

Literature

- Yoshito Anno, "The Mission to Israel in Matthew: The Intention of Matthew 10:5b-6 Considered in the Light of the Religio-Political Background" (Diss., Chicago, 1984).
- F. W. Beare, "The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: Matthew 10 and Parallels," *JBL* 89 (1970) 1–13.
- Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *The Cost of Discipleship* (New York: Macmillan, 1969) 221–46.
- Boring, *Sayings*, 141–50, 158–69, 208–12.
- Brooks, *Community*, 47–57.
- Schuyler Brown, "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section," *ZNW* 69 (1978) 73–90.
- H. J. B. Combrink, "Structural Analysis of Mt 9:35–11:1," *Neot* 11 (1977) 98–114.
- Dungan, *Sayings*, 41–75.
- Goulder, *Midrash*, 338–53.
- Hahn, *Mission*, 120–28.
- Harnack, *Mission*, 36–42.
- Kloppenborg, *Formation*, 190–203, 206–16.
- Lange, *Erscheinen*, 250–60.
- Akira Ogawa, *L'histoire de Jésus chez Matthieu: La signification de l'histoire pour la théologie matthéenne* (EHS 23/116; Frankfurt: Lang, 1979) 234–40.
- Hiltrud Stadtland-Neumann, *Evangelische Radikalismen in der Sicht Calvins: Sein Verständnis der Bergpredigt und der Aussendungsrede (Mt 10)* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Lehre der reformierten Kirche 24; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1966) 42–49.
- Jirair S. Tashjian, "The Social Setting of the Mission Charge in Q" (Diss., Claremont, 1987).
- Uro, *Sheep*.
- Weaver, *Discourse*.

Position in the Gospel

The second discourse is also carefully incorporated into the structure of the gospel, although it does not exhibit the careful ring composition that we find in the Sermon

on the Mount. Only 9:35 corresponds to 11:1b, and 10:1 corresponds to 11:1a.

The linkage of the discourse's content to earlier material is clear. The charge to the disciples in 10:7b to preach corresponds to the proclamation of Jesus in 4:17. The charge to heal in 10:8 is reminiscent of some of the deeds of Jesus reported in chaps. 8–9.¹ The sending of the disciples to Israel (10:5–6, 23; 11:1) corresponds to Jesus' activity in Israel (4:23; chaps. 8–9). Jesus' healing in 9:35c corresponds to the authority that is given to the disciples (10:1c). The disciples' behavior and fate correspond to the commands of the Sermon on the Mount. The disciples are defenseless (10:10, 16, cf. 5:38–42), poor (10:9–14, cf. 6:19–34), and persecuted (10:16–23, 38–39, cf. 5:10–12). They are under God's care (10:28–31, cf. 6:25, 31) and do not need to worry (10:19, cf. 6:25–34). Thus Matthew makes clear that the mission given to the disciples is no different from Jesus' own mission, just as their authority and their fate are no different from those of Jesus. The content of their proclamation corresponds to their lifestyle.

Matthew 11:1–7 takes up the narrative thread of chaps. 8–9 without a break. Matthew is able to do this because he does not report that Jesus sent the disciples out (as in Mark 6:7–13, 30 or Luke 10:1, 17–20). When the discourse is completed it is not the disciples who go away, having been sent out, but Jesus himself (11:1b).² Reading the concluding statement in 11:1, this discourse, like the other Matthean discourses, has no immediate function in the narrative thread. Since it has no direct consequences, it is as if Jesus has simply spoken it into thin air. Thus 11:1–7 takes up the narrative thread where Matthew had left it in chap. 9, which explains why there are so many references in 11:1–7 back to chaps. 3–9.³ In view of what follows in the Matthean report we

1 Cf. 8:16–17; 9:35; 9:18–26; 8:1–4; 8:28–34; 9:32–34.

2 Patte, 138–39, concludes from this fact that the organization of the Gospel of Matthew is not narrative but didactic and then, with the help of the contrasts in the text, he analyzes the themes Matthew deals with. Incorrectly! He fails to recognize that the narrative parts of Matthew (i.e., of chaps. 8–9, 11–12, etc.) are complete units into which this discourse of Jesus, like others, is inserted, and he treats the Matthean discourse and narrative sections as the same kind of literature. Matthew himself intend-

ed—as he indicates with the conclusions of the discourses—to give the discourses a special position *within* the narrative.

3 Matthew 11:3 refers to 3:11b, 11:5a–d to the miracles in chaps. 8–9, the end of 11:5 and 6 to the macarisms 5:3 (–12), 11:7 to 3:1, 5.

can understand the sending discourse as a preview of coming events. The next main section, chaps. 12–16, tells of the separation between the disciples and Israel and thus makes clear the meaning of the saying about sheep among wolves (10:16). Israel's opposition and the new family of disciples (cf. 10:25, 34–37) will be the subject of the following section. Jesus faces the burden of the cross and the loss of his life. Even in its details, chap. 10 sounds themes of later sections. Texts that from the perspective of the entire narrative are previews of what is to come are, for example, 10:6 (cf. 15:24; 28:18–20), 10:15 (cf. 11:20–24), 10:17–22 (cf. 24:9–14), 10:25 (cf. 12:22–30), 10:38–39 (cf. 16:16–21; 27:31–56), 10:40–42 (cf. 18:1–14; 25:31–46).

That Matthew here interrupts the flow of his narrative with a second discourse has several meanings. At the earliest possible place following the first gathering of a group of disciples, Jesus instructs the disciples about the task and shape of discipleship. He thus applies ecclesiologically what he has thus far done and taught. That the discourse has no immediate consequences within the story of Matthew and is, as it were, spoken into thin air, is an indication that it is designed to be meaningful beyond the unique historical situation of that time. The numerous allusions to the future story or words of Jesus not only serve the didactic purpose of heightening the interest through anticipation and repetition, they especially show that Jesus is master of this story and in his words and deeds will remain true to himself.

Structure

Outlining the structure of our discourse is not easy. Clearly recognizable is (1) *the narrative introduction in 9:36–10:5a*. It begins in the same way as the narrative introduction of the Sermon on the Mount,⁴ but is then

more detailed. In addition to the list of the apostles (10:1–4), it contains two logia important for the interpretation of the discourse (9:36, 37–38) that are heard again in the discourse itself. The actual discourse is to be divided into two main parts⁵ of approximately equal length.

(2) *The first main section is 10:5b–23*. As does the second part, it ends with an amen word with οὐ μὴ (vv. 23, 42). The catchword “Israel” (Ἰσραήλ) forms an inclusion (vv. 6, 23). The unit is divided into the two subsections, vv. 5b–15 and 16–23, each of which contains at its beginning the catchwords “I send” (ἀποστέλλω) and “sheep” (πρόβατον; vv. 5–6, 16) that are anticipated in the introduction (9:36; 10:2a). Both conclude with a reference to the judgment in the form of an amen saying (vv. 15, 23). In the first section, imperatives are dominant, in the second, future tenses. The first section contains the actual mission commands, the second speaks of the persecution that is part of the mission.

(3) *The second main section, 10:24–42*, cannot be organized unequivocally. Verses 24–25 have a key function. They connect the fate of the disciples with that of the master with whom they are members of the same household. For this reason vv. 34–39 are best understood around the theme of whether one is attached to Jesus or to the “members of the household” (οἰκιακοί, vv. 25, 36) to which one has previously belonged. Jesus' appearance means a severing of one's previous household relationships (vv. 34–36; three times κατά), for the attachment to him must take precedence over everything else (vv. 37–39; three times “is not worthy of me,” οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος, seven times “me,” μου, ἐμέ) and leads to suffering. Verses 26–33 are characterized by the catchword “to fear” (φοβέομαι) and are designed to encourage the proclaimers. For reasons of their content, vv. 32–33 belong

4 After 4:23 par. and 9:35 cf. 5:1 par. and 9:36: ἰδὼν δὲ τοὺς ὄχλους. See similarly Terence J. Keegan, “Introductory Formulae for Matthean Discourse,” *CBQ* 44 (1982) 428–29.

5 Jean Radermakers (*Au fil de l'Évangile selon saint Matthieu* [2 vols.; Heverlee-Louvain: Institut d'études théologiques, 1972] 135–47), H. J. B. Combrink (“Structural Analysis of Mt 9:35–11:1,” *Neot* 11 [1977] 98–114, 109–11), and N. W. Lund (*Chiasmus in the New Testament* [Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942] 262–71) suggest a division of vv. 5–42 into five sections that

are arranged chiastically (5–15/34–42; 16–23/26–33) around the center 24–25. It is not clear, however, that the sections A and E or B and D linguistically correspond to one another. Rainer Riesner (“Der Aufbau der Reden im Matthäus-Evangelium,” *ThBei* 9 [1978] 176) regards the two main sections as 10:1(!)–16 and 17–42. My own suggestion owes much to the observations of Weaver, *Discourse*, 71–126.

6 For formal reasons (inclusion with vv. 5–6) v. 16 could be assigned to the preceding section. Because of its content, however, it belongs to vv. 17–23. Furthermore, the image changes in v. 16.

to this unit. They make clear which proclamation was meant in vv. 26-31. Both sections emphasize the christological foundation of vv. 24-25 (λέγω ὑμῖν, vv. 27, 32-33; ἡλθον vv. 34-35, ἐμέ, vv. 37-39, 40a, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, v. 42). A promise to the disciples and those in solidarity with them concludes the discourse (vv. 40-42).

The most important difference between the two main sections consists in their *temporal structures*. The first main section is framed by the two sayings that limit the disciples' mission to Israel (10:5-6, 23). In addition, there are in this main section sayings that indicate that it is speaking of the mission in Israel (vv. 17-18, cf. 16). Our interpretation will have to show whether the readers of the Gospel of Matthew understood the words to be speaking to their own present. In the second section, by contrast, nothing is limited to Israel; here the church can understand everything that Jesus says as spoken directly to its own situation.

Sources

The relationship to *the sources* is complex. As with all of the discourses, the disciples discourse is a composition consciously composed by the evangelist. There are disciple sendings in Mark (6:7-13, 30-31) and in Q (Luke 10:2-16). The placement of the disciples discourse is suggested by both sources relatively but not absolutely. In his use of Mark, Matthew had proceeded as far as Mark 5:43 (= Matt 9:26), but in the verse that frames chaps. 5-9 (4:23 = 9:35) he had already used formulations from Mark 6:6. From Q he had moved Luke 9:57-60 to an earlier place (= Matt 8:19-22) so that Luke 10:2-16 would now come next. In both sources, however, there are still omitted materials (Mark 2:23-4:34; 6:1-6a; Q = Luke 7:18-35). The evangelist thus generally follows his sources faithfully, but the exact placement of the disciples discourse is his own free choice. He wants the dis-

ciples discourse to appear immediately after the cycle of Jesus' deeds (Matthew 8-9).

There is similar freedom in the way Matthew arranges the details. The introduction, 9:36-10:4, is not only especially long, but also especially independent. Matthew frames a logion from the sending discourse (9:37-38 = Luke 10:2 Q) and the introduction to the Markan sending discourse (10:1 = Mark 6:7) with two Markan units that come from different contexts (9:36 = Mark 6:34?; 10:2-4 = Mark 3:16-19). Unlike the Sermon on the Mount, only in a very loose sense does the sending discourse of Q provide the total framework: 10:7-16 and the conclusion 10:40 (= Luke 10:16 Q) correspond to it. At the beginning (10:7-16) Matthew follows textually the sending discourse of his sources. In the process he freely rearranges the Q material that goes beyond the common kernel of the two sending discourses (Mark 6:8-11; Luke 10:4-12 Q), or he moves it to other sections of his gospel.⁷ In 10:17-39 he adds additional material to the sending discourse of his sources (much as he does in 13:24-52; 18:10-35; 24:37-25:46). The first traditional unit comes from Mark (10:17-22 = Mark 13:9-13), the later material mostly from Q.⁸ The evangelist doubles the Markan unit, as he does in other cases⁹ (Mark 13:9-13 = Matt 10:17-22 and 24:9-14). The material that comes from Q is given essentially in the order of the source. Matthew goes through the source and excerpts what thematically fits his own discourse. This also is a procedure with which we are familiar from other discourses.¹⁰ In places that are decisive for his composition he adds material from special traditions (10:5-6, 23, 24-25, 41-42, cf., e.g., 5:17-19; 18:20; 23:8-11). It is noteworthy that Matthew frequently makes use of his sources this same way in other discourses. This is in my judgment a convincing confirmation of the two-source theory that our analysis

- 7 He consistently deals this way with Q. Only in the Sermon on the Mount does Matthew follow the outline of the Sermon on the Plain of Q (because no Markan counterpart exists). By contrast, in Matthew 23 he follows the structure of Q only minimally. The outline of Luke 17:22-37 is partially destroyed by Matthew, that of Luke 12:39-59 completely.
- 8 Similar instances in which Matthew concludes with Q material after material from other sources are Matt 5:25-26 (after 5:23-24 = special material of Matthew), Matt 5:38-48 (after the "primary" antitheses), and Matt 13:31-33 (after 13:24-30), but

Matthew can also use a different approach. Even more important is that in all the discourses, with the exception of the Sermon on the Mount, the first part comes from Mark.

- 9 Cf. vol. 1, Introduction I F and the commentary on 9:27-31.
- 10 Cf. vol. 1, II A 3 and Vincent Taylor, "The Original Order of Q," in Angus J. B. Higgins, ed., *New Testament Essays: Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1959) 246-69.

presupposes.¹¹ In general, in spite of the careful way he treats his sources, he creates a new discourse with a clearly recognizable, new profile.

Addressees

The discourse is addressed to the “twelve disciples” (10:1; 11:1) to whom Matthew can also refer as the “twelve apostles” (10:2). The use of both terms, “apostles” and “disciples,” reveals a problem. “Disciples” is a term that is transparent of the community. The “apostles” by contrast are a unique entity from the church’s beginnings. For whom is the discourse intended? Is it meant for the apostles of the beginning period or basically for the church?

The difficulty facing the interpreter lies in the fact that Matthew here appears to make no distinction at all. Sayings that can apply only to the beginning period (10:5-6, 23), sayings that clearly suggest a past situation (e.g., 10:17-18), and sayings that are always valid alternate with one another without an indication anywhere from the evangelist that the validity of the sayings is limited. By not distinguishing between the “transparent” disciples and the “past” apostles he shows that he wants to see past and present together. Not until the history of interpretation did it become important to distinguish between the two. Distinguishing between them was a way to confine to the beginning period of the church those sayings that contradicted one’s own church situation.¹² Another advantage of limiting the validity of the sending discourse to the apostles is that individual sayings thus did not have to be applied to the entire church but could be limited to those who held an office. Here too the discourse’s challenge is considerably toned down.¹³ By contrast, Matthew seems to make such simple distinctions impossible.

A second, related difficulty is that a number of the sayings of the sending discourse speak to the so-called wandering charismatics, that is, to itinerant disciples (10:5-6, 9-14, 23, 40), while others are directed expressly to settled Christians (10:41-42). Most of the sayings can be applied to wandering charismatics and to settled members of the community without distinction. Again, however, Matthew does not appear to make a distinction. The addressees are always the same.

Verses 40-42 give us information about the situation of the Matthean church. It has close contact with wandering charismatics.¹⁴ According to v. 42 even ordinary members of the church are on the road. The use of *μικροί* for itinerant members of the church in 10:42 and for Christians in general in chap. 18 shows that Matthew does not fundamentally distinguish between them. The same is true of other texts. Matthew applies 6:25-33 to the entire church—a text that originally spoke of the wandering charismatics. The content of the perfection that according to Matt 5:48 is the goal for the entire church is, according to 19:21, that the “rich young man” sell all his possessions and become Jesus’ follower, that is, a wandering charismatic. That most likely corresponds to the historical reality. We should avoid making a fundamental distinction between itinerant and settled Christians.¹⁵ Acts 13:2-3 gives an example of settled Christians becoming wandering charismatics, while *Didache* 12-13 gives instructions for the wandering charismatics who would settle down. If we regard the relationship between settled Christians and wandering charismatics as fluid, then it is understandable why Matthew can address in our discourse the entire church as potential wandering charismatics. With their preaching they vicariously fulfill the mission given to the

11 An example of the difficulty of other hypotheses is that Goulder (*Midrash*) is forced to assume that Matthew deals differently with different kinds of Markan material. He paraphrases the discourse material by expanding it (345–47 on 10:7-15, 347–53 for the midrashlike expansion 10:23-42), while he consistently rigorously abbreviates the Markan narrative material. Even 10:17-22, 38-39 do not expand the Markan source. Furthermore, the redactional vocabulary is relatively minor in the so-called midrashlike additions to Mark.

12 Cf. below, nn. 24, 30, 39, 69 on Matt 10:5-15.

13 This reduction is made frequently with 9:37. The laborers are the teachers or preachers (e.g., Dionysius bar Salibi, *Commentarii in Evangelia*, 3 vols., ed. I. Sedlacek, and Arthur Vaschalde

[Louvain: Durbecq, 1953] 208; Christian of Stavelot, 1343B). In the Lima Document “Ministry” 9 (*Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry* [Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982] 21) Matt 10:1-8 is used as one of the biblical foundations for the ordained (!) ministry (“The church has never been without persons holding specific authority and responsibility”).

14 Cf. vol. 1, Introduction 5.2.

15 Ulrich Luz, “Die Kirche und ihr Geld im Neuen Testament,” in Wolfgang Lienemann, ed., *Die Finanzen der Kirche* (Munich: Kaiser, 1989) 535–37.

entire church, while the church is in solidarity with “its” wandering radicals (10:10, 40-42). Itinerant radicalism is a special possibility of Christian perfection (19:16-30). In my judgment, this is the only way to understand why Matthew does not change the addressees in our chapter, even though he speaks to wandering radicals and to settled believers.

Our interpretation will take seriously what the discourse’s location in the gospel has demonstrated. Having been granted the same authority as Jesus, the disciples have the same mission to heal and to proclaim as does their master. They correspond in their life to the *εὐαγγέλιον τῇ βασιλείᾳ* of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount, and will suffer the same fate as Jesus. That all speaks in favor of attributing fundamental ecclesiological significance to the sending discourse. In it Matthew

extends the ministry of Jesus into the church. In it Matthew speaks of the church as the figure of Jesus. *For this reason we are calling it disciples discourse rather than sending discourse.* The concept of “disciple” (μαθητής) frames the discourse at the beginning (9:37; 10:1), in the middle (10:24-25), and at the end (10:42; 11:1). Of course, this basic thesis will have to prove itself in the interpretation of the historicizing and limiting verses that appear to be valid only for a certain time or for a certain group of the church.

The two sections 9:36-38 and 10:1-5a have no catchwords in common and are also different in content. The list of the names of the apostles in 10:2-4 at first looks like an excursus that became necessary because Matthew transposes the Markan sequence of the text and has to append Mark 3:13-19 as a necessary presupposition for Mark 6:7-13. The interpretation will show that that is not *only* the case: An implicit connection between their contents underlies both sections.

