

## 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." 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 the 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 that Luke would have dismantled the material in Matthew 5 – 7, scattering it among a variety of narrative settings, and destroying its literary unity.

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 recontextualizing of material found in Matthew's Sermon on the Mount? This paper is a preliminary 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>1</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>2</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 theory is that both

---

<sup>1</sup> Austin M. Farrer, "On Dispensing with Q." In *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R.H. Lightfoot* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), pp. 55-88.

<sup>2</sup> See, for instance: (1) Robert H. Stein, *The Synoptic Problem: An Introduction* (Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1987), pp. 89-112 -- note the placement of the argument for independence in this construction; (2) Werner G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, Revised Edition (Nashville: Abingdon, 1990) pp. 63-77, especially p. 64; (3) E. P. Sanders and Margaret Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press International, 1989), pp. 62-66, p. 67.

evangelists depend on common source material.<sup>3</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>4</sup> Similarly, B. H. Streeter notes that the simplest solution to the material common to Luke and Matthew, but absent from Mark, is that Luke knew Matthew’s gospel. In response to this, he offers fundamental problems to this “easy” solution: (1) the disagreement in the order of such common material in the Marcan 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>5</sup> 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>6</sup> Simply put, without the independence of Luke and Matthew, the need for Q disappears.

---

<sup>3</sup> C. M. Tuckett, “the Synoptic Problem” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary [ABD]* (NY: Doubleday, 1992), vol. 6, p. 268.

<sup>4</sup> John C. Hawkins, “Double Tradition in Matthew and Luke” in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1911), p. 102.

<sup>5</sup> B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (NY: The Macmillan Co., 1925), p. 183.

<sup>6</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 (p. 91 ff): (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 tend to be overstatements or, in my opinion, finds reasonable explanations. There is a

A counterpart to the idea that Luke could not have used Matthew as a major source is the nature of Luke's role as an author, or, more correctly, the conception that Luke was not an author, but rather a compiler and editor. For 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>7</sup> But modern Lukan studies have increasingly emphasized Luke's skill as a composer, not just an editor. Of course this understanding has been developed with respect to Matthew as well, and Matthew is seen as having formed from disparate material his great sermons.<sup>8</sup> But there still remains an underlying resistance to conceiving Luke's work 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>9</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

---

tendency toward a circularity in many of the arguments based on the starting assumption of a "Q." The scope of this paper, however, cannot address all of these directly.

<sup>7</sup> Farrer, p. 56.

<sup>8</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), pp. 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* 66 (1988): 405-414; J. Smit Sibinga, "Exploring the Composition of Matth. 5-7," *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 7(1994): 175-196.

<sup>9</sup> Hence the continual reference to Luke's material as retaining the original order of the Q material.

(which is often presumed to have been presented in the order found in 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>10</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>11</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 Lk, for example, to shatter Mt'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>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Tuckett, *ABD*, p. 268.

<sup>11</sup> Streeter, p. 183.

<sup>12</sup> Kümmel, p. 64.

Finally, we must also note a prevailing assumption that Luke must have a uniform, and again I use the term wooden, 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 material, we should expect Luke to follow a similar approach with respect to Matthew.<sup>13</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 aesthetically pleasing than Matthew? Is it less compelling? Is it less convincing for the purpose that the Evangelist puts forward?
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 educates this exploration of

---

<sup>13</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.

the Sermon on the Mount material. Without arguing extensively in support of these points, they can be summarized as follows:

1. Mark is the first gospel written, and 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 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 a perceived editorial freedom on the part of Matthew that Luke was more willing to modify. 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 stated 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 which 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 Luke's use of Matthew's

Sermon on the Mount 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>14</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 Gospel. These units are:

" Mt 5:21-24	On Murder and Anger
" Mt. 5:27-30	On Adultery
" Mt. 5:33-37	On Oaths
" Mt. 6:1-4	On Almsgiving
" Mt. 6:5-6	On Prayer
" Mt. 6:7-8	Don't Pray as Gentiles
" Mt 6:16-18	On Fasting
" Mt. 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. In the first instance, Matthew's antitheses, one can note that Matthew's antithesis construction

---

<sup>14</sup> I am indebted in the following discussion to observations made by Mark Goodacre in his forthcoming book, *The Case Against Q* (Trinity Press International, forthcoming).

