

65

THE MEANING OF MATTHEW 7:6
IN THE LIGHT OF ITS CONTEXT

by
Gerry W. Mohr

A Research Report Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Master of Divinity Degree

Course B595, Research Elective
David P. Scaer, Adviser

Concordia Theological Seminary
Springfield, Illinois
July, 1976

CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY
FT. WAYNE, INDIANA 46825

84269

Mohr, Gerry W. "The Meaning of Matthew 7:6 in the Light of Its Context." Research Elective B595, Prof. D. Scaer, Adviser.

Matthew 7:6, "Give not that which is holy to dogs, nor cast your pearls before swine, lest they trample them underfoot and, turning, rend you," has traditionally been interpreted as a prohibition against giving the Eucharist (holy thing) to the unworthy or the Gospel (pearls) to the unreceptive. That interpretation was held, almost without exception (but for Methodius' refutation of the "gospel prohibition" about 300 A.D.) until about 1800. Then the rise of a more critical attitude toward the Bible brought forth two other interpretations. The first applies dogs and swine specifically to Gentiles, thereby making 7:6 an anti-Gentile saying. The second maintains that the existing Greek text is a mistranslation from Aramaic and, therefore, retranslates back into the "original" Aramaic to get at the meaning. The traditional view, however, is still dominant, although the applicability of 7:6 to the Lord's Supper has been questioned recently.

The above interpretations practically disregard the relationship of 7:6 to its context, especially to 7:1-5, the "Judge not" section of the Sermon on the Mount. Also, they concentrate attention on the nouns (holy thing, pearls; dogs, swine) in spite of the verbs' (give, cast) being the tie to the context and being in the emphatic position in each clause of the verse.

Matthew 7:6 is actually integrally related with its

context. It is the culminating verse of a long section (6:19-7:6) bound together by μὴ prohibitions and of the paragraph 7:1-6, which is an admonition against censorious judging of brothers in the Kingdom. Within this context, there is no mention of proper treatment of the Lord's Supper or of the Gospel. The concern is proper treatment of the brother.

The link between 7:6 and the preceding verses (7:1-5 and the Lukan parallel) is the verb-pair, ἐξωμύ and βάλλω. Of the two, βάλλω is the prime carrier of theological meaning, and in the Sermon refers to casting out of the Kingdom and into hell.

The noun-pair τὸ ἅγιον (singular neuter) and ὁ μαρτυρῶν is of non-specific reference in itself. The meaning of the pair is dictated by the context and the significance of βάλλω, and so the holy thing and the pearls are the brother, the fellow-believer.

The purpose of 7:6, then, is to impress on the mind of the hearer, in a single and memorable parallel-construction epigram, the point of the preceding verses: do not exercise a judgmental attitude toward your brother, thereby treating him as if he were not a brother at all and throwing him out to be at the mercy of the savage enemies (the dogs and swine) of the Kingdom.

Therefore, 7:6 can no longer be used as a proof-text against indiscriminate dissemination of the Gospel or the Sacrament; such problems are, of course, dealt with elsewhere in Scripture.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
1. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
2. THE GREEK TEXT OF MATTHEW 7:1-6 AND LUKE 6:37-42	4
3. HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW 7:6	9
FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE TO 400 A.D.	9
FROM 400 A.D. TO 1800 A.D.	18
FROM 1800 A.D. TO THE PRESENT	23
7:6 as an anti-Gentile Saying	24
Aramaic Interpretations	27
The Traditional View	31
CONCLUSION	36
4. THE INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW 7:6	39
IDENTIFICATION OF THE CONTEXT	39
COMPARISON OF MATTHEW 7:1-6 AND LUKE 6:37-42	43
Matthew 7:1 and Luke 6:37a: <u>iva μη</u> and <u>ou μη</u>	44
Matthew 7:1,2a and Luke 6:37ab: <u>kpivw</u>	45
Luke's First Major Insertion-- Luke 6:37c-38c	47
Matthew 7:2b and Luke 6:38d: Measuring	48
Luke's Second Major Insertion-- Luke 6:39-40	49
Matthew 7:3,4 and Luke 6:41-42c	52

Matthew 7:5a and Luke 6:42d:	
<u>ὑποκρίτα</u>	54
Matthew 7:5b and Luke 6:42e:	
<u>διαβλέψεις</u>	55
Matthew 7:5c and Luke 6:42f:	
<u>ἐκβαλεῖν</u>	55
MATTHEW 7:6 AS THE CULMINATION OF THE SECTION 6:19-7:6 AND THE PARAGRAPH 7:1-6 . .	56
THE STRUCTURE OF MATTHEW 7:6	60
MATTHEW 7:6ab: THE WORD-PAIRS IN THE TWO INDEPENDENT CLAUSES	60
<u>δίδωμι</u> and <u>βάλλω-ἐκβάλλω</u>	61
<u>τὸ ἅγιον</u> and <u>ὁ μαργαρίτης</u>	64
<u>ὁ κύων</u> and <u>ὁ χοῖρος</u>	69
MATTHEW 7:6cd: THE DEPENDENT CLAUSE	72
Matthew 7:6c: <u>μηποτε... αὐτῶν</u>	72
Matthew 7:6d: <u>στραφεῖντες</u> <u>ῥηξουσιν ὑμᾶς</u>	74
RELATIONSHIP OF MATTHEW 7:6 AND MATTHEW 5:21-26	75
5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS	77
CONCLUSIONS	77
IMPLICATIONS	78
BIBLIOGRAPHY	82
APPENDIX: CHIASMUS IN MATTHEW 7:6	97

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Matthew 7:6, at least for most Christians, is not a difficult passage. Indeed, for the first eighteen centuries of church history, it was pretty much assumed that the passage was clear and that the words "Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither throw your pearls before swine" were an admonition to Christians not to treat lightly the holy things of God, namely the Gospel, and the Lord's Supper, by offering them to the unreceptive or unworthy.

With the rise of a more critical attitude toward Scripture, a slight variation was introduced in the traditional interpretation: the dogs and swine were seen as referring specifically to Gentiles. Also during the last century and a half, investigation of a possible Aramaic background for the gospel has led some to suggest that Matthew mistranslated Jesus' words; these interpreters then suggest their own rendering of what Jesus originally said.

Both the traditional and the newer interpretations tend to treat verse six as unrelated to the immediate context. Beare rather baldly states what is implicit in

almost all treatments of the passage: "Certainly it has no bearing upon what goes before or what follows."¹ Even those who find a connection between verse six and its context see the relationship as one of contradiction or, at the least, of being "complementary",² rather than being a continuation of the ideas expressed in the preceding verses.

Besides almost disregarding the context, most interpreters also concentrate their attention on only the nouns (holy, pearls; dogs, swine), disregarding the verbs (give, throw, trample, rend). Emphasis is placed on the proper identification of what is the holy thing and (synonymously) the pearls and who are the dogs and their synonym, the swine.

Unfortunately, both the traditional and the more recent interpretations, by substantially ignoring the context and the verbs of v.6, have misunderstood the function of the verse and misinterpreted its intent. This paper presents, on the other hand, the results of an analysis of the context of Matt. 7:6, the relationship of 7:6 thereto, and of 7:6 itself, especially the verbs.

Chapter 2 presents the Greek text of Matt. 7:1-6 and the parallel portion of Luke (6:37-42) with notes

¹Francis W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962), p. 66.

²Suzanne de Dietrich, The Gospel According to Matthew, trans. Donald G. Miller (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961), p. 46.

regarding variant readings.

Chapter 3 gives a history of the interpretation of the text from the first known reference to it outside the New Testament, through the early church fathers, the major theologians of the medieval period and the reformation era, and modern views. The period since 1800 includes three schools of thought: (1) the view of 7:6 as an anti-Gentile saying, (2) the view that 7:6 must be translated into Aramaic to get at the original meaning, and (3) the continuing traditional view.

Chapter 4 presents the writer's study of the text. It examines (1) the context, in ever-narrowing terms of the Sermon on the Mount, the section 6:19-7:6, and then 7:1-6 in comparison with Luke 6:37-42; (2) the structure of 7:6; and (3) the major words of 7:6.

In Chapter 5, conclusions regarding the meaning of 7:6 are drawn, and implications for its use in doctrine, practice, and the exegesis of other portions of Scripture are discussed.

Chapter 2

THE GREEK TEXT OF MATTHEW 7:1-6 AND LUKE 6:37-42

The Greek text of Matt. 7:1-6 and of Luke 6:37-42 is given on page 5. Notable differences between the two accounts are indicated in two ways: (1) words appearing in one account but not the other are underlined with a solid line (_____) and, (2), words appearing at different places in the two accounts are underlined with a broken line (_ _ _ _ _).

Textual variants are few and generally of minor import. The following, however, should be noted:

- A. Matthew 7:4a-- λεγεῖς is substituted for ερεῖς in the original of Sinaiticus in θ , and in the Latin versions. The substitution would bring the reading closer to that of Luke.
- B. Matthew 7:4b-- ἀπὸ is substituted for ἐκ in Family E, from about the sixth century;³ the effect is to reduce the sharpness of the statement; ἐκ implies the speck is deeply imbedded, but ἀπὸ would imply that it is on the surface.⁴

³Russell Champlin, Family E and Its Allies in Matthew, Studies and Documents, Vol. XXVIII (Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1966), p. 10.

⁴A. Carr, The Gospel According to St. Matthew (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1906), p. 137.

COMPARISON OF THE ACCOUNTS

5

MATTHEW 7:1-6

LUKE 6:37-42

1 Μὴ κρίνετε
ἵνα μὴ κριθῆτε

(parallel: Matthew 6:14)

37a Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε,
καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῆτε.

b καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε,
καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε.

c απολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε.

38a δίδοτε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν.

b μέτρον καλὸν πεπερισμένον σεσαλευμένου
ὑπερεκχυνόμενου

c δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν.

2a ἐν ᾧ χάρι κρίματι κρίνετε
κριθήσεσθε

b καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

(parallel: Matthew 15:14)

(parallel: Matthew 10:24-25a)

d ᾧ χάρι μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε
ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

39a Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς

b Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν;

c οὐχὶ ἀμφότεροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;

40a οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον,

κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται,

ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.

3a Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος
τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου,

b τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν
οὐ κατανοεῖς;

4a ἢ πῶς ἔρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου

b ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου

c καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου;

41a Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος

τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου,

b τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ
οὐ κατανοεῖς;

42a πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου,

b Ἀδελφέ,

ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου,

c αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν
οὐ βλέπων;

5a Ὑποκριτὰ,
ἐκβάλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν
ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,

b καὶ τότε διαβλεψείς

c ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ
τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου.

6a Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν,

b μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν
ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων,

c μηποτε καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς
ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν

d καὶ στραφέντες ῥήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.

d Ὑποκριτὰ,
ἐκβάλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν
ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,

e καὶ τότε διαβλεψείς

f τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ
τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.

- C. Matthew 7:5a--The correct location of τὴν δοκὸν is uncertain. Almost all witnesses have it in the middle of the line, as it is here. However, this placement may be an early harmonization with Luke, in which case Nestle would be correct in following Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, and C in placing it at the end of the line.
- D. Matthew 7:6a--the plural τὰ ἄγία is substituted for the singular in minuscules 5,38,48,51,53,71, 422, and 1346, in one lectionary of the gospels, and by Chrysostom and Suidas. Wettstein attributed the usage of Chrysostom and Suidas to their habit of seeing the term as a symbol for the elements of the Lord's Supper.⁵
- E. Luke 6:37a--ἵνα is substituted for καὶ οὐ in D, Ψ, and a few others, apparently to harmonize with Matthew.
- F. Luke 6:37a--The corresponding forms of δικάζω appear in p⁷⁵ and in Vaticanus in place of κατὰ δικάζω; the meaning is not seriously altered.
- G. Luke 6:38d--The words preceding μετρεῖτε exhibit a number of variants. The best supported are the one printed in the text, τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ, and τῷ γὰρ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ ᾧ. A number of less well

⁵Jacobus Wettstein, Novum Testamentum Graecum (Graz, Austria: Akademische, 1962), p. 340.

supported variants also appear. The manuscript evidence is rather⁶ evenly divided, but

ὅ γὰρ μέτρω has the most diversified support.

None of the variants has a significance different from the others.

- H. Luke 6:42a -- πῶς is read by Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, four ancient translations, and perhaps p⁷⁵.

ἡ πῶς is by far the more common reading (including A, C, D, family E, K, L, Θ, family Π, families 1 and 13, and a number of the early versions); in either case, there is no difference in meaning.

- I. Luke 6:42f -- The entire Byzantine tradition, including Family Π whose archetype may go back to the fourth century,⁷ places ἐκβαλεῖν earlier in the verse, after διαβλέψεις, thereby harmonizing with Matthew. Fitzmyer⁸ also prefers such a placement, in line with the wording of the passage as it appears in Oxyrhynchus Papyrus 1 of the Gospel According to Thomas. However, all modern

⁶ Bruce M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament (London: United Bible Societies, 1971), p. 141.

⁷ Jacob Geerlings, Family Π in Luke. Studies and Documents, Vol. XXII, p. 8.

⁸ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971), pp. 388-390.

editors (including Alford,⁹ Nestle,¹⁰ the United Bible Societies text,¹¹ and Tasker in the New English Bible text¹² have ἐκβαλεῖν at the end of the verse.

⁹Henry Alford, The Greek New Testament (London: Rivington's, 1874), pp. 500-501.

¹⁰Eberhard Nestle and Kurt Aland, Novum Testamentum Graece (25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971), p. 162.

¹¹The Greek New Testament, ed. Kurt Aland, et. al. (2d ed., London: United Bible Societies, 1968), p. 229.

¹²R. V. G. Tasker, The Greek New Testament, Being the Text Translated in the New English Bible (Oxford: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1964), p. 100.

Chapter 3

HISTORY OF THE INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW 7:6

Although some modern scholars have found 7:6 to be one of the most obscure sayings in the gospels,¹³ "an enigmatic saying which has persistently eluded the ingenuity of exegetes,"¹⁴ and "capable of infinite adaptation,"¹⁵ there has been little disagreement on its interpretation until modern times.

FROM THE BEGINNING OF THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE TO 400 A.D.

Already in the Didache, about 100 A.D., the verse was used as an injunction against giving the Eucharist to the unbaptized.¹⁶ Later in the second century the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" employed the verse in the same way.¹⁷

¹³Martin Dibelius, The Sermon on the Mount (New York: Scribner's, 1940), p. 36.

¹⁴Douglas R. A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1967), p. 122.

¹⁵Willoughby C. Allen, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912), p. 67.

¹⁶Didache ix. 5.

¹⁷The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles ix. 5.

A similar interpretation is offered near the end of the second century by Clement of Alexandria who writes, immediately after quoting 7:6, "for it is difficult to exhibit the really pure and transparent words respecting the true light to swinish and untrained hearers" and then goes on to offer, as a parallel verse, I Cor. 2:14: "But the natural man does not receive the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness to him".¹⁸ Here the holy and pearls refer more to the teachings of the Church.

The single interpretation, that of exercising discrimination, but with twin objects (eucharist and gospel teachings) was well expressed by Tertullian during his orthodox period (around 200 AD), when he wrote:

I must not leave out a description of the heretic's way of life.... To begin with, one cannot tell which is a catechumen and who is baptized. They come in together, listen together, pray together. Even if one of the heathen arrive, they are quite willing to cast that which is holy [sanctum, meaning the eucharist] to the dogs, and their pearls (false ones!) before swine.¹⁹

About a quarter of a century later, the pseudo-Clementine "Epistles Concerning Virginité" recorded the general practice of not ministering where heathens were present.²⁰ Around 230 A.D. Hippolytus attributed to a certain Pythagorean-oriented heretic named Elchesai a

¹⁸Clement of Alexandria The Stromata or Miscellanies i.14.

¹⁹Tertullian Prescription Against Heretics 41.

