From Conquest to Commission: Matthew 28:16-20 as Transformative Climax

Introduction: The Gospel's Theological and Literary Climax

The Gospel of Matthew stands as a carefully orchestrated narrative, weaving together the story of Jesus with a theological vision that speaks to its first-century audience while continuing to resonate today. Composed likely in the late first century, post-70 CE, Matthew reflects the concerns of a community navigating its identity amidst the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple and the expansion of the Christian mission.[1] At its heart, the Gospel emphasizes Jesus's authority as teacher and Christ, culminating in the final pericope, Matthew 28:16-20, commonly known as the Great Commission. This passage, set on a Galilean mountain, serves as both the narrative climax and theological capstone, encapsulating Matthew's themes of discipleship, authority, and mission while simultaneously resolving the fundamental tensions between Old Testament conquest narratives and Jesus's message of inclusive love.[2]

Recent scholarship further underscores the eschatological framework behind Matthew's vision. As Romeo Popa argues, Matthew 28 draws not merely from Christological authority (cf. Dan 7:14) but also from Old Testament pilgrimage texts like Isaiah 2:2-3 and Zechariah 2:15. These traditions imagine the nations flowing to Zion, reframing the so-called Great Commission not as imperial expansion but as eschatological inclusion.[3] The act of "making disciples" also serves as a ritualized identity transfer, forging a new covenantal community rooted in Jesus's teachings and sacramental practices.

Scholarly Convergence and Contemporary Methodological Developments

The work of Popa (eschatology) and Barton (contemporary relevance) converges on understanding Matthew 28:16-20 as a text requiring careful historical-critical analysis with significant implications for modern Christian mission and interfaith relations.[4] This convergence has been enriched by sophisticated narrative-critical approaches, particularly those of Jeannine K. Brown, whose reader-response methodology demonstrates how Matthew's rhetorical strategies position contemporary readers as participants in the eschatological mission rather than mere observers of completed events.[5]

Recent scholarship has transformed our understanding of this pivotal text through multiple interpretive lenses. Narrative criticism examines the literary dynamics of plot, characters, and settings, revealing how Matthew's ending functions as both resolution and commission.[6] Post-colonial criticism, exemplified by scholars like Daniel Patte and Musa Dube, challenges Western interpretive assumptions and exposes how traditional readings have perpetuated imperial models of mission.[7] Typological analysis, as demonstrated by Kenton

Sparks, uncovers how Matthew transforms Old Testament conquest motifs into gospel proclamation.[8] Global South voices, including African scholars like Kolawole Olumafemi Paul, offer constructive alternatives that emphasize community formation and anti-discrimination principles.[9]

Contemporary Scholarly Perspectives in Dialogue

A survey of select commentaries reveals both convergent insights and distinctive emphases that illuminate different facets of the Great Commission's theological and literary significance.

R.T. France's Literary Unity and Structural Analysis

R.T. France's commentary in the New International Commentary on the New Testament (2007) underscores the **literary unity** of Matthew, framing the Great Commission as the climactic assertion of Jesus' cosmic authority (πᾶσα ἐξουσία, "all authority").[10] France interprets the disciples' doubt (28:17) as practical uncertainty, akin to their reaction at the Transfiguration (17:6–7), suggesting a deliberate narrative parallel to highlight human frailty amidst divine revelation.[11]

The fourfold repetition of "all" (authority, nations, teachings, days) signals a universal scope, dismantling ethnic exclusivity and redefining Israel's mission to include Gentiles.[12] France's analysis reveals how Matthew's post-70 CE Jewish-Christian community navigated the tension between traditional Jewish boundaries and the universal scope of Jesus' mission, using the Commission to legitimize Gentile inclusion amid ongoing synagogue conflicts.[13]

Davies and Allison's Intertextual Framework

Dale C. Allison Jr. and W.D. Davies' monumental three-volume International Critical Commentary (1997) emphasizes **Old Testament intertextuality**, particularly Daniel 7:14's "son of man" imagery, which grounds Jesus' authority in apocalyptic tradition.[14] They identify the Trinitarian formula (28:19) as a theological innovation that challenges Jewish monotheism while anchoring baptism in communal divine identity.[15] Their work demonstrates how the Commission's call to "teach all nations" subverts Roman imperial claims, presenting Jesus as the true sovereign whose reign transcends ethnic and political borders.[16] For post-70 CE readers, this universal mandate would legitimize Gentile inclusion while countering sectarian isolationism, positioning the Commission as the Gospel's hermeneutical key that integrates Torah fulfillment (5:17) with eschatological mission.[17]

Carson's Mandate and Promise Integration

D.A. Carson's analysis in the Expositor's Bible Commentary balances **exegetical precision** with pastoral application, interpreting the Commission as both a

"mandate and promise."[18] Carson highlights the participle πορευθέντες ("go") as foundational, emphasizing proactive mission over passive waiting while demonstrating how the text counters Pharisaic legalism by prioritizing Christocentric obedience over ritual purity.[19] His emphasis on the "with you" promise (28:20) as echoing Immanuel (1:23) provides theological grounding for communities facing persecution, transforming the Commission into both challenge and comfort.[20]

Jeannine K. Brown's Reader-Response Innovation

Brown's **narrative and reader-response critique** significantly enriches contemporary understanding by highlighting the Great Commission's role as the **theological and narrative climax** that directly engages readers as participants.[21] Her analysis of rhetorical strategies demonstrates how Matthew's text moves beyond historical narration to contemporary application through specific techniques: the shift from second-person disciples to third-person "nations" (28:19) invites readers to self-identify as participants in the mission, while the open-ended "I am with you always" (28:20) extends the narrative beyond the text, implicating readers in ongoing discipleship.[22] Brown's interdisciplinary approach bridges redaction criticism and literary methods, offering a nuanced lens for understanding Matthew's missional ethos that anticipates postcolonial concerns by revealing how Matthew's narrative techniques empower marginalized communities.[23]

Hagner's Textual-Theological Synthesis

Donald Hagner's Word Biblical Commentary provides **textual-theological synthesis** that explores μαθητεύσατε ("make disciples") as a call to holistic formation, contrasting Greco-Roman intellectualism with transformative allegiance to Christ.[24] Hagner's interpretation of the disciples' doubt (28:17) as realistic portrayal of faith struggling against fear resonates with communities facing persecution, balancing divine assurance with missionary urgency.[25] His analysis of baptismal "naming" (28:19) connects to Old Testament covenantal markers, signifying entrance into the eschatological people of God while emphasizing the Commission's placement after the resurrection as necessary vindication for mission legitimacy.[26]

Gibbs's Pre-70 Perspective

Jeffrey A. Gibbs's three-volume commentary challenges the post-70 CE consensus, arguing for earlier authorship where the Commission urges Jewish Christians to embrace universal mission before the Temple's destruction.[27] His emphasis on the *missio Dei* views the Commission as God's sovereign initiative rather than human effort, while the triadic structure (birth, ministry, resurrection) culminates in 28:18–20, mirroring Moses' Sinai commission and

positioning Jesus as the new covenant mediator.[28] For pre-70 CE readers, this interpretation validates Gentile outreach amid ongoing synagogue tensions, framing it as prophetic obedience rather than post-catastrophe adaptation.[29]

Methodological Integration and Theological Implications

These diverse scholarly perspectives converge on several key insights while maintaining distinctive emphases. The Commission's literary placement as narrative climax (France, Brown), its intertextual density (Davies/Allison), its pastoral balance of challenge and comfort (Carson), its holistic formation vision (Hagner), and its theological innovation (all commentators) collectively demonstrate the passage's sophisticated integration of Christology, ecclesiology, and missiology. Brown's reader-response approach particularly complements Popa's eschatological framework by demonstrating how Matthew's rhetorical strategies position contemporary readers as participants in the eschatological mission, while her analysis of direct reader engagement supports Barton's emphasis on moral seriousness by showing how the text demands active response rather than passive reception.[30]

Translation Issues and Contemporary Relevance

Reinbold's Translation Analysis

Reinbold's analysis of German Bible translations reveals how even subtle shifts in rendering "make disciples" (μαθητεύσατε) influence theological perception.[31] The 20th-century move from "teach" to "make disciples" foregrounds intentional formation, but also raises concerns about colonial undertones in modern missiology. This makes it imperative to consider how translation affects public theology and interreligious dialogue—especially in contexts where "mission" evokes trauma or domination.[32]

Barton's Contemporary Framework

According to Barton, Matthew's apocalyptic worldview reflects a community navigating the trauma of the synagogue-church split, using "language of resistance and ultimate vindication" that gives urgency to the Great Commission's universal scope. Barton describes Matthew's "Christological hermeneutics" as reinterpreting Jewish messianic language to present Jesus as the definitive Christ, which culminates in the authority claim of Matthew 28:18.

