

LUKE'S REWRITING OF THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT  
Mark A. Matson  
Milligan College

As a solution to the Synoptic Problem, the reigning two-source hypothesis posits in addition to Mark a second source termed "Q."<sup>1</sup> A major foundation upon which the argument for a source "Q" is built is the perceived independence of Luke and Matthew. If Luke and Matthew did not know each other, then there must be a source common to both of them to explain the remarkable similarities between the two gospels. If, however, the Third Gospel used Matthew as one of its sources, the whole structure of the two-source hypothesis becomes unstable, since one of its major foundations is removed. Without the independence of Luke and Matthew, a hypothetical source is rendered functionally unnecessary.

One reason that has often been put forward for the independence of Luke and Matthew is the perceived literary superiority of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount. Since much of the material in the Sermon on the Mount is found in various places in Luke's narrative, it has been argued that Luke must have relied on a source with a dissimilar order to the material. This is because, given the distinctive, structured, and rhetorically powerful thrust of Matthew's presentation, it would be unlikely or impossible for Luke to have dismantled the material in Matthew 5–7, scattering it among a variety of narrative settings, and destroying its literary unit.

But is it a necessary or even compelling conclusion that Luke would not have used Matthew in such a way that resulted in a restructuring and re-contextualizing of material found

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a revision of a paper originally published in 2000 SBL Seminar Papers and discussed at the Synoptic Gospels Section of the AAR/SBL Annual Meeting in Nashville, 2000. My thanks to the other participants on the panel, Mark Goodacre, and Jeff Peterson for helpful discussion before and during the presentation for helping shape the thoughts expressed, and to the respondents, John S. Kloppenber and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon, for sharpening my thoughts.

in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount? This paper is a tentative attempt to examine critically the assumption that Luke's compositional strategy could not have used Matthew's material in such a way as to dismantle the First Gospel's construction. Or, put in a more positive way, this paper will explore Luke's use of material from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount from the perspective of the Farrer Theory, that is, that Luke had available two primary sources: Mark and Matthew.<sup>2</sup> While the test for any theory of gospel relationships is, of necessity, complex and depends on a cumulative demonstration of reasonableness, still a narrow test case is often a worthwhile means of gaining entry to the larger questions. The issue of the Sermon on the Mount, and Luke's alternative presentation of that material, is an ideal test case.

### I. The Importance of the Independence of Matthew and Luke

It is not necessary to repeat the primary arguments for the existence of "Q," which have been developed in a number of places.<sup>3</sup> But it is perhaps worth reviewing the importance that has been placed on the independence of Luke and Matthew and its relationship to the Q hypothesis, as well as some of the correlate assumptions that go along with this view.

Christopher Tuckett lays out the basic situation quite clearly:

The case for the existence of Q, like the case for Markan priority, is a cumulative one. It is also in some sense a negative one, since the Q hypothesis is essentially the alternative to the possibility that Luke knew Matthew. (The theory that Matthew knew Luke is hardly ever proposed today.) If Luke did not know Matthew, the only real alternative

---

<sup>2</sup> Austin M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), 55-88.

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance: (1) Robert H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987), 89-112, and in his new edition of the book, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels: Origin and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2001), 97-123, notes the placement of the argument for independence in this construction; (2) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Revised Edition (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990) 63-77, especially 64; (3) E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989), 62-67.

theory is that both evangelists depend on common source material.<sup>4</sup>

One also finds similar attention to the central role of the independence of Matthew and Luke in J. C. Hawkins: “In thus speaking of the lost document Q we are making the second of the two assumptions for which grounds have to be here stated. We are assuming that neither Mt nor Lk drew upon the other’s Gospel as his written source, but that they used independently an older document.”<sup>5</sup> Similarly, B. H. Streeter notes that the easiest explanation for the material common to Luke and Matthew, but absent from Mark, is that Luke knew Matthew’s gospel. In response to this, he offers objections to this “easy” solution: (1) the disagreement in the order of such common material in the Markan outline (“... subsequent to the Temptation story, there is not a single case in which Matthew and Luke agree in inserting the same saying at the same point in the Marcan outline”), and (2) the “original form” of the saying varies between Luke and Matthew.<sup>6</sup> Without raising too many objections to the accuracy of Streeter’s observations, it is worth noting that his starting point is the conclusion that Luke and Matthew were independent—and this is the result of a reliance on a “rote” use of sources as a dominant model for how the gospels were constructed. Given this model, he then adopts a theory of independence, and this then demands a Q source. These representative references from scholars who have defended the Q hypothesis are sufficient to indicate the importance of the independence of Luke and Matthew.<sup>7</sup> Simply put, without the independence of Luke and Matthew, the need for Q

---

<sup>4</sup> C. M. Tuckett, “the Synoptic Problem” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary [ABD]* (NY: Doubleday, 1992), vol. 6, 268.

<sup>5</sup> John C. Hawkins, “Double Tradition in Matthew and Luke” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon, 1911), 102.

<sup>6</sup> B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (NY: The Macmillan Co., 1925), 183.

<sup>7</sup> In addition to the arguments lodged by Streeter against the improbability of Luke’s use of Matthew, one might note others that have been raised. See, for instance, Stein’s summary (*Studying the Synoptic Problem*, 103): (a) Luke’s lack of Matthean additions to the triple tradition, (b) Luke’s different context for the Q material, (c) Luke’s more primitive context for the Q material, (d) the form of the Q material is more primitive, (e) Matthew’s and Luke’s lack of agreement in order, (f) Luke’s absence of “M” material. Each of these tends to be an overstatement or, in my opinion, finds reasonable explanations. There is a tendency toward circularity in many of the arguments based on the starting assumption of a “Q.” The scope of

disappears.

Closely related to the idea that Luke could not have used Matthew as a major source is an attitude regarding Luke's role as an author, more precisely, the conception that Luke was not an author, but rather a compiler and editor. The original Q hypothesis, with the independent reliance of Luke and Matthew on that source, originated in great part on a view of the gospel writers as compilers of traditions with little independent authorial design.<sup>8</sup> But modern Lukan studies have increasingly emphasized Luke's skill as a composer, not just an editor.<sup>9</sup> Of course this understanding has been developed with respect to Matthew as well, and Matthew is seen as having formed his great sermons from disparate material.<sup>10</sup> But there still remains an underlying resistance to conceiving Luke as having substantial freedom with his source material, a freedom that is educated primarily from a literary artistic sense, not a restricted reliance on source documents.<sup>11</sup>

As a result of this rather wooden view of Luke's compositional strategy, it is argued that Luke would hardly have disrupted the order of Matthew's material if he were relying on the First Gospel, this despite the fact that the Q theorists are willing to grant that Matthew has rearranged the material from Q (which is often presumed to have been presented in the order found in

---

this paper, however, cannot address all of these points directly.

<sup>8</sup> Farrer, 56.

<sup>9</sup> So, for instance, see Luke Timothy Johnson's discussion of Luke's compositional style (*The Gospel of Luke* [Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991], 1–17). Tannehill's work on the narrative unity of Luke and Acts (*The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986]) presupposes also a very intentional literary creativity.

<sup>10</sup> The existence of five large discourse blocks has often been noted, which suggests an intentional compositional strategy. See W. D. Davies and Dale Allison, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 58–72. Analysis of the Sermon on the Mount has also shown its intentional design: cf. Dale Allison, "The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount," *JBL* 106 (1987): 423–445; Dale Allison, "A New Approach to the Sermon on the Mount," *ETL* 64 (1988): 405–414; J. Smit Sibinga, "Exploring the Composition of Matth. 5–7," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 7(1994): 175–196.

<sup>11</sup> Hence the continual reference to Luke's material as retaining the original order of the Q material.

