

THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE AND MATTHEW 10:23b

CHARLES H. GIBLIN, S.J.

Fordham University

THE MISSION discourse reported in Mt 10 has always been difficult to interpret. In particular, the statement that the apostles will not finish the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes (10:23b) has been a source of real ambiguity. The many current interpretations of this verse have been well summarized by C. F. D. Moule:

Either the evangelist identified the coming of the Son of Man here with the Resurrection, despite other passages in which it seems clearly to relate to the remoter future; or he is interpreting the mission-charge of Matt. x without any relation to the context of the ministry of Jesus in which he has himself placed it, and applying it instead to his own contemporary situation; or he is faithfully preserving a saying found in his traditions, which (whether genuinely dominical or not) had ceased to have any relation to his own day; or, finally, the saying originally related to the 'coming of the Son of Man' in the crisis of the Jewish War [Feuillet]. Of these difficult choices, the last is perhaps the least difficult to believe.¹

Differing as these interpretations are, they all seem to mask a common perspective, a temporally delimited one, one that might be called a clock-and-calendar outlook. A. L. Moore has already challenged the validity of this perspective in his monograph *The Parousia in the New Testament*.² In interpreting Mt 10:23b, another outlook or perspective seems to yield much richer theological fruit. Let us see whether this new perspective meets the demands of unified and clear understanding of the data in this perplexing logion.

According to the perspective adopted by most exegetes, the interpretation of the mission discourse and of Mt 10:23b is historically oriented in the more limited sense of being concerned with the clock-and-calendar point of reference. That is, most exegetes tend to view the saying in terms of a one-to-one correspondence between this saying (whether it be originally or interpretatively dominical) and a single episode situated at a given moment or period of clock-and-calendar

¹ C. F. D. Moule, *The Birth of the New Testament* (2nd ed.; London, 1966) p. 90.

² A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament* (Leiden, 1966) pp. 143-46, 172-74, 187-90.

time (cf. the interpretations summarized above). The currently accepted perspective is well exemplified by a mistranslation of Mt 10:23b in *The New English Bible*. In fact, it is evidenced even in those commentators (e.g., Schniewind and Kümmel³) who give a correct translation, but then proceed to interpret the logion according to the perspective accurately represented in a mistranslation like that of *NEB*, which has "before you have gone through all the towns of Israel, the Son of Man will have come." The Greek has *ou mē telesēte tas poleis [tou] Israēl heōs [an] elthē ho huīos tou anthrōpou*.^{3a} Now compare the differences between the following examples: "Before you finish the book, I will have come," and "You will not finish the book until I come." Even if we modify⁴ the translation given in *NEB* to read "Before you finish the cities of Israel, the Son of Man will have come," the connoted perspective remains the same. It is that of a cutting short of the mission, perhaps even the frustration of the mission, not its fulfilment and completion in the action of another. Again,

³ J. Schniewind, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (7th ed.; Göttingen, 1954) pp. 129–30; W. G. Kümmel, "Die Naherwartung in der Verkündigung Jesu," in *Zeit und Geschichte*, ed. E. Dinkler (Tübingen, 1964) pp. 41–43. P. Gaechter makes a similar error, *Das Matthäusevangelium* (Innsbruck, 1963) p. 336: "Ehe diese Arbeit ihr Ziel erreicht hat, wird ein anderes Ereignis eintreten." E. Käsemann regards the logion as an expression of the imminence of the parousia, a hope proved wrong; cf. "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," *ZTK* 57 (1960) 184. Like Kümmel, he takes imminence in terms of clock-and-calendar time.

^{3a} The text in Mt 10:23b may be somewhat peculiar in Mt in that, according to K. Aland, *Synopsis quatuor evangeliorum* (Stuttgart, 1964), it contains neither a relative like *hou* nor the particle *an*. The MS tradition supports *an* (C K D W Θ pl) almost as strongly as it supports *heōs* alone (B and S*), especially when one considers the more regular Matthean usage, notably when *heōs an* + subj. appears after a negative main clause (Mt 5:26; 5:18 [*bis*]; 16:28; 23:29; 24:34), and when one observes that *an* has been omitted by B* in Mt 5:18 as well. The Bible Societies' edition, *The Greek New Testament*, ed. by K. Aland, M. Black, B. M. Metzger, A. Wikgren (Stuttgart, 1966), places *an* in the text, but in brackets; Merk (9th ed.) accepts *an*. In any case, the textual evidence for *heōs hou* is very weak (S³). In the light of Matthew's over-all stylistic usage (see n. 22 below), *heōs hou* can be set aside. While we are inclined to accept *an* after *heōs* in Mt 10:23b, it does not seem that our interpretation would be affected adversely by the omission of the particle. The temporal reference would simply become more obscure (see n. 25 below).—The article before "Israel" is omitted by B and D. Matthew's usage in the twelve cases where "Israel" occurs varies; with the article: 2:6; 8:10; 9:33; 11:28; anarthrous (almost all instances are Hebraizing formulae): 2:20,21; 10:6; 15:24,31; 27:9,42. Reading the article in 10:23b is favored by the fact that "Israel" has already been mentioned in 10:6 (anaphora); cf. Blass–Debrunner–Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago, 1961) §260–62.

⁴ Kümmel notes that the verb *teleō* is transitive here; cf. *art. cit.*, pp. 41–43.

note the examples: "Before you finish the book, I will have come," and "You will not finish the book until I come." In the first example, "my coming" cuts short "your finishing the book." In the second example, "my coming" has a quite different scope: it connotes the completion of the writer's work, perhaps in something which he himself cannot accomplish. In the first example, the perspective is rather that of clock-and-calendar time and perhaps even of frustration; in the second, it is rather that of finality and fulfilment—notably when, as in Greek, the subjunctive is employed in the subordinate clause.⁵

A few commentators have been more or less careful not to interpret the logion of Mt 10:23b simply or primarily in the perspective of clock-and-calendar time, but it does not seem that they have accurately and consistently interpreted the scope of the logion. For example, Stendahl⁶ says that the logion looks to the mission of the Church until the grim and painful end. But the end is not presented precisely as grim and painful; he who perseveres to the end will be saved (Mt 10:22b). Besides, how does this interpretation fit with the apparently restricted mission to Israel expressed in Mt 10:6? Bonnard⁷ suggests

⁵ Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *op. cit.*, §383 (2). The reason for the subjunctive "probably lies in the fact that the old prospective subjunctive (Schwyzer 11, 310) survived in these clauses due to a certain affinity with the final clause" (*ibid.*).

⁶ Krister Stendahl, "Matthew," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley (Edinburgh, 1962) §631i. Cf. G. Barth, "Das Gesetzesverständnis des Evangelisten Matthäus," *Überlieferung und Auslegung im Matthäusevangelium* (2nd ed.; Neukirchen, 1961) p. 93 n. 2: "Mt. sieht in den $\mu\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ die Kirche allgemein verkörpert."