1.1 The Task: The People's Suffering (9:36-38)

For *literature* see above, II C on Matt 9:36–11:1.

36 When he saw the crowds, he had compassion for them, because they were harassed and beaten down, like "sheep who have no shepherd." 37/ Then he says to his disciples: "The harvest is great, but there are (only) few laborers. 38/ Ask therefore the Lord of the harvest to send out laborers into his harvest."

Analysis Matthew again begins a new major section not with a caesura but with a transition.¹ Verse 36a immediately follows the preceding summary. We will be able to see how important the following *v. 36b, c* is for Matthew only from the source analysis: Mark 6:34a-c is moved up from the feeding narrative to this point. *Σκύλλω* is a word from a Markan section (Mark 5:35) that had been omitted from 9:18-26 but that the "conservative" Matthew did not want to lose.² Most of the other

changes in *v. 36* are redactional.³ Verses 37-38 contain, after a Matthean introduction,⁴ the first logion of Q's sending discourse (Luke 10:2) without changes.⁵ "Laborer" (*ἐργάτης*) is a connecting link to 10:10. Because of its eschatological understanding of the disciples' preaching activity, this logion could come from Jesus.⁶

Interpretation

■ **36** The disciples discourse begins with compassion for the people without a shepherd. Matthew thus makes clear that discipleship is fundamentally related to the people, that is, its mission. The *church* is *eo ipso* a missionary community in the sense of proclamation by works, signs, and words. *Σκύλλω* means "to torment," "to oppress," *ρίπτω* "to throw on the ground," passive "to be prostrate, depressed." The "sheep who have no shepherd" is an Old Testament expression that occurs several times;⁷ it should not be restricted to the sense of an individual Old Testament text. However, it is clear from the Old Testament language that one is thinking of the people of Israel.⁸ The open formulation permits a variety of understandings of need.⁹ For Matthew obviously the entire nation is in need. The stories of the sick told in chaps. 8 and 9 are representative of all the people. The singular *ποιμήν* ("shepherd") does not suggest a direct polemic against the Jewish leaders.¹⁰ On the basis of 2:6 the most natural assumption is that Matthew

1 Cf. vol. 1, Introduction 1 on the difficulties related to Matthew's outline.

2 *Σκύλλω* is a Matthean and Markan hapax legomenon. Cf. also n. 3 on 9:32-34.

3 On *ὁράω* (*ιδών*), *δέ*, *ὄχλος* plural, *ὥσεί*, cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.2. Also redactional is *ρίπτω* (cf. 15:30; 27:5). *Σπαραγχνίζομαι περί* is neither redactional, nor LXX language, nor good Greek (BDF § 229 [2]).

4 Cf. on *τότε*, *λέγω* with the dative vol. 1, Introduction 3.2, on the historical present with *λέγω* vol. 1, Introduction 3.1.

5 It was probably Luke who changed the word order *ἐργάτης ἐκβάλλη*. Cf. Paul Hoffmann, *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle* (NTA NF 8; Münster: Aschendorf, 1972) 263.

6 Hahn (*Mission*, 40, n. 3), e.g., argues for authenticity. Others advocate a Q formation. Uro (*Sheep*, 208-9), e.g., attributes it to the optimistic perspective of the gentile mission. Jirair S. Tashjian ("The Social Setting of the Mission Charge in Q" [Diss.,

Claremont, 1987] 220) correctly notes that the early stages of the mission discourse do not yet anticipate a negative reaction from Israel.

7 Num 27:17; 3 *Βασ* 22:17; 2 Chr 18:16; Jdt 11:19; Ezek 34:5.

8 Cf. the resumption of the image in 10:6.

9 Based on the end of 9:35 and 10:1 one will initially think of the affliction that Israel's sick brought to Jesus in Matthew 8-9. Looking back on Matthew 8-9 from the perspective of 9:36 reveals that the sick and the demon-possessed represent the people of Israel.

10 This is a frequent interpretation based on Zech 11:16-17. There is, however, no allusion here to that text. There is no reference to bad shepherds in 9:36.

11 Uro (*Sheep*, 201) provides Old Testament and Jewish material. In a marginal note in his *Matthäusevangelium*, Schnackenburg interprets it, however, in terms of an understanding of mission that was developing in the primitive church. Relevant here would be not only John 4:36-38 but

is thinking of Jesus himself as a shepherd. He thus begins his disciples discourse by calling attention to grace—Jesus' mercy toward God's people.

■ **37-38** The disciples' task will be to heal Israel's affliction. In the Old Testament and Judaism the image of harvest is definitely associated with judgment.¹¹ In the sayings source a strongly eschatological tone probably resonated. The gathering of Israel for the kingdom of God by means of the disciples' proclamation is an eschatological event. Matthew was also familiar with this eschatological outlook (3:12; 13:39); for him also in the proclamation of the disciples a degree of judgment happens in advance (10:13-15, cf. 34-36). By contrast, the harvest laborers¹² in 13:39, 41 (cf. 24:31) are the angels of the Son of Man and not the disciples. The images of mission as harvest and of the coming of the Son of Man as harvest are juxtaposed in Matthew without being connected. Our saying was important for the evangelist not only because of its eschatological perspective, but also because he was thus able to place at the beginning of his disciples discourse an admonition to prayer (cf. Acts 13:1-3). As we have seen already in the Sermon on the Mount, prayer is for him the basis of the disciples' mis-

sionary existence. The disciples' discourse thus begins by looking to the Lord of the harvest whose work the disciples will do; it ends by referring to him who is present in those who are sent (10:40).

Summary

The juxtaposition of the images of the shepherd and the harvest that are so different leaves the reader somewhat uncertain. The positive element, mercy, dominates the image of the shepherd. In the image of the harvest another element resonates: the threat of judgment. Matthew does not remove the uncertainty; he lets the two images stand side by side without connecting them. Something of this ambivalence will also be felt in the charge to the disciples in 10:7-15. We are confronted here by one of the major problems in understanding the entire gospel: How are the merciful shepherd and the Lord of judgment—Son of Man—to be understood together?

also the Pauline usage of *καρποί*. However, the use of the image elsewhere in Matthew contradicts this view. Important for the decision on this question is whether Matthew expected an imminent parousia (a view that I would affirm).

12 However, Matthew does not use the term *ἐργάτης*,

which comes from the missionary language and anticipates 10:10. Paul gives evidence of the same usage—strangely enough, always to refer to his opponents (2 Cor 11:13; Phil 3:2). Cf. n. 44 on 10:5-15.

1.2 The Commissioned (10:1-5a)

Literature

Antonio Salerno, "Un nuovo aspetto del primato di Pietro in Mt 10,2 e 16,18-19," *RivB* 28 (1980) 435-39.

For additional literature see above, II C on Matt 9:36-11:1.

- 1 And he called his twelve disciples together and gave them authority over the unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal every sickness and every weakness.
- 2 But these are the names of the twelve apostles: first Simon, who is called Peter, and his brother Andrew, and James, the son of Zebedee, and his brother John,
- 3 Philip and Bartholomew, Thomas and Matthew, the tax collector, James, the son of Alphaeus, and Thaddaeus,¹
- 4 Simon the Cananaean² and Judas of Iscariot³ who also betrayed him.
- 5 These twelve Jesus sent out and commanded them:

Analysis

Structure

The list of apostles in vv. 2-4 is framed by the authorization and sending of the twelve (vv. 1-2a, 5).⁴ The wording of the authority in v. 1b, c goes back to 4:23 and 9:35. In addition, Matthew uses catchwords from

9:6, 8 (ἐξουσία) and 8:16 (πνεῦμα, ἐκβάλλω). Ἐδωκεν ἐξουσίαν anticipates the key christological text of 28:18. Together with 11:1 δώδεκα μαθηταί constitutes an inclusion. The compositional bracketing that Matthew achieves with the introductory verse is thus very intensive.

Source

Verse 1 is largely redactional.⁵ Even the agreements with Luke 9:1 do not contradict this observation.⁶ Verses 2-4 correspond to the list of the twelve in Mark 3:16-19. The opening words in v. 2a are probably redactional.⁷ Changing the location of Andrew in the list makes v. 2b-e a reminiscence of the calling of the disciples in 4:18-22.⁸ After this emphatic reminder, Matthew structures the list so that the apostles are listed in pairs. The introduction to the discourse in v. 5a, formulated along the lines of Mark 6:7-8, is also redactional. The other changes in the Markan source also are redactional.⁹

Interpretation

■ 1, 2, 5 Jesus responds to Israel's suffering by calling the twelve disciples to himself. The word δώδεκα ("twelve") appears three times in short intervals (vv. 1, 2, 5). Matthew knows that the twelve disciples correspond to the twelve tribes of Israel (19:28).¹⁰ Thus the section

- 1 Is Λεββαῖος (with parts of the Western tradition and Origen) or Θαδδαῖος (with the most important Alexandrian mss and parts of the Western tradition) original? Most mss harmonize the two names and understand one as the surname of the other. The witnesses for Θαδδαῖος are weightier. According to McNeile (132), Λεββαῖος comes from the Hebrew לב = heart, Θαδδαῖος from the Aramaic ܬܕܕܝ = breast. Dalman (*Words*, 50) thinks of the Greek name Θεῦδας and understands Λεββαῖος as the corresponding Aramaic name. The matter remains puzzling.
- 2 Very many mss read Κανανίτης; they obviously understand the designation to be a *nomen gentilicium* (as, e.g., *Ιεροσολυμίτης*).
- 3 The variants fluctuate between Ἰσκαριώθ (thus also Mark and Luke), Σκαριώτης (D etc.; from Hebrew כרס: Piel = hand over [very rare] or from *sicarius* [dagger bearer] or from קרש = lie, cheat?) and Ἰσκαριώτης (the most important witnesses and Matt 26:14). This reading is not only the best attested; it also conforms to the Matthean tendency of a limited Grecianizing of Aramaisms. Cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.3, n. 98.
- 4 Δώδεκα (v. 1); ἀπόστολοι (v. 2a); δώδεκα ἀπέστειλεν (v. 5a).

- 5 Mark 3:13 and 6:7 are in the background. On μαθητής, ὅστε, θεραπεύω, μαλακία, νόσος cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.2; on the participle and aorist, vol. 1, Introduction 3.1. On the bracketings cf. above II C, "Position in the Gospel." Προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς . . . μαθητάς (cf. 15:32) is a redactional Markan formula taken over by Matthew.
- 6 Luke also has a preference for the aorist, νόσος (plural!), and θεραπεύω. The different order of the bestowal of authority and the sending (Luke 9:2//Matt 10:5) is obvious. The minor agreements are so numerous, however, that one may ask whether the original Q introduction to the sending discourse is to be found behind Matt 10:1 and Luke 9:1 (Uro, *Sheep*, 74-75).
- 7 To be sure, this cannot be proved linguistically, but leaving out the Markan bestowal of the names (Mark 3:16b, 17b) corresponds to the omission of a report about the appointment of the twelve (Mark 3:16a: ἐποίησεν). Ὄνομα comes from Mark 3:16-17, ἀπόστολος from Mark 6:30.
- 8 With the exception of πρῶτος, all the words of v. 2b-e appear in 4:18, 21. Luke 6:14 also changes the location of "his brother Andrew." Was this the reading in the Markan text that was available to the two evangelists, or did Luke, who had to add Andrew

9:36–10:6 is entirely about Israel. Matthew presupposes that Jesus has twelve disciples, but unlike Mark 3:13-15 he says nothing about the institution of the circle of the twelve. His concern here is not with its historical constitution, but with the authorization by Jesus that determines the church's entire activity. The disciples share in his own authority; that is made clear by the references back to 4:23, 9:35, and 8:16. As 28:18-20 will underscore, their power is an expression of the power of the Lord who remains with his church. Matthew is thus not simply interested in giving a report about the beginnings of the church. In all probability that is why in 10:1 he uses the word that is transparent of the present, *μαθηταί* ("disciples"), instead of *ἀπόστολοι* ("apostles").¹¹ On the other hand, he uses the apostles to interpret the disciples and with the number "twelve" also indicates that he is speaking of the twelve disciples of Jesus back then. Matthew thus presents the mission of the twelve as the prototype of the continuing mission of the church.

The authority of the disciples to perform miracles—mentioned here alone and in vv. 7-8 along with the charge to preach—is eminently important for the formation of the church. If miracles are regarded as a peculiarity that was necessary only at the beginning of the church's history because uneducated fishermen had to proclaim a new truth to the entire world,¹² then we have missed, or at least repressed, something that is fundamental for Matthew.

■ **2a** The circle of the apostles had already been identified with the twelve in Mark (6:7, 30) prior to Matthew, and alongside Matthew the identification also appears in

Revelation and in Luke. In contrast to Revelation, however, Matthew is not interested in the heavenly nature of the apostolic church (Rev 21:14), and in contrast to Luke he is less interested in the continuity of tradition that is assured by the testimony of the twelve apostles.¹³ Along with the following list of names, the term *ἀπόστολος* enables him to connect discipleship with the earthly Jesus.¹⁴ Likewise, it is *Jesus'* message ("gospel of the kingdom"; *εὐαγγέλιον τῆς βασιλείας!*) that the disciples proclaim, *his* miracles that they continue, and *his* presence that defines them (10:40, cf. 28:16-20). Mentioning the twelve apostles is a reminder that the exalted one is the earthly one.

■ **2b-4** From a literary perspective the list of names is an instructive incidental observation. In general, the changes in the Markan source are easily understandable. The list begins with the four disciples whose call was reported in Matt 4:18-22. Matthew says no more about renaming Peter and the sons of Zebedee (Mark 3:16-17) than he does about the establishment of the circle of the twelve. Simon is Peter from the beginning.¹⁵ Probably the surname "sons of thunder" no longer played a role in his community. Matthew is, clearly based on 9:9, the tax collector. The surnames of Simon and Judas remain difficult to explain. On "Cananaean" (*Καναναῖος*) we can surmise that the evangelist was not thinking of the place-name Cana¹⁶ or of the biblical Canaanites (= *Χαναναῖος*) but, as Luke translates in Luke 6:15 and Acts 1:13, of the zealous one,¹⁷ Simon the Zealot. Obviously his readers did not need a translation. The evangelist understood "of Iscariot" (*Ἰσκαριώτης*) proba-

- after 5:1-11, edit it independently of Matthew?
- 9 Verse 2: On *ὁ λεγόμενος* cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3:2. On the position of the apposition cf. vol. 1, I A 3.2 on 4:18-22, n. 1. Verse 3: on *ὁ τελώνης* cf. 9:9; on *Ἰσκαριώτης* cf. 26:14. Verse 4: on *παραδούς* cf. 27:3-4. The change in the order of Thomas and Matthew remains unclear.
- 10 Since Origen (fr. 195 I = GCS Origenes 12.94) there has been speculation about further symbolism of the number twelve: 12 legions of angels, 12 hours of the day, 12 as the perfect number ($3 \times 4!$), 12 patriarchs, 12 stones in the Jordan river (Joshua 4), a combination of Trinity and the 4 areas of the world, etc. The symbolism in Rabanus (Thomas Aquinas, *Catena* 1.162 = ET 1.363) is especially prolific.
- 11 *Μαθητής* is a key word at the beginning, in the

- center (vv. 24-25), and at the conclusion (v. 42; 11:1) of the disciples discourse.
- 12 Cf. Maldonat, 210; Bullinger, 97B.
- 13 Unlike the church's interpretation since Origen (fr. 194 = GCS Origenes 12.93), who says that Matthew explicitly names the twelve apostles to distinguish them from the false apostles.
- 14 Cf. Luz, "Jünger," 142-43, 145 and above, n. 16 on Matt 9:9-13.
- 15 4:18; 8:14 in contrast to Mark. *Σίμων* occurs in Matthew only as direct address (16:17; 17:25).
- 16 In which case we would expect *Καναῖος* or something similar.
- 17 Cf. Hebrew/Aramaic *נָזִיר* = to be zealous.

bly in the sense of a *nomen gentilicium*: the man from “Iscaria.”¹⁸ That is the most likely explanation for a writer who probably was not familiar with Hebrew but knew the Greek noun formation.¹⁹ The most difficult element is the word “first” (*πρῶτος*) before Peter that corresponds neither to 4:18-22, nor to the Markan source, nor to Matthew’s customary language.

History of Interpretation

The Vulgate translates: *Primus Simon*. For the church’s interpretation the term has always meant that Peter was the first one called. One frequently finds the idea that Peter’s *meritum* also caused him to be at the head of the list.²⁰ That enabled a connection with 16:18, but seldom was a line drawn beyond Peter to the papacy.²¹ It was not until the sixteenth century that the text became the object of major controversy.