²⁰Pseudo-Clementine Epistles Concerning Virginité .ii.6.

super-secrecy based supposedly on Matt. 7:6, in which "it would be an insult to reason that these mighty and ineffable mysteries should be trampled under foot, or that they should be committed to many".²¹ During the same period, the apocryphal "Recognitions of Clement" twice reported legendary conversations of the Apostle Peter with Clement of Rome, in which Peter quotes Matt. 7:6 as a proof-text for restraint in talking of sacred things in the presence of unbelievers.²²

Three major figures in the middle of the third century refer to the verse, and all with the same general view already presented. Novatian, in opposing the easy re-instatement of those who had lapsed, applies 7:6 to the Lord's Supper and to teachings.²³ Cyprian twice identifies the holy thing with the Gospel.²⁴ And Origen supplied a connecting link for the twin identification of eucharist and gospel when he identified the Pearl of Great Price of Matt. 13 with Christ and then quoted Matt. 7:6, noting that the disciples had found the pearls and possessed them.²⁵ Thus the essence of the holy thing/pearl is Christ himself; the common means of contact with Christ, by

²¹Hippolytus The Refutation of All Heresies ix.12.

²²Recognitions of Clement ii.3 and iii. 1.

²³Novatian Letters ii.6.

²⁴Cyprian Treatises v.1 and Testimonies iii.50.

²⁵Origen Commentary on Matthew x. 8-10.

extension, are also the holy thing/pearl and so His body and blood (the eucharist) and the gospel (His teachings) are holy and pearls.

At the end of the third century, Methodius, an early opponent of Origen's spiritualizing hermeneutical technique, argued against the identification of the pearls with the gospel. Earlier, he had accepted the identification,²⁶ but his later argument is so strong I have recorded it here in full:

If we must understand by pearls the glorious and divine teachings, and by swine those who are given up to impiety and pleasures, from whom are to be withheld and hidden the apostle's teachings, which stir men up to piety and faith in Christ, see how you say that no Christians can be converted from their impiety by the teachings of the apostles. For they would never cast the mysteries of Christ to those who, through want of faith, are like swine. Either, therefore, these things were cast before all the Greeks and other unbelievers, and were preached by the disciples of Christ, and converted them from impiety to the faith of Christ (as we believers certainly confess), and then the words, "Cast not your pearls before swine," can no longer mean what has been said; or meaning this, we must say that faith in Christ and deliverance from impiety have been accorded to none of the unbelievers, whom we compare to swine, by the apostolic instructions enlightening their souls like pearls. But this is blasphemous. Therefore the pearls in this place are not to be taken to mean the deepest doctrines, and the swine the impious; nor are we to understand the words, "Cast not your pearls before swine," as forbidding us to cast before the impious and unbelieving the deep and sanctifying doctrines of faith in Christ; but we must take the pearls to mean virtues, with which the soul is adorned as with precious pearls; and not to cast them before swine, as meaning that we are not to cast these virtues, such as chastity, temperance, righteousness, and truth, that we are not to cast these to impure

²⁶Methodius, The Banquet of Ten Virgins, ch. 4. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XIV, p. 40.

pleasures (for these are like swine), lest they, fleeing from the virtues, cause the soul to live a swinish and a vicious life.²⁷

Although Methodius' argument logically destroys the case for identifying pearls with gospel truths in Matt. 7:6, his argument appears to have gone unnoticed in the church-- I found no mention of it in any of the subsequent literature. This may be due less to the argument itself than to the weakness of "virtues" as a replacement identification to go with pearls. Only Gregory of Nyssa (c. 360) appears to follow Methodius, as he identifies the pearls as elements of the virtuous life, especially with virginity.²⁸ In addition, as Robertson has pointed out, 7:6 was needed as a "Reserve principle" for the church during the next century (the fourth), "when Christianity was acknowledged by the state but not embraced by the population"²⁹ and so there existed great temptation to share the mysteries of the faith with the uninitiated.

Indeed, the fourth century was a time of rather frequent invocation of 7:6 as a reserve clause. Among its users were the Egyptian bishops defending Athanasius (c. 338-339), who had been offended by the presence of the

²⁷Methodius, "Extracts from the Work on Things Created", pp. 176-177.

²⁸Gregory of Nyssa, On Virginity, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), Second Series, Vol. V, p. 363.

²⁹Archibald T. Robertson, ed. Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. IV, p. 106.

emperor and especially his soldiers at a theological discussion.³⁰ Cyril of Jerusalem (c. 350) falls into the very trap Methodius had warned against a half century earlier, claiming that

the Lord in enlisting souls examines their dispositions...whoever is found worthy, to him He readily gives His grace. Holy things He does not give to dogs, but where He perceives a good conscience, there He gives the wondrous and salvific seal.³¹

Three times Gregory Nazianzen used 7:6, once at the beginning of his ministry (c. 362)³² and twice several decades later, towards its close;³³ each time it is used as Robertson's "reserve principle". Basil (c. 375) concluded his letter "On the Holy Spirit" with the remark that he would never have written it to his reader except he were sure "that you would not publish what I was about to say to all the world...to avoid casting pearls to swine."³⁴ Here we see that 7:6 may have been used so widely that it had become not only a theological principle, but also a popular aphorism.

³⁰Athanasius, "Defence Against the Arians," Select Writings, ed. A. T. Robertson, p. 106.

³¹Cyril of Jerusalem Catechetical Lectures i.3.

³²Gregory Nazianzen, "In Defence of His Flight to Pontus", The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. VII, pp. 213, 221.

³³Gregory Nazianzen, "Second Theological Oration at Constantinople" and "Second Oration on Easter", pp. 289, 429.

³⁴Basil, "On the Holy Spirit," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. VI, p. 177.

On the other hand, when Jerome (c. 380) used 7:6, he put it in the mouths of his opponents. He says of those who accuse him of following Origen: "from these passages [several, including 7:6] they conclude that we uninitiated ought to be told falsehoods lest...we choke on solid food."³⁵ And he reports the following use of 7:6 by those who wanted to deny recognition to priests who had been ordained by Arians but had later rejected Arian opinions: "Will you replace at the altar the man who having been cast out ought to lie in the mire and be trodden under foot by all men?"³⁶ Here 7:6 appears to have been used in connection with disfellowshipping, with the intent that those who had been cast out should stay out.

Nearing the close of the fourth century, we find that Ambrose used 7:6 in regard to Holy Communion,³⁷ and that Chrysostom used it in regard to preaching to the unreceptive,³⁸ in regard to receiving the Lord's Supper

³⁵Jerome, "Letter 84," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. VI, p. 177.

³⁶Jerome, "The Dialogue Against Luciferians," p.321.

³⁷Ambrose Concerning Repentance ii.9.

³⁸Chrysostom, The Preaching of Chrysostom, Homilies on the Sermon on the Mount, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967), pp. 196-198. Chrysostom made frequent use of 7:6 in this manner; the following references are all from The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series: "Resisting the Temptations of the Devil," Vol. IX, p. 194; "Homilies on the Gospel of St. Matthew," i.15, Vol. IX, p.7 and xxxviii, Vol. IX, p. 251; "Homilies on First Corinthians," vii. 3, Vol. XII, p. 35; "Homilies on Second Corinthians," viii. 2, Vol. XII, p. 318; "Homilies on the Gospel of St. John," i. 5, Vol. XIV, p. 3.

unworthily,³⁹ and in regard to turning a church over to an Arian--the context indicates he especially wants to safeguard "the divine Word".⁴⁰ At the west end of the Church's influence, Paulinus of Nola (in Spain) advised Christians harrassed by persecutors that when "these outsiders demand from you a reason for your holy work...give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine. For what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever [2 Cor. 6:14]?"⁴¹ And Augustine finds in 7:6 justification for sometimes concealing the truth (not, it should be noted, for telling a lie) when the prospective audience would not appreciate or be able to bear the truth.⁴²

Several works of undetermined authorship and date of composition, but probably originating in the first three or four centuries of the Christian era, mention or allude to 7:6. The apocryphal apocalypse, The Revelation of Saint John the Theologian, near its conclusion, reads "Behold

³⁹Chrysostom, "Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews," XX.3, Vol. XIV, p. 458.

⁴⁰Theodoret The Ecclesiastical History v.32.

⁴¹Paulinus of Nola. Letters of St. Paulinus of Nola i.8.

⁴²Augustine. The Preaching of Augustine: Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount, ii.20.67-20.70. Augustine, like Chrysostom, used 7:6 frequently; the following references are all from The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series: "Letters", xxix.2, Vol. I, p. 253; "Of the Morals of the Catholic Church," xix.33, Vol. IV, p. 51; "Sermons on New Testament Lessons," xxvii. 9-11, Vol. VI, p. 345.

thou hast heard all these things, righteous John; deliver them to faithful men, that they also may teach others, and not think lightly of them, nor cast our pearls before swine."⁴³ Another apocryphal work, the Constitutions of the Holy Apostles, also identifies the pearls with teachings, urging widows to be cautious in discussing religion "as the Lord exhorts us [in 7:6]," especially urging them to limit their remarks to arguments against polytheism and in favor of the rulership of God; after all, "unbelievers, when they hear the doctrine concerning Christ not explained as it ought to be, but defectively...will rather reject it with scorn."⁴⁴ In addition, some of the early liturgies used the words "holy things for holy people (ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις) to declare that only the baptized could partake of the Lord's Supper;⁴⁵ many scholars believe this formula was derived from 7:6.

Edsman found that the symbol of the pearl was common in many of the European and Asian religions of this period; although he does not deal with interpretations of 7:6, he reports that the Pearl of Great Price in Matt. 13:45-46 was identified with Christ by the Gnostics, the Alexandrian theologians, the Manichaeans, and in several

⁴³Revelation of Saint John the Theologian The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VIII, p. 586.

⁴⁴Constitutions of the Holy Apostles iii. 6.

⁴⁵"Early Liturgies," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VII, p. 547.

Syriac liturgies; however, Ephraem of Syria (c. 370) believed the pearls were the Christians.⁴⁶

FROM 400 A.D. TO 1800 A.D.

The next fourteen centuries saw a far less frequent use of 7:6; the crises of the fourth century were past and apparently conditions during this later period were not such as demanded the frequent invocation of the "reserve principle". However, to say that conditions were such as to never require its use would be to misrepresent the case. For already by 430 A.D., Cassian used it twice, once in regard to withholding communion from the demon-possessed and a second time in regard to sharing Christian teachings⁴⁷ And in 458 A.D. Pope Leo the Great wrote a letter explaining why he would send envoys to the emperor to explain the faith, but would not send them to discussions with the Eutychian heretics: "We will have no dealings with rebel

⁴⁶Edsman, Carl-Martin. Le Baptême de Feu, selected portions trans. Franklin Giebel (Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska, 1940), pp. 190-199. Mircea Eliade, Images and Symbols (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1961) reports that Origen's identification of Christ with the pearl was followed by numerous authors, among them pseudo-Macarius, for whom "the pearl symbolizes on the one hand the Christ as King, and on the other the descendant of the King, the Christian," p. 148.

⁴⁷Cassian (both references are in The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. XI) "First Conference of Abbot Serenus," xxix-xxx, pp. 372-373 and Second Conference of Abbot Nestoros, xvii, p. 444.

heretics, remembering the Lord's command, 'Give not... swine.'"⁴⁸

In the middle of the eighth century, John of Damascus applied 7:6 to Communion and to the gospel. In his description of orthodoxy, he exhorts "with all our strength, therefore, let us beware lest we receive communion from or grant it to heretics; Give not...to dogs, saith the Lord, neither cast...before swine".⁴⁹ And in his tale of Barlaam and Ioasaph, Barlaam tells Ioasaph that if Ioasaph's heart appears to be good fruit-bearing ground, he will plant the seed of the gospel there.

But and if the ground be stony and thorny, and the wayside trodden down by all who will, it were better never to let fall this seed of salvation, nor to cast it for a prey to fowls and beasts, before which I have been charged not to cast pearls.⁵⁰

Here John seems, just as Cyril of Jerusalem did four hundred years earlier, to have fallen into the trap Methodius described so well.

The two great theologians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, both identified spiritual teachings with the 7:6 passage. Lombard (c.1155) cautioned against indiscriminate giving of

⁴⁸ Leo the Great, "Letter 162," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. XII, pp. 104-105.

⁴⁹ John of Damascus An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith iv.13.

⁵⁰ John Damascene, Barlaam and Ioasaph, trans. G. R. Woodward, ed. H. Mattingly (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), p. 69.

the priestly office, "lest sordid lives crush with their feet the heavenly pearls of spiritual words and divine offices;"⁵¹ here we see an extension of the application from the teachings themselves to the office that does the teaching. But a century later, Aquinas used 7:6 in the more restricted sense of Scriptural truths as he explained the value of metaphor in doctrinal exposition: "the very hiding of truth in figures is useful for the exercise of thoughtful minds, and as a defence against the ridicule of the impious, according to the words 'Give not that which is holy to dogs' (Matth. vii.6)".⁵² Aquinas was careful to avoid the pitfall outlined by Methodius, as he applied 7:6 when "a public confession of faith" may "cause a disturbance among unbelievers, without any profit either to the faith or to the faithful," but "if there is a hope of profit to the faith, or if there be urgency, a man should disregard the disturbance of unbelievers, and confess his faith in public."⁵³ However, although Aquinas did not generalize 7:6 as Lombard had, he did refer it not only to teachings, but also to the Lord's Supper, quoting 7:6 and remarking, "Now it is especially casting holy things to dogs to give this sacrament to sinners."⁵⁴

⁵¹Peter Lombard Sentences iv. 24.3.

⁵²Thomas Aquinas, Summa Theologica i.9, ad 2. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1947), Vol. I, p. 6.

⁵³Aquinas, ii,ii.3,ii,ad3, Vol.II,p.1189. Other references of 7:6 to teachings are at ii,ii. 40.3,ad 2 (p. 1362) and ii,ii.43. 7 ad2 (p. 1371).

⁵⁴Aquinas, iii. 80. 6 ad 1 (p. 2491).

The Reformation brought no real change in use of 7:6. Luther stated that trampling upon holy things occurs in two areas, doctrine and life--in doctrine, as "false teachers do it," in life "when people despise or have become tired of the gospel".⁵⁵ Luther applied 7:6 to four areas: Communion, Scriptural teachings, the Christian's deeds, and his own teaching. Regarding Communion, he remarked that "Satan through the ordinance of the pope has thrown the sacrament before swine by compelling everybody to partake of the sacrament at Easter, whether they believe or not."⁵⁶ While frequently applying 7:6 as a restriction concerning the sharing of Scriptural teachings, Luther was careful not to be overly exclusive as he follows the use of 7:6 with "I would rather sin in preaching fruitlessly than in refusing to preach at all. For in fruitless preaching I would not be guilty of a soul while in refusing to preach I might be held accountable for many souls."⁵⁷

Luther applied 7:6 to the works of a Christian in his Notes on Ecclesiastes: "To do something good for the

⁵⁵Martin Luther, Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, trans. Charles A. Hay (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1892), pp. 385-386.

⁵⁶Luther, Works, Vol. XXXVI (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg 1959), p. 263. Other applications of 7:6 to the sacrament are at Vol. XXXVII, p. 131; Vol. XL, p. 64; and Vol. LIII, p. 104.

⁵⁷Luther, Vol. XL, pp. 254-255. Other applications of 7:6 to proper use of the Word are at Vol. XXVII, p. 48; Vol. XXXVII, p. 68; Vol. XXXVIII, p. 134; Vol. XL, p. 148; Vol. XLII, p. 80; Vol. XLIII, p. 134; and Vol. XLV, p. 171.

world, therefore, is nothing less than to lose one's good deeds, to cast gold into the manure or pearls before swine."⁵⁸ This identification is, although probably not based upon, at least similar to that of Methodius (virtues) and Gregory of Nyssa (aspects of the virtuous life). Finally, probably by generalization from the identification of 7:6 with Scriptural teachings, he applied 7:6 to his own teachings, as he opened his "Judgment of Martin Luther on Monastic Vows" by encouraging his opponents not to read his argument, as he does not wish to "waste my breath against them...I neither want to give that which is holy to dogs, nor to cast pearls before swine."⁵⁹

John Gerhard followed the traditional interpretation, using 7:6 as a proof-text for excluding from the Lord's Supper "those who are defiled with heresy;" this meant that "nor are all Christians promiscuously to be admitted to the Lord's Supper".⁶⁰

Roman Catholic interpreters also continued to follow the traditional interpretation. Bossuet (c.1700) divided the two parallel clauses. Of the holy clause, he wrote:

The sacred Reality is the body of Jesus Christ....

⁵⁸Luther, Vol. XV, p. 154.

⁵⁹Luther, Vol. XLIV, p. 251.

⁶⁰John Gerhard, Loci Theologici, Vol.X, p.381 in Heinrich Schmid, The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, trans. Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs (3d ed., Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1899), p. 577.

