

The Costs of Discipleship

📖 Matthew 8:18-22

👤 Pastor Jeremy Thomas

📅 February 18, 2015

🌐 fbgbible.org

📍 Fredericksburg Bible Church

107 East Austin Street

Fredericksburg, Texas 78624

(830) 997-8834

Last time we looked at the first group of three miracles; the cleansing of the leper, the healing of the Gentile centurion's servant and the making well of Peter's mother-in law. Each of the three miracles authenticate that Jesus is the Messiah. He did things that had never been done and it was well-known that He could do these things. They also lay out the kingdom program in general as being an offer to the Jews followed by rejection, a time of great Gentile faith and finally a restoration of the kingdom to the Jews.

In 8:1 Jesus is portrayed as being very popular; large crowds followed Him. In verse 2 a Jewish leper came to Him. Never in history had a Jewish leper been healed. The leper bowed before Him in a stance of worship. His request lacked any sign of presumption. He merely stated that if the Lord was willing He could make him clean. In verse 3 Jesus did the unthinkable and stretched out to touch him, saying, "I am willing; be cleansed." At that very moment the leprosy was cleansed. Both Mark and Luke add that the man was healed of his leprosy. In verse 4 Jesus told him to tell no one but to go to the priest and show him the evidence and uphold the requirements of the Mosaic Law. This was to be a testimony to the priests that the Messiah had come and offered cleansing to all Israel; such an extensive cleansing that it would reach into the fallen creation so that such abnormal diseases picked up by merely living in a fallen world could not be contracted in the kingdom. However, the Messiah would predictively be rejected and therefore the second miracle begins in 8:5. Jesus, upon entering Capernaum, had a Gentile centurion approach Him. In verse 6 he was imploring Him saying that his favorite servant was lying with paralysis and in great pain. In verse 7 Jesus states that He was willing to come to his home and heal him. But in verse 8 the centurion revealed his humble attitude by the statement "I am not worthy for You to come under my roof." He knew that if Jesus just said the word his favorite servant would be healed. In verse 9 the centurion explains that he understood hierarchy and rank since he himself was a man of authority. In verse 10, when Jesus heard this we find that He marveled. This is one of only two times in the Gospel's when Jesus marvels. He marveled at the great faith of a Gentile relative to the faith of those in Israel. This stinging rebuke of the Jews essentially amounts to the humility of faith manifested by the centurion. In verse 11 he reveals that the centurion represented one of many who would respond positively to the Messiah in the wake of the Jewish rejection. These Gentiles from around the world would recline in the kingdom with the Jewish patriarchs, each a

direct recipient of the Abrahamic Covenant. But verse 12, the rightful sons of the kingdom, the Jews, would not enter the kingdom. Instead they would be cast into outer darkness where they would be weeping and gnashing of teeth. In conclusion in verse 13 Jesus returned to the centurion and said, "Go, it shall be done for you as you have believed." And the servant was healed that very moment. This miracle signified that Israel's kingdom program would be postponed due to their rejection and a time of great Gentile faith would ensue. The third miracle answers to the question, what about Israel? In light of their rejection is God going to reject them? The answer is no because here we find Peter's mother-in-law, a Jewess, being made well. In verse 14, at Capernaum Jesus went into Peter's home and found his mother-in-law diseased with a fever. In verse 15 He did the unthinkable and touched her. At that moment the fever left her. The evidence of her being made well is she got up and served Him. This looks to Israel's final restoration in the kingdom. In verse 16 He also cast out demonic spirits and healed all who were ill. This shows that Jesus is able to cast demons out of the kingdom, a necessary prerequisite of the kingdom, as well as heal all Israel's sickness, another necessary prerequisite of the kingdom. In prediction of the basis of such works of power Matthew says Isa 53:4 was fulfilled. The prophecy was fulfilled with Messiah's work on the cross. The application to Israel was being made in part to demonstrate His person, the ultimate application will be made when they receive Him as their Messiah at the Second Advent.

