

THE
BIBLIOTHECA SACRA

ARTICLE I.

THE SOCIAL OUTLOOK IN MATTHEW AND LUKE.

BY THE REVEREND WILLIAM ALLEN KNIGHT, LITT.D.,
BOSTON, MASS.

As an approach to the social outlook in the First and Third Gospels we notice certain differences between these two pieces of writing which mark the workmanship of the authors. These differences, it is believed, will exhibit a distinct social sensitiveness in Luke.

Matthew, agreeing with Mark, has, "If any man would come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." Luke has this, word for word, adding "daily," "Let him take up his cross daily."

Mark in a passage paralleled by Matthew says, "The unclean spirit . . . convulsing the man, came out of him." Luke adds, "having done him no hurt."

Mark, speaking of the woman who had an issue of blood twelve years, puts the case thus: "She had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing better, but rather grew worse." Matthew drops this distinctly lay view of the case entirely and does not attempt to record a judgment. Luke sums up the matter with words describing it as a physician would see it: "She could not be healed of any."

Matthew says of the epileptic son, "He suffereth grievously; for oft-times he falleth into the fire, and oft-times into the water," thus noticing outward matters. Luke says instead, He suddenly crieth out, and he foameth, and is sorely bruised. That is, he notes pathological effects.

Matthew with Mark speaks of the man with a withered hand; but Luke says his *right* hand was withered. Every one knows why a physician would be interested as to which side of the body was smitten.

In the story of Jairus' daughter, told by the three Synoptics, Luke alone mentions that she was an *only* daughter and that she was "about twelve years of age," the sense of the pathetic appearing in the phrase "and she lay a dying"; and Luke keeps the point in Mark's narrative which Matthew omits, how, when life was restored, the Master commanded "that something be given her to eat."

Again, in the story of the demoniac boy, told by all three, Luke alone heightens the father's appeal by the words "for he is mine only child."

In the account of the Temptation, Matthew says, "Then the devil leaveth him"; Luke adds, "for a season."

Matthew says, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you"; Luke adds, concerning enemies, "and do them good, and lend, never despairing."

Matthew has it, "Be ye perfect, as your Father is"; Luke says, "merciful."

Matthew tells of a centurion's *servant*; Luke adds, "who was dear unto him."

Matthew says, The disciples began to pluck and eat the ears of corn; Luke adds, "rubbing them in their hands."

Matthew reports, "The laborer is worthy of his food"; Luke, "of his hire."

Matthew tells of "a wise man which built his house upon a rock"; Luke, of "a man building a house, who digged and went deep, and laid a foundation upon a rock." Matthew says, that when the storm came "it fell not"; Luke declares, that "it could not be shaken." Matthew explains, "for it was founded upon a rock"; Luke, "because it had been well built."

Matthew says, "When even was come"; Luke, "When the day began to wear away."

Matthew has "the cares of the world, and the deceitfulness of riches," as the thorns that choke the growing grain; Luke has "the cares and riches and pleasures of this life."

Matthew, with Mark, says that Jesus called unto him his twelve disciples, and gave them *authority* over unclean spirits and diseases; Luke says, he gave them *power* and authority. This added mention of power with authority is found repeatedly in Luke. Matthew records that, at the last, Jesus said, "All *authority* is given unto me"; Luke reports the words, "Tarry ye in the city until ye be clothed with *power* from on high," while in the opening of the kindred book of Acts, we read, "Ye shall receive power."

Time and again when Matthew, with Mark and even John, calls the little body of water thirteen miles long and six or seven miles wide, the *sea* of Galilee, Luke calls it a *lake*. Mark terms it a sea seventeen times, Matthew fourteen, but Luke never once. It is always only a lake to him, as if the air of the sea, where rolled the world-tide, had preserved his mind for all time against provincial thought and feeling.

These and many similar instances surely are significant. Each one seems to suggest that in Luke there must have been a certain fine sensitiveness of eye and mind to the human meaning of all things. Together they seem indicative of a sense of humanity both keen and sympathetic, a social feeling of extra-

ordinary susceptibility to like sensitiveness in the utterance of another. They prepare us for finding in Luke's writing distinct reproductions of the social sympathies of Jesus.