Connection to Eschatological Interpretation

This eschatological interpretation (Popa) supports Reinbold's translation argument that μαθητεύσατε should be understood as "teach" rather than "make disciples." The debate between traditional "make disciples" interpretations and newer "teach/instruct" translations represents a significant development in Matthean studies.

This typological reconfiguration is not incidental but deeply theological. Sparks highlights that Matthew redeploys the language and setting of conquest narratives (e.g., Deut 7 and Joshua 1) while subverting their violent intent. Instead of extermination, Jesus sends disciples to disciple; instead of boundaries, Matthew envisions inclusivity.[33] The language of "all nations" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) that once marked divine judgment is now a sign of divine embrace. This aligns with Bockmuehl's observation that Matthew reconfigures sacred geography and scriptural precedent around Jesus's risen presence, turning Galilee into a new theological center.[34]

This article argues that Matthew 28:16-20 functions as the narrative and theological climax that transforms conquest into commission, resolving Old Testament tensions while establishing new community identity through a sophisticated integration of Mosaic typology, inclusive ecclesiology, and universal mission mandate. By examining the passage's narrative function, typological significance, global interpretive voices, and contemporary applications, we uncover how Matthew concludes his Gospel with a revolutionary vision that continues to challenge and inspire Christian communities worldwide.

The Commission as Reader-Engaging Climax

Rhetorical Buildup and Narrative Pacing

Matthew's Gospel demonstrates sophisticated narrative pacing that builds toward the Great Commission through a carefully orchestrated series of revelations and delays. Brown's analysis reveals how Matthew employs "delayed resolution" of the disciples' mission throughout the Gospel, creating narrative tension that culminates in 28:19-20.[35] From the initial calling of disciples (4:18-22) through their limited commissioning (10:5-42), to their gradual understanding of Jesus' identity (16:13-20), the Gospel builds anticipation for the final, comprehensive mission mandate.[36]

The rhetorical buildup employs what Brown identifies as "indefinite language strategies" and "contrasting alternatives" that force reader participation in interpretation.[37] Throughout the Gospel, Matthew presents choices between competing allegiances (God or mammon, 6:24), destinations (broad or narrow roads, 7:13-14), and responses to Jesus (acceptance or rejection). This pattern of choice-forcing rhetoric prepares readers for the ultimate decision demanded by the Great Commission: participation in universal mission or withdrawal into sectarian isolation.[38]

Climactic Authority Declaration as Narrative Payoff

The authority declaration in 28:18 represents the culmination of Matthew's Christological development and provides the narrative payoff for sustained

investment in Jesus' identity. Brown's analysis of the fivefold "all" (πᾶς) repetition—authority, nations, teachings, days, presence—demonstrates how Matthew employs structural markers to emphasize the cosmic scope of the Commission.[39] This linguistic pattern creates what narrative critics call "climactic intensification," where repeated elements build toward a decisive revelation.[40]

The phrase "all authority in heaven and on earth" functions as both resolution and new beginning. It resolves the question of Jesus' identity that drives Matthew's plot while simultaneously opening the narrative beyond its textual boundaries through the universal mission mandate.[41] This dual function exemplifies what Brown describes as Matthew's technique of extending "the demands of discipleship to the reader, who is challenged to obey Jesus' teachings" rather than merely observe completed events.[42]

Reader Implication Strategies in the Commission

The Great Commission employs specific rhetorical techniques that directly implicate readers as participants rather than observers. Brown identifies the crucial shift from second-person pronouns addressing the disciples ("you have been with me," 28:20) to third-person generics ("all nations," 28:19) as a deliberate strategy to invite readers to see themselves as part of the ongoing mission.[43] This grammatical transition moves the narrative from historical account to contemporary application, positioning readers as successors to the original disciples.[44]

The participial construction (πορευθέντες, βαπτίζοντες, διδάσκοντες) serves multiple rhetorical functions that enhance reader engagement. Grammatically, it subordinates going, baptizing, and teaching to the central imperative of making disciples, creating unified rather than fragmented mission understanding.[45] Rhetorically, the participial structure implies ongoing action rather than completed tasks, suggesting that the Commission describes a process in which readers participate rather than a historical event they merely commemorate.[46]

Open-Ended Conclusion as Invitation to Participation

The Commission's temporal framework—"until the end of the age" (ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος)—creates what Brown terms an "open-ended conclusion" that extends the narrative beyond its textual boundaries.[47] Unlike other Gospel endings that conclude with wonder (Mark 16:8) or worship (Luke 24:52-53), Matthew's ending projects the story forward into the ongoing mission of disciples and, by extension, the community of readers.[48]

This open-ended structure serves both theological and literary purposes. Theologically, it locates the Commission within salvation history while pointing toward eschatological consummation. Literarily, it transforms readers from

passive observers to active participants in the continuing story.[49] Brown's analysis demonstrates how this narrative technique anticipates reader-response theory by positioning the text as incomplete without reader participation, making the Commission not merely an ancient mandate but a contemporary invitation.[50]

Narrative Function of the Gospel's Ending

Plot Resolution and Narrative Closure

Matthew 28:16-20 resolves the narrative tension that builds throughout the Gospel with masterful literary craftsmanship. From the outset, Jesus is portrayed as the authoritative teacher (Matt 7:29) and promised Christ (Matt 1:1), whose mission unfolds through teaching, miracles, and escalating conflict with temple leaders and teachers of the law. The crucifixion represents the apparent defeat of this authority, but the resurrection and commission reveal its ultimate vindication and cosmic extension.[51] The mountain setting creates a powerful inclusio with earlier Matthean mountain scenes of divine revelation, particularly the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:1) and the Transfiguration (Matt 17:1), positioning the commission as the climactic encounter with God's will.[52]

The geographical movement from Galilee to Jerusalem and back to Galilee creates a narrative arc that emphasizes both continuity and transformation. Jesus begins his ministry in "Galilee of the Gentiles" (Matt 4:15), faces rejection in Jerusalem, and returns to Galilee to commission his disciples for universal mission. This circular structure suggests that the true significance of Jesus's ministry emerges not in the religious center of Jerusalem but in the marginalized periphery of Galilee, where Gentiles and Jews intermingle.[53] Unlike the other gospels, in Matthew Jesus travels only once to Jerusalem—a mountain—where he is rejected and crucified by the representatives of the temple in collusion with Gentile leaders. The mountain location in Galilee evokes the great revelatory mountains of biblical tradition—Sinai, Horeb, Zion—while simultaneously pointing toward a new kind of divine presence that transcends geographical boundaries.[54]

The temporal markers in the passage create both closure and openness. The phrase "to the end of the age" (ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος) provides eschatological closure while simultaneously opening the narrative beyond its textual boundaries. Unlike other Gospel endings that conclude with wonder or worship, Matthew's ending projects the story forward into the ongoing mission of the disciples and, by extension, the community of readers.[55] This open-ended structure invites readers to see themselves as participants in the continuing story rather than mere observers of completed events.

Literary Techniques and Thematic Convergence

The passage employs sophisticated literary devices that underscore its climactic significance. The participial construction (πορευθέντες, βαπτίζοντες, διδάσκοντες) subordinates going, baptizing, and teaching to the central imperative of making disciples, creating a unified mission mandate rather than separate commands.[56] This shifts the focus from Jesus' actions as teacher—focusing on the disciples' (students) responsibility to share what they have learned.

The authority declaration in verse 18 represents the culmination of Matthew's Christological development. Jesus's claim to "all authority in heaven and on earth" (πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς) echoes his earlier displays of power (Matt 9:6; 21:23-27) while universalizing them beyond any previous scope.[57] The passive voice construction (ἐδόθη μοι) emphasizes that this authority comes from God rather than human achievement, connecting to Daniel 7:13-14's vision of the Son of Man receiving dominion from the Ancient of Days.[58]

The Emmanuel framework provides a significant thematic closure in the Gospel. The promise "I am with you always" (ἐγὼ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας) directly fulfills the opening promise of Jesus as "Emmanuel, God with us" (Matt 1:23).[59] This divine presence formula employs the same Greek construction used in the Septuagint for GOD's promises to accompany his people, suggesting that Matthew presents Jesus as the ultimate fulfillment of God's covenant faithfulness.[60]

Mosaic Typology and the Transformation of Conquest

Jesus as New Moses: Fulfillment and Transcendence

One of the most sophisticated aspects of Matthew's narrative strategy involves his presentation of Jesus as the new and better Moses, a typology that reaches its climax in the Great Commission. This Mosaic framework, first systematically analyzed by Dale Allison and further developed by Kenton Sparks, reveals how Matthew addresses one of early Christianity's most challenging theological problems: reconciling the Old Testament's apparent endorsement of violence against foreign nations with Jesus's command to love one's enemies.[61]

The biographical parallels between Moses and Jesus create a sustained typological pattern throughout Matthew's Gospel. Just as Pharaoh killed Israelite children, Herod killed Jewish children. Just as Moses was saved through divine intervention, Jesus escaped to Egypt. Just as Moses fasted forty days in the wilderness, Jesus underwent temptation for the same duration. Just as Moses delivered the law from Mount Sinai, Jesus delivered the new law from the Mount of Beatitudes.[62] These parallels establish Jesus's credentials as the prophetic successor promised in Deuteronomy 18:15: "The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own brothers. You must listen to him."

