
A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

we still set upon this thing? Do you remember how in Bunyan the man with a stout countenance, looking at what it means and weighing all the difficulties of the spiritual life, went boldly to him with the book and pen and ink-horn, and, 'Set down my name, sir,' he demanded. For I have looked this whole thing in the face, and, cost me what it may, mean to have Christlikeness, and will. If we could look across his shoulder, whose name is it he is writing down, what new recruit is valiantly flinging in all that he has and is into the great adventure? Is it yours? Have you made up your mind, and set your teeth? Is your one answer to the long and trying story of the difficulties to be faced, the sacrifices to be made, the steady valour it requires—all that I know, have reckoned up, and am prepared to meet. But this I mean to have, cost what it may. Dare you? Will you? Do you?

Who compiled the Sermon on the Mount?

By the Reverend V. C. MacMunn, B.A., Eccleshall.

To many of us the view that the Sermon on the Mount is simply a compilation of St. Matthew's will always appear improbable on the face of it. It presupposes in the Evangelist or some predecessor a literary genius which they are not really likely to have possessed; added to which it is doubtful if any degree of such genius could properly explain the facts. The seeming interpolations are exceptional and incidental; fundamentally and essentially the Sermon is a unity, a coherent artistic whole. First come the Beatitudes, together with two sayings upon 'salt' and 'light' to apply the Beatitudes to the persons addressed. Now that the disciples have been characterized, Christ can define His attitude and theirs to the commandments of Scripture or the religious practices of contemporary Pharisaism. Once, however, Christ has urged His followers, in contradistinction from the Pharisees, to think solely of the Divine approval instead of seeking the good opinion of their fellows, it is a natural continuation of the same line of thought when He warns them against being prevented from putting God invariably first by worldly ambitions or anxieties. So far—and it is unnecessary to go further—the connexion is admirably maintained. Could so close a unity ever have resulted, in the words of Dr. Plummer, from stringing together scattered pearls? The process would seem to require an almost unlimited stock of aphorisms, whereas not very many sayings have actually come down to us, qualified by their intrinsic sublimity and beauty, to be regarded as genuine utterances of Christ; and the preservation even of these seems to be accounted for only if Christ had induced His disciples to learn them by heart. If other sayings were also memorized, why have they been lost to us? So far from the Evangelists having a great number of our Lord's maxims at command, they seem, on the contrary, to eke out an all too scanty store by inferior additions. Besides, what reason is there for thinking that Christ's teaching consisted solely of disconnected texts and not of statements dealing at some length with particular themes? The one theme, however, likely beyond all others to have invited consecutive development is precisely the theme of the Sermon—the qualifications for discipleship, or, as Dr. Stanton expresses it, 'the character of the heirs of the Kingdom.'

What, then, are the reasons which lead the great majority of scholars to believe that St. Matthew's Sermon is mainly the product of St. Matthew's literary skill? One objection, that the Sermon is not really a sermon, is not, as we have just seen, in effect a very serious one. The real question, of course, is whether our Lord, who preferred the oral teaching of His disciples to the writing of books, may not have drawn up a logical statement of His ethical demands which is not the less capable of being called a 'Disciple's Manual' because it was written, not on paper, but in human memories. Then there is the objection alluded to by Harnack: the Sermon in St. Matthew seems to imply a definite community or Church. The Gospels, however, contain several allusions to followers of our Lord other than the Twelve. 'They were many, and they followed him,' says St. Mark in his account of the call of Levi; and he describes our Lord as