Following, for example, John Chrysostom, many Protestants interpret it to refer to the time of the call, not to Peter’s special qualities.²² However, the question then remained why *πρῶτος* is mentioned at all. That Peter was the first one called in 4:18-20 and is first in 10:2 does not need to be mentioned explicitly. Furthermore, at the other extreme Judas is always placed at the end of the list because he was unworthy.²³ The question repeatedly asked by Catholics is whether Peter’s *dignitas* can be excluded from 10:2.²⁴ A number of Protestants have conceded a possible “merit” for Peter but deny that it might have any legal significance for the Roman pope.²⁵ By contrast, during the time of the Counter-Reformation, many Catholic interpreters²⁶ wanted to find in our text “the subordination of the apostles, bishops, and all believers under the one head,” the pope.²⁷

- 18 Cf., e.g., Πατριώτης, Ἡρακλειώτης, Κωρυκιώτης, Μασσαλιώτης, Πηλουσιώτης, Σικελιώτης, Ἀφαμιώτης. Cf. Eduard Schwyzer, *Griechische Grammatik* (3 vols.; Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 2/1; vol. 1, 5th ed. [1977]; vol. 2, ed. Albert Debrunner [1950]; vol. 3 ed. D. Georgacas [1953]; Munich: Beck, 1950–77) 1.500, and Wilhelm Dittenberger, “Ethnica und Verwandtes,” *Hermes* 41 (1906) 181–88.
- 19 Matthew was not aware that Ἰσκαριώθ might come from יִשְׁכָּרְיָהוּ (= a man from the Judean place, Keriōth; cf. Josh 15:25) (thus obviously John 14:22 D!); the article ὁ then would not be necessary.
- 20 The concept of “meritum” appears since Jerome, 63. Cf., e.g., Paschasius Radbertus, 403 (“in meritis primus” with reference to Matt 16:18); Euthymius Zigabenus, 324 (although Peter is younger than his brother Andrew, he is superior to him in stability).
- 21 Most clearly in Albertus Magnus, *In Evangelium secundum Matthaeum Iuculenta expositio*, vols. 20–21: *Opera Omnia* (Adolphe Borgnet, ed.; Paris: Ludicorum Vives, 1893–94) 443: “Petrus . . . dicatur primus. Non tamen dicitur Andreas secundus . . . sed omnes secundi sunt Petro ad iurisdictionem: quia non unus sub alio, sed omnes sub Petro.” By contrast, Augustine interprets our text much differently in relation to Matt 16:18: Peter is the first apostle because of Matt 16:18, but the rock is Peter’s confession, i.e., actually Christ himself (in *Joh. ev. tract.* 124.5 = FC 92.89).
- 22 See, e.g., Zwingli, 263; Calovius, 265 (*principatus ordinis*). John Chrysostom (32.3 = PG 57. 380) says that Mark lists the apostles according to their worthiness, Matthew without order.
- 23 Cornelius Jansen (1585–1638), *Tetrateuchus sive*

- Commentarius in sancta Jesu Christi Evangelia* (Brussels: Francisci T’Serstevens, 1737) 91.
- 24 Maldonat, 211. Maldonat’s opponents based their argument primarily on the different order of the apostles in the various New Testament lists. Beza (43) incites the special wrath of Maldonat by asking whether perhaps *πρῶτος*, which is not followed by any other number, might be a later gloss for the purpose of stabilizing the papacy. However, few followed his lead.
- 25 See, e.g., Calvin 1.290. Cocceius (18) interprets the “primacy” of Peter typologically and thus approaches Matthew’s understanding: The special revelation to and temptations of Peter show him as “ὑπόδειγμα lapsorum, gratia ipsius (scil. Jesu) conservatorum.” Bengel (116) asks sharply: “*Primus . . . inter apostolos, non supra apostolos; . . . quid hoc ad papam Romanum?*”
- 26 Maldonat (210–11) regrets that in his time even many Catholics interpreted the text incorrectly.
- 27 The quotation is from Lapide, 219. Alfonso Salmeron (*Commentarii in Evangelicam Historiam* [11 vols.; Coloniae Agrippinae: Apud Antonium Hierat, et Ioan. Gymni, 1612], 4/2.13 = 4.341–42) says that because the *primus* is not followed by *secundus*, etc., the absolute primacy of Peter is meant. Robert Bellarmine (*De summo pontifice* [Sedan, 1619] 1/18 = 123–26) says that it cannot be the time of the call, because Andrew was called before the younger Peter and that it cannot be because of Peter’s personal virtue, because the virtue of the married Peter was less than that of the celibate John.

Leaving the overinterpretation of the confessional controversies, we return to the text. Peter was the first one called. Why is that underscored with *πρῶτοι*? We can offer an answer only on the basis of later texts.²⁸ That answer will be that Peter, the first to be called by Jesus, is especially important for Matthew, because Peter can show in an exemplary way that discipleship basically means nothing more than becoming part of the one-time story of Jesus with his disciples back then. However, *πρῶτος* implies neither a special ecclesiastical competence or office of Peter,²⁹ nor a special succession in the later church. Rather, in Peter the “power” (*ἐξουσία*) that Jesus gives to *all* disciples becomes clear in a *special* way.

■ **5a** The actual introduction to the discourse, v. 5a, is clearly related to vv. 1-4. Jesus sent out those twelve to

whom he had given authority over demons and illnesses and whose names have just been mentioned. Thus Jesus first gives the disciples his authority; only then does he send them out. With its connection to vv. 1-4 the discourse also receives its clear place in the *story* of Jesus. In what follows we have not simply timeless instructions about mission but a charge of Jesus to his disciples at a definite point in his story. What the disciples *always* are to do is rooted in a mission given by Jesus back then.

28 Cf. the excursus “Peter in the Gospel of Matthew” at 16:13-20.

29 Sand (*Evangelium*, 218) is of a different opinion. He says that the group of four who are listed first has “a special significance for the constitution of the

church” that “justifies a rudimentary structure of ‘offices’ that already exists in the Matthean community.” Unfortunately he offers no evidence. We can only warn against such claims made at a theologically controversial sensitive place.

2.1 The Mission (10:5b-15)

Literature

- Roman Bartnicki, "Tätigkeit der Jünger nach Mt, 5b-6," *BZ* 31 (1987) 250-56.
- Schuyler Brown, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel," *StTh* 31 (1977) 21-32.
- Lucien Cerfaux, "La mission apostolique des Douze et sa portée eschatologique," in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant* (Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca apostolica vaticana, 1964) 43-66.
- Martino Conti, "Fondamenti Biblici della povertà nel ministero apostolica (Mt 10,9-10)," *Anton* 46 (1971) 393-426.
- Hubert Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 123-30.
- Idem, "Zur Theologie der Mission im Matthäusevangelium," in Karl Kertelge, ed., *Mission im Neuen Testament* (QD 93; Freiburg: Herder, 1982) 93-129.
- A. E. Harvey, "The Workman Is Worthy of His Hire: Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church," *NovT* 24 (1982) 209-21.
- Hoffmann, *Studien*, 254-84, 287-304, 312-31.
- Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 201-95.
- Levine, *Dimensions*, 13-57.
- Heinz Schürmann, "Mt 10,5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes," in idem, *Untersuchungen*, 137-49.
- Schulz, *Q*, 404-19.
- Trilling, *Israel*, 99-105.
- Zumstein, *Condition*, 429-35.
- For additional literature on the disciples discourse see above, II C.

- 5b **"Do not go on the way to the Gentiles,**
and do not enter a city of the Samaritans.
- 6 **Go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.**
- 7 **But go and proclaim:**
'The Kingdom of Heaven has come near.'
- 8 **Heal the weak,**
raise the dead,
cleanse lepers,
cast out demons.
You received freely, give freely.
- 9 **Do not take gold, silver, or small change¹ in your**
girdles,
- 10 **no bag on the way, not two undergarments, no**
shoes, and no staff,
for the laborer is worthy of his food.
- 11 **When you enter any city or village,**
inquire who is worthy in it,
and stay there until you leave.
- 12 **But when you enter a house, greet it.**
- 13 **And if the house is worthy of it let your peace**

come on it.
But if it is not worthy, let your peace return to you.

And whoever does not receive you and does not listen to your words—
Go out of the house or that city and shake the dust from your feet.

Amen, I say to you:
It will be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorra on the day of judgment than for that city.

Analysis

Structure

The commands of Jesus recall first of all his own activity. Like Jesus (9:37) the disciples are to care for Israel's sheep (10:6). They are to carry his proclamation (4:17) further (10:7) and perform (10:8) his deeds (8:1-4, 17, 28-34; 9:18-26, 32-35). The text consists entirely of imperative sentences; only the concluding amen saying in v. 15 changes this basic structure and provides a definite caesura. Verses 5b-6 contain a double prohibition in parallel form and a simple but correspondingly longer command. Verses 7-8 command the disciples to preach and to heal. The preaching is defined with a statement of its content, and the healing is made specific with three exemplary imperatives. The brief final sentence with the double *δωρεάν* ("freely") is rhetorically effective. The sevenfold prohibition against accumulating things follows in vv. 9-10. Each of the middle members has an additional definition with *εἰς* resulting in a double sentence with mirrored symmetry. Again an unusual sentence follows containing the word *ἐργάτης* ("laborer"), familiar from 9:37-38, and that begins with the key word *ἄξιός* ("worthy")—a term that is repeated in vv. 11-13 (and in vv. 37-38) in close sequence. The structure of vv. 11-13 is not completely clear. Presumably v. 11 describes how the disciples are to find a suitable host in the city or village that they enter. Verses 12 and 13a then speak of entering an individual house and of the positive reception there. Verses 13b-14 describe in much more detail how the disciples are to leave the house and the city when they do not find a friendly reception. Thus the first part, vv. 11-13a, speaks in two stages of entering (*εἰσελθῆτε/εἰσερχόμενοι*), the second part—taking the house and the city together—of leaving (*ἐξερχόμενοι*, v. 14b). The change in direction takes place between v. 13a and v. 13b (parallel formulation!).

1 *Χαλκός* = νομισμάτιον λεπτόν (Pollux *Onom.* 9.92). Pollux points to common phrases such as οὐκ ἔχω

χαλκόν or ὀφείλω χαλκόν. *Χαλκός* is in this sense non-Attic. Atticists say *χαλκίον* (Pollux *Onom.* 9.90).

Sources²

Matthew combines Mark 6:8-11 and Q = Luke 10:4-12 into a new text. He is more likely to follow whichever source has the more detailed wording, and he takes some liberties especially with Q in wording and placement. Verses 5-6 and the end of 8 are special material. In detail:

Verses 5b-6: The logion, which in my judgment is not redactional,³ has come to Matthew either from his special material or from Q^{Mt}, but Matthew is probably responsible for the placement.⁴

Verses 7-8: Matthew himself formulates the mission charge patterned loosely after Luke 10:9 and Mark 3:15; 6:13.⁵ By so doing he makes concrete in terms of 4:17 the charge to preach, and in terms of Matthew 8-9 he makes concrete the charge to heal. The end of v. 8 formulates the Matthean understanding of vv. 9-10. We can no longer say whether the short sentence was already (in Q^{Mt}?) transmitted.

Verses 9-10: Matthew formulates an equipment regulation that is almost as long as that of Mark 6:8-9 but in content approaches the severity of the short rule of Q = Luke 10:4a.⁶ However, while Luke 10:4 is a rule about *possessing*, Matt 10:9-10 is formulated as a prohibition against *acquiring*. Appropriately, the Old Testament triad “gold-silver-small change,” unknown in Mark and Q, is listed first.⁷ Linguistically, neither it

nor the verb *κτάομαι* (“to acquire”) is Matthean. Since, however, the prohibition against earning money by means of preaching and healings corresponds with the scope of v. 8e and the statement about the laborer in v. 10b that was moved here by Matthew, the entire reworking is most likely Matthean. *Τροφή* (“food” instead of “wages” [*μισθός*]) is also probably from Matthew’s hand.⁸

Verses 11-14: Instead of the two logia about entering a house (Luke 10:5-7) and a city (Luke 10:8-11), Matthew formulates a single saying. The possibility of a positive reception is mentioned only briefly (the corresponding Q material had already been used in part in vv. 7-8) so that, as is often the case in Matthew, the idea of judgment is dominant. Therefore, Luke is probably closer to the wording of Q. The editing is for the most part Matthean, even if not everything can be conclusively demonstrated on linguistic grounds.⁹

Verse 15 generally¹⁰ corresponds to Q = Luke 10:12.

Origin

In their various versions the sayings give us a glimpse into the history of early Christian itinerant radicalism and show how it developed in the first century and adapted to changing circumstances. However, early Christian itinerant radicalism is understandable only

- 2 Q texts in Athanasius Polag, *Fragmenta Q* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979) 44–46, and in Laufen, *Doppelüberlieferungen*, 245; detailed reconstruction also in Hoffmann, *Studien*, 263–84.
- 3 Contra Heinrich Kasting, *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission* (BEvTh 55; Munich: Kaiser, 1969) 113–14; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 129–30; Uro, *Sheep*, 54–56; Gnlika 1.362. In my judgment there is not enough redactional vocabulary (*πορεύομαι*, *πρόβατον*, *ἀπόλλυμι*, cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.2 and 4:15) to support the conclusion. Well documented is Trilling’s view (*Israel*, 99–101) that 10:5b-6 is a traditional, complete logion, while in 15:24 Matthew has reused part of this logion and fitted it into a new context.
- 4 Cf. the compositionally important references to 9:33, 36; 10:16. Schürmann (“Vorgeschichte,” 139) assumes that Matthew has placed the word here also because he has moved Luke 10:3 (sheep!) to a later point. His thesis that the logion stood in Q, between Luke 10:7 and 8, is a mere postulate. Schürmann believes that Luke has replaced it with the pericope of the Samaritan village in 9:51-56 (141–49).
- 5 Matthew omits *ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς* from Luke 10:9 (adaptation

to 3:2; 4:17). *Πορευόμενοι* establishes the connection with v. 6. *Κηρύσσειν* and *θεραπεύειν* are catchwords from 9:35.

- 6 Matthew takes over the catchwords *πήρα*, *χαλκός*, *εἰς τὴν ῥάνην*, *εἰς ὁδόν*, *δύο χιτῶνες*, and *ράβδος* from Mark 6:8-9, *πήρα* and *ὑπόδημα* from Q = Luke 10:4. *Ἄργυρος* also may have stood in Q. Cf. Luke 9:3.
- 7 Exod 25:3. Also Num 31:22; Josh 6:19, 24; 1 Chr 22:14; 29:2; Dan 2:35, 45 in connection with other metals.
- 8 *Μισθός* is in Matthew the reward at the last judgment. On *τροφή* cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.2.
- 9 Mark’s influence is decisive in v. 11b and v. 14a. Probably Matthean redaction are: v. 11: *κώμη* (from 9:35), *ἐξετάζω* (cf. 2:8), *ἄξιος* (key word of chap. 10, taken over from Luke 10:7 = Q); v. 14: *λόγοι* (cf. for Jesus: 7:24-28). Is *ἀσπάζομαι* (v. 12) a reminiscence of the omitted part of the verse Luke 10:4b = Q?
- 10 Matthean are (cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.2) *ἀμήν*, *γῆ*, *ἡμέρα κρίσεως*. *Γομόρρων* is a secondary (cf. 11:24!) and understandable addition to the Q text, but it is not completely appropriate, since in Genesis 19 it is only the Sodomites who were not hospitable.

as a continuation of the disciples' itinerant life with Jesus. For precisely this reason we may be relatively optimistic about the authenticity of most of the logia. Jesus is the initiator of a movement of itinerant charismatics.¹¹ Jesus' call to discipleship is to be understood as a commissioning to join him in an itinerant life of proclaiming the kingdom of God.¹² From this perspective the sending is, as it were, the crux of discipleship and is thoroughly appropriate for Jesus. That our logia have been handed down in duplicate and have often been changed also confirms that they are quite old. In particular, the equipment regulation of Luke 10:4 is formulated so radically that all of the gospels were forced to modify it explicitly.¹³ Mark has adapted it by permitting staff and sandals (6:8-9). Luke has partly invalidated it (22:35-36). Matthew has changed it into a rule about acquiring. In short, we may conclude that most of the logia of Luke 10:2-12 and Matt 10:9-16 come from Jesus. It is also possible that a one-time sending of the disciples by Jesus is historical. Along with additions like Matt 10:8e and 10b, we can say that Luke 10:12 and Matt 10:15 (presumably in Q a secondary creation based on Luke 10:14)¹⁴ and Matt 10:5-6 do not go back to Jesus. With its harsh *no* even against the Samaritans, its appearance only in Matthew, and its "technical" use of the term "lost" (cf. Luke 19:10 and 1 Cor 1:18 among oth-

ers), this saying is most at home in a Jewish-Christian church that separated itself from the gentile mission and saw its own task to be solely the proclamation to Israel.¹⁵

Interpretation

Few gospel texts let us feel the distance between their original situation and our own time as clearly as does this text. That is due on the one hand to the changed church situation. The text speaks of itinerant radicals who, dirt poor and without an established residence, roam through the countryside. We live in a church that has at its disposal stable institutions, buildings, and salaries. The distance is created on the other hand primarily by vv. 5-6, Jesus' command to the apostles to go only to Israel, that would seem to be long obsolete. It is not surprising, therefore, if in parts of the history of interpretation the dominant opinion has been that this text is concerned not with generally valid instructions for Christian mission but with something unique, something obsolete,¹⁶ as if it were a missionary "trial mission"¹⁷ that after Easter was then replaced by a definitive form. With this text the question of the enduring validity of the individual instructions is especially acute.

11 Gerd Theissen, "The Wandering Radicals," in idem, *Social Reality*, 45: "Probably more of the sayings must be 'suspected' of being genuine than many a modern skeptic would like to think."

12 Hengel, *Leader*, 74-75.

13 Admittedly, no small difficulty lies in the tension between the image of Jesus as "glutton and winebibber" (Matt 11:19) and the severity of the equipment regulation. Uro (*Sheep*, 133) attributes it, therefore, to a later ascetic radicalizing of the Jesus movement in Q. On the other hand, the fact of the homelessness of Jesus (demand to follow him!) is well established, and Matt 10:9 fits well other radical demands that Jesus placed on his followers (e.g., Luke 9:60; 14:26-27). There is no direct contradiction, since Matt 10:9 does not contain a regulation about food; cf. Luke 10:7. We must also distinguish between fundamental asceticism and prophetic symbolic action, to which, in my judgment, the equipment regulation belongs.

14 Cf. Lührmann, *Redaktion*, 62-63.

15 This saying is hardly ever attributed to Jesus today. Still, an argument on its behalf could be that throughout early Christianity the gentile mission was regarded as an innovation and was never understood as something that had been commanded by

the earthly Jesus (cf. Matt 28:16-20; Luke 24:47; Acts 10; Gal 1:16). However, this is also an argument against its authenticity. Where gentile mission was not an issue anyway, it also does not have to be explicitly prohibited. The main argument for not attributing the word to Jesus, however, is the command not to go to the Samaritans that, in my judgment, contradicts such texts as Luke 10:30-35.

16 Calvin 1.289; Bucer, 103D ("*temporaria*"); Dickson, 125, calls it a "temporary commandment."

17 Augustus Neander, *The Life of Jesus Christ in Its Historical Connexion and Historical Development* (trans. from 4th German ed.; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1870) 257. Bengel (70) compares the mission with the internship of theology students who then return to the "*schola*."

18 The expression does not mean: through a gentile area. ὁδός plus a geographical term in the genitive case means "way to": 4:15; *Iep* 2:18; Exod 13:17.

19 It is improbable, at least for Matthew, that undetermined πόλις = מדינה is a Semitizing term for province (thus Jeremias, *Promise*, 19, n. 5), since πόλις in the meaning "city" is a key word in Matt 10:5-23 (6 times).

20 For a detailed collection of material see Str-B 1. 538-60.

■ **5b-6** After the disciples have received their authority from Jesus, he sends them on their way. They are not to take a road that leads to the Gentiles.¹⁸ Even more remarkable is that they also are not to go into Samaritan cities,¹⁹ for there are in the gospels several texts that indicate that Jesus was much more open toward the Samaritans than were most Jews of the day²⁰ (Luke 9:51-56; 10:30-35; 17:11-19; John 4). The lost sheep of the house of Israel²¹ who are contrasted with the Gentiles and Samaritans are not (partitively) the sinners, outcasts, and marginalized in Israel but (explicatively) all Israel.²² Matthew puts this saying emphatically at the beginning. It sounds harsh even for early Christian ears, for at the time of the Gospel of Matthew the gentile mission was successful and was being carried out by many churches. Nevertheless, there are no limitations placed on it, as, for example, by adding *νῦν* ("now"). It corresponds to Jesus' own mission to Israel as described in Matthew 8-9. In 15:24 the evangelist will again take up the traditional v. 6 and apply it redactionally to the mission of Jesus: I am sent *only* to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. Again the formulation is harshly exclusive.²³ In comparison with this statement, the mission command to go to all *ἔθνη* (28:19) takes a different course. How are we to understand the two texts together?