Coming now to the full view of the social outlook in these two Gospels, we seek, first, to see accurately the Jewish interest and outlook in Matthew, and the Gentile, or rather the non-racial, in Luke. For this distinction is in the literature of the Christian church from the latter part of the second century, and is prevalent in many writings of the present day. What evidence is there of this difference? This is a fundamental question in any sound interpretation of the social outlook in these Gospels.

1. This venerable judgment cannot rest on *the frequency of reference* to the Old Testament in Matthew as compared with Luke.

Matthew has about forty-five quotations from the Old Testament. Eleven of these are put in by the author, bringing together an Old Testament prophecy and an event in the life of Jesus, under the formula, "That it might be fulfilled." The remaining thirty-four are quotations from the Old Testament in the utterances of Jesus. That so large a number are quotations by Jesus is an important point to note, in view of the long-accepted judgment that Matthew is specially set on reporting our Lord's words. It may well be considered how far Matthew would seem to be distinguished by frequency of Old Testament quotations if this were not the method followed. Turning to Luke we find but one or two instances like the eleven in Matthew, where the author himself quotes with such words as "that it might be fulfilled." But we find numerous quotations from the Old Testament in Luke's narrative, and such abundant references as to leave no warrant for differentiation from Matthew on the ground of *frequency* of Old Tes-

tament quotation or allusion. Doubtless there is apparent in Matthew a special *argumentative* interest in prophecy, because he brings into his pages eleven times Old Testament passages which he himself identifies with points in his narrative; but I think that this is about all we can maintain.

On the other hand, Luke has many Old Testament references and quotations not found in Matthew — notably in the Magnificat, given by Luke only; in the utterance of the father of John the Baptist, given by Luke only; in the quotation from Isaiah concerning the preaching of John, where Luke quotes about three times as much as Matthew; in the quotation from Isaiah, given by Luke only, when Jesus read in the Nazareth synagogue and said, "To-day hath this scripture been fulfilled"; in the saying, given by Luke alone, "I say unto you that many prophets and kings desired to see and hear the things which ye see and hear"; in that other saying, given by Luke only, "For I say unto you that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors: for that which concerneth me hath fulfilment." And, to end a list by no means exhaustive, there is that incomparable account, given by Luke alone, of the walk to Emmaus, so thoroughly Jewish and of Old Testament tone, with its "We had hoped that it was he which should redeem Israel," and "O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not *the Christ* to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." Then follows that distinctive passage at the close of Luke, singularly of Old Testament coloring, the like of which is not to be found in the final uplift of Matthew, when Luke alone records: "And he said unto them, These are my words which I spake unto you while I was yet

with you, how that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, *beginning at Jerusalem.*" Matthew's final word about all nations is not followed by any reference to beginning at Jerusalem. And Luke records, as Matthew does not, that when the last great utterance was lingering in their lonely hearts "they returned to *Jerusalem*, and were continually in the temple."

Surely after such instances are set in array we must disallow the judgment that frequency of Old Testament quotation and reference indicates a distinctive Jewish interest and outlook in Matthew as compared with Luke. It is striking, as all must see, that Matthew alone in reporting the Sermon on the Mount records the saying that Jesus "came not to destroy the law or the prophets, but to fulfil"; striking indeed that Matthew alone follows this statement with a series of six utterances, each beginning, "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you" — words which expressly carry the old law on to higher application. But while Luke does not link his disunited allusions to utterances thus massed in Matthew's report, by such impressive repetition of a form of words, he does record, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass away, than for one tittle of the law to fall," and he does give numerous passages, as we have seen, which distinctly show the teaching and the mission of Jesus as a carrying out to fulfilment of the ideas, laws, hopes of old Israel.

2. It is equally clear that we cannot say, as so many writers have done, that Matthew is peculiarly Jewish in its

point of view, because it is fashioned upon a conception of the Kingdom of Heaven which is Hebraic. Luke is as much given to setting forth the same concept, which with equal constancy he calls the Kingdom of God. Matthew has his phrase about fifty times, and Luke his about forty times.