In general, the sacred Reality signifies all the mysteries which the shepherds of the Church are admonished to present with a great deal of discernment in order to prevent the unworthy from treating them with irreverence.⁶¹

But he was more specific with the pearl clause: "the pearls before swine are the saintly discourses presented before those who are incapable of appreciating them".⁶² The division of the parallel clauses had been made as early as Tertullian (cf. p. 10 above) who associated holy with the sacrament and pearls with teachings. But it seems not to have been followed much. And Bossuet changed the division slightly: for him, the holy clause is general, the pearls clause specific.

The general, non-Lutheran Protestant view of 7:6 was typified by Wesley, who applied it to spiritual truths: "talk not of the 'deep things of God,' to those whom you know to be wallowing in sin; neither declare the great things God hath done for your soul to the profane, furious, persecuting wretches."⁶³

FROM 1800 A.D. TO THE PRESENT

The interpretation of 7:6 became less monolithic

⁶¹Jacques Benigne Bossuet, Selections from Meditations on the Gospel; trans. Sr. Lucille C. Franchere (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1962), pp. 73-74.

⁶²Bossuet, p. 74.

⁶³John Wesley, Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament (Naperville, Illinois: Allenson, 1950), p.32. The same view had been offered in 1555 by John Calvin, Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Vol.I (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949), p. 349.

at about the beginning of the nineteenth century. Two factors in the change were the rise of a more critical attitude toward the Scriptures (and, in some cases, a more critical attitude toward Jesus Himself) and, second, an interest in trying to reconstruct a presumed Aramaic background of the gospels.

7:6 as an anti-Gentile Saying

Although many of the more critically-inclined have come to rather traditional conclusions about 7:6, not all have. The most common difference is in the identification of the dogs and swine: they become the Gentiles. Allen, for example, in the International Critical Commentary series, observes that "it may express the Jewish-Christian point-of-view with regard to the preaching of Christianity to pagans".⁶⁴ As support, he cites the Jewish-Christian reluctance to admit Gentiles into fellowship and the application of KUVapia (dogs) to Gentiles in 15:26. In 1943, Craig listed 7:6 along with 5:18-19 ("not a jot nor tittle of the Law will pass away") as a Bible reading illustrating "the case for the Judaizers".⁶⁵

Jesus himself is seen as the origin of what Geza Vermes considers to be an anti-Gentile remark:

It may have been Galilean chauvinism that was responsible for Jesus' apparent antipathy towards

⁶⁴Willoughby C. Allen, p. 67.

⁶⁵Clarence T. Craig, The Beginning of Christianity (New York: Abingdon, 1943), p. 178.

Gentiles. For not only did he feel himself sent to the Jews alone; he qualified non-Jews, though no doubt with oratorical exaggeration, as "dogs" and "swine".⁶⁶

Argyle, on the other hand, ascribes to the writer of Matthew (rather than to Jesus) the selection of matter that is Judaistic and anti-Gentile.⁶⁷ And Hare finds in 7:6 an "ambiguous reference" to persecution; thus the dogs and swine "refer to Gentile opponents" and "the preceding imperatives may be taken as designating a course of action intended to avoid violence".⁶⁸

But Friedlander sees more than just anti-Gentile exclusiveness in 7:6. He characterizes the Sermon on the Mount as

a series of precepts that are to form the rule of life for the disciples in the Messianic Kingdom about to be inaugurated. All outside the kingdom are lawless and sinners. The disciples were to look upon all these excluded people as though they were "dogs".⁶⁹

As corroborating evidence, Friedlander cites Jesus' referring "to the heathens as 'dogs' or 'little dogs,' his use of 'dogs' and 'swine' in 7:6, his telling parables so most people could not understand his message (Matt. 13:11,13)

⁶⁶Geza Vermes, Jesus the Jew, A Historian's Reading of the Gospels (New York: Macmillan, 1973), p. 49.

⁶⁷A. W. Argyle, The Gospel According to Matthew (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1963), p. 61.

⁶⁸Douglas R. A. Hare, The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1967), pp. 122-123.

⁶⁹Gerald Friedlander, The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount (New York: KTAV, 1969), p. 76.

and his orders to his disciples not to go to the Gentiles and Samaritans (Matt. 10:5)."⁷⁰

However, Wood argues against the anti-Gentile position. He claims that Matthew's "primary concern is to commend the Gospel to the Jews," but "he is not a Judaizer" and in fact "he takes for granted the evangelization of the Gentiles".⁷¹ And Davies has argued convincingly that both Jesus and Matthew were strongly "universalistic" in their view of the scope of Gospel preaching. He cites Matthew's use of the Magi at the opening of the book and his closing the book with the Great Commission; in addition, Davies treats a number of passages in Matthew that support his case.⁷²

Manson, in 1937, advanced a position that has not been supported since, but is interesting for its ingenuity in labelling 7:6 as at one time anti-Gentile, but later anti-Jewish:

Mt 7:6 looks very like a bit of apocalyptic Jewish exclusiveness, adopted by extreme Jewish Christians, and incorporated among the sayings of Jesus. Later the Gentile Church turned the saying to face the opposite way, interpreting the holy thing as the Eucharist, and the dogs and swine as Jews, heretics, and unbaptized persons. An early stage in this

⁷⁰Friedlander, p. 219.

⁷¹Herbert George Wood, "Some Characteristics of the Synoptic Writers," The Parting of the Roads, Studies in the Development of Judaism and Early Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes Jackson (London: Edward Arnold, 1912), p. 159.

⁷²W. D. Davies, The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1964), pp. 326-332.

process is reflected in the Didache 9:5.⁷³

The possibility that 7:6 was an anti-Gentile saying will be analyzed in the pertinent section of Chapter 4.

Aramaic Interpretations

Already in 1792 J. A. Bolten suggested that holy in 7:6 was a mistranslation from an original Aramaic saying that had the word for rings instead.⁷⁴ Indeed, many scholars have recognized a Semitic background behind our Greek gospels, so that Surburg can simply state that Jesus spoke an Aramaic dialect⁷⁵ and Manson can broaden the same claim to: "Aramaic was the mother tongue of Jesus and his disciples".⁷⁶ Fletcher, who believes the Gospels were originally written in Greek, the language of the young Church, in order to preserve eyewitness accounts that were in Aramaic,⁷⁷ no doubt speaks for many:

In the Gospel records we must necessarily expect to hear two voices--the voice of Jesus speaking in Aramaic, and the voices of many courageous

⁷³T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus (London: SCM Press, 1937), p. 174.

⁷⁴Joachim Jeremias, "Matthaus 7:6a," Abraham Unser Vater, ed. Otto Betz (Leiden and Koln: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 271.

⁷⁵Raymond F. Surburg, "The Influence of Syriac Christianity" (unpublished Th.D. dissertation, American Theological Seminary, 1942), p. 2.

⁷⁶T. W. Manson, The Teaching of Jesus (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1955), p. 46.

⁷⁷Basil Fletcher, The Aramaic Sayings of Jesus (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1967), p. 95.

early Christians speaking in the Greek of Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome.⁷⁸

In order to get back to what Jesus originally said, some writers posit a need to retranslate the existing Greek gospels back into Aramaic. Some (e.g., John Chapman,⁷⁹ Howard,⁸⁰ Lamsa,⁸¹ and C. C. Torrey⁸²) believe that the first written records were in Aramaic and our gospels are a translation from written Aramaic, but this view is opposed by most scholars; Surburg expresses the view of the great majority: "the theory that advocates the Gospels were originally written in Aramaic is unfounded and unproven".⁸³

In either case, several interpretations have been advanced based on a mistranslation from Aramaic into Greek. Bolten's in 1792 has already been noted; this would eliminate holy and strengthen the parallelism of the clauses, since they would both include articles of jewelry. In 1926, Perles claimed to have found "no fewer than four mistranslations" in the Greek, and dismissed the μνητοτε

⁷⁸Fletcher, p. 28.

⁷⁹John Chapman, Matthew, Mark and Luke (London; Longmans, Green and Co., 1937), p. 181.

⁸⁰Wilbert F. Howard, "Semitisms in the New Testament," A Grammar of New Testament Greek, ed. James H. Moulton and W. F. Howard (Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1919), Vol. II, p. 419.

⁸¹George M. Lamsa, Gospel Light, Comments on the Teachings of Jesus from Aramaic and Unchanged Eastern Customs (Philadelphia: Holman, 1939), pp. ix, x.

⁸²Charles Cutler Torrey, The Four Gospels (2d. ed., New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947), pp. vii, xviii.

⁸³Surburg, p. 4.

clause as a Greek addition to the Hebrew (not Aramaic) original.⁸⁴ Black, however, while accepting the probability of rings being original, rejects Perles elimination of the final clause.⁸⁵ Jeremias dealt with the Greek ἐμπροσθεν, decided it was a mistranslation, and suggested this translation:

Do not put a ring on the dogs
And do not hang your pearls on the snout of
the swine.⁸⁶

Bowman and Tapp find Jeremias' rendition satisfactory, commenting that "Black's suggestion at this point is more acceptable [than holy] as it serves to maintain the parallelism in the two parts of the saying."⁸⁷ Schwarz alters Jeremias' translation slightly, and on that basis guesses that the original situation for the saying was the question some young women among Jesus' followers had about the proper use of jewelry.⁸⁸

However, others have retranslated into Aramaic and apparently seen no mistranslation; Lamsa's retranslation

⁸⁴Felix Perles, "Zur Erklärung von Mt. 7:6," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 25 (1926), p. 164.

⁸⁵Matthew Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3d ed., London: Oxford University Press, 1967), p. 201.

⁸⁶Jeremias, "Matthaus 7:6a," p. 275. English translation is the present writer's.

⁸⁷John Wick Bowman and Roland W. Tapp, The Gospel from the Mount (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957), p. 150.

⁸⁸Gunther Schwarz, "Matthaus vii. 6a, Emendation und Rückübersetzung," Novum Testamentum 14 (1972), p. 24.

yields the traditional interpretation and wording.⁸⁹ C. C. Torrey found 250 mistranslations from Aramaic to Greek in the New Testament, but 7:6 was not one of them;⁹⁰ his own translation, in which he claims to have used the Semitic original continually, reads just like the usual translation from the Greek,⁹¹ and the same is true of the translations of Dalman⁹² and Burney.⁹³ In fact, it is just such lack of agreement among those who translate Greek back into Aramaic that forced Filson to conclude that "the process is too subjective to be convincing".⁹⁴ Even Dalman, who advocated Aramaic retranslation, admitted that "absolute certainty in regard to minutiae cannot possibly be expected".⁹⁵

Riddle has criticized the Aramaic interpretations on the grounds that the "retroversions" are "highly synthetic" and no actual parallels in the extant Aramaic

⁸⁹Lamsa, Idioms in the Bible Explained (St. Petersburg, Florida: Aramaic Bible Society, 1971), p. 62.

⁹⁰Torrey, Our Translated Gospels (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1936).

⁹¹Torrey, The Four Gospels, p. 14.

⁹²Gustaf Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, trans. Paul R. Levertoff (New York: KTAV, 1971), p. 232.

⁹³C. F. Burney, The Poetry of Our Lord (London: Oxford University Press, 1925), pp. 131-132.

⁹⁴Floyd V. Filson, Origins of the Gospels (New York: Abingdon, 1938), p. 71.

⁹⁵Gustaf Dalman, The Words of Jesus, trans. D. M. Kay (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 72.

literature are cited for the suggested locutions.⁹⁶ Others have even established the possibility that Jesus and the disciples were conversant in Greek.⁹⁷⁻¹⁰¹ In conclusion, the efforts to go behind the Greek to a hypothetical Aramaic have not been successful and appear not to be a useful tool in understanding 7:6.

The Traditional View

The traditional view has continued to dominate interpretation of 7:6. Some who have published with this view are Aborn (pp. 130-131),¹⁰² Albright (p. 84), Charles L. Allen (p. 153), Brown (p. 47), Bonhoeffer (pp. 165-167), Alexander B. Bruce (p. 129), Carr (p. 139), Coleman (p. 70), Eichholz (pp. 152-154), Gore (pp. 162-163), Hanson (p. 34),

⁹⁶Donald W. Riddle, "The Aramaic Gospels and the Synoptic Problem," Journal of Biblical Literature, 54 (1935), p. 138.

⁹⁷Ernest C. Colwell, The Greek of the Fourth Gospel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), pp. 130-131.

⁹⁸Saul Lieberman, Greek in Jewish Palestine (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1942), p. 39.

⁹⁹Saul Lieberman, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (2d ed., New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962).

¹⁰⁰E. V. Rieu, The Four Gospels (Baltimore: Penguin, 1953), p. xv.

¹⁰¹Nigel Turner, Grammatical Insights into the New Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965), pp. 174-188.

¹⁰²Rather than giving an extensive listing of footnotes here, the pertinent pages in each work are cited with the author's name above; please consult the bibliography for titles and publication data.

Hill (pp. 147-148), Kent (p. 23), Lang (p. 39), Lange (pp. 138-139), Lehman (p. 172), Micklem (p. 65), Morison (p. 113), Mumford, Pink (p. 292), Seventh-Day Adventist Commentary (p. 355), Strack-Billerbeck (p. 450), Thomas (pp. 74-75), Tholuck (pp. 268-279), and Trilling (pp. 129-130). Conservative Lutherans in the United States have held to the traditional view, both outside the Missouri Synod among Ylvisaker (p. 288), Loy (pp. 256-259), and Lenski (p. 291) and within the Missouri Synod: Graebner, Wessel, and Dau in the 1920 Catechism (pp. 151-152), Kretzmann (p. 37), Bartling (p. 409), Weidenschilling (p. 44), and Franzmann (p. 60).^{102a}

During this period, Makrakis has carefully maintained the distinction between the holy and the pearls that Tertullian and Bossuet before him made: the holy being the "holy body of Christ" (the sacrament) and the pearls being the "holy truths of Christ".¹⁰³ Hendriksen, on the other hand, considers the two terms "rather indefinite," that "Jesus is saying that whatever it is that stands in special relation to God and is accordingly very precious should be treated with reverence and not entrusted to those who...can be compared to dogs;" he then applies

^{102a} Rather than giving an extensive listing of footnotes here, the pertinent pages in each work are cited with the author's name above; please consult the bibliography for titles and publication data.

¹⁰³ Apostolos Makrakis, The Interpretation of the Gospel Law, trans. D. Cummings (Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1955), p. 106.

7:6 to the gospel message, the office of the ministry, positions of lay leadership, and the Lord's Supper.¹⁰⁴

Some writers have pointed out the relevance of 7:6, as traditionally interpreted, for fellowship and discipline. Loy considered 7:6 to be a text on fellowship and saw its parallel in II Cor. 6:14-17: "Do not be bound together with unbelievers...therefore come out from their midst and be separate".¹⁰⁵ Bartling took this attitude too, in commenting on 7:6: "Also in church discipline there is a necessary final step when the former brother must be told that he is henceforth regarded a heathen man and a publican until he repents."¹⁰⁶ As will be seen from the analysis to be presented in Chapter 4, Loy and Bartling are correct in applying 7:6 to fellowship, but they have almost exactly reversed the intent of the passage.

Three writers have proposed views that, at first glance, appear rather different from the traditional, but actually are not. Davies calls 7:6 "a bit of cautionary gemara, i.e. it urges discriminatory caution following on the prohibition of judging". He believes the verse is "directed not against the Gentiles or heretics as such but

¹⁰⁴William Hendriksen, Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew, New Testament Commentary Series (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973), pp. 359-360.

¹⁰⁵Matthias Loy, The Sermon on the Mount (Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1909), pp. 258-259.

¹⁰⁶Victor Bartling, "Our Need of Clear Vision--Sermon Outline on the Gospel for the Fourth Sunday After Trinity," Concordia Theological Monthly, 16 (1945), pp. 407-409.

against 'those without' whoever they might be".¹⁰⁷ This is reminiscent of Friedlander's idea, but that it is no real change from the traditional view is apparent from his citing as a parallel the Dead Sea Scroll Manual of Discipline (ix.17) requirement that leaders of the community conceal the counsel of the Torah from the perverse. The second writer, Bornkamm, began with an overall observation that Matthew's arrangement of materials shows the "catechetical" nature of the work, that this is especially true in the Sermon on the Mount, and that the section including 7:6 consists of "Gemeinderegeln" (congregation-rules).¹⁰⁸ But although he considers the Didache's application of 7:6 to the Eucharist to be "free supplementing" rather than precise exegesis, he appears to accept such interpretation as valid. Third, Bowman and Tapp initially exclude the traditional interpretation as a proper one, advancing a view of the verse "as a pedagogical principle".¹⁰⁹ But that their position is basically traditional is seen on the next page, (p. 150): "no more is it wise to place the deepest spiritual truths or doctrines before those who have not had an adequate foundation laid for their reception". The one question that arises, however, with this interpretation is

¹⁰⁷W. D. Davies, Christian Origins and Judaism (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), p. 123.

