on God's interests, but man's. Peter wanted a kingdom without a cross; glory without suffering. This cannot be in a fallen world; sin stands in the way; it must be dealt with. One would think it would be of great interest to Jews of the 1st century but the evidence is that it was not! However, it is in God's interest to deal with it. Walvoord suggested, "Like many modern readers of the Bible, Peter did not want to accept what did not agree with his hopes and ambitions. The disciples who had been led to faith in the person of Christ were not yet prepared to accept His work on the cross."12 They were selectively reading the OT.

In 16:24 Jesus now gave some further instruction **to His disciples.**¹³ Essentially this is a section on the costs of discipleship. He teaches them that in order for them to qualify to enter into the kingdom to reign in glory they too must first suffer. Suffering always precedes reigning. It is walking in the footsteps of Christ. To be clear the subject here is not salvation, gaining entrance to the kingdom, which is a free gift acquired by faith alone, but rewards, gaining rewards in the kingdom, which is acquired by discipleship alone. One should never confuse salvation with discipleship or kingdom entrance with kingdom reward. The focus in the following chapters becomes greatness in the kingdom and how to acquire greatness. Most people want an easy road to greatness. That is not realistic. Jesus' road was not easy. But for the joy set before Him He endured the cross. We, too, must take up our cross...

So what does all this mean? In 16:24 Jesus said to His disciples, "If anyone wishes to come after Me, he must deny himself, and take up his cross and follow Me." The verb to come coupled with the preposition after

means "to be an adherent/follower." This is another way of saying be a committed disciple. This is more than just being a believer. This believer wants to follow hard after Christ. This is where rewards enter into the picture. To gain rewards three things are required; first, he must deny himself, second, take up his cross and third, follow Me. Let's take these apart. The first thing he must do, which is non-negotiable, is deny himself. This does not mean deny yourself of things you like or enjoy. Constable described this best when he said, "Self-denial as Jesus taught it does not involve denying oneself things as much as it does denying one's own authority over his or her life (cf. 4:19; John 12:23–26)."14 The hardest thing for anyone to do is to deny that they are the authority over their own life; but that is a necessary component of committed discipleship. The committed disciple has denied that he is the authority over his own life. The second thing he must do, which is non-negotiable, is take up his cross. Wiersbe says, "(I once met a lady who told me her asthma was the cross she had to bear!)" Having asthma, a terminal disease or other such hardships are not one's cross. The Romans required one condemned to crucifixion to carry their cross part of the way to demonstrate publicly submission to the authority of Rome. Jesus' disciples did not yet know He would die on a cross but they understood what it meant. To be His disciple they would have to publicly identify with Him and demonstrate submission to His authority. So the other side of denying that oneself is the authority is confessing that Jesus is one's authority. Finally, the third thing he must do, which again is non-negotiable, is follow Me. This means to walk behind Jesus in the same direction He was going. Where was Jesus going? He was going to Jerusalem. What for? To suffer, die and be raised to enter into glory to reign. In other words, the path for a committed disciple is to deny that he will do what he wants to do and will do what Christ wants him to do which is to follow His example of suffering with Him and perhaps even dying for Him in order to enter into glory to reign with Him. Suffering with Him is the road to glory. So to deny oneself is to deny oneself is the authority, to take up one's cross is to put oneself under His authority and to follow Him is to continue living in that way no matter what happens.

Because it was becoming increasingly dangerous to follow Him Jesus spends verses 25, 26 and 27 giving reasons to help them overcome the natural fear. The first fear of identifying with Him in verse 25 is losing one's enjoyment of life. This is something people naturally fear. To overcome this fear Jesus says, **For whoever wishes to save his life will lose it; but whoever loses his life for My sake will find it.** The word **life** is $\psi \nu \chi \eta$, sometimes translated as "soul." Sometimes people make this refer just to the spiritual side of man and so conclude that this verse is talking about eternal salvation so that you have to lose your life or be willing to lose your life in order to go to heaven. However, the context is not the cost of salvation, which is free, but the costs of discipleship. The word $\psi \nu \chi \eta$ often refers to the whole person and his well-being or enjoyment of life. What is in view in this verse is the believers concern over his well-being and enjoyment of life. If a believer chooses not to identify with Christ because he is afraid about how that will disrupt his life then it will result in a loss of life later. But if a believer chooses to identify with Christ despite which brings hardship into his life then it will result in a gain of life later. So the contrast is the tradeoff between having a fuller life now or a fuller life later. Later is defined at the end of verse 28 as life in the kingdom. "Truly I say to you, there are some of those standing here who will not taste

death until they see the Son of Man coming in His kingdom." Constable says, "Jesus was not talking about one's eternal salvation. The point of Jesus' statement is that living for oneself now will result in a leaner life later whereas denying oneself now for Jesus' sake will result in a fuller life later." 16