(you have heard it said ... but I say) is avoided entirely by Luke. Certainly the framing context of reinterpreting the Law is avoided. Of course, Luke does use some snippets of material from the section found in Mt 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. Mt 5:22-26 without Mt 5:21, or Mt 5:32 without Mt 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 the section from 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, as a section, to have 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, one 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 one 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>15</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 Mt. 7:6, which would almost certainly be viewed as a pejorative statement against Gentiles.

Scholars have argued that Luke resists the large blocks of teaching that are found in Matthew in preference to smaller units of teaching.<sup>16</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 a less compelling explanation for the omissions. And it certainly does not explain why this material in particular was omitted over against other material that was used.

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

---

<sup>15</sup> Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans, 1997), p. 21.

<sup>16</sup> Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1976), p. 134; M. D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989) p. 346.

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. We can quickly chart this out as follows:

**Comparison of Placement of Matthew and Luke  
Sermon on Mount Material<sup>17</sup>**

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

At first glance, this comparison of the placement of material in Matthew's sermon and Luke's use of it appears hodge-podge and almost random. But a closer look shows some very strong evidence of Luke's knowledge of Matthew's order and a thoughtful approach to transposing the

---

<sup>17</sup> Note the following listing of clustering of Luke's material that will be used in the following discussion: Cluster "A" - **Highlighted**; Cluster "B" - Underlined; Cluster "C" - *Italic & Underline*; Cluster "D" - **Bold Type**; Cluster "E" - *Italic*; Cluster "F" - **Bold Italic**.

material.

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 incorporate shows a remarkably common ordering:<sup>18</sup>

<u>Order of Material Common to Sermon on Mount and Sermon on Plain</u>				
<u>Matthew 5:1-7:27</u>			<u>Luke 6:17-49</u>	
5:1	Setting of the Sermon		6:17	Setting of the Sermon
5:3-12	The Beatitudes		6:20-23	The Beatitudes + Woes
5:38-42	On Retaliation		6:27-28	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 material (the major

---

<sup>18</sup> The chart is a modification of that found in Drury, p. 133, to whom I am indebted for the clarity such a chart presents.

exceptions dealing with calling and naming of “the twelve”). Luke follows Mark in having Jesus name the twelve apostles on a mountain top (Lk 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>19</sup> The emphasis on the placement of the sermon appears as well to be a deliberate rejoinder to Matthew’s sermon on the mountain. Perhaps this 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).<sup>20</sup> This 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

---

<sup>19</sup> Green notes (*Luke*, p. 262), I think correctly, that this is a theological construction by 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>20</sup> Hans Conzelmann (*The Theology of Luke* [NY: Harper and Row, 1960], p. 44) rightly notes that for Luke mountains are places of revelation and prayer. Luke has Jesus on mountains generally alone or with a small group of disciples, e.g. Lk 9:37. There is, then, a theological as well as a narrative reason for disagreeing with Matthew on the placement of the sermon.

with Matthew.<sup>21</sup>

What follows then in Luke is a number of pericopes selected from Matthew's sermon, presented in the same 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 Mt 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 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 one compares 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

---

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

that Matthew's sermon is a collection of disparate materials, with 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 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 movement from loose collection to a tighter more coherent sermon not what one might expect from Luke's 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

---

<sup>22</sup> K. Grayston, "Sermon on the Mount" in *IDB* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1962), vol. 4, p. 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, "A New Approach to the Sermon on the Mount," pp. 405-414.

<sup>24</sup> Emanuel Hirsch, *Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums*, as quoted in Betz, p. 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], p. 628).

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

<sup>26</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), p. 110. Johnson argues that there are 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.

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 moved 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 Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount. In many ways, then, Luke has accentuated and expanded the material he found in Matthew.

Chapter 11 in Luke begins with Jesus praying, a particular emphasis in Luke.<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 (Lk 11:5-8). This is then followed by a passage drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, Mt 7:7-11, Encouragement to Pray.

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 become part of a catalog of various virtues. By separating the prayer material and bringing it together, and framing it with both Jesus’ own prayer attitude and the disciples’ request to learn about this attitude, Luke has given it an independent status that makes it more important as an independent quality. This strikes me as a very

---

<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*, p. 287). (my emphasis)

<sup>28</sup> Joel Green, *The Theology of Luke* (Cambridge: University Press, 1995), p. 58-9.

rational methodology for an evangelist who is frequently concerned about prayer.

