STUDIUM BIBLICUM
JURNAL TEOLOGI DAN STUDI BIBLIKA
Email: biblicalresearchcenter@stftjakarta.ac.id

Pusat Kajian Biblika
Sekolah Tinggi Filsafat Theologi Jakarta
Jalan Proklamasi 27 - Jakarta - Indonesia

Submitted:17/09/2025 Revised:19/12/2025 Accepted:22/12/2025

Forgiveness Among People as an Expression of Jesus' Hospitality in Matthew 18:21-35

Joice Engie Wella Sianipar
Jakarta Theological Seminary, Jakarta, Indonesia
* joice.sianipar@stftjakarta.ac.id

Abstract:

The theme of forgiveness plays an important role, both in the biblical context and today, because the Bible is the basis for reflecting on how the content should be the proclamation of hospitality in everyday life. Matthew 18:21-35 makes this topic even more important because in addition to forgiveness that should be based on love and has no limits, for those who have suffered deep wounds or trauma, it requires an admission of guilt from the offender. Forgiveness must come from those who are hurt (victims), but the person who hurt (the perpetrator) must also not be passive, but must make efforts to support forgiveness, namely by humbling themselves and declaring their full guilt. The author uses a qualitative method through a descriptive approach and literature review, such as biblical books and books in which figures who discuss ethics are informed. Through this research, it is found that humans who are expected to give forgiveness are also entitled to receive an admission of guilt from the perpetrator. It does not mean that forgiveness cannot be presented in this situation, but rather to realize one's position as a guilty human being. Here, self-awareness becomes a very important aspect.

Keywords:

Forgiveness; Hospitality; Love; Self-Awareness; Trauma

Studium Biblicum
Jurnal Teologi dan Studi Biblika

INTRODUCTION

Matthew 18:21-35 provides a profound foundation for practicing hospitality in embodying forgiveness. This narrative is framed through an allegory in which the "King" represents Jesus, the "Servant" represents humanity, and the "Debt" represents sin, thereby drawing an analogy between Jesus' forgiveness and human forgiveness. The key points clearly convey three essential truths: (1) forgiveness must be unlimited and without exception; (2) those who receive God's forgiveness must extend the same forgiving attitude toward others; and (3) the unforgiving will be excluded from the mercy of God. Taken together, these highlight that every person is called to forgive just as the Lord has forgiven with compassion, leaving no room for any excuse not to forgive.

This study argues that Matthew 18:21-35 presents forgiveness not merely as an unlimited moral obligation to imitate God's mercy, but as an expression of Jesus' hospitality that ethically involves both the victim and the offender. While forgiveness is initiated by the victim, the text implicitly demands the offender's self-awareness and acknowledgment of guilt, Thus, when questions about forgiveness arise, they can be answered with confidence that everything ultimately points back to Jesus, rooted in His compassion. One example concerns whether victims of trauma can still extend forgiveness despite the heinous and extreme acts committed against them. Forgiveness, no doubt, is not easy, yet hatred must not be allowed to corrode harmonious relationships. In this regard, the solution necessarily involves both parties: the perpetrator must sincerely acknowledge their wrongdoing to the traumatized victim, and the victim, with readiness of heart, must extend forgiveness.

Several studies have examined forgiveness in Matthew 18:21–35. R. T. France emphasizes unlimited forgiveness as the imitation of God's boundless mercy, stressing the moral obligation of disciples to forgive as those who have already been forgiven.[115] Similarly, Davies and Allison interpret the passage

[115] R. T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew: New International Commentary on the New*

within the framework of ecclesial discipline, presenting forgiveness as a non-negotiable ethical demand placed upon members of the Christian community.[116] John Nolland further underlines that forgiveness presupposes the seriousness of sin, yet his focus remains on the responsibility of the one who forgives rather than on the ethical role of the offender.[117] While these studies rightly highlight the necessity and limitlessness of forgiveness, they give little attention to the ethical responsibility of the offender, particularly in situations involving deep trauma. This study differs by arguing that forgiveness in Matthew 18:21–35, understood as an expression of Jesus' hospitality, presupposes not only the victim's readiness to forgive but also the offender's self-awareness and acknowledgment of guilt. In particular, the study finds that while humanity must look to Jesus as the limitless giver of forgiveness, human beings are also entitled to receive acknowledgment of wrongdoing from their fellow human beings. This does not mean forgiveness cannot be extended in such situations; rather, it points to the necessity of recognizing one's own position as a fallible human being. In this respect, the study will further explore the concept of self-awareness.

