

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE II.

IS THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT HOMILETICALLY
DEFENSIBLE?BY THE REVEREND EDWARD NORMAN HARRIS,
SHWEGYIN, BURMA.

ALTHOUGH the Sermon on the Mount as recorded in the First Gospel has probably been more assiduously studied than any other portion of the New Testament, yet the opinions entertained as to its internal structure are most diverse. Schmiedel, for instance, regards it as little more than a jumble of contradictions and of fragmentary ideas torn out of all connection of thought. Others, as Holtzmann, Weizsäcker, Heinrici, Ibbeken, think it is a curious conglomeration, a collocation of various sayings of Jesus arbitrarily arranged and grouped together by the evangelist in parts with more, in parts with less, of skill. Still others, as Calvin, Semler, Pott, Kuinöl, Strauss, Baur, Achelis, Neander, Tholuck, Godet, Bleek, Weiss, de Wette, Votaw, Bacon, Allen, variously find in it, indeed, a genuine discourse of Jesus, but mixed with so much of extraneous material, including parts of other discourses, disconnected sayings, and sayings referable to entirely different historical situations, as seriously to mar its unity. A few, as Meyer, Olshausen, Lange, Morison, Broadus, Steinmeyer, Hugo Weiss, Nösgen, Plummer, conceive of it as one continuous, closely connected discourse, but when they attempt an analysis of it, do not profess to develop a true homiletical scheme. As for the Sermon on the Mount being considered a model for the imitation of the modern preacher,

one may search in vain the homiletical treatises of Christlieb, Fenelon, Vinet, Dale, Blaikie, Stalker, Robertson, Watson, Porter, Kidder, Alexander, Armitage, Robinson, Broadus, Pattison, Burrell, Phelps, Garvie, Hoyt, for a study of it. Yet it is evident that, if there is a single line of thought consistently pursued from the beginning to the end of this discourse, a clear perception of that thought and of its development will be invaluable for a right understanding of the Sermon as a whole and may be helpful to a right interpretation of individual passages in it.¹

¹ Votaw (Hastings, Dict. of the Bible, Extra Vol., art. "Sermon on the Mount"), in treating of the Sermon as set forth in the Matthaean and Lucan versions, points out two facts which he says are decisive in the minds of most scholars against the strict unity of the Sermon as given in Matthew, namely, "(1) Particular verses . . . have no logical connexion with the theme of the discourse and its development, e.g., Matt. v. 25, 26, 31, 32; vi. 7-15; vii. 6-11, 22, 23. . . (2) Most of the material in Matthew which appears to be extraneous to the discourse has parallels in Luke's Gospel *outside* of his Sermon." He appends a table of passages from Matthew's version of the Sermon which are found in Luke outside of the Sermon, as follows:—

Matt. v. 13	= Luke xiv. 34, 35	Matt. vi. 22, 23	= Luke xi. 34-36
v. 15	= xi. 33 (viii. 16)	vi. 24	= xvi. 13
v. 18	= xvi. 17	vi. 25-33	= xii. 22-31
v. 25, 26	= xii. 58, 59	vii. 7-11	= xi. 9-13
v. 32	= xvi. 18	vii. 13, 14	= xiii. 24
vi. 9-13	= xi. 2-4	vii. 23	= xiii. 27
vi. 19-21	= xii. 33, 34		

With reference to the passages mentioned under (1) above, it may be said that the connection of Matt. v. 25, 26, 31, 32, with the context is much closer, as will be shown in the proper place, than seems to be commonly supposed. Matthew vi. 7-15; vii. 6-11, 22, 23, may not, indeed, show a close logical connection with their context; but in each passage there is a thought relation, if not to the contiguous sections, at least to the Sermon as a whole, and, moreover, a homiletical suitableness each to its place in the discourse, which the preacher of experience can readily feel.

With reference to (2) it has to be said that the so-called Synoptic problem is still far from a satisfactory solution. The facts demand a more elastic hypothesis than seems to be held by many

THE PRESUMPTION OF UNITY.

If now the question be raised as to whether there really is a unity of plan and purpose to be traced throughout the Sermon, it would seem that the burden of proof should rest, not on those who maintain, but on those who deny, the existence of such unity. That so long a discourse represented as being delivered in so authoritative a manner at such an important period in the Lord's history should be composed of miscellaneous and heterogeneous, unrelated elements, is not a natural supposition. And this conclusion is not affected by the question of the genuineness of the Sermon. Whether we have here a single discourse or the interwoven fragments of many scholars. It ought not to be possible for any one to infer, from the use of such simple metaphors as those of salt, light, the eye, etc., or even of more complex figures, such as that of the man being sued at law, in different connections in Matt. and Luke, that "if Matthew has right places for these verses, Luke has wrong ones" (Votaw above). In Matt. v. 13 the parallelism with ver. 14 seems to make it clear that reference is had to the preserving power of salt, but in Luke xiv. 34, 35, the connection of thought in the entire passage (Luke xiv. 25-35) indicates that its normally inherent savor is in view. In Matt. v. 15 the lamp enlightens others; in Luke xi. 33 it enlightens one's own members; and in Luke viii. 16 it is the candle of truth which God sets up in the world. In Matt. vi. 22, 23, the figure of the eye is used to show the importance of single-mindedness, but in Luke xi. 34-36 the same figure is used to express quite a different idea, that of harmonious and intelligent action among the powers of the being. Much the same thing may be said of agreeing with one's adversary (Matt. v. 25, 26; Luke xii. 58, 59), laying up treasure (Matt. vi. 19-21; Luke xii. 33, 34) and the two masters (Matt. vi. 24; Luke xvi. 13). The same figures are used, but with quite a different purpose in each case. Does any one mean to say that Jesus cannot have used any one of these comparisons more than once, or in more than one significance? So as to the Model Prayer and other sayings of Jesus which find repetition in the same or in different Gospels, it is too much to require that a peripatetic preacher like Jesus who had necessarily to emphasize the same truths again and again as he preached to different groups of people, should never repeat himself.

discourses, whether we have the very words of Jesus or words which were merely ascribed to him by a reverent tradition, are quite irrelevant matters. That the writer of the book commonly ascribed to Matthew put it forth as a single discourse is evident, and this fact of itself creates the presumption that he at least intended it to be thought of as a unit unless the contrary can be proved. To be sure, a study of the Sermon itself reveals an epigrammatic style which, together with the remarkable condensation of thought, makes the connection at some points difficult to trace. Evidently the great discourse is barely sketched in outline. But the presumption of unity still remains, and whether or not this presumption is strengthened by a careful study of the Sermon itself, and, especially, whether or not it presents a consistent homiletical scheme, is one purpose of this inquiry to ascertain. Others have considered the Sermon from the point of view of the grammarian, or the dogmatist, or the sociologist. This inquiry will not disregard the fruits of their investigations, but it will be conducted from the point of view especially of the homilist or preacher.¹

THE SETTING OF THE SERMON.

The First Gospel begins with the genealogy of Jesus, but Matt. i. 17 seems to indicate that this is given with a purpose quite distinct from that of the genealogical table found in Luke's Gospel. The chief intent is not to trace descent from

¹It seems safe to say that less progress has been made during the last quarter of a century in the exegesis of the New Testament than in any other department of Biblical investigation. This science reached its climax in Meyer, that prince of exegetes, and a few of his contemporaries. Unfortunately, since their day, the attention of scholars has been so diverted by critical questions that pure exegesis has been neglected. In the study of the Synoptic Gospels in particular, the so-called Synoptic problem has been so much to the front that exegesis has often failed to re-

Abraham and from David, nor is it even, as might at first seem, to point out a singular coincidence in the mind of the writer in the duration, genealogically, of certain marked periods in the history of Israel, the number of generations in each being fourteen, or twice the sacred number; but rather the purpose seems to be to call attention to these momentous periods themselves and to indicate by implication that the time was come for entrance upon still another period or dispensation in the course of God's dealings with his people. The fourteen generations from Abraham to David covered the period of the theocracy; those from David to the carrying away into captivity, that of the monarchy; and those from the carrying away to Babylon to the Christ, that of the hierarchy. Each of these periods was characterized by a special method; in each the Jewish people were proven untrue to their God; and, after each, the transition to the next was in effect a judgment, a culling out of the worthy from the unworthy, a separation of God's chosen from those who were rejected of God,—in other words, that saving of the "remnant" which received such strong comment from the prophets. Soon after the call of Abraham came the separation of Isaac, and then of Jacob, from the rest of his seed. Soon after David came the division of the kingdom. And after the captivity came the return of a portion only of the

celve its proper dues. It has been taken as a matter of course (as pointed out on p. 332), that if a passage were found in substantially the same wording in different connections in two of the Gospels, or (as in Matt. v. 32; xix. 9) in the same Gospel, in only one of them could the connection be correct, and exegesis in the case of the other must be quite out of place. But exegesis cannot flourish until, while not disregarding questions of criticism, it, nevertheless, proceeds on the assumption that each writing set before it is self-consistent; and, however these questions may be answered, the necessity of seeking to trace the connection of thought is not removed.

Jewish people to Canaan, and the scattering of the remainder over the face of the earth. To the Jewish reader, then, trained to study and interpret the history of his people as being a revelation of divine plans and counsels, the thought of the fulfillment and passing away of the third period in God's dealings with his chosen race would come with profound suggestiveness. It would presage change, upheaval, sifting, judgment.

This first note sounded in the Gospel of Matthew is not to be disregarded in the interpretation of the whole. It is the keynote to much that follows. In Luke the account of the nativity records the songs of the angels, the glad visit of the shepherds, the ecstatic "*Nunc dimittis*" of Simeon, and the giving of thanks to God by the aged prophetess Anna. In Matthew, on the other hand, we have Joseph minded to put Mary, his betrothed wife, away because of her conception, and restrained only by a dream; all Jerusalem thrown into commotion and troubled because of the question of the Magi as to where should be found "he that was born king of the Jews"; and finally the flight into Egypt and the massacre of the innocents — to most of those who were affected by the advent of the Christ being brought embarrassment or wrath or sorrow, few only being gladdened.