### C. Cluster of Material On Lamp

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

But Luke does not insert this into his text by itself, but rather Luke inserts it into a section of Luke which has already drawn on Sermon on the Mount material (the Prayer section discussed above, Lk 11:1-13). And, further, Luke connects the Lamp on a Stand pericope with another piece of material drawn from the Sermon on the Mount, The Sound Eye, Mt. 6:22-23. Since the eye is deemed the "lamp of the body," Luke has apparently made the connection that Lamp on the Stand stands for a person of sound spirit, a "whole" person, a righteous individual. The material which stands unconnected in Matthew is thus contextualized in Luke.

Luke has also connected the parable of the Light on a Stand with the preceding passage on the Sign of Jonah (Lk 11:29-32), by means of the linking word "evil."<sup>29</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

---

<sup>29</sup> Green, *Luke*, p. 462. Johnson, *Luke*, 184 ff., has also linked these passages together as a single pericope.

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 (Lk 11:37-52), who can be taken to be examples of the evil generation that does not hear the prophetic call.

Viewed from Luke’s narrative design, in which Jesus in the central section of the gospel is taking on the role of Prophet journeying toward Jerusalem with increasing opposition, Luke’s use of the Matthew material fits perfectly. He has taken material from various places in Matthew, and recontextualized 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:

“ Lk 12: 13-15	Warning Against Avarice	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
“ Lk 12:16-21	Parable of the Rich Fool	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
“ Lk 12:22-32	Do Not Worry	From Mt. 6:25-34
“ Lk 12:33-34	Treasure in Heaven	From Mt. 6:19-24

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>30</sup>

This section in Luke is but one of many that address 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 on the Rich Fool is addressed to the multitude as a warning, the subsequent teaching about care and anxiety is addressed to the disciples, who one can assume have already made the commitment to follow God rather than personal gain.<sup>31</sup> To these disciples the words of comfort (“do not worry”) are given. Luke has allowed the accumulation of material from different sources to discriminate between audiences, which is a fairly sophisticated narrative device.

Note also here the hand of Luke in the modification of Mt 6:19-21, an indication 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 Mt 6:19, Luke makes a stronger statement with a positive, “Sell your possessions, and give alms (Lk 12:33).” This is clearly the hand of Luke.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Green, *Theology of Luke*, p. 112.

<sup>31</sup> My gratitude to Mark Goodacre for this observation, who noted this following a first reading of this paper.

<sup>32</sup> Note, for instance, similar themes in Lk 14:33, 18:22 (and cf. 11:41), and especially in Acts 4:32 ff.

So this construction has all the marks of Luke's emphasis and his redaction. Luke has gathered material together, and modified it, to make a strong rhetorical point about the way to deal with possessions. It is easier 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 it and lost the original power of it. This is especially true if one argues that Lk 12:16-21 were part of Q and originally preceded Q 12:22-34.<sup>33</sup> In this case, one might wonder whether Matthew was a "crank" for breaking up such a carefully constructed unity of material! But such a unity of material and emphasis is comprehensible given Luke's theological agenda.

#### E. Cluster of Eschatological Material

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, one 12:35-13:9, and then a subsequent return to the theme in 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, Lk 13:23-24 (Two Ways) // Mt 7:13-14, and Lk 13:25-27 (On That Day) // Mt 7:22-23.

At first glance it would appear that this whole section is a bit of a hodge-podge of teachings drawn from various sources.<sup>34</sup> The initial eschatological warnings have a parallel with Mt. 24 where this

---

<sup>33</sup> As Schürmann does, with some appreciation by Kloppenborg. See Kloppenborg, *The Formation of Q*, p. 216, note 182.

<sup>34</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 there is a careful compositional effort in this section.

is added to the material drawn from Mk 13, but Luke also returns to this subject in its “proper” chronological order in Luke 21. But Luke appears to have thought it appropriate following the sections on courage in face of tribulation (12:1-12) and concern over possessions (12:13-34) to address eschatological concerns.