METHODS

In this study, I employ a qualitative method through a descriptive approach and literature review. The study will be presented by first outlining how the intended theme is portrayed in the text. This, of course, cannot be separated from the interpretation of the text itself, but ultimately it will lead to the ethical values implied within it. In undertaking this effort, I seek to analyze sources that support the discussion of this topic, such as biblical works as well as books that introduce key figures who have contributed significantly to ethical

---

Testament (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007), 704-7.

[116] W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Volume II: Matthew 8–18* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 789-93.

[117] John Nolland, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005), 758-61.

discourse. All of these serve to strengthen my ideas, ensuring that this work offers novelty while remaining grounded in the insights of established scholars.

DISCUSSION

Biblical and Scholarly Perspectives on Forgiveness

The Bible recounts many stories that deal with forgiveness, spanning from the Old Testament (OT) to the New Testament (NT). In the OT, several remarkable narratives concerning forgiveness are presented. First is the story of Esau forgiving Jacob, who had taken his birthright (Gen. 27:33). Although Esau initially harbored open resentment and sought to kill his brother, Jacob, he eventually reconciled with him. Jacob approached Esau with fear and reverence, while Esau ran to embrace his brother without restraint. This moment led Jacob to rightly acknowledge the gracious gift of God. He recognized how God had clearly transformed Esau, as seen not in a face marked by hatred or bitterness, but by brotherly love.[118] In short, Esau's forgiveness toward Jacob is regarded as the generosity of God extended to someone who had clearly done wrong.

Second is the story of Joseph forgiving his brothers, who had sold him into slavery (Gen. 37:12-36; 45:4-8). Despite having the authority to punish them without mercy, Joseph chose not to retaliate. Instead, he interpreted their actions as part of God's plan to demonstrate His sovereign love and care for many nations through Joseph's leadership in Egypt during the famine.[119] In other words, Joseph transformed his brothers' wrongdoing into a personal motivation to channel God's love to all people.

Third is the story of David forgiving Saul, who repeatedly sought to harm him (1 Sam. 18:6-11; 24:1-15; 26:1-25). David made no attempt at revenge but instead spared Saul's life. For David, retaliation was unnecessary, for Saul's fate

[118] John MacArthur, *Genesis 12–33: The Father of Israel* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2015), 141.

[119] Bill T. Arnold, *Encountering the Book of Genesis* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House Company, 2004), 159.

rested solely in God's hands.[120] The lesson here is that vengeance does not belong to humanity, for life itself belongs only to the Lord.

The NT likewise features three compelling narratives of forgiveness. First is the story of a father forgiving his "lost" son (Luke 15:11-32). This act of forgiveness reveals the restoration of the relationship between father and son. The son is a repentant sinner, while the father is a figure of compassion. The father no longer dwells on the wrongs committed by his son but focuses instead on forming a renewed and better relationship through his compassion.[121] Such forgiveness is future-oriented, refusing to rehash past failures, and instead concentrating on constructive solutions.

Second is the story of Jesus forgiving the woman caught in adultery (John 8:1-11). According to the law of Moses, adultery was punishable by death, often by stoning. Yet Jesus defended the woman, upholding justice by declaring that no one is without sin, and therefore no one had the right to condemn her. What Jesus did for this woman opened the way for her to embrace a new life in the forgiveness and freedom He provided. This does not mean that Jesus dismissed justice; rather, He upheld justice on the basis of His grace.