In verse 26 the second fear of identifying with Him is losing material possessions. This is also something people naturally fear. To overcome this fear Jesus says, For what will it profit a man if he gains the whole world and forfeits his soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul? Again, the word soul, which is the same word used in the previous verse, is used to refer to the whole person's well-being. The issue is not eternal life. The issue is fullness of life now or later. If a believer decides not to identify with Christ because it might negatively affect his gain of material possessions in this life then as a consequence he will lose out on a more enhanced life later on (i.e. loss of rewards) in the kingdom. A further rhetorical question Jesus asks is what will a man give in exchange for his soul? The question points up the ridiculousness of standing before God with all kinds of material possessions and trying to get God to exchange them for rewards that will bring a richer life in the kingdom. Of course, God is uninterested in making any such exchange. What He is interested in is whether you will identify with Christ now despite the loss of material possessions in this life. Walvoord said, "For the world, there is immediate gain but ultimate loss: for the disciple, there is immediate loss but ultimate gain." He is exactly correct.

In 16:27 the third fear of identifying with Him, and this time a proper fear, is that **the Son of Man is going to come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and will then repay every man according to his deeds.** This verse, commonly cited from the OT is with respect to the dispensing of rewards in the kingdom. If we refuse to identify with Christ in this life do we think that we will be rewarded in the kingdom? Of course not. But if we choose to identify with Christ now we will be rewarded then. Jesus is using the promise of rewards to motivate us to deny ourselves, take up our cross and follow Him today.

As a brief aside, it is okay to strive to get rewards when it is understood that they are not things we earn to be selfishly used in the kingdom but relate to a fuller life and greater opportunities to glorify Him. The NT sometimes refers to these rewards as crowns. The book of Revelation says that we will lay our crowns at His feet. The crowns are symbols of kingdom rule for a life of faithful service that we performed out of gratitude for God's grace to us.

The bottom line is clear, the cost of discipleship is high but the results of a fuller life later will be completely worth it. Just as Jesus endured the cross for the joy set beyond it in the kingdom so we should endure suffering for Christ for the joy set beyond it in the kingdom. Peter wanted Jesus to bypass suffering and simply reign in glory. No doubt many of us want that as well. But this is not a possibility. Wiersbe gives a good chart depicting the two ways a believer can approach life.

Approach 1	Approach 2
Deny yourself	Live for yourself
Take up your cross	Ignore the cross
Follow Christ	Follow the world
Lose your life for His sake	Save your life for your own sake
Forsake the world	Gain the world
Keep your soul	Lose your soul
Share His reward and glory	Lose His reward and glory ¹⁸

Kingsbury gave a helpful explanation when he said, "... Jesus reveals to his disciples, in all he says and in all he does beginning with 16:21, that God has ordained that he should go to Jerusalem to suffer, and that his way of suffering is a summons to them also to go the way of suffering (i.e., the way of servanthood) (cf. 20:28). In other words, Matthew alerts the reader through the key passages 16:21 and 16:24 that suffering, defined as servanthood, is the essence of discipleship and that Jesus will show the disciples in what he says and does that this is in fact the case."

In summary, in 16:21 Matthew says "From that time Jesus began to show..." signifying a shift in His ministry. Now He is showing them plainly what was only hinted at before, namely "that He must of divine necessity go to Jerusalem and suffer many things from the Sanhedrin and be killed and be raised up on the third day. All of these things must take place because they are the prophetic plan of God for the Messiah. In 16:22 Peter took Jesus aside and began to stand in His way, going so far as to say "May God's mercy not permit the cross" and "This shall never happen to you." Peter was willing to use physical restraint to stop Jesus from being arrested and killed and despite Jesus' words in verse 23 he still tried to stop it later. In 16:23 Jesus turned and said to Peter, "Get behind Me, Satan!" Satan means adversary and Peter was voicing the purpose of the adversary himself. In this Peter the rock had become a stumbling block. The reason set forth is that God requires suffering for sin on the cross before reigning in glory in the kingdom. Like Satan, Peter wanted Jesus to bypass suffering for sin on the cross. But this is not possible. In 16:24-27 Jesus lays down the cost of committed discipleship. It will cost now but it will pay later. If anyone wishes to be a committed disciple of Jesus Christ he must do three things, first deny himself which is to deny that he himself is the authority over his life, second take up his cross which is to publicly come under the authority of Jesus Christ and third, follow Him no matter what comes along in life. Such a life is one that naturally invokes fear and so in 16:25 Jesus begins to motivate them by saying that it will all be worth it later. For whoever wishes to save his quality of life by not identifying with Christ will lose out on quality of life in the kingdom. But whoever sacrifices quality of life for his identifying with Christ will gain quality of life in the kingdom. In 16:26 what will it profit a man if he gains all the worlds material possessions and yet he refused to identify with Christ to get it, will he not forfeit quality of life in the kingdom to come? Or what material possessions will a man trade God for in order to receive a greater quality of life in the kingdom? In 16:27 the final