The return to the issue of eschatological concerns in 13:22 flows rather naturally from the intervening teaching on the Kingdom of God. Following the parable of the mustard seed and the leaven, Luke interprets the Kingdom of God eschatologically as the narrow door (Lk 13:22-24), and the call to the householder to open the door (Lk 13:25-30). Here Luke also combines the material from Mt 7:22-23 with other material from Mt (8:11-12) and Mk (10:31) to produce a powerful eschatological warning. Note also that by using Mt 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) and the Lament over Jerusalem, 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 an anticipation of the passion. Luke has combined 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

Luke has created a final cluster of Sermon on the Mount material in 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 Mt 6:24
" 16: 14-15	Pharisees Reproved	Lukan <i>Sondergut</i>
" 16: 16-17	Law and Prophets	From Mt 11:12-13; 5:17-20
" 16:18	On Divorce	From Mt 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 Matthean/Q material is inserted into a fundamentally Lukan section is as difficult for the Q 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 these pericopes here.

Notwithstanding some real 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 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's previous modification of the Treasure in Heaven saying from the Sermon on the Mount, Lk 12:33 ("sell your possessions and give alms ... make purses for a

treasure in heaven...”).<sup>35</sup> One wonders, then, whether this recollection does not lead Luke to insert the saying on Two Masters, which in Matthew is found close to the Treasure in Heaven section. At any rate, it does fit well, 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.

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 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 problematic, vv. 16-17, which draws on material found in Mt 11:12 -13 and Mt 5:17-20, and v. 18 which is similar to Mt 5:31-32. These two units would be problematic, as I indicated earlier, whether Luke was drawing them from Matthew’s Sermon on the Mount or from a document Q. What appears to be happening is that Luke is trying to make application to the importance of the law, and thus the reference to the law and the prophets, as well as divorce, perhaps are meant to resonate with the Pharisees concern to keep the

---

<sup>35</sup> Johnson, *Luke*, p. 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.”

law.<sup>36</sup> From this perspective, the final turn in the Lazarus parable achieves a slightly stronger sense of irony.

What I conceive Luke doing, then, is drawing on some previous material he is aware of from Matthew that deals with the Law as a foil for the Lazarus parable. While it is not a perfect fit, it serves Luke's purpose and drives the narrative forward to the final ironic twist in 16:31. But clearly, especially given all the extensive Lukan *Sondergut* in this section, Luke is creating thematically linked units.<sup>37</sup> I certainly would credit Luke here with creativity in constructing these units, and it fits this creativity to see Luke controlling his source material, which would include Matthew.

#### G. Various Minor Transpositions

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

" Lk 8:16	Light on a Stand	From Mt 5:14-16??
" Lk 12:57-59	On Settling with an Opponent	From Mt 5:25-26
" Lk 14:34-35	Salt Losing its Saltiness	From Mt 5:13

I have already briefly discussed Luke's handling of the Lamp on the Stand. Luke in 8:16 seems to be reliant in fact on Mark 4:21-25. The wording is closer to Mark, and finds its place in Luke's

---

<sup>36</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], p. 1119)

<sup>37</sup> It is not unimportant that chapter 16 follows Luke's carefully constructed chapter 15, the "Lost" chapter, in which he weds extensive *Sondergut* material with the parable of the Lost Sheep (par. Mt 18:12-14), producing another thematically cohesive unit. Luke seems to be exercising significant authorial creativity in this section.

narrative matching exactly Mark's narrative order. While it somewhat appears to be a doublet of Matthew 5:14-16, I think Luke has followed Mark closely in one unit, and drawn on Matthew in another part of his narrative (Lk 11:33).

Luke's use of Mt 5:25-26, The Settling with an Opponent, is found in the midst of some of his eschatological material (see section discussed above). Here it follows the pericope on Interpreting the Times (Lk12:54-56) and precedes the *Sondergut* story of the Barren Fig Tree (Lk 13:1-9). The net effect is to interpret the judge in Luke's version Settling with an Opponent as God; this is an eschatological judgement. Listeners are to recognize they are currently on the Way, and the judgement to come will reflect one's effort to reconcile. Notice that the Lukan understanding is very different than Matthew's, which takes it 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>38</sup>

The final transposition is Luke's use in 14:34-35 of the Salt parable from Mt 5:13, or possibly Mk 9:49-50. The location in Lk 14 is somewhat fitting if Luke is still aware of Mark's order. From Lk 9:51 to 18:15, Luke has little contact with the Synoptic outline. At Lk 9:49-50, the Third Evangelist was drawing on Mk 9:38-41, and he returns to the Lukan outline at 18:15-17, drawing on Mk 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 chronology. The placement of the parable