Third, and serving as the core and central focus of forgiveness, is the parable of forgiveness (Matt. 18:21-35). In this passage, Peter first asks Jesus how many times he should forgive. Jesus responds with a number far beyond Peter's expectation, seventy times seven, and then proceeds to present the parable of forgiveness.[122] This parable will be further explored in the subsequent sections, particularly in relation to the description and implications of forgiveness.

Joseph Butler, a bishop of the Anglican Church, cited by Jeffrie Murphy and Jean Hampton argued that forgiveness is the rejection of resentment, the

---

[120] Paul Borgman, *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story* (London: Oxford University Press, 2008), 51.

[121] Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke: New International Commentary on the New Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997), 582.

[122] Herman N. Ridderbos, *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997).

resolve to overcome anger and hatred that naturally arise toward an offender who cannot be justified or excused. Butler emphasized the distinction between "forgiving" and "forgetting" (which may occur incidentally). Forgiving is a deliberate act, carried out for a reason, as an expression of virtue and moral duty. Forgetting, on the other hand, may simply happen on its own. Yet Butler stressed that resentment can turn a person into someone vengeful, and thus forgiveness is justified as a way to avoid undesirable consequences. Moreover, he stated that without forgiveness, resentment remains a barrier to many human relationships.[123] It is clear, then, that Butler recommended forgiveness over forgetting, since forgetting does not necessarily eliminate the element of revenge.

Julie J. Exline and Roy F. Baumeister, both psychologists, observed that victims are far more likely to forgive offenders who respond with genuine remorse. Offenders must acknowledge their wrongdoing, offer sincere apologies with a sense of guilt, and take positive steps to "make amends" for their actions.[124] For forgiveness to occur, it involves not only the "victim" but also the offender's participation in humbling themselves to admit their fault.

Jacques Derrida argued that true forgiveness consists in forgiving the unforgivable. If forgiveness were only extended to what is forgivable, the very notion of forgiveness would vanish. True forgiveness, therefore, must involve the attempt to forgive what seems unforgivable, whether murder, bloodshed, or acts that cause deep trauma.[125] In essence, genuine forgiveness is universal and unconditional.

Emmanuel Levinas offered a perspective distinct yet not contradictory to the preceding thinkers: forgiveness is a reversal of time, as though the act had never been committed by the offender. In forgiveness, the forgiver acts upon the

---

[123] Jeffrie Murphy and Jean Hampton, *Forgiveness and Mercy* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 15-17.

[124] J. J. Exline and Roy F. Baumeister, "Expressing Forgiveness and Repentance: Benefits and Barriers," in *Forgiveness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, ed. M. E. McCullough, K. I. Pargament, and C. E. Thoresen (New York: The Guilford Press, 2000), 136.

[125] Jacques Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (London: Routledge, 2001), vii-viii.

past, granting the offender a new past, namely, a past that is forgiven, which releases the offender from the weight of their offensive history and makes possible a new beginning.[126] In short, forgiveness opens the door to a new future: a renewed opportunity to become good.

A Description of Forgiveness Between Jesus and Humanity, and Among Human Beings, according to Matthew 18:21-35

One cause of disharmony within the circle of Jesus' disciples was the actions or attitudes of an individual that were perceived by the rest of the group as "oppositional." They realized that it would be dangerous to allow personal hostilities to poison the community. Thus, forgiveness became the key to restoring relationships toward what is good and harmonious. Verses 21 and 22 in Matthew 18 serve as both the introduction and the heart of how forgiveness ought to be extended, namely forgiveness without limit. Verse 35, in turn, provides the conclusion, showing how human beings are to forgive one another just as God has forgiven them.