In conclusion, the sequence of Jew-Gentile-Jew lays out the kingdom program in general. First an offer to the Jews to cleanse which would be rejected, in the wake of the rejection a time of great Gentile faith which we presently live in and finally a return to the Jews whom God will heal and bring into the kingdom. This sequence is exactly the same as the one Paul lays out in Romans 11 and one theologian even thinks that Romans 11 is Paul's theological interpretation of these miracles. The scheme is that of dispensational premillennialism.

So that is the first group of miracles recorded by Matthew. Following this first group there is a short section on discipleship, then a second group of miracles followed by another section on discipleship and then a third group of miracles. Tonight then, a short section on discipleship in Matthew 8:18-22. There are two cases here, a scribe that comes to him and some other disciple. The issue in committed discipleship is always priority. What is your first priority? Only those who put Christ first are truly disciples.

In verse 18 Matthew signals a change in scene with the word **now**. This is the Greek word $\delta\epsilon$ which signifies for Matthew a change of scene (cf 1:18; 2:1). **Now when Jesus saw a crowd around Him, He gave orders to depart to the other side of the sea.** Apparently Jesus did not always want to have a **crowd** around Him. He had become very popular. His fame had spread beyond the borders of Israel to the Gentiles and His time was now under constant demand. Finding Himself in such a situation demanded that he escape for some rest and repose. He wanted to take his closest disciples with Him. The text says **He gave orders to depart to the other side.** The words **of the sea** were added by the translators. What did they actually go to the other side of? Shepard holds that they went to the other side of the Jordan to Bethsaida-Julias. He says, "They started out from Capernaum, probably expecting to land somewhere in the vicinity of Bethsaida-Julias on the north-east side of the lake.

There they could seek out some quiet nook in the hills near enough to the town to get food, and spend some hours in complete repose.”¹ Franz holds that they went to the other side of the sea to Gadara and makes much of this city being Gentile as the cause of one of the disciples hesitating. He says, “Jesus was about to take the Twelve across the Sea of Galilee to the Decapolis city of Gadara...this trip is the first recorded journey of Jesus to minister in Gentile territory. One of His disciples hesitated, probably because he did not want to go to those unclean, non-kosher people.”² Either trip is a possibility.

Now as to the events that occur next in verses 19-22 we have no help from Mark or Luke because neither record these events. They both immediately move on to give the account of Jesus’ stilling of the storm, which Matthew gives in verses 23ff. Therefore we have events uniquely recorded by Matthew that happened on the shore just before they set sail to go **to the other side**. Why Matthew alone recorded them is unknown but we do know that Matthew has a peculiar interest in discipleship and since these events relate directly to discipleship he recorded them.

Now before we look at the two men who interact with Jesus we make some observations. In verse 19 one is said to be **a scribe** and the other in verse 21 is said to be **another of the disciples**. The fact that Matthew says “another” likely indicates that both of them were already disciples. A. T. Robertson agrees saying of the scribe, “Already a disciple as shown by “another of the disciples”³ However, since Jesus ordered neither of these men to depart to the other side it is obvious that there is not just one class of disciples. One may be a disciple without being in the inner ring, so to speak, of disciples.

This prompts us to try to understand the concept of a “disciple.” The word “disciple” is from the Greek word *μαθητης* and simply means “a student, a learner, a pupil.” It presupposes a master teacher relationship. Its common use was therefore in the education setting where a master teacher had students or disciples who followed him. Throughout the NT the word “disciple” is used in three senses. First, it is used of those who were curious about Jesus’ claims and teachings. Those who were curious were not yet convinced and so had not yet believed. They simply followed Jesus around amongst the crowds in order to investigate further His claims and teachings. Thus we call them curious disciples. Second, it is used of those who were convinced of Jesus’ claims and teachings. These had followed Him around amongst the crowds and been convinced of His claims and so had believed in Him. Thus we call them convinced disciples. Third, it is used of those who were committed to Jesus’ claims and teachings. Those who were committed had considered the cost of following Him and had committed themselves to His teaching. Thus we call them committed disciples.

