Interpretative strategies for Jesus’ ‘Sermon on the Mount’ (Matthew 5–7)

Geoff Broughton

Well-known or much-loved texts can be every bit as daunting for the preacher as the ‘hard sayings of Jesus’ or long and obscure genealogies. The ‘Sermon on the Mount’ (Matthew 5–7, ‘the Sermon’) – particularly the Beatitudes – is well known and much loved. Diligent preparation on Matthew 5 to 7 might induce ‘analysis-paralysis’ due to either the volume of commentary or the variety of conclusions drawn. Discouraged preachers might (erroneously) conclude there is nothing left to be said! Matthew’s account of Jesus’ teaching on the Mount, however, provides a glimpse of the earliest Christian interpretation of Jesus Christ. From the Apostle Paul to
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the bishop-theologian Augustine; from the reformer Luther to the pacifist
John Howard Yoder; and from the German martyr Dietrich Bonhoeffer to
the contemporary Baptist peacemaker Glenn Stassen; each generation has
found Jesus’ imaginative vision of God’s kingdom utterly compelling. Each
interpreter has suggested a different strategy, however, for applying Jesus’
words for the life of Christian discipleship. This essay briefly identifies
the strength in each approach and concludes that Jesus’ ‘enemy-love’ best
integrates Jesus’ teaching and actions with Jesus’ death and resurrection.

**The Apostle Paul**

The earliest evidence of Jesus’ words known as the ‘Sermon on the Mount’
are recorded by the Apostle Paul in his letter to the Romans, chapter 12
beginning at verse 14 ‘bless those who persecute you; bless and do not curse
them’. Jesus’ radically different relationship with his enemies – summarised
by the command to ‘love your enemies’ (Matthew 5:44) – is interpreted and
applied by Paul in 12:14–21 with multiple direct quotes (for example, ‘do
good’ and ‘do not return evil for evil’) plus many other allusions.1 Evidently
Paul’s theology and mission were not only aware of, but made significant use
of, the words spoken by the earthly Jesus.2 The Apostle rightly understood
enemy-love as a genuinely distinctive Christian way of life, with no existing
parallel in Jewish, Greek or Roman teaching and custom. Enemy-love, as
taught by Jesus in the Sermon, renounces self-interest, retaliation (the *lex
talionis*), harsh words and violence and promotes humility, peace, blessing
and human flourishing. Has familiarity with the Beatitudes blunted the
force and effect of Jesus’ alternative vision of God’s kingdom? How have
subsequent thinkers interpreted Jesus’ Sermon?

**Augustine of Hippo: Jesus as the teacher of the Christian life**

The title of Augustine’s commentary is *De sermone domini in monte* (‘The
Lord’s Sermon on the Mount’) because as Lord, Jesus addressed his fol-
lowers, that is, Christians who were already ‘set free by his love’.3 There is
no ‘universal ethic’ in Jesus’ words for Augustine because they can only be
understood *Christianly*. Only through Jesus’ own incarnation, death and
resurrection – as confessed in a Trinitarian framework and the historic
creedes – can the Sermon be fully understood. Jesus is teaching *a way of life*
for the faithful and not a set of principles for moral philosophy. Augustine’s
linking of the seven Beatitudes with Isaiah’s seven gifts of the Spirit highlights
his emphasis. Augustine’s approach to the Sermon continues to exert its influence on writers such as Oswald Chambers:

The Sermon on the Mount is not a set of principles to be obeyed apart from identification with Jesus Christ. The Sermon on the Mount is a statement of the life we will live when the Holy Spirit is getting his way with us.

Anglican evangelical John Stott also witnesses to the Sermon’s enduring call to radical discipleship in his own preaching and scholarship.

**Luther the Reformer: Jesus’ Gospel of grace (or the impossibility of the Law)**

A kingdom vision of a radically Christian way of life is not the only interpretation of the Sermon. The ethical implications of its teaching were severely criticised for eroding faith in God’s grace and forgiveness by no less of a figure than the great reformer, Martin Luther.

[the Gospel] is accompanied by the Holy Spirit and it creates a new heart. Man, driven into fear and anxiety by the preaching of the Law, hears this Gospel message, which, instead of reminding him of God’s demands, tells him what God has done for him. It points not to man’s works, but to the works of Christ, and bids him confidently believe that for the sake of his Son God will forgive his sins and accept him as his child.