Thus much as to the general trend and purpose of Matthew's Gospel as indicated in the first two chapters. The immediate historical setting of the Sermon on the Mount as given in this Gospel may be said to begin with the third chapter. This is in strict harmony with what has gone before. John the Baptizer comes preaching in the wilderness of Judea. The burden of his message is, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," and in accord with his message is his manner of life. Multitudes of people from Jerusa-

lem, and the other cities and villages of Judea, and from round about Jordan pour out to hear him. They are baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins. Pharisees and Sadducees have no immunity from his scathing denunciations because of their influence and social position, but are assured of a wrath to come and warned to show the fruits of a true repentance. Lineal descent from Abraham affords no certainty of exemption from condemnation, for God is able of the very stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And even now is the axe laid at the root of the trees, for there cometh a mightier one who shall baptize not with water but with the Holy Spirit and with fire, whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly cleanse his threshing floor, and gather his wheat into the garner, but burn the chaff with unquenchable fire.

Into the midst of this activity comes Jesus. And he comes not to overthrow or modify John's teaching, but, by himself submitting to John's baptism, to confirm it. More than that, after having first been led of the Spirit into the wilderness, that by vanquishing Satan in his most subtle attacks he may be shown worthy to become a teacher of righteousness, he himself, returning and withdrawing to Galilee after John's incarceration, begins a tour of the cities and villages about, and takes up the very same theme which John proclaimed, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Summoning men to become his disciples, he promises to make them fishers of men, — a figure of speech which, being interpreted in the light of Matt. xiii. 47, 48, is to be understood not exclusively of saving men, but of bringing them within the realm of judgment. His fame extending, many possessed with demons, spirits of evil, are brought to him, and he heals

them, not merely as an act of mercy, but chiefly as the fulfillment of his mission of judgment against the powers of evil.¹

THE THEME OF THE SERMON.

Consistently with the events thus narrated, the very first sentence of the Sermon on the Mount recalls the general theme of the preaching of Jesus announced in Matt. iv. 17. There it was, "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Here it is, "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." The recurrence of the term "the kingdom of heaven" is at once suggestive; and even the exhortation to repentance finds virtual repetition in the blessing pronounced upon poverty of spirit, since the consciousness of poverty of spirit is the first indication of repentance in the heart. But the preaching of repentance requires as a foundation the preaching of righteousness, and in the fourth Beatitude this very term is found ("Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness"); while, a little farther on, the two terms "righteousness" and "the kingdom of heaven" are first combined in the same sentence, "Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (ver. 10), and then repeated with slight but significant change in form, "for my sake" taking the place of "for righteousness' sake," and "great is your reward in heaven" standing for "theirs is the kingdom of heaven" (ver. 11, 12).

¹ The catalogue of diseases mentioned in Matt. iv. 24 is unique in that it lays special emphasis on demoniacal possession and kindred diseases. Thus Meyer's comment on *kai daimon. kai selên. kai paralut.* is that it "makes prominent three special kinds of what had been previously described in a general manner, so that the first *kai* is to be rendered: *especially also, particularly also.*" In evidence that *selên.*, at least, was a kindred disease, cf. Matt. xvii. 15, 18.

To those familiar with Jewish modes of expression, the parallelism and balancing of sentences with seeming reiteration but actual progression or accretion of thought,—this, taken in connection with the special qualities on which blessing is pronounced, already suggests as a possible theme of the Sermon “The righteousness of the kingdom of heaven,” and when, on further study, these same terms “righteousness” and “the kingdom of heaven,” or their equivalents, are met with at precisely the most determining points in the discourse,¹ at first in contrast with the righteousness of the law of Moses (Matt. v. 20; vi. 1, in the latter passage “reward with your Father which is in heaven” standing for “the kingdom of heaven”), and later as descriptive of a new and altogether unique righteousness (Matt. vi. 33, to which should perhaps be added Matt. vii. 21, where doing the will of the Father which is in heaven takes the place of “righteousness”), this theme fairly thrusts itself upon the attention as being the one which the writer had in mind.²

¹ In Matt. v. 17–20 is contained a statement of the subject developed from this point on to Matt. v. 48. Matthew vi. 1 is similarly introductory to the topic pursued to Matt. vi. 18. Matthew vi. 33 is the culmination of the section beginning at Matt. vi. 19, but even at the beginning of this section the equivalent of the two terms of the general theme are found, “treasures” occurring instead of “righteousness” and *ouranōi* being singular instead of plural.

² Failure to agree on the theme of the Sermon on the Mount has probably been more responsible than anything else for the many divergences among scholars in their interpretation of its meaning. Votaw has pointed out (*loc. cit.*) that this has been due to difference of opinion as to whether the theme of the discourse is to be found in the Beatitudes (Matt. v. 3–12) or in the verses about the fulfillment of the law (Matt. v. 17–20), and he has given cogent reasons for holding, as above, that it is not to be found in the latter. Votaw himself gives as the theme for the Sermon, *The Ideal Life*, or, *The True Righteousness*, and states as his reason for preferring the former title that “righteousness” is a technical term of theology, and, while it occurs five times in Matthew’s ac-

THE PURPOSE OF THE SERMON.

Every true sermon must have a theme, a purpose, and a plan. The theme of the Sermon on the Mount has already been indicated. The plan it will be the aim of this inquiry to discover. Its purpose might fittingly be left for consideration until after the study of the Sermon as a whole has been completed. But whatever preliminary light may be available will be of immediate service in the study itself. And if any special significance was intended by the writer of this Gospel in his narrative of events leading up to the Sermon on the Mount as already outlined, the purpose of the discourse is not far to seek. It was to call men to repentance in view of the near approach of the kingdom of heaven. Meyer well says, "The whole discourse is a lively commentary on the words with which Jesus introduced his public ministry, *metanoete, engiken gar hē basileia tōn ouranōn*, setting forth the great moral effects of the *dikaiousunē* which he requires, and declaring them to be the condition of Messianic bliss for those who believe in him." Any study of this discourse which count of the Sermon, it is wholly absent from Luke's account. But the present inquiry is concerned with Matthew's account only, and it seems better to adopt the phraseology of the Sermon itself. Certainly in the Sermon "righteousness" is not used in a technical sense.

The frequent recurrence of the terms of the theme throughout the Sermon on the Mount, not less in those sections which some scholars are accustomed to throw out as extraneous than elsewhere, argues strongly for the unity of the discourse as a whole, especially when taken in connection with the recurrence of other closely allied terms. Thus the *heneken emou* of Matt. v. 11, which is itself a parallel of the *hen. dik.* of Matt. v. 10, finds repeated reference in the *egō legō*, or its equivalent, of Matt. v. 18, 20, 22, 26, 28, 32, 34, 39, 44; vi. 2, 5, 16, 25, 29, and most emphatically as claiming divine authority on the part of the Speaker in Matt. vii. 21-23, 24-27. So also the *misthos* and *apodōsei* of Matt. v. 12; vi. 4, 6, 18, which may be said to sustain a relation to the *bas. our.* of the theme somewhat similar to that of the *heneken emou* to the *hen. dik.* in Matt. v. 10, 11.

fails to keep this great purpose in mind will prove unavailing as an effort to arrive at its true inner meaning.

THE BEATITUDES (MATT. V. 3-12).

The Beatitudes have from the first been held in esteem for their singular beauty and suggestiveness. To the student of homiletics they are no less interesting as furnishing the introduction to the Sermon on the Mount. No part of a sermon is more difficult to prepare, as all who have had experience can testify; and probably more fail here than anywhere else.¹ The commonly accepted dictum is that the introduction should lead up to the subject. Where it is to start from is not generally indicated; but, from whatever point it takes its origin, its chief purpose is supposed to be to prepare the mind of the hearer for the general theme to be treated. But, instead of ending with the subject, the introduction should begin with the subject. *In media rerum*, "into the midst of things," was the rule of the old classical writers, and no better direction can be found for authors or preachers of the present day.² Apart from other considerations, the Sermon on the Mount must ever command admiration, from the homiletical point of view, for the superb manner in which in its very first sentence it presents in germ the idea and potency of the whole, "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." In this utterance is contained an epit-

¹ Vinet: "No part is either more difficult or in more danger of mismanagement." Gaichies: "No part of the discourse needs as much exactness and as much address." Pascal: "The last thing which a man finds out in writing a book is how to begin."

² Cicero: "Your preamble is not to be sought from abroad nor elsewhere, but must be taken from the very essence of your cause." Phelps: "Nowhere are compactness, rapidity of approach, directness and singleness of aim more admirable than in introducing the subject of discourse." Pattison: "With a few strokes carry your audience at once to the heart of your subject."

ome of the entire discourse; for those who are inwardly conscious of spiritual poverty and need are the ones, and the only ones, who can receive and develop that righteousness of the kingdom of which the discourse is an exposition.

Whether or not a connected, systematic order can be traced in the Beatitudes has long been a mooted question. Broadus says, "The regular gradation which some endeavor to point out in the several Beatitudes is artificial, if not imaginary," and adds that they are simply grouped in "a natural way." But what he means by a natural way is not evident, and some degree of order is certainly not unnatural in any writings. As for an "artificial" gradation or grouping of the Beatitudes, these sayings have been universally recognized as being highly poetic at least in thought! and, as all poetry is necessarily more or less artificial in structure, it is entirely reasonable to search, if haply there may be discovered some more or less elaborate framework on which they are strung. As has already been pointed out, one member of the general theme of the entire discourse, namely, "the kingdom of heaven," is to be found in the first Beatitude (ver. 3), and the other, namely, "righteousness," is to be found in the fourth (ver. 6), while the two are found together in the seventh (ver. 10). In view of the habit of parallelism which was almost instinctive to the Jewish mind and furnishes the surest key to correct interpretation, this fact is certainly worthy of consideration. Evidently ver. 10-12 stand in a group by themselves. While in the beatitudinal form, they differ from the preceding Beatitudes in that they pronounce blessing not for some inward quality of the mind or heart, but for outward experiences sustained. It may also be noticed that the fourth Beatitude (ver. 6) differs from the Beatitudes preceding and following it in that it pronounces blessing, not on

specific spiritual attainments or exercises, but on a fervent desire for such attainments. It seems, therefore, to divide these Beatitudes into two groups: one to three (ver. 3-5), and five to seven (ver. 7-9).