Luke). But this assumes an estimation of literary aesthetics that overshadows the strictly historical question: Matthew's arrangement is good, and Luke's is not as good. So Tuckett succinctly states the argument "If Luke knew Matthew, why has he changed the Matthean order so thoroughly, disrupting Matthew's clear and concise arrangement of the teaching material into five blocks, each concerned with a particular theme?"<sup>12</sup> Note the statement that Matthew's arrangement is clear and concise, thus implying that Luke's alternative arrangement is less than that. To put it more bluntly, Streeter suggests:

If then Luke derived this material from Matthew, he must have gone through both Matthew and Mark so as to discriminate with meticulous precision between Marcan and non-Marcan material; he must then have proceeded with the utmost care to tear every little piece of non-Marcan material he desired to use from the context of Mark in which it appeared in Matthew—in spite of the fact that contexts in Matthew are always exceedingly appropriate—in order to re-insert it into a different context of Mark having no special appropriateness. A theory which would make an author capable of such a proceeding would only be tenable if, on other grounds, we had reason to believe he was a crank.<sup>13</sup>

Streeter's rhetoric is remarkably excessive, and the facts of the case do not support him well. But the point here is the underlying assumption that Luke's arrangement is inferior to Matthew, which is an aesthetic view. Kümmel takes this aesthetic perspective and directly applies it to the Sermon on the Mount when he asks, "What could possibly have motivated Luke, for example, to shatter Matthew's sermon on the mount, placing part of it in his sermon on the plain, dividing up other parts among various chapters of his Gospel, and letting the rest drop out of sight?"<sup>14</sup>

Finally, we must also note a prevailing assumption that Luke must have a uniform, and inflexible approach to his use of sources. Thus one critique lodged against the possible use of Matthew by Luke is based on Luke's pattern of usage of Mark. Since Luke often follows Mark's order of pericopes rather closely, albeit with large segments or interpolations of non-Markan

---

<sup>12</sup> Tuckett, *ABD*, 268.

<sup>13</sup> Streeter, 183.

<sup>14</sup> Kümmel, 64.

material, we should expect Luke to follow a similar approach with respect to Matthew.<sup>15</sup> This assumes that Luke held his various sources in equal esteem, which again assumes a rather cut and paste approach to authorship.

The foregoing objections to Lukan use of Matthew are significant. Any attempt to propose an alternative to the two-source hypothesis must ultimately deal with them. In this attempt to explore the viability of the Farrer theory in the case of the Sermon on the Mount, the following questions must be faced head on:

1. Is Luke's use of Matthew reasonable, given his authorial design and behavior?

2. Is Luke's arrangement necessarily less aesthetic than Matthew? Is it less compelling? Is it less convincing for the Evangelist's purposes?

3. Can one imagine Luke using Mark in a different way than he does Matthew?

These concerns will guide the evaluation of Luke's use of the Sermon on the Mount material, and I will return to these explicit concerns at the conclusion of this paper.

It also appropriate at the outset to attempt a clear and concise statement of the major features of the tentative hypothesis (alternative to the two-source hypothesis) that influence this exploration of the Sermon on the Mount material. Without arguing extensively in support of these points, they can be summarized as follows:

1. Mark was the first gospel written, was used by churches, and thus was available to the authors of Luke and Matthew some years before subsequent gospels were written.

2. Matthew used Mark as his major source, supplementing it with a variety of traditional material, as well as creatively shaping that material in a new gospel.

3. Luke also relied on Mark as his primary source for structure and wording. As with Matthew, Luke added additional material to Mark's gospel, and was willing to modify and edit Mark when he deemed it appropriate.

4. Luke also used Matthew, but was more critical of Matthew than he was of Mark. This

---

<sup>15</sup> This assessment of Luke's use of Mark is not entirely accurate. I will return to this point in the conclusion of my paper.

may have been due to the perceived priority of Mark (perhaps having already achieved a firm place in the church's teaching and preaching), or it may be due to what Luke perceived as editorial freedom on the part of Matthew—a freedom that then granted Luke freedom to modify and rearrange this material more than Mark's material. Luke also drew on other traditional material, and was willing to freely shape material in accordance with his view of the purpose of Jesus.

5. Luke also has his own design, which is inherently theological and literary. As he suggests in the prologue, Luke was critical of other attempts at presenting the life of Jesus, either because they were not properly ordered or, more probably, because the presentation of material did not adequately present the story so that the readers would “know the truth” about Jesus. Luke is, then, a rhetorical document – one that has an intended purpose to persuade an audience about a particular perspective – that aims to produce a more compelling story for the reader.

From this alternative perspective of the Farrer theory of synoptic relationships, I will explore the reasonableness of Luke's handling of the Sermon on Mount material. If it is found to be plausible within the context of Luke's theology and literary methods, then the necessity of Luke's independence from Matthew will need to be questioned on a more global basis. In the discussion that follows I will deal with three features of the difference between Luke and Matthew relative to the Sermon on the Mount material: (1) omitted material, (2) differences in order and placement of material, and (3) differences in language and emphasis in similar material.<sup>16</sup>

## II. The Case of Omitted Material

If Luke had available Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, why would some of Matthew's material simply be left out of the newly constructed gospel? A comparison of Luke and Matthew quickly allows one to identify units of material that have no counterpart in the Third

---

<sup>16</sup> I am indebted at a number of points in the following discussion to observations made by Mark Goodacre in his recent book, *The Case Against Q* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2002).

Gospel. These units are:

- Matt 5:21–24      On Murder and Anger
- Matt 5:27–30      On Adultery
- Matt 5:33–37      On Oaths
- Matt 6:1–4        On Almsgiving
- Matt 6:5–6        On Prayer
- Matt 6:7–8        Don't Pray as Gentiles
- Matt 6:16–18     On Fasting
- Matt 7:6          Pearls and Swine

This list of material in Matthew's sermon that is absent from Luke is intriguing, in part because this material is primarily found grouped together in Matthew. This suggests the possibility that Luke found whole units of material less than satisfactory and tended to delete them in somewhat block fashion.

One can note that Matthew's antithesis construction (you have heard it said ... but I say) is avoided entirely by Luke. Certainly the framing context of reinterpreting the Law (Matt 5:21–48) is avoided. Of course, Luke does use some snippets of material from the section found in Matt 5:21–48, but in a very different way than Matthew. For instance, the latter part of the first antithesis on murder and anger is found in Luke 12:57–59 as an admonition for reconciliation, but without the framing context (e.g. the antithesis construction) of a reinterpretation of the Law. Now it is possible that Matthew added the framing context, and that the essential teaching (e.g. Matt 5:22–26 without Matt 5:21, or Matt 5:32 without Matt 5:31) was present in Q. But this avoids dealing with the fact that most of the material on the antithesis section is either missing in Luke or found in very different contexts. This suggests a more intentional pattern of avoidance of this section of material.

Similarly, most of 6:1–18 is missing, with the major exception only being the Lord's Prayer. This section, introduced in Matthew with the words "beware of practicing your piety before others to be seen by them" seems to have, as a section, been avoided by Luke. Again, some small segments of this material are found elsewhere in Luke (e.g. the advice against public demonstration of righteousness seems to have been picked up by Luke at 16:15), but it has lost

its Matthean focus as part of a multi-pronged argument against various acts of Jewish piety. Again, we might assume that Matthew has simply added this anti-piety material to other “Q” material in forming his sermon, and Luke may not have known of this material. But a more likely explanation is that Luke has found clusters of material in Matthew’s sermon that were considered unhelpful in his presentation of the teaching of Jesus.

What is noteworthy is that both sections that are avoided by Luke tend to deal with a reinterpretation of Jewish law or criticism of Jewish practice. The antithesis section addresses a rather particular reinterpretation of Jewish law, almost as an intramural legal debate. And the “piety” unit deals with particular pietistic practices of Judaism, practices which might often be ways of distinguishing Jews from other peoples. To the degree that we might conceive of Luke’s audience as being heavily Gentile, and Luke’s purpose as addressing salvation for all people, these particular deletions then make sense.<sup>17</sup> Certainly Luke’s horizon is broader, encompassing in Acts the inclusion of Gentiles. And Luke sees the church as the new Israel, not over against Judaism, but embracing it in a broader more universal way. As such, attention to divisive issues such as particular practices might serve to distract from Luke’s sense of the synthesis of Jewish practices and Gentile inclusion. The combination of the concern for audience and the interest in bridging the divide between Jews and Gentiles might also explain the deletion of Matt 7:6, which would almost certainly be viewed as a pejorative statement against Gentiles.

It has been argued that Luke resists the large blocks of teaching that are found in Matthew in preference to smaller units of teaching.<sup>18</sup> This may well be a supporting reason for Luke to have cast a critical eye on material taken over from Matthew. But this, in itself, seems less compelling of an explanation for the omissions. And it certainly does not explain why in particular this material was omitted while other material from the Sermon on the Mount was used.

---

<sup>17</sup> Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1997), 21.

<sup>18</sup> John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976), 134; M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 346.