selecting the Twelve from a larger group of adherents. At the very same scene, as we are told by St. Luke, a 'great multitude of disciples' were present to provide accordingly an auditory for the Sermon on the Plain. Nor did the disciples in question fall away, since the same Evangelist describes another 'multitude' of them as taking part in the Messianic entry. Wellhausen declares that in Mark 'disciple' always means follower in the most general sense, and Carter attributes precisely the same usage to 'Q.' In the absence of fuller information than, in fact, we possess, how can any one possibly be sure that Christ did not intend the general body of His followers to constitute in literal truth a community or Church? St. Matthew makes Him speak of the Church as the Kingdom; and where is the difficulty? The designation may even be an important clue, hinting that Christ identified His disciples in their corporate capacity with Daniel's 'Kingdom of the Saints of the Most High,' and provided them accordingly in the Sermon on the Mount with maxims which prescribe, not goodness, but perfection. And the same reference to Daniel would explain why the early Christians called themselves 'the Saints.' If our Lord, 'Pastor gregis' as well as 'Pastor pastorum,' actually established some sort of a Galilean community, for instance at the great gathering by the sea which is so emphasized by St. Mark and St. Luke, we can understand how later, at the time of His resurrection, there were more than five hundred 'brethren' to whom He could appear. To suppose that St. Matthew did these three several things—first, that he groundlessly made our Lord twice allude to the Ecclesia; secondly, that, still groundlessly, he made our Lord several times identify the Kingdom with the Church; thirdly, that in the Sermon on the Mount he put together a discourse in which subtly, delicately, yet really, the community or church is implied—is to attribute to the Evangelist extraordinary persistence and ingenuity without any adequate motive; and perhaps it is simpler, when all is said, to regard St. Matthew as preserving for us an authentic note which really distinguished our Lord's teaching, though St. Luke, for example, has failed to reproduce it.[1]

The mention of St. Luke takes us at once into the real heart of our subject. For, of course, the principal arguments for the compilation-view are derived from the comparison with St. Luke. We are told, for instance, that it was much more natural for St. Matthew to combine, than for St. Luke to separate, sayings which occurred together in a common source. This objection, however, as Harnack remarks, falls immediately to the ground when we turn to St. Luke to examine what his practice actually is, and find him presenting, in different places up and down his Gospel, sayings which form a group in Mt 10, and must have formed also a group in the source, since, even when he separates them, St. Luke presents them in St. Matthew's order. Then, again, we are told that St. Luke had no possible motive for detaching sayings from their original positions. But here, as before, St. Luke's practice refutes expectations which in themselves seem reasonable enough. It is universally acknowledged that in Lk 11^{33-36} two sayings on 'light,' and in Lk 16^{16-18} three sayings on 'the Law,' are grouped together arbitrarily; in both cases alike St. Luke, or his source, set sayings together irrespective of their proper context, on the principle of a commentary or index, because they seemed to illustrate one another or contained the same word.

It will be well, perhaps, to go somewhat carefully into the question how far such principles explain St. Luke's treatment of excerpts from the Sermon. There are three main passages from Mt 5 and 6 which St. Luke places in another setting.

First, there is the salt-saying (Lk 14^{35}). It is associated with sayings on cross-bearing and counting the cost; and the reason for the association is fairly obvious. St. Luke would seem to put the obscurer Salt-saying by the side of a distinct and definite utterance dealing with the same topic of the essential note of discipleship, in order that the latter may explain the former. Yet we are asked to accept St. Luke as evidence for the proper position of the salt-saying against St. Matthew, an absurdity which only becomes the greater when we note that St. Luke's reason for thinking that the

[1] See, however, Lk 6^{22} (allusions to persecution) 6^{46} ('Why call ye me Lord, Lord?'). For the rest our only authority for the actual course of our Lord's ministry is St. Mark. In St. Mark, however, according to Wellhausen, 'We hear of Disciples and *wonder how He comes to have them.*' It is merely a part of the same mystery if St. Mark fails to tell us what precisely was the relation of the disciples to their Lord, or with what purpose He gathered them together.