3. We must recognize further that the difference between the two writings does not consist in this, that Matthew represents the gospel as for Israel and Luke for mankind. Universality has been vastly overworked as the ground of differentiation between these Gospels. For the contrast on this point is as marked within the limits of each book as it has been claimed to be between the two. Matthew breaks away from any Jewish interest traceable and rises to universality in the most pronounced fashion; and Luke repeatedly turns from the world-view to the fond concentrations of the elect race, seeing clearly that they are the people "whose is the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom is Christ as concerning the flesh."

First, as to Matthew's universality, it is in his account that we read of the Roman centurion of whom Jesus said, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel. And I say unto you, that many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven; but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness." It is in Matthew that we find such illumined words as, "Galilee of the Gentiles, the people which sat in darkness saw a great light, and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, to them did light spring up"; or this, "I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall declare judgment to the Gentiles. . . . And in his name shall the Gentiles hope." Matthew parallels Luke in his account of the severe rebuke ad-

ministered to the chief priests and scribes and elders, and he intensifies it by reporting what Luke does not; Matthew alone gives the parable ending, "the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom before you"; he alone caps the account by giving this crushing break with Hebraic hopes, "The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Matthew alone gives the great declaration, "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations"; he alone preserves for us the word-picture when "before him shall be gathered all the nations." And to push on to the summit of his universality, it is Matthew's record which caught the fullest sweep of the Master's mind and registered the impelling motive, the limitless range, the all-sufficient method, and the unspeakably blessed upholding, which have possessed the heart of the church through nineteen centuries of world-wide missions: "*All* authority . . . hath been given unto me. Go ye therefore and make disciples of *all* the nations, baptizing them . . . and teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you through *all* the days."

One cannot be greatly impressed with the view which makes much of distinguishing Luke by universality and his use of the word *all*, when one mounts through such passages and stands on this final peak of Matthew's Gospel, feeling the blowing of the winds of the whole earth.

Of the seemingly contrary passage in Matthew, "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," it need only be said that the occasionalism of the words lifts them quite above Judaic narrowness of interest; and of the other kindred utterance in the charge to the twelve, the same remark may be supplemented by noting that this is fully par-

alleled in Luke when concerning the sending out of the seventy it is said, "He sent them two and two before his face into every city and place *whithersoever he himself was about to come.*" The range of the personal ministry of Jesus makes this limiting phrase coextensive in import with Matthew's limitation.

Note, on the other hand, Luke's Jewish interest. He alone gives the announcement to the temple priest of the son that should be born to him, John the Baptist, wherein are the words, "And many of the children of Israel shall he turn unto the Lord *their* God." He alone gives the annunciation to Mary of her Jesus that was to be, with its rich depth of Hebrew coloring, "And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David: and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." Luke alone records the song which the virgin sang, untrifled and exultant because she was filled with Hebrew idealism — a song that reaches its climax in the words,

"He hath holpen Israel his servant
That he might remember mercy
(As he spake unto our fathers)
Toward Abraham and his seed forever."

Luke alone records that burst of Hebrew rapture when the lips of Zacharias were unsealed, beginning,

"Blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel;
For he hath visited and wrought redemption
for his people,"

and vibrant with Jewish joy to the end.

Luke alone gives that thoroughly Hebrew scene in the temple, when the devout Simeon blessed Mary and her Babe and said, "Behold, this child is set for the falling and rising up of many in Israel." It may be noted as significant that in Simeon's song, which is recorded only by Luke, we get the words,

"A light for revelation to the Gentiles."

True, but the next and final line is,

"And the glory of thy people Israel."

If it be observed that these instances are all from the opening part of Luke, then let us look further. In the seventh chapter Luke alone records the Nain incident, where all who beheld it are reported as saying, "A great prophet is arisen among us; and God hath visited *his* people." In the nineteenth chapter Luke alone records the incident of Zacchæus the publican, where Jesus himself is quoted as saying, "To-day is salvation come to this house, forasmuch as he also is a *son of Abraham.*" In the twenty-fourth chapter, where Luke alone records the Emmaus walk, he shows how, through all, the glow of discipleship had been fed by Jewish hopes, as he reports the lament, "But we hoped that it was he which should redeem Israel."