At any rate, the material in Matthew that is not represented in Luke is distinguished by its presence in clusters in Matthew, and its cohesive subject matter. These two factors would certainly fit with an editorial pattern of selecting material from Matthew for reuse in a rewritten gospel.

### III. The Case of Re-ordering and/or Transposed Material

A comparison of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount with Luke finds that similar material is found in a wide variety of contexts in Luke. Much is, indeed, found in Luke's Sermon on the Plain (6:17–49). But within Luke's sermon, some has a slightly different order. Additionally, other material from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is transposed to completely different settings. The net effect is that Luke has engaged in intentional clustering of this material. We can quickly chart this out as follows. In the chart below I have indicated these clusters as follows: Cluster "A" is highlighted; Cluster "B" is underlined; Cluster "C" is in *italics and underlined*; Cluster "D" is in **bold type**; Cluster "E" is in *italics*; and Cluster "F" is in **bold italics**.

## Comparison of Placement of Matthew and Luke Sermon on Mount Material

Matt 5:1	Setting of Sermon on Mount	Luke 6:17	Setting of Sermon on Plain
Matt 5:3–12	Beatitudes	Luke 6:20–23	Beatitudes
Matt 5:13	Salt of the Earth	Luke 14:34–35	Salt is Good
Matt 5:14–16	Light on a Stand	Luke 8:16; <i>11:33</i>	<i>Light on a Stand</i>
Matt 5:17–20	On the Law & Prophets	<b>Luke 16:16–17</b>	<b>Law and Prophets</b>
Matt 5:25–26	On Reconciling	Luke 12:57–58	On Reconciling
Matt 5:31–32	On Divorce	<b>Luke 16:18</b>	<b>On Divorce</b>
Matt 5:38–42	On Retaliation	Luke 6:29–30	Turn the Cheek
Matt 5:43–48	Love Your Enemies	Luke 6:27–28; 32–36	Love your Enemies
Matt 6:9–15	The Lord’s Prayer	Luke 11:1–4	Lord’s Prayer
Matt 6:19–21	Treasure in Heaven	<b>Luke 12:33–34</b>	<b>Treasure in Heaven</b>
Matt 6:22–23	The Good Eye	<i>Luke 11:34–36</i>	<i>The Good Eye</i>
Matt 6:24	Two Masters	<b>Luke 16:13</b>	<b>Two Masters</b>
Matt 6:25–34	Do Not Worry	<b>Luke 12:22–32</b>	<b>Do Not Worry</b>
Matt 7:1–5	Do Not Judge	Luke 6:37–42	Do Not Judge
Matt 7:7–11	Ask, Seek, Knock	Luke 11:9–13	Ask, Seek, Knock
Matt 7:12	Golden Rule	Luke 6:31	Golden Rule
Matt 7:13–14	Two Ways	<i>Luke 13:23–24</i>	<i>Two Ways</i>
Matt 7:15–20	Known by its Fruit	Luke 6:43–45	Known by its Fruit
Matt 7:21–23	On that Day	<i>Luke 13:25–27</i>	<i>On That Day</i>
Matt 7:24–27	House Built on a Rock	Luke 6:47–49	House Built on a Rock

At first glance, it might appear that both Matthew’s and Luke’s arrangements are hodge-podge and almost random. But a closer look shows some very strong evidence of Luke’s very intentional ordering. Luke has taken material and clustered it into thematic units. Thus if Luke was reworking Matthew’s gospel, he did not simply disrupt an existing coherent sermon, but rather created his own thoughtful approach to the material by transposing it into his plan. It seems very reasonable that Luke has grouped material from the Sermon on the Mount into related groups or clusters. This suggests a rational and coherent editing of Matthew’s material under the constraints of a different authorial perspective.

### A. The Sermon on the Plain

Luke does utilize a significant amount of material from Matthew’s sermon in his Sermon on the Plain. Of course, as the previous chart has shown, much has also been moved to

completely different contexts. But a comparison of the material that Luke does utilize shows a remarkably common ordering.<sup>19</sup>

Order of Material Common To  
Sermon on Mount and Sermon on Plain

<u>Matthew 5:1 – 7:27</u>		<u>Luke 6: 17-49</u>	
5:1	Setting of the Sermon	6:17	Setting of Sermon
5:3-12	The Beatitudes	6:20-23	The Beatitudes + Woes
5:38-42	On Retaliation	6:20-27	Turn the Cheek
5:43-48	Love Your Enemies	6:29-30	Love Your Enemies
		6:31	Golden Rule
		6:32-36	Love Your Enemies
7:1-5	Do Not Judge	6:37-42	Do Not Judge
7:12	Golden Rule		
7:15-20	Known by its Fruit	6:43-45	Known by its Fruit
7:21-23	On That Day (Lord, Lord)	6:46	Lord, Lord
7:24-27	House Built on a Rock	6:47-49	House Built on a Rock

With the exception of a cluster of material dealing with the topic of Love Your Enemies, Luke’s order is identical with Matthew’s. This order of material is readily explainable if Luke has relied on Matthew.

To begin with, Luke has a setting of his sermon that is heavily dependent on Mark’s language at 3:7–13, whom he has in general been following very closely for much of the order of his narrative (a major exception being the placement of the calling and naming of “the twelve”). Luke follows Mark in having Jesus name the twelve apostles on a mountain top (Luke 6:12–16), which is the unit of text immediately preceding the Sermon on the Plain, different than Matthew’s placement. He, therefore, has Jesus coming down from the mountain just before beginning his sermon. Luke, then, has Jesus begin the sermon on a level place, a very explicit contrast to the previous mountain setting.<sup>20</sup> The emphasis on the placement of the sermon

<sup>19</sup> The chart is a modification of that found in Drury, 133, to whom I am indebted for the clarity such a chart presents.

<sup>20</sup> Green notes (*Luke*, 262), I think correctly, that this is a theological construction by

appears as well to be a deliberate rejoinder to Matthew's sermon on the mountain. That is, it is no accident that both of the sermons in Luke and Matthew begin with a geographical setting. Perhaps Luke's use of the level place was to emphasize that the sermon was for all the people, since the mountain seems to be a place for Jesus' close relationship with his disciples (in Mark and Luke, the disciples are selected on a mountain; in Matthew the disciples alone seem to follow Jesus to the mountain to hear the sermon). This different emphasis of the setting for the sermon would seem to be additionally suggested by the clear differences in the audience for the sermons: Matthew addresses only his disciples (i.e. the twelve), while Luke emphasizes that there was a great crowd of his disciples and a great crowd of people. Perhaps Luke was also uncomfortable with the Mosaic imagery. But at any rate, Luke's emphasis on the level place appears to be a specific counterpart to Matthew's placement on the mountain. Since the setting in Matthew is hardly likely to be from Q, this opening language in Luke which parallels Matthew's setting, seems to suggest some literary engagement with Matthew.<sup>21</sup>

What follows then in Luke is a number of pericopes selected from Matthew's sermon, in order. The exception to the common ordering of material is a small cluster which seems to be an interpretation of Matthew's admonitions on love of enemies. Luke has taken the material from Matt 5:43-48 and slightly re-ordered it, inserting into its midst the Golden Rule. Luke resists the antithesis format ("you have heard it said... but I say") which Matthew uses to introduce teaching on loving enemies. Instead, Luke moves to the beginning of the unit a thesis statement, "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you," then picks up Matthew's examples (turn the other

---

Luke to emphasize the movement from prayer place to action. But this does not exclude additionally that even the placement of the choice of the disciples before the sermon was deliberate to accentuate some difference.

<sup>21</sup> John Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 70, 74 shows the Q material starting at Luke 6:20 and Matt 5:3, thus relegating the setting of the sermons to redaction by the evangelists. Hans Dieter Betz, *Sermon on the Mount* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995) ignores both settings, though he thinks the common orientation suggests a similar prior setting in the pre-gospel tradition (80–81). But if so, how does one account for the specifically different geographical placement? This must a conscious choice of the evangelists.

cheek, give your shirt, 'etc. '), and finally follows that with more generalizing comments on the thesis established at the outset: do to others as you wish others would do, do good to evil since even sinners do good to those who do good. He completes the section returning to a modification of Matthew's close of this pericope: "be merciful as your Father is merciful," substituting "merciful" for Matthew's "perfect." Luke appears to be closely following Matthew's material, then, but making some rhetorical improvements and interpreting the command to love one's enemies in terms of the very broad Golden Rule.