'savour' of discipleship lies in the capacity for loyal sacrifice, hinges on the accident that in St. Matthew the salt-saying follows immediately the Beatitude on the persecuted.[1]

Then there is the Lord's Prayer, in regard to which there are three things to be said. If we confine our attention to sayings common to St. Luke and St. Matthew (and entitled accordingly to a place in 'Q'), then the Lord's Prayer in Lk 11^{2-4} will follow on Lk 11^{21-24}, the passage which contains our Lord's own address of thanksgiving to the Father. Is this an accident, or is it an instance of the principle which we have found already exemplified in the case of the sayings on 'light,' or 'the Law,' and, as we noted a moment ago, on 'salt'; since nothing could be more natural for any one desirous of 'classifying' our Lord's sayings than to associate a prayer of our Lord's own with the form of prayer which He gave to His disciples? That is the first point. In the second place, if we include, instead of neglecting, St. Luke's peculiar matter, the same principle is still found operating. No one can read the episode of Mary and Martha (which precedes the Lord's Prayer in St. Luke) without finding in it a double lesson on the subject of prayer—the lesson of Mary 'sitting at our Lord's feet and hearing His words,' the lesson of Martha 'anxious and troubled about many things,' whereas 'but one thing is needful.' Is this obvious connexion of thought simply fortuitous, or is it designed? The third point is this. The sequel as well as the prelude to the Lord's Prayer in St. Luke is very interesting and significant in that it reproduces incidents attaching to the Marcan scene which St. Luke appropriates to form the setting of the Sermon on the Plain. That is true of the 'Beelzebub section' which corresponds to Mk 3^{21-30}. But it is true also of the woman's exclamation upon the blessedness of our Lord's mother, since it elicits from our Lord a reply framed upon the model of Mk 3^{35}. Why, then, does St. Luke provide the Lord's Prayer with a repetition of the context of the Sermon? I suggest that it is because he has transplanted not only the flower but the pot.

Then there is the teaching on 'wealth and trust' to be found in Lk 12^{22-34}. The theme possessed for St. Luke a very special interest. Thus he gives us in Lk $12^{21, 33}$ 16^{9} three paraphrases of the words with which the corresponding section in St. Matthew opens: 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth . . . lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven.' The same words form also the basis of three parables, those of the Rich Fool, of the Unjust Steward, of Dives and Lazarus. One reason for this interest is doubtless the poverty of the Church at Jerusalem; but another reason is hinted at when, before the parable of the Rich Fool, our Lord is found exclaiming, 'Man, who made me a ruler or a divider over you?' We seem carried back to days when the Christians of Jerusalem were still discussing whether their founders had been right in thinking that our Lord's teaching on wealth led logically to the institution of communism.

If we apply to Lk 12 the method which we have employed elsewhere and omit the episode and parable just alluded to, on the ground of their being peculiar to St. Luke, then Lk $12^{22ff.}$ will come immediately after Lk 12^{2-12}. As in the other cases, St. Luke's arrangement has an obvious motive, since the two passages brought into juxtaposition agree in deprecating anxiety. And, as before, inasmuch as Luke's interests are purely topical, he has no real testimony to offer on the historical occasion of our Lord's words.

We found that St. Luke was led to a certain interpretation of the salt-saying by a consideration of its position in St. Matthew. The same process of deduction is traceable elsewhere. Turn, for instance, to Lk 16^{14}, where we are informed that the Pharisees are 'lovers of money.' Or see Lk 11^{24-27}, where the Evangelist, by first quoting our Lord's saying on the 'single eye' and then adding, 'Now *as he spake* a certain Pharisee asked him to dine with him,' shows that he regards the maxim quoted as peculiarly applicable to the Pharisees. What is the ground for these inferences? St. Luke attributes to the Pharisees covetousness on the one hand and transgression of the principle of the 'single eye' on the other, simply because in St. Matthew's Sermon the section on wealth (containing at its commencement the saying about the 'single eye') immediately succeeds, and so might be thought to continue, our Lord's criticism of the Pharisees.