However, Matthew's typology involves not mere repetition but transformative fulfillment. Where Moses spoke with authority derived from his encounters with God, Jesus speaks "as one who had authority, and not as their scribes" (Matt 7:29), suggesting an inherent rather than delegated authority.[63] Where Moses's law addressed specific situations for a particular people, Jesus's teaching addresses universal human conditions with cosmic scope. Most significantly, where Moses died before entering the Promised Land, Jesus rises from death to commission the ultimate conquest.

The Two Mountains in Moses's Life

The mountain setting of Matthew 28:16-20 gains profound significance when understood as the culmination of a carefully constructed parallel with Moses's two most important mountains. Just as Moses received the law on Mount Sinai and died on Mount Nebo before the conquest, Jesus delivered his interpretation of Mosaic law on the Mount of Beatitudes and now commissions his disciples from another Galilean mountain.[64] This typological pattern reveals Matthew's theological solution to the tension between Mosaic and Christological ethics.

The parallels between Moses's final charge and Jesus's Great Commission are striking. From Mount Nebo, Moses delivered his final exhortations to the people, commanding them "to obey everything I have commanded you" (cf. Deut 11:28; 31:5, 29), the same phrase that appears in Matthew 28:20 (πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν).[65] Both leaders promised divine presence for the coming mission: Moses assured Israel that "the LORD your God goes with you" (Deut 31:6), while Jesus promises "I am with you always" (Matt 28:20).[66]

However, the crucial difference transforms the entire enterprise. Where Moses died before the conquest, leaving Joshua to lead the violent subjugation of Canaan, Jesus rises from death to commission a radically different kind of conquest. The semantic transformation of "all nations" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) from objects of destruction to subjects of discipleship represents Matthew's most ingenious theological move. The same phrase that in the Septuagint often describes nations to be conquered (cf. Deut 11:23; Josh 23:4; 24:18) now describes nations to be evangelized through love rather than sword.[67] Yet this parallel also reflects Matthew's engagement with the Abrahamic covenant, where "all nations" are to be blessed through Abraham's descendants (Gen 12:3), and with Israel's calling to be a "priestly nation" serving the world (Ex 19:6).[68] The Commission thus fulfills multiple Old Testament trajectories: conquest transformed, Abrahamic blessing universalized, and priestly mediation enacted through discipleship formation.[69]

High Christology and Divine Identity

The theological implications of this typological framework extend far beyond literary artistry to fundamental questions of Jesus's identity. When Jesus declares "I am with you always" (ἐγὼ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι), he employs the same formula used throughout the Old Testament for divine presence promises.[70] The phrase echoes God's assurances to Abraham (Gen 21:22), Isaac (Gen 26:3, 24, 28), Jacob (Gen 28:15, 20; 31:3, 5; 35:3), Joseph (Gen 39:3, 21), and Moses (Exod 3:12), suggesting that Jesus speaks not merely as God's agent but as God himself.[71]

This high Christological claim becomes even more significant when connected to Matthew's broader presentation of Jesus as fulfilling multiple Old Testament roles simultaneously. He is not only the new Moses but also the greater Joshua (whose name in Greek is Ἰησοῦς), the ultimate David, the eschatological Son of Man from Daniel 7, and the suffering servant of Isaiah.[72] The convergence of these typologies in a single figure suggests that Jesus represents the definitive revelation of God's character and purposes, transcending any individual Old Testament precedent.

Augustine recognized this typological significance when he wrote: "And it was to prefigure this [the promise about all nations] that it was not Moses who received the law for the people on Mount Sinai, that led the people into the land of promise, but Joshua, whose name also was changed at God's command, so that he was called Jesus."[73] This early Christian insight demonstrates how the church fathers understood the Great Commission as the fulfillment of Old Testament conquest narratives through transformed means.

Reading with Global Voices: Deconstructing Western Interpretations

Post-Colonial Critique of Imperial Mission

The interpretation of Matthew 28:16-20 has been fundamentally challenged by postcolonial biblical criticism, which exposes how Western scholarly assumptions have perpetuated imperial models of mission. Daniel Patte's work on "reading with others" draws from Gayatri Spivak's analysis of colonial relationships to reveal three ways interpreters can relate to marginalized voices: "speaking for them," "listening to them," and "speaking with them."[74] Most Western biblical scholarship, Patte argues, has fallen into the first category, imposing interpretations rather than engaging in genuine dialogue with non-Western perspectives.

Patte's "Russian nesting dolls" framework illuminates how interpretive choices operate at three interconnected levels: analytical-textual (which textual features are considered most significant), hermeneutical-theological (how theological concepts are constructed), and contextual-ideological (what purposes the interpretation serves).[75] These choices are "isomorphic"—shaped in the same way—revealing how ideological commitments shape seemingly objective

exegetical conclusions. Traditional Western interpretations of the Great Commission, exemplified by scholars like Davies and Allison, present what appears to be careful historical-critical analysis while actually reinforcing imperial assumptions about Christian superiority and Western missionary hegemony.[76]

The post-colonial critique reveals how traditional readings transform Jesus's commission into a mandate for cultural domination. The emphasis on "making disciples of all nations" becomes interpreted as a call to impose Western Christianity on non-Western peoples, with "teaching them to observe all that I have commanded" understood as replacing indigenous knowledge systems with European theological formulations.[77] This imperial interpretation treats potential converts as "blank slates" who must abandon their cultural heritage to become authentic Christians, precisely the colonial mentality that Spivak identifies as rendering subalterns voiceless.

African Liberation Perspectives

Musa Dube's post-colonial feminist critique of Matthew 28:19 represents one of the most challenging contemporary readings of the Great Commission. Writing from Botswana, Dube argues that the traditional interpretation cannot be separated from its colonial implementation: "The command not only instructs Christian readers to travel to all nations but also contains a 'pedagogical imperative'—'to make disciples of all nations.' Does such an imperative consider the consequences of trespassing? Does it make room for Christian travelers to be discipled by all nations, or is the discipling in question conceived solely in terms of a one-way traffic?"[78]

Dube's questions expose the asymmetrical power dynamics embedded in traditional missionary interpretation. The Commission becomes a mandate for religious imperialism that views other cultures as inferior and treats evangelism as a civilizing mission rather than genuine encounter.[79] Her critique reveals how biblical scholarship itself can function as a form of imperialism, with Western scholars determining the "correct" interpretation and dismissing alternative readings as illegitimate or uninformed.

However, Dube's analysis also points toward alternative possibilities. If the Commission is read as an invitation to mutual transformation rather than one-way conversion, it could support genuine dialogue between cultures and religions. The phrase "all nations" could include the nations from which missionaries come, suggesting that the discipleship process should transform both evangelizers and evangelized.[80] This reading challenges Christians to approach mission with humility and openness to learning, rather than assumptions of superiority. Dube's valuable critique is less about the text than it is the hegemonic, often imperialistic, assumptions readers bring to the text.

Asian Dialogue Approaches

George Soares-Prabhu's comparative analysis of Matthew 28:16-20 with the Buddhist missionary command in the Mahavagga offers a constructive model for cross-cultural biblical interpretation. Writing from India, Soares-Prabhu places the Christian and Buddhist texts in dialogue to illuminate aspects of both traditions while questioning triumphalistic interpretations of either.[81] His approach demonstrates how "reading with others" can enrich rather than threaten Christian understanding.