Both of the men in these verses were already convinced disciples. They had been following Jesus around listening to His teachings and watching His life. They had been convinced of His claims and so had believed in Him. Both now desired to become committed disciples. This was an important decision to weigh carefully because of the principle, “To him who is given much, much is required.” It is not a trivial thing to become a committed disciple. Jesus is therefore trying to communicate to them the high cost of being His disciple.

The historical background for costly discipleship was well known and only the wealthy and privileged could usually afford it. The Greek philosopher Socrates earned a living by getting paid by disciples, so did Plato and Aristotle. Alexander the Great had been a disciple of Aristotle. We can imagine Aristotle made a pretty good living out of it. Jewish Rabbi's had disciples as well and earned a living by getting paid. Paul was a disciple of Gamaliel in Jerusalem at the time of these events in the Galilee and his family could afford it. Jesus had had his disciples too and since education was costly Jesus is here emphasizing the cost of following Him. To be His disciple did not cost a lot of money but it did require wholehearted allegiance. One needed to be totally dedicated to His teachings and His way of life. In this way it was very expensive because it required one to set aside all other loyalties in favor of loyalty to Christ. It was an honorable thing to finish the designated curriculum of the master and as a result the student would then be qualified to serve in a privileged position. On the other hand it was a dishonor to not finish the curriculum. Therefore it was important to consider the cost before too hastily becoming a committed disciple.

Both men in this section are being challenged to consider the cost of following Him. Constable thought that "The first disciple was too quick when he promised wholehearted allegiance. This second disciple was too slow performing wholehearted allegiance."⁴ Fruchtenbaum agreed saying, "Whereas the first one was too hasty, this one was too slow. The point is: once you are faced with the call to become a disciple, do not delay in making your decision."⁵ This may be but we don't know how either man ultimately responded to the challenge laid before them. It probably gave them something to think about. But I don't think Matthew's point is to highlight their response. Instead it is Matthew's point to highlight the steep cost of becoming a committed disciple. Jesus is challenging them to consider the steep cost of following Him.

It may be significant that the two men approached Him just before departing to the other side. The self-assertiveness of the scribe may indicate that he desired fame. Jesus was already very famous and if he could become one of Jesus' disciples he too could become famous. He may have seen Jesus' departure as one of his last opportunities to seize fame. The other disciple may not have had his priorities in order. There was nothing wrong with a son burying his father, in fact it was expected, but to put it first before following Jesus was not the proper order of priorities. Toussaint says, "The King desires wholehearted disciples to learn of Him... One who desired to become a disciple was motivated by a desire for fame; another who was already a disciple took it as something which could be dropped and picked up again. Both were regarding discipleship as a small thing."⁶ I see this as possible. Whenever committed discipleship is being sought for, it must be sought for understanding the level of commitment required. It is not a trivial thing to become a committed disciple.

So we come to the road along the shores of the Sea of Galilee. The order has been given to depart and in verse 19, **Then a scribe came and said to Him, "Teacher, I will follow You wherever You go."** Who was this man? This man was **a scribe**. What was **a scribe**? The **scribes** of this class likely developed in the time of Ezra. Originally they had been founded to protect and uphold the Law. They studied to become experts of the Law.

During the Intertestamental times they developed oral law or commentary that formed a hedge around the Law. This oral law became more authoritative than the Law itself. The scribes were almost exclusively Pharisees. It was the scribes that Herod brought in to identify the birthplace of the Messiah in Matthew 2. It was scribal righteousness which Jesus in Matthew 5-7 rejected as sufficient for that generation to enter the kingdom of God. Yet here we find one **scribe** who had been following Jesus around, listening to His claims and he had already been convinced that He was the Messiah. In other words, he was already a believer. Here he wants to take the step of becoming a committed disciple.