⁷ Pierre Bonnard, *L'Évangile selon saint Matthieu* (Neuchâtel, 1963) p. 149; see n. 21 below. Bonnard avoids interpreting the logion as referring to the proximity of Jesus' return. J. Dupont, " 'Vous n'aurez pas achevé les villes d'Israël avant que le Fils de l'Homme ne vienne' (Mat. X 23)," *NT 2* (1958) 239, 244, is not as cautious. He proceeds to consider the logion with regard to a specific episode as such (a Galilean mission), not with regard to instructions to twelve disciples and the work of the Son of Man. Dupont does not really move beyond a specific temporal perspective; he is also concerned more with the source of the logion than with its perspective in the present discourse. The latter is unfortunately neglected even when Dupont provides most valuable insights, viz., regarding the connection between Mt 10:5b-6 and Mt 10:23b and the fact that the achievement of the mission (10:23b) is prefaced by a *description* of it (*art. cit.*, pp. 236-38). It is this inserted material with its expanding perspective which must be examined to assess the scope of Mt 10:23b in its *present* literary context. As we shall see, the vocabulary of part of this inserted material in the sections addressed to the Twelve is repeated in the section dealing more generically with disciples. What is more, the theme of personal identification of the disciple with Jesus in work and attitude is made progressively clearer thanks to this inserted material. Thus, in separating what he has in 10:5b-6 from 10:23b, Matthew is also seen at work making room for descriptive material which seems to unify the whole discourse and give it a wider perspective. It is in this redactional perspective that 10:23b must really be judged.

that the logion looks to the possibilities of evangelization. But the term *teleō* is quite intelligible without this specific connotation and refers, as Kümmel and Dupont insist,⁸ to the completion of a task. Moreover, the possibilities for evangelization by those described in this context as sheep sent among wolves (10:16a) are hardly to be stressed. A. L. Moore more appositely underscores the Christological reference.⁹ Unfortunately, however, he does not view the mission of the disciples in the perspective of the human as well as divine fulfilment of their mission by Christ, but refers to the failure of the disciples in winning the Jews to allegiance of the gospel.¹⁰ What is more, Moore does not spell out the Christological reference in terms of finality and fulfilment in a mystery which is delimited neither temporally *nor spatially*. Moore rightly denies temporal delimitation when he argues against the opinion that the text looks to a temporally imminent parousia. But he supposes a kind of spatial delimitation, taking "Israel" in a racially or nationally delimited sense.¹¹

The interpretation which will be submitted here attempts to move beyond the categories of "identification" (one-to-one correspondence of the scope of the text with a given episode in the life of Christ or in secular history). It attempts to do this by moving beyond a delimited perspective—which is more that of secular history or church history than that of salvation history—whether that perspective be temporally delimited (as in almost all the interpretations save those of Stendahl, of Bonnard, and especially of Moore) or spatially and numerically

⁸ Dupont, *art. cit.*, p. 231; W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfillment* (London, 1957) p. 62, appealing to Lk 12:50.

⁹ A. L. Moore, *The Parousia in the New Testament*, pp. 172, 194, 206; for a more general discussion, cf. pp. 108–58, 175–90. Moore speaks of the eschatological perspective (the presence of the end in Christ) and the grace motif (time for repentance). Even so, Moore does not seem to have freed himself from interpreting some difficult parallel texts in terms of episodic rather than Christological reference, e.g., Mt 16:28 (*op. cit.*, pp. 177, 189). Also, some clarification is required regarding the way events are understood as summed up in Christ. Moore speaks of "coinherence," which suggests the point of view of formal aspects, i.e., an essentialistic viewpoint, rather than that of finality, an existential viewpoint (*op. cit.*, p. 172). Are not these aspects interrelated in Christ in the way one experience is ordered to another fulfilling experience, e.g., the Transfiguration to the Resurrection, and the Resurrection to the Parousia, so that what is fundamental is the *lived* mystery of the Son of Man?

¹⁰ Moore, *op. cit.*, p. 145. ¹¹ *Ibid.*

delimited as well (*viz.*, in its understanding of "Israel" and "you"). It attempts also to judge the logion primarily in the context of the mission discourse itself and in that of the Matthean presentation of Christ's own mission. Accordingly, the interpretation offered involves a hermeneutical principle which might well be called consistently analogous typology.

Thus, I would say that Mt 10:23b speaks of the *finality of the mission of the Church*, affirming that this finality lies in the coming of the Son of Man. The realization and manifestation of the lived mystery of Christ is that which alone will complete the Church's mission, which is an extension of and part of the mission of Jesus Himself. Accordingly, this saying may be judged to be verified for the Twelve in their lifetime, for the Matthean church in its own day, for the Church today and in the future. What the text has in view is not a single historical event as such but a theological understanding of the mission of the Church, expressed in terms of the mystery of Christ. We may spell out the reasons for this interpretation by way of answering four questions: To whom is the saying addressed? What is the verbal force of the statement "You *will not finish . . . until . . .*"? What is the meaning of the coming of the Son of Man? What is the scope of "Israel" here?

THOSE ADDRESSED

Those who are addressed in the logion ("you") are not only the Twelve whose names are listed (10:1-4) in the introduction to the discourse (9:35-10:4), but, in and through them, the disciples, the Church. For the discourse transcends the spatial and temporal delimitations of a probationary mission of six pairs of individuals during the public life of Jesus. The total literary unit¹² contains in its first

¹² 9:35-38; 10:1-4	INTRODUCTION
10:5-42	DISCOURSE
10:5-15	1) Specific Instructions to the Apostles concerning Their Mission
10:16-23	2) Warnings and Assurances for Their Mission
10:24-42	3) Warnings and Assurances regarding Disciples
11:1	CONCLUSION-TRANSITION

Sections 1, 2, and 3 of the discourse are each closed with an *amēn . . . legō hymin*. Sections 1 and 2 are similarly introduced (*cf. apostellō*, vv. 5, 16) and are joined by an *inclusio* on *Israēl* (vv. 6, 23b). Section 3 is marked out by an *inclusio* on *mathētēs* (vv. 24, 41). The conclusion-transition contains a double *inclusio* with the second and first parts of the in-

major section (10:5–15) specific instructions for the Twelve on their mission to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The Evangelist himself never relates the actual exercise during the public life of any of the exceptional things mentioned in v. 8. In fact, there is some evidence to show that at least the *éclat* of the disciples' powers did not at that time come up to the expectations of these instructions.¹³ But, more significantly, powers like those indicated here could not have been exercised in the public life without having made the Twelve at that very time as much an object of hatred to Jesus' enemies as Jesus Himself proved to be. In the second major section (10:16–23), in which the Twelve are still being addressed,¹⁴ there are warnings and assurances which, even to the Evangelist's knowledge, go well beyond the

troduction: *dōdeka mathētai* (11:1a; cf. 10, 1a); *ho Iēsous* (9:35; 10:5; cf. 11:1a). Other significant connections (e.g., the use of *polis*) will be seen to confirm this analysis. But we may note here that the vocabulary towards the end of section 3 of the discourse is markedly similar to that of the vocabulary in section 2: *eirēnē* (10:33; 10:13); *axios* (10:37,38; 10:11,13); *dechomai* (10:40,41; 10:14). In both of these sections, moreover, there is a general pattern: warnings alternate with assurances:

	<i>warnings</i>	<i>assurances</i>	<i>instruction</i>
2:	{	10:16b–18	10:19–20
		10:21–22a	10:22b
			10:23a (tying in with the "movement" theme of 10:5–15)
3:	{	10:26–28	10:29–31
		10:31	10:32
		10:33–38	10:39–42

¹³ Mt 17:19 contains an admission of impossibility in a specific instance, whereas Mt 10 envisages success on a scale commensurate with that of Jesus.—Powers of the disciples on the scale suggested here are attested in the postpaschal mission of the disciples: e.g., preaching the kingdom (Acts 8:12; 20:25; 28:31; etc.); healing (Acts 4:14; 5:16; 8:7; 28:9); raising the dead (Acts 9:36–43; 20:9–12); casting out demons (Acts 16:16–19a). Matthew seems to do in one book and even in one discourse what Luke does in the course of two books. Matthew's "telescoping" derives partly from his insistence on teaching and on principles of action, as contrasted with Luke's emphasis on exemplification of the power of the spirit in act and on moral dispositions illustrated in the concrete life of the Church. But Matthew's "telescoping" can also be accounted for by a concern to present the Church in terms of a disciple-Master relationship focused on the mystery of Jesus' life among the immediate recipients of the law and the prophets.