If we compare Luke's shorter Sermon on the Plain with Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, it would appear that Luke has achieved a more focused sermon than Matthew. It has often been noted that Matthew's sermon is a collection of disparate materials, within which it is somewhat difficult to find a clear pattern.<sup>22</sup> Allison has argued cogently for a pattern of triads which reflects the evangelist's own pattern of composition.<sup>23</sup> But even with this pattern, there is still the sense of a loose collection of material covering a variety of ethical subjects. In contrast, Luke's sermon is far more focused and consistent: "One single theme is carried through, and the individual sections follow each other in meaningful order, joining member to member by internal connection."<sup>24</sup> Goulder has argued that Luke's sermon is essentially a simple two pronged sermon: the first part deals with poverty and persecution the disciple must expect, and the latter part deals with the peril of blind leaders.<sup>25</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson has similarly argued that Luke's Sermon on the Plain is "thematically more integrated" than Matthew's sermon.<sup>26</sup> Is this

---

<sup>22</sup> K. Grayston, "Sermon on the Mount" in *IDB* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), vol. 4, 288, notes that "the sayings of 6:19-24 are loosely held together by the thought of possessions," and "the section 7:1-12 is an oddly assorted group of sayings..."

<sup>23</sup> D. C. Allison, "The Structure of the Sermon on the Mount," 432-440, and "A New Approach to the Sermon on the Mount," 406-409.

<sup>24</sup> Emanuel Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums*, (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1941) as quoted in Betz, 41. Hirsch's evaluation is far more accurate than Joseph Fitzmyer's: "In contrast to the well-constructed Matthean sermon on the mount, the Lucan sermon is loose and rambling." (*The Gospel According to Luke, I-IX* [NY: Doubleday, 1981], 628).

<sup>25</sup> M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 348.

<sup>26</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 110. Johnson argues that there are

movement from loose collection to a tighter more coherent sermon not what we might expect from Luke culling the Matthean material, collecting it in a more cohesive and systematic order? Is this not implicit in what Luke says of his own work, that he intends to put things down “in order?”<sup>27</sup>

### B. Cluster of Material Relative to Prayer

It is striking, of course, that Luke does not include the Lord’s Prayer in his Sermon on the Plain. Instead, this is transposed to a later chapter. But Luke again shows a keen eye for order and systematic presentation in this transposition. Luke includes the Lord’s Prayer in a section that deals more extensively with prayer than Matthews Sermon on the Mount. In many ways, then, Luke has accentuated and expanded the material he found in Matthew.

Luke 11 begins with Jesus praying, a particular emphasis in the Third Gospel.<sup>28</sup> The Third Evangelist then uses this setting as an opportunity to bring together a number of teachings about prayer as response to the disciples’ request to be taught. First is the Lord’s Prayer, followed by a unit of *Sondergut* material, the example of the Importunate Friend (Luke 11:5–8). This is then followed by a passage drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, Matt 7:7-11,

Encouragement to Pray. This cluster can be seen effectively in the following chart:

<input type="checkbox"/> Luke 11:1	Disciples’ Request on Prayer	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Luke 11:2–4	The Lord’s Prayer	From Matt 6:9–13
<input type="checkbox"/> Luke 11:5–8	Importunate Friend	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> Luke 11:9–13	Encouragement to Pray	From Matt 7:7–11

What Luke presents in this small cluster is an effective mini-sermon on the importance of prayer. The material is selected around a central theme and coheres well. In comparison, Matthew’s presentation separates two different teachings on prayer, with the result that they

---

essentially two parts of a unified topic: first a prophetic statement that issues a radical commandment for love (which interprets the beatitudes and woes) and then exhortation to be compassionate as God is compassionate.

<sup>27</sup> I particularly like Fitzmyer’s translation of the prologue here: “I too have decided, after tracing everything carefully from the beginning, to put them systematically in writing for you...” (*Luke*, 287). (my emphasis)

<sup>28</sup> Joel Green, *The Theology of Luke* (Cambridge: University Press, 1995), 58–59.

become part of a catalog of various virtues. By separating the prayer material and bringing it together in one unit, and framing it with both Jesus' own prayer attitude and the disciples' request to learn about this attitude, Luke has given this aspect of Jesus' life and teaching an independent status that makes it more important than if it were scattered in various places in the gospel or simply part of list of virtues. This would seem to be a reasonable methodology for an evangelist who is frequently concerned about prayer.<sup>29</sup>

It should also be noted that Luke's emphasis on prayer furthers a theological emphasis, that of the relationship between Father and Son – an emphasis which as already anticipated previously in the gospel at 10:21–22. Thus Luke not only accentuates the importance of prayer, but uses it to continue to develop a theme that can be seen to be of particular importance to his conception of Jesus.<sup>30</sup>

### C. Cluster of Material On Lamp

More problematic is Luke's handling of Matt 5:14–16, the Light on a Stand. In the first place, Luke actually retells this teaching twice: Luke 8:16 and Luke 11:33. The first is actually relying on Mark 4:21–25, and is found in Luke precisely following material drawn from Mark 4:13–20. A close examination shows that Luke 11:33 is drawn fairly closely from the Matthew version found in the Sermon on the Mount.

But Luke does not insert this unit into his text in a disconnected way, but rather it is found first of all close to a section of Luke which has already drawn on Sermon on the Mount material (the Prayer section discussed above, Luke 11:1–13). And Luke connects the Lamp on a Stand pericope with another piece of material drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, The Sound Eye (Matt 6:22–23). Since the eye is deemed the “lamp of the body,” Luke has apparently made the connection that the Lamp on the Stand stands for a person of sound spirit, a “whole” person,

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Luke 3:21–22; 5:16; 6:12; 9:18, 28; 10:21–22.

<sup>30</sup> See Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 110–112. Note that Joel Green (*Luke*, 437) entitles the entire section of 11:1–13 as “The Fatherhood of God.” And he further connects it narratively to the preceding section, thus emphasizing Luke's careful integration of material in an overarching plan.

a righteous individual. The two units of material which stand unconnected in Matthew are thus contextualized in Luke by being brought together to interpret one another.

But Luke has also connected it with the preceding passage on the Sign of Jonah (Luke 11:29–32), by means of the linking word “evil.”<sup>31</sup> This generation is “evil” because it does not recognize that the need to repent was already spoken through Jonah. So also the person’s eye that is “evil” produces a darkness, like placing a lamp under a basket. But the prophetic call to repentance and forgiveness, as with Jonah so also with Jesus (something greater than Jonah! v. 32), should be an occasion for light and soundness. The net result of this is that Luke has produced a nuanced interpretation of material available from Matthew (Light on Stand, Good Eye, Jonah) and reconfigured seemingly independent material into a prophetic warning about hearing the announcement of repentance and forgiveness. This construction from disparate Matthew material also leads quite nicely to Luke’s warnings against the Pharisees (Luke 11:37–52), who can be taken to be examples of the evil generation that does not hear the prophetic call.

☐ Luke 11:29–32	Jonah as Warning (to Darkness)	From Matt 12:38–42
☐ Luke 11:33	Light on a Stand	From Matt 5:15
☐ Luke 11:34–36	The Eye is the Lamp of Body	From Matt 6:22–23
☐ Luke 11:37–54	Warnings of Pharisees	(Darkness) From Matt 15:1–9, 23:25–26

Another linking feature that ties the Jonah passage (Luke 11:29–32// Matt 12:38–42) with the Light on a Stand (Luke 11:33// Matt 5:15) passage is the implicit idea in Luke that the Sign of Jonah was primarily that of preaching to the Ninevites. Jonah then embodied the “light on the stand” in terms of his proclamation of God to those in need of hearing it. In contrast, the “unsound” eye is not open to God’s message. The Pharisees, by being criticized immediately after the discussion of the relative quality of eyes, are literarily evaluated according to the quality of their “light.” Because they are seen to be unable to discern truth, they become an example of

---

<sup>31</sup> Green, *Luke*, 462. Johnson, *Luke*, 184–187, has also linked these passages together as a single pericope.

“darkness” and an “unhealthy eye” because of their closed and “evil” attitudes. Openness to repentance and justice is then a sign of the “light on a stand,” as contrasted with the “evil generation” approach which resists the message; this is a theme which draws together these various passages by means of interlinked images and implications.