Passing over many other instances in which Luke matches Matthew with passages of this sort, we may well pause on that last and most awesome of all, when Luke, side by side with Matthew, records that story of triple emphasis on Christ's Jewish kingship, how Pilate asked him, "Art thou the king of the Jews?" and the answer was given, "Thou sayest"; how some one (John alone says it was Pilate) wrote and set this superscription on the cross, "This is the King of the Jews"; how they that stood beholding taunted the Nazarene as he died with this pitiless jibe at his now almost expiring hope, "If thou art the King of the Jews, save thyself." All this Luke, too, fully records. And there is a very subtle touch of the author's hand in the fact that Luke puts it "King of the Jews," instead of "King of Israel," as both Matthew and Mark have it; for while Matthew and Mark note that it was the Jewish priests who were uttering the mockery, Luke observes that the Roman soldiers, who were Gentiles, were joining in it. Jewish priests would be likely to whet their taunt by saying "King of *Israel*"; and Gentile soldiery would be sure to vent their

scorn by the mocking words, "King of the Jews." It is in strict accord with the point we are making, that, while Matthew lets this claim to a Hebrew mission die out in the raillery of the priests of Israel, Luke lets the last echo of this same Hebrew expectation expire in the coarse-voiced clamor of the soldiery of world-empire. This is a characteristic instance of how they report the same thing. What shall be said, then, of the ancient and still prevailing judgment that Matthew is marked by a Jewish interest and outlook, while Luke's are non-racial? Shall we reject it? This cannot be done wholly. We must disallow, however, that any difference of this kind between the two Gospels can be based on any great, determinative factors like those we have been discussing.

This is a matter of central importance in studying their social attitudes. For if one is distinctively marked by direct interlacing with the Old Testament and the other not, that fact must be reckoned in accounting for the *source* of the social teachings and the *form* of expressing them; if one lays special emphasis on a unique concept of the kingdom of heaven in contrast with the other, that fact would throw a great light on the method of working as regards the social teachings; or if one sets forth the gospel as specially for Israel while the other views it as for humanity regardless of race, that fact would be immensely important in showing the *range of application*, and so would become determinative in interpreting their social doctrines for men of our day. But if, on the contrary, Matthew and Luke are not truly differentiated on these grounds, we are left to the conclusion that the Old Testament scriptures, the Kingdom of God, Israel, and the world of mankind are common factors in the two books, that they bear a common relation to the report of the gospel in each, and that their social teachings are to be considered on that basis.

We may and should allow for such differences as appear, in the two writings in general and in their social teachings in particular, much as we recognize variation in the vegetation of different countries — variation due to difference of soil, climate, seasons, while the same solid structures of the earth underlie all, and the same vegetable qualities inhere in each. A strawberry is a strawberry, whether grown in California or a Boston hothouse; tobacco is tobacco whether grown in Cuba or Connecticut; because, differ as the product may in form or color or flavor, the same vegetable principle is present in what comes forth from the different conditions. It must not be denied that there is this kind of difference in the writing of Matthew and Luke, because of which there is often a Jewish form, color, flavor, given to the way in which Matthew puts things while Luke's is non-racial. But neither their social teachings nor any other staples in their output are differentiated by more radical causes. There is a steadfast persistency of the inherent, essential ideas, which makes their conceptions and statements essentially identical, however they differ in appearance. And this is nowhere more surely true than in their social views.

This conclusion in part is very exactly expressed by my most helpful friend, Dr. F. G. Peabody, in his book "Jesus Christ and the Social Question." "The first gospel," he says, "is beyond question colored in many respects by the Palestinian tradition, and the third gospel is, in general, adapted to Gentile readers" (p. 197). But my studies have not brought me out in comforting conjunction with the second part of his sentence: "But when we examine the social teachings of the two there is exhibited a reversal of these relationships, and the first gospel rather than the third appears to free itself from the pressing trials of Palestinian poverty and relief."