The Buddhist parallel reveals significant insights about missionary qualifications and purposes. In the Mahavagga, the Buddha commissions disciples who have achieved the same liberation he has attained: "I am delivered, O Bhikkus, from all fetters, human and divine. You, O Bhikkus, are also delivered from all fetters, human and divine."[82] This suggests that effective mission requires personal transformation rather than mere institutional authorization. The Buddhist mission is explicitly motivated by compassion: "Go now, O Bhikkus, and wander for the profit of many, for the happiness of many, and out of compassion for the world."[83]

Soares-Prabhu's analysis raises critical questions about Christian missionary assumptions. What qualifies disciples for mission? Matthew's account emphasizes Jesus's authority but says little about the disciples' spiritual state, leading to interpretations that prioritize institutional authorization over personal transformation. How does the Commission relate to the welfare of those being evangelized? Traditional interpretations focus on saving souls for the afterlife but may neglect present wellbeing and cultural integrity.[84]

The comparative approach also illuminates the distinctive aspects of Christian mission. Where the Buddha provides an example for disciples to follow, Jesus promises his ongoing presence throughout the mission. Where Buddhist mission aims at individual liberation, Christian mission envisions community formation through baptism and teaching. These differences need not be interpreted triumphantly but can highlight the particular gifts each tradition offers to human flourishing.[85]

Feminist Hermeneutical Readings

Elaine Wainwright's feminist reading of Matthew 28:16-20 reveals the "heteroglossal possibilities" within the text—the multiple legitimate interpretations that traditional scholarship has suppressed.[86] By reading the Commission as part of the larger resurrection narrative (Matt 27:32—28:20), Wainwright demonstrates how women function as the first missionaries in Matthew's Gospel, commissioned by Jesus before the eleven male disciples.

The female disciples' mission in Matthew 28:7, 10 involves both proclamation and reconciliation. They are authorized "to proclaim the message of Jesus having been raised to disciples" and "to direct disciples who had been alienated themselves from the crucified one to reconciliation with the one who has been raised."[87] This suggests a model of mission as healing alienation rather than imposing authority, offering an alternative to imperial interpretations.

Wainwright's analysis reveals how the Commission's traditional interpretation reflects patriarchal assumptions about leadership and authority. The emphasis on the eleven male disciples as the primary recipients of the Commission obscures the prior commissioning of women and reinforces male-dominated models of church leadership.[88] A feminist reading suggests that the Commission envisions inclusive leadership and collaborative mission rather than hierarchical control.

The "open road" tradition that Wainwright identifies offers a dynamic alternative to institutional Christianity. This tradition emphasizes adaptive discipleship, continuous learning, and responsiveness to new situations rather than rigid adherence to established patterns.[89] It suggests that the Commission calls for creative engagement with changing contexts rather than mechanical repetition of traditional formulas.

An African Constructive Reading

Kolawole Olumafemi Paul's African reading of Matthew 28:16-20 demonstrates how Global South scholarship can offer constructive alternatives to both Western imperial interpretations and post-colonial critiques.[90] Writing from Nigeria, Paul emphasizes the Commission's Trinitarian foundation, community-centered approach, and anti-discrimination mandate while maintaining commitment to biblical authority and evangelical mission.

Paul's structural analysis reveals the Commission's careful organization around three movements: Jesus's authority declaration (v. 18), the mission mandate (vv. 19-20a), and the presence promise (v. 20b).[91] This structure emphasizes that mission flows from divine authority rather than human initiative and is sustained by divine presence rather than human effort. The participial construction shows that going, baptizing, and teaching serve the central purpose of making disciples, creating a unified rather than fragmented mission.

Paul's African perspective highlights aspects of the text that Western interpretations often minimize. The emphasis on "all nations" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) challenges ethnic discrimination and supports inclusive evangelism that respects cultural diversity.[92] The Trinitarian baptismal formula suggests community formation through divine relationship rather than institutional

membership. The teaching mandate involves ongoing formation rather than initial indoctrination, implying lifelong growth in discipleship.

Paul's reading addresses contemporary African concerns while remaining faithful to the text's theological content. The Commission speaks to issues of ethnic conflict, economic inequality, and political oppression by establishing divine authority over all human powers and calling for universal inclusion in God's family.[93] This contextual application demonstrates how biblical interpretation can be both culturally responsive and theologically sound.

Transformative Pedagogy and Holistic Discipleship Formation

Brown's analysis of μαθητεύσατε ("make disciples") connects to Matthew's broader theme of **transformative pedagogy**, where teaching involves embodying Jesus' mercy and justice rather than mere doctrinal transmission.[94] This pedagogical approach contrasts sharply with Greco-Roman intellectualism, which emphasized cognitive mastery, by calling for holistic formation that integrates belief, practice, and character development.[95] The Commission's teaching mandate specifies content as "all that I have commanded you" (πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν), referring not to systematic theology but to Jesus' lived demonstration of covenant faithfulness throughout Matthew's Gospel.[96]

This transformative pedagogy reflects what Brown identifies as a **covenantal ethic** rooted in Jesus' interpretation of Torah rather than legalistic compliance.[97] The Sermon on the Mount (5:1-7:29) provides the paradigmatic example of this teaching approach, where Jesus deepens rather than abolishes Mosaic law by addressing heart attitudes and social relationships.[98] The Great Commission thus calls disciples to transmit not merely propositional content but a way of life that embodies divine love in concrete historical circumstances.[99]

The holistic nature of Matthean discipleship challenges reductionist approaches that separate evangelism from social action or individual salvation from community transformation. Brown's analysis demonstrates how "teaching them to obey" implies ongoing formation within communities that practice economic sharing (19:16-30), ethnic inclusion (15:21-28), and restorative justice (18:15-35).[100] This integrated approach to discipleship formation offers practical guidance for contemporary Christian communities seeking to embody gospel values in diverse cultural contexts.[101]

Detailed Exegetical Analysis: Literary Structure and Theological Content

Verses 16-17: Setting and Discipleship Complexity

The opening verses establish both continuity and transformation in the disciples' relationship with Jesus. The return to Galilee creates geographical inclusio with the Gospel's beginning while the mountain setting evokes the

major revelatory scenes of Jesus's ministry.[102] The specification of "the eleven disciples" acknowledges the community's brokenness following Judas's betrayal while affirming its reconstitution under divine grace.

The disciples' response—"they worshiped him, but some doubted" (προσεκύνησαν αὐτῷ, οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν)—presents one of the most psychologically realistic portrayals of faith in the New Testament.[103] The juxtaposition of worship and doubt reflects the complex dynamics of post-resurrection faith, where overwhelming divine presence coexists with human uncertainty. The Greek verb διστάζω suggests hesitation or wavering rather than absolute unbelief, indicating that doubt can coexist with worship in authentic discipleship.[104]

This portrayal of ambivalent discipleship serves Matthew's broader theological purposes and demonstrates what Brown identifies as **paradoxical encouragement** for struggling readers.[105] Rather than presenting the eleven as spiritual superheroes qualified for mission through perfect faith, the text shows them as ordinary people struggling with extraordinary claims. Their qualification for mission comes not from their spiritual achievements but from Jesus's authority and presence. This democratizes mission by suggesting that effective witnesses need not attain spiritual perfection before engaging in evangelism.[106] For post-70 CE Jewish-Christian communities facing persecution and doubt, this realistic portrayal would provide comfort and hope rather than discouragement.[107]

The mountain setting connects this scene to the broader biblical tradition of theophanic mountains while pointing toward the new kind of divine presence Jesus represents. Unlike Mount Sinai, where Moses alone could approach God, or the Temple mount, where access was restricted by ritual requirements, this Galilean mountain suggests the accessibility of divine encounter through Jesus.[108] The location in Galilee, "of the Gentiles," symbolically anticipates the universal scope of the mission about to be commissioned.

Verse 18: Authority Declaration and Cosmic Sovereignty

Jesus's authority declaration represents the theological climax of Matthew's Christology and provides what Brown terms the "narrative payoff" for the Gospel's sustained Christological development.[109] The phrase "all authority in heaven and on earth" (πᾶσα ἐξουσία ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς) employs merismus—a figure of speech that uses opposite extremes to denote totality—to assert unlimited divine sovereignty.[110] This cosmic scope transcends any previous authority claims in the Gospel, suggesting that the resurrection has vindicated and universalized Jesus's messianic identity.

The passive voice construction "has been given to me" (ἐδόθη μοι) emphasizes the Father's role in conferring authority while avoiding any suggestion that Jesus

seized power independently.[111] This grammatical choice reflects the trinitarian understanding that permeates Matthew's Gospel, where Jesus's authority derives from his filial relationship with the Father rather than autonomous divine power. The aorist tense indicates a completed action with ongoing results, suggesting that the resurrection permanently established Jesus's cosmic authority.

The authority claim directly alludes to Daniel 7:13-14, where "one like a son of man" receives dominion from the Ancient of Days: "To him was given dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away."[112] This background suggests that Jesus's authority encompasses not only religious but political dimensions, challenging all competing claims to ultimate sovereignty.

The connection between authority and mission proves crucial for understanding the Commission's theological logic. Jesus's universal authority provides both the basis and the goal of the mission. The disciples are commissioned to proclaim the reign of one who actually possesses the authority he claims, and their mission aims to extend recognition of that authority throughout the world.[113] This transforms evangelism from religious recruitment to political proclamation—announcing the true king to subjects who may not yet recognize his rule. This is an appropriate ending to the Gospel that opened with "A book of the beginning of Jesus Christ, son of David, son of Abraham." The story climaxes as Jesus announces that he has been given all authority and, as such, is the Christ. The rest of the Gospel narrates how Jesus arrived at that point.