Viewed from the perspective of Luke’s narrative design, in which Jesus in the central section of the gospel is taking on the role of a Prophet journeying toward Jerusalem with increasing opposition (i.e. it is in the long travel narrative section of Luke chapters 9–18), Luke’s use of the Matthew material fits perfectly. He has taken material from various places in Matthew, and re-contextualized them to effectively move forward Luke’s story of Jesus the prophet on the Way.

#### D. Cluster of Material on Riches

More easily perceived is Luke’s use of Sermon on the Mount material in his chapter 12. Here the connecting theme of riches is apparent. Luke has constructed a unit of material that all emphasizes the relationship of the disciple with wealth. This cluster of material, which Johnson entitles “Treasure and the Heart,” consists of:

☐ Luke 12:13–15	Warning Against Avarice	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
☐ Luke 12:16–21	Parable of the Rich Fool	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
☐ Luke 12:22–32	Do Not Worry	From Matt 6:25–34
☐ Luke 12:33–34	Treasure in Heaven	From Matt 6:19–21

These four units provide a striking and powerful sermon on the relative value of wealth and the relationship of belongings to a relationship with God. By combining material from Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount, together with unique material, Luke has made a more effective point. This is, of course, consistent with Luke’s literary and theological emphases. As Green notes:

Prominent among the several motifs serving the larger theme in Luke of advancing the purpose of God is the issue of discipleship and possessions. Poverty and wealth stand out as critical concerns for the work of God, and Jesus addresses these subjects relentlessly in

the Gospel of Luke.<sup>32</sup>

This section in Luke is but one of many that addresses the special concerns of poverty and riches and discipleship.

One should also note in this unit of material that Luke has made a rather specific interpretation of the role of possessions in the context of discipleship. While the original parable of the Rich Fool (Luke 12:16–21) is addressed to the multitude as a warning, the subsequent teaching about care and anxiety (Luke 12:22–32// Matt 6:25–34) is addressed to the disciples, who one can assume have already made the commitment to follow God rather than personal gain.<sup>33</sup> To these disciples the words of comfort (“do not worry”) are given. Luke has narratively constructed the units of material from different sources in such a way as to discriminate between audiences, which shows some sophistication in the way the overall theme is presented. The issue of poverty and riches is thus developed both positively and negatively, as both comfort and warning. There is a thematic coherence to the unit, but Jesus’ words have a different effect based upon the audience to whom they are addressed.

We might also note here the hand of Luke in the modification of Matt 6:19–21 (cf. Luke 12:33–34), a sign of Luke’s interaction with the material. Luke has added a strong reinterpretation of the Matthean language. Instead of the negative exhortation “do not lay up treasures on earth” in Matt 6:19, Luke makes a stronger statement with a positive, “Sell your possessions, and give alms.” (Luke 12:33) This is clearly the hand of Luke.<sup>34</sup>

So this construction has all the marks of Luke’s emphasis and his redaction. Luke has

---

<sup>32</sup> Green, *Theology of Luke*, 112.

<sup>33</sup> My gratitude to Mark Goodacre for this observation, who noted this following a first reading of this paper; see Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 114.

<sup>34</sup> Note, for instance, similar themes in Luke 14:33, 18:22 (and cf. 11:41), and especially

gathered material together, and modified it, to make a strong rhetorical point about the way to deal with possessions. It is easier, in my opinion, to argue for Luke's active redaction here than to assert that this was Q's original order which Luke happened to pick up, and that Matthew has adapted the material from Q and lost the original power of it by displacing it. This is especially true if one argues that Luke 12:16–21 was part of Q and originally preceded Q 12:22–34.<sup>35</sup> In this case, one might wonder whether Matthew was a “crank” for breaking up such a carefully constructed unity of material! But in contrast such a unity of material and emphasis being created by Luke's authorial construction from disparate materials is certainly comprehensible given the Third Evangelist's theological agenda. Certainly if Luke modified material taken over from Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, his adaptation shows signs of literary and theological cohesion.

#### E. Cluster of Eschatological Material

In Luke, directly following the teaching on possessions discussed above, Luke turns to an extensive group of teachings that center on eschatological concerns. This eschatological material actually is found in two clusters: 12:35–13:9 and 13:23–35. In between these two sections is a small section that deals with the Kingdom of God. In the latter eschatological section Luke has drawn on material that was found in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount: The Two Ways (Luke 13:23–24// Matt 7:13–14, and On That Day (Luke 13:25–27// Matt 7:22–23).

---

in Acts 4:32.

<sup>35</sup> As Schürmann (“Sprachliche Reminiszenzen an abgeänderte oder ausgelassene Bestandteile der Redequelle im Lukas- und Matthäusevangelium” in *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* [Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968], 119–20) does, with some appreciation by Kloppenborg. See Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, 216, note 182. *The Critical Edition of Q*, ed. James M. Robinson, Paul Hoffman and John S. Kloppenborg (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 324, allows the possibility of 12:16–20, 21 as being part of Q by giving it a “C” rating but not including it in the text of Q.

At first glance it might appear that this whole section in Luke is a bit of a hodge-podge of teachings drawn from various sources.<sup>36</sup> The initial eschatological warnings have a parallel with Matt 24 together with material drawn from Mark 13, but Luke also returns to this subject of eschatology in its “proper” chronological order in Luke 21. Yet Luke appears to have thought it appropriate, following the sections on courage in face of tribulation (Luke 12:1–12) and concern over possessions (Luke 12:13–34), to address eschatological concerns.

The return to eschatological concerns in 13:22 flows rather naturally from the intervening teaching on the Kingdom of God. Following the Parable of the Mustard Seed (Luke 13:18–19) and The Leaven (Luke 13:20–21// Matt 13:33), Luke interprets the Kingdom of God eschatologically as the narrow door (Luke 13:22–24// Matt 7:13–14), and the call to the householder to open the door (Luke 13:25–30). In this latter passage, Luke also combines the material from Matt 7:22–23 with other material from Matt 8:11–12 and Mark 10:31 to produce a powerful warning. Note also that by using Matt 8:11–12 material to focus on the rejection of God’s prophets, he anticipates Jesus’ own rejection and death as the Prophet. Since he follows this up with both the warning against Herod (“L” material, Luke 13:31–33) and the Lament over Jerusalem (Luke 13:34–35// Matt 23:37–39), the dual focus of eschatological concern and passion anticipation seems to be carefully constructed.

Looking at the whole narrative construction, these two sections of eschatological material are appropriate and provide an existential warning to the disciples and crowds about the importance of the teaching, as well as anticipating the passion. Luke has plausibly combined

---

<sup>36</sup> Note Johnson’s observation at this point: “This section challenges the reader’s commitment to Luke as a conscious author of his Gospel ... Do we meet here a deft and deliberate crafter of the story, or only a clumsy editor? At stake is the interpretation of the passages themselves.” (*Luke*, p. 219). Johnson finally concludes, as I do, that Luke is demonstrating a careful construction of material in this section.

material from various sources, especially using the material from the Sermon on the Mount linked here by the thematic common feature of the door (narrow door, closed door) to emphasize commitment to the Kingdom and eschatological exclusion for those who reject Jesus.

#### F. Cluster of Material About the Law

Finally, Luke has inserted some additional Sermon on the Mount material into a unit which deals with the relationship of possessions and the Law. The cluster of material is arranged as follows:

☐ 16: 1–9	The Dishonest Steward	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
☐ 16: 10–12	Faithful with much	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
☐ 16: 13	Two Masters	From Matt 6:24
☐ 16: 14–15	Pharisees Reproved	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
☐ 16: 16–17	Law and Prophets	From Matt 11:12–13; 5:17–20
☐ 16:18	On Divorce	From Matt 5:31–32
☐ 16: 19–31	Rich Man and Lazarus	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>

It is fairly clear that the entire section of chapter 16 deals with the proper relationship to money and possessions, although there are a number of very difficult and troubling issues in this section. But the difficulties of understanding why some of the double tradition material is inserted into a fundamentally Lukan section is as difficult for the two source hypothesis as for the Farrer hypothesis. Simply put, why does Luke insert the section on the Law and Prophets, or more particularly the saying on divorce, at this point? Even if he were drawing on Q, it is difficult to fully understand why he would insert them here, interspersing them with unique Lukan material.