The concept of forgiveness in Matthew 18:21-35 is anchored in the Greek verb ἀφίημι, which carries a meaning far richer than a mere emotional act of letting go. Lexically, ἀφίημι denotes "to release," "to remit," or "to cancel an obligation," particularly in legal, financial, and moral contexts. According to BDAG, the term is frequently used to signify the remission of debts or sins, emphasizing the release of a legitimate claim rather than the denial of wrongdoing.[127] Similarly, Louw and Nida classify ἀφίημι within the semantic domain of removing guilt resulting from wrongdoing, highlighting its juridical and relational dimensions.[128]

---

[126] Christopher R. Allers, "Undoing What Has Been Done: Arendt and Levinas on Forgiveness," in *Forgiveness in Perspective*, ed. Christopher R. Allers and Marieke Smit (New York: Rodopi B.V, 2010), 31.

[127] Walter Bauer, Frederick William Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000),155-56.

[128] Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains.* 2nd ed. (New York: United Bible Societies, 1989), 502.

In Matthew 18:21-35, the meaning of ἀφίημι is interpreted through the parable's controlling metaphor of debt. R. T. France notes that forgiveness in this passage is expressed entirely in economic terms, namely the cancellation of an unpayable debt, which serves as an analogy for the remission of sin.[129] Importantly, this cancellation does not negate the reality of the debt itself; rather, it presupposes its seriousness. Davies and Allison stress that ἀφίημι in this context refers to the withdrawal of the demand for repayment, not the erasure of the offense.[130] John Nolland further underscores that forgiveness does not trivialize wrongdoing but assumes its gravity as the very condition that makes forgiveness meaningful.[131] Thus, in Matthew 18:21-35, ἀφίημι frames forgiveness as an ethical act that releases the offender from rightful claims while simultaneously presupposing the acknowledgment of guilt, an understanding crucial for interpreting forgiveness in contexts of deep relational harm and trauma.

First, Peter's proposal of up to seven times (a number often used to symbolize perfection) in verse 21 was intended to express the outer limit of one's generosity. According to rabbinic teaching at the time, a person was expected to forgive up to three times; on the fourth, forgiveness was no longer required. Yet Peter proposed more than what was considered the maximum by rabbinic standards, seven times.[132] This reveals Peter's attempt to demonstrate an extraordinary willingness to forgive, exceeding the conventional Jewish norms of his day.

Jesus, however, rejected Peter's suggestion, declaring that it was not enough to forgive seven times but rather "seventy times seven." This number alludes to the story in Genesis 4:24 about Lamech's vengeance, which uses the

---

[129] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 704-5.

[130] Davies and Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew,* 790-91.

[131] Nolland, *The Gospel of* Matthew, 760.

[132] D. A. Carson, Walter W. Wessel, and Walter L. Liefeld, *Matthew, Mark, Luke: The Expositor's Bible Commentary Volume 8* (Grand Rapids, MI: The Zondervan Corporation, 1984), 405.

same figure. Such hyperbolic language deepens the understanding of forgiveness: a disciple must be as extravagant in forgiveness as Lamech was in vengeance.[133] In other words, members of the Christian community must practice forgiveness without measure, not merely three or seven times, but seventy times seven, signifying that forgiveness cannot be exhausted or counted.

Second, Jesus further explained God's forgiveness toward His people through the parable of a servant who owed his king ten thousand talents (vv. 23-25). Ten thousand talents represented an unimaginably vast debt, the largest sum conceivable. Even selling his wife, children, and possessions would not begin to cover it.[134] Such a debt was humanly unpayable, highlighting the servant's utter hopelessness.

Some commentators note that the figure given in the text refers to a measure of weight, namely silver. One talent of silver was typically valued at six thousand denarii. Since a single denarius was a day's wage for a laborer (cf. Matt. 20:1-15), a debt of ten thousand talents equaled sixty million denarii, an amount that would require saving one hundred percent of wages for 165,000 years.[135]

In verse 26, the servant's plea, "Be patient with me", was little more than an impossible promise to repay. At the very least, he sought more time to settle his debt. Yet rather than granting mere patience, the king, moved with compassion, completely forgave the debt (v. 27).[136] In short, the king recognized the futility of repayment and, out of mercy, chose to cancel the servant's debt altogether.