A historical interpretation of the difference between Matt 10:5-6 and Matt 28:16-20 assumes either that there were two distinct stages of the activity of Jesus,²⁴ or that one of the two texts, viz., Matt 28:16-20, is post-Easter,²⁵ or, finally, that both texts are post-Easter and perhaps come from different churches or periods. In any case, a historical explanation cannot

replace an interpretation of the *content* of the sayings. We must ask: How did Matthew understand the juxtaposition of the two texts whose tension he has created with "a certain subtlety"²⁶? There are the following possibilities.

a. Matt 10:5-6 does not mean a mission to Israel at all. This is the approach of the classical allegorical interpretation that related the prohibition of the Samaritan mission to the heresies and the prohibition of the gentile mission to heathen doctrines, to philosophy, or to heathen festivals, and especially to the theater.²⁷ "Israel" means the true Israel, viz., the church. This way out of the dilemma is impossible. Even the presuppositions of the church's allegorical exegesis make it problematic, since the allegorical approach usually tries to deepen the literal meaning, not replace it.

b. An explanation based on the history of the church: In the Matthean church there is a particularistic Jewish-Christian wing. Another group in the community also wants to evangelize the Gentiles (cf. v. 18). With the context and the mission command the evangelist is trying to strengthen the position of those who claim that the gentile mission is a legitimate possibility even for the Matthean community.²⁸ That is, however, an unsatisfactory explanation. Are we to assume that Matt 10:5b-6 is valid only for his community, but not for the rest of the church, and only until further notice?

c. 10:5-6 applies only to the Twelve, while the great commission is for the entire church.²⁹ That explanation is also completely unsatisfactory. With the exception of Judas, the mission command is directed to the same disciples as is 10:5-6.

All other interpretations assume that vv. 5-6 are valid only for the time of Jesus. Matthew thus regarded the disciples' mission limited to Israel as a thing of

21 LXX language! Cf. Herbert Preisker and Siegfried Schulz, "πρόβατον κτλ," *TDNT* 6 (1968) 689, 690. *Οἱ κτοὶ Ἰσραήλ* appears frequently in the LXX.

22 The macrotext also supports this interpretation: 4:23; 9:35! On the basis of 9:37-38, Levine (*Dimensions*, 56-57) emphasizes the social aspect and says that the issue is the sheep, not their shepherd.

23 *Οὐκ . . . εἰ μὴ*. The *πρῶτον* of Mark 7:27 is omitted.

24 See, e.g., Schlatter, 798; Zahn, 712 ("a preliminary exercise").

25 Klostermann, 232; Manson, *Sayings*, 180. Harnack (*Mission*, 43, n. 1) says that 10:23 (along with 10:5-6) "precludes the hypothesis that the speech of Jesus referred merely to a provisional mission."

26 Harnack, *Mission*, 40, n. 2.

27 See, e.g., *Didasc.* 13 = 72 Achelis-Flemming (Hans Achelis and Johannes Flemming, eds., *Die Syrische Didaskalia* [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1904]); Hilary, 10.3 = SC 254.218.

28 Primarily Schuyler Brown, "The Two-fold Representation of the Mission in Matthew's Gospel" (*StTh* 31 [1977] 21-32) 30-32. Cf. idem, "The Matthean Community and the Gentile Mission," *NovT* 22 (1980) 215-21.

29 Goulder, *Midrash*, 343.

the past.³⁰ What is clearly correct about this view is that vv. 5-6 locate the sending discourse in the narrative thread of the Gospel of Matthew. Similarly, in other discourses narrative insertions such as 13:36a and 24:1-3a serve to locate the discourse in the macrotext of the Matthean narrative. As far as the content is concerned, what is at issue here is that the disciples are to assume the mission of Jesus. And up to this point—with the exception of 8:28-34—Jesus has not crossed the borders of Israel. In 15:24, when the crisis in Israel has become so intense that he is forced to “withdraw” into gentile territory, Jesus will again speak of his exclusive mission to Israel. However, we do not find a basically different orientation until 28:19-20. Then the disciples are to make disciples of πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (“all the Gentiles”). The two catchwords πορεύομαι and ἔθνη show that 28:19 in all probability consciously refers to 10:5-6.

We are confronted with two questions. In the first place, what is the meaning of the mission of Jesus and his disciples to Israel? It could be here a case of fulfilling biblical promises.³¹ In any case, the biblical language of the verse would support this view.³² The second question is more difficult. How is 10:5-6 related to the mission command in 28:19-20? It is a question that includes the issue of the meaning of Matthew’s entire narrative.

Two interpretations are possible. First of all, we may interpret the mission of the disciples to all ἔθνη as an *expansion* of their mission only to Israel. The Matthean paradigm would be that of two concentric circles. Israel

stands in the center, the nations are arranged around it.³³ Ἐθνη in 28:19 would have to be translated as “nations” so that Israel remains the center of the circle and also can continue to be addressed by the message of Jesus. Verses 5-6 would then be “preserved” in the mission command and would underscore the continuity of the post-Easter community with Jesus and with Israel.³⁴ A second possibility, however, is that we interpret the sending of the disciples to all ἔθνη as a *cancellation* of their exclusive mission to Israel. In this case Matthew would be advocating a substitutionary view. The gentile church would replace Israel (cf. 21:43). Then ἔθνη would have to be translated as “Gentiles.” According to 28:19-20 there would, at least in principle, no longer be a mission of the disciples to Israel. Verses 5-6 would not be preserved in the mission command but would be “canceled” by it. In this case vv. 5-6 would prepare for the idea of Israel’s guilt. Although Jesus himself and his disciples came exclusively to Israel, it has rejected Jesus.³⁵ We cannot yet choose between the two alternatives, but two items suggest the second interpretation. For one thing, it is noteworthy that the formulation of vv. 5-6 is exclusive and particularistic. Thus the mission command appears as something new that has not already been given by Jesus—as a change of direction. For another, the deliberate reference of 28:19 to 10:5-6 suggests that ἔθνη is to be interpreted the same way in

30 This interpretation is as old as Tertullian (*Fuga* 6.1 = CChr.SL 2.1142), who limits the text to the apostles. Jerome (65) distinguishes between the time before and after the resurrection. Today it has a number of advocates. See, e.g., Strecker, *Weg*, 196; Günther Bornkamm, “Der Auferstandene und der Irdische: Mt 28,16-20,” in Erich Dinkler, ed., *Zeit und Geschichte: Dankesgabe an Rudolf Bultmann zum 80. Geburtstag* (Tübingen: Mohr/Siebeck, 1964) 181–82; Anton Vögtle, “Das christologische und ekklesiologische Anliegen von Mt 28,18-20,” in idem, *Evangelium*, 266. Cf. also above, n. 16 and below, n. 71.

31 Kasting, *Anfänge*, 113.

32 Cf. above, n. 21 and Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 128, n. 227.

33 See, e.g., Kilpatrick, *Origins*, 122–23; Hahn, *Mission*, 127; Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 121 (ἔθνη = nations in 28:19 is contrasted not with Israel but with the community of the disciples immediately after Easter); idem, “Zur Theologie der Mission im

Matthäusevangelium,” in Karl Kertelge, ed., *Mission im Neuen Testament* (QD 93; Freiburg: Herder, 1982) 93–129, 124; Roman Bartnicki, “Der Bereich Tätigkeit der Jünger nach Mt 10,5b-6,” *BZ* 31 (1987) 155–56; Gnlika 1.362–63; Levine, *Dimensions*, 46.

34 Frankemölle, *Jahwebund*, 142.

35 This interpretation also has roots in the ancient church. It appears wherever interpreters refer to the mission model of Acts (in which the message was first preached in the synagogue) and to the guilt of the Jews: e.g., Origen fr. 197 = GCS Origenes 12.95; Cyril of Alexandria (*Commentariorum in Matthaeum quae supersunt* [PG 72.365–474]) fr. 113 = Reuss, 190; Gregory the Great *Hom. in ev.* 4.1 = PL 76.1089. More recent advocates are, e.g., Trilling, *Israel*, 103. Walker (*Heilsgeschichte*, 63) says that “the rebellion . . . of the people is ignited by the salvation which is aimed at it alone.” Yoshito Anno (“The Mission to Israel in Matthew: The Intention of Matthew 10:5b-6 Considered in the Light of the Religio-Political Background” [Diss., Chicago, 1984])

both places. In our text, however, it is clear that *ἔθνη* means the Gentiles in contrast to Israel and not the nations including Israel.³⁶

■ **7, 8a-d** In the following charge to preach and to heal, one already no longer senses any kind of temporal limitation. The charge to preach, given to the disciples, is the same as that of John the Baptist (3:2) and Jesus (4:17, cf. 9:35). Even after Easter the disciples proclaim not the kerygma of the suffering and risen Christ but Jesus' own message (28:20). That the message is here described in terms of the nearness of God's rule is not an indication that Matthew reckoned with a distant parousia. The kingdom of God is primarily the setting for the ethical proclamation of Jesus.³⁷ Alongside the preaching mission the charge to heal is equally important. The three examples of healing the sick take up stories from Matthew 8–9 and correspond in part to the formulations of 11:5. Healings and proclamation are closely related. With the healings the crowds are made aware that something extraordinary is happening in Israel (9:33). They demonstrate to John the Baptist that Jesus is the coming one (11:2-6). In Jesus' miracles the church also recognizes its own experiences and thus experiences the powerful help of its Lord. The mission to heal and the proclamation are thus essentially related so that the message does not become mere ethical exhortation but includes concrete experiences of salvation—indeed, of healing. It is no accident that prior to his disciples discourse Matthew has spoken of the disciples' *ἐξουσία* ("power"; 10:1) and has put programmatically at the beginning the command to heal that is

mentioned somewhat incidentally in the sayings source (Luke 10:9).

History of Interpretation

Problems arose here for later Christians, because the experience of miracles was often denied them (cf. already 17:19-20). It may be that the problems are already visible when in the transmission of the text there is the tendency to reduce the number of the four miracle commands. John Chrysostom provides good evidence of these difficulties. It is only with a great deal of effort that he can claim the model of the apostles for the priests and teachers of his time. For him the virtues (10:9-10!) that the proclaimers are to exhibit are more important than the miracles. Miracles are often dubious, "fantastic deception or otherwise very suspicious," as the example of the Corinthians demonstrates.³⁸ The greatest miracle is the freedom from sin. John Chrysostom is an example of a process of displacement that usually has taken place implicitly. The important thing about our text became what doctrine the apostles are to preach; all of v. 8 is minimized or even ignored.³⁹ It has remained that way in most Western churches until the present.⁴⁰ For Matthew, however, experiences of miracles are constitutive of faith, just as Jesus' miraculous deeds are of his activity. They make grace—that is, what the disciples have received "freely"—concrete. They are emergency cases of a faith that certainly is not limited to them (cf. 9:22, 29-30; 17:19-20), and they are experienced answer to prayer (cf. 8:25; 9:27). In Matthew's view the loss of such experiences cannot simply be irrelevant.

In my judgment v. 8 also poses an important question to the modern church. It is not yet answered with

36 If the second interpretation is correct, the question is still open about *when* the change from the Israel mission to the gentile mission takes place. On the surface of the Matthean narrative Easter constitutes the great caesura. However, many of the sayings taken over by Matthew (e.g., 5:11-12; 10:17-18, 23 or 23:34-39) indicate that after Easter Matthew's church did initially pursue a mission to Israel. At the level of the church's own history, therefore, that we have called "indirect transparency" (cf. above on the summary of chaps. 8–9), the transition takes place at a later time. Has it already taken place? Or is Matthew writing his gospel in order to cause it? Cf. on this matter vol. 1, Introduction 5.2.

37 Cf. vol. 1, on 3:2 (*βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*), on 4:17, and the excursus following 4:25.

38 32.6-8 = PG 57.384–388. The quotation is from 57.387.

39 Luther, WA 38.495. Additional examples of suppressing v. 8: For Thomas Aquinas (*Lectura*, no. 818), once faith has been acknowledged, miracles are no longer necessary. For Jerome (65) the miracles are important because the apostles were uneducated and incapable of speaking eloquently and needed "reinforcement"; Christian of Stavelot (26 = 1346C) and Faber Stapulensis (44B-C) are primarily interested in the spiritually/mentally "sick" and "dead."

40 Is it an accident that in the conversation of the peasants of Solentiname the discussion of Luke 9:1-2 is

the observation that we can experience love today as miracle,⁴¹ but neither is the simple exhortation to obey the Matthean command to heal satisfactory. Jesus healed and cast out demons, because those deeds were for him signs of the inbreaking kingdom of God. Matthew tells about that and passes it on to his church as part of its mission, because he has learned from Jesus that “sickness . . . (contradicts) the saving will of the creator God, who wants life and not death,” and that in the final analysis, therefore, we cannot simply accept it.⁴² Is, however, this radical view the whole truth of the gospel? It can also be very unloving and ungracious for those who have to bear the burden of illnesses and disabilities. Is becoming well the only form of liberation from illness, or can it also be a form of healing, for example, to recognize in an illness some meaning, perhaps even an opportunity? We will have to pose such questions not only from Matthew and Jesus but also to them when we attempt to make concrete the command to heal the sick as a call to pray, perhaps to lay hands on the sick, but also to pastoral care and to service.

■ **8e, 10b** Verses 8e and 10b indicate a new emphasis. Matthew has framed the old equipment regulation with two short proverbial statements. The brief sentence “you received freely, give freely,” tying the disciples’ gifts to the gift of Jesus,⁴³ on the surface appears to be in tension with the proverbial sentence of v. 10b⁴⁴ that the laborer is to receive his food. The tension is removed, however, when we observe that Matthew has replaced the *μισθοί* (“wages”) that he found in his source with

τροφή (“food”).⁴⁵ In this case the reworking is polemical: The laborer is to receive only food, no salary.⁴⁶ The ancient sentence is thereby protected against a possible misunderstanding. The meaning is that financial compensation for the messengers of the gospel or performing miracles for pay are completely out of the question.

■ **9-10** This also determines the interpretation of the equipment regulation in vv. 9-10a. *Κτήσεσθε* (“acquire,” “take”) must be understood literally. The issue is not possessions—whether an itinerant charismatic might leave something at home is not the question; it is that one is to accept no compensation for preaching and performing miracles, except for food which God will provide through the churches and other people (cf. 6:26). This is the only way to understand the prominent position of money and the plerophorous enumeration of gold, silver, and small change in the belt.⁴⁷ The sequence probably involves a graduation: You are not to accept the smallest coin for your labor! Admittedly the following enumeration of the bag for provisions,⁴⁸ the two undergarments, the shoes, and the staff does not fit well. It is difficult to imagine payment in produce that would consist of a staff or a bag for provisions. Since *κτάομαι* is a somewhat general verb and can also mean approximately “to get for oneself,” the old equipment regulation most likely has influenced v. 10 so that it also refers to what one is not to take on the journey. Thus two things

focused on the healing (Ernesto Cardenal, *The Gospel in Solentiname*, vol. 2 [Maryknoll: Orbis, 1978] 142–46)?

- 41 Thus Gnllka 1.371. According to Matthew, however, more is at stake. We should remember here not only the fundamental significance of the charismatic movement but, e.g., also the fundamental importance for the church (!) of the therapeutic mission, e.g., of Eugen Drewermann.

- 42 Klaus Seybold and Ulrich B. Müller, *Sickness and Healing*, trans. Douglas W. Stott (Nashville: Abingdon, 1981) 191.

- 43 Important is not only the imperative “give freely,” but also the reminder of the receiving (Zumstein, *Condition*, 435). Gustaf Dalman (*Jesus-Jeshua: Studies in the Gospels* [1929; reprinted New York: Ktav, 1971] 226) cites proverbial parallels to Matt 10:8e.

- 44 The parallels in A. E. Harvey (“The Workman Is Worthy of His Hire”: Fortunes of a Proverb in the Early Church,” *NovT* 24 [1982] 209–21, 211, n. 9) are, admittedly, not literal.

- 45 1 Tim 5:18 quotes the saying (as *γραφή!*) with *μισθός*. The *Didache*, a work influenced by Matthew, offers in 13:1 a version that agrees with Matthew. Paul is familiar with the apostolic privilege of support and does not claim it for himself (1 Corinthians 9). There the catchwords *ἐργάζομαι* (vv. 6, 13) and *μισθός* (vv. 17–18) appear. In 2 Cor 11:13 the (*ψευδ*-)*ἀπόστολοι*, against whom Paul boasts that he has not accepted money from the Corinthians (2 Cor 11:7: *δωρεάν!*), are *ἐργάται δόλοι*. It is quite possible that Paul knew the saying in its Q form.

- 46 HbrMt inserts: “accept no payment.”

- 47 Money was kept in the belt (Str-B 1.565; Wettstein 1.368–69).

- 48 *Πήρα* is a general word for the bag for provisions (Suidas, 4.126 [Ada Adler, ed., *Suidae Lexicon* (5 vols.; Leipzig: Teubner, 1928–38)]): *θήκη τῶν ἄρτων* and, unless there is some indication from the context, does not mean the beggar’s sack, e.g.,

are important for Matthew: first, that the proclamation of the gospel is not to be a business, and then—taking up the Q tradition—that a person who has made arrangements in advance for food, is on the road in good shoes,⁴⁹ strides along in normal clothing,⁵⁰ and is armed with a staff against attacks⁵¹ cannot proclaim the king-

dom of God. For Matthew, poverty and defenselessness belong to the proclamation of the gospel.⁵²

In the old equipment regulation of the *sayings source* the proclamation of the messengers was connected to demonstrative poverty and defenselessness. Even the most necessary things were forbidden. Without shoes one lives below the minimum for existence.⁵³ That

of the Cynic (Wilhelm Michaelis, “πήρα,” *TDNT* 6 [1968] 119).

- 49 By contrast with σανδάλιον (Mark 6:9) ὑπόδημα is a generic term for shoe (Pollux *Onom.* 7.80–94). Σανδάλια (with only a sole and straps for tying) belong to the λεπτά ὑποδήματα (7.86), in addition to which there are also ὑποδήματα κοιλά with leather on the top and boots that go up to the calves. Ὑπόδημα is preferably the “entire” shoe. Pollux notes in 7.84: Τὰ δὲ μὴ κοιλά αὐτὸ μόνον ἀποχρῶν (a misuse) ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ὑποδήματα. There does not have to be a contradiction with Mark then if one understands ὑποδήματα only as shoes with leather on top. More natural—and to be assumed for Q—is a general prohibition of shoes.

