16:27-28
According to verse 13, we are still in Ceasarea Philippi. Remember all the similarities between the Moses and Jesus parallels. We're going to see in the next chapter another one: Just as God spoke to Moses out of the heavens (Exodus 19-20) and the people pled for Moses to do the talking with God whereas Peter, James, and John show the same fright. We can sort of call this next episode the "New Sinai" for this same reason: Jesus is the ultimate Moses.

For the Son of Man will come in the glory of His Father with His angels, and then He will reward each according to his works. 28 Assuredly, I say to you, there are some standing here who shall not taste death till they see the Son of Man coming Both here and in verse 27 we do not have the word *parousia,* but rather *erchomai* and can be simply the action of "coming" or "going." **in His kingdom."** "…Until they are rewarded (by implication, verse 27)."
This is very awkward, it seems, since we have what appears to be a very clear reference to the "second coming" and a very clear understanding that these men are all now dead. 3-4 of them, however, did live another 40 years or so.

1. Is this a reference to the very next chapter? If it really is only six days later, then we can see how awkward this is to look at a group of men and say "some of you are going to live another six days!" Well…the implication is that some of them would die…and there is no indication that any died in that next week.
2. Is this Pentecost? Well, that's only another six months or so. Is this really any less awkward when we know all but one (Judas) was alive than the previous possibility? Isn't it a little anti-climactic to say so?
3. Is this the destruction of 70A.D.? It's hard to fathom that the **Son of Man** and He came with His angels and He **reward**ed folks, and all were able to see it who were alive. Of course, we're faced with asking, "If it happened? How?" 2 Timothy 1:15 shows people believed it did happen literally during this time.
4. Was Jesus mistaken? Perhaps He was hopeful like Paul was in 1 Corinthians 15:51 and 1 Thessalonians 4:13 and his "we statements." This seems hard: "The Son of God was wrong."
5. Is this just a progressive reality? During revivalism in different eras—moving westward? Not good. That would mean the apostles—some of them—are still alive.
6. Is this speaking of John only? Since he saw the book of the Revelation, does he qualify? Was that the fulfillment? It cannot be John only since this passage here speaks of 2nd person, plural (not singular) that would not "die."
7. Is this Daniel simply going to the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7? If so, how will he **reward** every man from Heaven's throne **according to their works?**
8. Is this simply a postponed promise? Was it a legitimate promise that was postponed since the Jews rejected Jesus? It would be Jesus, once again, uncertain of their rejecting them.

Let's talk about "dual fulfillment." This is the idea that Scriptures can be fulfilled in more than one way. I don't particularly care about this because it sounds like a "cop out." However, there are examples (3 to be shared here) of Scripture having dual fulfillment:

1. Daniel 11 speaks of Alexander the Great's coming and all of his exploits—to include the splitting of his kingdom into four sections. One of these four kingdom-ettes was

led by Antiochus IV, and Daniel 11:35 very clearly speaks of his influence in the temple of Jerusalem. It's prophecy. By the time Jesus speaks of it, it is history.

However, Jesus takes this history of Daniel 11:35 and says it is <u>also</u> prophecy in Matthew 24:15. Is Jesus wrong?

2. Hosea 11:1 speaks of the history of the Exodus of the Israelite nation, and Matthew calls it a history of—not Israel, but of Jesus, and his trip out of Egypt (Matthew 2:15). Is Matthew wrong?

3. Zechariah 12:9 speaks of a prophecy that John says occurred at Jesus' death on Calvary (John 19:34) while he said it will also occur at Jesus' second coming (Revelation 1:7). Is John wrong?

We don't think any of these were wrong.