¹⁴ *Idou egō apostellō hymas*; cf. *apesteilen*, v. 5. The "sheep image" is also repeated, but in a paradoxical way; cf. *probata* in 10:6,16.

temporal and spatial framework of the public life. Those sent (10:16a) are warned that they will be brought before procurators and kings (v. 18a) to bear testimony "to them and to the nations" (v. 18b).¹⁵ They will be hated by "all" (v. 22a). Such warnings envisage full-fledged proclamation of the gospel. In the third major section (10:24-42) warnings and assurances are more clearly widened to encompass all disciples, as indicated at the outset by the rather generic use of this term (vv. 24-25). Although "disciples" are still seen in relation to the Twelve who are being instructed (11:1: "His twelve disciples"), they are shown to include all those who enjoy a relationship through Jesus to the heavenly Father (10:24-25, 29, 32). What is stated by way of warning to the disciples in general (v. 36) reflects what has been said in v. 21 to those directly addressed and sent on the mission. The passage closes with mention of one of the least disciples and his being received for what he really is,¹⁶ viz., a disciple, a representative of Jesus Himself who is received. We have here not only an identification of Jesus with the group addressed ("you"), but an identification with those

¹⁵ The theme of "testimony to" (*eis martyrion* + dat.; cf. W. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel* [3rd ed.; Munich, 1964] 130) is progressively expanded in Matthew's Gospel as a whole. It first appears in Mt 8:4, where Jesus sends the cured leper to the priest. It appears a second time in 10:18—with a double reference: "to them [those in whose synagogues the disciples will be beaten] and to the nations." The third time, in the eschatological discourse which occurs after the woes on the false Israel, it appears clearly in a world-wide dimension (Mt 24:14). Thus, the Evangelist presents the theme in the context of Jesus' own work in Israel, in the context of a mission of the Twelve to Israel (which, contra D. Bosch, *Die Heidenmission in der Zukunftsschau Jesu* [Zurich, 1959] 155, is not to be conceived as separated from or opposed to that to the Gentiles; see below), and, lastly, in the context of a discourse concerning the program for the disciples' fidelity and hope to the consummation of the age.

¹⁶ For the identification with Christ, cf. *dechomenos* and *dechetai* in v. 40 and the objects given there; the resumption of *dechomenos* in the subsequent verses in apparent parallel to v. 40a; and the predication of a reward for the "least" in a climactic series: prophet—just man—disciple (Gaechter).—For the intention, note *eis onoma*, three times in vv. 41-42. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Chicago, 1957) 575, c, suggest in another connection that *eis to onoma* can mean "for what he really is" (i.e., his name truly represents him). Cf. Mt 18:20, which gives the reason for the gathering in terms of the personal object of the action; cp. Mt 28:19 (notion of personal consecration). Contrast the use of *epi to onomati* in Mt 18:5, which seems to state the reason or intention without insisting on full identification with a person in question (for the child is an *illustration* of the disciple).

addressed of the ordinary disciple who is received.¹⁷ Lastly, the warnings which are directed in this section to disciples indicate that greater abuse is to be expected by the disciples than that shown to Jesus (v. 25b) and include the prospect of martyrdom (vv. 28–31). Moreover, the motivation given presumes a grasp of the mystery yet to be accomplished, for the worthy disciple is said to be one who receives the cross and follows after Jesus (v. 38).

Consequently, those addressed in this discourse are best taken as *representative* persons—as the Twelve, to be sure, but in and through them as all the disciples whom Jesus sends, who may thus be regarded as successors of the Twelve in the mission from one city to the next. In this respect, the perspective of the discourse is typological, transcending the mission of the Twelve during Jesus' life on earth while focusing on His instructions, warnings, and assurances to the Twelve. Furthermore, the perspective of this discourse should be judged to transcend the picture of the church of Matthew's day, even while it also reflects the perspective of that church. Käsemann has noted that the motivation given the disciples does indeed suppose the church as Matthew viewed it, a church characterized by prophets and just men (cf. v. 41).¹⁸ Nevertheless, while this observation shows us that the mission is conceived in terms reflecting a later period and thus helps show that the mission is not temporally delimited to the activity of those addressed by Jesus during His public life, it should not lead us to judge the discourse or the logion in 10:23b simply in terms of church history.

¹⁷ The identification is achieved by repeating the same verb with different objects or by paralleling objects (and various qualifications):

v. 40a	one receiving <i>you</i> (pl.)		
40b	receives me;		
40c	one receiving me		
40d	receives the one who sent me;		
41a	one receiving a prophet	as a prophet	—reward obtained
41b	one receiving a just man	as a just man	—reward obtained
42	(... refreshes) <i>one of these little ones</i> ; cf. Mk 9:41:← "you" (pl.)	as a <i>disciple</i> (with emphasis on this qualification: <i>monon</i>)	—reward (not lost)

The technique has roots in the OT: e.g., in the identification of "your fathers" and "you" in Jos 24:5–7; "Structural Patterns in Jos 24, 1–25," *CBQ* 26 (1964) 50–69, 62.

¹⁸ E. Käsemann, "Die Anfänge christlicher Theologie," *ZTK* 57 (1960) 170 f.

The mission is conceived not mainly in terms of church history but in terms of Jesus' own mission as one to be shared and projected by the Twelve as representative disciples. The progressively clearer point of reference is neither spatial nor temporal but personal. This fact can be discerned from a number of features.

First of all, the scope of the mission is expressed in Mt 10:6 in terms almost identical with those used in Mt 15:24 of the mission of Jesus Himself (sent only to the lost sheep of Israel). Within the context of the mission discourse itself, the instructions given in vv. 7-8 reflect (in expanded form) the redactional entry describing Jesus' own work (9:35b; cf. 4:23), and the lost sheep to whom the apostles are sent (v. 6) recall those on whom Jesus has had compassion (9:36). The solemn assurance of judgment on those who reject the Twelve (10:15) is formulated along lines quite similar to the sentence on the cities of Galilee which had not acknowledged the miracles of Jesus (11:23-24). Thus, in the first main section of the discourse there are rather clear indications that the mission of the Twelve is one with that of Jesus in the object of the work to be done, the work itself, and the consequences of rejection.

Secondly, a more strictly personal identification of Jesus with the Twelve and the disciples is evidenced in the second major section and is developed more fully in the third. In the second major section of the discourse (10:16-23) it is said that what the emissaries will suffer is suffered for Jesus' sake (v. 18) or Jesus' name (v. 22), and assurance is given that their testimony will be provided by the spirit of their Father. Also, the most prominent danger they face is the very one which Jesus Himself will suffer, betrayal (vv. 17, 19, 21; cf. v. 4b). Then, in the third major section, the disciple is equated with a servant or member of Jesus' household and on this basis is warned of abuse to come (vv. 24-25). The disciples' Father is seen as Jesus' Father in heaven, before whom He will testify on behalf of those who testify to Him before men.¹⁹ The whole discourse, as we have already seen, ends on the note of multiple personal identification (vv. 40 ff.): that of the

¹⁹ J. Schmid, *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* (4th ed.; Regensburg, 1959) *in loc.*, alerts us to the concept of the talion in connection with judgment. But the formulation (*en* + dat. instead of *anti* + gen., as in Mt 5:38, to which Schmid refers us) suggests not "compensation by an equivalent" but personal identification and even finality: "in and through (and even because of)." Cf. Mt 11:6, "who is not scandalized in me," i.e., "because of me, my being what I am"; 26:31, "because of me, smitten as I will be"; cp. also Mt 23:20, 21.

disciple with the one who receives him, of Jesus with the one who sent Him, of one of these little ones with the disciple envisaged in the discourse, and of the disciples with the Twelve (11:1) who have been instructed by Jesus. It is this personal relationship to Jesus rather than a conception of the specific work of the Matthean church which is the dominant theme unifying the discourse.²⁰ Consequently, one is justified in seeing those addressed in 10:23b as representative persons whose mission is conceived basically in terms of a personal relationship to Jesus—a relationship which could be verified in the life of the Twelve or in the church of Matthew's day, but one which is not delimited by the spatial or temporal circumstances of those respective life-situations.