Instead of reversing these relationships of the two Gospels, their social teachings seem to me to show only more fully what is discernible throughout—the Palestinian coloring of the First Gospel and the adaptation of the Third to Gentile readers, without variation in substance. In considering this matter we here pass over various social questions, to come at once to the great divide—their attitude toward riches and poverty and the problems growing out of them. Here is the field of heaviest battle array among scholars in the social teachings of the New Testament.

It is held by many, that in the material on this subject common to both there is an intensification in Luke favoring the poor and against the rich, and that there is much in Luke but not in Matthew (or Mark) which bears on this subject and bears in the same way. So, for example, Renan declared,¹ that Luke “is a passionate democrat and Ebionite, that is to say, much opposed to property, and is persuaded that the poor will soon have their revenge”; Keim and Colin Campbell thought that we have “gross, naked Ebionism” in Luke; many German writers hold similar views, and Rogge² cites a number of passages because of which, he says, Luke may be called the evangelist of socialism; Professor Peabody, referring to Rogge’s designation, says that “we have as marked a difference of teaching between Matthew and Luke as may be found in modern literature between the teachings of an earnest philanthropist and the teaching of a socialist agitator, it being quite within the truth to speak of Luke as ‘the socialist-evangelist’” (p. 194); and Cone, in his “Rich and Poor in the New Testament,” upholds these judgments in repeated

¹ *Life of Jesus*, Introduction.

² *Der Irdische Besitz im neuen Testament*, p. 10; compare pp. 13, 17.

passages, finding in Luke "a decided sympathy with poverty and antipathy to wealth," and sections having a "marked coloring of interest in the poor and opposition to the rich that distinguishes them from all other parts of the New Testament except the Epistle that bears the name of James" (pp. 62, 118).

There is no uncertainty as to the kind of socialism meant in these judgments. The socialism of which coöperation is the watchword as against competition, and brotherhood the conception of society as against class-conflict and "the spoils to the strong"; the socialism which regards society and humanity not as a mass of contending individuals but as an organic whole, "a vital unity formed by the combination of contributory members mutually interdependent" — this is the essence of Christianity, and it would be commonplace to aver that such a view characterizes Luke's Gospel. But it is clear from the language reproduced and much more like it that these scholars mean to say that they find in Luke the fevered, reactionary, and revolutionary type of socialism which passionately sides with the poor and denounces the rich and broods over catastrophic change as the hope of rectification in human affairs, and fixes its passion on certain specific social wrongs which must be righted as requisite to welfare and, indeed, are constituents of welfare. It is the kind of socialism now voiced by the pastor of City Temple, London. Surely it is not commonplace to say that the Third Gospel is distinctively marked by this sort of feeling and thought.

What shall we say of this view? Beyond question there is much in Luke which might suggest such a judgment. There is a certain sensitiveness to the pathos of things human in his writings, a dramatic tenderness of touch in his narrative, which is so frequent and unique that I think it is clearly characteristic. This shows itself not only in added words and phrases in

reporting incidents and utterances common to the other Gospels, but also in the selective tendency which is seen in the preservation of matter not found in the others.

But more than this is true. There are a number of passages in Luke distinctly social in character which are given by him only. Of this nature is Luke iii. 10-14, where there is added to the account of the Baptist's preaching as given in Matthew a series of questions and answers specifically social; such also is the account (Luke iv. 16-30) of the appearance in the Nazareth synagogue, the reading of the passage from Isaiah filled with social relief work and the striking comment of the Master; such is the parable of the good Samaritan, the scene with Zacchæus the publican, and a long list of instances where the principle of selection indicates great social sensitiveness on the part of Luke.

But when full allowance has been made for all this, two facts must be reckoned with: 1. There is much in Luke to bar out the conclusion that he is socialistic in the sense indicated by the writers above mentioned; 2. There is much in Matthew which, taken alone, would fix like judgment on his writing as surely as on Luke's. That is to say, this contrast found between Matthew and Luke can be set up within Luke and within Matthew.