- 50 Wearing an undergarment under the upper garment or the cloak is normal with Jews: Josephus *Ant.* 17.135–36 (ἐντὸς χιτῶν of a [royal] slave); Str-B 1.566; Samuel Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie* (3 vols.; 1910–12; reprinted Hildesheim: Olm, 1966), 1.523, n. 47 and 593, nn. 466–67 (cases of more than one ἱμάτιον). It is hardly a matter of prohibiting special luxury; for obvious reasons undergarments can serve only in a limited way to demonstrate one’s wealth. However, cf. Krauss, *Archäologie* 1.161. Important are *b. Besa* 32b = Str-B 1.566 (some say: whoever has only one shirt has no life) and the references to a lack of clothing in extreme situations in Krauss, *Archäologie* 1.135. Jews, Greeks, and Romans also designate as “naked” (nakedness is to be avoided under all circumstances!) people who have only an undergarment (Krauss, *Archäologie* 1.128; Albrecht Oepke, “γυμνός κτλ,” *TDNT* 1 [1964] 773–74). For Romans, wearing a woolen *tunica interior* under the tunic is normal. For outdoor wear there is, in addition, the toga (Marquardt, *Privatleben* 2.552–53). For the most part the Cynic philosophers wear no undergarments as a sign of the simple life (Lucian *Cyn.* 20); Epictetus *Discourses* 3.22.45–47 (ἐν τριβωνάριον [worn out cloak] = γυμνός); Diogenes Laertius, 6.13 (Antisthenes doubles his cloak and wears only the one garment).

- 51 ῥάβδος is a general word for sticks of all kinds. The prohibition of a staff is quite unusual, since one

never was safe against attacks, dogs, and similar dangers. For this reason even itinerant Essenes carry a weapon, although they have the reputation of being peace-loving (Josephus *Bell.* 2.125–34). The same is true of Cynic philosophers (Carl Schneider, “ῥάβδος κτλ,” *TDNT* 6 [1968] 969, n. 21) and itinerant rabbis (*Gen. Rab.* 100.2 [end] on 49:33: the equipment for the dead indicates that slippers and (!) shoes, and staff are the normal equipment of a rabbi on the road). Cf. in addition Schneider, n. 22. On the staff as a weapon see Krauss, *Archäologie* 2.312. Not having a staff is a very unusual sign, probably of defenselessness. It is understandable that it quickly was again permitted (Mark 6:8, cf. 1 Cor 4:21).

- 52 The prohibition against earning money with the Torah was valid also for the rabbis (*m. ’Abot* 1.13; 4.5; *b. Ned.* 62a = Str-B 1.562). At a later date individual regulations were necessary for the payment of teachers (among others), for supervising children, grammar lessons, or as support for the poor (Str-B 1.563 d). The difference is that the rabbinic regulations applied only to the misuse of the Torah for profit and that poverty as such was never constitutive for teaching the Torah as it was among the Christian itinerant charismatics for proclaiming the kingdom of God.

- 53 Cf. *b. Besa* 32b, above, n. 51. Mourners, people who are under the ban or are fasting, and the entire nation on the Day of Atonement go barefoot (Krauss, *Archäologie* 1.183–84), but not outside of the villages (Str-B 1.569). To have no shoes is an expression of extreme poverty: *b. Šabb.* 129a = Str-B 1.568 (it is better to sell the beam of the house than to have no shoes; only starving is worse); *b. Šabb.* 152a = Str-B 1.568 (whoever has no shoes is not a human being). For additional references see Krauss, *Archäologie* 1.184. On the condition of the roads in the orient, cf. Krauss, *Archäologie* 2.323–24.

corresponded, however, to the gospel that was being proclaimed—the good news for the poor (Q = Luke 6:20), the defenselessness (Q = Luke 6:29), the love of one's enemies (Q = Luke 6:27-28), the break with all earthly relatives (Q = Luke 14:26), and living alone for the kingdom of God (Q = Luke 12:31). The equipment regulation⁵⁴ presumably had nothing to do with the holiness of the messengers⁵⁵ and definitely nothing at all to do with the idea that the messengers should travel lightly, because they would find hospitality anyway in friendly houses!⁵⁶ The issue is, rather, demonstrative, shocking poverty and defenselessness that is appropriate to the kingdom of God. It is a confirming sign for the proclamation⁵⁷ and is best understood as analogous to prophetic symbolic actions.⁵⁸

The *Matthean interpretation* is in no way a “cold” invalidation of this rule. There is no parallel to Luke 22:36 in Matthew. Indeed, he had already emphasized the basic significance of poverty for the life of a Christian in 6:19-34.⁵⁹ The rule of poverty remains valid as the command of Jesus for Matthew's own present and with “do not take gold, silver, or small change,” he merely gives it an emphasis—the prohibition of earning and begging—that because of the experience with wandering charismatics

obviously was of special importance for his own present. Religious begging was common at the time and was repeatedly portrayed as a great evil.⁶⁰ In order not to discredit themselves, the messengers of Jesus had to be fundamentally different. Furthermore, people had obviously had quite different experiences with traveling Christians.⁶¹ There probably were current reasons why Matthew made of the regulation a rule against acquiring. That does not change the reality, however, that for Matthew poverty is a fundamental part of the gospel and of the existence of a disciple. In that regard the disciples are like their master (8:20).

History of Interpretation

The question of what we should do with this equipment regulation today is especially difficult, since this rule was already being interpreted differently, softened (Mark 6:8-9), and eliminated (Luke 22:36) in the gospels. Paul and other missionaries in the Diaspora carried out their mission differently. Furthermore, the difference between the various ages is especially great here. In place of the early Christian itinerant charismatics without (solid!) shoes there are now Christian pastors, employed and

54 Migaku Sato (“Q und Prophetie” [Diss., Bern, 1984] 311) speaks pointedly of “disarmament.”

55 According to *m. Ber.* 9.5 one is to come to the temple mount with veiled head and without staff, shoes, bag, and dust on the feet, is not to spit there or use it as a shortcut. Schniewind (129) thus interprets the regulation to mean that one should be “like the worshippers.” Hoffmann (*Studien*, 323–24) correctly objects to this view, since the parallel is only partial.

56 Calvin 1.293–94. Dungan (*Sayings*, 68) similarly explains the Matthean text as a “‘non-provision’ passage” and says that the disciples can assume that they will be taken care of by the brothers. It is the same with the Essenes in Josephus *Bell.* 2.124–26. Gottfried Schille (*Frei zu neuen Aufgaben* [Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1986] 63–69) offers an original suggestion: One can go barefoot only in cities, where the mission in the houses also will take place (v. 13). Q is post-Markan and presupposes an urban situation. That is not the case, however! Even in ancient cities, where the streets were not always paved, people did not go barefoot.

57 Martino Conti, “Fondamenti Biblici della povertà nel ministero apostolica (Mt 10,9-10),” *Anton* 46 (1971) 393–426, 425 (“dovute credenziali”).

58 A similar, if not completely identical, symbolic

action is found in Isa 20:2-4, where Isaiah is barefoot and “naked,” i.e., wearing an undergarment. Cf. also *Mart. Isa.* 2.10–11 that speaks of poverty in the wilderness as a prophetic sign against injustice. Cf. vol. 1, II A 2.4, 2.4.1, 2.4.2 on 6:31-34, and below, IV C 3 on 19:16-30.

60 Among the numerous references are, e.g., Lucian *Fug.* 14-21 (Cynics); Apuleius *Met.* 8.24-30 (*Dea Syria*); Juvenal, 6.542-91 (Jewish, Chaldean, and other interpreters of dreams and sellers of horoscopes). For a Syriac inscription from Kefr-Hauar see Deissmann, *Light*, 109 (*Dea Syria*). Especially instructive as a parallel to vv. 11-15 from the opposite perspective is Menander *Sent.* 43 (trans. according to Krauss, *Archäologie* 3.26): “Do not grant hospitality to the priest. . . . If you invite (him) . . . to enter your house: at entering he blesses you, at leaving he . . . curses”; he puts the food into a bag for his family and still curses!

61 Itinerant Christian beggars: Paul defends himself against the pseudo-apostles who (perhaps in the name of the apostolic right of support?) fleece the congregations (2 Cor 11:6-13; 12:13, 17). *Did.* 11.5–6, 9, 12 (close to Matthew!) has to defend against greedy itinerant apostles and prophets and says that the community should entertain them only

with a car. So much has changed in the course of history that here too changes are probably unavoidable. On the other hand, it is noteworthy that—without exception!—all of the changes have weakened the regulation. The history of the text's influence will illustrate the problems.

a. In the dominant *church interpretation* the attempts to soften the regulation began where there were differences among the individual gospel texts. Of course Peter and Paul went round in cloak and shoes.⁶² A staff is allowed for walking but not for hitting.⁶³ Going barefoot is good for toughening; walking in sandals is less troublesome than is walking in high shoes.⁶⁴ Several times it was “discovered” that it was possible to add a *δύο* before *ὑποδήματα* so that the only thing prohibited is taking a second pair of shoes.⁶⁵ The text lent itself well to polemics against opponents of the church who allegedly lived in luxury and lived the life of a vagabond.⁶⁶ The allegorical interpretation, which discovered much in the details that is theologically sound, is by and large also a way of evading the text's severity.⁶⁷ In the context of the two-tiered ethics, living without possessions is a *consi-*

lium for priests and bishops but not a *praeceptum*.⁶⁸

Hermeneutically interesting is the attempt to attribute the discrepancies among the individual gospel texts to the meanings of the *words*, while the *basic* meaning lying behind the words is the same in all the gospels.⁶⁹ Our texts are then concerned with warning against pride and avarice and with trust in God.⁷⁰ The center of the texts is shifted from concrete matters to the question of one's attitude. Similar is the attempt to declare that the concrete form of this command is valid only for the beginning period of the first apostolic mission.⁷¹ Olshausen makes it easy for himself: “The details given must not be too much pressed but must be taken in all the freedom in which the apostles themselves received them.”⁷²

b. Seldom do we find *literal obedience* to the equipment regulation—even less so than with the commands of the Sermon on the Mount. The itinerant brothers of the pseudo-Clementine letters *Ad virgines*, whose life is strongly influenced by Matthew 10, are first of all ascetics, that is, celibate. Their major concern is not poverty, but whether they will accept hos-

three days; then they should work. For the journey they should get only provisions, no money (cf. Matt 10:10b!); a prophet who demands money is a pseudo-prophet. *Herm. Man.* 11.12 offers similar advice. Lucian tells how the former Cynic and later Christian Peregrinus became rich (*Pergr. Mort.* 11–16). Cf. also Julian *Or.* 7.224B (*Oeuvres complètes*, ed. Gabriel Rochefort [Paris: Société d'édition “Les Belles Lettres,” 1963] 2.70).

62 Bullinger, 99A.

63 Zwingli, 266, Lapide, 226.

64 Jerome, 66 (according to Plato's advice!); Lapide (225) praises sandals for their practicality.

65 Maldonat, 215; Jansen, 93; Paul Schanz, *Commentar über das Evangelium des heiligen Matthäus* (Freiburg: Herder, 1879) 289–90. Paulus (4.291–92) says that one should not accept shoes as a gift (*μη κτήσεσθε*)! 66 Eusebius *Hist. eccl.* 5.18.7 (Apollonius against the Montanists); Luther, WA 38.497 (with the aid of 2 Tim 3:6 Luther is principally opposed to itinerant preachers); Musculus, 286; Bullinger, 998 (is against papal luxury and papal delegates who do not even travel on foot anymore); Cocceius, 18 (opposes sellers of indulgences).

67 Examples of allegorical interpretation are: *to go barefoot*: Augustine (*Cons. ev.* 2.30 [75]): without worry; Christian of Stavelot, 26 = 1347A: no covering up of the gospel; *to own only one chiton*: Hilary, 10.5 = SC 254.220–21: to put on only Christ; Apollinaris of Laodicea fr. 47 = Reuss, 14: not to put on Christ and the old man; *no staff*: Ambrose *In Luc.* 7.60–61 =

BKV 1/21.651–52: the spirit of punishment; Maldonat, 215 on Mark 6:8: the staff of Moses for performing miracles; Hilary, 10.5 = SC 254.220–21: the root of Jesse.

68 Thomas Aquinas *S. th.* 2/2, q.185, a.6 corpus and ad 2.

69 Lapide, 224: the *substantia* of the text has to be distinguished from the *modus praeceise ad litteram*, viz., protecting the mind against greed; similarly Luther, WA 38.496.

70 Usually the text is interpreted, parallel to 6:25–34, as a warning against *sollicitudo* (common since John Chrysostom, 32.7 = PG 57.382). Admonitions to moderation are also widespread: e.g., Theophylactus, 237 (*τροφή*, not *τρονφή* [luxury]). Zwingli (265) recommends the middle way between Anabaptist renunciation of salary and papal accumulation of riches: moderation.

71 Cf. above, n. 30. Calvin (1.289, 293–94) is a prominent advocate of the view that the text refers only to the initial sending of the apostles; thus not all servants of the word are to be subject to the norm of Matthew 10. The argument had already played a role in the Middle Ages for the inquisitors in the fight against the itinerant radicals (cf. Georg Schmitz-Valckenberg, *Grundlehren katharischer Sekten des 13. Jahrhunderts* [Veröffentlichungen des Grabmann-Instituts, NF 11; Munich: Schöningh, 1971] 66, 74).

72 400, on the basis of the differences among the synoptic versions.

pitality from women on their wanderings.⁷³ The letters take it for granted that they have possessions at home.⁷⁴ They differ from pagan religious beggars by not dishonoring the gospel in the presence of blasphemous Gentiles.⁷⁵ The equipment regulation plays a major role then with the itinerant preachers of the High Middle Ages⁷⁶ and later with the mendicant orders. It is said that Francis of Assisi threw away his shoes after hearing the gospel text Matt 10:9-10.⁷⁷ Our equipment regulation is at the center of the first rule of St. Francis⁷⁸ but no longer in the second. It is even more important for the Waldensians. It is a special command for preachers who enter the *via apostolica*.⁷⁹

c. An actual paradigmatic case for applying our rule would be the question of *church salaries*. The findings are largely negative in the history of interpretation. In accordance with Matt 10:10b the following formula has found a degree of acceptance. The support is to come from the people, the reward from God.⁸⁰ *Ps-Clem. Hom.* 3.71 offers a concrete case: Paying support to a bishop who is poor is not sin, but only if he is poor.⁸¹ John Chrysostom confesses open-

ly, although not without pangs of conscience, that he owns shoes and a second garment.⁸² Thomas Aquinas and Luther are in agreement that preachers must be free of worldly worries but may not be greedy.⁸³ According to Zwingli and Musculus the pastor must not have more than physical necessities and clothing.⁸⁴ This rule is later relaxed: It does not basically matter whether a servant of the gospel is rich and lives by his own means or whether he is poor and is supported by his brothers.⁸⁵ The Anabaptist preachers did not receive a fixed salary but were supported by the members of the congregation.⁸⁶ The question of the pastor's salary was a controversial issue in the disputations; the preachers defended their salary on the basis of Luke 10:7b.⁸⁷

Our text plays no role in the modern discussion of ecclesiastical salaries and the form of the churches. The statement, rather moderate when measured by Matt 10:9, that "the rights of a university education and social standing mean nothing to those who have become messengers of Jesus" appears characteristically in a book that is regarded as radical.⁸⁸ Any sympathy the itinerant charismatics enjoy is only secret.⁸⁹

73 1.10–11; 2.1–5 = ANF 8.58–59, 61–62.

74 *Ad virgines* 2.1 = ANF 61.1.10–11 warns against idleness.

75 *Ad virgines* 2.6.3 = ANF 62.

76 Herbert Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter* (2d. ed.; Hildesheim: Olms, 1961) 17, 21. Cf. the description of Robert of Arbrissel in Johannes von Walter, *Die ersten Wanderprediger Frankreichs*, vol. 1: *Robert von Arbrissel* (Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche 9/3; Leipzig: Dieterich, 1903) 128: barefoot, rough clothing, tattered penitential clothing.

77 Werner Goetz, "Franciscus von Assisi," *TRE* 11 (1983) 299–307, 300; Kajetan Esser, *Anfänge und ursprüngliche Zielsetzungen des Ordens der Minderbrüder* (Studia et documenta Franciscana 4; Leiden: Brill, 1966) 119.

78 *Regula non bullata* no. 14. On the prohibition of money cf. no. 8, printed in Hans Urs von Balthasar, *Die grossen Ordensregeln* (Menschen der Kirche in Zeugnis und Urkunde, NF 6; Einsiedeln: Benziger, 1974) 300, 295–96.

79 Reinhold Mokrosch and Herbert Walz, eds., *Mittelalter* (Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte in Quellen 2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1980) 119; Kurt Victor Selge, *Die ersten Waldenser* (Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 37; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967) 1.49–50, 116–17.

80 Augustine *Sermo* 46.5 = CChr.SL 41.533; John Chrysostom, according to Lape, 226.

81 Luke 10:7 is here cited. Origen also understands the

compensation given to coworkers in the church as support of the poor. Cf. 16.21 on Matt 21:12 = GCS Origenes 10. 546: no riches, *μόνον διαζῆν*.

82 32.6 = PG 57.385.

83 Thomas Aquinas *S. th.* 3, q.40 a.3 corpus (affirmed is *terrenorum possessio*, rejected is *nimia . . . sollicitudo*); Luther, WA 38.496 (*licet vivere de Euangelio* even with a family; rejected is *avaricia, fastus et luxus*).

84 Cf. Zwingli, above, n. 70. Musculus, 289: only living expenses and clothing, *corporalis necessitas*.

85 Calvin (1.293) is of the opinion that one can leave gold, silver, bag, etc. at home. Zinzendorf (2.717–18) sees various possibilities: Proclaimers can live from their possessions and even do good things with them; they may have part-time employment; one of the Christian "siblings" gives support, or it "resolves itself."

86 "Schleitheimer Bekenntnis" 5 in Heinold Fast, ed., *Der linke Flügel der Reformation* (Bremen: Schünemann, 1962) 65. In the seventeenth century Luke 10:7b (*μισθός*!) was already being used to justify the church tax (in Kleve, 1662 and 1687). Cf. Friedrich Giese, *Deutsches Kirchensteuerrecht* (Stuttgart: Enke, 1910) 27–28.

87 Heinold Fast, *Heinrich Bullinger und die Täufer* (Schriftenreihe des Mennonitischen Geschichtsvereins 7; Weierhof: Pfalz, 1959) 25, 143; Zofingen Colloquy of 1532 = Quellen zur Geschichte der Täufer. Schweiz 4.221.