THE VERBAL ELEMENTS IN MT 10:23b

Even within v. 23b, the action of those addressed is personally oriented; it is ordered to completion not in itself but in the action of another. The main verb, *teleō*, looks to the accomplishment or fulfilment of a task and requires no further nuance of "opportunities for evangelization" to render it intelligible.²¹ Furthermore, an analysis of the *heōs*, *mechri*, *achri*, and *prin* clauses in the *NT* supports the judgment that finality and fulfilment are in question here.²² This is

²⁰ Cf. the indications of redactional work given above, n. 7. F. Neiryneck draws attention to the way in which Mt uses and develops Mk in presenting the association of Jesus and the disciples in the mission discourse: "La rédaction matthéenne et la structure du premier évangile," in *De Jésus aux évangiles*, ed. I. de la Potterie (*J. Coppens Festschr.*; Gembloux, 1967) pp. 41-73, 70-72.

²¹ Bonnard himself senses the difficulty in requiring this connotation. Had Mt wished to say "finished evangelizing," he could easily have used a Greek supplementary participle; cf. Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Grammar*, §414 (2). He does so at the close of this discourse, Mt 11:1: *hote etelesen . . . diatassōn*.

²² *Prin* occurs in Mt 1:18; 26:34,75; Mk 14:30,72; Lk 2:26; 22:61; Acts 2:20; 7:2; 25:16; Jn 4:49; 8:58; 14:29. The conjunction in these passages may always be regarded to refer to the *terminus ante quem*. When *prin* is followed by the infinitive, as it is after a positive main clause, the emphasis falls on the main clause, and the *prin* clause stresses futurity, not finality. When a negative clause precedes, as in only two of the thirteen *NT* instances, viz., Lk 2:26 and Acts 25:16, the subjunctive or optative is employed in the *prin* clause. A certain note of finality is then present, and emphasis falls on the *prin* clause; temporal priority, however, rather than fulfilment is what is principally affirmed.—The uses of *heōs*, *achri*, and *mechri* may be grouped together under the following main headings: (1) *With the indicative, in dependence on a positive main clause*: "while" (Jn 9:4; Heb 3:13; Mt 5:25); "before" (Acts 27:33); "until" or "before" (Mt 2:9; Mk 6:45; Jn 21:22,23; Ap 17:17; Mt 13:33 [=Lk 13:21]; Acts 7:18; 21:26; 1 Tim 4:13).

especially true when one compares with other clauses those temporal statements involving a term meaning "until" which employ the subjunctive after a negative main clause.²³ The emphasis in such cases lies clearly on the subject and action stated in the "until" clause. Thus, the action of those addressed in 10:23b (their not finishing) is ordered to completion precisely in the coming of the Son of Man.

The aorist subjunctive of the verb "come" may be taken in various ways. The "coming" may be regarded as inceptive (begin to come),²⁴ though this is rare, as specific (a single coming in the sense of one that occurs at a given time and place and at no other),²⁵ or as complexive (a "coming" that can cover several events).²⁶ Selection of one of these senses on the basis of v. 23b alone is probably impossible. The same is

In the latter instances, matter-of-fact termination or actual completion of the action in the main clause is indicated. (2) *With the indicative, in dependence on a negative main clause: "until"—though "before" may be used equally as well in all the NT examples, since the *heōs* clause does not imply that the (negated) action of the main clause was subsequently performed. The indicative simply marks the termination of the negated action (without necessarily implying subsequent completion): Mt 1:25; 24:39; Jn 9:18; 13:38; Lk 22:34.* (3) *With the subjunctive, in dependence on a positive main clause: "until" (Mt 2:13; 10:11; 14:22; 18:30,34; 22:44 [citation of LXX Ps 109:1; cf. Mk 12:36; Lk 20:41 f.; Heb 1:13; Acts 2:35]; 26:36; Mk 6:10; 14:32; Lk 12:50; 13:8; 15:4,8; 17:8; 21:24; 24:39; Acts 25:21; Rom 11:25; 1 Cor 11:26; 15:25; Gal 3:19; 4:19; 2 Th 2:7; Jas 5:7; 2 Pt 1:19; Ap 2:25; 6:11). Finality or intention is regularly indicated in these cases.* (4) *With the subjunctive, in dependence on a negative main clause: Mt 5:18 [bis]; 5:26; 16:28; 17:9; 23:39; 24:34; Mk 9:1; 13:30; Lk 1:20; 9:27; 12:59; 21:32; 22:16,18; Acts 23:12,14,21; 1 Cor 4:5; Ap 7:3; 15:8; 20:3,5. There is always an indication of finality and fulfilment in these clauses.*

²³ See n. 22, *heōs*, category 4. One may compare especially the way in which Mt 17:9 reflects the emphasis in Mk 9:9 (which stresses an exclusive condition: *ei mē hotan*). One should not conclude, however, that fulfilment cannot be anticipated; cf. Lk 1:20 (*achri hēs hēmeras genētai tauta*); Zechariah does speak before every single thing which the angel said would occur (Lk 1:13–17) does in fact take place.

²⁴ Cf. Blass–Debrunner–Funk, *Grammar*, §§318, 331. This may well be the better sense of the verb *genētai* in the parable in Mk 13:28 pars. (cf. *ēde*), where the seasonal image is that of spring turning into summer.

²⁵ E.g., where the subjunctive can often be translated as a future perfect: Mt 17:9; Mt 5:26; Lk 12:59. In this connection, it seems that a more precise point of reference is given when *heōs hou* rather than *heōs an* is used; cf. *heōs hou* in Mt 17:9; *heōs an* in Mt 5:26 (interest focuses on complete payment of the debt, whenever that may be). For *heōs hou*, cf. also Mt 26:36; Lk 15:18; 22:18; 24:39; Acts 23:12,14,21; 25:21; 2 Pt 1:19. In the case of simple *heōs*, the temporal reference is not as clear; cf. Lk 15:4 = *heōs hou*, Lk 15:8; Mt 18:30 = *heōs hou* according to *K D Θ* in 18:30 and is paralleled by *heōs hou* in Mt 18:34, but seems to equal *heōs an* in Mt 5:26.

²⁶ Blass–Debrunner–Funk, *Grammar*, §§318, 332. Cf. Lk 1:20; n. 23 above.

true of relatively parallel statements when taken in themselves.²⁷ But if one considers both the apocalyptic character of the saying and especially the scope of the whole discourse in which it is situated, it seems more probable that the complexive sense is to be preferred.

Apocalyptic tends to express finality in terms of futurity (largely because of its radical dependence on images together with its view of things in relation to decisive judgment consequent upon trials). It also tends to speak of things complexively rather than singly,²⁸ and, notably in Christian circles, to regard the end of the process as being to some proportionate extent verified in present or more proximate events.²⁹ Even when a course of events is schematized in an apocalyptic view of things to come, the verb describing the fulfilment of the total picture does not involve a "countdown" nor is it necessarily tied to one moment.³⁰ The perspective of apocalyptic is not univocal, but can perhaps best be described as typological. It is not typological in the sense that it sees simply the *likeness* of one event in another—which would suppose a kind of conceptualistic viewpoint—but in the sense that it sees one series of significant events as *ordered* to another in the

²⁷ Some of the parallels closest to Mt 10:23b are the statements in Mt 5:18; 16:28; 23:29; 24:34.