Verses 19-20a: Mission Mandate and Community Formation

The mission mandate employs a sophisticated grammatical structure that subordinates all activities to the central imperative of making disciples. The main verb μαθητεύσατε (make disciples) governs three participles—πορευθέντες (going), βαπτίζοντες (baptizing), and διδάσκοντες (teaching)—indicating that these activities serve the overarching purpose of discipleship formation.[114] This structure prevents fragmenting the Commission into separate commands and emphasizes the unified nature of Christian mission.

The phrase "all nations" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) has generated extensive scholarly debate regarding its precise scope and implications. In Septuagintal usage, ἔθνη typically refers to non-Jewish peoples, suggesting that Matthew envisions primarily Gentile mission.[115] However, the universal scope implied by πάντα and the Gospel's inclusive trajectory suggest a broader interpretation that encompasses all ethnic groups, including Jews. The parallel usage in Matthew 25:32, where "all nations" clearly includes both Jews and Gentiles, supports this inclusive reading.[116]

The discipleship process outlined in verses 19-20a involves three essential components: initiation through baptism, community incorporation through trinitarian identity, and ongoing formation through teaching. The baptismal formula "in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" (εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) represents the earliest explicit trinitarian formulation in the New Testament and what Davies and Allison identify as a **theological innovation** that challenges Jewish monotheism while maintaining it.[117] The formula suggests the fundamental role of trinitarian theology in Christian identity formation.[118]

The preposition εἰς indicates movement toward or into, suggesting that baptism involves transfer of allegiance rather than mere ritual performance.[119] Being baptized "into the name" implies entering into relationship with the triune God, with "name" representing the person's essential character and authority. This theological understanding transforms baptism from human action to divine encounter, where converts are incorporated into the divine life itself and form what Brown describes as **communal divine identity** rather than individualistic spirituality.[120]

The teaching mandate specifies the content as "all that I have commanded you" (πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν), referring to the entirety of Jesus's ethical and theological instruction throughout the Gospel.[121] The verb τηρεῖν emphasizes observance or obedience rather than mere intellectual comprehension, indicating that Christian formation involves behavioral transformation rather than only doctrinal instruction. This holistic approach to discipleship challenges reductionist interpretations that separate belief from practice or knowledge from obedience.

Verse 20b: Presence Promise and Eschatological Horizon

The climactic presence promise employs divine self-identification language that connects Jesus directly to GOD's covenant commitments throughout the Old Testament. The phrase "I am with you" (ἐγὼ μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν εἰμι) echoes God's assurances to the patriarchs, Moses, Joshua, and other biblical figures, suggesting that Jesus now fulfills the role of divine companion that GOD played throughout Israel's history.[122]

The temporal specification "all days" (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας) emphasizes the continuous rather than episodic nature of Jesus's presence. Unlike Old Testament theophanies that occurred at specific moments for particular purposes, Jesus promises uninterrupted accompaniment throughout the mission enterprise.[123] This daily presence transforms the disciples' experience from periodic divine encounters to constant divine fellowship.

The eschatological phrase "until the end of the age" (ἕως τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος) places the mission within the framework of salvation history while pointing toward its ultimate completion.[124] The term συντέλεια suggests consummation rather than mere termination, indicating that the mission will reach its intended goal when God's purposes for history are fulfilled. This temporal horizon prevents the mission from becoming an endless obligation while maintaining its urgency and importance.

The presence promise also functions as the Gospel's theological conclusion, fulfilling the Emmanuel prophecy that opens Matthew's narrative. The progression from "God with us" (Matt 1:23) to "I am with you always" (Matt 28:20) reveals the incarnation's ultimate purpose: not merely to accomplish salvation but to ensure permanent divine presence with the community of faith.[125] This presence transforms the nature of post-resurrection discipleship from following an absent teacher to partnering with a present Lord.

First Century Implications: Pre-70 vs. Post-70 Dating Perspectives

Post-70 CE Community Context

A dominant view about the date for Matthew's gospel is that it was written between 70 to 90 CE after the destruction of the temple and in a period when the early Christian movement was in the midst of separating from the synagogue.[126] For communities in this context, such as those in Antioch, the Great Commission would address fundamental questions of identity and mission in the aftermath of catastrophic loss. The destruction of the Temple challenged traditional Jewish categories of covenant faithfulness, making the Commission's redefinition of Israel around discipleship to Jesus particularly relevant.[127]

Post-70 communities would read the Commission's universal scope as validation of their inclusive practices amid accusations of betraying Jewish tradition. The phrase "all nations" (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) would counter sectarian tendencies by grounding Gentile inclusion in Jesus' explicit command rather than pragmatic accommodation.[128] The Trinitarian baptismal formula would provide theological vocabulary for communities navigating the relationship between Jewish monotheism and emerging Christological convictions.[129]

Pre-70 CE Mission Debates

If Matthew was written before 70 CE, as Gibbs argues, the Commission addresses ongoing debates about Gentile inclusion that are documented in Acts 11-15.[130] The intention here is to provide a glimpse into implications of the ending of Matthew for Christians if it is pre-70 in locations, such as Antioch on the Orontes, where the nature of the mission to all the Gentiles (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη) is being debated. Acts 11:2 states after Peter's encounter with Cornelius and his household, "So when Peter went up to Jerusalem, the circumcision party criticized him..." A

similar reaction is recorded in Acts 15 after Paul and Barnabas return to Antioch. "Then certain individuals came down from Judea and were teaching the brothers, 'Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved.' 15:5 reports that one group arguing this perspective were "some believers who belonged to the sect of the Pharisees". The relationship with Gentile converts in Jerusalem and presumably also in other cities such as Antioch was being exasperated by Christian Pharisees. This group matches with how Paul describes some of his opposition during his travels as well as the context in Antioch.[131]

Matthew depicts the Pharisees as one of Jesus' main antagonists which makes it surprising to find that some have become followers of Jesus.[132] If Matthew is being written during debates around the time of Acts 15, then Matthew reflects an intra-Christian debate rather than a church vs synagogue separation. Matthew's focus on Jesus-as-teacher who rejects the teaching of Pharisees (Sadducees, scribes, and others) would not so subtly be taking sides in this debate and, like Paul and Barnabas, affirms Gentile inclusion without the additional requirements being insisted upon by Pharisees and any others of the "circumcision party".[133] Matthew's focus on Jesus as teacher of the law shapes how the law that is to be taught to the Gentiles is to be understood and it is not the same as the Christian Pharisaic interpretation.[134]

Synagogue-Church Tensions and Anti-Pharisaic Polemic

Regardless of precise dating, the Commission addresses the fundamental tension between Jesus' Torah interpretation and competing Jewish authorities. Matthew's sustained critique of Pharisaic teaching throughout the Gospel (especially chapter 23) culminates in the Commission's authorization of an alternative pedagogical authority.[135] The command to teach "all that I have commanded you" explicitly privileges Jesus' interpretation over Pharisaic traditions, providing theological justification for communities following distinctive practices.[136]

The Commission's Trinitarian theology would be particularly controversial in synagogue contexts, where monotheistic confession was central to Jewish identity. Brown's analysis demonstrates how Matthew's narrative prepares readers for this theological innovation through gradual revelation of Jesus' divine status, making the Commission's explicit Trinitarian formula the culmination rather than an abrupt departure.[137] For Jewish Christians navigating dual loyalties, the Commission provides theological vocabulary for maintaining Jewish identity while embracing distinctively Christian practices.[138]

Contemporary Applications: Decolonizing Christian Mission

Partnership Models and Mutual Transformation

The insights gained from narrative criticism, typological analysis, and global interpretive voices converge to suggest radically transformed approaches to contemporary Christian mission. Rather than the unidirectional model that characterized much of colonial missions, the Great Commission calls for partnership models that emphasize mutual learning and reciprocal transformation.[139] The presence promise suggests that Jesus accompanies all participants in the mission enterprise, implying that Western Christians can encounter Christ through engagement with non-Western believers rather than simply delivering Christ to them.

The typological transformation from conquest to commission suggests that contemporary mission should prioritize persuasion over coercion, dialogue over domination, and service over superiority. The semantic shift from killing nations to making disciples implies that effective evangelism requires demonstrating the gospel's life-giving power rather than employing force or manipulation.[140] This transformation challenges missions that employ economic incentives, political pressure, or cultural superiority to secure conversions, suggesting instead that authentic Christian witness flows from love and service.