If now this division of ver. 3-12 into two main parts (ver. 3-9 and ver. 10-12) be accepted, and also the subdivision of ver. 3-9 into two groups (ver. 3-5 and ver. 7-9, with ver. 6 as the pole of the balance between them), is any order or connection to be traced between the members of the first group of three (ver. 3-5)? Much depends on the meaning of the words used. This can, for the most part, be best determined by reference to the Old Testament Scriptures, whose spirit breathes throughout the Beatitudes. Grimm's definition of *ptōchoi* as given by Thayer in his lexicon, namely, "destitute of the wealth of learning and intellectual culture which the schools afford," is untenable. It is excluded not only by the use of the term *ptōchos* in every passage in the Psalms in which it occurs (Ps. ix. 12, 18; x. 2, 9, 12; xii. 5; xl. 17; lxix. 29; lxxii. 2, 4, 12, 13; lxxxii. 3, 4; lxxxvi. 1; cix. 22; cxiii. 7), and in Isa. lxi. 1; lxvi. 2 (the first Beatitude is strongly reminiscent of Isa. lxi. 1), but also by the use of the word *pneuma* in other passages of the New Testament, where it never stands for intellectual power but rather in contrast with it, e.g., 1 Cor. xiv. 2, 14, 15, 16. Nor does it stand, as some have contended, for spiritual destitution alone irrespective of the personal sense of need. This meaning is excluded by the succeeding Beatitudes, which, in any right interpretation, must be considered as complementary to, and in part explanatory of, this Beatitude. The correct meaning is that given by Thayer himself (*et al.*), "conscious of their spiritual need." *Hoi penthountes* (ver. 4), also, is to be understood not of those who grieve because of the afflictions

to which all men are subject, but of those whose mourning of spirit has its origin on account of sin, whether in their own hearts or in the hearts of others. *Hoi praeis* refers to those who possess not mere humility, which is a very uncertain quality and itself often becomes an object of pride, but that positive submission of the will to God which is again and again enjoined in all the Scriptures. The consciousness, the emotions, and the will, in other words all the elements which go to constitute human personality, are then laid under tribute in these first Beatitudes.¹

Passing over now ver. 6, the special function of which in connection with the statement of the theme has already been pointed out, the fifth, sixth, and seventh Beatitudes may be said, briefly, to pronounce blessing upon the particular kinds of righteousness springing from the conditions of mind and heart described in the first, second, and third. Thus, those who are most conscious of their own spiritual destitution will be most merciful to others who are suffering from similar destitution. Those who mourn most for their sins, if their mourning is sincere, are most likely to purge themselves from sin and be pure in the sight of God. Those who have learned to subject their own wills will be best qualified to teach others to hold their wills in subjection, — which is the chief condition of peace.²

The first seven Beatitudes, then (ver. 3–9), pronounce blessing or happiness on certain qualities of the mind and heart, or, more specifically, of the consciousness, the emotions, and the will, and upon certain exercises of these qualities. In connection with them have been introduced two terms of

¹ The present order of ver. 4, 5, seems to be accepted by the general consensus of scholarship.

² This arrangement of the Beatitudes is substantially the same as Stier's.

the general theme, namely, "righteousness" and "the kingdom of heaven." In ver. 10-12 is introduced a third element, which, while not distinctively developed at any point in the discourse, is yet tacitly assumed throughout, and at times insisted upon with great energy and with really sublime authority, namely, the identity of the righteousness of the kingdom with loyalty to Jesus himself. To do this three assertions are made in the form of beatitudes. The first (ver. 10) is transitional and also serves to unite the two terms "righteousness" and "the kingdom of heaven," as already indicated; the second identifies righteousness with loyalty to the person of Christ (for, according to the laws of Hebrew parallelism, the *heneken emou* of ver. 11 must be understood as equivalent in meaning to the *hen. dik.* of ver. 10); and the third declares with special emphasis (the *makarioi* of the preceding Beatitudes being replaced with *chairete kai agalliasthe*) the harmony of the righteousness which Christ comes to set up with the divine economy of the Old Testament (*houtos* = not "in such degree," but "on such grounds," "on the grounds of a similar righteousness").¹

These closing verses of the Beatitudes (ver. 11, 12) are worthy of especial attention from the homiletical point of view, because of the personal element revealed in them. Teachers of homiletics have much to say about the importance of personality in preaching. Just what is meant by the

¹ Much has been written as to the question of the number of the Beatitudes, some reckoning them at seven, some at eight, some at nine, and some at ten. But there being several different kinds of Beatitudes, they ought not to be classed together as if they were all of the same kind. The meaning is determinative. Verse 12 is just as much a Beatitude as ver. 11, although it has not the form. And, as has been pointed out above, ver. 10-12 are manifestly of a different character from ver. 3-9. Again, ver. 3-5 are different from ver. 7-9, and ver. 6 is different from any of the rest.

term is difficult to define. Probably the same thing is intended as was well described by Vinet under the head of "authority."¹ This writer defines authority as the "consciousness and the exercise of the right to be obeyed." He regards it as before everything essential in preaching, and lays down certain conditions for its exercise. In the case of the Sermon on the Mount there can be no doubt that the consciousness of authority, as manifested not only in these verses but throughout the discourse, accounts in no small degree for the sublimity and power which have ever been recognized as regnant in it.

MATTHEW V. 13-16.

Paul's sermon on Mars' Hill has often been commended for the masterly address it displays, the marvelous skill and adroitness of the speaker in approaching his audience. This passage in the Sermon on the Mount is deserving of no less praise. To the preacher the manner of it is really superb. The Jews of Christ's day—and it must be borne in mind that the people to whom Jesus was speaking, not excepting his disciples, were still Jews and still had the Jewish outlook

¹Vinet: "Authority is, in general, the right to be believed or obeyed, the right to require confidence or obedience. But the word *Authority*, denotes also the consciousness and exercise of this right." The conditions which Vinet lays down for the exercise of authority are as follows:—"1. That the preacher speak in the name of God, and as to the things of God have no wish to know anything except what he has learnt from God himself. 2. To the authority of God's testimony he must unite that which springs from his own inner experience. 3. The external life of the preacher must conform to his words. 4. He must be seen to be the first to bow his shoulder to the burden he puts upon others. 5. He must be free from subserviency to men, must not be overawed by them nor tremble before them. 6. He must give evidence that he loves those over whom his word has command." It may be pointed out that these conditions were more than met not only in the present instance, but throughout the life of Christ.

— were notoriously conscious of their divinely appointed mission in the world. They regarded themselves as a preserving and illuminating element amid its corruption and darkness. To be the salt of the earth and the light of the world would be their natural claim. It would be their boast that their religion, like their chief city, set on a hill, could not be hid, and that as a people they were the express glory of God. Nor did Jesus intend at this time to controvert this claim. He rather approves it. His purpose was, as he said, not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfill, and he could not fulfill the law and at the same time reject the Jewish people, for that would have been to disregard, and, in fact, to destroy, the prophets, for it was chiefly on the words of the prophets that the claim of the people was built, and the law and the prophets were so indissolubly united that to destroy the one would have been to destroy the other. And although there is no further reference in the Sermon to the mission of the Jews as a people, yet this is probably the real reason for the use of the words “or the prophets” in ver. 17, over the significance of which there has been much discussion. What attitude Jesus and the apostles took toward Judaism at a later time and what led to the change, does not concern this inquiry. In the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus, accepting the people at their own valuation, — which is indispensable for a successful approach to any audience, — pursues a line of thought which may be paraphrased as follows:—You say you are the salt of the earth. Granted, but if the salt have lost its savor, as you are inwardly conscious that it has to a great degree, how hopeless is the situation, for salt cannot be seasoned, but is only fit to be cast out, rejected, as you are in danger of being rejected. You claim to be the light of the world. Granted, but, if so, remember that that

sets you the more surely in every one's eye so that you cannot be hid, and your shame will be the greater if you fail of accomplishing your high mission. And indeed it is for no less a purpose than that of letting His glory be known in the world that God has chosen you and set you on high among the peoples. See, then, that you let your good works be to the praise of your heavenly Father.¹

¹This is not the commonly accepted interpretation of this passage. Many of the earlier writers held that it applies exclusively to apostles and ministers of the word. Salmero (T. v. tract. 27), as quoted by Tholuck, even says, *sal ipsum, videlicet Prælatos, ut tales, minime doceri neque corrigi, quia quatenus tales sunt, ut apostoli et summi pontifices, haud saliantur*. Luther, Bucer, and Chemnitz make out that what is here spoken is especially suited to the clergy, *proprie de officio ministerii*. Tholuck himself says, "Undoubtedly the principal reference is to those whose vocation it is to season and illuminate the world: in so far, however, as all Christians have part in the universal priesthood, they all have part likewise, in a limited degree, in this vocation." More recent writers almost without exception (some find here only stray *logia* and so attempt no interpretation) regard these words as addressed to the listening disciples as already essentially Christians. Thus Meyer: "The course of thought: The more important and influential your destined calling is, all the less ought you to allow yourselves to be dispirited and to become faithless to your calling through indignities and persecutions; you are the *salt* and the *light*." Morison: "The point of transition from the exhibition of their [the disciples'] peculiar bliss to the exhibition of their peculiar mission is found in the correspondence of their position to that of the prophets of old. What the prophets were to Israel in ancient times, that Christians in modern times are to be to the whole of mankind." Allen: "Since salt may become useless for household purposes, and be thrown out of doors, so the disciples should beware lest they lose their essentially Christian character." Plummer: "Perhaps the connecting thought is, that Christians, like the Prophets who saved Israel from corruption, must be ready to suffer persecution. . . . But they must beware lest, instead of preserving others, they themselves become tainted with rottenness." Votaw: "The connection of these words with those which precede is close. Men of such character and conduct as Matt. v. 3-9 has described will assuredly meet with opposition and calumny, Matt. v. 10-12, but they must not on this account

From the homiletical point of view the function of this paragraph in the Sermon on the Mount is not far to seek. The purpose of the Sermon as a whole is to call men, the people of Christ's own time, to repentance. The theme of the Sermon has already been set forth as the righteousness demanded for citizenship in the kingdom of heaven. The next thing in order in a well-arranged, carefully-thought-out discourse would be to point out the relevancy of this theme to the occasion, that is, to the persons present. The intention of this section is, then, to bring to the minds of the auditors the religious conditions existing in their midst and to challenge them to produce the rightful fruits of their own system into hiding — rather must they stand forth, endure persecution, and uphold the Gospel standard in the world, Matt. v. 13-16."