The use of *hōs an* in Mt 16:28 pars. should not too readily be equated with the use of *prin ē an* in Lk 2:26. In Lk 2:26 (along with the emphasis on the age of Simeon) it is said that one experience (seeing the Messiah) will come before another (seeing death); in Mt 16:28 one experience (not tasting death) is more positively ordered to another (a vision of the Son of Man; cf. n. 35 below). That some will actually live to see this vision is implied, but it is not as directly the point affirmed, viz., a special experience, but not one which virtually marks the end of the preceding life of those to whom it is given.

²⁸ Dietrich Rössler has already noted this tendency in the treatment of the term "law": *Gesetz und Geschichte—Untersuchungen zur Theologie der jüdischen Apokalypthik und der pharisäischen Orthodaxie* (Neukirchen, 1960). Significantly, the characteristic tendency is tied to a view of history as a whole.

²⁹ Cf. the way in which the need for vigilance stated in Mk 13 is seen to obtain in the scene in Gethsemane: R. H. Lightfoot, *The Gospel Message of St. Mark* (London, 1950) pp. 48–59. Cf. also the way Mt anticipates events of the end-time in his presentation of the crucifixion (Mt 27:51–53).

³⁰ The verb can be taken in a complexive sense, e.g., Mt 24:34; cf. n. 26 above. The subject of the temporal clause can be interpreted accordingly, especially as given in Mt, who seems to distinguish two expressions (a suggestion I owe to I. de la Potterie): *Tauta panta* (Mt 4:9; 6:33; 13:34,51,56; 19:20) seems to focus attention on specific details as given in the context; *panta tauta* (Mt 24:8,33,34; 6:32) is more generic, looking to an eschatological totality (e.g., in Mt 6:32 a false eschatological totality is expressed; in 6:33, however, there is question of specific needs). For the interpretation of "this generation," see n. 47 below.

process of fulfilling ultimate judgment or salvation. It is according to this dynamic rather than static view of things that one may best appreciate the "telescoping" of events which many would recognize as a salient feature of *NT* apocalyptic and even of some *OT* prophetic declarations. Thus, in the case of Mt 10:23b, it would seem reasonable to say that the "coming" which is indicated marks the consummation in a way which does not preclude but may even suppose prior verifications of the theme of "coming" or visitation. What these may be will be discussed under the next subheading; we must content ourselves here with indicating that the apocalyptic character of the saying suggests that we consider the "coming" complexively.

The scope of the discourse itself, as already examined under the first subheading, likewise suggests that the "coming" is to be taken complexively. For the Twelve represent the disciples in a mission which transcends various specific temporal and spatial frameworks. Since the overriding perspective is the personal one of the relationship of the disciple sent to Jesus who sends him, the scope of the discourse is not to be divided up according to what may be called physical details. For instance, one should not affirm that a given phrase refers to the Twelve, but that another refers to the church of Matthew's day, and a third to something else, as if the total discourse had emerged by a kind of addition. In such a partitive interpretation—which cannot altogether be ruled out as an initial option, but which seems to create insoluble problems—the properly theological as opposed to the properly historical perspective is really lost. For what has been lost is, ultimately, a grasp of the whole mystery of the mission of disciples in relation to the Son of Man and, proximately, the viewpoint of the biblical author as discerned in the structured composition as a whole.

In the interpretation which we would offer, the mission of the disciples remains incomplete as long as the coming of the Son of Man remains to be completely verified. The mission involves succession in the life-experience of the church as ordered to the coming of the Son of Man.

THE COMING OF THE SON OF MAN

How the qualitative aspect of the coming may be discerned (*viz.*, a coming in judgment) depends mainly on noting that the coming is

that of the Son of Man. Although the term "Son of Man" is employed in a variety of ways, its use in Mt with the term "coming" in a future sense suggests quite clearly the advent of the eschatological Judge.³¹ The basic text is that where the judgment scene itself is presented (Mt 25:31), though there is also mention in this text of His glory (and His glorious throne) and all the angels with Him. The scene is clearly one of universal judgment (25:32a) with both reward and requital (25:32-46). Earlier in the eschatological discourse which is closed in this judgment scene there is mention of the Son of Man's coming on the clouds of heaven—again, with great power and glory and the sending of angels (24:30c). In close connection with this, as a sequel to the great tribulation and heavenly signs (24:29), the appearance of the ensign of the Son of Man is mentioned (24:30a). It is conceivable that this latter indication of His triumph is to be distinguished from the coming with glory, for it is separated from 24:30c by a reference to mourning or contrition (24:30b; cf. Ap 1:7; Za 12:10 ff.). Thus, it may be that the coming for judgment is related to a prior manifestation of the Son of Man,³² though this prior manifestation is not called a "coming." The "coming" par excellence seems identified with the parousia, at least in the texts warning of a decisive cataclysm (24:44b + 24:39b, 37). On the other hand, a text dealing with the parousia like the text in 24:27 seems more akin to the text on the ensign of the Son of Man (cf. the use of *phainomai* in both cases). "Parousia" in 24:27 is situated, however, within the events of the great tribulation itself.³³ What

³¹ Eschatological judgment seems to be the dominant note of this figure both in Dn 7 and in the NT. The sense of "Son of Man" in this context is further determined by the discourse itself, for the unique theme of the preaching enjoined in the mission discourse is that the kingdom of heaven is at hand (10:7); cf. H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Philadelphia, 1965). The mandate which is given in this discourse is a mandate of mercy in the context of fulfilment of God's judgment: G. Bornkamm, "End Expectation and Church in Matthew," *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew* (London, 1963) pp. 15-51, 18.

³² The suggestion has been made by Feuillet, but his interpretation is different: "Le sens du mot parousie dans l'évangile de Matthieu: Comparaison entre Matth. xxiv et Jac. v. 1-11," in *The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology*, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (*C. H. Dodd Festschr.*; Cambridge, 1964) pp. 261-80.

³³ Mt 24:9-28 (world perspective: 24:9-14; Judean perspective: 24:15-28). This central section on the tribulation is preceded by 24:4-8 (which speaks of earthly disturbances) and is followed by 24:29-31 (which speaks of heavenly disturbances). The perspective of the tribulation itself is stereoscopic rather than successive in its over-all lines.

emerges from the survey of these texts is that a coming in glory or a parousia like the visitation in the days of Noah refers to the decisive, final moment of judgment or salvation, but that a kind of triumph (or parousia) prior to this and ordered to it might also be affirmed. The triumphal coming or parousia is not necessarily conceived univocally or as a single temporal event.

In Mt 16:27–28 we find another twofold perspective, but one which is considerably clearer. “Coming” is predicated of the Son of Man twice in succession. The first occurrence (16:27) speaks of a coming in the glory of His Father with His angels and clearly indicates the scope of this coming in words referring to judgment (reward according to conduct). The second occurrence, however, which is immediately subjoined (16:28), takes the form of a solemn assurance that “some of those standing here” will not taste death until they have a vision of the Son of Man coming in His (own) kingdom (or kingly power). Mt has reordered Mk 8:34 ff. to present an invitation to disciples³⁴ to follow Jesus in self-denial in order to receive from Him their reward. But a twofold perspective of reward is indicated in terms of a twofold coming. One coming looks to the final judgment (16:27); the other (16:28), to an experience of the kingly power of the Son of Man prior to that judgment. The reason for regarding the latter coming as a prior coming is not only the reference to “some of those standing here”³⁵ but the reference to the kingdom of the Son of Man as *His* kingdom. For it is clear from Mt 15:36–43 (the apocalyptic explanation of the parable of the wheat and the tares)³⁶ that a certain distinction obtains between the kingdom of the Son of Man and that of the Father.

³⁴ Mt 16:24–28. The wider audience indicated in Mt 8:34 has been narrowed in Mt 16:24. Accordingly the untoward prospects of Mk 8:38, especially the reference to an adulterous generation, are omitted after Mt 16:26.