He says, **Teacher, I will follow You wherever You go.** The title **teacher** was an honorary one. The scribe is giving honor to Jesus and claiming Him as his teacher. His statement **I will follow You wherever You go** is a statement of total dedication. The word **follow** means “to move behind someone in the same direction.” In this case the **scribe** is stating his desire to move behind Jesus’ teaching and way of living.

Jesus’ response in verse 20 is surprising, but then most of His responses are surprising. We might expect Him to praise the scribe’s willingness to follow Him or challenge his sincerity,⁷ but instead He lays down the gauntlet of what committed discipleship to Him demands. **“The foxes have holes and the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head.”** The general point is clear. Constable says, “Jesus was very busy travelling from one place to another as an itinerant preacher and teacher. His healing ministry complicated His life because it attracted crowds that placed additional demands on Him. He had no regular home as most people did but travelled all over Galilee. The scribe needed to understand this if he wanted to keep up with Jesus. We should not interpret Jesus’ statement to mean that He was penniless and could not afford shelter at night (cf. Luke 8:1–3). His ministry simply kept Him on the move.”⁸ Was the scribe truly willing to constantly be on the move? This was the cost. If he had a wife and kids at home they would have to be put on the back burner in order to follow Him. Was he willing to pay this price? He needed to consider this carefully.

One comment needs to be made with respect to the translation. It might be better to refer to the dwelling place of foxes as dens and of birds as roosting places or branches since birds don’t live in nests but only lay their eggs and raise their young there. But the overall point is clear. If the scribe wanted to be a committed disciple he would need to be willing to be constantly on the move.

Is there anything else in verse 20? Does anyone see anything important in Jesus’ response in verse 20? Jesus’ reference to Himself as **the Son of Man**. If you did not notice that you are probably among the 95% plus that heard him say this and did not notice it or at least what it meant. They may have thought it strange to refer to Himself this way but they probably did not understand what it meant unless they were thoroughly solid Bible students. In fact, He may have used this of Himself because He was addressing a scribe who should have known what this title meant.

This is the first use of the title **the Son of Man** in the Gospel of Matthew and a full third of all the NT uses occur in this Gospel. Volumes have been written on the title **the Son of Man**, and rightfully so. It is used 81 times in the NT, 80 of which are in the Gospels (1 in Acts 7:56), 78 of which are uttered by Jesus Himself and two are repetitions of Jesus' claims of Himself. The title has been given so much attention that I found three main views as to its significance. Charles Clough holds that it is a title signifying His deity. Dwight Pentecost, Don Carson and Ed Glasscock hold that it signifies His humanity. Renald Showers, Stanley Toussaint and Louis Barbieri hold that it signifies His Messiahship which includes both deity and humanity.

Now, part of the trouble with this title is that it is used four ways in the OT. The first way it is used is of mankind in general. In Psalm 8:4 the psalmist says, "What is man that You take thought of him, And the son of man that You care for Him?" By Hebrew parallelism "the son of man" refers generally to mankind. The second way it is used is of Israel. In Psalm 80:17 speaking of Israel the psalmist says, "Let Your hand be upon the man of Your right hand, Upon the son of man whom You made strong for Yourself. 18Then we shall not turn back from You." So by Hebrew parallelism again, "the son of man" was used to refer to Israel. The third way it is used is of Ezekiel multiple times. For example, in Ezek 6:1 we read, "And the word of the LORD came to me saying, "Son of man, set your face toward the mountains of Israel, and prophesy against them." This occurs multiple times in the book of Ezekiel (e.g. 2:1; 3:1; 4:1; 5:1; et al.). The fourth way it is used is of the Messiah. In Dan 7:13 Daniel summarizes his visions saying, "I kept looking in the night visions, And behold, with the clouds of heaven One like a Son of Man was coming, And He came up to the Ancient of Days And was presented before Him. 14And to Him was given dominion, Glory and a kingdom, That all the peoples, nations, and men of every language Might serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion Which will not pass away; And His kingdom is one Which will not be destroyed." My point in citing all these uses is that when Jesus uttered this title of Himself it might not have been caught by 95% of the people. Toussaint says, "...it may be inferred that" Jesus "used the term to make a veiled revelation of Himself."⁹ More poignantly Clough says, "The reason Jesus is using the "Son of Man"...is to reveal His true character to those who know their Bible...This is kind of a sneaky way He has of communicating to those in the know; it is His signal."¹⁰ In order to understand the significance of what Jesus was claiming one would have to have a thorough knowledge of the uses of "son of man" in the OT and the ability to distinguish which usage Jesus was applying to Himself. For most it probably went right over their head.