Paul's African emphasis on community formation and anti-discrimination principles offers practical guidance for contemporary missions. Rather than extracting individuals from their cultural contexts, effective discipleship should form communities that maintain cultural integrity while embracing gospel transformation.[141] The trinitarian baptismal formula suggests that Christian identity transcends ethnic boundaries without erasing ethnic distinctions, creating unity in diversity rather than uniformity.

Global partnership models emerging from the Majority World church provide concrete examples of decolonized mission practice. The emphasis on indigenous leadership, contextual theology, and reverse mission challenges Western assumptions about who sends missionaries and who receives them.[142] These developments fulfill the Commission's vision of universal discipleship by recognizing that all nations include both sending and receiving communities.

Transformative Pedagogy in Contemporary Context

Brown's analysis of the Commission's pedagogical emphasis offers guidance for contemporary Christian formation that moves beyond colonial models of cultural transmission. The call to teach "all that I have commanded" requires contextual interpretation that embodies Jesus' mercy and justice in specific cultural circumstances rather than mechanical repetition of Western theological formulations.[143] This transformative pedagogy challenges both liberal approaches that minimize distinctive Christian content and conservative approaches that separate belief from social practice.[144]

Contemporary applications of Matthean pedagogy should emphasize community-based formation that integrates worship, service, and social justice rather than individualistic spirituality.[145] The Commission's holistic vision suggests that Christian education should address economic inequality, ethnic discrimination, and political oppression as central rather than peripheral concerns.[146] This integrated approach provides theological foundation for communities seeking to embody gospel values while engaging contemporary social challenges.[147]

The Commission's emphasis on ongoing formation ("teaching them to observe") challenges both perfectionist and antinomian tendencies in contemporary Christianity. Rather than expecting immediate spiritual maturity or dismissing ethical demands as legalistic, Matthean discipleship envisions gradual transformation within supportive communities that model divine love in concrete practices.[148] This pedagogical vision offers hope for communities struggling with the tension between high ethical standards and realistic acknowledgment of human limitation.[149]

Interfaith Dialogue and Religious Pluralism

The Commission's universal scope raises complex questions about Christian relationships with other religious traditions. The post-colonial critique reveals how traditional interpretations have often justified religious imperialism and cultural destruction, while global voices suggest alternative approaches that maintain Christian distinctiveness while showing genuine respect for other traditions.[150]

Soares-Prabhu's Buddhist-Christian dialogue model demonstrates how comparative analysis can illuminate both traditions without requiring either to abandon its distinctive claims.[151] The Commission's emphasis on making disciples rather than destroying cultures suggests that Christian mission can engage other religions through dialogue and collaboration on shared concerns like justice, peace, and human flourishing.

The typological transformation from conquest to commission provides theological grounding for irenic rather than antagonistic interfaith relations. If Jesus transforms the Old Testament mandate to destroy enemies into a command to love them, contemporary Christians should approach other religions as potential partners rather than inevitable opponents.[152] This does not require abandoning Christian convictions about Jesus's unique significance but does suggest that those convictions should lead to generous rather than defensive engagement with others.

The eschatological horizon of the Commission ("until the end of the age") suggests that ultimate questions about religious truth will be resolved by God

rather than human polemics. This temporal perspective can encourage humility and patience in interfaith relations while maintaining commitment to faithful witness.[153] Christians can share their convictions about Jesus's significance without claiming the right to determine others' eternal destinies.

Digital Age Challenges and Opportunities

Contemporary Christian mission operates within global digital networks that present both unprecedented opportunities and serious ethical challenges. The Commission's universal scope ("all nations") gains new relevance in an interconnected world where geographical boundaries no longer limit communication and relationship.[154] Digital platforms can facilitate the kind of mutual learning and partnership models that post-colonial criticism advocates.

However, digital missions also risk perpetuating the imperial patterns that traditional missions exemplified. Western technological dominance can create new forms of cultural imperialism where Christian content reflects primarily Western perspectives and priorities.[155] The proliferation of digital Christian resources may overwhelm local theological voices rather than amplifying them, recreating colonial dynamics in virtual spaces.

The Commission's emphasis on presence ("I am with you always") offers theological resources for ethical digital engagement. Authentic Christian witness requires genuine relationship and incarnational presence rather than mere information transfer.[156] Digital tools should facilitate rather than replace personal encounter and community formation, supporting local Christian communities rather than substituting for them.

The global nature of digital communication also provides opportunities for the kind of reading with others that postcolonial criticism advocates. Western Christians can access non-Western biblical interpretation, theological reflection, and spiritual resources more easily than ever before, facilitating the mutual transformation that authentic mission requires.[157] This accessibility challenges Western assumptions about theological authority and invites more collaborative approaches to biblical interpretation and Christian formation.

Matthew's Gospel for Today: Participatory Hermeneutics and Community Formation

Barton argues that Matthew's apocalyptic theology fosters an "ethos of moral seriousness" particularly relevant in our "post-truth" age, encouraging obedience, righteousness, and resistance to evil. The integration of Barton's insights with Popa's eschatological framework and Reinbold's translation analysis provides a foundation for mission as partnership rather than domination, grounding contemporary interfaith dialogue in humility and mutual transformation.

Narrative Theology and Reader Participation

Brown's reader-response analysis reveals how the Commission models **participatory hermeneutics** that moves beyond traditional subject-object interpretive frameworks toward collaborative meaning-making.[158] The text's open-ended conclusion invites readers to see themselves as co-authors of the continuing story rather than passive recipients of completed revelation.[159] This participatory model challenges both fundamentalist approaches that claim definitive interpretation and liberal approaches that relativize textual authority.[160]

The Commission's narrative structure demonstrates how **literary form serves theological content** in Matthew's missional vision. The movement from doubt to worship (28:17), from limited to universal authority (28:18), from ethnic restriction to global inclusion (28:19), and from temporary to eternal presence (28:20) creates a literary arc that models the transformation the text advocates.[161] Contemporary readers are invited to participate in this same transformative process through engagement with the text and embodiment of its vision.[162]

Community Formation and Collective Discipleship

Brown's emphasis on communal divine identity challenges individualistic approaches to Christian faith and formation. The Trinitarian baptismal formula suggests that Christian identity emerges through participation in divine community rather than personal decision or individual experience.[163] This communal foundation provides theological grounding for collective rather than privatized approaches to contemporary discipleship.[164]

The Commission's pedagogical vision supports **learning communities** that embody the gospel through shared practices rather than mere cognitive transmission of propositional content.[165] Contemporary applications should emphasize experiential learning, collaborative interpretation, and mutual accountability within communities that demonstrate divine love through concrete actions.[166] This approach offers alternatives to both institutional models that emphasize hierarchical authority and therapeutic models that prioritize individual fulfillment over communal transformation.[167]

Conclusion: The Commission's Continuing Challenge

Synthesis of Interpretive Approaches

Matthew 28:16-20 stands as more than the conclusion of a first-century Gospel; it functions as a continuing challenge to Christian communities seeking to embody

Jesus's vision in contemporary contexts. The narrative and typological analysis reveals how Matthew's ending resolves fundamental tensions between Old Testament violence and gospel love through transformative fulfillment rather than simple replacement. The post-colonial and global perspectives expose how Western interpretive assumptions have often betrayed the Commission's inclusive spirit while pointing toward more faithful alternatives. The detailed exegetical analysis demonstrates the text's sophisticated theological vision that integrates Christology, ecclesiology, and eschatology into a unified mission mandate.

Contemporary Relevance and Global Concerns

The Commission's contemporary relevance emerges through its ability to address current challenges while maintaining connection to its first-century origins. The transformation from conquest to commission speaks directly to global concerns about religious violence and cultural imperialism, suggesting that authentic Christian mission requires demonstrating rather than imposing gospel values. The emphasis on partnership and presence challenges individualistic approaches to evangelism while supporting community-based models of discipleship formation. The universal scope ("all nations") affirms cultural diversity while proclaiming transcendent unity in Christ.

Dialogical Interpretation and Scholarly Engagement

The ongoing scholarly dialogue between traditional and alternative interpretations exemplifies the kind of reading with others that the Commission itself seems to envision. Just as Jesus promises to be present with disciples engaged in cross-cultural mission, contemporary interpreters can expect to encounter fresh insights about the text through engagement with diverse perspectives. This dialogical approach to biblical interpretation models the mutuality that authentic Christian mission requires.

The Commission's Dynamic Vision

The Commission's open ending ("until the end of the age") ensures its continuing relevance for each generation of believers. Rather than providing a completed program to be mechanically implemented, the text offers a dynamic vision that requires contextual application and creative interpretation. Contemporary Christians are called not merely to repeat first-century patterns but to embody the Commission's transformative spirit in their own cultural contexts.