³⁵ The note of exclusivity can be taken as a way of representing a special grace (which is no injustice to others; cf. Mt 20:1–16). The expression “who have not tasted death” is employed in 4 Esdras 6:26 in apposition to “the men who have been taken up,” i.e., not only men who were removed from the earth without dying, but prophetic visionaries like Enoch and Elijah; cf. R. H. Charles, *Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford, 1913) p. 576. There is no need to say with McNeile, *Matthew* (London, 1957) p. 248, that the consummation will prevent their death. Even 1 Th 4:15, to which McNeile appeals, looks precisely to special union with the Lord (cf. 1 Th 4:17; Phil 1:23; 2 Cor 5:8; 2 Th 2:1b).

³⁶ Cf. J. Jeremias, “Die Deutung des Gleichnisses vom Unkraut unter dem Weizen (Mt xiii 36–43),” *Neotestamentica et patristica* (O. Cullmann Festschr.; Leiden, 1962) pp. 59–63.

The former involves a process with several stages: the activity of the Son of Man in sowing the word of God, in letting the tares grow with the wheat, and in sending the angels to gather "from His kingdom" all scandals and those who act rebelliously. The kingdom of the Father occurs at the end of the whole process, consequent upon judgment and entailing a kind of transformation ("shining like the sun in the kingdom of their Father," 13:43; cf. 1 Cor 15:41b, 42). Thus, the kingdom has a complexive aspect, that of its growth and that of its final realization, the latter being the point at which it becomes the kingdom of the Father. More important, the kingdom as involving the coming of the Son of Man has a complexive aspect, covering everything from His public life to the judgment towards which it is ordered and which is par excellence His coming.

In the light of this polarized concept of the kingdom, especially the polarization of the kingdom of the Son Himself, one can more readily appreciate the scope of two other key texts which will illuminate Mt 10:23b. The first text is that containing Christ's response to the high priest (Mt 26:64). What is paradoxically promised in this scene where Jesus is being judged is a vision of the divine Messiah³⁷ coming in judgment (cf. 24:30c). But the connoted judgment by the one now on trial is not viewed as an event placed solely at the end of the end-time; it is "from this moment" (*ap' arti*).³⁸ Thus, it is viewed complexively, as being operative within the Passion itself. The eschatology expressed here is not strictly future nor is it fully realized; it is anticipated. This complexive perspective is borne out in subsequent events of the Passion as Matthew describes them, where eschatological events like earthquakes and the resurrection of the dead are anticipated at the moment of Jesus' death (27:50-54).³⁹

The second text (Mt 19:28) does not mention the coming of the Son of Man but does speak of His being "seated on the throne of His glory."

³⁷ Cf. P. Lamarche, "Le 'blasphème' de Jésus devant le Sanhédrin," *RSR* 50 (1962) 74-85, or in *Christ vivant: Essai sur la christologie du Nouveau Testament* (Paris, 1966) pp. 147-63.

³⁸ Cf. A. Vanhoye, *Structure and Theology of the Accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels* (Collegeville, 1967) p. 32. *Ap' arti* clearly does not mean "in the future" or "here-after" (to the exclusion of the present); cf. Jn 13:19: *ap' arti legō hymin pro tou genesthai*; cp. Mt 23:39; 26:29; Jn 14:17; Ap 14:13.

³⁹ Vanhoye, *loc. cit.*

The context clearly deals with rewards for the Twelve and, indeed, for everyone who has left possessions for the sake of Jesus' name (19:27–29). Among these rewards are a share in judgment by the Twelve and eternal life for everyone who has renounced things for Jesus' sake. Thus, the note of final judgment is clearly present. The glory explicitly referred to is His glory, as in the scene of the final judgment (Mt 25:31). On the other hand, there are indications that a complexive perspective is not ruled out even here. The whole picture of judgment is qualified by a reference to the time of rebirth (*paliggenesia*, 19:28),⁴⁰ which could suggest a time consequent upon the Passion-Resurrection, in which Jesus' judgment and glorification is anticipated (cf. also 20:18b ff., where He is with the disciples to the end of the age). What is more, the Twelve are here represented as the ones who will judge the twelve tribes of Israel. "Israel" is certainly taken in a somewhat complexive sense, as required by the symbolic term, whether it be interpreted here as the true Israel, that which is defined in terms of discipleship in relation to Jesus,⁴¹ or (less probably) as the old Israel which rejected Him and is liable to judgment. For one can hardly delimit the reference to the Israel of Jesus' earthly contacts in Palestine in about A.D. 28 or to the tribes actually surviving on the day of judgment.

We may now return to consider Mt 10:23b in the context of the mission discourse. At the end of the first major section we find a perspective of judgment for that city (in Israel, cf. 10:5–6) which has rejected the Twelve sent to them (10–15). Towards the end of the second major section we find the perspective of salvation for one who has endured to the end (10:22b). Then, after mention of flight from one city to the next (10:23a), we read the logion about not finishing the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes (10:23b). The logion in 10:23b is tied proximately to the theme of reward for the persevering disciple in his work from one city to the next, while it also seems to echo the theme of judgment on the cities which have rejected those sent to them. In other words, the coming of the Son of Man in Mt 10:23b readily admits the connotation of a twofold judgment, one of requital and reward. Furthermore, the coming of the Son of Man looks

⁴⁰ Cf. Arndt-Gingrich, *Lexicon*, *Ib*, where this is understood of the messianic age.

⁴¹ Cf. Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel* (3rd ed.; Munich, 1964) pp. 30, 213.

to the whole task enjoined on the Twelve in the cities of Israel. Insofar as the Twelve themselves can be taken as persons representative of the mission of the whole Church, the coming of the Son of Man can be understood of the final judgment. But, to the extent that the perspective of the mission itself is focused more narrowly (e.g., on a mission of the Matthean church among the Jews or on a mission of twelve individuals in Palestine during the public life), the coming of the Son of Man will be focused accordingly (e.g., on an anticipatory coming in a judgment on Jerusalem or in events of Jesus' earthly life itself—say, the Passion-Resurrection). Our interpretation of related texts suggests that the dominant but not exclusive perspective is that of the final judgment. This interpretation squares with our taking the Twelve as representative of the whole Church as such (the disciples as one with the Master) and with our interpretation of their task as one which is personally finalized in the mystery of Jesus as Son of Man rather than historically terminated in a single temporally or spatially circumscribed event. It remains to be seen whether "Israel" can be interpreted in the same theological perspective.

THE CITIES OF ISRAEL

The term "Israel" in 10:23b does not seem to have been interpreted heretofore in a way that is consistent with the complexive, typological scope of the other elements in this logion. The reason for this is not hard to find. Opening the whole discourse proper is the explicit injunction to go to the lost sheep of the house of Israel in contradistinction to going off in the direction of Gentiles or entering into a city of Samaritans (10:5-6). One who opts for a basically racial, nationalistic, or historical understanding of "Gentiles" and "Samaritans" will probably make a corresponding option in his understanding of "Israel." He will judge it to mean exclusively the Jews of Palestine in about A.D. 28 or at most in the period at which Matthew's Gospel was written. Accordingly, he will judge the solemn assurance of the Lord's coming (10:23b) as a prophecy that proved false or as one that was reinterpreted in terms of the physical destruction of Jerusalem. In any event, his interpretation will remain on a narrowly conceived "historical" level. In this respect the most esteemed critic can be as literal-minded as the fundamentalist. But is this literal-minded perspective,

which practically prescind from the mystery of salvation in the person, words, and work of Jesus, the perspective of the Evangelist himself? Is it not probable that the literal sense of his Gospel must be grasped by assuming a perspective which transcends mere physical events even while it does not prescind from them? We have already seen grounds for this perspective in our interpretation of other elements in the logion. It remains for us consistently to apply the hermeneutical principle already verified in part.