Luther insists God's gracious gift – not God's demanding law – is the heart of the Christian Gospel and therefore the foundation of the Christian way of life. What role does Jesus’ Sermon fulfill? Its impossible demands force the Christian to rely solely on God's free gift: *sola gratia*. The great reformation concern that the grace of God-in-Christ might be displaced by the ethical demands of the Sermon (misinterpreted as works-righteousness) remains prominent in some preaching and teaching. The reformed interpretation of the Sermon correctly notes Jesus' teaching in the Sermon is introduced by the six antithesis (5:21–48), giving rise to a long and complex scholarly debate about Jesus’ continuity (or, discontinuity) with the Law. Jesus’ attitude to the Law (of Moses) provides important clues for how his words ‘but I say to you …' are best understood. While the debate shows no sign of
abating, Banks’ insight of the proper relation between Jesus and the Law remains prescient:

This leads [Matthew] to emphasise the prophetic, and so provisional, function of the Mosaic legislation and to underline its realisation and fulfilment in Christ’s ministry ... For Matthew, then, it is not the question of Jesus’ relation to the Law that is in doubt but rather its relation to him!10

Augustine taught that the Sermon must be interpreted Christianly. Reformers, like Luther, qualified this by teaching that the Sermon must be taught Christologically. The wider context of Jesus’ life, death and resurrection – indeed the entire arc of the biblical narrative – becomes the best context for interpreting the Sermon. The first of these, the earthly political life of Jesus, is the enduring contribution of John Howard Yoder.

Yoder’s recovery of Jesus’ nonviolent practice

Yoder derived important Christological insights for his nonviolent theological ethics from the Sermon. In his The Original Revolution, Yoder makes a convincing case for Christian pacifism where he simply and succinctly captures the teaching of Jesus as ‘how a person behaves whose life has been transformed by meeting Jesus.’ For Yoder, the ‘deep nonconformity’ of Jesus’ words reveals a double standard in the world, not between ‘discipleship and common-sense’ but between ‘obedience and rebellion.’11 Yoder locates the discipleship practices of Jesus’ followers within the Sermon and accomplishes this by constructing a sevenfold ethic: repentance, discipleship, testimony, fulfillment, perfect love, excess and reconciliation. The strength and limitation of Yoder’s approach to the Sermon is evident here. For example, he correctly interprets Jesus’ radical call to love the enemy (5:44) as the call to ‘resemble God’ because,

Jesus is saying that we should not love only our friends because God did not love only His friends. As the parallel statements in Luke 6 make clear, we are asked to ‘resemble God’ just at this one point: not in His omnipotence or His eternity or His impeccability, but simply in the undiscriminating or unconditional character of His love.12
Yoder argues that Jesus’ followers must ‘resemble God’ by loving political, national and international enemies with (God’s) limitless, undiscriminating, unconditional goodness. Yoder demonstrates that Matthew 5:39 (‘Do not resist one who is evil …’) is the biblical origin of ‘nonresistance’. Yoder argues ‘nonresistance’ is stronger and more precise than ‘nonviolence’ because it renounces ‘a response in kind, returning evil for evil’. Yoder’s understanding of the cross is limited because he sees Jesus’ victory over the forces of evil through his suffering and Jesus’ resurrection as the vindication of God’s suffering love on the cross. Jesus’ death and resurrection, in Yoder’s view, makes the Sermon’s discipleship of non-retaliation possible. In a curious footnote to The Original Revolution Yoder more adequately grounds the practice of non-retaliation in the Cross with the suggestion that Jesus’ disciples are to ‘foster reconciliation at [their] own expense’. While ‘costly discipleship’ remained under-developed in Yoder, it was profoundly expressed by Dietrich Bonhoeffer in his The Cost of Discipleship (or simply in the original, Nächfolge). Bonhoeffer’s sustained reflection on the Sermon – while analogous to Yoder’s nonviolent ethics at key points – goes beyond him in some important respects.