1. The following examples are illustrative of much in Luke which bars out the socialistic judgment of him.

Where Matthew has, "How much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to those that ask him," Luke drops "good things" and reports "Holy Spirit." Luke alone records the incident in the Bethany home closing, "Thou art anxious and troubled about many things, but one thing is needful, for Mary hath chosen the good part which shall not be taken away from her." Luke alone records the incident

about dividing the inheritance in which Jesus says, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?" It is a surprising study to array the numerous passages in Luke of this nature which point to a spiritual interest rather than material concern. The inheritance passage, given by Luke alone and coming as it does after a long presentation (chapters x.-xii.) of intense and widely ranging social utterances, almost seems to be set as a guard against this very judgment of a socialistic spirit. For it furnishes a downright repudiation of the fundamental claim and characteristic proposal of socialism as we know it; it is full of specifics to cool the fever which typical socialism produces. For example, "Take heed and keep yourselves from all covetousness"; or this, "A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things which he possesseth"; or this, "Be not anxious for your life, what ye shall eat; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on. For the life is more than the food, and the body than raiment"; or this cardinal utterance of Jesus which in Luke comes as a repetition lending emphasis to a part of it, "And seek not ye what ye shall eat, and what ye shall drink, neither be ye of doubtful mind. For all these things do the nations of the world seek after: but your Father knoweth that ye have need of these things. Howbeit seek ye his kingdom, and these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." These last works, given by Luke alone, are a choice instance of the tender touch so often given in his report, and the tone of the whole passage is at once so trustful and serene that it affords winsome evidence of the spirit of the man who garnered the utterances of his Master according to his own selective impulse. Such words are by no means like the tenets of socialism, neither are they in any degree keyed to the mind of the socialist agitator.

If it is suggested that socialism is in the closing words of the passage, "Sell that ye have and give alms," the reply must be that the method, purpose, and warrant for the action are the utmost remove from distribution of property as conceived by the socialist.

With such passages abounding in Luke, we may recognize the social vision and sensitiveness and the social concern which mark his writing; but how can we ignore these guards set against the delusive thought of typical socialism, and speak of him as the socialist evangelist, a passionate democrat and Ebionite, or even say that we have as marked a difference between his Gospel and Matthew's as may be found between the teaching of an earnest philanthropist and a socialist agitator?

To do so is to fall into the same error which brings on the preacher or college professor or public official (even though he be the chief executive) the ban of the charge "He is a socialist," simply because he shows sympathetic interest in the poor or the laborer, or because his convictions lead his mind to apply itself to questions having to do with such social distresses as the wrongs of the rich or the hardships of the socially weak. There is no graver injustice to earnest men of well-poised thoughtfulness and sane moral fervor in our time than this. And when a man shows that he recognizes as well the hardships of the socially strong and the wrongs of head and heart into which the poor fall, and so keeps free from one-sided zeal, he is in truth both sane and well-poised and cannot be classed with the socialist agitator. And Luke does this very thing. Socialism is based on a specific view of what constitutes social welfare and of what would right matters according to that ideal. It cannot be predicated of a man simply because he sees vividly that certain things are wrong in life conditions and feels with keen sympathy how pressing is the need of righting them.

So while Luke shows that the conditions growing out of poverty and riches are seen and felt sharply and sympathetically by him, it must be misleading to apply to him Rogge's characterization, "the socialist evangelist," as a number of scholars do; for there is no evidence in Luke of the specific ideas of socialism, and the book abounds with utterances which are deeply and to the utmost remove at variance with the characteristic spirit of the socialist.

2. But there is much in Matthew which taken alone would mark it as socialistic quite as strongly as Luke, even on the ground of such passages.

Does Luke alone give as the program of Christ's ministry the great words read from Isaiah beginning, "He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor"? But Matthew joins Luke in recording a declaration equally full of social relief work, how in the full tide of that ministry Jesus sent to the imprisoned John the proofs to identify himself to this man whose spirit was breaking in enforced inaction; and the crowning item in the specifications was, "The poor have the gospel preached unto them."