As the servant had been forgiven his immense debt, he was expected to act likewise toward others. Instead, verses 28–30 depict a striking failure: when a fellow servant owed him one hundred denarii, he had the man thrown into

---

[133] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 636-37.

[134] David Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew: New Century Bible Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1981), 278.

[135] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 637.

[136] Hill, *The Gospel of Matthew: New Century Bible Commentary*, 278.

prison for failing to pay. One hundred denarii equaled roughly one hundred days' wages, a minuscule fraction (1/600,000) of the first servant's forgiven debt.[137]

Because of this merciless act, the king summoned the first servant once more. Though his debt had been forgiven, his refusal to show mercy toward a fellow servant revealed him as a "wicked servant." He was then handed over to the jailers for torture until he could repay the unpayable debt (vv. 32-34). This illustrates the dual nature of the heavenly Father, overflowing in mercy yet severe in judgment.[138] As a God of compassion, He cannot accept as His own those who themselves lack compassion.

Thus, the fifteen verses of Matthew 18:21-35 employ the metaphor of "debt" to signify sin in need of forgiveness (cf. 6:12), and the figure of the "king" to represent God as the one who forgives humanity. The parable vividly portrays that forgiveness must be reciprocal: God cannot be expected to forgive the unforgiving. The disciples are assumed to be those who have already been forgiven. Clearly, the initiative lies with God, who forgave first; yet the forgiveness received by humans may be nullified by their failure to forgive others.[139] The parable strongly underscores that those who have been forgiven must also forgive, lest they demonstrate themselves incapable of extending forgiveness.

In conclusion, Matthew 18:21-35 emphasizes two central truths: (1) forgiveness must be unlimited, regardless of the magnitude of the offense, and (2) forgiveness requires initiative acknowledge wrongdoing and assume responsibility, just as God Himself took the initiative to freely forgive His servant.

Interpreting Forgiveness Toward Others

The fundamental idea in discussing forgiveness in its practical sense is that forgiveness must arise from within the individual (the victim) and must be

---

[137] France, *The Gospel of Matthew,* 638.

[138] Carson, Wessel, and Liefeld, *Matthew, Mark, Luke: The Expositor's Bible Commentary Volume 8*, 407.

[139] France, *The Gospel of Matthew,* 635.

extended without limit and without regard to the size or severity of the offense committed. Therefore, the act of forgiving means practicing a moral virtue, imitating the essential nature of God. To forgive is to follow the ideals and way of life exemplified by Jesus. Thus, forgiveness represents the ethics of the kingdom of God (including love and compassion).[140] Those who embody the ethics of the kingdom are those who strive to make God's reign present in the world by practicing mercy.

A person forgives not because of the general belief that every event has its own cause, but because hatred must be prevented or restrained in certain situations for specific reasons. More broadly, this may be classified as a voluntary act; otherwise, it risks becoming offensive or harmful in the moral character of the relationship between the one who has wronged (the perpetrator) and the one who has been wronged (the victim).[141] In other words, if hatred is nurtured, it will gradually become dominant within the self, shaping a character of resentment.

However, forgiveness also often seems undeserved, for certain transgressions or offenses, in some sense, cannot be forgiven (due to their seriousness, brutality, or the depth of betrayal involved). In such cases, forgiveness cannot be forced, since at its core it must involve an inner change of heart on the part of the victim, releasing hatred and seeing the perpetrator with renewed mind and heart. This commitment cannot be coerced, much less imposed by the presence of a third party.[142] Therefore, if someone attempts to forgive merely to soothe their own mind, whatever outcome they achieve does not fully amount to true forgiveness.

---

[140] Anthony Bash, *Forgiveness and Christian Ethics* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 99.

[141] Jerome Neu, "To Understand All Is to Forgive All – Or Is It?," in *Before Forgiving: Cautionary Views of Forgiveness in Psychotherapy*, ed. Sharon Lamb and Jeffrie G. Murphy (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 19.