¹⁰⁸Gunther Bornkamm, "Endwartung und Kirche in Matt-hausevangelium," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1956), p. 225.

¹⁰⁹Bowman and Tapp, p. 149.

whether Bowman and Tapp are implying that the dogs and swine might be within the Church, but just need less advanced spiritual nourishment.

Two interpretations, though, are somewhat novel. Kahane and Kahane went to Byzantine and modern Greek for a clue to the passage. They began by taking holy to be sacrificial meat; they then found what they believe to be uses of pearls (μαργαρίτες) that refer to the bread of the eucharist or perhaps "crumbs". From the foregoing, they give the translation:

Do not give the Sacrificial meat to dogs,
and do not throw the crumbs of your shewbread before
swine.¹¹⁰

By substituting shewbread for pearls, the Kahanes justify the interpretation that the passage speaks against "sacrilege". But such, of course, is essentially also the traditional view.

Hobb's view is also novel. He proposes the following:

Suppose we think of "dogs" and "swine" separately. Both are unclean. Now imagine a dispute between them. This suggests a controversy between two who are not Christian brothers. The Christian is asked to settle the dispute. Obviously he should do so on Christian principles, principles which neither disputant is capable of comprehending or appreciating. To do so is to give holy things to dogs and pearls to swine. The result is that both refuse your counsel and turn on you in the process.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰Henry and Renee, "Pearls Before Swine? A Reinterpretation of Matthew 7:6," Traditio, 13 (1957), pp.423-424.

¹¹¹Herschel H. Hobbs, An Exposition of the Gospel of Matthew (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965), p. 82.

The problem, unfortunately, with Hobbs' view is that his whole situation is imagined and not in the text.

Finally, M. D. Goulder has attempted, as have few others, to relate 7:6 to its context. He considers 7:1-6 to be a unit related to the Second Beatitude.¹¹² As the Second Beatitude says that it is the humble and penitent (those who mourn) who receive the comfort of God, so it is humility and penitence (seeing one's own sin, not those of the brother) which are commanded in 7:1-6. Goulder believes 7:1-6 has "three parts: (a) don't criticize (in your heart); (b) don't criticize your brother to his face; (c) don't criticize your brother behind his back;"¹¹³ verse six is the third part. Thus Goulder identifies holy and pearl with the brother, and finds in 7:6 an admonition against "backbiting".¹¹⁴

CONCLUSION

The traditional view that 7:6 is an injunction to be discriminating in offering gospel teachings (and derivatives thereof, as the Lord's Supper) has dominated the entire period beginning with the Didache. However, in the last two centuries that interpretation has been under some attack by those who see it as an anti-Gentile saying and

¹¹²M. D. Goulder, Midrash and Lection in Matthew (London: SPCK, 1974), pp. 264-265. A fuller treatment of Goulder's understanding of the structure of the Sermon on the Mount is presented in Chapter 4.

¹¹³Goulder, p. 265.

¹¹⁴Goulder, pp. 266-267.

those who see it as a mistranslation from the Aramaic.

Neither of these attacks, however, has proven to have much substance. A third attack, however, has also been mounted, and this against the application to the Lord's Supper.

F. F. Bruce has stressed the general character of the verse, and rejected any specific application to the sacraments.¹¹⁵

Argyle states that "the text does not refer to the Eucharist,"¹¹⁶ and Fenton contends that it is not "a command not to admit the unbaptized to the Eucharist" because that interpretation does not fit the context.¹¹⁷

Fenton's point is the key to the passage--the Lord's Supper is nowhere to be found in the context. To put it more strongly, 7:6 is part of the Sermon on the Mount, but the Lord's Supper was not instituted till much later in Jesus' ministry, so the hearers of 7:6 could have had no notion of the Lord's Supper, and it is therefore unlikely that the passage had anything to do with the Eucharist. Instead, to find its meaning, we must follow the lead given by Fenton and look to the context of 7:6; Goulder did that and identified the holy as the brothers mentioned in vv. 1-5. In Chapter 4 Goulder's identification will be seen to

¹¹⁵F. F. Bruce, St. Matthew, Scripture Union Bible Study Books (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), p. 24.

¹¹⁶Argyle, p. 61.

¹¹⁷J. C. Fenton, "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew" Studia Evangelica; Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957," ed. Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, et. al. (Berlin: Akademie, 1959), p. 110.

be correct, although he mistook the point of the admonition, which is not against backbiting.

Chapter 4

THE INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW 7:6

IDENTIFICATION OF THE CONTEXT

Filson has remarked upon the "careful arrangement" of material in Matthew,¹¹⁸ noting that "the ultimate origin of these patterns might go back to Jesus" although he favors the view that "teachers of the early Jewish-Christian Church" constructed the arrangement.¹¹⁹ In either case, he (as have many others) has been struck by the careful structuring of Matthew's gospel. And yet many have worked on the premise that 7:6 is unrelated to its context. Willoughby Allen finds it "has no particular connection with the preceding"¹²⁰ and originally was "probably not in the Sermon" on the Mount at all.¹²¹ Beare calls it "an isolated logion of uncertain provenance".¹²² Dibelius declares "the framework of its setting is missing,"¹²³ Gerhardsson that it "has become separated from its

¹¹⁸Floyd V. Filson, "Broken Patterns in the Gospel of Matthew," Journal of Biblical Literature 75 (1956), p. 227.

¹¹⁹Filson, "Broken Patterns," p. 231.

¹²⁰Willoughby C. Allen, p. 66. ¹²¹Ibid, p. lviii.

¹²²Beare, p. 66. ¹²³Dibelius, p. 36.

situation,"¹²⁴ Kilpatrick that "vii.6 does not well agree with vii.1-5,"¹²⁵ and Hill that "it does not seem to be linked to what precedes or what follows".¹²⁶ Ylvisaker was certain that it does not apply to brothers (the objects in vv.1-5),¹²⁷ Pink called 7:6 by itself "the seventh and shortest division of the Sermon,"¹²⁸ and Perry goes so far as to label Chapter 7 of the Sermon on the Mount "the scrap basket".¹²⁹ Chapman, who was impressed by the retentive ability of whoever wrote down the Sermon on the Mount (from memory) suggests that during the section covered by 7:1-13 "the reporter being [was] perhaps tired".¹³⁰

Even editions of the Bible separate out v.6. In Wyclif's 1380 Bible and in Tyndale's 1534, the text ran vv.1-5, then v.6 by itself, then vv. 7ff. However, other editions (e.g. Crammer in 1539, the Geneva of 1557, and Rheims of 1582)¹³¹ agree with the Vaticanus paragraphing,

¹²⁴Birger Gerhardsson, Memory and Manuscript (Uppsala and Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961), p. 332.

¹²⁵George D. Kilpatrick, The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew (London: Oxford University Press, 1950), p. 76.

¹²⁶David Hill, The Gospel of Matthew, New Century Bible Series (London: Oliphants, 1972), p. 147.

¹²⁷Ylvisaker, p. 288.

¹²⁸Pink, p. 288.

¹²⁹Alfred M. Perry, "The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount," Journal of Biblical Literature 34 (1935), p. 114.

¹³⁰John Chapman, p. 217.

¹³¹The English Hexapla (London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841)

in which 7:1-6 are a unit. However, even those who see vv.1-6 as a unit generally see the paragraph as Erdman did: "Jesus gives two warnings to his followers...He warns them against censoriousness [vv.1-5] and, second, against carelessness [v.6]."¹³²

However, Matthew placed 7:6 at a particular point in the gospel and the verse will be studied in terms of its placement by Matthew. The verse appears in the Sermon on the Mount, Jesus' great message about the Kingdom. Within this context, Hendriksen views Matt. 5:17-7:12 as "the righteous demands of the King upon the citizens"¹³³ and Ladd views the context as "the Kingdom of God as a present gift".¹³⁴ Viewing 7:6 as part of the Sermon on the Mount, then, we may anticipate that it deals not with life in general, but with life in God's Kingdom.

Within the Sermon, Lund's chiasmic analysis provides a way to see the overall structure of the Sermon and its parts.¹³⁵ Although Manson has questioned Lund's arrangement of the Sermon,¹³⁶ the arrangement agrees at

¹³²Charles R. Erdman, The Gospel of Matthew (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1920), pp. 58-59.

¹³³William Hendriksen, "The Beauty of Matthew's Gospel," Westminster Theological Journal 35 (1973), p. 116.

¹³⁴George Eldon Ladd, A Theology of the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), p. 72.

¹³⁵Lund, pp. 241-248, esp. pp. 241, 247-248.

¹³⁶T. W. Manson, "Review of Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament," Journal of Theological Studies 45 (1944), pp. 83-84.

many points with the findings of others and does appear to capture the beauty of the Sermon. Lund came to the conclusion that 6:19-7:6 comprised a single section, "one of the most remarkable in the Sermon;"¹³⁷ in his opinion, 6:19-21 ("Lay not up for yourself treasures upon the earth") was stylistically related to 7:6, in which treasures (the holy) are treated.

Lund's division of the Sermon into the 6:19-7:6 section is borne out by a careful look at the literary character of the section. The identifying characteristic of this section is its use of the μη prohibition¹³⁸ as headwords of clauses, as follows:

- 6:19 - μη θησαυρίζετε
- 25 - μη μεριμνᾶτε
- 31 - μη μεριμνήσατε
- 34 - μη μεριμνήσατε
- 7:1 - μη κρίνετε
- 6 - μη δῶτε
- 6 - μη δὲ βάλητε (followed by μήποτε)

These μη prohibitions bind 6:19 through 7:6 together into a single long section that begins and ends with exhortations about the treatment of heavenly treasures. In 6:19-20 we

¹³⁷Lund, p. 259. Charles H. Lohr, although not treating the Sermon, finds much evidence of "concentric symmetry" in Matthew in "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," Catholic Biblical Quarterly 23 (1961), p. 424.

¹³⁸Although Albright, p. 84, and Turner, p. 32, have noted this set of prohibitions, they apparently did not see them as a unifying device; Albright even remarked that "there is no particular logical connection between v.34 and vii.1," p. 85.

are to lay up such treasures; in 7:6 we are not to treat such treasures unwisely or disrespectfully. Verse 6, with its double ~~μη~~ prohibition, and its final ~~μητιν~~ clause, appears to be the climactic end-point of the whole section, 6:19-7:6, on the treatment of the treasures of the Kingdom.

Within 6:19-7:6, the section 7:1-6 appears to be a sub-section. Goulder, in his analysis of the Sermon, found it to be an expansion of the Second Beatitude. He had analyzed the Sermon into a pattern in which the eight beatitudes are given, 1-8, and then they are expounded in reverse order: 8,7,6....¹³⁹ The Second Beatitude is handled in 7:1-6 (cf. the summary of Goulder at the end of Chapter 3).

Finally, most of Matt. 7:1-6 has a parallel in Luke 6:37-42.¹⁴⁰ A comparison of how the two writers use the same basic material will clarify Matthew's unique emphases in his treatment.

COMPARISON OF MATTHEW 7:1-6 AND LUKE 6:37-42

Verse 6 is one of only two verses (the other is

¹³⁹Goulder, pp. 251,269. J. C. Fenton had earlier suggested the same scheme and also reported that Farrer favored it, "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew," Studia Evangelica, Vol. I (Berlin: Akademie, 1959), p. 178.

¹⁴⁰Cf. "Comparison of the Accounts" in Chapter 2. For a different rendering, using mostly Byzantine texts and harmonizing wherever possible, consult Richard Chapman, A Greek Harmony of the Gospels (London: Rivington, 1836), pp. 45-46. The synopses of Aland and of Huck are more difficult to use for comparing exact wording.

7:15) of the Sermon on the Mount that are not recorded somewhere by Luke. Such a rare omission is striking, especially since 7:1-5 is almost entirely recorded by Luke, and in a single locus. The remainder of the section (6:19-34) is scattered in Luke chapters 12 and 16.

However, Luke's account is much fuller than Matthew's, being perhaps twice as long. Two longer insertions are especially prominent: vv. 37b-38¹⁴¹ and vv. 39-40. The fact that Luke has these insertions (or, Matthew has these deletions) and the fact that Luke omits the climactic verse of the section give the two accounts startlingly different emphases. These differences will be considered along with a number of differences in wording between the two writers.

Matthew 7:1 and Luke 6:37a: ὅτι μὴ and οὐ μὴ

The very first sentence of the parallel accounts contains our first indication of different emphases. Both writers quote Jesus as saying "Stop judging" (or, "Don't be judging"). But the reason for ceasing judgment is different. Matthew follows the command with a purpose clause, which may be treated either as an exhortation ("in order that") or a warning ("lest you be"). But Luke uses the οὐ μὴ firm denial ("and you will definitely not be"). By doing so, Luke gives a promise for the future.

¹⁴¹Verse designations refer to p. 5, "Comparison of the Accounts".

That the choice of these words is not just a stylistic difference between the two writers is clear as they use the terms with approximately the same frequency (ὅτι μὴ uses: Matthew 8, Luke 9; οὐ μὴ uses: Matthew 20, Luke 19).

Thus Matthew's attention is focused on present fear of a later judgment, whereas Luke's emphasis is on assuring the reader that he need not fear any later judgment if he behaves properly now.

Matthew 7:1,2a and Luke 6:37ab: κρίνω

Matthew uses κρίνω only six times, four of them in these verses. In 5:40 "to sue" is meant; in 19:28 the disciples will "judge" the twelve tribes of Israel. Neither of these uses carries any necessary hint of condemnation; instead they appear to reflect an essentially neutral, impartial view of judging.¹⁴²

Matthew uses two other words, κατακρίνω and καταδικάζω when judging specifically means "condemn," the first word four times and the second word twice. Luke records parallels to the contexts of all four of Matthew's uses of κατακρίνω, but he uses κατακρίνω in only two of the cases (11:31,32); in the other two cases he completely omits the condemnation recorded by Matthew (cf. Matt. 20:18 with Luke 18:31-33 and Matt. 27:3 with

¹⁴²Moule, too, asserts that κρίνω is "a neutral word" unless "the context compels it" to be negative, pp. 470-471.

Acts 1:16-19). Likewise, Luke has parallels of the passages in which Matthew uses KATAΓΙΚΑΖΩ but he omits the condemnation in them too (cf. Matt. 12:7 with Luke 6:1-5 and Matt. 12:37 with Luke 6:43-45).

The use of KATAΓΙΚΑΖΩ is especially significant. In 12:7, Matthew uses it for mistaken judgment in which the innocent one is condemned; in 12:37 it is condemnation rendered by God, the opposite of "justified".

Thus Matthew uses KΡΙΝΩ for judging in general, not necessarily condemnatory judging. However, his usage is also dependent on "the primary significance of the original word," which "seems to be to separate."¹⁴³ Especially in Matthew it was the Pharisees who judged or separated people "into two categories of 'righteous' and 'sinners'."¹⁴⁴ Within the kingdom, then, citizens are not to judge each other in terms of who is "righteous" and who is a "sinner". As it turns out in Jesus' teaching all citizens of God's Kingdom are righteous, and all are also sinners.

But Luke's use of KΡΙΝΩ is more varied. In addition to not making as much use of other words that specifically mean condemn, he uses KΡΙΝΩ with that meaning. KΡΙΝΩ appears five times in Luke and many times in Acts, with meanings such as estimate (Luke 7:43), evaluate

¹⁴³Hendriksen, Sermon, p. 182.

¹⁴⁴Bowman and Tapp, p. 146.

(Luke 12:57), rule (Luke 22:30), and condemn (Luke 19:22). With such a variety of meanings, Luke finds it necessary to define κρίνω. This he does in v.37b, where he makes his lone use of a word that specifically means condemn:

καταδικάζουαι.

Luke's First Major Insertion--Luke 6:37c-38c

Because of Matthew's more specific use of words for judging, he is able to assume his readers understand he is using it without any negative connotation. He therefore follows with the two-part statement in verse 2, tying the standard of judgment used to the standard that will be later used on those who now judge. Thus in Matthew, verse 2 serves as a transition to verse 3; if we will be judged just as we ourselves judge, then we ought to stop judging (v.1) until our judging apparatus is in good shape (vv.3-5).