We may begin by noting how the work of "finishing cities" reflects the opening remark about Jesus' own activity ("all the cities . . .," 9:35; cf. also the occurrence of "city" with "village" in 9:35a—of the mission of Jesus—and again in 10:11a—of the mission of the Twelve). It also looks ahead to the conclusion-transition (11:1) in which Jesus Himself is said to preach "in their cities." Thus, the task to be finished is a movement in cities that reflects the work which Jesus Himself has been doing and continues to do. Along with other features already discussed, this association helps bring out the fact that the mission of the Twelve is conceived in terms of a mission to Israel's cities because such was the scope of Jesus' own mission. In short, Jesus' earthly mission is paradigmatic for that of the twelve disciples. Accordingly, it should be further noted that Jesus' own mission to the lost sheep of Israel is not such as to exclude Gentiles, although it is indeed such as to show that the condition for their receiving the messianic benefits is faith (cf. the episode of the Canaanite woman, Mt 15:21-28). Similarly, Jesus' mission in cities has a wider scope even while it is exercised in terms of the territory of Palestine. The redactional summary introducing the mission discourse (9:35) recalls quite clearly that of 4:23, where Jesus' work in the territory of Galilee is described. It is from this area, where He works among the people (*laos*), that He is heard of in the whole of Gentile regions as well (Syria, 4:24); crowds follow Him from the Decapolis and from beyond the Jordan as well as from Galilee, Judea, and the city of Jerusalem (4:25). Thus, His mission in the land and cities of Israel cannot be taken (unless one simply opts for contradiction and unintelligibility on the level of the final redaction) as one which is meant exclusively for Jews. Rather, a wider perspective is indicated precisely in terms of what seems at first to be a narrower perspective: the mission to the land and people of Israel. Is not the same to be

said of the mission of the Twelve, whose work is geographically patterned on that of Jesus?

Turning again to 10:5-6, we observe that what is forbidden is going off "into a way of Gentiles," i.e., in their direction. Coupled with this injunction is another forbidding entrance into "a city of Samaritans." All these quoted terms are anarthrous, which already suggests that they have a certain generic character.⁴² Parallels to the use of the term "Samaritan" are wanting in Matthew. But one may advert to a similarity between Mt 10:5 and Mt 4:15 which suggests the way in which the paired groups of Mt 10:5 are to be understood. In Mt 4:15, the geographical scope of Jesus' activity is indicated largely in terms of an area in Palestine which is prophetically representative both of Israel and of the nations. Jesus moves into Galilee: "coming, He dwelt in Capharnaum, the (city) by the sea,⁴³ in the boundaries of Zebulun and Naphtali." This area is then seen as the scene of prophetic fulfillment involving the Gentiles as well: "land of Zebulun and land of Naphtali, (in the) direction of the sea, beyond the Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people sitting in darkness saw a great light, and for those seated in a region and shadow of death, a light arose for them (too?)" (cf. Is 8:23 f.). What makes "Gentiles" designate an acceptable audience for Jesus' preaching in the context of Mt 4:15 is their conjunction with regions of Israel (here presented under the aspect of tribes which were dispersed). Conversely, what would seem to make "Gentiles" unacceptable objects of the mission of the Twelve in Mt 10:5-6 (which we have seen is patterned on that of Jesus Himself) is their conjunction with a group traditionally representative of anti-Israel, scil., Samaritans. Fuller investigation of Matthew's geographical contrasts or his use of the term "Gentiles" would take us far beyond the limits of this article.⁴⁴ Enough has been indicated, however, to

⁴² Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Grammar*, §262: "Samaritans" is taken as a "collective whole."

⁴³ The epithet given Capharnaum, *parathalassian*, is used in the OT only of Gentile cities. Note also that, in Mt 11:23-24, Capharnaum is assimilated to the "world cities," to a Babylon worse than Sodom.

⁴⁴ In Matthew's theological geography, one country seems to have two foci: "Kapharnaum ist für Matthäus das Paradigma der begnadeten, aber unbussfertigen und daher verworfenen Stadt, in dieser Hinsicht das galiläische Gegenstück zu Jerusalem" (Trilling, *Das Wahre Israel* [3rd ed.; Munich, 1964] 132).—The Servant's hidden role in Israel prefigures his work of mercy and judgment with regard to the Gentiles (Mt 12:15-21).

provide a reasonable assurance that our interpretation of the sense and scope of Mt 10:23b need not founder on the reef of Mt 10:5-6.

The universal mission of the Church is expressed in terms of the mission to Israel because the universal mission of Jesus Himself was so expressed. The apparent narrowness of the missionary perspective can be accounted for by a theological focus on the mystery of the work of Jesus Himself in fulfilment of God's word. He enjoins what He Himself does. The mission of His disciples is one with His own.

In the course of the Gospel, as the rejection of Jesus becomes quite clear, the delineation of a true and false Israel will also become clear. The false Israel is itself typological even while it is seen concretely and in this sense "historically." The "sons of Israel" who priced the servant as a slave (27:9) and those who mock the "king of Israel" (27:42) represent more than the individuals involved or the people of Jesus' day who rejected Him. Their blood-guilt is not to be judged in racial or nationalistic terms, but as representative of a decisive rejection of the one who, as Son of God, defines the true Israel in His own person.⁴⁵ In this connection, one should note another key text concerning blood-guilt which evidences quite clearly a typological perspective, one not delimited in space and time. Climaxing the woes on the hypocrites (23:29-36) is an attack on their alleged innocence of the sins against the prophets like those committed by their fathers (23:30). They are

Jesus' spiritual nourishment for the Gentiles, prefigured in the second multiplication of the loaves (cf. L. Cerfaux, "La section des pains [Mc VI,31—VIII,26; Mt XIV,13—XVI,12]," in *Synoptische Studien* [A. Wikenhauser Festschr.; Munich, 1953] pp. 64-77, 75-77) is immediately prefaced in Mt with the notation that the crowds "glorified the God of Israel" (Mt 15:31). In the eschatological discourse, addressed specifically to disciples (Mt 24:3 ff.), a world perspective is juxtaposed to a specifically Judean perspective (Mt 24:9-14, 15-28). When the counterproductive Israel is contrasted to a nation productive of good works (Mt 21:33-46,43), it is seen in the person of its representatives, enemies of Jesus (Mt 21:45), and the theme of dissociation in the parabolic representation of Israel and the passion of Christ focuses ultimately on the person and actions of Jesus Himself. Thus, associations and contrasts involving Israel and the Gentiles are viewed radically not in terms of phenomenological history but in terms of a historico-personal relationship between genuine disciples and Jesus.

⁴⁵ Cf. Birger Gerhardsson, *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4,1-11 & Par), Chapters 1-4* (Lund, 1966) esp. pp. 11-24.—In this connection, one may note that Jesus comes to His baptism, too, as a *representative* person; cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Baptism in the New Testament* (London, 1962) p. 56. The dove and the voice both seem to show that the revelation of the people of God is centered on and in Him.

said actually to fulfil the measure of their fathers and are ordered to judgment. Accordingly, their own sins are to be fulfilled⁴⁶ in what they do to the ones whom Jesus sends to them and whom they will pursue from city to city (23:34b; cf. 10:23a). The objective result of all this (*hopōs* etc., 23:35) is that all the just blood poured out on the earth from Abel to a certain Zechariah whom they have slain will come upon them (23:35), that is, upon "this generation" (23:36). Thus, the Pharisees epitomize hypocrisy and the murder of the prophets; their blood-guilt is the guilt of "this generation."⁴⁷ In Mt 10:23, "Israel" is not yet clearly distinguished in two senses, although the progressively adverse picture presented in the mission discourse (cp. 10:11–13 with 10:14–15, and then 10:11–15 with 10:16–23) suggests the alienation of a good number. "Israel" in 10:23b stands for those to whom Jesus Himself has come in fulfilment of God's word, and who are representative of the Church's universal mission.