What then is He claiming? Almost all scholars of any notoriety agree that ultimately the usage He is applying to Himself is the one from Daniel 7:13. So let's turn to Dan 7:13. What's Dan 7? Daniel's vision of the four beasts. What do the four beasts signify? Four Gentile kingdoms. What other chapter in Daniel parallels and teaches the same four Gentile kingdoms? Dan 2. How do we see them portrayed in Dan 2? As four metals. So Dan 2 and Dan 7 parallel one another. What's the significance of the difference? Dan 2 is looking at the four Gentile kingdoms from man's point of view as beautiful, magnificent kingdoms. Dan 7 is looking at the same four Gentile kingdoms from God's point of view as horrible, terrifying kingdoms. What man thinks he has generated as far as politics, economics, philosophy, law and military is impressive, but God is not impressed. He considers each of

these kingdoms and what they have generated as sub-human, not fit for man to live in. That's why they are all portrayed as wild beasts. The kingdoms ravage and oppress man. There's more to the horrible picture that we won't go into but what does Daniel see in verse 13 after the four sub-human Gentile kingdoms have run their course? "And behold, with the clouds of heaven, One like a Son of Man was coming..." and who is he coming to? "the Ancient of Days." And what does the one like a Son of Man receive from the Ancient of Days? A kingdom. Who then is Jesus claiming to be when He uses this title Son of Man of Himself? The King of the coming kingdom. His kingdom, end of verse 14 says, "is one Which will not be destroyed." An eternal kingdom. Now the issue is what is the significance of this title? Is it referring to Jesus' deity? His humanity? Or both? Note in verse 13 the expression "a Son of Man." This definitely connects Him to man, He is the offspring of man. But is he said to be "a Son of Man" or "One like a Son of Man?" "One like." This implies that He is more than just a man. Note also that He came "with the clouds of heaven." Commonly in the OT the clouds are viewed as the chariot of God (cf Ps 104:3; Isa 19:1). Therefore, the fact that this One like a Son of Man" came with the clouds of heaven signifies that He is also God. Showers says, "Daniel was seeing a person who was deity incarnated in human form."¹¹ This person that looked like a man then received a kingdom. The title Son of Man is used to starkly set off this kingdom from the four beastly Gentile kingdoms that come before. His kingdom would truly be a beautiful, magnificent kingdom, one actually fit for man to live in. What then was Jesus claiming when He used the title Son of Man of Himself? Toussaint says, "There is no doubt that the term had Messianic connotations in the time of Jesus...As the Son of Man" Jesus "sustains a physical relationship to David and Abraham."¹² Yet He is more than mere human because he was like a Son of Man and came riding on the clouds of heaven. "Therefore the term refers to the union of God and man in the One who was to be the King of Israel."¹³ It can be concluded then, that while probably most people in the audience missed it, Jesus was claiming by this title to be able to establish the kingdom, if they would receive Him as their King. Did the scribe get it? We don't know. All we know was that in reality the King was challenging him to count the cost of following Him. Committed discipleship is a difficult road and not a decision to be taken lightly.