88 Bonhoeffer, *Cost*, 186.

Kierkegaard's experience remains typical. After he had concluded on the basis of our text that the salary of clergy employed by the state is "directly contrary to Christ's ordinance" and that there is literally not a single honest priest, he once shared this opinion with Bishop Mynster. "To my surprise Bishop Mynster replied, 'Yes, there is something in that.' I had not really expected this answer; for though this was said, to be sure, in private, yet on this point Bishop Mynster was usually prudence itself."⁹⁰

Our text is among the most suppressed statements of the gospels. Is it to be laid *ad acta*? Or how is its meaning to be claimed in a changed situation? We postpone this question until our summary.

■ **11-15** The following five verses belong together.

Matthew probably intended that the disciples upon entering a village or a city should first make inquiries among the inhabitants about suitable places to stay. Thus they are not just to go to the first possible house but from the beginning are to avoid "bad" houses. The sayings source was much less concerned here.⁹¹ The Matthean text may reflect experiences of ambiguous and difficult missionary situations. Only after these inquiries are they to enter the house. Early (cf. Mark 6:10) problematic experiences with missionaries may lie behind the command to stay in the quarters once one has occupied them (v. 11c). One should not look around for a better place to stay or give the impression of instability.

■ **12-13** When entering the house, they are to extend the greeting of peace. This is not the everyday Semitic greeting of שלום (Shalom) but a special blessing that spreads

something of the material presence of God's salvation over the house and can also be withdrawn. Behind this formulation was perhaps originally the thought of the *Tg. Isa.* 52.7 that speaks of the revelation of the kingdom of God and of eschatological peace.⁹² The decisive question is whether the chosen house really proves to be worthy. The reaction of its inhabitants must correspond to the peace given to them. Initially this is demonstrated simply by whether they do or do not receive the messengers of Jesus.

■ **14** If they do not, then they no longer live in the realm of God's eschatological peace. Therefore the messengers leave the house and the city and terminate all fellowship with them. That is the meaning of the symbolic action of shaking the dust from the feet.⁹³ It is neither a symbolic discharge of responsibility,⁹⁴ nor a curse, nor a pronouncement of judgment; it is an execution of judgment.⁹⁵ When the peace of God returns to the messengers and they break off fellowship, then the house or the city lies outside the saving sphere of God's peace. The issue of salvation or disaster is finally decided in the encounter with the disciples of Jesus.

■ **15** The judgment word of v. 15 simply seals what has already happened. In the final judgment it will be better for the notoriously sinful region of Sodom and Gomorra⁹⁶ than for this city. The solemn "amen" and

89 Cf. Gerd Theissen, *Sociology of Early Palestinian Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978) 125, n. 40.

90 "The Instant 7, 8," in Kierkegaard's *Attack Upon "Christendom"* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944) 228, 230.

91 Cf. Hoffmann, *Studien*, 273.

92 Text in Str-B 3.8.

93 The shaking of the dust from the feet is probably a spontaneously created prophetic symbolic action, thus a parallel to Neh 5:13 (shaking out the garment!) and not a copy. The (later) rabbinical conviction that gentile land is unclean (references in Str-B 1.571) did not lead to a rite of shaking off the dust; this has been created (!) by Billerbeck. The meaning of the symbolic action is the demonstrative termination of all fellowship. Cf. Acts 13:51; 18:6.

94 Examples: Erasmus (*Paraphrasis*, 60): The messengers testify that they have not received any earthly advantage from this house. Or the messengers emphasize the effort they have made on behalf of this house (a view widespread since Jerome).

95 Luise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann, *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1986) 50: "The messengers do not see themselves as judges." Indeed, they proclaim the love of one's enemies. On the contrary! They may indeed make no decision about God's judgment, but since they are bearers of the saving sphere of the eschatological peace that returns to them, they become instruments of judgment.

96 Sodom and Gomorra are regarded as models of sinfulness: Str-B 1.571-76.

the biblical language of the saying⁹⁷ intensify the seriousness and the inescapability.

History of Interpretation

The Syriac Book of Stages, the *Liber Graduum*, offers in its fifth homily, "Concerning the Milk of the Little Ones," an interpretation of our text that can reveal a fundamental problem with the content of the text. The entire Book of Stages distinguishes between the commands for the perfect and the commands for the beginners or ordinary Christians, for example, the "milk of the little ones." Surprisingly, it applies our commands for the wandering charismatics not to the perfect but to the "little ones." "Because they were (*scil.* still) children in the truth, . . . they were afraid to go to the Gentiles." Those who are little and unstable greet no one on the road, and they shake the dust from their feet. The little ones go only to the worthy, "so that their spirit might not suffer harm." The perfect, however, say that "God sends us to the nations, not to righteous sheep." They spend the night with sinners and tax collectors just as Jesus himself did. If someone does not receive them, instead of shaking the dust from their feet, they pray for those who persecute them.⁹⁸ Zwingli also asks whether this command of Jesus could not destroy the sinners and the weak instead of encouraging them.⁹⁹

Whoever deals with the command of Jesus in v. 14 has to ask whether and how it can be governed by love. To shake the dust from one's feet in the name of God can inwardly be an act of weakness and self-protection on the part of people who do not dare to expose themselves to what is foreign and new. Outwardly it can be an act of extreme self-absolutizing and of lovelessness and not a sign of God. Here lies a danger of this text. On the other hand, a church that is no longer able to shake the dust from its feet because it has its cathedrals and palaces next to the houses of those who do not receive its message, testifies less to the truth of God than to its own lack of freedom. To the princely housed but unfree church, our word asks whether it is still capable of confronting people with binding decisions as did the homeless but free Son of Man and his disciples.

Summary and Meaning for Today

The message of the entire text is that the authority and the lifestyle of Jesus that come from his mission are entrusted completely to his disciples. They represent him in their defenselessness, homelessness, and in their poverty. To live as a disciple is to live as Jesus does. That is why telling about this Jesus is so important for Matthew. Jesus' way of living is a prophetic sign that embodies the truth of his message of the kingdom of God. The message is thus destroyed for Matthew if the life of the messengers is not "right." Of whom is Matthew speaking here? Jesus' "mission instruction" was initially directed to the itinerant charismatics, to those who followed him in the literal sense of the word. Does that mean that this text speaks of a special kind of discipleship? Matthew is writing for a settled community, but he makes no distinction between the "twelve apostles" of the beginning and the disciples who are transparent of the entire church. We have surmised that for him the missionary proclamation is a task of the *entire* church and, correspondingly, that living as an itinerant charismatic is a way of life for each member of the church. Since the defenselessness and poverty of the messengers make concrete some of the commands of the Sermon on the Mount (cf. 5:38-42; 6:25-34), it probably is safe to say that all in freedom should do as much as they can on the way to righteousness. In any case, the community identifies to a great degree with the itinerant charismatics and their mission.

How can we transfer that into the present? First of all, we must consider the rest of the New Testament. Such things as Paul's renunciation of the apostolic claim for support, abandoning the traditional style of itinerant radicalism in the great urban centers of Greece and Asia Minor, and certainly the transition to the missionary proclamation of the local churches in the later period reveal that there was a great deal of freedom in dealing with Jesus' commands. That may be even more true for our own Western European situation, where the

97 On γῆ with a geographical designation cf. vol. 1. Introduction 3.2. *Ἡμέρα κρίσεως* is a postbiblical-Jewish expression (*Ps. Sol.* 15:12; *Jdt* 16:17; *4 Ezra* 7:102, 113; 12:34; for rabbinical material see Schlatter, 335).

98 Mihaly Kmosko, ed., *Liber Graduum*, 101-38; quotations 107, 127, 134. Homily 30 on the command-

ments of faith and love also assigns 10:5 to the (lower) commandments of faith (*Liber Graduum*, 895).

99 267. Both Zwingli and Bullinger (100B) argue against casually leaving the church on the basis of this passage (against the Anabaptists).

Christian national churches in a complex way have become a factor and ferment of society as a whole. On the other hand, the history of interpretation has demonstrated drastically that just about anything has been repressed and excused by “all the freedom”¹⁰⁰ of Jesus. It is part of the basic *orientation* of the Gospel of Matthew that “gospel” means the *binding* commands of Jesus. Proclamation means that these commands take shape in the works (5:16) and in the life of the proclaimers. It may be that Matthew would fundamentally deny the claim of our Western European churches to proclaim the “gospel of the kingdom,” not because of their preaching, or because they do not uncritically take over *his* form of the church, but because they no longer go in the *direction* that he indicates and scarcely demonstrate anymore in their own life signs of the poverty, the homelessness, and the powerlessness that would make recognizable the “higher righteousness” and with it the gospel.

I am of the opinion that what is at stake here, just as

in the Sermon on the Mount,¹⁰¹ is risktaking in two ways. On the one hand, the *entire* institution of the church, including all of its members and office bearers, is challenged to take small but intentional and active steps in the direction of greater poverty and powerlessness, of greater wholeness of its proclamation and distance from the world—and to do so in such a way that the existing form of the churches is not simply negated but changed.¹⁰² There is no *evangelical* legitimacy of a national-church reality, only a practical “legitimacy”! On the other hand, it is indispensable for the entire church that *in* it (not alongside it!) individual groups and communities raise up on behalf of the entire church signs of radical homelessness, nonviolence, poverty, and holistic proclamation.

100 Olshausen, 400.

101 Cf. vol. 1, II A 2.2.5 on 5:38-42 (Summary), II A 2.5 on 7:12 (Summary), and the concluding reflections on the practice of the Sermon on the Mount today.

102 Cf. on this subject the suggestions in Ulrich Luz, “Die Kirche und ihr Geld im Neuen Testament,” in Wolfgang Lienemann, ed., *Die Finanzen der Kirche* (Munich: Kaiser, 1989) 554.

2.2 The Persecution of the Disciples (10:16-23)

Literature

- Ernst Bammel, "Matthäus 10,23," *StTh* 15 (1961) 79-92.
- Barry S. Crawford, "Near Expectation in the Sayings of Jesus," *JBL* 101 (1982) 225-44.
- Jacques Dupont, "'Vous n'auriez pas achevé les villes d'Israël avant que le fils de l'homme ne vienne' (Mat 10,23)," *NovT* 2 (1958) 228-44.
- André Feuillet, "Les origines et la signification de Mt 10,23," *CBQ* 23 (1961) 182-98.
- Geist, *Menschensohn*, 227-38.
- Charles H. Giblin, "Theological Perspective and Matthew 10:23b," *TS* 29 (1968) 637-61.
- Grässer, *Parusieverzögerung*, 137-41.
- Volker Hampel, "Ihr werdet mit den Städten Israels nicht zu Ende kommen': Eine exegetische Studie über Matthäus 10,23," *ThZ* 45 (1989) 1-31.
- Hare, *Theme*, 96-114.
- Werner Georg Kümmel, "Die Naherwartung in der Verkündigung Jesu," in idem, *Heilsgeschehen*, 1.457-70.
- Künzi, *Naherwartungslogion*.
- Lange, *Erscheinen*, 252-60.
- McDermott, "Mt 10:23," 230-40.
- Bo Reicke, "A Test of Synoptic Relationships: Matthew 10,17-23 and 24, 9-14 with Parallels," in William R. Farmer, ed., *New Synoptic Studies* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983) 209-29.
- Léopold Sabourin, "You will not have gone through All the Towns of Israel, Before the Son of Man Comes' (Mat 10:23b)," *BTB* 7 (1977) 5-11.
- Heinz Schürmann, "Zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10,23," in idem, *Untersuchungen*, 150-56.
- Schweitzer, *Quest*, 326-66.
- Anton Vögtle, "Exegetische Erwägungen über das Wissen und Selbstbewußtsein Jesu," in idem, *Evangelium*, 296-344.
- For additional literature on the disciples discourse see above, II C.

18

and before governors and kings you will be led

for my sake

as a testimony to them and to the Gentiles.

19

But when they hand you over do not worry

how or what you shall speak,

for it will be given you at that hour

what you shall say.

20

For you are not the ones who are speaking,

but it is the spirit of your father speaking

through you.

21

But brother will deliver brother to death,

and the father his child;

and children will rise up against their parents

and kill them.

22

And you will be hated by all for my name's sake.

But whoever endures to the end will be saved.

23

But when they persecute you in this city,¹ flee to the next.

For amen, I say to you:

You will not complete the cities of Israel until the Son of Man comes.

Analysis

Structure

The section consists of an introductory sentence (v. 16) with the catchwords ἀποστέλλω ("to send") and πρόβατον ("sheep") from 10:5-6,² a concluding sentence (v. 23b-d) introduced (as was v. 15) by ἀμήν λέγω ὑμῖν ("amen, I say to you") that speaks of judgment, and the intervening sentences vv. 17-23a. Thus on the one hand to a degree the section parallels vv. 5-15. On the other hand, however, v. 23 also points back to vv. 5-6 (πόλις, Ἰσραήλ) so that the inclusion vv. 5-6/23 frames the entire first main section of the discourse. The intervening sentences consist of an introductory imperative (v. 17a), two pronouncement statements introduced by the future tense of παραδίδωμι ("to deliver"; vv. 17b-18, 21-22), and two statements of instructions for behavior introduced by ὅταν δέ ("But when"; vv. 19-20, 23a). The concluding v. 23b supports the instruction of v. 23a with a word of comfort much as the encouragement of vv. 19b, c-20 does with v. 19a, b. The determinative catchword of the section, παραδίδωμι, reveals that our section, although closely connected with vv. 5-15, has a different theme.

Sources

Verse 16a comes from the sending discourse of Q (= Luke 10:3). Matthew has saved it until this point

16

Behold, I send you as sheep in the midst of wolves; become, therefore, as wise as the serpents and as pure as the doves.

17

**Beware of people!
for they will deliver you up to councils,
and in their synagogues they will scourge you,**

1 The long text "and when they persecute you in the next, then flee (again) to another" (primarily Western mss but also Q, f^{1.13} and Origen) reveals the effort to interpret the advice to flee as a fundamentally valid command.

2 Cf. above, II C.

because it serves as an appropriate introduction to the section on persecution. *Verse 16b* is missing in Q. Since similar comparisons appear in Jewish texts,³ and since only the defenselessness and innocence of the dove, not the serpent's craftiness, fit into Matthean theology, it is better to assume here a pre-Matthean addition (Q^{Mt}?) rather than Matthean redaction. Only *v. 17a* may be a redactional introduction.⁴ Verses 17b-22 are moved up from Mark 13:9-13.⁵ Καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν in *v. 18b* corresponds to the Markan καὶ εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη of 13:10.⁶ For reasons of content Matthew has omitted (cf. 10:5-6!) the rest of this verse that speaks of the gentile mission. In addition, vv. 18-20 have a parallel in Q (Luke 12:11-12) that has clearly influenced our text. It immediately follows the section Q = Luke 12:2-9 that Matthew will use for vv. 26-33.⁷ Matthew has taken from it μὴ μεριμνήσητε ("do not worry") with which he creates one of the frequently occurring reminiscences in chap. 10 of Matt 6:25-34. Here, as in his use of Mark 13:9-13, it is clear that Matthew is surveying those parts of his sources that he has not yet used. In *v. 17* μαστιγῶ ("scourge") is redactional. Along with "in their synagogues" and the motif of persecution from city to city (*v. 23a*), this verb looks forward to 23:34 where Matthew again will take up the theme of the persecution of the messengers of Christ in Israel and will pronounce a sharp judgment on Israel. The reference to the "father" in *v. 20* is also redactional. *Verse 23* is special Matthean material. Worth considering is the suggestion that the logion comes from Q, or more likely from Q^{Mt}, where it could have

appeared after Q = Luke 12:11-12; the structure of the two sayings is very similar.⁸ It has recently been suggested that the verse could come completely or partially from Matthew.⁹ In my judgment, however, there is not enough linguistic evidence to support such a thesis.¹⁰ In any case it was Matthew who inserted the logion; important for him in the process were the catchword connection τέλος/τελέω ("end," "complete") in vv. 22/23 and the compositional references to vv. 5-6, 14-15, and 19.

Tradition History and Origin

Originally, there were four individual logia:

- a. *Matt 10:16a* reflects the situation of persecution in only general terms. There are no compelling reasons to deny this saying to Jesus.
- b. *Matt 10:17b-20* (= Mark 13:9, 11; Luke 12:11-12) is an originally self-contained logion that in the course of the history of tradition increasingly emphasized the disciples' situation of persecution. It may well have originated as a prophetic word assuring the spirit to the post-Easter church engaged in mission in Israel.¹¹
- c. *Matt 10:21-22* (= Mark 13:12-13), like *Matt 10:34-36*, is influenced by Mic 7:6. The change from the third (*v. 21*) to the second person plural (*v. 22*) is like that in vv. 17-18. The saying probably was formed in the post-Easter community. Whether a kernel of this tradition goes back to Jesus will be discussed in connection with *Matt 10:34-36*.
- d. The circumstances of the tradition of *Matt 10:23* are complex. Controversial are: (1) whether the

3 Cf. below, nn. 27-28.

4 Cf. *Matt 6:1*; 7:15; 16:11-12.

5 Bo Reicke ("A Test of Synoptic Relationships," 213) regards this strange (not unique!) procedure of Matthew as "too artificial" and assumes that *Matt 10:17-22* and *24:9-13* (just as the other synoptic parallels) are in literary-critical terms independent variants of the same Jesus tradition.

6 Schweizer (242) argues that since Matthew did not read punctuation marks in his Markan text, he perhaps thought that the end of the Markan sentence did not come until after ἔθνη (Mark 13:10). Of course, in that case the asymmetrical connection εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς καὶ εἰς . . . would become difficult. *Matt 24:14* also shows that Matthew read it differently.

7 Matthew omits Q = Luke 12:10, because he will combine it in 12:32 with the corresponding Markan parallel.

8 Thus especially Heinz Schürmann, "Zur Traditions-

und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10,23," 150-56.

In my opinion, a position after Q = Luke 10:12 (vox πόλις) or the assumption that it is special material would be just as possible.

9 Frankemölle (*Jahwebund*, 130) as a possibility; McDermott ("Mt 10:23," 230-40, 236-40) for *v. 23b*; Gnllka 1.374-75.

10 Redactional are: διώκω, πόλις, ἀμὴν (γὰρ) λέγω ὑμῖν, ἔως, cf. vol. 1, Introduction 3.2. Not redactional are: τελέω (used redactionally by Matthew in a different way), the motif of flight ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ after 10:14-15 that is somewhat surprising (after *v. 14* ἐκεῖνη would be expected) and ἔτερος with the article (cf. 6:24).

11 Cf. Pesch, *Markusevangelium* 2.287.

logion is a unity or whether v. 23a is secondary and provides a situation for v. 23b, and (2) its origin.