Against this view may be urged the following considerations: — (1) In the Beatitudes as given in Matthew neither the hearers in general nor the disciples in particular are identified with the citizens of the kingdom, for it is not until ver. 11 that the second person is used, and then in a conditional connection only. In Luke's account the second person is used throughout the Beatitudes, to be sure, but the idea of the kingdom is so little developed in that account that no criterion is afforded for the Sermon as given in Matthew. (2) The potential second person having been used in ver. 11, 12, the emphatic *hymets* seems out of place here, unless some special reference is intended. (3) The connection of thought between this passage and the preceding one, as given for instance in the comments quoted above,— which are thoroughly representative,— seems to make this passage neither a good advance on what has gone before, nor a suitable step to what comes after. (4) Savorless salt, a city set on a hill yet inglorious, a lamp hidden under a bushel, are figures of speech which seem scarcely appropriate to apply to the poor in spirit, to those who mourn, to the meek. (5) From this point on throughout the remainder of chap. v., as at ver. 18, 20, 21, 27, 33, 38, and especially at ver. 47, the second person is used of the hearers not as already citizens of the kingdom of heaven but, as Jews still needing much to enable them to attain it. (6) Elsewhere in the Sermon little or no emphasis is placed on the idea that the citizens of the kingdom are to be the salt of the earth and influence the world. Here as Jews they are commanded to let their light shine that men may see their good works, but in chap. vi. 1 the citizens of the kingdom

tem. Later on he will proceed to show, by the high standards he himself sets up, how empty their claims are; but here he takes those claims at their face value, and calls upon his hearers to substantiate those claims by means of works which shall cause men to glorify the heavenly Father. There is no need to trace the connection of thought here, as some have laboriously sought to do. There has been suggestive preparation for the paragraph, to be sure, yet rather by way of contrast than of comparison, in the amazing array of characteristics set forth as the determining traits required by the new standard of righteousness, but of direct connection there is none, and need be none.

are not to do their righteousness before men to be seen of them. The whole discourse has in view rather the conditions requisite for the attainment of righteousness than the effect of that righteousness on the world. (7) A warning to the citizens of the kingdom seems out of place in this part of the discourse. It should rather come near the end along with the other warnings which are properly found there. (8) Jesus was not one to adopt the too common modern practice of preaching against people who were not in his audience. If he insists upon a righteousness deeper than that of the scribes and Pharisees, it is because he has before him those who have hitherto considered the latter type of righteousness sufficient. If he charges men not to do their good works before others to be seen of them, it is because he has before him those who are accustomed to virtues which show off best in the sight of men. If he urges the importance of seeking before all else the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, it is because among those listening to his words are those who have been giving their chief attention and thought to seeking for treasures on earth. And if here he sounds out a most solemn warning to those who prefer sanctity without possessing the real savor of true piety, and a most solemn charge so to let the light of divine truth shine through the life that men may glorify the Father in heaven, it is because the audience before him knows only too well what it is to be as savorless salt. This is not to say that these words of Christ's have no application to Christians of the present day. They have a powerful application. But the exceeding seasonableness of the warning against a savorless Christianity should not lead to the original reference to a savorless Judaism being obscured.

MATTHEW V. 17-48.

In presenting himself before the Jewish people as the teacher of a righteousness different from that commonly esteemed and practiced among them as having been handed down from Moses, it was manifestly necessary, first of all, that Jesus should make clear the relationship of this righteousness to the ancient law. This he does with great vigor and force in the opening verses of this section by declaring that the righteousness which he has come to inaugurate fulfills, not abrogates, the law of Moses (ver. 17), for, first, the law is permanent, it cannot pass away (ver. 18); second, so far is the new righteousness from abrogating the old law that greatness in the kingdom of heaven will even be dependent on keeping and teaching the latter (ver. 19); third, no one can even enter the kingdom of heaven unless he has a righteousness surpassing that attained by the best reputed exponents of the law, the scribes and Pharisees (ver. 20).

These verses are important as introducing the rest of the section (ver. 21-48), which is evidently intended to explain and illustrate the way in which Christ fulfilled the law. But some commentators think that ver. 18, 19, and especially the word *plērōsai* as used here, are inconsistent with ver. 21-48, and in fact with the general tenor of the Sermon as a whole. Thus Allen says (International Crit. Com., Matthew, *in loc.*), "The attitude to the law here described is inconsistent with the general tenor of the Sermon. Verses 21-48 . . . describe a fulfillment which consists in a penetrating insight into the true moral principles underlying the enactments of the Mosaic code, . . . Fulfillment in this sense is something very different from the fulfillment which rests upon the idea of the permanent authority of the least commandment of the law (cf. ver. 19). It seems probable, therefore, that ver. 18, 19

did not originally belong to the Sermon, but have been placed here by the editor, who has thus given to *plērōsai* (= to bring into clear light the true scope and meaning) a sense (viz. to reaffirm and carry out in detail) which is foreign to the general tenor of the Sermon." He adds that "Christ is here represented as speaking in the spirit of Alexandrine and Rabbinical Judaism." Bacon (*Sermon on the Mount*, pp. 14, 15) seems to concede the view that Matthew shows certain legal tendencies. He has "still somewhat to learn of Christ from Paul." On this ground ver. 18 is to be referred to another connection.

Is then the Sermon so inconsistent with itself? Whether or not our evangelist "still has somewhat to learn of Christ from Paul" does not concern the present inquiry. That belongs to the history of doctrine within the New Testament. Suffice it to say, that, so far is any seeming legalism in the Sermon from showing the influence of neo-legalism on the early church and so on the evangelist, as is supposed by these scholars, that we have here rather an evidence of the keen historical sense of the evangelist. Jesus could not at this time baldly proclaim what later became the ground for Pauline anti-legalism. With great multitudes following him, among whom was doubtless a rabble element, there was imminent danger that the religious movement which he was leading would degenerate into libertinism. In order to avert any such catastrophe Jesus was obliged to affirm again the old law. This he does in ver. 21-48 by relieving it of the Jewish casuistical emendations which had been allowed to grow up around it and sap its power, by restoring to it its original authority and incisiveness, and by laying down certain principles of righteousness which far transcended the law in its literal form and thus more than met its demands. And this

accords fully with the use of the word *plērōsai* in ver. 17, as contrasted with the antithetical *katalusai*. The meaning of the latter word is well represented in English by the expression "to let down," that is, to relax a rule or law. Contrariwise *plērōsai* should mean "to hold up, to tighten, to make taut or tense." But this was as far as possible from Alexandrian and Rabbinical legalism, and in fact was a fitting preparation for Pauline anti-legalism.

As for the connection of thought in ver. 17-20 to which commentators have taken exception, it is hard to see how it could be closer or more strictly consecutive. The postulate that Jesus has come not to destroy but to establish the law and the prophets, and its supporting propositions, namely, that the law cannot pass away, that the new righteousness is a carrying out of the old ideals, and that no one can even enter upon the new estate unless he has to start out with a righteousness beyond that which was even conceived under the old *régime*, are beyond criticism. The three propositions do not in any way overlap one another, nor can their order be changed without marring the symmetry of the whole; and, as to exhausting the subject, there is absolutely nothing more that can be said, — which things are the test of accuracy in the concatenation of thought in any statement.

Verses 21-48 contain a series of illustrations of the way in which Jesus "fulfills" the law of Moses. He fulfills the law against murder by placing anger on the same plane with murder and by enjoining on the citizen of the kingdom the utmost assiduity in seeking reconciliation with an adversary. He fulfills the law against adultery by forbidding the lustful look; and that restricting wanton divorce, by prohibiting divorce altogether, except on the ground of fornication. Similarly, he fulfills the laws placing a restraint upon swearing and re-

venge by inculcating strict sobriety in speech and generosity in conduct, and he restores to its original intention the law of love to one's neighbor which had been so grossly perverted by the Pharisees.

In taking up the law which has been at once most universally recognized among men as to its letter and violated as to its spirit, namely, that against murder, Jesus first quotes the Mosaic enactment, and, following that, the comment of the Pharisees that whoever should violate this law would be in danger of judgment at the hands of the local court, which, according to Deut. xvi. 18, was to be found in every town of importance. This comment appears on the surface to be not so much mischievous as commonplace. But Jesus immediately gives utterance to that which makes it seem probable that it was not more innocent than other Rabbinical emendations cited in this chapter. For the tendency of all Rabbinical comment seems to have been to relax the requirements of the law in a way to give rein to human passion; and so, while these words, "Whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment," contain a traditional addition which seems to Meyer to be "not alien to the law," they may have been utterly subversive of its teachings by ignoring God's jurisdiction in human affairs, or even by being actually intended to imply that, while the murderer stood in danger of judgment by the local court alluded to above, there was no higher, no divine tribunal to which he was liable. This may seem like almost incredible perverseness on the part of the Jewish rabbis, but that they were capable of just such outrageous interpretations of the law is to be inferred from the terrible denunciations of Pharisees and scribes contained, for instance, in Mark vii. 5-13; and on no other supposition is it easy to account for the intense vehemence of the Lord, who here goes on immediately

with threefold repetition (Matt. v. 22) to affirm the imminence of divine judgment. For there seems little doubt that, as Meyer again says, — he does not appear to grasp the full significance of the remark himself, or at least of its bearing upon the matter in hand, which apparently has not suggested itself to him, — “*krisis, sunedrion, ge-enna* illustrate different degrees of culpability before God (for *krisis* and *sunedrion* are also analogical representations of divine, although temporal penal judgment), down to the everlasting damnation.” If Jesus here is so strenuous in laying emphasis on the divine retribution that is sure to follow upon anger, it cannot be simply for the purpose of making petty distinctions between different degrees or expressions of anger, but rather for the purpose of asserting the reality of the divine judgment itself.¹

This thought of the imminence of the divine judgment forms the connecting link between ver. 22 and 23, for, in entire consistency with the tendency of the Jews to nullify the commands of the law while professing the utmost reverence for them, was evidently the further tendency in their worship of God to set him afar off, and, while seeming to exalt him as the high and holy one, really ignore him as a factor in their daily concerns. To such an extent was this carried that morals and religion were to no small degree divorced.

