

SG Q Matthew 9.35-10.15

1. Before Sunday's sermon, how would you have stated the mission of Jesus and his church?
2. The sermon argued that Matt 9.35 (and 4.23) are intentional programmatic statements of Matthew to define Jesus mission and ministry in a three-fold manner, and that the verbal similarities make this the mission of the Apostles and church. The argument is based on these two nearly identical statements, the intentional preponderance of the word **θεραπεύω**, the narrative flow of the book up to ch 10 emphasizing these three elements, the fulfillment interpretation of Is 53.4 at MT 8.17, and then the commissioning in Mt 10.1, 5-8. Does this make sense? Is it convincing?
 - a. But this is controversial in some circles, since Mt 28.16-20 is seen as the controlling statement of the mission of the church and it does not mention healing, but rather it supports "the Spirituality of the Church," defining the church's responsibility to the sphere's of evangelism and discipleship only. What do we do with that? The overarching need to understand all of Matthew's intention.
3. Assuming the validity of the 9.35 statement, how do we hold all three together? Should there be priority among them? How can we be faithful to all three? How do we motivate and enable Christians and the church to do them? What limits or signs of unbalance should we be aware of?
4. Although we should take James 5.13ff literally, there is still some interpretation, application or translation work that needs to take place with "healing" to know how to implement it. What did the sermon argue? What do you think? How does the fact of future resurrection impact our current hopes and expectations of healing?
5. How can we use the resource of Suite 600 in pursuing our mission as a church?
6. Pray for Grace Hill and yourself.