Green suggests that the entire section of 16:1–31 deals with proper kingdom economics, a counterpart and extension to his teaching in chapter 15 about table fellowship. Within this context, the key issue for including Luke 16:16–17 and 16: 18 is that they serve as polemical

rejoinders to the Pharisees, who are initially termed “lovers of money.”<sup>37</sup> Such a view seems likely. The use of the double tradition material arises from a desire to contrast the main teachings on the proper use of possessions with a polemical counter thrust against the Pharisees who had previously been criticizing his choice of dinner companions (at Luke 15:1–2) and now criticize his teachings on the proper use of money. Divorce and the proper use of possessions are thus equal to or perhaps more important than being pure at dinner, and together can be comprehended under the term “keeping the law and the prophets.”

Notwithstanding some questions about Luke’s authorial strategy, the broad outlines of Luke’s purpose are clear. The first part of the unit (16:1–13) deals generally with the need to consider the proper use of possessions. The difficult Parable of the Dishonest Manager (Luke 16:1–9) at least suggests that one should use possessions to gain advantage. From this perspective, the moralizing summary in v. 9 “make friends for yourselves by means of mammon so that when it is gone they may welcome you into the eternal homes” seems to refer back to Luke 12:33 (“sell your possessions and give alms ... make purses for a treasure in heaven...”).<sup>38</sup> One wonders, then, whether this recollection does not lead Luke to insert the saying on Two Masters (Luke 16:13// Matt 6:24), which in Matthew is found close to the Treasure in Heaven section (Matt 6:19–24). At any rate, it does fit well in Luke’s narration, since the question at stake is the proper use of money: for the kingdom of God or for its own sake. Thus the summary statement that one can’t serve both God and mammon is appropriate to interpret the whole section preceding.

---

<sup>37</sup> Green, *Luke*, 586–587, 602–604.

<sup>38</sup> Johnson, *Luke*, 248: “As the manager used possessions to secure a place for himself, so should the disciples. In the light of Luke’s language elsewhere about laying up treasures in heaven (12:33) there can be no doubt that this saying refers to almsgiving.”

The second unit of material in Luke 16, vv.14–31, plays off a controversy with the Pharisees to develop a bit more fully the relationship of money with God’s kingdom, especially with the Jewish understanding of the Law. This controversy is, of course, epitomized by the parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man (Luke 16:19–31) which concludes this unit of material. The linkage of the Law with proper use of possessions is made clear in the final phrase, which implies that the problem with the Rich Man (=Pharisees) was simply that he was not really listening to the Law or he would have cared for Lazarus.

Within this last unit, Luke has inserted two units of material that are somewhat problematic, vv. 16-17 (Law and Prophets), which draws on material found in Matt 11:12–13 and Matt 5:17–20, and v. 18 (Divorce) which is similar to Matt 5:31–32. What appears to be happening is that Luke is making an application to the importance of the law; and thus the reference to the law and the prophets, as well as divorce, are meant to resonate with and critique the Pharisees’ concern to keep the law.<sup>39</sup> From this perspective, the final turn in the Lazarus parable achieves a slightly stronger sense of irony. The Rich Man and his brothers in the Lazarus parable have ignored the law of Moses by treating the poor improperly. By comparison, then, the Pharisees are also condemned by having a too-narrow understanding of the Law. Whether drawing from Q or from Matthew, Luke has achieved a literary unit that links together the issues of use of possessions and law-keeping, and connects them to an ongoing narrative dispute with the Pharisees. Luke has certainly shown an ability to weave material together from

---

<sup>39</sup> Kloppenborg argues that it is situated in Luke here because of its location in the original order of Q, “(there is scarcely any reason for Luke to move this saying from its Matthean position to its present Lucan location).” (*Formation of Q*, p. 79) But it stands out in Matthew as well, so Fitzmyer: “It is almost as isolated there [Matt 5:32] as it is here in Luke, being unrelated to the topics of the other five antitheses, although agreeing with them in form.” (*The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* [NY: Doubleday, 1983], 1119)

disparate sources into a narrative whole that has an internal consistency. But such thematic consistency only points to Luke's compositional skill, and suggests an ability to frame and interpret disparate material. Luke's use of Matthew, then, would be a very comprehensible literary adaptation of Sermon on the Mount material, especially since the use Matt 6:24 sets up a critique of the Pharisees, and the general comment about the Law and Prophets from Matt 11:12–13 and Matt 5:17–20 as well as 5:31–32 sets the narrative up for the final ironic twist in 16:31. Luke is thus able to use material from the Sermon on the Mount to interact with Lukan *Sondergut* material in an effective way to emphasize Jesus' teachings on possessions and to criticize the Pharisees' rejection of his teachings. Such a use of Matthew's material would not be illogical or arbitrary, but would be a thoughtful literary reworking.

#### G . Various Minor Transpositions

What remains from Luke's use of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount material are a few minor transpositions:

☐ Luke 8:16	Light on a Stand	From Matt 5:14–16??
☐ Luke 12:57–59	On Settling with an Opponent	From Matt 5:25–26
☐ Luke 14:34–35	Salt Losing its Saltiness	From Matt 5:13

I have already briefly discussed Luke's handling of the two pericopes dealing with Light on the Stand (Luke 11:33). For the other similar periscope, Luke 11:33, the Third Evangelist seems to be reliant, in fact, on Mark 4:21–25. The wording is closer to Mark, and finds its place in Luke's narrative matching exactly Mark's narrative order. While it appears to be a doublet of Matt 5:14–16, I think Luke has followed Mark closely in one unit, and drawn on Matthew in another part of his narrative (Luke 11:33).

Luke's use of Matt 5:25–26, The Settling with an Opponent (Luke 12:57–59), is found in the midst of some of his eschatological material (see section discussed above). This pericope is

located following that of Interpreting the Times (Luke 12:54–56// Matt 16:2–3) and preceding the *Sondergut* story of the Barren Fig Tree (Luke 13:1–9). By situating the pericope between two clearly eschatological texts, Luke achieves the effect of interpreting the judge as God Himself; this is an eschatological judgment. Listeners are to recognize they are currently on the Way, and the judgment to come will reflect one’s effort to reconcile with enemies. The Lukan understanding as presented in this context is very different that Matthew’s, which presents it simply as part of a general teaching on maintaining good relations with others. Given Luke’s extensive and nuanced interest in eschatology, this use of the pericope from Matthew is fitting.<sup>40</sup>

The final transposition is Luke’s use in 14:34–35 of the Salt parable from Matt 5:13, or possibly Mark 9:49–50. The location in Luke 14 is somewhat fitting if Luke is still aware of Mark’s order. From Luke 9:51 to 18:15, Luke has little contact with the Synoptic outline. At Luke 9:49–50, the Third Evangelist was drawing on Mark 9:38–41, and he returns to the Lukan outline at 18:15–17, drawing on Mark 10:13–16. But in this large interpolation section there are still some indications that Luke is aware of Mark’s order in placement of some material. The Markan parallels that occur fit generally into the Markan outline, although topical clustering seems to outweigh any Markan sequencing. The placement of the Parable About Salt in Luke 14:34 may reflect some of this sense of Markan outline, drawing on Mark 9:49–50 at this point. In its Lukan narrative context, it serves to summarize a cluster of material which generally deals with commitment to the Kingdom. The cluster begins with Luke 14:15–24, the Parable of the Great Supper, which emphasizes the rejection of those who choose not to accept an invitation to the dinner. Luke 14:25–33 then deals with demands of discipleship. Here discipleship is

---

<sup>40</sup> Certainly one of the better evaluations of Luke’s complex approach to eschatology is found in Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1982), 100–157.

compared, first choosing between following Jesus and one's family, then with building a tower without calculating the cost. The statement about salt that has lost its saltiness, fit only to be tossed out, summarizes these passages emphasizing commitment to the task of, and invitation to, discipleship.

Luke, though, is drawing on Matthean language in his version of the Salt pericope. The statement in Luke, "it is fit neither for land or dunghill, men throw it away" has no counterpart in Mark, and is a modification of Matthew's form. So Luke, while perhaps locating the Salt pericope here under the influence of Mark's order, has nonetheless utilized Matthew's form of the parable. Still, Luke's rhetorical use is at the same time uniquely Lukan, used to drive home the pointed remarks about the need for commitment to the Kingdom.