Bonhoeffer’s following the Crucified Jesus as costly discipleship

Bonhoeffer locates the enemy-to-be-loved within the practical and everyday orbit of the disciples’ lives. Bonhoeffer identifies the active dimension and goal of loving one’s enemies: hostility must be requited with love and enemies must become brothers. Following Jesus’ words, Bonhoeffer explicitly describes the concrete activities of discipleship in terms of blessing, doing good and praying. The everyday context of Bonhoeffer’s radical discipleship affords a remarkable insight into the eschatological nature of loving one’s enemies: ‘their persecution of us only serves to bring nearer to reconciliation with God and to further the triumphs of love’. From the eschatological vantage point of reconciliation with God, Bonhoeffer insists that ‘the love for our enemies takes us along the way of the cross and into fellowship with the Crucified’. Bonhoeffer is therefore more faithful to God’s revelation and action in Jesus Christ. In Letters and Papers from Prison, Bonhoeffer develops his understanding of following the Crucified as enabling Jesus’ disciples to take distance from their own ‘immediacy’, freeing them from pursuing their interests only and creating in them the space for the interests of others. Following Jesus’ life and teaching, suffering and death is the distinct way of
enemy-love and the cost of such discipleship ‘itself is ceaseless suffering … in it the disciple endures the suffering of Christ.’ To avoid the interpretation of ‘suffering’ as abstracted from real pain and hardship, Bonhoeffer writes from the confines of his own prison cell:

- this being caught up into the messianic sufferings of God in Jesus Christ takes a variety of forms in the New Testament. It appears in the call to discipleship, in Jesus’ table fellowship with sinners … in the act of the woman who was sinner (Luke 7) … in Jesus’ acceptance of children.

In the book he never completed, Bonhoeffer outlined a Christology (Jesus the ‘man for others’) and discipleship (‘being for others’) where the Christian’s unqualified love for an enemy was the test of authenticity, because ‘we are disciples of Christ, or we are not Christians at all.’ Suffering love is different from the ‘passive endurance of evil’ because of Jesus’ specific injunctions to bless, do good and pray. Bonhoeffer goes beyond Yoder by articulating the triumph of love as manifested in the cross of Jesus Christ ‘who for the sake of his enemies went to the cross and prayed for them as he hung there.’ The cost of discipleship in the Sermon, according to Bonhoeffer, can only be interpreted by Jesus’ death on the cross. Stanley Hauerwas argues that both Yoder and Bonhoeffer know the Gospel ‘must be read Christologically from back to front, so you read the Sermon on the Mount from the perspective of the crucifixion.’ Hauerwas emphasises that:

- The eschatological character of the Sermon is nowhere more apparent than in Jesus’ charge that we are not to retaliate against those that would seek to do us harm as well as his demand that we are to love our enemies. To so live requires the patience that is made possible through the cross.

Bonhoeffer, following the Apostle Paul and Augustine, interprets the Sermon as a distinctively Christian way of life. Like Yoder, Bonhoeffer understands the Christian’s ‘enemy-love’ as resembling God. Following Luther, Bonhoeffer interprets the Christian life described in the Sermon Christologically, pre-eminently through the Cross.
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**Stassen’s transforming enemy-love of Jesus**

Bonhoeffer’s approach holds continuing import for the just-peacemaking project of Glen Stassen who strives to integrate the biblical, theological and ethical dimensions of Jesus’ Sermon in his theological ethics. Three aspects of Stassen’s work deserve mention. The first is his claim that the theological heart of ‘the way of Jesus in the Sermon is the way of deliverance based on grace’. The second distinctive contribution made by Stassen is his exegetical identification of a ‘triadic structure’ repeated fourteen times within the Matthean version of Jesus’ Sermon:

My thesis is that each pericope in the central section, 5:21–7:12, has a carefully crafted triadic structure, consistent across the pericopes ... and this unites them all as members of one family. The main section of the sermon, from 5:21 through 7:12, is composed of fourteen triads. The first member of each triad is traditional righteousness. The second member is the diagnosis of a vicious cycle and its consequence. The third member is a transforming initiative that points the way to deliverance from the vicious cycle.

The third is Stassen’s emphasis on ‘transforming initiatives’ as the ethical implication (so, Yoder and Bonhoeffer) contained within each of Jesus’ instructions in the Sermon. Stassen rightly observes that ‘for too long, people have treated Jesus’ teachings of peacemaking practices as if they were general principles. This diverts us from actually doing Jesus’ words’. This conclusion Augustine and the Apostle Paul would strongly endorse!

**Conclusion**

Matthew’s account of Jesus’ teaching (chapters 5–7) provides a dramatic glimpse of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in each approach but different implications for the life of Christian discipleship. In conclusion, the love for the enemy as manifested in the cross of Jesus Christ ‘who for the sake of his enemies went to the cross and prayed for them as he hung there’ becomes the place where the follower of Jesus Christ also discovers the one in need of grace ‘stands like himself beneath the cross of Christ’. The way of life portrayed by Jesus in the Sermon, properly interpreted as participation in the Crucified Christ, means that ‘the disciple can now perceive that even his enemy is the object of God’s love.’
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