¹ Although Meyer is right in making *krisis, sunedrion, and ge-enna* equally representations of divine judgment, there seems to be little ground for his making the first and second refer to temporal punishment, as in the quotation given above, and the third to eternal. It is difficult to discover any special gradation in the meaning of the opprobrious epithets *Raka* and *Môre*, or any special degree of sinfulness in saying them over being angry with a brother which would justify the supposed gradation in the punishments threatened; and it is probable that no gradation is intended, and that the threefold form is adopted for the sake of emphasis.

and to be engaged in religious exercises was considered quite a sufficient excuse for disregarding other duties even of the most solemn and obligatory kind. (Cf. the rule of Corban in accordance with which anything which was declared devoted to God was considered exempt from human claims such as those of father and mother.) So that the remark of Bengel in connection with ver. 23 that "The recollection of offences comes up in the midst of sacred things rather than in the noise of business," is inappropriate here.¹ While just enough as a comment wherever there is sincere worship of God, and doubtless true enough as applied to the few genuinely religious souls of Christ's day, as regards those against whom Jesus was inveighing, they would have no applicability. So far from the recollection of offenses coming up in the midst of sacred things more easily than elsewhere, or, if they came up, receiving especial thought or attention there, the fact of being engaged in the performance of religious observances would be considered as an amply sufficient justification for disregarding such matters.

Verses 25, 26, are confessedly difficult. To give to the language what Broadus likes to call "the simple, natural sense" of merely setting forth the duty of adjusting personal difficulties with what speed one may (Broadus himself, Chrys., Theoph., Euthym., Jerome, Zwingli, Calvin, Gill) is opposed to the context (ver. 21-24) and especially to the stern solemnity of ver. 26 itself. If Jesus had meant to say merely that no one who, for failure to meet a momentary obligation, had been sentenced to imprisonment by a human judge, would

¹ Equally inappropriate with the remark of Bengel cited above is that of Flacius, "He wishes the reason of moral things to be esteemed first, of ceremonial things second." No distinction between moral and ceremonial things is intended. The thought is rather that of man's accountability to God in all the affairs of life.

be discharged until he had paid the last farthing, his words would have been both trivial and untrue. On the other hand, to understand the language, with most commentators, as referring allegorically to the necessity of being reconciled to God lest he cast one into the perpetual imprisonment of perdition, requires a sudden change and resulting confusion in the terms of the metaphor introduced above at ver. 22, God instead of the offended brother becoming the plaintiff, although still retaining his position as judge. Thus Allen:—“Verses 25–26 are clearly a warning against the risk of appearing before God at the judgment day unreconciled to Him. He is alike Prosecutor and Judge and executor of judgment.” It is much better with Meyer, in part, to find here a continuation of the thought contained in ver. 21–24. According to this interpretation the “adversary” is the offended brother of ver. 23 who has access to God the judge as well as the one who committed the offense, and the practice of human courts which in Christ’s day allowed the defendant to settle disputes with the plaintiff on any terms while they were on the way to the tribunal but required the matter to go according to law after that was reached, is allegorically transferred to the court of heaven. As it is the part of common prudence to make terms with an adversary “out” of human courts, so it is the part of a higher wisdom to seek reconciliation with an offended brother “out” of God’s court, lest the brother finally bring suit and one be cast into perdition. (Cf. Deut. xv. 9 for a somewhat similar thought.) With this understanding of the passage not only is the figure of a judgment contained in ver. 22 preserved without a change in its component parts, but a most solemn and, to the Jew, most startling reason is given for the exhortation contained in ver. 23, 24. It is as if Jesus had said, ‘Leave thy gift before the altar, and be at

peace with thy brother speedily, lest the very altar become a judgment seat before which thou shalt be arraigned.'

If now the interpretation of ver. 22-26 as given above is correct, the connection of thought is as follows:—'Whoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of judgment, and that a divine, an eternal judgment (ver. 22). So imminent is this judgment that one should even leave the altar to seek reconciliation with a brother who has been offended in any way (ver. 23, 24). For, far from religious observances placating God and turning aside his judgment, the very altar may become a tribunal before which one will be arraigned' (ver. 25, 26).

After the law against murder Jesus takes up the law which, next to that, has been most universally recognized among men, namely, that against adultery. He first, as in the former instance, declares the breach against this law to consist not merely in the outward act, but in the inner thought (ver. 28). Next he shows the importance of using even the most extreme measures, if necessary, to prevent the rise of the lustful impulse; here again, as in the preceding example, declaring the imminence of the divine judgment (ver. 29-30). The relevance of the words immediately following is less generally conceded. Not a few scholars profess to find ver. 31, 32, out of place here. Thus Köstlin and Holtzmann assert that, if Jesus had delivered this declaration in the connection given here, the later discussion regarding divorce in chap. xix. could not have taken place. Olshausen, Bleek, Hilgenfeld, and Ritschl substantially agree in making this a non-original appendix to what preceded. But, whether or not one is disposed to accept the historicity of the account in chap. xix., there seems to be nothing here of the nature of an appendix, for, in the law which permitted divorce, there was evidently

that which, left to Rabbinical explanations, had in effect completely undermined the Seventh Commandment and thrown wide open the floodgates of lust, so that these verses are indispensable to the complete setting forth of Christ's idea regarding sexual morality. In fact, without ver. 31 and 32, ver. 27 and 28 would be null and void.

Another objection raised not only to ver. 31, 32, but also to all the three remaining constructions which Jesus in this chapter puts upon the ancient enactments, is that there is found here no longer a fulfillment, but a virtual abrogation, of the Mosaic law. But one fundamental requirement of homiletics — and it applies equally to all well-constructed discourse — is that there must be progress as well as unity. This is a more relentless requirement than many are disposed to think. A mere repetition of the same principle as applied to various and sundry Mosaic enactments, such as some scholars would have had the writer of the Gospel put into the mouth of Jesus here, would have resulted in a series of rules as lifeless and devoid of power as the casuistical precepts and hair-splitting refinements of the Jewish rabbis themselves. If Jesus had nothing more to say than he had already said potentially, if from ver. 31 on he intended to "fulfill" the law of Moses merely by applying to other statutes the same principle he had applied above to the law on murder, he should have stopped. A mere repetition of the same principle with new examples would have justified no such elaboration as is to be found in ver. 31-48. A general assertion would have been enough.

But Jesus did not come to fulfill the law of Moses merely in the sense which might be inferred from ver. 21-30. He came to fulfill it by enjoining the practice of a holiness far beyond that contemplated in that law. Accordingly there be-

gins with ver. 31 a marked change in Christ's treatment of the law in general. In his exposition of the law on murder, although there is an immense advance on the law of Moses, Jesus does not, after all, go beyond a strict fulfilling of what may fairly be said to be already implicitly contained in that law. But his law on adultery, while starting out in the same way, by ultimately forbidding divorce, is already significant as opening the way for all the subsequent Christian ruling on the subject of the relations of husbands and wives. This was not an abrogation of the law of Moses, not even of that concerning divorce; for, after all, the permission to put away one's wife was certainly not a command to do so, and this very permission was qualified with such conditions and regulations as were calculated to restrict divorce. Rather the law of Christ here reaches at once that which the law of Moses aimed at but could not attain, and which would have been the requirement of that law had it not been prevented by the perverseness of the people to whom it was given, as explained in chap. xix. It is therefore more than a fulfilling of the mere letter of that law, — it is a fulfilling of its intent, a setting of it free from the entrammelments which a human environment had placed upon it, that it might stand forth in all its divine pristine perfection.

Christ's law on swearing is a still further advance upon the law of Moses. A fulfilling of that law in the sense in which the law on murder is fulfilled above would perhaps have demanded nothing more than that all oaths of whatever sort should be strictly performed. But, instead, Jesus forbids swearing. This again is in seeming conflict with the law of Moses, for to the casual reader Deut. vi. 13 seems distinctly to commend swearing, if not actually to enjoin it upon the pious Jew as a duty. Nevertheless, here again, Jesus is not abrogating the

law of Moses, but fulfilling it, for a more careful study of that law shows that its intent was to inculcate reverence for the name of Jehovah to the exclusion of every other god; while here the Lord teaches a still greater reverence in the recognition of the divine presence and power in everything, and so lays down his injunction to strict sobriety in speech. Yet it is to be observed that while there is here no abrogation of the law of Moses, there is on the other hand not so much a fulfilling of its intent as rather the introduction of a new and sublimely transcendent idea laid down as the basis of a new command.

But it is in Christ's law on revenge and on love to one's neighbor that his method of dealing with the Mosaic law comes out most clearly and reaches its complete development. While the commands to give to him that asks and to love one's enemies seem sufficiently startling, if considered as deductions from the laws of Moses cited in ver. 38 and 43, yet the most distinguishing, and to the Jew doubtless the most surprising, feature of ver. 38-48 is not so much in those commands, as in the promulgation of the great principle on which all true righteousness is to be based, the principle of likeness to the Father in heaven. Here the question of the abrogation or non-abrogation of the letter of a law, or even of its spirit and intent, ceases to be of interest except to mere quibblers. The law of Moses is indeed fulfilled, but it is much more than fulfilled,—it is transcended. It is a fulfillment which may be said to find some feeble parallel in that fulfillment which geniuses are sometimes said to give to the law of whatever arts they may be the exponents of, a fulfillment far surpassing those laws, seeming sometimes perhaps to ignore or even to defy them, and yet having always a certain subtle harmony with them, and seeming indeed to defy only because so far

outreaching them. These laws of Christ's may to the tyro seem to be contradictions of the laws of Moses. But, if so, it is only because they far transcend them. In rare passages the ancient law calls upon its people to be holy because their God is holy, but nowhere does it command them to be holy as He is holy. It is only Christ who makes of divine holiness a standard for the righteousness of men. It is He alone who dares to say, Ye therefore shall be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect.