[142] Charles L. Griswold, *Forgiveness: A Philosophical Exploration* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 20.

What About Trauma?

When traumatic crimes and injustices committed in one generation remain unresolved, the following generations are inevitably drawn into conflict. In the United States, the impact of mass trauma, such as African slavery and the genocide of Indigenous peoples, continues to echo in the collective consciousness. Immigrant groups who fled extreme circumstances, such as the Nazi Holocaust, the Armenian genocide, or the Vietnam War, have passed down a "legacy of memory" of these events to their descendants. The fate of all individuals involved is deeply accounted for. Although they may have perished, both the victims and perpetrators of mass crimes and trauma maintain their presence in the lives of others.[143] This compels children and grandchildren to feel obligated to resolve what they did not begin and to atone for what they did not commit. In this way, the obligation to pursue revenge remains a persistent force within the next generation.

Transgenerational forgiveness[144] cannot be achieved through a simple apology followed by acceptance. When the actions that caused harm cannot be undone, the path toward forgiveness places specific demands on both sides. For perpetrators or their descendants, forgiveness requires an acknowledgment of guilt, an expression of genuine remorse, and a reasonable offer of restitution. For victims and their descendants, forgiveness entails an act of profound compassion and humility that restores the sweetness of life.[145] Thus, forgiveness leaves the perpetrator with a sense of guilt while liberating the victim from the desire for revenge.

---

[143] Ani Kalayjian and Raymond F. Paloutzian, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building* (New York: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2009), 149.

[144] In this study, "transgenerational forgiveness" refers to the process by which forgiveness is sought, negotiated, or withheld across generations in situations where trauma, guilt, and moral responsibility extend beyond the original victims and perpetrators, particularly in cases of mass violence and historical injustice.

[145] Kalayjian and Paloutzian, *Forgiveness and Reconciliation Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building*, 149.

The cases presented here, of course, do not capture the entirety of traumatic events. Forgiveness is never easy, especially when life itself has been taken. Yet this does not mean that the realization of forgiveness is impossible, provided that the perpetrator experiences and expresses heartfelt remorse and is willing to offer "reparation" in a form deemed appropriate by the victim.

To arrive at such genuine remorse, however, requires self-awareness. Awareness is the state or capacity of understanding, feeling, or perceiving events, objects, or sensory patterns. Cited from Agoes Dariyo, Daniel Goleman asserts that self-awareness functions primarily as a way of reflecting on one's emotional state through past experiences and circumstances.[146] In this study, self-awareness is understood not merely as emotional recognition, but as an ethical capacity that enables the offender to acknowledge guilt and assume responsibility toward the victim. Here, awareness occupies a deeper role than mere knowledge; it involves spontaneous emotional responses.

In such cases, Sydney S. Shoemaker explains that an individual must engage in self-reference through identification. Superficial self-identification produces a kind of immunity to wrongdoing.[147] From this, it becomes clear that self-awareness is a matter of great seriousness: it is not merely recognizing that an action was wrong and then simply forgetting it, for such superficiality will have consequences in the days to come when wrongdoing is repeated. On the contrary, awareness is something attained when one has truly reflected and recognized that an action was wrong through identification with past deeds, followed by reflection, and ultimately by offering a response to the victim (acknowledging the wrongdoing and accepting whatever consequences may follow).

---

[146] Agoes Dariyo, "Peran Self Awareness Dan Ego Support Terhadap Kepuasaan Hidup Remaja Tionghoa," *Kajian Ilmiah Psikologi* 15, no. 2 (2016): 254-74, https://journal.unika.ac.id/index.php/psi/article/view/991/660.

[147] Andrew Brook, "Kant, Self-Awareness and Self-Reference," in *Self-Reference and Self-Awareness* (Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001), 9-10.