Returning to Matthew 8, in verse 21 we find another disciple. **Another of the disciples said to Him, "Lord, permit me first to go and bury my father."** The Luke account indicates that this statement comes as a response to Jesus' call to "Follow Me" (Luke 9:59). But Matthew's focus was more on the disciple's response relative to the high costs of committed discipleship. The fact he is said to be **another of the disciples** shows that he was already a convinced disciple. This would take it to another level.

The disciple's response is not a mere excuse. The oldest son was expected to take care of his father's burial as a responsibility under the command to honor one's father (Exod 20:10). Jesus' response in verse 22 has been classified as one of the hard sayings of Jesus. At first glance the statement seems rather harsh. **But Jesus said to him, "Follow Me, and allow the dead to bury their own dead."** Was Jesus telling this man to deny honoring his father? The meaning of the statement **let the dead bury their own dead** has been historically difficult. There are three views. The first view is that Jesus means let the dead spiritually bury the dead physically. Constable

says, "Apparently He meant, let the spiritually dead (i.e., those who have no interest in following Jesus) bury the physically dead."¹⁴ This view is the majority view among commentators. While it is feasible it does have some weaknesses. First, it requires the word **dead** to have two different meanings. The first use meaning spiritually dead and the second use meaning physically dead. This is not impossible but it is difficult to maintain. Second, it leaves the responsibility that was expected of the son to others. This would probably make the son appear irresponsible since he was not honoring his father. This would be a poor witness to his unbelieving family members. Again, while this is not impossible since Jesus was not always concerned with people's perceptions, it does seem strange. Third, it does not fit with Jewish burial practices. When a person died they were normally taken and immediately buried in the family burial cave which was hewn out of bedrock. If the son's father had just died he would not have been present with Jesus but attending to his customary duties. This objection has been responded to by the claim that the father had not yet died and that the son was requesting that he remain close to his father until he died and then he would follow Jesus. This response has no textual support. The fact is this third objection alone places serious doubt on the majority interpretation that Jesus is saying let those who are spiritually dead, that is, those who have no interest in following Me, bury the physically dead. It takes too many liberties with the text and customs of the day. The second view is that Jesus is speaking with hyperbole of the disciples priorities. Glasscock says, "The best understanding is that the statement was hyperbolic, as were many of His statements, intended to draw attention to a point. The point was the priority of Jesus and His work."¹⁵ This view is better than the first but still suffers from the third objection made against the prior view. If the son's father had just died he would not have been present with Jesus but attending to his customary duties. While it is possible it is highly unlikely. A third view is that the statement refers not to the first burial but the second burial in accordance with Jewish burial customs. This view requires explanation of Jewish burial customs. When a person died the body was immediately placed in the burial cave of the family that was hewn out of the bedrock. There it was left to decompose. This process could take up to one year. The bones were then gathered and placed into a bone box called an ossuary. This secondary burial of placing the bones in an ossuary is what Franz thinks best explains both the disciples request and Jesus' seemingly harsh response. He says, "When the disciples requested time to bury their fathers they were actually asking for time to finish the ritual of secondary burial. Their fathers had died, been placed in the family burial cave...They then requested anywhere from a few weeks up to 11 months to finish the ritual...Jesus' sharp answer also fits well with secondary burial...When Jesus stated "Let the dead bury their own dead," He was referring to the two kinds of dead in the tombs: the bones of the deceased which had already been neatly placed in the ossuaries and the fathers who had yet to be reburied."¹⁶ Why would Jesus seemingly respond so harshly? Not only would a few weeks up to 11 months be a long time to put off becoming a committed disciple but also 1st century Rabbinic theology was false on the meaning of bodily decomposition. Franz points out, "According to Rabbinic sources, the decomposition of the flesh atoned for the sins of the dead person...and the final stage of this process was gathering the bones and placing them in an ossuary."¹⁷ Would Jesus want his committed disciples involved in such heresy? He alone is the Lamb of God who atones for the sins of the world, not one's decomposing flesh. To be a committed disciple

would require one to separate from this false theology. The harshness of Jesus' statement may then be taken at face value as a stinging rebuke for being involved in the corrupt Jewish practice of secondary burial. If that corrupt practice was getting in the way of becoming a committed disciple then this prospective disciple's priority system needed serious realignment.