If the purpose of preaching is to produce conviction, this section (ver. 17-48) was admirably adapted to the end in view. It is well worthy of the study of the homilist. The religious leaders among the Jews were constantly seeking to turn the popular tide against Jesus by making him appear to be at variance with the law. But here he effectively proves that they are the ones who are at variance with the law, having nullified it by their casuistical emendations, while he in his teaching was honoring the law by raising it to its true plane and giving to it its true meaning. At the same time he lays down certain ruling principles which were calculated to convince his hearers of sin, and are to this day of such universal application, that, in the entire range of Scripture, there is no passage which is more powerful to arouse the conscience of the individual, or more potent in keeping all Christendom keyed up to high ideals. These principles are nowhere expressly formulated, and they overlap one another in the argument, but they are easily discerned and form the underlying foundation of the whole argument. The first principle may be summarized as follows:—

Principle I. Sin in the heart is culpable before God as well as sin in the outer conduct.

This, it will be readily perceived, is the fundamental

assumption underlying the entire passage ver. 21-30 and brought out with great clearness in ver. 22, 28. No attempt is made to prove it. It is promulgated on the authority of the speaker himself. Doubtless it came to his hearers with startling forcefulness as contrasted with the teachings of their scribes, but there were many passages in their own Scriptures to substantiate it.

The second principle is equally important, although perhaps not quite so easy to trace. It may be stated as follows:—

Principle II. The consciousness of the presence of God and of our accountability to him in all things is to be the dominating influence in our lives and determine all our conduct (see ver. 23-26, 29, 30, 34-36).

As has already been pointed out, the tendency of Jewish casuistry was to divorce morals from religion and, in fact, to make religion a cloak or an excuse for immorality. Even the law against murder was so interpreted as to remove fear of divine judgment. The Mosaic permission of divorce, instead of being a restraint on sexual license as originally intended, was used to give easy excuse for immorality. Similarly the laws about swearing, incredible as it may seem, were so interpreted, as is evident from Matt. xxiii. 16-22, that the most solemn oaths were made to lie by. Jesus sweeps away all these subterfuges by his truly astounding intimation that the very altar may become a judgment seat, that sins of the least member may bring the entire body to hell, and that insobriety of speech may be blasphemy.

A third principle comes out clearly from ver. 45 on and may be stated as follows:—

Principle III. Divine perfection is the true standard of righteousness in the kingdom.

The subject of the section ver. 21-48, which is, The right-

eousness of the kingdom does not abrogate but fulfills the law of Moses, is now exhausted. There is nothing more to say. Other laws might be adduced, restated, and illustrated, other principles formulated, but beyond this one final, sufficient, and universal law of righteousness it is impossible to go.

MATTHEW VI. 1-18.

Having set forth the relations between the righteousness which he has come to inaugurate and the law of Moses, Jesus now goes on, in a brief but highly significant passage, to show that, still in contrast with the spirit of Pharisaism, they who would be citizens of the kingdom of heaven must exercise themselves to please God rather than to win glory from men (ver. 1). Here again, as in v. 17-48, he lays down certain general principles of startling originality. In illustrating these principles he chooses as examples certain observances, namely, alms-giving (ver. 2-4), prayer (ver. 5-15), and fasting (ver. 16-18), which have generally been recognized as pertaining especially to religion, but at that time were not uncommonly practiced for the purpose of getting glory from men.

The chief problem of the passage is found in ver. 7-15, which many commentators (Schmiedel, Weizsäcker, Weiss, and most recent writers) regard as an interpolation disturbing the connection of thought. Thus Bacon (*Sermon on the Mount*, p. 146) thinks that both "the symmetry of the antitheses," that is, the antitheses between "the righteousness" (which he aptly paraphrases "acts of piety") of the hypocrites on the one hand and of citizens of the kingdom on the other, in alms-giving, prayer, and fasting, and "the integrity of the thought, which," he says, "forbids digressions into general instruction on how to pray acceptably," are strongly opposed to their presence here. He accordingly assigns ver.

7, 9-13 to the Lucan discourse on prayer (Luke xi. 1-13) (ver. 7, however, which is very important, has no parallel in Luke), holding that that offers the more probable setting; rejects ver. 8=vi. 32 as being redactional; and removes ver. 14, 15, to the conclusion of the parable on forgiveness (Matt. xviii. 21-35).

As has been pointed out elsewhere, this inquiry is not concerned with questions of the higher criticism, such as how the Model Prayer comes to appear in Matthew and Luke in different historical connections,¹ but solely with the integrity of the Sermon as given in Matthew. As to "the symmetry fo the antitheses," too much weight should not be attached to mere symmetry of form, especially not to the disadvantage of symmetry of thought. Hebrew poetry, for instance, was built up on the symmetrical arrangement of words and phrases, yet every one knows that in the best examples symmetry of arrangement was often intentionally sacrificed for the sake of balance of thought. The main question, then, concerns the integrity and completeness of the thought as found here. Is this disturbed by the presence of ver. 7-15?

The very first word of the entire passage (vi. 1-18), the emphatic *prosechete*, should not be overlooked. It calls for heed, attention, thoughtfulness, on the part of those who would be citizens of the kingdom. Then are laid down, as has been said, certain principles of great originality and power, which may be summarized as follows:—

¹ Bacon expresses fine scorn for those who have the temerity to suggest that the Model Prayer may have been taught by Jesus on more than one occasion. But there seems no reason for thinking that so simple a prayer as this may not have been taught in substantially the same form, during a ministry of two or three years, half a dozen times to different groups of people, or even to the same people on different occasions.

Principle I. The quality of piety is determined by its motives.

Principle II. Acts of piety done to be seen of men have their reward here and now (in being seen), but there is nothing further to be expected.

Principle III. In order that acts of piety may receive a reward from the heavenly Father, they must be done in such a way as to be seen of Him, that is, in secret.

In the three examples in connection with which these principles are laid down there is a certain progression in hypocrisy. In the first, that of alms-giving, those who are denounced actually do give alms,—their mistake is simply that they do so ostentatiously. In the second, that of prayer, not only are they ostentatious, but they pray and do not pray. Their prayers are not real prayers, but are mere babblings of words. Yet they do not deliberately deceive. In the third, that of fasting, they not only make their fasting ostentatious, but they contrive to appear to be fasting more strenuously than is really the case, or they may even make themselves appear to fast when they are not fasting at all.

This progression is by no means accidental. It was undoubtedly intentional and deliberate. But in order to bring it out clearly, especially in the second member (ver. 7),—and indeed all the rest of the passage to ver. 15 (ver. 14, 15, being an explanation of ver. 12),—is indispensable, for the whole point of *battalogēsēte*, which is explained by *en tē polulogia*, is just that of prayers which are mere babblings of words with multitudinous repetitions, senseless, thoughtless prayers without true reverence, and in contrast with this idle verbosity is placed the simplicity, directness, and sweet filial devotion, the thoughtful adoration, of the Model Prayer. Here is perceived the significance of that first word of the section (*prosechete*, ver. 1, which means, with *ton noun*

understood, "to turn the mind to, attend to, be attentive" [Thayer]). No one can be truly pious without being attentive. In the babbling of prayers, which was evidently frequent among the religious leaders of Christ's day and which he recognizes as a reflex of Gentile influence,—as it is in fact true of heathen prayers down to the present time,—there could be no appreciative realization of things, no sense of God's presence and of his personal, fatherly concern, such as there must be if the Model Prayer is uttered with any perception whatever of its true meaning.

How well suited the Model Prayer itself is in its relation to the Sermon as a whole becomes evident on a consideration of its individual contents. The invocation, "Our Father who art in heaven," is the special designation of God found throughout the Sermon in Matthew and nowhere else in the New Testament. The first petition, "Hallowed be thy name," is in marked contrast to the terrible and blighting desecration of God occasioned by the gross casuistical emendations of the law which Jesus so strongly denounced in v. 17-48. Who shall say that the words, "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so on earth," are out of place in a sermon whose very theme is the righteousness of the kingdom, and whose course is largely taken up with showing that this righteousness consists in likeness to God? Verse 12 and its interpretation (ver. 14, 15), which Bacon would relegate to the far-off eighteenth chapter, are surely an echo of v. 43-47. Verses 11, 13, only have no clear connection with the preceding contents of the Sermon, but are general petitions voicing the natural desires of every true child of God, and may be regarded as anticipatory of vi. 26-32; vii. 13-27. Whether the Model Prayer has a suitable setting in Luke or not, it is manifestly not out of place here.

Instead of ver. 7-15 being an interpolation and interrupting the course of thought in the section under consideration, it would seem, then, that they are indispensable to the proper development of the argument from ver. 1 on. To be sure a somewhat similar line of thought might have been carried out with reference to alms-giving and to fasting, for these acts of piety also require thoughtful attention, but that is to be understood, and it is especially with reference to prayer that the Lord's teaching has been of value.

Of the homiletical significance of this section (vi. 1-18) as a whole, it only remains to point out that it constitutes an advance on the preceding section and a preparation for the section which is to follow. In the preceding section (v. 17-48), Jesus has shown that he comes not to abrogate but to fulfill the law of Moses. Here he shows that the righteousness which he has come to establish must not only fulfill the law of Moses, but must be a righteousness of the heart seeking its reward from God and not from men. The very first word of the section (*prosechete*) has sounded a note which will ring out in full power in vi. 19 f., the necessity of heed. in fact of utter devotion, if one would be a citizen of the kingdom. The skill with which these three sections of the discourse are thus bound together is worthy of admiration. It may be added that so effective has been this particular section of the Sermon that hypocrisy in the forms here denounced is almost unknown among Christian people at the present time. Rather men have gone to the other extreme, and oftentimes hide their piety more than is meet.

MATTHEW VI. 19-VII. 11.

With a few erratic exceptions (Schmiedel, for instance), commentators show a greater or less degree of agreement as

to the meaning and connection of thought in the Sermon on the Mount up to Matt. vi. 18. It is from this point on that the greatest divergences arise. De Wette gives up all further idea of a fixed plan. Neander, Bleek, Weiss, regard vi. 9-34 as an irrelevant interpolation, and even Broadus terms it a partial digression. Schmiedel says a really good connection is found only within each of the following groups: vi. 25-34; vii. 1-5; vii. 7-11, not between these groups reciprocally, nor yet between them and the other sayings contained in these chapters.