Reader Engagement and Participatory Discipleship

Brown's analysis of the Commission as reader-engaging climax demonstrates how the text functions not as historical artifact but as continuing invitation to participatory discipleship.[168] The psychological realism of doubt alongside worship (28:17) provides encouragement for struggling believers while the promise of divine presence (28:20) offers sustenance for challenging mission.[169] Contemporary communities can embrace the Commission's transformative vision precisely because it depends ultimately on Jesus' presence and power rather than human capability and determination.[170]

Embracing Humility and Boldness

Ultimately, Matthew 28:16-20 challenges contemporary believers to embrace both the humility and the boldness that authentic discipleship requires. The humility emerges from recognizing that the text's diverse interpretations across cultures and centuries reveal the limitations of any single reading, while the boldness comes from the promise of Jesus's continuing presence with those who risk engaging in cross-cultural mission. The Commission thus functions not as a mandate for cultural domination but as an invitation to participate in God's ongoing work of reconciliation and transformation throughout the world.

Symbolic Significance of the Mountain Setting

The mountain setting of the Commission provides a final symbolic key to its contemporary significance. Mountains in biblical literature represent places of encounter between divine and human realms, suggesting that the Commission calls believers to live at the intersection of heaven and earth.[171] This liminal position requires both spiritual grounding and cultural engagement, theological conviction and practical wisdom, local rootedness and global vision. The Commission challenges contemporary Christians to maintain these creative tensions rather than resolving them through simplistic reductionism.

Divine Partnership in Mission

The promise "I am with you always" transforms the Commission from an impossible burden to sustainable calling. The disciples' mixed response of worship and doubt models realistic discipleship that acknowledges both the overwhelming nature of the mission and the adequacy of divine grace to accomplish it.[172] Contemporary believers can embrace the Commission's challenging vision precisely because it depends ultimately on Jesus's presence and power rather than human capability and determination.

Eschatological Framework and Hope

The eschatological horizon ("until the end of the age") places contemporary mission within the broader context of God's purposes for creation. This temporal framework prevents mission from becoming either triumphalistic conquest or despairing obligation by locating it within God's ultimate plan for universal reconciliation.[173] The Commission thus calls contemporary Christians to faithful participation in God's ongoing work while entrusting ultimate outcomes to divine sovereignty.

Challenge and Hope for the Contemporary Church

In an era marked by religious pluralism, cultural globalization, and increasing skepticism about institutional Christianity, Matthew 28:16-20 offers both challenge and hope. The challenge lies in embodying the gospel's transformative love in ways that attract rather than repel, that demonstrate rather than merely proclaim Christian distinctiveness. The hope emerges from the promise that this seemingly impossible task occurs not in human isolation but in divine partnership, with the assurance that the risen Christ accompanies all genuine efforts to extend his reign of justice, mercy, and peace throughout the world.

Framework for Faithful Engagement

The Commission's enduring power lies not in providing easy answers to complex contemporary questions but in establishing the theological framework within which those questions can be faithfully addressed. By grounding mission in divine authority, enabling it through divine presence, and directing it toward universal discipleship, Matthew 28:16-20 creates space for the creative adaptation that each generation of believers must undertake. The text thus functions as both anchor and sail for the Christian community—providing stability in changing circumstances while empowering movement toward God's ultimate purposes for creation.

Resources

[1] W.D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, vol. 3 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1997), 682-683, https://www.google.com/books/edition/A_Critical_and_Exegetical_Commentary_on/Wf1BAQAAIAAJ.

[2] Jack Dean Kingsbury, *Matthew: Structure, Christology, Kingdom* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975), 161-162, https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/review/matthew-structure-christology-kingdom/.

[3] Romeo Popa, "Der Weg der Völker: Die eschatologische Begründung der Völkermission im Matthäusevangelium," *New Testament Studies* 65 (2019): 166–89, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/new-testament-studies/article/abs/der-weg-der-volker-die-eschatologische-begrundung-der-volkermission-im-matthausevangelium/DD58E8A4AB0E3D01E81A862DC96F957A.

[4] Popa, "Der Weg der Völker;" Stephen C. Barton, “Matthew’s Gospel for today,” *Theology* 126 (2023): 3–19, https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0040571X221146273.

[5] Jeannine K. Brown, "Direct Engagement of the Reader in Matthew's Discourses," *New Testament Studies* 51 (2005): 19–35, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/new-testament-studies/article/abs/direct-engagement-of-the-reader-in-matthews-discourses-rhetorical-techniques-and-scholarly-consensus/E48A332C13BBE021DD1B18B00E7DFD03.

[6] Mark Allan Powell, *What Is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 1–10, https://www.logos.com/product/164583/what-is-narrative-criticism.

[7] Daniel Patte, "Reading Matthew 28:16-20 with Others: How It Deconstructs Our Western Concept of Mission," in *Teaching the Bible*, eds. Fernando Segovia and Mary Ann Tolbert (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1998), 1–26, https://www.sbl-site.org/assets/pdfs/Patte_Reading.pdf; Musa W. Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (St. Louis: Chalice, 2000), 224–245, https://chalicepress.com/products/postcolonial-feminist-interpretation-of-the-bible.

[8] Kenton L. Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest: Mosaic Typology in Matthew 28:16-20," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 68 (2006): 651–663, https://scientia-sanbeda.org/index.php/scientia/article/download/113/VOL9-1-ARTICLE-REVIEW/264.

[9] Kolawole Olumafemi Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate of the Church in Matthew 28:18–20," *Word & World* 40, no. 4 (Fall 2020): 419–426, https://wordandworld.luthersem.edu/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/40-4_Holiness_And_Discipleship/The%20Great%20Commission%20Mandate%20of%20the%20Church%20in%20Matthew%2028;18-20.pdf.

[10] R.T. France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, New International Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 1108-1109, [https://www.eerdmans.com/9780802825018/the-gospel-of-matthew/]{.underline}.

[11] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1104-1105.

[12] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1112.

[13] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1115-1118.

[14] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:685-687.

[15] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:688-690.

[16] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:691-693.

[17] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:695-697.

[18] D.A. Carson, "Matthew," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*, rev. ed., vol. 9 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010), 659-661, https://www.eerdmans.com/9781467454230/eerdmans-commentary-on-the-bible-matthew/.

[19] Carson, "Matthew," 660.

[20] Carson, "Matthew," 661-662.

[21] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 19-35.

[22] Jeannine K. Brown and Kyle Roberts, *Matthew*, Two Horizons New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018), 288-292, https://www.eerdmans.com/9780802825667/matthew/.

[23] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 32-35.

[24] Donald A. Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, Word Biblical Commentary 33B (Dallas: Word Books, 1995), 886-887, https://zondervanacademic.com/products/matthew-14-28-volume-33b.

[25] Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 884-885.

[26] Hagner, *Matthew 14-28*, 887-889.

1450-1455.

[28] Gibbs, *Matthew 21:1-28:20*, 1456-1460.

[29] Gibbs, *Matthew 21:1-28:20*, 1461-1465.

[30] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 290-292.

[31] Wolfgang Reinbold, "Gehet hin und macht zu Jüngern alle Völker? Zur Übersetzung und Interpretation von Mt 28,19f," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 109 (2012): 176–205, https://www.mohrsiebeck.com/artikel/gehet-hin-und-machet-zu-juengern-alle-voelker-zur-uebersetzung-und-interpretation-von-mt-2819f-101628004435412800650909.

[32] Reinbold, "Gehet hin und macht."

[33] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 661.

[34] Markus Bockmuehl, *This Jesus: Martyr, Lord, Messiah* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 175–180, https://books.google.com/books/about/This_Jesus.html.

[35] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 25-28.

[36] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 285-287.

[37] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 22-24.

[38] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 287-288.

[39] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 289.

[40] Jeannine K. Brown, *The Gospels as Stories: A Narrative Approach to Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2020), 132-135, https://bakerpublishinggroup.com/books/the-gospels-as-stories/352251 .

[41] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 134-136.

[42] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 30-32.

[43] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 28-30.

[44] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 290-291.

[45] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 291.

[46] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 136-138.

[47] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 32-34.

[48] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 292.

[49] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 138-140.

[50] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 34-35.

[51] Terence L. Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain: A Study in Matthean Theology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 183–186, https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/jesus-on-the-mountain-a-study-in-matthew-9780567622358/.

[52] Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 185-187.

[53] Warren Carter, *Matthew and the Margins: A Sociopolitical and Religious Reading* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2000), 549–552, https://books.google.com/books/about/Matthew_and_the_Margins.html.

[54] Donald Senior, *Matthew*, Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1998), 343, https://www.amazon.com/Abingdon-New-Testament-Commentaries-Matthew/dp/0687057663.

[55] David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel: A Study in Literary Design* (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1988), 137–138, https://www.bloomsbury.com/us/structure-of-matthews-gospel-9781474231213/.