#### H. Summary Observations

As we review Luke's use of the material common to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, we find the following features:

(1) Luke has tended to use the material, whether drawn from Matthew or a hypothetical Q, in clusters which develop fairly coherent themes. These thematic clusters often accentuate or develop the material which is somewhat "thrown together" in Matthew as a list of ethical admonitions. One way in which Luke develops these themes is to wed together special Lukan material (*Sondergut*) with material drawn from Matthew to add emphasis or expand on the importance of the central idea. Luke, then, has shown a fairly sophisticated authorial purpose in developing important themes. The theme of prayer (developed in cluster "B," Luke 11:1–13), the theme of proper use of riches (cluster "D," Luke 12:13–34), the theme of eschatological tension (cluster "E," Luke 13:23–30), and the theme of interpreting the Law in terms of use of possessions (cluster "F," Luke 16:1–31) together pick up important parts of Luke's theology.

This thematic clustering, then, seems to further Luke's theological agenda and is consonant with a careful compositional strategy.

(2) Luke is quite willing to modify the order of Matthew's sermon, yet shows some reliance on it at certain points. This is especially true in Luke's Sermon on the Plain, where his use of common material follows Matthew's general order, though with some minor modifications. Virtually everyone agrees that Matthew has constructed his sermon from disparate material. The common ordering of material in the two sermons (even given the Lukan transpositions that remove material to other locations in his narrative) would suggest some literary relationship. Is it a common reliance on Q, or would it be (more) reasonable to posit Luke's reliance on Matthew? Luke's reliance on Matthew would appear to be a reasonable conclusion. At the very least one can conclude that Luke's use of Matthew is very plausible – this is not the work of a “crank.”

(3) Given Luke's integration of the double tradition material into the flow of the narrative along with Lukan *Sondergut* and Markan material, is there a strong case to be made that the order of Q material in Luke is simply the order of the document “Q”? But the “Lukan order of Q” appears to be simply a negative response to Matthew's obviously constructed order; if Matthew's is not the original order, then Luke must have the original order.<sup>41</sup> Given Luke's careful attention to thematic coherence, it seems unlikely that Luke would have simply developed his themes around certain Q sayings as they happened to occur in this prior document,

---

<sup>41</sup> This is the primary thrust of Kloppenborg's section on the order of Q (*Formation of Q*, 72–80). Material in Matthew is deemed out of order because one can see a theological emphasis. But it is frequently stated that Luke has no reason to tamper with the order of Q, so Luke's order must reflect Q's order.

adding various Markan or *Sondergut* material as necessary.<sup>42</sup> And perhaps Q theorists have been a bit enamored with Matthew's editorial construction and have paid less attention to Luke's own narrative design. Given Luke's authorial control over material, it seems more likely that he has selected material as needed to build thematic units in a narrative development.

#### IV. Luke's Interpretation of Matthew Material

In addition to understanding Luke's intentional ordering of material, there are signs that Luke has demonstrated an active editorial approach to contextualizing and modifying sources that he draws on in the service of a distinctive theology. I will consider one important example from material in Luke that is drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, the Beatitudes<sup>43</sup>:

##### A. The Beatitudes:

Luke's beatitudes certainly show a clear tendency to pick up themes that are central to his theological program. It is well known that Luke's beatitudes demonstrate a different emphasis. The Third Gospel has, instead of Matthew's eight (or nine) beatitudes, simply four.<sup>44</sup> First let us consider the four Matthean beatitudes that are missing in Luke:

1. blessed are the meek
2. blessed are the merciful
3. blessed are the pure in heart
4. blessed are the peacemakers.

---

<sup>42</sup> One might also note that Luke has not slavishly taken over Mark's material or order without some attempt to achieve thematic coherence. See Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 91–93.

<sup>43</sup> Additional examples of this editorial control has been seen in Luke's modification of the Golden Rule section, sandwiching it into sections of the admonition to love one's enemies. Another example can be seen in Luke's modification of "treasures in heaven" (Luke 12:33), where the addition of "sell your possessions and give alms" is certainly an indication of a freedom with source material in support of Lukan theological aims. The narrow focus of this paper does not allow extensive support of more examples of Luke's modification of his material.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. H. Benedict Green, *Matthew: Poet of the Beatitudes* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001)

It is striking that these four omitted beatitudes all deal with spiritual qualities of the listener. The rationale for omitting these four may be seen even more clearly in the modification of the beatitudes taken up by Luke:

**Matthew's version**  
Blessed are the poor in Spirit  
for theirs is the kingdom of heaven

Blessed are those who mourn  
for they shall be comforted

Blessed are those who hunger and thirst for righteousness  
for they shall be satisfied

Blessed are those persecuted for righteousness' sake  
for theirs is the kingdom of heaven  
Blessed are you when people revile you  
And persecute you and utter all kinds of evil against you falsely on my account

Rejoice and be glad, for your reward is great in heaven, for so people persecuted the prophets who were before you.

**Luke's version**  
Blessed are the poor  
for yours is the kingdom of God

Blessed are you who weep now  
for you shall laugh

Blessed are you who hunger now  
for you shall be satisfied

Blessed are you when people hate you and exclude you and revile you, and cast out your name as evil, on account of the Son of man!

Rejoice in that day, and leap for joy, for behold, your reward is great in heaven; for so their fathers did to the prophets.

A quick comparison of the beatitudes above shows the distinctive difference between Matthew's and Luke's versions. What has been often noted is the emphasis in Luke on real immediate physical concerns. Hence the use of "poor," instead of "poor in spirit;" or "weep now," instead of "mourn;" or "hunger now," instead of "hunger and thirst for righteousness;" all these modifications speak to a concern for real present suffering. In contrast, Matthew's version interprets these difficulties as spiritual difficulties: poor in spirit, hungering and thirsting for righteousness, persecuted for righteousness' sake. That Luke wants to emphasize the physical reality of present suffering is made manifest by his inclusion of a set of woes that exactly parallel the blessings: woe to the rich, woe to those full now, woe to those who laugh now, woe to those when people speak well of them. These woes would appear to be Luke's own composition, and

speak to his unique emphasis.<sup>45</sup> The concurrence of the woes, which are Luke's addition, with the focus of the beatitudes strongly suggests that Luke has had a strong hand in shaping the beatitudes. The use of the pronoun "you (pl.);" is also an indication that Luke has exercised a compositional role in this section.<sup>46</sup>

But more important than any linguistic argument is the theological and narrative argument for Luke's strong redactional hand in the section of the beatitudes and woes. Luke has signaled his interest in the issue of physical needs and the reversal of fortunes early in the Third Gospel. Mary's Song in Luke 1:46–55 has an anticipatory nature, and it sings of the concern for the poor and the hungry in ways that look forward to the beatitudes: "He has brought down the powerful from their thrones and lifted up the lowly; he has filled the hungry with good things, and sent the rich away empty." (Luke 1:52–53). Similarly, Jesus' inaugural sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:16–21), which has often been called programmatic for the gospel, evokes the same themes.<sup>47</sup> There the use of Isaiah 61 anticipates again the beatitudes: "he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor." In such a carefully constructed anticipation of the themes of reversal, is it likely Luke's beatitudes are simply taken over from a source? Or is it not more likely that Luke has extensively modified them? Given Luke's overall narrative pattern of concern for physical needs, then, we should consider it very possible, even likely, that Luke has utilized Matthew's beatitudes rather simply relying on a common source. In general the Q theory requires that Luke would not have used Matthew in such a way that it produced a text like the Third Gospel. To assert Luke's independent use of a source rather than Matthew, which is required to affirm the Q theory, would require explicit reasons why Luke could not have used Matthew. But given Luke's theological program, such a modification of Matthew is exactly what one would expect. In other words, Luke's modification of Matthew in the beatitudes is consonant

---

<sup>45</sup> As Fitzmyer notes, *Luke I-IX*, 627.

<sup>46</sup> Henry J. Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), 124–26.

<sup>47</sup> Green, *Theology of Luke*, 76.

with his overall theology. The burden of proof thus lies with proponents of independence to show why this is not possible or likely.

In addition to the theme of physical needs and reversal which are central to the Third Gospel, a Lukan emphasis is also found in the final beatitude. There the hearers are reviled and persecuted just as the prophets of old were persecuted by the Jewish leaders (“so their fathers did to the prophets”). This theme of the rejection of prophets by their own people is anticipated in the conclusion of the Nazareth sermon (Luke 4:24–27), and continues to be a theme in Luke. Jesus is particularly rejected by the Jewish leaders in Luke (note the emphatic rejection at Pilate’s trial, Luke 23:1–24, ending with Pilate’s handing him over “to their wishes.”) And in Acts this is developed further in Stephen’s speech, Acts 7:52.