Luke, on the other hand, cannot make this smooth transition because he must first explain what he means by "judge". And once he has defined it as "condemn" (37b), he must prepare for the "measure" saying by also illustrating the opposite of "condemn". He therefore goes on to describe the positive action which he has not included in "judging" and which his readers should not stop doing: forgiving. But although bringing in forgiveness has rounded out the larger concept of judging, Luke still needs to prepare for the "measure for measure" element. The transition is made by the use of "giving". Δίδετε follows ἀπολυετε; then it leads into a description of the bounty

that the giver will receive (38a); then the use of μετρον in describing the bounty leads into the μετρω of 38d. Thus Luke in rather lengthy fashion gets to the same place that Matthew had so directly reached: the saying in Matt. 7:2b about "measure for measure".

Matthew 7:2b and Luke 6:38d: Measuring

The μέτρῳ μετρεῖτε saying is not only reached by different routes, it is also handled slightly differently. The use of γὰρ here is the key.

Matthew 7:2 has a two-part, parallel construction:

2a: Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι κρίνετε κριθήσεσθε

2b: καὶ ἐν ᾧ μετρω μετρεῖτε μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.

Here the first line, the fact that judgment will occur, is given as the reason for the "stop judging" of verse 1.

Luke also uses parallelism, but his parallelism does not involve the measuring saying. His parallelism is as follows:

37a: μὴ κρίνετε	οὐ μὴ κριθήτε	don't condemn
37b: μὴ καταδικάζετε	οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε	don't condemn
37c: ἀπολύετε	ἀπολυθήσεσθε	but build
38a: δίδοτε	δοθήσεται	but build

Then after "good measure", (38bc) the μετρω μετρεῖτε saying follows as a reason (γὰρ).

So, for Matthew the measuring saying is not a carrier of added meaning; it serves as a literary device, balancing the meaningful judging saying of 2a. For Luke, the measuring saying is critical; it summarizes vv.37-38. Matthew can therefore be a little less precise than Luke

here; he uses the more general word μετρῆθησεται thereby preserving the parallelism. But to make his point, Luke uses a form of ἀντιμετρεῖν, stressing that there will be an exact measurement, that the receiving will be in like amount to the giving.

Our discussion has indicated that Luke is emphasizing general promises: the promise of averted condemnation and the promise of blessings (forgiveness, giving, measured back to the listener). These promises are of the type that could be made to general Christian audiences. But Matthew has not given such general promises; he has instead exhorted his hearers to be perceptive judges. At this point we are unable to distinguish the listeners the two writers have in mind for the originally-spoken words, but if there is a difference it would be along the lines of a more general group in Luke and a more restricted group in Matthew.

Luke's Second Major Insertion--Luke 6:39-40

This Lukan insertion¹⁴⁵ (or, Matthean deletion) clarifies who Luke and Matthew consider to be the recipients of this speech. Luke includes these two parables, which can have both wider and narrower applications. In the wider application, they can refer to all people; in the narrower

¹⁴⁵"One suspects that Luke may have inserted 39, 40...from other discourses of Jesus," Frederick S. Wenger, Exegetical Notes on the Gospel According to Luke (Springfield, Illinois: Concordia Mimeo, n.d.), p. 50.

sense, they could refer to Jesus' disciples, but it is unlikely that here such is the case.

The first parable (Luke 6:39) about "the blind leading the blind," is placed by Matthew (15:14) in a condemnation of the Pharisees. Since the Sermon on the Mount is about life in the kingdom and does not include the Pharisees, if Matthew had included the blind leading the blind here, he would have been applying Jesus' words about the Pharisees to Jesus' own followers. Luke's use of the parable here, on the other hand, suggests that Luke is not treating this statement of Jesus as particularly addressed to His disciples.

Matthew's parallel to Luke 6:40 ("the disciple is not greater than his master") appears in 10:24-25a and clearly refers to the disciples there. But the use in Chapter ten is for instructional purposes, whereas if Matthew had placed it within the section 7:1-6, it would have taken on (from the Judge not of v.1) a castigating sense; it is hardly credible that Jesus would have accused the disciples of thinking themselves better than He, yet that would be the meaning if the parable had been placed in 7:1-6 by Matthew.

From Luke's use of these two parables, then, it appears that the Lukan audience is a fairly general group that includes the disciples, but may even include Pharisees. This conclusion is consistent with the setting established by Luke in 6:19-20 and confirmed in 7:1. Although this

portion of Luke follows the listing of the twelve (6:13-16), yet the multitudes predominate over the disciples in vv. 17-19.¹⁴⁶ In v.20 Jesus gazes on the disciples and this could mean they were the direct object of his speech, but the text never states that they were. At the end of the sermon, it is reported that the discourse was given "in the hearing of the people" (7:1); this indicates a general audience was present, but does not specify whether they or the disciples were the intended hearers. But, because of the unacceptability of the narrow application of the two parables, it is more likely that Luke has the general audience in mind.

Matthew deletes the two parables because they would be a digression from the point of the paragraph. This is not to say that Matthew is denying the authenticity of these parables (he does report them elsewhere), but just that they are not appropriate here. But if Matthew sees Jesus as speaking to a general audience, they would at least be acceptable in this context (as they are in Luke). Why, then, are they inappropriate here? It would seem to be that they do not apply to the disciples--and this implies that, for Matthew, the disciples must be the primary audience. This limitation of the immediate audience in Matthew to the disciples is consistent with Matt. 5:1,2 in

¹⁴⁶A contrary position is advanced by Jacques Guillet, The Consciousness of Jesus (New York: Newman, 1971), who believes Luke stresses even more than Matthew that the disciples are the primary audience, p. 71.

which "disciples" is the immediate antecedent for "he began to teach them". Although a more general audience may have been present, they were not the direct object of the message in Matthew.¹⁴⁷

Matthew 7:3,4 and Luke 6:41-42c

In these verses Matthew continues his presentation on an even tone level, but Luke's heightens in emotion. Matthew writes "your eye" a simple, rather neutral expression. But Luke's emotions rise: "in your own eye" (ἰδίῳ, belonging to an individual; private).¹⁴⁸ That he is getting rather excited at this point is also indicated by his moving δοκῶν forward in the sentence and his doubling of τῇ (v. 41b: "the log which is in your very own eye"). Matthew, by comparison, practically buries δοκῶν in the middle of the sentence and somewhat matter-of-factly notes that it is in the listener's eye.

Matthew continues on about the same level in v.4, but Luke's emotions are continuing to climb. He opens v.42

¹⁴⁷This view is consistent with that of most scholars, including Charles L. Allen, The Sermon on the Mount (Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1966) who calls the Sermon on the Mount "the ordination Sermon" (p.16), Bowman and Tapp who think Jesus went up the mountain "to escape the crowds" (p.21) Makrakis (p.1), and Minear: "the prevalent accent...falls upon the correct ways by which mathetai, as successors and competitors of the scribes, should interpret the Law" (p.33).

¹⁴⁸William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 370. (Hereinafter abbreviated BAG.)

with δύνασθαι λέγειν "how are you able to say?" (cf. Matthew's ἐρεῖς and the simple variant λέχεις). We have moved now in Luke from amazement to exasperation and perhaps derision. And Luke continues with ἀδελφε (v.42b) reaching the heights of sarcasm. We can almost hear him screaming, "How hypocritical of you to call that splinter-toting man 'Brother,'¹⁴⁹ you log-toting condemning judge!" He stresses the judge's insensitivity and self-righteousness by having the log-hauler say "Let me remove the splinter which is in (τὸ ἐν τῷ) your eye" (v.42b), the emphasis being on the fact that the object is in the judged man's eye. That Luke is making this point is clear from Matthew, where the request is "Let me remove the splinter from (ἐκ τοῦ) your eye" (v.4b).

Continuing on (v.42c), Luke maintains his emotional pitch. The illustration has become so vivid that it fairly lives. And so he uses the word for actual physical seeing, βλέπω. Matthew, at this point (v.4c), begins increasing the emotional level of his account. The use of ἰδοὺ serves a double purpose: (1) to signal increased emotive content (Behold!) and (2) to keep the illustration from becoming too physically oriented--perceiving, not seeing, is the meaning of the illustration.

¹⁴⁹Pink makes the point that "it is two Christians who are in view, from the circumstance that the 'eye' mentioned is not altogether blind (which is spiritually the case with the regenerate [sic]) but merely contains some foreign substance which needs removing," p. 279.

The two writers use word order here to maintain the tone, and to stress different aspects of the illustration. Luke (v.42c) begins the clause with αὐτός (you yourself!), builds during the question (We are given the article τὴν, but made to wait through a prepositional phrase for the accompanying noun.), and at the end gives us a dramatic negative (οὐ βλέπων), but one that does not of itself go beyond the illustration to even a foreshadowing of non-physical application. This is in contrast to Matthew (v.4c), whose first strongly emotive word (ἰδοὺ) points to perception, a non-physical application for the illustration. Matthew follows ἰδοὺ with ἡ δοκός, thereby emphasizing the size of the matter in each person's eye, but the remainder of the question is uneventful compared to Luke. Matthew apparently has a way to go yet before he reaches his climax, while Luke has already reached his emotional peak and is on a high plateau.

Matthew 7:5a and Luke 6:42d: ὑποκριτα

This passage is the only instance in which Matthew and Luke use hypocrite in the same setting. Although there is no pattern in Luke's three uses of the word, Matthew's use of the word is germane to our discussion. He uses ὑποκριτή fourteen times; three uses are in relative isolation from other occurrences of the word, but the other eleven occurrences are gathered into two strings:

(1) 6:2,5,16; 7:5 and (2) 23:13,14,15,23,25,27,29. In

the second of these strings, it is used as one unifying element in the "Woes" section. And in the first string, it also serves a unifying function, connecting the closing verses of the 6:19-7:6 section to the opening and closing verses of the preceding section (6:1-18). In this way, the disciples are warned not to be like the true hypocrites, the Pharisees. As Van Tilborg has observed, "Whatever the original meaning of the 'Bildewort' may have been, in the present text it is an utterance for the benefit of the ἀδελφοί who are warned not to constitute themselves as judges who place themselves above their brothers."¹⁵⁰

Matthew 7:5b and Luke 6:42e: διαβλεψέις

Both Matthew and Luke use διαβλεπώ. For Matthew, a natural progression from general perception (ὁρᾶω) to insightful, thorough vision is made. For Luke the progression is more important: it is a mark of the application that follows the illustration begun in v. 41. The illustration had been physical (βλεπώ); the application moves on to insight.

Matthew 7:5c and Luke 6:42f: ἐκβαλεῖν

The infinitive form ἐκβαλεῖν may be considered a "purpose" or a "result" use. The Christian is to remove the mote from his own eye so that he is able to see clearly

¹⁵⁰Sjef van Tilborg, The Jewish Leaders in Matthew (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972), pp. 13-14.

and can then "cast out" (ἐκβαλλω) the speck from the brother's eye.¹⁵¹

Luke uses ἐκβαλεῖν to close the paragraph 6:37-42; he had maintained a high emotional tone since the beginning of v.41 and now relaxes a little. ἐκβαλεῖν closes the paragraph not as an emotional climax, but as a straightforward concluding statement: the purpose of all the promises and illustrations in his paragraph has been to move the audience to a condition in which they are able to take the speck out of the brother's eye. To do so, is to perform a good work, and also to enable the brother to perform good works, and so ἐκβαλεῖν leads the audience into vv. 43-49, an exhortation to good works.

But Matthew places ἐκβαλεῖν at the beginning of the clause; located as it is at the opening of the last clause before v.6, it stands out, it foreshadows βαλλω of v.6, but it is not climactic. Rather than leading into an exhortation to good works (as in Luke), it points toward the final verse of the paragraph.

MATTHEW 7:6 AS THE CULMINATION OF THE SECTION 6:19-7:6 AND THE PARAGRAPH 7:1-6

Luke has now finished his account; only Matthew has

¹⁵¹Hendriksen, *Sermon*, p. 188. Pink has grasped the significance of taking the speck out of the brother's eye: "our aim [is] the recovery of an erring one," p. 287. He quotes as a parallel text Galatians 6:1, "Brethren, if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness lest thou also be tempted."

v.6. Luke's account reached its climax and passed; Matthew's account is still building. Therefore, Matthew had to use this verse, but Luke could not because for him the verse would have been anti-climactic (6:41-42 were his climax), inappropriate to his audience (which includes the general listener, who does not necessarily possess the holy nor the pearl), and off the subject (since v.42 leads into a section on good works).

Verse six brings all the major elements of Matthew's entire section (6:19-7:6) and especially the paragraph (7:1-6) together into one parallel-construction sentence. Inasmuch as the three key verbal (in the sense of words, not verbs) elements of v.6 are μη, οιδωμι, and βαλλω it might be expected that, for all three, their appearance in v.6 is the culmination of a thread running through the entire paragraph and perhaps through the entire section.

The first verbal thread, the μη prohibitions, is the basic framework of the entire section (cf. p. 42). This thread opens the section (6:19), gives continuity by twice appearing midway (6:25,31) through the first half, concludes the first part (6:34), opens the concluding paragraph (7:1), and dominates the final verse (7:6) by heading both major clauses (and a variation on the theme heads the subordinate clause).

The οιδωμι thread is not so obvious, but the use of a form of οιδωμι in the first clause of v.6 (especially when the existence of the μη and βαλλω threads are

considered) suggests its existence. At first glance, of course, no such thread is seen since no form of διδωμι has appeared in Matthew since 6:11, which is not in the paragraph or even the section at hand. However, διδωμι does appear in the Lukan material (6:37-42), three times in v. 38abc. This suggests that Luke's "first insertion" (vv. 37b-38c) was probably originally part of the Sermon, and so might rather be called a "Matthean deletion". For when Matthew completed 7:5, he continued right on to the culminating verse, and the first few words of v.6 recalled earlier elements of Jesus' sermon: the μη prohibitions and the three uses of διδωμι by Jesus. (It is noteworthy that there are also exactly three appearances of forms of διδωμι almost immediately preceding its use in v.6.)

In addition to the probable existence of the διδωμι thread, two other factors suggest that Luke 6:38abc was originally part of the speech that Matthew reports. First, the stylistic advantage of deleting the verse is obvious, for by deleting it (it would originally have appeared between 7:2a and 7:2b) the striking parallelism of v.2 is obtained. Second, given Matthew's focus on the disciples as the main audience (in contrast to Luke's more generalized main audience), it would be most incongruous to retain the earlier διδωμι passage, for that would have set up a parallel between the disciples as the indirect object of giving in the earlier διδωμι passage and the dogs as the indirect object of giving in v.6. The parallel may not

have been apparent when the sermon was spoken, but it would be readily apparent to the reader who could reflect on and study the written record.

The third verbal string is even more complex because it uses two different lexical forms from the same root: βαλλω and ἐκβαλλω. The first form βαλλω, appears six times in the first chapter of the Sermon on the Mount, then it appears twice in 6:19-7:6 (once in 6:30 and once here). The second form ἐκβαλλω, is frequently used by Matthew, but it does not appear until 7:4. It appears once in 7:4 and twice in 7:5. So βαλλω in 7:6 builds upon the appearance of ἐκβαλλω in those verses where Matthew began heightening his emotional pitch; because of this, we might expect βαλλω to be a word of prime importance in v.6.

Besides combining the three verbal threads of the preceding verses in a single verse, v.6 also uses the beginning elements of the section (treasure) and of the paragraph (judging). That it speaks of treasure (recalling 6:19-21) is obvious from the use of holy and of pearl. And within v.6, judging is necessary to determine the identification of dogs, swine, holy, and pearls. Thus 7:6 may properly be considered to be the climactic, culminating statement used by Jesus and recorded by Matthew to impress upon believers the exhortation that began in 6:19, especially that is contained in 7:1-5: the exhortation to stop judging brothers in the Kingdom.

THE STRUCTURE OF MATTHEW 7:6

Matthew 7:6 is composed of two independent clauses, and a third subordinate clause. The two main clauses appear to exemplify the parallelism common in Hebrew poetry, the second clause repeating the same basic content of the first:

6a: $\mu\eta$ $\delta\omega\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\iota\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ $\kappa\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$

6b: $\mu\eta$ $\beta\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\epsilon$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\mu\alpha\rho\gamma\alpha\iota\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\chi\omicron\iota\rho\omega\nu$

The third clause (6cd) appears to be dependent on 6b, with the swine trampling the pearls, turning, and tearing the throwers. Many interpreters, however, favor splitting 6c from 6d, applying 6c to the swine of 6b, but 6d to the dogs of 6a, so that it is the dogs that turn and tear the throwers. Neither interpretation much affects the meaning of the main clauses, since dogs and swine are parallel; a fuller treatment of the problem appears in the appendix.