[56] Daniel J. Harrington, *The Gospel of Matthew*, Sacra Pagina (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 414–415, https://litpress.org/Products/5803/Sacra-Pagina-The-Gospel-of-Matthew?srsltid=AfmBOopkXBKvOtsc6AiQEvCDC1J2MGtLCy4XaE6c8VnZBfMoq0lbuHJU.

[57] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 422.

[58] Ulrich Luz, *Matthew 21–28: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005), 617–618, https://www.fortresspress.com/store/product/9780800637705/Matthew-21-28.

[59] Dale C. Allison Jr., *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 262–263, https://books.google.com/books/about/The_New_Moses.html.

[60] Paul S. Minear, *Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel* (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1974), 141–142,https://wipfandstock.com/9781592443345/matthew-the-teachers-gospel.

[61] Benjamin J. Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning: An Exegesis of Matthew 28:16-20*, SBLDS 19 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974), 151–175, https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Matthean_redaction_of_a_primitive_ap.html.

[62] Allison, *The New Moses*; Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 651-663.

[63] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 658-659.

[64] Leon Morris, *The Gospel according to Matthew*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 745, https://www.eerdmans.com/9780802836960/the-gospel-according-to-matthew/

[65] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 660.

[66] Allison, *The New Moses*, 263; Hubbard, *Matthean Redaction*, 151-75.

[67] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 661.

[68] Dale C. Allison Jr., *Studies in Matthew: Interpretation Past and Present* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005), 215–220, https://bakerpublishinggroup.com/books/studies-in-matthew/263812.

[69] N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 645–650., https://www.fortresspress.com/store/product/9780800626822/Jesus-and-the-Victory-of-God.

[70] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 662–663.

[71] Allison, *The New Moses*, 263–264.

[72] Rolf Rendtorff, *Das überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch*, BZAW 147 (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1977), https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/9783110802436-fm/html.

[73] Augustine, *City of God* 16.43, cited in Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 662n32.

[74] Patte, "Reading Matthew 28:16–20 with Others," 1–2.

[75] Patte, "Reading Matthew 28:16–20 with Others," 5–7.

[76] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 3:687–688.

[77] Patte, "Reading Matthew 28:16–20 with Others," 2–3.

[78] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 224–225.

[79] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 233–235.

[80] Dube, *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation*, 242–243.

[81] George M. Soares-Prabhu, "Two Mission Commands: An Interpretation of Matthew 28:16–20 in the light of a Buddhist Text," in *Voices from the Margins*, ed. R.S. Sugirtharajah (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995), 319–339, https://orbisbooks.com/products/voices-from-the-margin-1.

[82] Soares-Prabhu, "Two Mission Commands," 330.

[83] Soares-Prabhu, "Two Mission Commands," 330.

[84] Soares-Prabhu, "Two Mission Commands," 331–333.

[85] Soares-Prabhu, "Two Mission Commands," 332–333.

[86] Elaine M. Wainwright, *Shall We Look for Another: A Feminist Rereading of the Matthean Jesus* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1998), 114, https://www.amazon.com/Shall-We-Look-Another-Liberation/dp/1570751846.

[87] Wainwright, *Shall We Look for Another*, 116.

[88] Wainwright, *Shall We Look for Another*, 114–118.

[89] Wainwright, *Shall We Look for Another*, 117-118.

[90] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 419–426.

[91] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 421.

[92] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 425.

[93] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 425–426.

[94] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 291–292.

[95] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 140–142.

[96] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 292–293.

[97] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 293.

[98] Jeannine K. Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective: The Portrayal and Function of the Matthean Disciples* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 145–150, https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Disciples_in_Narrative_Perspective.html?id=cqH-IJTG3iIC.

[99] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 150–155.

[100] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 294–295.

[101] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 142–144.

[102] Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 183–186.

[103] Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave*, vol. 2 (New York: Doubleday, 1978), 1292–1293, https://www.amazon.com/Death-Messiah-Gethsemane-Grave-Commentary/dp/0300140096.

[104] Daniel Patte, *The Gospel according to Matthew: A Structural Commentary on Matthew's Faith* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 395–398, https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Gospel_According_to_Matthew.html.

[105] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 155–158.

[106] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 295–296.

[107] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 158–160.

[108] Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 170–190.

[109] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 144–146.

[110] David R. Bauer, *The Structure of Matthew's Gospel*, 115–117.

[111] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 421.

[112] Dale C. Allison Jr., *The New Moses*, 262.

[113] N.T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God*, 612–653.

[114] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 422.

[115] Douglas R.A. Hare and Daniel J. Harrington, "'Make Disciples of All the Gentiles' (Matthew 28:19)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 359–369, https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40149886 [underline].

[116] Douglas R.A. Hare and Daniel J. Harrington, "'Make Disciples of All the Gentiles' (Matthew 28:19)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 37 (1975): 359–369, https://www.jstor.org/stable/i40149886.

[117] John P. Meier, "Nations or Gentiles in Matthew 28:19," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 94–102, https://www.jstor.org/stable/43714227.

[118] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 423.

[119] F. Blass, A. Debrunner, R. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), 82, https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/G/bo3655673.html.

[120] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 296–297.

[121] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 423.

[122] Hubbard, *Matthean Redaction*, 151–175.

[123] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 424.

[124] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 424.

[125] Minear, *Matthew: The Teacher's Gospel*, 141–142.

[126] Davies and Allison, *Matthew*, 1:127–138.

[127] Carter, *Matthew and the Margins*, 550–555.

[128] France, *The Gospel of Matthew*, 1116–1118.

[129] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 297–298.

[130] Gibbs, *Matthew 21:1–28:20*, 1460–1465.

[131] Craig S. Keener, *The Gospel of Matthew: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 715–720, https://www.eerdmans.com/9781467465502/the-gospel-of-matthew/.

[132] Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthew's Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994), 155–164, https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3632737.html.

[133] Amy-Jill Levine, *The Social and Ethnic Dimensions of Matthean Salvation History* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), 245–250, https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Social_and_Ethnic_Dimensions_of_Matt.html.

[134] David C. Sim, *The Gospel of Matthew and Christian Judaism* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 215–225, https://www.amazon.com/Gospel-Matthew-Christian-Judaism-Community/dp/0567086410.

[135] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 298–299.

[136] Hagner, *Matthew 14–28*, 890–892.

[137] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 160–165.

[138] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 299–300.

[139] David J. Bosch, *Transforming Mission: Paradigm Shifts in Theology of Mission* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1991), 420–432, https://books.google.com/books/about/Transforming_Mission_Paradigm_Shifts_in.html.

[140] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 661–663.

[141] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 425–426.

[142] Lamin Sanneh, *Whose Religion is Christianity? The Gospel beyond the West* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 43–68, https://www.eerdmans.com/9780802821645/whose-religion-is-christianity/.

[143] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 300–301.

[144] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 146–148.

[145] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 301–302.

[146] Paul, "The Great Commission Mandate," 426.

[147] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 165–170.

[148] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 302–303.

[149] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 148–150.

[150] S. Wesley Ariarajah, *The Bible and People of Other Faiths* (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1985), 15–32, https://wipfandstock.com/9781606089088/the-bible-and-people-of-other-faiths/ .

[151] Soares-Prabhu, "Two Mission Commands," 319–339.

[152] Sparks, "Gospel as Conquest," 661–663.

[153] Christopher J.H. Wright, *The Mission of God: Unlocking the Bible's Grand Narrative* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2006), 540–565, https://www.ivpress.com/the-mission-of-god.

[154] Philip Jenkins, *The Next Christendom: The Coming of Global Christianity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 214–220, https://academic.oup.com/book/12865/chapter-abstract/163158715.

[155] Heidi Campbell, *Digital Creatives and the Rethinking of Religious Authority* (New York: Routledge, 2021), 156–178, https://www.routledge.com/Digital-Creatives-and-the-Rethinking-of-Religious-Authority/Campbell/p/book/9781138370975.

[156] Samuel Escobar, *The New Global Mission: The Gospel from Everywhere to Everyone* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 112–135, https://www.ivpress.com/the-new-global-mission.]

[157] Patte, "Reading Matthew 28:16-20 with Others," 25–26.

[158] Brown, "Direct Engagement," 34–35.

[159] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 303–304.

[160] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 150–152.

[161] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 304–305.

[162] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 170–175.

[163] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 305–306.

[164] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 152–154.

[165] Brown and Roberts, *Matthew*, 306–307.

[166] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective*, 175–180.

[167] Brown, *The Gospels as Stories*, 154–156.

[168] Brown, *The Disciples in Narrative Perspective,* 160–62.

[169] Ibid.

[170] Ibid.

[171] Donaldson, *Jesus on the Mountain*, 1–25.

[172] Raymond E. Brown, *The Death of the Messiah*, 2:1292–1293.

[173] Wright, *The Mission of God*, 540–565.