---

<sup>38</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), pp. 100-157.

about salt in Lk 14:34 may reflect some of this sense of Markan outline, drawing on Mk 9:49-50 at this point. In its Lukan narrative context, it serves to summarize a cluster of material which generally deals commitment to the Kingdom. The cluster begins with Lk 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. Lk 14:25-33 then deals with demands of discipleship. Here discipleship is compared first with 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 taken up Matthew's form of the parable. But Luke's 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 a review of Luke's use of the material which is common to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount, I note the following features:

(1) Luke has tended to use the material, whether drawn from Matthew or 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 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,” Lk 11:1-13), the theme of proper use of riches (cluster “D,” Lk 12:13-34), the theme of eschatological tension (cluster “E,” Lk 13:23-30), and the theme of interpreting the Law in terms of use of possessions (Lk 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 is fundamentally Matthew’s. Virtually everyone agrees that Matthew has constructed his sermon from disparate material. This 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.

(3) Given Luke’s integration of the common (Q/Matt) material into the flow of the narrative along with Lukan *Sondergut* and Markan material, is there a strong case to be made for the order of Q material in Luke as simply demonstrating 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>39</sup> But given Luke’s careful attention to

---

<sup>39</sup> This is the primary thrust of Kloppenborg’s section on the order of Q (*Formation of Q*, pp. 72-80). Material in Matthew is deemed out of order because one can see a theological emphasis. But

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, adding various Markan or *Sondergut* material as necessary. And perhaps Q theorists have been a bit enamored with Matthew's editorial construction, but have given 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>40</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. First let us consider the four Matthean beatitudes which are missing in Luke:

---

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.

<sup>40</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" (Lk 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.

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

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 men 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 men persecuted the prophets who were before you.

**Luke's version**

Blessed are the poor  
for yours is the kingdom of God

Blessed are you that weep now  
for you shall laugh

Blessed are you that hunger now  
for you shall be satisfied

Blessed are you when men 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 major differences between Matthew's and Luke's versions. What has been often noted is the emphasis in Luke on real physical concerns and the present reality of those. 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 are certainly Luke's own composition, and speak to his unique emphasis.<sup>41</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>42</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 Lk 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." (Lk 1:53-53). Similarly, Jesus' inaugural sermon at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-21), which has often been called programmatic for the gospel, evokes the same themes.<sup>43</sup> There the use of Isaiah 61 anticipates again the beatitudes:

---

<sup>41</sup> As Fitzmyer notes, *Luke I-IX*, p. 627.

<sup>42</sup> Henry J. Cadbury, *Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1920), pp. 124-26.

<sup>43</sup> Green, *Theology of Luke*, p. 76.

“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 the beatitudes are simply taken over from a source? Or is it not more likely that Luke has extensively modified them? If so, why is it unlikely that he modified the form found in Matthew, rather than that found in a common source?

In addition to the theme of physical needs and reversal which are central to the Third Gospel, an additional Lukan emphasis is 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 (Lk 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, Lk 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 suggested by the Q hypothesis -- at least that view that has Luke reflecting the early state and order of Q. And if Luke can be shown to be exerting a strong compositional strategy, then it is also equally likely that he has been willing to modify Matthew toward this end rather than simply adopting Q material.

## V. Conclusions

I return, then, to the initial concerns that have been raised 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 "dismantling" of Matthew's Sermon on the Mount would appear to be very 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 (Lk 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 (Lk 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 anticipates, then, 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 sparser sermon is particularly fitting for the setting, a setting he has placed after the appointment of the twelve, which itself follows healings and signs which should (and did) elicit a response from his disciples (which includes, 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 open 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 strikes me as 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's section on the parables (chapter 4) in much the same way – that is that some is omitted, some is retained, and some is moved to different contexts.<sup>44</sup> Luke's control over his source material, then, is not 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

---

<sup>44</sup> Mark Goodacre, *The Case Against Q*, chapter 4, developing material from Goulder, *Luke a New Paradigm*.

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 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 efficacy, one 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 account, Luke has produced a pleasing narrative that tells a particular story of Jesus that is effective. It is not the same story as 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. Literarily, Luke is more willing to develop his prophetic story with literary

foreshadowing and summaries, rather than explicit proof-texting from Scripture. Luke, one should remember, has actually written 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.