Concerning (1): I would vote for the unity of all of v. 23. *Οὐ μὴ τελέσῃτε τὰς πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ* (v. 23b) presupposes something—if not v. 23a, then a different statement that later would have been replaced by v. 23a.¹² The former is the simpler assumption. *Ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ* (v. 23a) again presupposes something. In the present context it probably refers back to vv. 14–15.¹³ Perhaps originally the actual city was meant to which the speaker alluded.¹⁴ The formal parallels to v. 23b also tend to support the verse's unity.¹⁵

Concerning (2): Even if we assume that the logion was a unity, we cannot automatically decide the question of authenticity in favor of the early church. The existence of the unfulfilled prophecy in v. 23b is not a convincing argument for authenticity; such a statement could also go back to an early Christian

prophet.¹⁶ The formal parallels to amen sayings with *οὐ μὴ* do not constitute an argument against authenticity.¹⁷ In my judgment, the suggestion that Jesus would not have advised flight instead of confession is also not convincing.¹⁸ Our interpretation will show that the focus of the saying lies not in limiting the mission of the disciples to Israel but in the comfort that the imminent arrival of the Son of Man provides. This focus is basically in harmony with Jesus' proclamation.¹⁹ Thus the decision will have to be based on whether we think that the situation of the persecution of the disciples in Israel presupposed in v. 23a is conceivable during the activity of Jesus. Usually a negative answer is given, but this negative answer for its part is based on the negative decision about numerous other sayings whose authenticity is similarly uncertain (for example, Luke 10:10–11; Matt 10:16a, 28, 34–36, 38, 39; 11:20–23; 23:37–39). Since we

12 Especially Werner Georg Kümmel ("Die Naherwartung," 1466–67) has argued that it is not a unity. He claims that *τελέω* (v. 23b) cannot mean "to come to an end with" (as it is offered, e.g., in the Zurich translation) and that v. 23b therefore does not fit v. 23a—that *τελέω* means "to bring to an end," "to complete," "to execute." Even objects whose execution or completion were not in the intention of the subject can be connected with *τελέω*. LSJ (s.v. *τελέω*, 1.7) notes, e.g., *πόνος, βίος, νοῦσος*. The problem lies not in the "singular" meaning of the word *τελέω* but in the abbreviated figure of speech possible in Greek that Kümmel did not recognize, viz., the "omission of the noun that can be supplied from the context" (Mayser, *Grammatik* 2/1.20). It is not the towns of Israel that will be "completed," but the mission to them. Kümmel did not recognize this stylistic device and attempted to translate literally. He thus arrived at the "singular" German translation "to come to an end with" (*zu Ende kommen mit*).

13 Anton Vögtle ("Exegetische Erwägungen über das Wissen und Selbstbewußtsein Jesu," 330–31) assumes that the (for him secondary) v. 23a was formulated on the basis of v. 14.

14 Jeremias (*Promise*, 20, n. 4) regards the awkward demonstrative pronoun *ταύτῃ* as a Semitism (pleonastic Aramaic demonstrative pronoun). However, in Aramaic "the one—the other" is usually paraphrased with the same pronoun (Dalman, *Grammatik*, 114–15). *Ἐτερος* for "another" is common in popular Koine (James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949] 257).

15 Related to v. 23b are other logia introduced by *ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν* that also terminate a prediction, made negative with *οὐ μὴ*, with an *ἕως* sentence (Mark 9:1; 13:30; 14:25; cf. Matt 5:18, 26; 23:39; John 13:38 and vol. 1, II A 2.1 on 5:17–20, "Structure"). Of these sayings Mark 14:25 and 13:30 are not understandable apart from their preceding context; Matt 5:26; 23:39; and John 13:38 are the literary conclusions of more comprehensive texts; only Matt 5:18 and Mark 9:1 are originally isolated logia. Matt 17:20 is not relevant here since the structure of this logion is different (contra McDermott, "Mt 10:23," 238–39).

16 Carston Colpe ("*ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*," TDNT 8 [1972] 400–477, 436–37) claims that the community would not have handed down an erroneous prediction of Jesus. However, it has done that in the case of Mark 14:25. Furthermore, the later church was never offended by this prediction.

17 Cf. above, n. 15. Mark 14:25 certainly, Matt 5:25–26 probably are genuine Jesus sayings (contra Boring, *Sayings*, 209; Barry S. Crawford, "Near Expectation in the Sayings of Jesus," 225–44, 242–43).

18 Differently Boring, *Sayings*, 210. The difference between leaving a town (10:14) and fleeing from it is not all that great.

19 Limiting the disciples to the cities of Israel will become programmatic only if one reads our logion together with 10:5–6 (contra Tödt, *Son of Man*, 60). Volker Hampel ("*Ihr werdet mit den Städten Israels nicht zu Ende kommen*," 24–27) argues that it came from Jesus.

can conclude from relatively secure logia that there were at the very least conflicts within families (Luke 14:26), with Jewish opponents (for example, Luke 11:15-20), and a possible trial situation (Luke 12:8-9); and since the sending of the disciples by Jesus as such is probable; and since Jesus' conscious anticipation of his own death presupposes that he expected to be persecuted; we can say at the very least that it is not impossible that the entire logion comes from Jesus.

Interpretation

This section of the text fluctuates in its time structures. In the Matthean narrative it is part of the sending of the disciples during the life of Jesus, but even the interpreters of the ancient church noted that many of Jesus' statements were fulfilled only after Easter.²⁰ Modern interpretation often questions whether our text must be limited to the time of the Matthean church's mission to Israel, which from Matthew's perspective is already a time of the past.²¹ It is claimed that Matthew repeated it in a different form in the context of the gentile mission of his day (24:9-14) and that especially v. 23, referring back to vv. 5-6, makes a pronouncement that may no longer have been relevant for the Matthean church. However, the literal repetitions from vv. 18 and 22 in 24:9, 13-14 show that the sending of the disciples to Israel "back then" must have a meaning for the gentile mission of the church in the present. The anticipation of the end in 10:22b shows that we cannot simply distin-

guish between "past" mission to Israel and "eschatological" mission to Gentiles. Furthermore, the end of v. 18 even refers to the Gentiles. For this reason our text has been understood "typologically," so that the church's *entire* mission is rooted directly in the sending by Jesus.²² Since a decision between the alternatives of past and present is impossible, the question is how the *past* situation of the sending of the disciples to Israel has for Matthew a basic, typological significance.

■ **16a** Verse 16a introduces a new theme. The coexistence of sheep and wolves raises the specter of experiences of violence. The eschatological peace in which wolf and sheep will live together in harmony (Isa 11:6; 65:25) is not yet a reality. In Old Testament and Jewish tradition sheep and wolves often appear together in descriptions of Israel's situation among the nations.²³ Now for Jesus or the earliest church to describe the situation of the disciples *in Israel* this way is to change the image so that it shocks and prepares for vv. 18-23. In the towns of Israel the disciples experience not only rejection (vv. 14-15) but violence. For their part they are to be defenseless as sheep who do not want "even in their thoughts to take revenge on their persecutors."²⁴ That corresponds to the Sermon on the Mount (5:38-48), foregoing the protective staff (10:10), and the greeting of peace (10:12-13). The readers who have been reading the gospel from the beginning know that the dangerous

20 Origen, 12.16 = GCS Origenes 10.106-7; John Chrysostom, 33.3 = PG 57.391.

21 Walker, *Heilsgeschichte*, 77 ("retrospective" Israel text"); Lange, *Erscheinen*, 254 ("historicizing"). Strecker (*Weg*, 41) sees the transition from the sending of the disciples to the description of the church's fate as lying between vv. 16 and 17. In v. 23, that appears to fit better with vv. 5-16, along with Knabenbauer (1.455) and Johannes Munck (*Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* [Atlanta: Knox, 1977] 256, n. 1) Strecker then has to interpret the πόλεις τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ as the Hellenistic cities of the Diaspora, in which Jews also resided, in order to save the direct reference to the present. A different kind of salvation-historical division distinguishes between the church's "continuing situation," described in the sending discourse (Willi Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1969] 202-3) and the still future eschaton that is described in chap. 24 (similarly Grässer, *Parusieverzögerung*, 139).

22 Zumstein, *Condition*, 444 (then there is no principal difference between the interpretation of 10:17-22 and 24:9-14); similarly Schuyler Brown, "The Mission to Israel in Matthew's Central Section," ZNW 69 (1978) 73-90, 74, 90 ("transparency"); Charles H. Giblin, "Theological Perspective and Matthew 10:23b," 637-61, 654-61 (the mission of the twelve disciples is representative of the mission of the entire church which is understood as the work of the Christ).

23 Herbert Preisker and Siegfried Schulz, "πρόβατον κτλ," TDNT 6 (1968) 690; sheep in contrast to wolves: 1 Enoch 89.55; 4 Ezra 5:18; Tanch. 32b = Str-B 1. 574; Esth. Rab. 10.11 on 9:2 (the sheep that is preserved among 70 wolves).

24 Basil, *Regulae brevius* 245 (Karl Suso Frank, ed. and trans., *Die Mönchsregeln: Basilius von Caesarea* [St. Otilien: EOS, 1981] 327).

situation of the Christians as sheep among wolves is not limited to the first mission in Israel. In 7:15 the evangelist had described their own experiences with the false prophets this way.²⁵ The sequence of vv. 7-15 and v. 16 makes clear from the beginning that Jesus' charge to preach leads to conflicts. Thus the emphatic ἐγώ ("I") is important. Jesus himself has sent the disciples into this situation, and from the beginning he is in charge of it.²⁶ It does not come as a surprise for the disciples.

■ **16b** General directions for behavior follow: Be wise as serpents and pure as doves. It is difficult to see how the two are related. The dove was for Greeks and Jews a model of integrity, defenselessness, and purity.²⁷ As early as Gen 3:1 the serpent is considered as crafty (נָחָשׁ, LXX: φρόνιμος). There is a Jewish text that also brings the cunning serpent and the pure dove together, but it does so in antithesis.²⁸ The dove's simple purity fits well with the sheep's nonviolence, but the serpent's craftiness poses a problem. Without other indications in the text, it cannot automatically be connected with the obedience of the "wise" in parables (7:24-27; 25:1-12) or timely flight in persecutions (10:23a!).²⁹ We should not press this general wisdom exhortation to be cunning, and we especially should not read too much into it theologically.

History of Interpretation

The church's interpreters have had difficulties with the serpent's cunning ever since in the name of the

simplicity of the orthodox dove the fathers had to defend themselves against the alleged cunning of the gnostic serpent.³⁰ In many different ways people make of it a Christian image. One often finds the claim, borrowed from ancient literature, that the snake when attacked coils up and protects its head with its body. In the same way the "clever" Christians should protect their "head," by which was meant faith or Christ.³¹ Other interpreters see the serpent's cunning in a dialectic with the dove's simple purity³² that later gave rise to the postulate of a "middle way" "between the intelligent use of humans and relationships" and "simple-hearted dedication to a great cause."³³ Karl Barth sets the "harmlessness of the dove" over the "diplomacy" of the "serpent's shrewdness."³⁴ In each case the interpreter's own understanding of the world of the interpreter finds here its battleground!

■ **17-20** The logion of vv. 17b-20 leads us into the complex time structure of our text. Matthew moves from the generally formulated "beware of people" (v. 17a) to a general understanding of the saying: All unbelievers are dangerous (vv. 17b-18). However, the traditional logion speaks only of the danger coming from Jews. Συνέδριον does not yet have the technical meaning of a Jewish

25 Προσέχετε ἀπό . . . intensifies this reference to 7:15.

26 Cf. John Chrysostom, 33.1 = PG 57.388 ("that no one should think that they had to suffer these afflictions because of the powerlessness of their lord").

27 Heinrich Greeven, "περιστερά κτλ," TDNT 6 (1968) 65, 67. Ἀκέραιος is frequently parallel to ἀπλοῦς (Wettstein 1.371).

28 Midr. Cant. 2.14 (101a) = Str-B 1.574-75. (Before God Israel is דבִּי as a dove, among the Gentiles cunning as a serpent.) In other texts Israel is compared with a dove but not with a serpent.

29 Jerome's explanation (69: per prudentiam devitent insidias) is later applied to v. 23a, e.g., by Maldonat, 218; Calvin 1.298 (the serpents are intent on flight); Bullinger, 101A (not to stumble carelessly into dangers); Olshausen, 405.

30 Tertullian *Scorp.* 15 = ANF 3.648; idem *Val.* 2-3 = CChr.SL 1.754-55 (the dove as a symbol of the Christians; the serpent as the robber of the divine image and the animal who trades in secrets); for the Ophites cf. Epiphanius *Haer.* 37.7.6 = GCS 31.60.

31 Since Origen (fr. 202 = GCS Origenes 12.97) this explanation has been repeated frequently. The fourth quality of the serpents in *Physiologus* 11 (Ursula Treu, trans., *Physiologus: Naturkunde in frühchristlicher Deutung* [2d ed.; Berlin: Union, 1981] 26) was influential. Cf. Virgil *Georg.* 3.422-24.

32 See, e.g., Gregory the Great *Pastoral Rule* 3.11 = NPNF Second Series 12.33 (the serpent's shrewdness makes the dove's simplicity alert, and the dove's simplicity mitigates the serpent's shrewdness; both are bad in excess); *Opus imperfectum* 24 = 57; Luther, WA 38.499 (cautious toward insidious people, sincere toward good people).

33 J. Weiss, 309. Bernhard Häring, *The Law of Christ: Moral Theology for Priest and Laity* (3 vols.; Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1966-67) 2.500: Cleverness of serpents and sincerity of doves correspond to the tension of being "in the world" but not "of the world."

34 Barth, CD 4/3.630-31.

Sanhedrin with seventy-one or twenty-three members,³⁵ but refers generally to the court of justice.³⁶ The scourging in synagogues refers to the punishment of thirty-nine lashes with the whip that, according to the Mishna, was imposed by a court of three men for severe transgressions of the law and was executed by the synagogue servant.³⁷ In New Testament literature ἡγεμόν almost always has the meaning “governor.” Βασιλεῖς will make the readers think of client-kings such as Agrippa I. The trial of Paul in Acts is an example. It shows that the logion does not absolutely have to be interpreted from the Palestinian situation, but that, on the other hand, that situation is nowhere clearly exceeded.³⁸ As in 23:34, where Matthew will refer back to 10:17, 23, he is most likely dealing with experiences that the church had in the past mission to Israel. Ἐνεκεν ἐμοῦ and εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς (“for my sake” and “as a testimony to them”) make clear that these persecutions came about only as the result of the proclamation. As in 8:4 and 24:14, μαρτύριον refers not to the testimony before the court against the governors and kings, but to the witnessing before them. By αὐτοῖς the governors and kings are meant, perhaps also those who “hand over” and “scourge.” Καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (“and to the Gentiles”) follows somewhat awkwardly, because at least the governors were also Gentiles. With this somewhat belated addition Matthew wants to move outside the framework of the disciples’ preaching to the Jews (vv. 5-6, 23) and to remind the readers of what they themselves are experiencing in the present—a subject of which Matthew will later speak (cf. 24:9-14; 28:18-20).

There is, therefore, a complex mixing of various levels of time. From the very beginning it is clear that Matthew is not speaking about experiences of the disciples during the lifetime of Jesus. The Matthean Jesus

looks into the future. However, he speaks not of the readers’ present but of the past when they were still under the jurisdiction of the synagogue and were being scourged. Yet v. 17a and the end of v.18 make clear that these past events are typical; the experiences of the mission to Israel will be repeated in the gentile mission (cf. 24:9-10, 14). Thus vv. 17-18 speak *indirectly* to the present; the past history of the proclamation in Israel has the continuing character of personal address. In addition, a third level of time becomes indirectly visible. Παραδίδομι (“to deliver”) reminds each reader of the passion of Jesus. The passion narrative of Jesus also contained a handing over to the Sanhedrin, a scourging,³⁹ and a rendering of accounts to the governor. In this way the readers are prepared to see that the suffering of the proclaimers means that they accept Jesus’ own fate (cf. 10:24-25). Thus the three levels of time correspond to each other typologically. In each period the experiences of the earlier are repeated.

■ 19-20 Verses 19-20 follow with the promise that belongs to vv. 17-18: God⁴⁰ will give the disciples the spirit. Behind this promise is the experience of early Christian prophecy. In a trial situation all disciples will have the prophetic gift. At the same time that affliction will be the eschatological hour of the bestowal of the spirit. That it is called the “spirit of your father” underscores the divine love. In a way our logion is an early stage in the direction of the Johannine idea of the

35 *M. Sanh.* 1.6.

36 As in Philo and Josephus. Cf. Eduard Lohse, “συνέδριον,” *TDNT* 7 (1971) 861–62. Lohse points out that, in Greek also, συνέδριον in a nontechnical sense may designate a court of justice.

37 Cf. 2 Cor 11:24; Jewish: *m. Mak.* 3.12; Str-B 3.527–30. We do not know how much these later regulations of the Mishna were applied to Christians in the synagogues of the first century. Thus from the synagogue punishment of scourging we cannot definitely conclude that the Christians were punished because of transgression of the Law.

Cf. Hare, *Theme*, 44–46.

38 Hare (*Theme*, 108) interprets v. 17 to refer to Jewish, v. 18 to gentile persecutions. Καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν would then equal καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν. That is not impossible, but it is more difficult in view of v. 23 and the emphatic resumption of the gentile mission in 24:9-14! 23:34-36 speaks explicitly and 5:11-12 (12b!) implicitly of persecutions by Jews.

39 In 27:26 designated with the Latin word *flagellatio*, corresponding to the Roman trial before Pilate but in 20:19 with *μαστιγόω*.

40 *Passivum divinum*.

Paraclete.⁴¹ However, what makes it special in the context of the Gospel of Matthew is that it is not embedded in a general and comprehensive discourse about the spirit. Matthew rarely speaks of the spirit, and when he does it is usually in connection with Jesus (1:18, 20; 3:16; 4:1; 12:18, 28). He downplays the idea of the bestowal of the spirit on Christians in favor of the idea of the presence of Jesus with his community (18:20; 28:20). Except for the baptismal formula in 28:19 (cf. 3:11), this is the only place where the spirit is promised to the disciples. It is clear that Matthew is thinking here, in the midst of persecution, of a very special, supportive experience of God.

History of Interpretation

■ 17-20 In the history of interpretation a certain reserve toward this promise is frequently evident. Augustine applies the text to the preacher's everyday situation and then has to defend himself against the suggestion that one would no longer engage in sermon preparation. However, preparation by prayer is more important than rhetorical preparation.⁴² Thomas Aquinas appeals to John Chrysostom in warning that God's promise is valid for the preacher only if he has no time for preparation; "he must not tempt God when he has time for reflection." Rejecting antirational thoughts is especially important for him. The difference between the spirit of God and the spirit of the devil is that the former does not suspend the *ratio* ("reason").⁴³ The reserve toward the spirit is especially poignant in the Reformed tradition, where the main concern is that the preachers would neglect the study of the Bible because of the promise of the spirit.⁴⁴ Those who, like the apostles, are uneducated are urged as a substitute to listen dili-

gently to sermons and to engage in careful study of the catechism.⁴⁵ It is perhaps not accidental that there is no reference to our text in most confessional writings; the only time it appears is in connection with the inspiration of the scriptures.⁴⁶

In the perspective of Matthew's understanding of discipleship it was certainly appropriate to expand the promise of this text beyond the situation of a trial. Indeed, there has often been the tendency to suppress the *special* experience of the prophetic spirit and the *concrete* support in times of crisis in favor of the general presence of the spirit. The history of interpretation here offers important examples of what especially the churches of the Reformation have lost by their "generalization" of the spirit, although such a development was theologically essential. The Matthean text, which with its almost singular use of the word "spirit" puts the accent on a very specific experience, becomes here a question to the reader.