motive is that "the Son of Man is going to come in the glory of His Father with His angels," that is to say, He is going to come and establish the kingdom on earth and those entering the kingdom will be rewarded according to their deeds done in the body. The bottom line is that suffering, defined as service in identifying with Christ, precedes reigning in glory. You can live for here and now or you can live for then and there. In 16:28 he mentions that some of them standing there would get a preview of the Son of Man coming in this kingdom and that really fits with chapter 17 and the transfiguration so that is where we are heading and we'll look at it next week.

In conclusion, what can we learn? First, that a believer can be infiltrated and influenced by Satan if he does not know the word of God. Peter did not have a concept of the death of the Messiah from the OT. He should have and he would have if he had been studying the OT word of God. But he didn't and so he was easily infiltrated and influenced by Satan to the point that he would rebuke Jesus and take up arms in order to restrain Him from going to the cross. It is a remarkable warning to all of us of how easily we can be deceived by Satan when we don't know this book and when we don't accept all of it, as it is written in ordinary-literal and ordinary-figurative language just as Dennis is teaching on Sunday mornings. Second, salvation is free; discipleship is costly. To be a committed disciple you must deny that you are the authority over your life, you must publically admit that Christ is the authority over your life and you must follow Him come hell or high water. This is extremely costly now but it will pay much more later and it will prove to be worth every minute. I think Jesus gave them a preview of the future kingdom in the next section because like them, it is difficult for any of us to see beyond the present. But with the previews in Scripture we have enough to meditate on in order to have a right perspective on the present. Third, it may cost us now but we will be paid later. The rewards will be entirely worth whatever suffering we have to endure now for Christ. With them we will have greater privileges and opportunities to glorify God.

¹ Daniel B. Wallace, Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics - Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament (Zondervan

² The Catholic Study Bible: New American Bible, note on Matt 16, 18, p 35.

³ BSac 91:361 (January–March, 1934) p. 34–45.

⁴ So the revelation is now made that during the postponement Christ will build His Church. This work was yet future as it presupposed the crucifixion, resurrection, ascension and sending of the Holy Spirit to baptize those who believe into Christ. It began on the Day of Pentecost in Acts 2 and will continue until the Church's resurrection when its members will be rewarded for roles of service in the kingdom to come. During that kingdom Peter will have a prominent role of authority. We should follow Him in making this faithful confession of the identity of Jesus in order to play a role of authority in the kingdom as well.

⁵ Warren W. Wiersbe, *The Bible Exposition Commentary*, vol. 1 (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996), 59.

⁶ Warren W. Wiersbe, *The Bible Exposition Commentary*, vol. 1 (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996), 59.

⁷ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 208.

⁸ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 208.

⁹ John Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 125.

¹⁰ J. Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 253.

¹¹ J. Vernon McGee, *Thru the Bible Commentary: The Gospels (Matthew 14-28)*, electronic ed., vol. 35 (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1991), 50.

¹² John Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 125.

It might be helpful to point out that the word disciple is used of three different groups in the NT. The word disciple simply means "a learner, a student." The first usage in the NT refers to those who were curious in Christ's teachings. These were the crowds that followed Jesus around. They were disciples only in a curious sense as they were learning some of His teachings. The second usage in the NT refers to those who were convinced of Christ's teachings. These had heard Jesus' teachings and became convinced that He was the Messiah, believing in Him. The third usage in the NT refers to those who were committed to Christ's teachings. These had committed themselves to following after Him and His teachings. These verses are written as a challenge for those who are convinced to become committed.

¹⁴ Tom Constable, Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 16:24.

¹⁵ Warren W. Wiersbe, The Bible Exposition Commentary, vol. 1 (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996), 60.

¹⁶ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 16:25.

¹⁷ John Walvoord, *Thy Kingdom Come*, p 126.

¹⁸ Warren W. Wiersbe, The Bible Exposition Commentary, vol. 1 (Wheaton, IL: Victor Books, 1996), 60.

¹⁹ Tom Constable, Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 16:21.