If the hermeneutical principle of consistently analogous typology which we have discerned and employed in the case of Mt 10:23b is

⁴⁶ Cf. an OT and Pauline expression, 1 Th 2:16; *The Threat to Faith: An Exegetical and Theological Re-examination of 2 Thessalonians 2* (Rome, 1967) pp. 131–35.

⁴⁷ The fact that the generation of Jesus' day is addressed does not justify one in saying that the group is addressed precisely as one which is temporally and nationally delimited. Those who opt for a strictly temporal perspective usually appeal to the Hebrew *dōr*, as in *haddōr hazzeḥ*; for the discussion cf. G. R. Beasley-Murray, *A Commentary on Mark Thirteen* (London, 1957) p. 100. But this very term has a nondelimited, typological perspective in texts like Dt 1:35, Gn 7:1, and Jg 2:10. In Dt 1:35 the generation is explicitly characterized as "wicked," but throughout these discourses the Deuteronomist is surely addressing the men of his own generation (age group). The Israelites of his own day are one with their fathers (cf. Dt 26:5–10; Jos 24:5–7). Jg 2:10 speaks of two generations, distinguishing them precisely in terms of knowledge of God, even though two successive generations are in question. But the second of these generations is really a prototype for those which follow; actually, numerically many generations are subsumed under this second of two generations. The distinction between the two generations occurs in close conjunction with a passage (Jg 2: 11–21) which is programmatic for the whole book and thus for understanding the generation(s) subsequent to the one which knew the Lord. This qualitative aspect of *dōr* may be further supported by the fact that in some passages it may be translated as "state," e.g., Is 53:8; cf. Gerhard von Rad, *Old Testament Theology 2* (London, 1965) 255, referring to G. R. Driver, *JTS* 36 (1935) 403.—M. Meinertz has examined the parallel instances of the term *genea* in greatest detail, and concludes that the temporal sense is present, but secondary: " 'Dieses Geschlecht' im Neuen Testament," *BZ* 1 (1957) 283–89. J. Jeremias more accurately discerned the basic question of perspective when he said that *hē genea hautē* "heisst nicht 'binnen 30 Jahren', sondern über die Menschen denen Jesu, Verkündigung galt und die sie ablehnten, werden die Eschata hereinbrechen": "Eine neue Schau der Zukunftsansagen Jesu," *Theologische Blätter* 20 (1941) 217.

applied to other thematically related texts, we believe the results will be illuminating, consistent, and confirmatory. It is possible, for instance, to see more readily how "this generation" in the eschatological discourse somewhat antithetically corresponding to that in Mt 23 (viz., the discourse in Mt 24–25) is also a typological expression. In Mt 24: 34, "this generation" does not refer exclusively to the group addressed by Jesus in or about A.D. 29 but, in and through them, to those to whom the Lord's words are addressed and communicated and who will not pass away as long as His words endure (24: 34–35; cf. 28: 20 in the light of 24: 3b—the end of the age is one with the final triumph of Jesus, but He is present with His disciples throughout this final age, which is a kind of continuum).⁴⁸

By way of summarizing our conclusions, we may say that every element in the logion can be interpreted consistently in a typological sense which seems to emerge from the perspective of the author himself as discerned from the structure of the discourse and an interlocking circle of expressions throughout his Gospel. *Qualis Christus, tales discipuli*. The ecclesial perspective of Matthew's Gospel focuses in this text on the personal relationships between the Twelve and Jesus Himself. Their mission, which is representative of the mission of all disciples, is conceived in terms of Christ's own mission, and its fulfilment is judged in terms of the fulfilment of the mystery of the Son of Man, the eschatological Judge. In what He said to the Twelve—actually or interpretatively—Jesus speaks to the whole Church today and looks to its mission as one with His mission. The task of preaching to those to whom He Himself came in fulfilment of God's word will not be completed until He comes in judgment; the task of the disciples will be incomplete until He who has begun the work comes to requite and reward.⁴⁹

⁴⁸ Cf. the way "your parousia" and "the consummation of the age" are joined by a single article in Mt 24:3b; cp. Mt 28:20. Even the genealogy (which is not without a contextual connection with Mt 28:20; cf. the *inclusio* with Mt 1:23) seems to situate Jesus' generation (*genesis*) in a kind of final generation (*genea*) of His people. For an OT association of *genesis* and *genea*, cf. Gn 6:9 and cp. von Rad's use of the term "Noahic aeon," *Genesis* (London, 1961) p. 126. With Jesus, however, the line is fulfilled rather than begun (as in Gn 5:1; 6:9).

⁴⁹ Cf. *The Documents of Vatican II*, ed. W. M. Abbott (New York, 1966): "Dogmatic Constitution on the Church," no. 2 (p. 15); "Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church," no. 9 (p. 595).

One may protest that this typological viewpoint is an attempt to save the inerrancy of the text and/or that it introduces dogmatic considerations into exegesis. In answer to the first objection, a theological viewpoint in terms of a typology of existential situations⁵⁰ seems to be required by the very affirmations of the text when these are grasped on the level of the whole final redaction. The alternative is to regard the author as being mindless of contradictory views or as deliberately perpetuating them: e.g., the notion of a mission conceived as directed exclusively to Israel (Mt 10) versus that of one ultimately directed exclusively to the Gentiles (Mt 20:18 ff.).⁵¹ Even on a critical basis, such an assumption does scant justice to the author or school who labored over the production of this concise work. The assumption amounts to a judgment that Matthew's Gospel is an attempt at compromise in contradictions rather than a nuanced grasp of the total mystery.

In answer to the second objection, one should readily concede that an exegesis of a text regarded as the word of God requires a theological and complexive viewpoint entailing a concern to preserve the integrity of the whole inspired message. While the critic must sit in judgment on the text which he accepts as the word of God, he is not entitled to pick and choose what he himself considers relevant or even to rest content with bracketing what does not fit his theory in a given related instance. If he seems to face insuperable problems in reconciling (i.e., in grasping the unity of) the *veritas salutaris* in various statements, he should rather seek a higher vantage point which will enable him to perceive

⁵⁰ Some basic differences in kinds of typology have been pointed out by G. W. H. Lampe and K. J. Woolcombe, *Essays on Typology* (London, 1957). Lampe remarks that "allegory differs radically from the kind of typology which rests upon the perception of actual historical fulfillment. The reason for this great difference is simply that allegory takes no account of history. The [allegorical-minded] exegete has to penetrate through the shell of history into the inner kernel of spiritual or moral truth" (p. 31). But in his subsequent discussion of various kinds of typology, Lampe does not really face the question of finality seen in and through significant events. It is finality that characterizes NT typology even in the case of Gal 4:21—5:1 (*freedom* by election for inheritance) and in the theology of Hebrews (cf. Heb 9:8—10, 11—12 [reading *mellontōn* in v. 11], 28).

⁵¹ J. Jeremias, for instance, speaks of the incompatibility of the logion in Mt 10:23b with Matthew's universalistic outlook: *Jesus's Promise to the Nations* (Naperville, 1958) p. 20. Is it probable that by accident or in disregard of statements in the rest of the Gospel this logion was retained or was inserted into a tightly composed discourse?

and preserve the whole. Such a “catholic” vantage point need not compromise critical methodology and may even serve to guide it. Admittedly, however, it will not really be justified by principles of the critical, scientific methods it employs, but only, like any form of wisdom, by its results. Perhaps this essay in theological perspective will have helped point out one route to a needed vantage point for grasping at least in a better way the theological state of the question and what John Courtney Murray called the radically important *impostazione*.