MATTHEW 7:6ab: THE WORD - PAIRS IN
THE TWO INDEPENDENT CLAUSES

Without exception, every published commentary on this verse treats at relatively great length the two word pairs holy-pearls and dogs-swine and either completely or almost completely¹⁵² ignores the word pair (give-throw) that is in the first position (the position of greatest emphasis) in each clause and that serves as the climactic

¹⁵²Only Tholuck, Exposition, pp. 268-279, treats either verb. He deals with $\delta\iota\delta\omega\mu\iota$, but ignores $\beta\alpha\lambda\lambda\omega$.

element. (cf. pp. 57-59) of the paragraph. We shall begin with this word pair.

δίδωμι and βάλλω-ἐκβάλλω

Both verbs have general meanings in everyday use and also carry special theological freighting. The basic meaning of δίδωμι is "to give". Frequently it refers to the giving of good things by God to man; among these good things in Matthew are food (6:11, 14:19, 15:36, 24:45), insight into spiritual matters (7:7, 13:11, 19:11), the Lord's Supper (26:26,27), the Kingdom (21:43), spiritual authority (10:1, 16:19, 28:12), and Jesus Christ Himself (10:8, 20:28). However, in each case where there is theological significance, it is not the word give which conveys the theological meaning, but it is the context; Abbott-Smith notes this as he defines δίδωμι as "to give-- in various senses, acc. to context."¹⁵³ Although John uses δίδωμι with strong theological meaning, the New Testament as a whole uses a variety of forms of the root with inseparable prefixes (as ἀποδίδωμι, ἀνταποδίδωμι, and παραδίδωμι) as the words with intrinsic spiritual import.¹⁵⁴

¹⁵³G. Abbott-Smith, A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament (New York: Scribner's, 1937), p. 114.

¹⁵⁴Friedrich Buchsel, "δίδωμι," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. II, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), pp. 166-173 makes this point in his discussion although he does not state it explicitly.

However, the Ballw-ἐκβαλλω set, especially in the light of the admonition against judging (7:1) carries great import. ἐκβαλλω is used 28 times in Matthew and 20 times in Luke; they may be summarized as follows:

	<u>Matthew</u>	<u>Luke</u>
Simple action (send, produce, bring grow) ¹⁵⁵	6	3
Expel demons ¹⁵⁶	13	9
Consign to hell ¹⁵⁷	3	1
Expel money changers from temple ¹⁵⁸	1	1
Quench smoking wick of faith ¹⁵⁹	1	-
Workers in vineyard <u>throw</u> Son out and kill him ¹⁶⁰	1	2
Remove speck/mote from eye ¹⁶¹	3	3
Excommunicate ¹⁶²	-	1
Totals	28	20

Thus ἐκβαλλω in Matthew and Luke means primarily to cast out evil from what is good, most commonly the casting out of demons, but carrying also the meaning of consigning people to hell (the ultimate meaning of excommunication).

The same word is also widely used by the apostle John, and with the same strong theological impact. In the gospel, ἐκβαλλω is used only six times, always with spiritual meaning. Christ drives the money-changers out of

¹⁵⁵Matt. 9:25,38; 12:35(2); 13:52, 15:17. Luke 4:29; 10:2,35.

¹⁵⁶Matt. 7:22; 8:16,31; 9:33,34; 10:1,8; 12:24,26,27(2),28; 17:19. Luke 9:40,49; 11:14,15,18,19(2),20; 13:32.

¹⁵⁷Matt. 8:12; 22:13; 25:30. Luke 13:28.

¹⁵⁸Matt. 21:12. Luke 19:45. ¹⁵⁹Matt. 12:20.

¹⁶⁰Matt. 21:39. Luke 20:12,15.

¹⁶¹Matt. 7:4,5(2). Luke 6:42(3). ¹⁶²Luke 6:22.

the temple (Jn.2:15), but He will never cast out those whom the Father has given Him (Jn.6:37). In 12:31 (and also in Revelation several times) John uses ἐκβάλλω of throwing the devil out of heaven or into the lake of fire. In Jn.9:34,35 ἐκβάλλω is the term for being thrown out of the synagogue (i.e., excommunication)¹⁶³ and in 3 John 10 of a certain Diotrophes it is said "Not satisfied with that, he refuses to welcome the brothers. He also stops those who want to do so and puts them out of the church (ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει).

But βάλλω, even more than ἐκβάλλω, has to do with throwing out of the Kingdom. Since 7:6 appears only in Matthew (whereas 7:4,5 where ἐκβάλλω was used also appeared in Luke), only Matthew's use of βάλλω is of concern here; and is summarized below:

	Matthew	Sermon on Mount only
Simple action ¹⁶⁴	13	-
Throw into hell, fire, out of Kingdom ¹⁶⁵	16	8
Remove from God's care ¹⁶⁶ . . .	1	-
Ungrateful servant throws debtor into prison ¹⁶⁷ . . .	1	-
Throw bread to dogs ¹⁶⁸ . . .	1	-
Cast sword, not peace ¹⁶⁹ . . .	2	-
Cast pearls to swine ¹⁷⁰ . . .	1	1
Totals	35	9

¹⁶³Merrill Tenney, John: the Gospel of Belief (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948), p. 159 and Leon Morris, The Gospel According to John (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971), p. 493.

¹⁶⁴Matt. 4:18; 8:6; 8:14; 9:2; 9:17(2); 13:47, 17:27; 21:21; 25:27; 26:12; 27:6,35.

¹⁶⁵Matt. 3:10; 5:13,25,29(2),30(2); 6:30; 7:19; 13:

So although βαλλω has a range of possible meaning, in the Sermon on the Mount it is used of throwing into hell, out of the Kingdom. In 7:6 then, βαλλω also carries this significance. In conjunction with the earlier warning not to judge one's brother, μη βαλητε must be a prohibition against throwing one's brother out of the Kingdom, i.e., judging him as if he were not a brother at all.

Τό ἅγιον and ὁ μαργαρίτης

The parallel between holy and pearls is so clear that Luther even substituted holy things for pearls in one rendition of 7:6, "Beware that ye cast not your holy things before swine and dogs."¹⁷¹ The identification of the referents for the word-pair has been, as was seen in Chapter 3, the cue to the interpretation of the verse. And so most exegetes have given their greatest attention to this word pair.

The traditional identification with the Eucharist, which began as early as the Didache and has continued since, fails on four counts. First, the Lord's Supper was not instituted till just before the end of Jesus' public ministry, but 7:6 is in the Sermon on the Mount, which is placed right near the beginning of the public ministry.

42,48,50; 18:8(2),9(2).

¹⁶⁶Matt. 4:6. ¹⁶⁷Matt. 18:30. ¹⁶⁸Matt. 15:26.

¹⁶⁹Matt. 10:34(2) ¹⁷⁰Matt. 7:6.

¹⁷¹Luther, Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, p.385.

Second, 7:6 uses the singular for holy, but all early references to the Lord's Supper as "the holy thing" use the plural, τὰ ἅγια.¹⁷² Third, it is in opposition to the preceding verses. And fourth, such an identification disregards the theological content of βαλλω.

The identification with the Gospel or Scriptural teachings also runs into difficulties. First there is the logical inconsistency described by Methodius. Second, nowhere is the gospel called "holy" in the New Testament. Third, it goes against Christ's commands in Matthew to confess Him before men in spite of persecution (10:27-33), to sow the seed even on poor ground (13:18-23), and to "make disciples of all nations" (28:19). And fourth, it also disregards both the context and the meaning of βαλλω.

Philbin has claimed that "there is but one definition of Das Heilige as it is found in Matthew's Gospel. Christ is Das Heilige."¹⁷³ Indeed, Jesus is "The Holy One" of Israel and of God (cf. the cry of the unclean spirit in Mark 1:24 and Luke 4:34; Peter's professions of faith in John 6:69 and Acts 3:14; and the statement of John in I John 2:20 and Revelation 3:7). But Matthew never uses

¹⁷²Several minuscules give the plural reading, but they all date from the late Middle Ages and would appear to result from the already common identification. Perhaps this may also explain E. V. Rieu's translation of 7:6 as "Do not give holy things [emphasis added] to dogs," p. 59.

¹⁷³Lester G. Philbin, "The Contemporary Understanding of the Holy and Its Reflection in Matthew's Gospel," Religion in Life, 42 (1973), p. 513.

this term to refer to Jesus. And the construction in 7:6 is a neuter, whereas Jesus as the "Holy One" is always a masculine word.¹⁷⁴

A more reasonable approach to the identity of the holy is to take it as a general term without specific identification, especially because of its neuter gender. Hendriksen does this: "The term 'that which is holy' is very general. It signifies whatever has been separated in a special manner unto the service of God."¹⁷⁵ Thus BAG define singular neuter τὸ ἅγιον basically as "what is holy".¹⁷⁶ They go on to define the use in 7:6 as "sacrificial meat,"¹⁷⁷ but 7:6 is their only example of this use in the New Testament. BAG give, as the second specific referent for τὸ ἅγιον (singular), "the sanctuary," as in Hebrews 9:1 (the only reference). But this does not appear to fit 7:6.

If we take τὸ ἅγιον as a general term, it receives its specific intention from the context, and in the light of vv. 1-5 and the meaning of βαλῶ, this must

¹⁷⁴Some have asserted that this is not a telling argument inasmuch as various figures used in the New Testament for Jesus are neuter or even feminine: τὸ ἄρνιον in Revelation, τὸ φῶς in Matt. 4:16, ἡ διζα in Romans 15:12, ἡ κεφαλὴ in Paul's letters, and John 14:6 with three feminine nouns, "ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ὁδὸς καὶ ἡ ἀληθεῖα καὶ ἡ ζωὴ." But all these nouns are always either neuter or feminine, whereas ὁ ἅγιος is usually masculine and, in all the certain references as a noun to Jesus, it is masculine.

¹⁷⁵Hendriksen, Sermon, p. 192.

¹⁷⁶BAG, p. 9.

¹⁷⁷BAG, p. 10.

be "brother". This identification is reasonable inasmuch as believers are called saints, although the usage in the New Testament is generally masculine. (Clement, about 96-97 A.D., used the neuter gender of Christians: "Behold, the Lord takes for himself a people from among the nations... the Holy of Holies [ἁγία] shall come from that nation."¹⁷⁸) Kohler concluded that "all things become 'holy' that are excluded from common or profane use by being connected with the worship of God" and this included Israel in the Old Testament.¹⁷⁹

The pearl, ὁ μαργαρίτης, is no more solid theologically than is τὸ ἄγιον. It was practically a universal symbol for treasure in ancient times.¹⁸⁰ It was used in the Talmud "metaphorically to denote any valuable thing,"¹⁸¹ but "it is doubtful if pearls are mentioned in the Bible [the Old Testament]".¹⁸² The word does not appear in the Septuagint. In the New Testament it is used in five other places. In Revelation 17 and 18 and in

¹⁷⁸First Clement XXIX. 3.

¹⁷⁹Kaufmann Kohler, "Holiness," The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. VI (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905), p. 440.

¹⁸⁰Elisabeth Goldsmith, Ancient Pagan Symbols (New York: C. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929), pp. 59ff.

¹⁸¹Max Seligsohn, "Pearl--in Rabbinical Literature," The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. IX, pp. 569-70.

¹⁸²Wilhelm Nowack, "Pearl--Biblical Data," The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. IX, p. 569. Nowack goes on to show that each alleged instance of "pearl" in the Old Testament is better translated otherwise.

I Timothy 2:9 it is used of literal precious stones; in Revelation 21, pearls serve as gates for the Holy City; and in the only other occurrence in the Gospels, Matthew 13:45-46 records the Parable of the Pearl of Great Price. Some have used the Pearl of Great Price as a clue to the pearl meaning in 7:6,¹⁸³ but to do so carries three dangers: it goes against the meaning of 7:6 already determined from the context, it uses one unclear (parabolic) passage to interpret another passage (Are we certain the parable in Matthew 13 is correctly identified?), and it assumes that the meaning of the figure is the same in both cases.

Rather than to use the pearl as a determiner of the meaning of 7:6, it would be better to let its meaning be determined by what is already known about 7:6. When that is done the pearl is seen as a flashback to the treasure statement of 6:19, so that 7:6 concludes the 6:19-7:6 section with a reminder of the beginning of the section and as an indicator of the great value Christ placed upon those who should not be judged nor cast out: the brothers.¹⁸⁴

Because the procedure advocated here, that of letting the context determine the meaning of holy and pearls, goes against the entire exegetical tradition on

¹⁸³Carr, p. 139; Fenton, p. 228; and F. Hauck, "μαργαρίτης," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. IV, p. 473 all identify the pearl as the Kingdom of heaven or its blessings on the basis of Matthew 13.

¹⁸⁴Seligsohn has listed several passages in the Talmud in which the soul is called a pearl, p. 570.

this verse, a summary of the reasons for the procedure are listed below:

1. The preceding context, esp. vv. 1-5, is clear in meaning.
2. Verse 6 is the culmination of the section beginning at 6:19 and especially of the paragraph beginning at 7:1.
3. The verbal elements connecting v.6 to the preceding verses are μη, βαλλω, and δίδωμι; within the Sermon on the Mount, βαλλω especially is significant theologically.
4. The neuter το ἅγιον and the word ὁ μαργαρίτης do not have clear theological referents in the Bible.
5. This word pair is in the position of least emphasis, the middle position in each clause. The emphatic initial position in each clause is given to the μη prohibitions using δίδωμι and βαλλω.

Therefore, holy and pearls are not the determinants for the meaning of 7:6. Instead, the identification of the referents for the word pair must be, and has been, drawn from the elements that do determine the meaning of 7:6.

ὁ κύν and ὁ χοῖρος

Both dog and swine were undesirable animals among the Semitic peoples.

The dog referred to in the Bible [Old Testament] is the semisavage species...held in contempt for its fierce, unsympathetic habits...He lives in the streets, where he acts as scavenger, feeding on animal flesh unfit for man, and even devouring human bodies...fierce disposition and therefore the type of violent men...treacherous and filthy...an unclean animal...shamelessness of the dog gave rise to the name...for the class of priests in the service of Astarte who practiced sodomy...in rabbinical literature for

shameless and relentless people, and therefore for wicked heathen.¹⁸⁵

Farbridge reports that "the affection and fidelity of the dog made hardly any impression on the Semites, and is almost always referred to by them in terms of contempt".¹⁸⁶ In Philippians 3:2 "evil workers" are called "dogs;" in Revelation 22:14,15 "dogs" are first in a listing of those who are not in the New Jerusalem, but are outside, i.e., the damned. So dogs seems to be more than just the heathen or "impure men".¹⁸⁷ They seem rather to be "wicked opponents;" the term dog, then, points "to the relentlessness and shamelessness of persecutors".¹⁸⁸

As reported in Chapter 3, some interpreters have found in dogs a reference to the Gentiles; they believe Jesus' calling the Syro-phoenician woman a "dog" (Matt. 15:26) provides the meaning Jesus attached to the word; even Augustine thought that the woman was a dog in the sense the word is used in 7:6, although he explains that by admitting she was a dog she showed humility and so was

¹⁸⁵Kauffman Kohler, "Dog", The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. IV, pp. 630-632.

¹⁸⁶Maurice H. Farbridge, Studies in Biblical and Semitic Symbolism (New York: KTAV, 1970), p. 79.

¹⁸⁷Joachim Jeremias, Unbekannte Jesusworte (3d ed., Gutersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1963), p. 57.

¹⁸⁸Isaac Abrahams, Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels (Second Series, Cambridge: at the University Press, 1924), p. 195.

accepted.¹⁸⁹ But the parallelling of Matthew 7:6 and 15:26 results from a superficial reading of the texts, for the dogs in 7:6 are ὁ κύν (the dogs described above) but in 15:26 (and the parallel passage, Mark 7:27,28) the word is τὸ κύναριον, the diminutive form for the pet or house-dog.¹⁹⁰ To clearly separate τὸ κύναριον from ὁ κύν, the woman replies: "Yes, but even the dogs under the table (τὰ κύναρια ὑποκατω τῆς τραπεζῆς) feed on the children's crumbs."¹⁹¹ Certainly the calling of the Syro-phoenician woman a dog has nothing to do, therefore, with the use of dog in 7:6.