So far, then, we have shown reason for believing that in the three passages most in dispute, the 'salt and light' sayings, the Lord's Prayer, the section on 'wealth and trust,' St. Luke so far from discrediting St. Matthew, has every appearance of arranging the passages arbitrarily and artificially,

[1] St. Mark interprets it by the aid of the preceding Beatitude on the peacemakers.

for purposes of his own, though not without presenting, however unconsciously, tell-tale indications that St. Matthew's order is known to him. St. Luke was not necessarily acquainted with St. Matthew; but he seems to have known of a Sermon on the Mount just as he knew of a Missionary Discourse in which the sayings were arranged as in St. Matthew. The same conclusion, it may be remarked, might have been arrived at otherwise, by noting that, if we neglect isolated texts and confine ourselves to passages of some length, the sections from St. Matthew's Sermon which St. Luke puts elsewhere are (1) the Lord's Prayer in ch. 11, (2) the trust and wealth section in ch. 12, (3) the narrow gate and shut door in ch. 13; the relative order is the same as St. Matthew's. On the compilation view of St. Matthew it would surely be a more extraordinary accident for the Evangelist to find the order of the common source coincide with the order required for the logical development of his theme; that St. Luke separated seems the more reasonable view; but he is certainly very successful in making his interweaving process interfere so little with the order which he found.

Can we, then, say that St. Matthew's version represents the original 'Manual of discipleship' drawn up by our Lord? Only, I think, with certain reservations. Vv.$^{21\text{-}24}$ of Mt 7 strike a different note from the rest of the Sermon. Instead of regarding our Lord as the new Moses legislating for the new Israel, they speak of Him as Judge in a way which seems to presuppose the revelation of Cæsarea Philippi. And the teaching on false prophets in the context seems more probably the product of unfortunate experience than an anticipation of the experience of our Lord. What is more, the Sermon presents traces of dislocation, suggesting that the Lord's Prayer occupied originally another position. Thus considerations of symmetry go to show that the Prayer is an interpolation in the place where it stands, while from the standpoint of logical fitness it would come most suitably after the passage on the subject of trust in God. Mt 6^{32} ('after all these things do the Gentiles seek; for your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things') would make quite as fitting an introduction to the Prayer as the earlier and practically equivalent vv. $6^{7.\ 8}$. The transposition would have the further advantage of bringing the Prayer more into the neighbourhood of Mt 7^{7} ('Ask, and it shall be given you'), and so would assimilate St. Matthew to St. Luke.[1]

It will be seen at once that these two conclusions of ours are probably not without a mutual relationship. It was just because room was required for sayings in which our Lord was spoken of as Judge that the Lord's Prayer was put back to an earlier position in the Sermon. It is *from* Mt 7 that the Lord's Prayer was taken; it is *into* Mt 7 that the new matter was inserted.[2]

If, then, the insertions and transpositions just considered prevent us from regarding St. Matthew's Sermon as an exact replica of Christ's 'Manual of discipleship,' we have now to approach the last part of our task, and ask ourselves what view we can best entertain of St. Matthew's Sermon as it stands. The question is really equivalent to another: Who was responsible for the modifications which changed the 'Manual' into the Sermon?

The answer is doubtless a very simple one. We can be certain that no individual Christian believer would deliberately make additions to a statement formulated by our Lord. But the case is different when we think of the Apostles acting in their corporate capacity and called upon to deal with the circumstances which confronted them in the early days of the Church at Jerusalem. On the one hand, they wanted a Manual of discipleship capable of fully meeting the needs of their converts, a condition which could only be satisfied if due reference was made to the typical and fundamental attitude of the Christian to His Lord as Messiah and Judge. On the other hand, Christ had left behind Him the very Manual required, except that it omitted the necessary reference. Would it not thus be almost inevitable for the Apostles to add to the declaration of our Lord one or two sayings which they seemed to remember hearing Him deliver later?

One of the acutest of New Testament scholars, Weizsäcker, argues, in his *Apostolic Age*, for the

[1] The very difficult text, Mt 7^{6} ('Give not that which is holy to the dogs'), precedes 'Ask and it shall be given you.' Is it an ecclesiastical warning against communicating the Lord's Prayer to unworthy recipients, and so another indication of the original position of the Prayer?