As to vi. 19-33, scholars by no means succeed in ascribing to it a uniform topic. Comparison reveals either a variation between one of two themes, or a combination of both. Thus some announce as the subject of the section "Single-hearted devotion to God" (Broadus), or "Entire dedication of the heart to God" (Alford); others give "Against worldly-mindedness" (Henry), or "Spurious worldliness of the Pharisees in their righteousness; or, the Pharisees sharing the cares of the heathen" (Lange), or "Care about earthly things" (Meyer); while still others propose "Heavenly-mindedness and filial confidence" (Jamieson, Fausset, and Brown) or "Single-eyed service of God and simple trust in him enjoined" (Burton and Mathews). But an examination of the text quickly reveals the occasion of this confusion. The evident unity of thought existing between ver. 19-24, 33, has compelled scholars to ascribe them to a single section, and yet in ver. 25-32 there seems at a casual glance to be developed another theme, and according as the one or the other of these two themes has appeared to writers to be the predominant one, or both have seemed equally deserving of mention, has been the topic assigned.

Is there, then, no single theme to be consistently traced

from ver. 19 to ver. 33, or must ver. 33 be considered as merely an erratic reminiscence of ver. 19-24?

With ver. 19 begins a series of metaphors of remarkable suggestiveness and power. Up to and including ver. 24 there may easily be traced in them all, notwithstanding great differences in form, a certain unity. This unity is based on a series of sharp contrasts. First, there is the contrast between treasures laid up on earth and treasures laid up in heaven, with the remarkable characterization of the earth as being the sphere of destruction, "where moth and rust are corrupting" (present indicative, not subjunctive, "may corrupt"), and "where thieves are breaking through and stealing," and the verbs left without an object, as if to imply that not some but all treasures laid up on earth are constantly perishing; and, on the other hand, the characterization of heaven as being a place where treasures are now to be laid up incorruptibly. Following this is the significant warning and incentive that where the treasure is, there will be the heart also, — a warning not to lay up the treasure on earth, because, if placed there, it will become the center of a vortex to draw down with it, like a whirlpool, all the desires and all the powers of the mind and heart, — an incentive to lay up the treasure in heaven, because if placed there, it will become the center of a counter-vortex to draw up, like a whirlwind, all the hopes and aspirations, all the affections and powers, of the being. For to understand the words of Jesus here as referring solely or chiefly to wealth seems too narrow an interpretation. The sayings of Jesus elsewhere, and especially some of the parables, indicate that in his thought every one is possessed of incalculable wealth, and such wealth could only be the common, yet invaluable, treasures which all men have, namely, all that distinguishes man from the brute and makes him what he is.

Next comes the contrast between the single and the evil eye. Many commentators interpret this as referring to single-eyed devotion to God, but it seems more consistent with the context to refer it to single-eyedness in itself. As treasure may be laid up either on earth or in heaven, so the eye may be directed to either earth or heaven. This is the single eye. As contrasted with this, by the evil eye must be meant the eye which tries to encompass within its range of vision both earth and heaven, the result being a confusion worse than actual blindness. "The lamp of the body is the eye." As Allen remarks, "The idea here is the naïve one that the eye is the organ through which light has access to the whole body, and that there is a spiritual eye through which spiritual light enters and illuminates the entire personality." As a lamp placed in a dark room enables the members of the family each to do his or her proper work, so the eye among the members of the body enables each one to do its part as if it had a light all to itself. "If therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light." It may look upon things of earth alone, not at all on the things of heaven, but at least it will see them clearly, and the whole body will be full of light, will conduct itself intelligently, consistently with a definite purpose. "But if thine eye be evil," that is, if, as contrasted with the single eye, it sees things confusedly, mingling earth and heaven, "thy whole body shall be full of darkness," confusion will exist in all the members, and there will be no consistency in the walk and conduct. "If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness." If the heart, the mind's eye, that part of the spiritual nature which corresponds to the eye in the physical body, be divided, confused, then how great is the darkness!

Better a vision confined exclusively to earth than a vision vibrating between earth and heaven.

The teaching of this passage is, then, along the line of out-and-outness in seeking the things either of earth or of heaven. It is reinforced under another figure in ver. 24. "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon," — all of which is in entire harmony with numerous other passages of Scripture calling for undivided service. Thus Broadus well remarks in this connection, "The Israelites of Elijah's time did not avowedly renounce Jehovah, but tried to worship both him and Baal; and the prophet calls on them to decide which of the two is God, and follow him — to be one thing or the other." It is less displeasing to God to be cold towards him than to be merely lukewarm (Rev. iii. 15, 16).

Up to the close of ver. 24 are, then, developed two closely allied lines of thought, the latter a distinct advance upon the former, namely,—first, treasure should be laid up in heaven rather than on earth because it has power to draw the heart thither; and, second, the thoughts and affections should be directed to heaven alone, not to earth and heaven, because the double vision brings confusion,—the service of God and the service of Mammon are incompatible. Verse 25 continues the method of illustration begun at ver. 19 by a twofold contrast between life and body on the one hand, and food and clothing on the other hand. The natural inference would seem to be that the same topic is to be pursued and further developed. Yet here commentators almost without exception find what appears to them an entire change in the line of thought. The true significance of *ouchi . . . endum*. is missed. Chrysostom's comment, *ho toinun to meizon dous pōs to elat-*

ton ou dōsei, has simply been passed on without question. Even Meyer, who is so careful to note the precise logical significance of every connecting particle, makes no attempt to trace the line of thought here except to quote in a footnote this interpretation of the golden-mouthed orator, although the asyndetous character of the sentence seems of itself to challenge attention. Broadus makes no reference to Chrysostom by name, but gives his interpretation almost word for word, saying, "If God has given the greater, viz., life, the body, is he likely to withhold the less, viz., the food and the raiment?" But this is only to bring into the passage the supposed meaning of what Jesus goes on to say in ver. 26-32, and manifestly this is a wrong method of interpretation. The primary connection in any passage or in any sequence of thought must always be with what precedes, not with what follows. Otherwise connection ceases, and what should be one chain of thought becomes two. And this, as already explained, is what actually happens in the interpretation of many commentators, resulting in two varying topics for the section (ver. 19-33).

The real course of thought is simple enough. Meyer is mistaken when he says that Jesus desires his people to be "superior to all care whatsoever as to food, drink, etc." Nothing could be wider of the mark. The thought is not at all that citizens of the kingdom should be free from care while the rest of mankind is engaged in a struggle for existence, but that they should care for the right things, — which is a far higher consideration. "Therefore," because ye cannot serve both God and Mammon, because doubleness of vision is worse than blindness, "therefore I say unto you, Be not anxious for your life, [as to] what ye shall eat, or [as to] what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, [as to] what ye shall put on. Is not the *life* more than food, and the *body* than

raiment?" In other words, it is the life rather than the food that demands attention, and the food is to be considered only as conserving the life. It is the body rather than the raiment to which we should give thought, even diligent thought, in so far as it is necessary for conserving the well-being of life and body.

Taken literally, the significance of ver. 25 as a maxim of wisdom is sufficiently evident. There are those who give their first thought or attention to food for its own sake. They live to eat. There are others who give even much thought to food, yet not for its own sake, but for the sake of conserving the life. These eat to live. Similarly there are those who give their thought and attention to raiment for its own sake, who regard the body as something to hang clothes on, like the forms in front of furnishing stores. There are others who give thought to clothing, but not with a view to display but to suitably covering the body. These belong to that fortunately large class who regard the body as more than raiment.

Treasure, the eye as the lamp of the body, service of a master, have all been used as representative of greater things, and so here life, as over against food, and the body, as over against raiment, are used as illustrative of principles of far higher application. The thought is that the spiritual nature should be esteemed above everything that can minister to it, and its interests should be considered above all other interests. This is not to say that no attention should be given to other things. The citizen of the kingdom is still to be in the world, and he must have earthly relationships, earthly duties, and earthly responsibilities. But there are those who seek the things of earth and give their thought to matters temporal in and for their own sakes. Such do not obey the command of Christ. On the other hand, there are those who give

thought, and perhaps much thought, to things temporal, and yet are heeding the command of Christ, because they think of these things with a view to making them minister to things eternal. Such are the spiritually wise. Of such is the kingdom of heaven.¹

With the interpretation of ver. 19-25 here presented, the rest of the passage under consideration is in harmony. The theme of the section instead of being given at the beginning, as in previous sections (the theme of v. 17-48 being found in ver. 17, and that of vi. 1-18 in ver. 1), is gradually developed and not distinctly stated until ver. 33. As there found, it sets forth the supreme demand of the kingdom of heaven upon all the powers of the being, for *prōton* evidently means not "with priority in point of time," but "supremely," and to seek first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness is to put forth all the powers for its attainment. From this point on, that is, in ver. 26 f., the antithetical method of ver. 19-25 is discarded, and in a passage which has ever been greatly admired, Jesus, as in previous sections (v. 17-48; vi. 1-18), brings the whole argument into its proper relation to God. To give attention to life rather than to food, to the body rather than to raiment, or rather to the latter for the sake of the former, is the requirement of faith; for, first, to do the contrary is the practice of the Gentiles in their irreligion,—it is essentially irreligion,—second, your Father knows your need as well as you do or even better, and third, he can and will supply the lesser things in order that you may give heed to the greater.

¹ The interpretation here given makes needless all discussion as to the significance of *merimnate*. Many commentators adopting the usual interpretation have felt compelled to limit the meaning to *anxious care*. This, as Meyer declares, is entirely unwarrantable, and is seen to be unnecessary as soon as the passage is understood to teach care for right things and not indifference to everything.

It is usual to unite ver. 34 of chap. vi. with the preceding verses, as closing the line of thought commonly supposed to begin at ver. 25. But if this is the true connection, it seems to make freedom from care an end in itself, and to offer, as a reason for this freedom, additional to that of faith in the heavenly Father, the stoical consideration that it is folly to be anxious for the morrow, since the morrow will have its own care. Not only is this consideration a distinct and painfully abrupt descent from the high ground of faith in ver. 26-32, scarcely to be expected in such a connection and from such lips, but the teaching here is not easy to reconcile with the teaching there. In ver. 26-32 the faith demanded is absolute, immediate, and continuous, but here an easy inference is that, although one should not be anxious for the morrow, yet one may very well be anxious for to-day. As has been shown above, however, in ver. 26-32 freedom from anxiety is by no means set forth as an end in itself. It is only of value as affording an opportunity for giving undivided attention to seeking the kingdom of heaven. It seems better, therefore, to regard ver. 34 as the beginning of a new paragraph continuing the same thought along a somewhat different line. Chapter vi. 19-32 has set forth a closely reasoned line of argument to show why one should seek first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness; vi. 34-vii. 11 goes on now to show what is needful in order to attain success in this pursuit. Without a distinct break in the thought, but rather continuing the same general topic of care for the things of the world which has been pursued in vi. 26-32, Jesus shows how indispensable freedom from care is to the supreme search for the kingdom of heaven. The thought is, 'Since now you are to seek first and above all else the kingdom of heaven, even though you cannot be free from care because

of your trust in the heavenly Father, yet be free from it because you have no time for such distractions. Be not anxious for the morrow: for the morrow will be anxious for itself. Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof. You have enough to do to attend to the duties of to-day without concerning yourself as to what may happen to-morrow.'