The swine, too, were among the unclean animals.¹⁹² They were held in contempt and thought of as an emblem of filthiness.¹⁹³ According to Feliks, "the pig formerly found in Eretz Israel differed from the present-day one;"

¹⁸⁹Augustine. Sermons on New Testament Lessons xxvii. 9-11. A similar view is expressed by Austin Farrer, St. Matthew and St. Mark (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954), who thinks Matthew 7:6-11 is a parallel to Mark 6:30-3:38, involving reminiscences of the Syro-phoenician woman, etc.

¹⁹⁰Friedrich Blass and Albert Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and rev. Robert W. Funk (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), p. 60, say the diminutive form here is "in the nature of hypocoristica," meaning a pet name with implications of tenderness and caressing.

¹⁹¹Mark 7:28. Similar wording, although not as striking, is in Matt. 15:27.

¹⁹²Leviticus 11:7, Deuteronomy 14:8.

¹⁹³I. M. Casanowicz, "Swine," The Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. XI, p. 609.

the earlier pig was closely related to "the wild boar".¹⁹⁴

Although some also see in swine a reference to non-Jews, citing the Jewish use of the word for that which is unclean and the Jewish perception of the gentiles as unclean, Friedlander argues that "there is no Jewish or Rabbinical foundation for this opinion."¹⁹⁵ Nor is there any evidence in the New Testament that Jesus or any of His followers made this racial identification. Instead, the swine and the dogs would be adamantly scorning unbelievers who were particularly harmful to the Kingdom; such is precisely the case in 2 Peter 2:21-22, where apostates are called dogs and pigs (ῥῆς, the sow).

MATTHEW 7:6cd: THE DEPENDENT CLAUSE

Matthew 7:6c: μηποτε... αὐτῶν

The key word in the dependent clause is καταπα-
τεῶν, to trample. In the Septuagint, the word is frequently used of the actions of the victor toward the vanquished:

- 1 Samuel 14:48--Saul "delivered Israel out of the hands of them that spoiled (καταπατοῦντων) them."
- 2 Chronicles 25:18--Joash of Israel to Amaziah of Judah..."there passed by a wild beast...and trode down (καταπατήσεν) the thistle."

Psalm 56:1,2 (LXX 55:2,3)--Be merciful unto me, O God, for men would swallow me up...Mine enemies

¹⁹⁴Jehuda Feliks, "Pig," Encyclopedia Judaica, Vol. XIII (Jerusalem: Keter and New York: Macmillan, 1972), p. 506.

¹⁹⁵Friedlander, p. 220.

would daily swallow me up (ΚΑΤΕΠΑΤΗΣΕΥ)."

Daniel 8:10--the little horn waxed great and threw down some of the host and the stars to the ground, "and stamped (ΚΑΤΕΠΑΤΗΘΗ) upon them."

Malachi 4:31 (LXX 3:21)--And ye [the saints] shall tread down (ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΗΣΕΤΕ) the wicked."

A particularly striking usage is in Isaiah 63:18b, "our enemies have trampled your sanctuary (ΟΙ ὙΠΕΒΑΝΤΟΙ ἡμῶν ΚΑΤΕΠΑΤΗΣΕΥ ΤΟ ἁγίασμα σου)" for here the enemies of God trampled upon the holy thing.

In the New Testament, only Luke 12:1 has a neutral use of trample (a large crowd gathered, so many they trampled one another). But the other uses are as follows:

Luke 8:5--some seed fell upon the path; it was trampled upon (ΚΑΤΕΠΑΤΗΘΗ)

Heb. 10:29--"How much more severely do you think a man deserves to be punished who has trampled (ΚΑΤΕΠΑΤΗΣΑΣ) the Son of God, who has treated as an unholy (lit. common) thing the blood of the covenant that sanctified him?

Matthew 5:13--when the salt has lost its savor, "it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out (ΒΛΗΘΕΝ ἔξει) to be trodden down (ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΕΙΣΘΑΙ) by men.

BAG also give a number examples from writers of the period of ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΕΩ meaning to "treat with disdain".¹⁹⁶ So, if a brother is wrongly treated within the Kingdom, it is equivalent to throwing him out to the anti-Christian forces, who will attempt to treat him as does the victor its spoils

The concept "under foot" is implicit in ΚΑΤΑΠΑΤΕΩ, so the question arises as to why ΕΝ ΤΟΙΣ ΠΟΔΙΝ is also used. The answer is two-fold. First, the action

¹⁹⁶BAG, p. 416.

is made more vivid and emphatic and, second, vanquished persons are put under the feet of the victor.¹⁹⁷ The writer of Hebrews (2:8) defines the term: "Now when He put everything under His feet (ὑποκατω τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ), He left nothing outside His control." In Romans 16:20, God will soon crush the devil under the feet of the believers.

The immediate danger then, in treating one's brother as if he were not a brother at all is that he will be vanquished by the powers outside the Kingdom.

Matthew 7:6d: στραφευτες ῥηξουσιν ὑμας

All English translations translate the last phrase with "rend you" or some variant thereof. But there is some question about the meaning of ῥηξουσιν. BAG derive it from ῥηγνυμι and define it as "tear in pieces".¹⁹⁸ But Blass and Debrunner report that the two verbs ῥηγνυμαι and ῥησσειν seem to have "converged in Koine"¹⁹⁹ and Moulton concurs in that opinion.²⁰⁰ If this is so, and it appears to be, then we cannot be certain if the meaning of the verb is "to rend" (from ῥηγνυμι) or to "throw down, dash to the ground" (from ῥησσω). Both meanings

¹⁹⁷BAG, defining ὁ πτῶς: "the one who is vanquished lies beneath the victor's feet," p. 703.

¹⁹⁸BAG, p. 742. ¹⁹⁹Blass and Debrunner, p. 54.

²⁰⁰James H. Moulton, A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. II (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919), p. 403.

appear in the Septuagint²⁰¹ and in the New Testament²⁰² and so the brother who caused such evil to fall upon his fellow-believer will be either torn to pieces or also thrown to the ground to be trampled under foot.

RELATIONSHIP OF MATTHEW 7:6 AND
MATTHEW 5:21-26

Various passages similar to 7:1-6 could be cited (e.g., Romans 14: 12-17), but the most relevant one appears earlier in the Sermon on the Mount, 5:21-26. In this paragraph, Jesus warns the disciples not to call a brother a "fool," a person who is spiritually benighted, even denying the natural knowledge of God (Ps. 14:1). As Jesus speaks of "your brother" three times in 7:1-6, he had spoken four times of "his" or "your brother" in 5:21-26. Then in v.25 appears a μῆτις clause; this is one of only three instances in Matthew in which μῆτις is used with the future indicative, the other instances being 13:15, which is a quotation from the Septuagint (Isaiah 6:9-10) and so not original with Jesus or Matthew, and 7:6; all other μῆτις clauses in Matthew are with the aorist subjunctive.²⁰³

²⁰¹For rend into pieces, see: Genesis 7:11; Exodus 14:16; Numbers 16:31. For throw to the ground: Ezekiel 13:11,13; 38:20. Jeremiah 46:2 is ambiguous: Nebuchadnezzar smote the Egyptian army.

²⁰²For rend into pieces, see: Matthew 9:17; Galatians 4:27. For throw to the ground: Mark 9:18 and the parallel Luke 9:42.

²⁰³Archibald T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (4th ed., New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923), p. 1415.

The entire clause in 5:25 is verbally similar to 7:6: "lest (μηποτε) your opponent deliver (παραδω, from παραδιδωμι) you to the judge (τω κριτη)... and you be thrown (βληθησθ, from βαλλω) into prison." All three of the verbal threads that culminated in 7:6, plus the key word beginning the paragraph 7:1-6, are present in 5:25.

To conclude, as Jesus devoted an early section of His Sermon on the Mount to proper treatment of one's brother in the Kingdom and on the penalty for such mistreatment, he repeated the same message late in the Sermon, using similar vocabulary and employing the same grammatical structure for the presentation of the effects of mistreatment.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

CONCLUSIONS

Matthew 7:6 is integrally related with its context in the Sermon on the Mount. It is the culminating verse of a long μη prohibition section running from 6:19 to 7:6, and especially of the paragraph 7:1-6, which is an admonition against censorious judging of one's fellow-believers. Within this context, there is no mention of proper treatment of the Lord's Supper, of the Gospel, or of Christ Himself. The concern is with proper treatment of the brother.

The key link between 7:6 and the preceding paragraph is the verb word-pair. This pair, διδωμι and βαλλω, appeared just before 7:6 in the Sermon on the Mount and is given the emphatic position in the word-order of v.6.

Διδωμι is not the prime carrier of meaning; βαλλω is, and in the Sermon on the Mount it refers to casting what is unworthy out of the Kingdom and into hell. In the light of the preceding verses, then, the double prohibition in 7:6 is a warning not to cast one's brother out of the Kingdom.

The noun word-pair, το ἅγιον and ὁ μαργαρι-
της, although used by most interpreters as the determinant

of 7:6's meaning, is in fact of non-specific reference in itself; the meaning of the two words here is determined by the context and the theological significance of βαλλω. On that basis, the holy thing and the pearl are found to be the "brother", the fellow-believer and member of Christ's Kingdom.

The purpose of 7:6, then, is to impress, on the mind of the hearer-reader, in a single parallel-construction, the point of the preceding verses. What had been expounded earlier in the Sermon (5:21-26) and again in 7:1-5 is capsulized in one memorable saying, so that the point of the exposition will stay with the audience and be easily recalled. Within the Kingdom, we are brothers. We are not to judge our brother, not to be of a fault-finding disposition toward him. Rather, we are to see our own faults, repent of them, and then help the brother with his fault. Rather than "judging" him and, by implication, placing him outside the Kingdom, we are to treasure him as holy and of great value.

IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study, which are practically the direct opposite of the traditional interpretation (and also the two other views, the "anti-Gentile-saying" school and the Aramaic school) of Matthew 7:6, have direct implications in four areas.

First, it is no longer possible to use 7:6 as a

prooftext for exercising caution in the proclamation of the Gospel to the unreceptive or as a prooftext for denying the Lord's Supper to those who are unworthy. The verse has nothing to do with either of those two practices; if anything, such use as a prooftext is a direct reversal of the intent of the passage, which is to discourage judging of the brother.

Second, however, the results of this study do not imply that there is to be no discipline in the Church. Guidelines and procedures for church discipline are dealt with elsewhere, e.g. in Matthew 18:15-18. Matthew 7:6, as does vv. 1-5 and also the Matthew 18 passage itself, provides the attitudinal framework for all relationships, including discipline, within the Church: the purpose of all dealings with a brother is to help him, to remove the mote from his eye, to reclaim him if he errs. The purpose is not to judge him, not to cast him out. So Matthew 7:6 does not negate in any way Matthew 18.

Third, the identification of the pearl with the believer in 7:6 raises questions about the identification of the Pearl of Great Price in 13:45-46. These are the only uses of any gem in the gospels, so the uses may be related; in the past, the pearl in both was seen as approximately the same: the gospel, the Kingdom, or Christ Himself (all related concepts). In contemporary interpretation, the identification of the Pearl of Great Price with the gospel, the Kingdom, or Christ is well-nigh

unanimous,²⁰⁴ although a few writers mention the alternate explanation that the pearl is the Church or the believer.²⁰⁵ The dominant interpretation sees the parable as a lesson in sanctification. But could it instead be dealing with atonement? If the pearl in Chapter 7 is the believer, could the pearl in Chapter 13 also?²⁰⁶ The possibility merits, at the least, a careful study of the Chapter 13 text.

The fourth implication is the most far-reaching. This study overturns what has been, according to the historical survey in Chapter 3, a solidly-entrenched exegetical conclusion throughout church history. Are there verses, perhaps even prooftexts as this one, which have been misinterpreted due to what appears to have been disregard for

²⁰⁴Cf. Emil Brunner, Sowing and Reaping (Richmond: John Knox, 1964), pp. 30-32; Francis H. Derk, Names and Titles of Christ (Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1969), p. 114; Archibald M. Hunter, The Parables Then and Now (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), pp. 77-78; Joachim Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (New York: Scribner's, 1963), p. 201; and Helmut Thielicke, Christ and the Meaning of Life (New York: Harper & Row, 1962), p. 63.

²⁰⁵The standard treatment from the nineteenth-century, Richard C. Trench, Notes on the Parables of Our Lord (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1948, orig. publ. 1861), p. 50, Erdman on p. 108, and Albright on p. cxliv all mention the alternate, but none favors it.

²⁰⁶Although the Pearl of Great Price as an atonement pearl is almost unheard of today, there are a few who see it this way, among them David L. Cooper, Messiah: the Historical Appearance (Los Angeles: Biblical Research Society, 1961), p. 101 and John A. Sanford, The Kingdom Within (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1970), p. 40. In the past the penetrating Dutch Reformed exegete, Casperus Vitringa, also made the identification, Verklaring van de Evangelische Parabolen (Amsterdam: Hendrik Strik, 1715), p. 231.

the context and simple superficial treatment? I have no suggestions for other passages to check, but the serious student of Scripture should not be unwilling to follow the text wherever it leads him, even if the direction may be unexpected.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott-Smith, G. A Manual Greek Lexicon of the New Testament, 3d ed. New York: Scribner's, 1937.
- Aborn, Thomas L. The Lectures of St. Matthew. Milwaukee: Morehouse, 1932.
- Abrahams, Isaac. Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Second Series. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1924.
- Aland, Kurt, ed. Synopsis of the Four Gospels, Greek-English Edition. United Bible Societies, 1972.
- Albright, William F. and C. S. Mann. Matthew. The Anchor Bible, Vol. XXVI. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1971.
- Alford, Henry. The Greek Testament, Vol. I. London: Rivington's, 1874.
- Allen, Charles L. The Sermon on the Mount. Westwood, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1966.
- Allen, Willoughby C. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Matthew. International Critical Commentary Series. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912.
- Ambrose. Concerning Repentance. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. X. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Aquinas, Thomas. Summa Theologica, 3 vols. New York: Benziger, 1947.
- Argyle, A. W. The Gospel According to Matthew. Cambridge Bible Commentary Series. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1963.
- Arndt, William F. and Gingrich, F. Wilbur. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957 (BAG).
- Athanasius. Select Writings, ed. Archibald T. Robertson. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.

Augustine. "Letters," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. I. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1892.

_____. "Of the Morals of the Catholic Church," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. IV. Buffalo: Christian Literature Company, 1887.

_____. The Preaching of Augustine: "Our Lord's Sermon on the Mount," ed. Jaroslav Pelikan; trans. Francine Cardman. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.

_____. Sermons on New Testament Lessons. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. VI. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1888.

Bacon, Benjamin W. The Sermon on the Mount. New York: Macmillan, 1902.

Bartling, Victor. "Our Need of Clear Vision--Sermon Outline on the Gospel for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity," Concordia Theological Monthly, 16 (1945), pp. 407-409.

Basil. "On the Holy Spirit," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.

Beare, Francis W. The Earliest Records of Jesus. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1962.

Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3d ed. London: Oxford University Press, 1967.

Blass, Friedrich and Albert Debrunner. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. and revised, Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. The Cost of Discipleship. New York: Macmillan, 1959.

Bornkamm, Gunther. "Enderwartung und Kirche im Matthäusevangelium," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1956.

Bossuet, Jacques Benigne. Selections from Meditations on the Gospel, trans. Sr. Lucille C. Franchere, O.S.B. Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1962.

Bowman, John Wick and Roland W. Tapp. The Gospel from the Mount. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1957.

- Brown, David. A Commentary--Critical, Experimental and Practical--on the Old and New Testaments, Matthew-John. Vol. V of Robert Jamieson, A. R. Fausset and David Brown. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain. "The Synoptic Gospels," The Expositor's Greek Testament, Vol. I, ed. W. Robertson Nicoll. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1897.
- Bruce, F. F. St. Matthew. Scripture Union Bible Study Books. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Brunner, Emil. Sowing and Reaping, trans. Thomas Wieser, Richmond: John Knox, 1964.
- Calvin, John. Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists, Vol. I. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1949.
- Büchsel, Friedrich. "διδωμι," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Vol. II, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964.
- Burkitt, Francis Crawford. Early Christianity outside the Roman Empire. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1899.
- Burney, C. F. The Poetry of Our Lord. London: Oxford University Press, 1925.
- Carr, A. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1906.
- Casanowicz, I. M. "Swine," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905.
- Cassian, John. "The Works of John Cassian," trans. Edgar C. S. Gibson, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. XI. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Champlin, Russell. Family E and Its Allies in Matthew. Studies and Documents Series, Vol. 28. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1966.
- _____. Family Π in Matthew. Studies and Documents Series, Vol. 24. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1964.
- Chapman, John, O.S.B. Matthew, Mark and Luke. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1937.
- Chapman, Richard. A Greek Harmony of the Gospels. London: Rivington, 1836.