CONCLUSION

Forgiveness, like love, must be without limits. Without such forgiveness, a community cannot restore its relationships with one another, nor can it truly embody Christ in its midst. A Christian community ceases to be itself if it does not insist that its members live according to the standard of Christ's conduct. Yet the spirit of forgiveness is not a form of indifference toward sin. It does not mean that Jesus failed to uphold justice; rather, He upheld justice on the basis of His grace, granting forgiveness as the exclusive way to disarm hatred.

God places no limits on forgiveness toward humanity, as illustrated in the parable that contrasts divine forgiveness with human forgiveness. This is because there are no boundaries to God's mercy toward His people. A community of the forgiven must, therefore, be a forgiving community. The deeper motive for this is gratitude and the imitation of God's grace.

It becomes clear that forgiveness is future-oriented, not by reopening past wrongs, nor by merely "forgetting" them in the sense described by Butler, but by focusing instead on constructive solutions. Genuine forgiveness requires not only the participation of the "victim" but also the humility of the offender in acknowledging wrongdoing. Through repentance, the offender lessens guilt; through forgiveness, the victim quenches hatred; forgiveness heals and restores.

Once again, true forgiveness, as taught by Jesus, must be forgiveness "seventy times seven" (without limit). True forgiveness must be forgiveness of "ten thousand talents" (without condition). In essence, genuine forgiveness is forgiveness that is both universal and unconditional.

REFERENCES

Allers, Christopher R. "Undoing What Has Been Done: Arendt and Levinas on Forgiveness," 19-42. In *Forgiveness in Perspective*, edited by Christopher R. Allers and Marieke Smit. New York: Rodopi B.V, 2010.

Arnold, Bill T. *Encountering the Book of Genesis*. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House Company, 2004.

Bash, Anthony. *Forgiveness and Christian Ethics*. New York: Cambridge University Press,

2007.

Bauer, Walter, Frederick William Danker, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. *A Greek–English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Borgman, Paul. *David, Saul, and God: Rediscovering an Ancient Story*. London: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Brook, Andrew. "Kant, Self-Awareness and Self-Reference,"9-30. In *Self-Reference and Self-Awareness*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001.

Carson, D. A., Walter W. Wessel, and Walter L. Liefeld. *Matthew, Mark, Luke: The Expositor's Bible Commentary Volume 8*. Grand Rapids: The Zondervan Corporation, 1984.

Dariyo, Agoes. "Peran Self Awareness Dan Ego Support Terhadap Kepuasaan Hidup Remaja Tionghoa." *Kajian Ilmiah Psikologi* 15, no. 2 (2016). 254-74. https://journal.unika.ac.id/index.php/psi/article/view/991/660.

Davies, W. D. and Dale C. Allison Jr. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew, Volume II: Matthew 8–18*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991.

Derrida, Jacques. *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Exline, J. J., and Roy F. Baumeister. "Expressing Forgiveness and Repentance: Benefits and Barriers,"133-55. In *Forgiveness: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by M. E. McCullough, K. I. Pargament, and C. E. Thoresen. New York: The Guilford Press, 2000.

France, R. T. *The Gospel of Matthew: New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 2007.

Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke: New International Commentary on the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997.

Griswold, Charles L. *Forgiveness: A Philosophical Exploration*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Hill, David. *The Gospel of Matthew: New Century Bible Commentary*. Grand Rapi: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1981.

Kalayjian, Ani, and Raymond F. Paloutzian. *Forgiveness and Reconciliation Psychological Pathways to Conflict Transformation and Peace Building*. New York: Springer Science+Business Media, LLC, 2009.

Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.

MacArthur, John. *Genesis 12–33: The Father of Israel*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 2015.

Murphy, Jeffrie, and Jean Hampton. *Forgiveness and Mercy*. London: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Neu, Jerome. "To Understand All Is to Forgive All – Or Is It?,"17-38. In *Before Forgiving: Cautionary Views of Forgiveness in Psychotherapy*, edited by Sharon Lamb and Jeffrie G. Murphy. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Nolland, John. *The Gospel of Matthew: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

Ridderbos, Herman N. *The Gospel According to John: A Theological Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing, 1997.