[2] Mt $5^{23\text{-}26}$, containing two sayings on forgiveness, is also misplaced. Probably these sayings formed with Mt $6^{14.\ 15}$ a pendant to the Prayer; when the Prayer was put back, so were these two sayings, though to another place.

superiority of St. Matthew over St. Luke as a reporter of our Lord's sayings on the ground that St. Matthew's groupings correspond to the needs of the Church at the very earliest stages of its history. That is surely especially true of the Sermon on the Mount; the earliest needs of all would be that for a definition of 'the Way.' What Weizsäcker failed to perceive is, in the first place, that the need had existed even earlier; as soon as our Lord began to gather about Him what St. Luke calls a 'multitude of disciples,' He would Himself be necessarily impelled to draw up a statement of the ethical principles in the following of which discipleship consisted. Then, secondly, there was another fact which escaped the notice of Weizsäcker, viz., that the Sermon on the Mount is a unity and, as such only explicable if the Apostles were not fitting our Lord's utterances into a framework of their own, but were simply supplementing very sparingly by quite trifling additions the Manual drawn up by Him and imprinted ineffaceably on their memories.

It hardly needs saying that the 'Manual' theory of the Sermon is perfectly consistent with the 'delivery' of the Sermon on a particular occasion; because the disciples learnt the New Law by heart, it does not follow that they were not gathered together previously to hear that Law solemnly promulgated by the Prophet greater than Moses from His Galilean Sinai. It is generally recognized that this is, in fact, the picture which St. Matthew draws for us. But sufficient regard, so it seems to me, has not been paid to the possibility that the symbolism had a higher origin than St. Matthew, or that He who rode into Jerusalem upon an ass in order to prefer His sublime claim in terms of the prediction of Zechariah might not deliberately have chosen to model His delivery of the Law on the procedure of His predecessor, Moses. But, be that as it may, the theory that St. Matthew's Sermon represents an Apostolic 'Manual of discipleship,' based upon the Galilean one originally drawn up by our Lord, explains to an extent otherwise impossible the treatment of the Sermon by St. Luke. On the one hand, the extraordinary pains which he takes to get at its meaning or to furnish it with illustrations, testify to his impression of its supreme importance. On the other hand, the liberties which he, or rather his sources, plainly take with it, were partially justified by the knowledge that it contained additions made by the Apostles, so that it was impossible to determine to what extent the original sayings had been modified.

That, however, was hypercriticism. If Christ's statement was memorized, if Mt 5–7 represents the Apostles' 'Teaching' as delivered in Jerusalem almost from the first, we can regard the chapters which contain the Sermon on the Mount as possessing on the whole a better claim to authenticity than any other passage in the Gospels.

Contributions and Comments.

A New German Writer on Religion.

WITHIN the last few years two very important books dealing with the history and psychology of religion have appeared in Germany, and are now becoming fairly well known in this country. They are *Das Heilige*, by Rudolf Otto of Marburg, and *Das Gebet*, by F. Heiler, also of Marburg. These have now been followed this year by the first volume of a much larger work entitled *Die Religionen, ihr Werden, ihr Sinn, ihre Wahrheit*, by Dr. J. W. Hauer of Tübingen. The writer, Dr. Hauer, is a *Privat Dozent* of Tübingen, and has had a somewhat remarkable career. He was connected with the Basle Mission in India, and, before the War, came to Oxford to complete his education in philosophy and theology with the intention of taking up a teaching post in the theological college connected with that Mission. While at Oxford he obtained a First Class in Greats, and began then to study for a special thesis with a view to the Bachelor of Letters degree. When the War broke out he was interned in this country, but ultimately was sent back to Berlin, where he took up pastoral work in a church left vacant by an army chaplain. Since then he has become a lecturer at Tübingen, and has