Similarly the thought of vii. 1 f. is not so much that of freedom from censoriousness for its own sake as that of freedom from judging others, in order that the citizen of the kingdom may the better judge himself. First, there is given the startling declaration that, in judging others, so far from really possessing the superiority which it is natural to feel, he simply places himself in the very same position as the person condemned, and pronounces judgment upon himself. Then it is pointed out that judging others has the fatal tendency to make him oblivious of his own faults, and so incapable of righting them. Finally, the intimation is thrown out that, even if a brother needs correction, this can best be given after, not before, one has succeeded in correcting himself, should that happy time ever arrive. Then in the solemn words of ver. 6 the warning is given, still to those who are seeking first the kingdom of heaven, that they must on no account suffer their high purposes to be desecrated by unholy ambitions or brutish lusts, lest these be brought to nought and they themselves suffer destruction. Finally comes the exhortation, 'Think not that you can attain the righteousness of the kingdom by means of your own unaided efforts, but ask, seek, knock, and ye shall receive, ye shall find, it shall be opened unto you. For it is the one who asks that receives, the seeker that finds, the one who knocks to whom it is opened. And the Father who knows how to give good gifts to his children, will give you the kingdom.'

MATTHEW VII. 12-27.

The summit of the Sermon on the Mount has now been reached. The righteousness of the kingdom of heaven has been set forth as being the complete fulfillment of that righteousness which was the aim, albeit the futile aim, of the law of Moses. Its character as a righteousness which seeks not, and delights not in, the praise of men but of God, has been duly emphasized, and its supreme demand upon the heart and life has been inculcated. It now remains to summarize the whole and bring it home to the hearts of the hearers.

Ewald, Bleek, Holtzmann, and others think that the original position of ver. 12 was near the close of chap. v., and Meyer, who defends its present position, does so on the ground of its significance as a concluding sentence. Broadus goes into quite an elaborate argument to show that Jesus "does not here mean to say that the whole requirements of the Scriptures as to *all* duties are summed up in this rule, but their whole requirements as to duties to our *fellow men*." But is the Sermon on the Mount after all so weak? In spite of the accumulative force of precept, illustration, exhortation, and solemn warning in chaps. v. and vi. and the preceding portion of chap. vii., is it still necessary to explain that "it is a great mistake to suppose," on the ground of this saying, "that nothing is involved in love to God beyond love to our neighbor"? It is precisely to those who have received all the foregoing instruction, who have learned the full demand of the law of Christ on their hearts, who desire no longer the praise of men but of the heavenly Father, who are seeking the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness above all else, — it is to such as these, and to such alone, that these words of Jesus could be addressed as containing a summary of the law and the prophets. For such no qualifying phrase or expla-

nation need be added as a warning that beyond one's duties to one's fellow men there remains still a duty to God. The position of this verse in the Sermon is to be defended, not on the ground of its significance as a concluding sentence, but on the ground of the preparedness of the hearers to receive it. It is to those only who have heeded the previous instruction that this simple, yet sublime, summary of the law can be entrusted. For they alone, doing to others as they would that others should do to them, bring blessing and not cursing into the world. So that Broadus' comment is again superfluous, "It is here taken for granted that what one wishes others to do to him is something right, such a thing as he ought to wish." The Golden Rule, so-called, owes its position in the Sermon on the Mount not to its rhetorical or logical significance as a concluding sentence, but to moral and spiritual necessity.

Passing on now from ver. 12, Jesus proceeds to give utterance to those concluding exhortations which are to add practical effect to the whole. Necessarily, first of all, the exhortation to make sure of entering into life, with the word of forewarning, that the way of life is by no means easy, but must be sought with diligence. *Strive* (ver. 13, 14). Next, a caution, — having once entered upon life, think not that all is secure, but be constantly on guard against false prophets, deceptive teachings, illusive motives, all that presents at first a fair appearance, but whose fruit is death. *Beware* (ver. 15–20). Finally, the solemn declaration that entrance into the kingdom of heaven is conditioned not on professions of loyalty, nor even on marvelous achievements though wrought in the very realm of spirit and through the name of Christ, but on doing the will of the Father which is in heaven. *Obey* (ver. 21–23).

The way is now prepared for that closing comparison, — which is yet not a comparison (cf. Meyer *in loc.*), — in which it is declared that he who hears these words of Christ's and does them, not "is like" but "shall," in the great day of judgment, "be made like," that is, shall be demonstrated as a matter of fact to be like, a man who built his house upon the rock, where neither storm nor flood could shake it; and he that hears and does not, shall be made like a man who built his house upon the sand, and when storms and floods arose, it fell, and great was the fall thereof.

REVIEW AND SUMMARY.

If now the conclusions arrived at in the course of this inquiry be correct, a review of the Sermon on the Mount shows that it falls naturally into four principal divisions, namely: 1. An introduction (v. 3-12); 2. A challenge or summons (v. 13-16); 3. The main body of the discourse (v. 17-vii. 11); and 4. The summary and conclusion (vii. 12-27).

In the introduction, the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven is described as regards (1) its inner character (v. 3-5); (2) its effects upon its possessors (v. 6-9), and (3) its influence upon the world at large (v. 10-12).

In the summons, the Jewish auditors are taken at their own valuation spiritually as being the salt of the earth (but with the solemn warning that savorless salt is good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden under foot of men) (v. 13), and it is even added that such is their position among the peoples of the earth that they cannot be hid (v. 14), and that God had indeed chosen them for the very purpose that they might shine (v. 15).

The main body of the discourse falls under three heads, showing, respectively, that (1) the righteousness of the king-

dom fulfills, not abrogates, the law of Moses (v. 17-48); (2) all who profess this righteousness must seek the praise not of men but of God (vi. 1-18); and (3) the attainment of this righteousness makes supreme demands on the heart and life (vi. 19-vii. 11).

In introducing the first of these heads, three affirmations are made, namely, (a) the law is permanent, it cannot pass away (v. 18), (b) so far is the new righteousness from abrogating the old law that greatness in the kingdom of heaven will even be dependent on keeping and teaching the latter (v. 19), (c) no one can even enter the kingdom of heaven unless he has a righteousness surpassing that attained by the best reputed exponents of the old law (v. 20).

Following this are given five illustrations of the way in which the new righteousness fulfills the old laws. Yet these illustrations are given, not for their own sake, nor even for the sake of showing what the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven is, but rather for the sake of laying down certain great principles which form the basis of this righteousness, thus:—

Principle I. Sin in the heart is culpable before God as well as sin in the outer conduct.

Principle II. The consciousness of the presence of God and of our accountability to him in all things is to be the dominating influence in our lives and determine all our conduct.

Principle III. Divine perfection is the true standard of righteousness in the kingdom.

The second head in the main body of the discourse, namely, that the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven seeks the praise not of men but of God, is elaborated more briefly, but nevertheless with great solemnity and power, the three

illustrations given being again subordinate, as under the first head, to the enunciation of certain great principles. These illustrations concern (a) alms-giving (vi. 2-4), (b) prayer (vi. 5-15), (c) fasting (vi. 16-18). The principles laid down are:—

Principle I. The quality of piety is determined by its motive.

Principle II. Acts of piety done to be seen of men have their reward here and now (in being seen), but there is nothing further to be expected.

Principle III. In order that acts of piety may receive a reward from the heavenly Father, they must be done in such a way as to be seen of him, that is, in secret.

The third head in the main body of the discourse on the demands of the righteousness of the kingdom on the heart and life is developed at great length and with great richness of illustration. Here again, however, the illustrations are not of so much importance in themselves but as vehicles for the conveyance to the minds and hearts of the hearers of certain great principles. These principles constitute an argument to prove that one should seek first and before all else the righteousness of the kingdom of heaven. They are:—

Principle I. The affections and all the higher powers of the being will follow the direction of one's treasure. The only way to draw the heart to *heaven* is to place the *treasure* there (vi. 19-21).

Principle II. To seek the things both of heaven and of earth brings confusion. The divided vision means deeper darkness than does absolute blindness (vi. 22, 23).

Principle III. Really to seek the things both of heaven and of earth is impossible. Sooner or later it will be the one to the exclusion of the other. No man can serve two masters (vi. 24).

Principle IV. The things of earth and the things of heaven hold their true relationship one to the other only when the former minister to the latter (vi. 25).

Principle V. The supreme search for the righteousness of the kingdom is the requirement of faith (vi. 26-32).

Following this enunciation of principles come three exhortations:—

Since now you are to give yourself to the supreme search after righteousness, in order that you may not be hindered in this search,—

I. As to your relations to yourself, put away anxiety for the morrow (vi. 34).

II. As to your relations to your fellow men, judge not (vii. 1-5).

III. As to your relation to God, permit not the desecration of his holy gifts to you (vii. 6).

Finally, there is given the promise that those who ask, who seek, who knock, shall receive, shall find, shall see before them an open door into the kingdom (vii. 7-11).

In the summary and conclusion of the Sermon there is given (1) an epitome of the essential elements of the law (vii. 12); (2) from the lofty plane of the final judgment are pronounced three warnings (*a*) Strive (vii. 13, 14); (*b*) Beware (vii. 15-20); (*c*) Obey (vii. 21-23). (3) With sublime authority, yet with simple figure, is set forth the destiny of those who heed and of those who reject "these words of mine."

Meyer says, "The unity of the Sermon on the Mount is not that of a sermon in our sense of the word." May the reply not be ventured, that, if this be true, it is to the disadvantage of the modern sermon?