Does Luke add four *woes* to match his four beatitudes, which are not found in Matthew and are against the rich and the well-fed and the self-congratulatory and the praised of men? This is indeed one of the most striking features in the matter we are studying. But we err if we conclude that the absence of a similar passage in Matthew leaves that Gospel without ample material to match it. For Matthew has repeated denunciation¹ of a class in Jewish society mentioned but once in Luke (and once only in Mark but not at all in John). These are the Sadducees. And who were these Sadducees? Here is a very significant fact. They were eminently a social

¹ Matt. iii. 7; xvi. 1, 6, 11, 12; xxii. 23, 34.

aristocracy, a political nobility, adherents of a line of secular rulers, Hellenizers, "their main interest was in the Jewish state and not, like that of the Pharisees, in the purity of the Jews as a religious community."¹ They and their limited following, as Josephus says,² were the well-to-do and those of social standing; they had not the people on their side, but constituted in Jewish society an hereditary nobility originally sacerdotal but through generations distinctly families of civil ambitions and prestige. Schürer says, that "the most salient characteristic of the Sadducees is that they were aristocrats"; and Keim adds, "The Sadducees were hated by the people, were the first in office and dignity, and reckoned their adherents among the rich."

Against these, the dominant rich aristocracy, chiefly interested in the social and civil affairs of the state, concerned with religion largely because their state was in origin theocratic — against this class mentioned but once in Luke, Matthew records repeated denunciation. And what denunciation it is! "Ye offspring of vipers, who warned you to flee from the wrath to come?"; "An evil and adulterous generation"; "Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees" (Luke mentioning only the Pharisees here). Luke's "Woe unto you that are rich" cannot be said to surpass such denunciation as this is in terms of Hebrew life.

And by as much as Matthew thus welds together Sadducees and Pharisees, by so much does he fix on the former the malediction uttered against the latter. For Matthew joins Luke in recording the woes of Jesus against the Pharisees, massing them as he does the beatitudes, increasing the number over

¹ See an excellent summary of much to be found in a wide range of writers, given in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible under "Sadducees."

² Ant. xiii. 10. 6; xviii. 1. 4.

Luke's, and greatly intensifying some of them, but giving a Jewish turn and application to some as compared with Luke.¹ And who were these Pharisees? They are characterized in the Gospels as the ruling religious class, the uncompromising tireless sectarians, the domineering hypocrites, the mercilessly selfish, condemned repeatedly on such ethical and social specifications as the following: They were lovers of money, they were inwardly full of extortion and excess, their scribes were "they who devour widows' houses," they were praised of men, and so on. These details are precisely the ones to make the words "Sadducee" and "Pharisee" cover, in terms of Jewish life, what Luke's four woes are stamped upon — the mercilessly rich, the full, the self-congratulatory, the praised of men. Against such Matthew's record pours out hot and flood-like malediction even beyond the flow of denunciation in Luke. There could be no intenser words than Matthew gives: "Ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte; and when he is become so, ye make him twofold more a son of hell than yourselves." "Ye blind guides, which strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel." Catch that ring of scorn and ridicule against the good churchmen and fine citizens of the land: "Ye are like whited sepulchres, outwardly beautiful, but inwardly full of dead men's bones." The modern socialist who has grown bitter to the point of hatred for the ruling classes hardly surpasses the utter scorn of the words, "Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell." Yet these are in Matthew.

When one reflects on what the classes so denounced were in Jewish society, one seems to hear the tone of the socialist agitator quite as distinctly as in anything contained in Luke. Indeed, I cannot find a match for these words in bitterness

¹ See the sevenfold Woe of Matt. xxiii. 13-29.

anywhere in Luke. Luke may carry over these ideas to the rich and prosperous and lauded of men in terms of general application, as Matthew, adapting his Gospel to Hebrew thought and life, does not; but the ideas, the attitude of mind, the social passion, are the same in Matthew and are all the more pronounced because he gives them development and application by leveling his words against those who were lording it over his own people. We well know that the moral earnestness which denounces tyrants among the Turks does not always measure up to the test of speaking out against the social vampires of our own nation.