The net result of this cursory examination of the beatitudes section shows Luke’s heavy compositional hand on the material used to shape the Sermon on the Plain. Luke has formed his version of the beatitudes to fit into a carefully constructed narrative pattern. In other words, Luke is quite willing to modify and craft material around distinct theological emphases. This is hardly a cut-and-paste editor, as is often suggested by some proponents of the Q hypothesis—at least that view that has Luke more closely reflecting the early state and order of Q here. And if Luke can be shown to be exerting a strong compositional strategy, then it is also likely that he has been willing to modify Matthew toward this end rather than simply adopting Q material. Since the Q hypothesis requires Luke to have been independent of Matthew—that is, that it is highly unlikely he could have used Matthew—Luke’s compositional strategy here casts serious doubt on the viability of that hypothesis. Simply put, it appears highly likely that Luke would have modified Matthew to produce his version of the beatitudes, thus obviating the need for Q.

## V. Conclusions

I return, then, to the initial questions that were posed about Luke's use of Matthew.

1. *Is Luke's use of Matthew reasonable, given his authorial design and behavior?* Luke indicates some of his literary emphasis and design in the prologue: he desires to produce a narrative that is ordered as a compelling testimony of who Jesus was. The key words here are narrative and order. I would suggest that Luke has always before him a concern to produce an ordered narrative, and that this drives much of his compositional effort. Given this concern, Luke's reworking of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, in accordance with clear theological and narrative concerns, would appear to be reasonable.

The following aspects of this literary concern would, in my opinion, support this conclusion:

a) Luke resists the long sermons that so dominate Matthew and tend to break up the narrative flow. Instead, Luke develops Jesus' teaching in smaller clusters that depict Jesus as responsive to questions or concerns that arise in the course of the narrative. We can see this responsiveness in the teaching on prayer (Luke 11:1–13), where the disciples ask, upon observing his own prayer life, to be taught about prayer. Or, similarly, Jesus' teaching on the proper estimation of possessions (Luke 12:13–34) follows a question about inheritance. These narrative settings are part of Luke's approach to the story of Jesus, and are as thoughtful and carefully constructed as Matthew's long sermons.

b) Jesus restricts his subject matter at the Sermon on the Plain to two issues which are pertinent at the beginning of His ministry: the concern for reversal, and a prophetic call for his followers to have a sound foundation. The first theme picks up the programmatic issues sounded in the infancy narrative (especially Mary's song) and the sermon at Nazareth. The second anticipates the rejection by the Jewish leaders, and serves as a call to his disciples to follow in the teachings that will be given in the rest of the gospel. It is, then, anticipatory of the rest of the gospel. But its setting in Luke, just after the appointing of the twelve, and the gathering of a large group of disciples, is particularly important. For Luke, this more sparse sermon is

particularly fitting for the setting, a setting he has placed just after the appointment of the twelve. It is worth noting that this appointment itself follows a series of healings and signs that should (and did) elicit a response from his disciples (and the disciples include, for Luke, more than the twelve). Luke's narrative setting, and the limited subject matter, is highly appropriate.

c). Much of Jesus' teaching awaits the journey, chapters 9–18. The journey is, of course, a literary motif that Luke uses to insert material that is not found in Mark. Given that travel narratives are common in Greco-Roman histories and romances, this shows Luke's awareness of literary conventions. Luke, then, uses the motif of the journey to situate a number of teaching clusters along the way. These clusters allow Luke to develop themes with more emphasis than Matthew has in his longer Sermon on the Mount. This is a logical and reasonable literary method, not simply the work of a crank.

d). Luke's way of dealing with Matthew is part of a general pattern. Mark Goodacre has noted that Luke treats Mark 4, the section on the parables, in much the same way—that is, some is omitted, some is retained, and some is moved to different contexts.<sup>48</sup> Luke's control over and manipulation of his source material, then, is a pervasive pattern, not just a feature of his use of Matthew.

2. *Is Luke's arrangement necessarily less aesthetic than Matthew? Is it less compelling? Is it less convincing for the purpose that the Evangelist puts forward?* The question of aesthetics is difficult. To whom should a work be aesthetically pleasing? To us, who have been brought up on Matthew as the gospel of the church? To ancients? Which ancients? Greek or Hebrew? The question is frankly impossible to answer.

To begin with, this question presumes that Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is a clear and compelling account of Jesus' teaching. The Sermon on the Mount does present Jesus in a

---

<sup>48</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, 91–92, cf. Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm*, 39–41. See also other notes in Goodacre about Luke's rearrangement of Mark (87), which points to the conclusion that Luke exercised editorial freedom with Mark, even as I suggest he did with Matthew.

Mosaic fashion as a giver of a new law, a new list of ethical mandates. But the Sermon does have a certain quality of accumulating a large number of seemingly unconnected issues. While there is an inherent logic built around a three-part structure, it is a loose structure. One has the impression of a collection of discrete teachings that have been accumulated together to form a compendium on ethical instruction. There is much in the Matthean sermon which might seem artificial, and it certainly buries in the accumulation of ethical mandates certain elements of teaching which could be more effectively treated if developed independently.

But without regard to questions of Matthew's compositional success, we can also affirm Luke's creative success. Luke does follow literary conventions in Luke and Acts that reflect aesthetic and rhetorical concerns of antiquity, especially Hellenistic history, biography and romances. In reworking Mark's and Matthew's gospels, fitting them into a narrative plot heavily derived from Mark, but with an extensive travel narrative, Luke has produced a pleasing and effective narrative that tells a particular story of Jesus. It is not the same story that Matthew or Mark produce. This story is more concerned about the marginalized, about Jesus the prophet of God being rejected by the Jews, and about the larger story God's plan for all of creation—including the Gentiles. And Luke is less concerned about the particularities of Jewish law. Luke is more willing to develop his prophetic story with literary foreshadowing and summaries, rather than explicit proof-texting from Scripture. Moreover, one must be aware that Luke is part of a two volume work which relies on parallel narrative techniques. The question of aesthetics and compelling narrative must then be answered within the context of Luke's larger purpose. From this perspective, Luke is an effective narrator of the story of Jesus. The change in order and setting of material drawn from Matthew works very effectively in Luke's story.

3. *Can one imagine Luke using Mark in a different way than he does Matthew?* A major argument posed against Luke's use of Matthew is that he would be utilizing his two sources in significantly different ways. This starts with the assumption that Luke has rather routinely used Mark with few changes, but this is not true. He has, for instance, in the passages just preceding the Sermon on the Plain, shown remarkable freedom in re-ordering the sequence of the initial

accounts of Jesus' first preaching, healing, and calling of the disciples. So Luke is not entirely a slave to the Markan account.

But notwithstanding this recognition that Luke is more sophisticated in his use of Mark than often credited, there are good reasons to imagine Luke dealing with Matthew quite differently. First, if Mark had achieved a place in the early church's "scripture" as a well known account of Jesus' ministry, and Matthew has been only recent addition to that, one can imagine that Mark would be given priority in assembling a new narrative. Secondly, since Matthew's interests often deal with issues particular to Jewish Christians, Luke's interest in showing a new Israel that extends to Gentiles as a more fundamental part of God's plan might well necessitate a more critical eye toward the First Gospel. And finally, Matthew's own construction into lengthy discourses can be seen as running contrary to Luke's narrative design which intersperses action, dialogue and teaching into smoother account of Jesus' movement toward Jerusalem. Given these features in Matthew, it is very reasonable to see Luke casting a more critical eye upon Matthew, even while considering material in it as valuable for a new edition of the story of Jesus.

This paper cannot in short compass address all the concerns that have been raised about Luke's possible use of Matthew. But with an understanding of Luke's purpose, and his literary method, it appears reasonable that the Third Evangelist would have rewritten the Sermon on the Mount in the fashion that he presents us. If so, then it is also reasonable to rethink the independence of Luke from Matthew, and rethink the role that the hypothetical document Q might have played in the construction of the Third Gospel. If Luke reasonably can be seen to have used and rewritten Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, then does one need to postulate a Q at all? The existence of the hypothetical Q is predicated on the independence of Matthew and Luke—the idea that Luke simply could not have creatively reworked Matthew to produce the Third Gospel requires a "Q." But a simpler explanation exists: that Luke used both Matthew and Mark under the control of a literary and compositional strategy to produce a pleasing and compelling narrative.