■ 21-22 Matthew takes over the logion about family disension from Mark with no changes. That he speaks of it again in 10:34-36, also on the basis of Mic 7:6, shows how important this experience is for him. As in 23:34-36 he even says that the believers will be killed.⁴⁷ When the Jewish-Christian church speaks here of its brothers and fathers, it is clear that experiences from the mission (*διὰ τὸ ὄνομά μου*) to *Israel*⁴⁸ lie behind the logion. However, the statement that "you will be hated by *all*" (cf. 24:9!) is an indication that these experiences have general validity. Matthew also includes in our text the promise to those who endure to the end (of the world).⁴⁹ Together

41 Cf. especially John 15:26 (the Paraclete's testimony in a trial situation!).

42 *Doctr. Chr.* 4.15.32 = FC 4.198.

43 *Lectura* no. 847 (quotation), 849.

44 Cf., e.g., Zwingli, 269 (human *iudicium* and *opera* are necessary); Bucer, 106B (study of the scriptures); Musculus, 304 (whoever neglects the study of scripture does not speak by the Holy Spirit); Cocceius, 19 (the promise applies only to those who make an effort to study the scriptures).

45 Brenz, 427.

46 "*Confessio Helvetica posterior*" 1 = BSKORK 223.19. = Arthur C. Cochrane, ed., *Reformed Confessions of the 16th Century* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966) 224-25.

47 On the persecution of the Matthean community by

Judaism, cf. Hare, *Theme*, 19-129 passim; Gal 4:29; 6:12; 1 Thess 2:15-16, etc.

48 Of the Jewish parallels that speak of eschatological divisions and struggles, *Jub.* 23.16, 19; 4 *Ezra* 6.24; 2 *Bar.* 70.1-3; *m. Sota* 9.15; *b. Sanh.* 97a (= Str-B 1.586) do not deal with struggles in the family. 1 *Enoch* 56.7 speaks only of the destruction of families; 99.5 speaks of the murder of infants by hunger, and only 1 *Enoch* 100.2 compares directly with our text. The historical experiences that were derived from Mic 7:6 clearly remake the apocalyptic topos.

49 The translation "whoever endures to the last" (*εἰς τέλος* adverbially; BAGD, *s.v.* *τέλος*, 1dγ) is linguistically possible. However, analogous to 24:13 (between 24:6 and 14) *εἰς τέλος* can refer only to

with 10:23b, this anticipation of the end shows that the evangelist was not thinking of divorcing the community's past mission to Israel from its eschatological expectation and of contrasting it with the eschatological gentile mission (24:9-14) as a historical experience.⁵⁰

Instead, the *entire* time of the disciples' mission stands under the sign of the end.

■ 23 Verse 23 is a well-known *crux interpretum*. We must distinguish among (a) the original meaning, (b) the pre-Matthean interpretation, and (c) how the evangelist might have understood the saying.

a. Since we have not been certain about its authenticity, we are able to offer only very cautious conjectures about the meaning of the logion for *Jesus*. In contrast to Luke 17:26-27, the issue is not that the Son of Man will come suddenly, but soon. Nevertheless, it is not the philosophical concept of the near expectation that is at the center; instead, the coming of the Son of Man—as with other statements about the near expectation in apocalyptic texts and perhaps even in Jesus (Mark 14:25)—is personal address and comfort for those who are under attack.⁵¹ The comfort is derived from the imminence of his coming.⁵² The emphasis lies not on the command to flee (23a), but on the comfort in those situations in which one has to flee (23b)⁵³ from one town of Israel⁵⁴ to the next. Albert

Schweitzer (*Quest*) made our logion the starting point of his thesis that Jesus expected the kingdom of God to come during the mission of his disciples in Galilee. My own hypothesis differs from Schweitzer's not in principle, but only in the fact that I do not claim to know that much. We can say nothing about an original connection of our logion with Jesus' sending of the disciples, since its position in Matthew 10 is secondary.⁵⁵ Also conceivable, for example, as a *Sitz im Leben* would be a farewell statement of Jesus that would speak of the continuing proclamation of the kingdom of God after his execution. In any case, if our logion does go back to Jesus it must belong to the last period of time before his death, when the resistance against the proclamation of the kingdom of God in Israel was already public.

b. The interpretation of our logion in the *pre-Matthean tradition* is also very uncertain, since we could make a clear statement only if it were in the context of Q or Q^{Mt}. Through the connection with Luke 12:11-12 the comforting element would be intensified. The imminent expectation and the central significance of the coming Son of Man would fit well in the sayings source. The persecutions are not further identified; the text gives no indication whether they are part of the eschatological afflictions.⁵⁶ It fits well in the situation of the post-Easter Palestinian itinerant radicalism.

the end of the world. Then the only remaining choice is to interpret the brief sentence either as piously preserved traditional material or as a witness to Matthew's near expectation of the end. At least some of his contemporaries will experience the end.

50 Contra Marxsen, *Mark the Evangelist*, see above, n. 21. On the Matthean near expectation cf. the excursus at Matthew 24.

51 Texts that presuppose that Jesus expected an imminent end are Luke 12:49-50, Mark 14:25, formulations with ἐγγίξειν, and (uncertain) Mark 9:1 and Luke 12:54-56. Admittedly, the nearness of the end is often the presupposition and not the scope of such sayings.

52 Gerhard Delling, "τέλος κτλ," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 60, n. 20: "The point . . . is not the time of the parousia but the promise to the afflicted." No! The promise consists precisely in the nearness of the time. False is the interpretation of Josef Schmid (*Das Evangelium nach Matthäus* [RNT 1; Regensburg: Pustet, 1965] 181) that de facto eliminates the near expectation (for the missionaries there will "always be a refuge in time of persecution") or of Zahn

(405: they will "not fail to find an Israelite city"). The comfort comes not from the large number of Israelite cities but from the imminent arrival of the Son of Man.

53 One even has to ask whether the imperative φεύγετε is not to be understood originally in the sense of a Semitizing conditional clause: "if they persecute you . . . and you have to flee into another town." Cf. the references to Semitic conditional clauses with the imperative in Klaus Beyer, *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*, vol. 1: *Satzlehre I* (SUNT 1; 2d ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968) 251.

54 Πόλις = ܡܕܢܐ = fortified settlement. Cf. n. 8 on Matt 9:1-8.

55 Those who believe that Jesus identified himself directly or indirectly as the Son of Man cannot, like Schweitzer, assume a coming (of another!) Son of Man during Jesus' lifetime.

56 Contra Heinz Schürmann, "Zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte von Mt 10,23," 150-56, 153 with n. 17; and Ernst Bammel, "Matthäus 10,23," 79-92. The text gives no basis for any such conclusions.

History of Interpretation

Our text confronts us with the problem that Jesus was mistaken in his belief that the eschaton was imminent. Even if it does not go back to Jesus, it is still true that early Christian prophets in the name of the exalted Lord accepted, emphasized, and even set a temporal limit to Jesus' expectation (cf. Mark 9:1). However, this is only a modern problem, since the ancient church scarcely noticed it.⁵⁷ It appears for the first time almost incidentally in Hermann Samuel Reimarus,⁵⁸ and it has found its most pronounced form in the studies of Albert Schweitzer and Martin Werner.⁵⁹ It is astonishing how little exegesis has dealt with this fundamental problem. Many exegetes, and not only Catholic exegetes, obviously still apply the principle: What a saying may not mean, it does not mean.⁶⁰ Especially in the Protestant scholarship of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, declaring that the logion was not genuine has been a way of avoiding the problem.⁶¹ Even the systematic theologians punish this uncomfortable logion by neglecting it.⁶²

Prior to the Enlightenment, the history of interpretation did not acknowledge this problem. The exegetical interest was focused largely—and incorrectly—on v. 23a and thus on the question whether a Christian is permitted to flee. It was repeatedly emphasized that flight would have to be in the service of spreading the gospel.⁶³ For many marginal groups such as Anabaptists, Puritans, or Huguenots, flight became the way of preserving and promulgating the gospel.⁶⁴ Those who thought more rigorously on this point interpreted the admonition to flee only as permission, or they limited it to the time of the apostles.⁶⁵ Since Augustine, it has been determined, in reference to Matt 10:23, when a shepherd could leave his flock. The primary consideration was that the congregations should not be without shepherds.⁶⁶

Less attention was given to v. 23b. Various "escapes" made it possible to claim that there simply was no problem. One was able to interpret the cities of Israel allegorically to refer to the cities of the new Israel, that is, to see them as a reference to the gentile

- 57 Martin Werner (*Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas* [Bern: Haupt, 1941] 72–73, n. 112) understands the lack of traces of Matt 10:23b in the second century to be an indication of the church's embarrassment. Künzi (*Naherwartungslogion*, 127–29) correctly argues against this view.
- 58 The concern of Reimarus, "Concerning the Intention of Jesus and His Teaching (Disciples?)," in *Reimarus*, 2 § 8 = 148. However, his main concern is not this problem but the demonstration that Jesus understood his Messiahship politically.
- 59 Schweitzer, *Quest*; Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, above, n. 57.
- 60 Cf. the report by Künzi, *Naherwartungslogion*, 125–34, 148–58.
- 61 Why can one cope with the error of an anonymous early Christian prophet of Jesus so much more easily than with an error of Jesus?
- 62 Karl Barth's *Church Dogmatics* mentions only v. 23a. Matt 10:23b is mentioned by: Helmut Thielicke, *The Evangelical Faith*, vol. 2: *The Doctrine of God and of Christ* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 133 ("praesens aeternum" [I] of Jesus); Michael Schmaus, *Katholische Dogmatik* 4/2 (Munich: Hueber, 1959) 150 (an inner historical interpretation in the sense of nn. 69–72 below). Otherwise, I have found nothing in modern dogmatics.
- 63 Especially since Jerome, 70: "tribulationis occasio . . . euangelii seminarium."
- 64 Cf. Barth, *CD* 4/3.626.
- 65 Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 4.76.1–2 = ANF 2.423

- (flight as a relative command so that the Christian does not become the cause for the persecutor to do something evil); similarly the martyr Mark of Arethusa in Gregory of Nazianzus *Or.* 4 (*ad Julianum tributorem ex aequatore*) 87–89 = BKV 1/59, 126–29; Tertullian *Fuga* 6 = CChr.SL 2.1142–44 (one-time permission only for the apostles to flee from Israel for the sake of the gentile mission); idem, *Uxor.* 1.3 = ANF 4.40 (flight is a concession for the weak); Origen in Künzi, *Naherwartungslogion*, 18 (flight = permission). Often flight is also interpreted as advice for the purpose of sparing the persecutors or in order not to tempt God. The Donatist Gaudentius categorically rejects the flight of officeholders. Augustine responds by appealing to Matt 10:23 (*Contra Gaudentius* 1.16 [17]–1.17 [18] = CSEL 53. 211–13).
- 66 Augustine, *Ep.* 228 to Honoratus 2 = FC 32.142. (if only an office bearer is persecuted, he is to flee, provided the church is not thereby abandoned; if all are persecuted, he is to remain); Thomas Aquinas *S. th.* 2/2, q.185, a.5 (when the salvation of the flock requires the presence of the shepherd, he must remain).

mission.⁶⁷ Or one could understand the mission to Israel, for example, in the sense of Rom 11:11-24 as a missionary activity that would continue concurrently with the gentile mission until the end of the world.⁶⁸ One was able to interpret the coming of the Son of Man to be Jesus' presence during his lifetime,⁶⁹ his resurrection,⁷⁰ the help of the spirit,⁷¹ or the judgment on Jerusalem in the year 70.⁷² These ways of avoiding the problem could also be combined. The difficulties of the logia exist only if the coming of the Son of Man is interpreted to refer to the parousia and at the same time the "cities of Israel" refer exclusively to the initial proclamation in them during the time of Jesus or the primitive church. That never happened in the ancient church. However, it seems to me that those who today make use of the escape mechanisms of the ancient church have to accept the charge that they are guilty of "evasion."⁷³

c. Does *Matthew's* own interpretation of our logion provide a way out of the difficulties? Here again clear statements are very difficult. Since the evangelist did not change the saying given to him, our interpretation depends exclusively on the context. Matthew spoke in vv. 16-22 of the persecutions of the disciples in Israel. Following v. 22, v. 23 shows the consequences that everyone's hatred has for the disciples. Not only the spirit (v. 20) but especially the imminent coming of the Son of Man comforts the persecuted disciples. Thus the perspective that dominates our section is the same as that of 24:9-36, and the transparency of the situation of the past mission to Israel for the present situation of the gentile mission becomes clear once again. It is also worth considering whether for Matthew the disciples' flight might have been an expression of their commitment to non-resistance (cf. vv. 10, 16a, b).⁷⁴

However, the connection with vv. 5-6 presents diffi-

culties. It is only in light of vv. 5-6 that the admonition to the disciples to flee into another city of Israel appears to restrict their flight to the cities of Israel. Then, however, difficulties arise for both possibilities for interpreting the mission to Israel that we considered earlier.⁷⁵ If the mission to Israel is still a reality in Matthew's own day, then v. 23 cannot be interpreted in terms of vv. 5-6 in spite of the catchwords that they have in common, "city" (πόλις) and Israel, for the church's mission is now *also* to the Gentiles and no longer exclusively to the cities of Israel.⁷⁶ However, this difficulty is minor in comparison with the one we have with the other interpretation. If we understand the Israel mission and the gentile mission in the sense of 21:43 as two successive epochs and the history of the Matthean church in such a way that it is in the process of reorienting itself from the mission to Israel to that to the Gentiles,⁷⁷ then our logion simply is no longer "true." The church's mission and persecution in Israel were terminated not by the coming of the Son of Man but by the command of the risen Lord to go to the Gentiles. Then Matthew's basic problem would have had to be—even with the differences in time—the same as our problem today. What came was not the Son of Man, but the history of the church. The text does not indicate whether or how Matthew thought about this problem.

If with the first interpretation the problem concerns "only" the failure of the near expectation and the elimination of the exclusivity of the mission to Israel (vv. 5-6), with the second interpretation v. 23 becomes "false." Are there ways out of the dilemma? Was *Matthew* thinking of the Hellenistic cities with

67 Rupert of Deutz, *In Opus de gloria et honore Filii Hominis super Matthaeum* (PL 168.1307-1634) 1496.

68 Hilary, 10.14 = SC 254.232-33.

69 John Chrysostom (34.1 = PG 57.397) (persecutions prior to Jesus' passion) and the Greek exegesis dependent on him. Latin exegesis interprets predominantly in terms of the (de facto distant) parousia (Künzi, *Naherwartungslogion*, 166).

70 Especially in medieval exegesis. See Künzi, *Naherwartungslogion*, 168 and more recently Levine, *Dimensions*, 51.

71 Since Calvin 1.302.

72 Since Bullinger, 1028 (scattering of Israel as the Son of Man's punishment).

73 Thus André Feuillet ("Les origines et la signification de Mt 10,23," 182-98, 187) against Jacques

Dupont ("Vous n'auriez pas achevé les villes d'Israël avant que le fils de l'homme ne vienne" (Mat 10,23), 241-43) (only the reunion of the disciples with the earthly Son of Man Jesus is meant). Feuillet himself is probably guilty of an "échappatoire." Following J. A. T. Robinson he claims that Jesus spoke in an imprecise way that was later applied to the parousia.

74 Basil (*Regulae brevius* 244) interprets on the basis of Matt 5:39. Cf. also the flight of the Arians from Constantinople under Theodosius in Socrates *Hist. eccl.* 5.7 = PG 67.573, 576.

75 Cf. the two possibilities above, II C 2.1 on 10:5b-6.

76 Gnlika (1.379) speaks of the mission to Israel as a "continuing task."

77 Cf. vol. 1, Introduction 5.2.

their Jewish Diaspora?⁷⁸ Then 21:43 would refer only to the Judaism of Palestine. It seems more likely to me that for Matthew not only 10:5-6 but also 10:23 were corrected by the Great Commission.⁷⁹ However, in 28:18-20 there are reminiscences only of 10:5-6, not of 10:23, so that this can only be postulated.

Verse 23 remains difficult in the framework of the Gospel of Matthew. At the very least the difficulties should not be ignored. We assume, therefore, that our logion in part was no longer valid for Matthew. However, its enduring significance lies for him in the reality that the church was constantly hated and persecuted in the world and rested its hope on the coming of the Son of Man.

Summary

The central point of the whole text is Matthew's conviction that proclaiming the kingdom, including following Jesus, *of necessity* involves suffering. For this reason the church's experiences in the mission to Israel that are expressed with the aid of Mark 13:9-13 are given a fundamental significance. Luther correctly translates the spirit of v. 22: "And you *must* be hated by everybody." On this point there is a deep convergence between

Matthew and Paul.⁸⁰ The "apostolate" is "essentially—not merely fortuitously— . . . active suffering and . . . suffering activity."⁸¹ In vv. 24-25 Matthew will indicate the christological basis of this conviction; in vv. 26-39 he will develop it.

The deepest problem posed by this text is that often today—especially in the first world countries—the church that glibly talks about suffering does not suffer, although according to Matthew suffering is a *necessary* consequence of the proclamation and of Jesus' lifestyle. Individuals who suffer *in* the church, such as, for example, Kierkegaard, are not able to compensate for the church's lack of suffering; they can only call attention to it. To understand our text means, therefore, to ask with John Chrysostom where the "practice field" for training in suffering might be. Is it only the life of the individual as, for example, Job's struggle can demonstrate?⁸² Or does the church itself also provide a field for practice? In his critical response to Thomas Müntzer, Konrad Grebel thus comments, for example, about the sheep among wolves: "Moreover, the gospel and its adherents are not to be protected by the sword, nor [should] they [protect] themselves."⁸³

78 Cf. above, n. 21.

79 Geist, *Menschensohn*, 231: Matthew sees "in retrospect a certain salvation-historical phase."

80 Cf., e.g., 2 Cor 4:10-11 or 1 Cor 15:31.

81 Jürgen Moltmann, *The Church in the Power of the Spirit* (New York: Harper & Row, 1977) 361.

82 John Chrysostom, 33.6 = PG 57. 95-96 (395: "practice field").

83 Leland Harder, ed., *The Sources of Swiss Anabaptism: The Grebel Letters and Related Documents* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald, 1985) 290.