But even in the more general application of blessing to the poor and woe to the rich, Matthew is close to Luke. A single instance will suffice for many. Beginning with a warning against Pharisaic practices, Matthew leads up to the great words, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures on the earth, where moth and rust doth consume, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth consume, and where thieves do not break through nor steal; for where thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also." This is, I think, one of the most thorough depreciations of riches contained in the Gospels. Compare with it Luke xii. 15. There is great force in Plummer's remark: "Throughout the third gospel there is a protest against worldliness, but there is no protest against wealth." Yet there is a significant depreciation of riches which is amply matched in the First Gospel. But this is quite a different thing from the thought of the socialist agitator.

It is much urged, however, that Luke gives a radically different import to the beatitudes from that found in Matthew. Luke says, "Blessed are ye poor"; Matthew says, "Blessed are the poor in spirit." Luke says, "Blessed are ye that hun-

ger now"; Matthew says, "Blessed are ye that hunger and thirst after righteousness."

It is argued here that there is seen in Luke a keen sense of distressing temporal conditions and a pungent sympathy reaching out the boon of hope and the solace of assured recompense; while Matthew's form "frees itself from the pressure of Palestinian poverty," rises above concern about social distress and deals with the higher interest of the poor in spirit and those who hunger and thirst after righteousness; so that Luke is distinctively social not to say socialistic in his sense of the meaning of the beatitudes.

But Matthew shows in this same chapter a deep sense of the material needs of men and of the importance of the things that concern the social thinker. He gives a passage about possessions, food, drink, clothing, and daily anxiety, and leads up to the words, "Seek ye first the kingdom of your heavenly Father and his righteousness," as the supreme concern; then he adds, "All these things shall be added unto you"—these things the lack of which makes the distressing social conditions. His "hunger and thirst after righteousness" is for a *righteousness which brings social welfare*. And does not this assurance of social welfare as a consequence of righteousness, brought in as the climax of this supreme appeal, show only the more positively how deep is his sense of the pressing trials, the imperative needs of the poor? It is Matthew, let it be noted, who alone preserves for us that sweetest wooing of the hard-pressed ever uttered, "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." If anything more is needed to show that Matthew is marked by this social consciousness as strongly as Luke, let it be observed that he alone caught these words of the Master for his Gospel: "I was an hungered and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me

drink; I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked, and ye clothed me; I was sick, and ye visited me; I was in prison, and ye came unto me." Four times this list of social distresses is repeated in his account of the Saviour's last discourse. It is surely as concrete and closely fitted to everyday life here in the world as language could make it. And in a special manner it reaches a deeper tone of social sympathy than Luke's "Blessed are ye poor . . . Blessed are ye that hunger now." For here the Master himself is actually identified with the least of the needy. "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these least, ye did it unto me." Then this profound down-reach of social consciousness and sympathy is repeated in reverse form: "Inasmuch as ye did it not unto one of these least, ye did it not unto me."

If it be said that the beatitudes are still the more significant passage, because Christ's great word "blessed" is there definitely affixed when he is announcing fundamental principles of his kingdom, it must be noted that this same great word is affixed here also: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom." That phrase "inherit the kingdom," uttered in the last great discourse reported in Matthew, seems to point back and link this last with the first utterance, where it is twice said, "Blessed . . . for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." And here, if not in the earlier instance, Matthew matches in the fullest manner the woes by which Luke is said to differentiate his report of the first great utterances. "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels," for in neglecting the temporal needs of the social sufferers, ye neglected the Master himself.

To sum up, the unsurpassed denunciatory passages of Matthew are turned against the rich and socially strong in terms

of the Jewish people and also in terms of general application, and expressly on the very grounds which make the curse of riches. We find, therefore, that the social teachings of Luke and Matthew, instead of reversing the relationships generally traceable in these writings, only show the more concretely and forcibly how Matthew's interest and outlook are Jewish without being shut off from universal scope, while Luke's are non-racial without losing a very definite field of Jewish interest and application. Both Gospels are profoundly social, recording deep concern for social welfare as an essential product of the kingdom of God on earth, but neither is socialistic. This is true because they are reporting the mind and life of one who, holding Himself in unfevered poise against the outcry and frenzy into which human conditions drive the socialistic agitator, was yet in the most thoroughgoing sense a social Saviour.