In conclusion, in verse 18, when Jesus saw a crowd around Him He wanted some rest and repose. He therefore gave orders to depart to the other side, perhaps to the mouth of the Jordan and Bethsaida-Julius or to the Gentile city of Gadara. As they prepared to leave in verse 19 a scribe came and said to Him, "Teacher, I will follow You wherever You go." This scribe was already a convinced disciple but wanted to become a committed disciple. Jesus' response in verse 20 is surprising. Rather than encouraging him to be a committed follower He lays down the cost of discipleship, "The foxes have dens and the birds of the air have roosting branches, but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay His head." If the scribe was willing to follow Him wherever He would go he would have to consider the reality of the Messiah's ministry. He was constantly on the move and the large crowds laid heavy demands on him. Was the scribe willing to give up whatever comforts of home and family he might have? Such were the costs of being a committed disciple. Within Jesus' response He also laid out that he was "the Son of Man." His use of this title was probably not understood by the vast majority of His audience yet Jesus used it of Himself 78 times in the Gospels. The title goes back to Daniel 7:13 where one like a Son of Man comes up to the Father to receive an eternal kingdom. By using the title of Himself He was claiming to be the King of that kingdom. What were they willing to drop in order to follow Him? In verse 21 another disciple said to Him, "Lord, permit me first to go and bury my father." But in verse 22 Jesus said to him, "Follow Me, and allow the dead to bury their own dead." In light of Jewish burial practices both statements are best understood in light of secondary burial. The father had already died and his body placed in the family burial cave. The disciple was requesting anywhere from a few weeks up to 11 months to complete the burial custom by placing the bones in an ossuary. Since the meaning of this final act given by Rabbinic Judaism in the 1st century was to complete the atoning of sins Jesus rebuked the man for putting off becoming His disciple at that time. He had already honored his father by completing the first burial. At this time he needed to immediately follow Him. Such are the demands of the King for all who would be His disciples.

By application we need to realize that being a disciple now does not require us to follow Jesus everywhere that He may go since He is not here. But it does require us to follow His teaching and practice wherever it may go since it's the eternal word of God. Before deciding to do this one should weigh carefully the cost. He demands total commitment; you must put His teachings above your ideas and His demands above those of others. If you have other ideas that conflict with His or desire to meet the demands of others before His you are not qualified to be a committed disciple. Understand that if you are qualified to be a committed disciple it will cost you dearly but in the end it will result in a privileged position in the kingdom to come.

¹ Shepard quoted by Dwight Pentecost, *The Words and Works of Jesus Christ*, p 220.

² *Bible and Spade* (1992) 5, no. 2 (1992): 55.

³ A.T. Robertson, *Word Pictures in the New Testament* (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1933), Mt 8:19.

⁴ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 8:21.

⁵ Arnold Fruchtenbaum, *The Spiritual Life and Discipleship, MBS140*, p 10.

⁶ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 126.

⁷ Ed Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 190.

⁸ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 8:20.

⁹ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 126.

¹⁰ Charles Clough, Lesson 27 Daniel Series.

¹¹ Renald Showers, *The Most High God*, p 80.

¹² Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 126.

¹³ Stanley Toussaint, *Behold the King*, p 126.

¹⁴ Tom Constable, *Tom Constable's Expository Notes on the Bible* (Galaxie Software, 2003), Mt 8:21.

¹⁵ Ed Glasscock, *Matthew*, p 191.

¹⁶ Gordon Franz, *Bible and Spade* (1992), Volume 5, p 55.

¹⁷ Gordon Franz, *Bible and Spade* (1992), Volume 5, p 57.