- Chrysostom. Homilies on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. XII. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1889.
- _____. Homilies on the Gospel of St. John and The Epistle to the Hebrews. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. XIV. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1890.
- _____. Homilies on the Gospel of Saint Matthew. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. X. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1888.
- _____. The Preaching of Chrysostom, Homilies on the Sermon on the Mount, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- _____. "Resisting the Temptations of the Devil," The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. IX. New York: Christian Literature Company, 1889.
- Clement. The Letter of the Church of Rome to the Church of Corinth. Early Christian Fathers, ed. Cyril C. Richardson. Library of Christian Classics, Vol. I. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- Clement of Alexandria. The Stromata, or Miscellanies. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. 2. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Codex Sinaiticus, photographs by Helen and Kirsopp Lake. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1911.
- Coleman, Robert E. The Master Plan of Evangelism. Old Tappan, New Jersey: Fleming H. Revell, 1964.
- Colwell, Ernest C. The Greek of the Fourth Gospel. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Cooper, David L. Messiah: the Historical Appearance. Los Angeles: Biblical Research Society, 1961.
- Craig, Clarence Tucker. The Beginning of Christianity. New York: Abingdon, 1943.
- Cranmer translation, 1539. The English Hexapla. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841.
- Cyprian. Testimonies. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.

- Cyprian. Treatises. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Cyril of Jerusalem. Catechetical Lectures. The Faith of the Early Fathers, trans. William A. Jurgens. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1970.
- Dalman, Gustaf. Jesus-Jeshua, trans. Paul R. Levertoff. New York: KTAV, 1971.
- _____. The Words of Jesus, trans. D. M. Kay. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.
- Davies, W. D. Christian Origins and Judaism. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- _____. The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1964.
- Derk, Francis H. Names and Titles of Christ. Minneapolis: Bethany Fellowship, 1969.
- Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel, trans. Bertram L. Woolf. New York: Scribner's, 1935.
- _____. The Sermon on the Mount. New York: Scribner's, 1940.
- Didache, trans. Cyril C. Richardson. Library of Christian Classics, Vol. I. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953.
- Dietrich, Suzanne de. The Gospel According to Matthew, trans. Donald G. Miller. Layman's Bible Commentary, Vol. 16. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1961.
- "Early Liturgies, The Divine Liturgy of James," The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Edsman, Carl-Martin. Le Baptême de Feu. Uppsala: A. B. Lundequistska, 1940.
- Eichholz, Georg. Auslegung der Bergpredigt. Neukirchen-Vluyn: New Kirchner Verlag des Erziehungsvereins GmbH, 1965.
- Eliade, Mircea. Images and Symbols. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1961.
- The English Hexapla. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841.
- Erdman, Charles R. The Gospel of Matthew. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1920.

Farbridge, Maurice H. Studies in Biblical and Semitic Symbolism. New York: KTAV, 1970.

Farrer, Austin. St. Matthew and St. Mark. Westminster: Dacre Press, 1954.

Feliks, Jehuda. "Pig," Encyclopedia Judaica, 12 vols. Jerusalem: Keter and New York: Macmillan, 1972.

Fenton, J. C. The Gospel of St. Matthew. Pelican Gospel Commentaries. Baltimore: Penguin, 1963.

_____. "Inclusio and Chiasmus in Matthew," in Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, et.al. Studia Evangelica, Vol. I. Papers presented to the International Congress on "The Four Gospels in 1957" held at Christ Church, Oxford, 1957. Berlin: Akademie, 1959. (Issued as Vol. 73 of Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literature.)

Filson, Floyd V. "Broken Patterns in the Gospel of Matthew," Journal of Biblical Literature 75 (1956), pp. 227-231.

_____. Origins of the Gospels. New York: Abingdon, 1938

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1971.

Fletcher, Basil. The Aramaic Sayings of Jesus. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1967.

Franzmann, Martin H. Follow Me: Discipleship According to Saint Matthew. St. Louis: Concordia, 1961.

Friedlander, Gerald. The Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount. New York: KTAV, 1969.

Geerlings, Jacob. Family 13 (The Ferrar Group) in Matthew. Studies and Documents Series, Vol. 19. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.

_____. Family E and Its Allies in Luke. Studies and Documents Series, Vol. 3. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1968.

_____. Family 77 in Luke. Studies and Documents Series, Vol. 22. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1962.

_____. Family 13 (The Ferrar Group) in Luke. Studies and Documents Series, Vol. 20. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press, 1961.

- Geneva Bible, 1557. The English Hexapla. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841.
- Gerhard, John. Loci Theologici. Cited in Heinrich Schmid, The Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, 3d. ed., trans. Charles A. Hay and Henry E. Jacobs. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1899.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. Memory and Manuscript. Uppsala and Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1961.
- _____. Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1964.
- Glasson, T. Francis. "Chiasmus in Matthew vii. 6," Expository Times, 68 (1956-1957), p. 302.
- Goldsmith, Elisabeth. Ancient Pagan Symbols. New York: C. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929.
- Good News for Modern Man, The New Testament in Today's English Version, 3d. ed. New York: American Bible Society, 1971.
- Gore, Charles. The Sermon on the Mount. London: John Murray, 1902.
- The Gospel According to Thomas, trans. A. Guillaumont, et. al. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959.
- Goulder, M. D. Midrash and Lection in Matthew. London: SPCK, 1974.
- Graebner, A. L., W. H. T. Dau, and Louis Wessel. The Proof Texts of the Catechism with a Practical Commentary. Springfield, Illinois: Concordia, 1920.
- The Greek New Testament, ed. Kurt Aland, Matthew Black, et.al. 2d ed., London: United Bible Societies, 1968.
- Gregory Nazianzen, "Select Oration," trans. C. G. Browne and J. E. Swallow. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. VII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Gregory of Nyssa. On Virginity. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Guillet, Jacques. The Consciousness of Jesus, trans. Edmond Bonin. New York: Newman, 1971.
- Hanson, R. C. P. Tradition in the Early Church. London: SCM Press, 1962.

- Hare, Douglas R. A. The Theme of Jewish Persecution of Christians in the Gospel According to St. Matthew. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1967.
- Hauck, F. "ματθαίτης," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, ed. Gerhard Kittel, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1967.
- Hendriksen, William. "The Beauty of Matthew's Gospel," Westminster Theological Journal, 35 (1973), pp. 115-120.
- _____. Exposition of the Gospel According to Matthew. New Testament Commentary series. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1973.
- _____. The Sermon on the Mount. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1934.
- Hill, David. The Gospel of Matthew. New Century Bible Series. London: Oliphants, 1972.
- Hippolytus. The Refutation of All Heresies. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Hjärpe, J. "'Pärlor åt Svin,' Ett 'Jesusord' i Arabisk Tradition" [Pearls to Swine' A 'Saying of Jesus' in Arabic Tradition], Svensk Exegetisk Arsbok 36 (1971), pp. 126-135. Abstracted in New Testament Abstracts, 17 (1973), p. 303.
- Hobbs, Herschel H. An Exposition of the Gospel of Matthew. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965.
- Howard, Wilbert F. "Semitisms in the New Testament," A Grammar of New Testament Greek, ed. James H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, Vol. II. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919.
- Huck, Albert. Synopsis of the First Three Gospels, 9th ed., revised Hans Lietzmann, English ed., F. L. Cross. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1972.
- Hunter, Archibald M. The Parables Then and Now. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Matthäus 7:6a," Abraham Unser Vater, ed. Otto Betz. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963.
- _____. The Parables of Jesus, revised edition, trans. S. H. Hooke. New York: Scribner's, 1963.
- _____. Unbekannte Jesusworte, 3d ed. Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1963.

Jerome. Letters and Select Works. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. VI. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.

John Damascene. Barlaam and Ioasaph, trans. G. R. Woodward, ed. H. Mattingly. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.

John of Damascus. An Exact Exposition of the Orthodox Faith, trans. S. D. F. Salmond. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. IX. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.

Kahane, Henry and Renee. "Pearls Before Swine? A Reinterpretation of Matthew 7:6," Traditio 13 (1957) 421-424.

Kent, Homer A. "Commentary, St. Matthew," in Charles F. Pfeiffer and Everett F. Harrison (eds.) The Wycliffe Bible Commentary. Chicago: Moody Press, 1962.

Kilpatrick, George D. The Origins of the Gospel According to St. Matthew. London: Oxford University Press, 1950.

Koester, Helmut. "The Purpose of the Polemic of a Pauline Fragment," New Testament Studies, 8 (1961-1962), pp. 317-32.

Kohler, Kauffman. "Dog," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905.

_____. "Holiness," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905.

Kretzmann, Paul E. Popular Commentary of the Bible, New Testament, Vol. I. St. Louis: Concordia, 1921.

Kümmel, Werner Georg. The Theology of the New Testament. Nashville: Abingdon, 1973.

Ladd, George Eldon. A Theology of the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Lamsa, George M. Gospel Light, Comments on the Teachings of Jesus from Aramaic and Unchanged Eastern Customs. Philadelphia: Holman, 1939.

_____. Idioms in the Bible Explained. St. Petersburg Beach, Florida: Aramaic Bible Society, 1971.

Lang, G. H. The Parabolic Teaching of Scripture. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.

- Lange, John Peter. A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures: Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, Vol. I, Matthew, trans. Philip Schaff. New York: Scribner's, 1884.
- Lehman, Chester K. Biblical Theology, Vol. II. Scottdale, Pennsylvania: Herald, 1974.
- Lenski, Richard C. H. The Interpretation of St. Matthew's Gospel. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1943.
- Leo the Great. Letters. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers Second Series, Vol. 12. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Lieberman, Saul. Greek in Jewish Palestine. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1942.
- _____. Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, 2d ed. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1962.
- Lohr, Charles H. "Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, 23 (1961), pp. 403-35.
- Lombard, Peter. "Sentences" (Selections from, trans. Owen R. Orr), A Scholastic Miscellany. Library of Christian Classics, Vol. X, ed. Eugene R. Fairweather. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956.
- Loy, Matthias. The Sermon on the Mount. Columbus, Ohio: Lutheran Book Concern, 1909.
- Lund, Nils Wilhelm. Chiasmus in the New Testament. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
- Luther, Martin. Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, trans. Charles A. Hay. Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1892.
- _____. Luther's Works, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehman, Vols. 15, 27, 36, 37, 38, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 53. Philadelphia: Muhlenberg and St. Louis: Concordia, 1955-1975.
- Maertens, Thierry, O. S. B. Bible Themes--A Source Book, 2 vols. Bruges, Belgium: Biblica, 1964.
- Makrakis, Apostolos. The Interpretation of the Gospel Law, trans. D. Cummings. Chicago: Orthodox Christian Educational Society, 1955.
- Mansi, Joannes D. Sacrorum Conciliorum, Vol. V. Florence, 1759 (reproduced, 1901).

Manson, T. W. "Review of Lund, Chiasmus in the New Testament," Journal of Theological Studies, 45 (1944), pp. 81-84.

_____. The Sayings of Jesus. London: SCM Press, 1937.

_____. The Teaching of Jesus. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1955.

Methodius. Writings. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XIV. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1869.

Metzger, Bruce M. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. London: United Bible Societies, 1971.

Micklem, Philip A. St. Matthew, with Introduction and Notes. London: Methuen, 1917.

Minear, Paul S. "The Disciples and the Crowds in the Gospel of Matthew," Anglican Theological Review, Supplementary Series 3 (1974), pp. 28-44.

Mitchell, Edward C. The Critical Handbook of the Greek New Testament. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1896.

Moffatt, James. The Historical New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901.

Morison, James. Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew. London: Hamilton, Adams, & Co., 1870.

Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to John. New International Commentary Series. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.

Moule, C. F. D. "The Judgment Theme in the Sacraments," The Background of the New Testament and Its Eschatology, ed. W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1956.

Moulton, James H. A Grammar of New Testament Greek, 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1919.

Mumford, Bob. The King and You. Old Tappan, N. J.: Fleming H. Revell, 1974.

Nestle, Eberhard and Kurt Aland. Novum Testamentum Graece, 25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971.

Novatian. The Trinity, etc., trans. Russell J. DeSimone. The Fathers of the Church Series, Vol. LXVII. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1974.

- Nowack, Wilhelm. "Pearl--Biblical Data," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905.
- Oesterley, W. O. E. The Gospel Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1936.
- Origen. Commentary on Matthew. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. X. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Paulinus of Nola. Letters of St. Paulinus of Nola, trans. P. G. Walsh. Westminster, Maryland: Newman Press, 1966.
- Perles, Felix. "Zur Erklärung von Mt. 7:6," Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, 25 (1926), pp. 163-164.
- Perry, Alfred M. "The Framework of the Sermon on the Mount," Journal of Biblical Literature, 34 (1935), pp. 103-115.
- Philbin, Lester G. "The Contemporary Understanding of the Holy and Its Reflection in Matthew's Gospel," Religion in Life, 42 (1973), pp. 508-513.
- Pink, Arthur W. An Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker, 1953.
- Pseudo-Clementine. Two Epistles Concerning Virginity, trans. B. L. Pratten. Ante-Nicene Christian Library, Vol. XIV. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1869.
- Recognitions of Clement. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Revelation of Saint John the Theologian. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VIII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- Richardson, Peter. Israel in the Apostolic Church. Cambridge: at the University Press, 1969.
- Riddle, Donald W. "The Aramaic Gospels and the Synoptic Problem," Journal of Biblical Literature 54 (1935), pp. 127-138.
- _____. "The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek," Journal of Biblical Literature 51 (1932), pp. 13-30.
- Rieu, E. V. The Four Gospels. Baltimore: Penguin, 1953.
- Robertson, Archibald T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research, 4th ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1923.

- Robertson, Archibald T., ed. Select Writings and Letters of Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. IV. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954.
- Sanford, John A. The Kingdom Within. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1970.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. Christian Existence in the New Testament, Vol. I. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- Schonfield, Hugh J. The Authentic New Testament. London: Dennis Dobson, 1955.
- _____. The Bible Was Right. London: Associated Newspapers Ltd, 1959.
- Schwarz, Günther. "Matthäus vii.6a, Emendation und Rückübersetzung," Novum Testamentum, 14 (1972), pp. 18-25.
- Seligsohn, Max. "Pearl--in Rabbinical Literature," The Jewish Encyclopedia, 12 vols. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1905.
- Seventh-day Adventist Bible Commentary, ed. Francis H. Nichol, Vol. V. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald, 1956.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Paul Billerbeck. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, Vol. I, Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. Munchen: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1922.
- Surburg, Raymond F. "The Influence of Syriac Christianity." Unpublished Th.D. dissertation, American Theological Seminary, 1942.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Greek New Testament, Being the Text Translated in The New English Bible. Oxford: Oxford University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1964.
- The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. VII. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951, pp. 371-382.
- Tenney, Merrill. John: the Gospel of Belief. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Tertullian, Prescriptions against Heretics. Library of Christian Classics, Vol. V. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956.

- Tertullian. "To My Wife," The Faith of the Early Fathers, trans. William A. Jurgens. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1970.
- Theodoret. The Ecclesiastical History. The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. III. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953.
- Thielicke, Helmut. Christ and the Meaning of Life, trans. John W. Doberstein. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.
- Tholuck, August. Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1874.
- _____. Exposition, Doctrinal and Philological, of Christ's Sermon on the Mount, trans. Robert Menzies. Edinburgh: Thomas Clark, 1843.
- Thomas, David. The Genius of the Gospel. London: Dickinson and Higham, 1873 (reprinted as The Gospel of Matthew, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1956).
- Torrey, Charles C. Our Translated Gospels. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1936.
- _____. The Four Gospels, 2d ed. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1947.
- Trench, Richard C. Notes on the Parables of Our Lord. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1948 (orig. publ., 1861).
- Trilling, Wolfgang. The Gospel According to St. Matthew. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.
- Turner, Nigel. Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965.
- Tyndale translation, 1534. The English Hexapla. London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841.
- Tyndale, William. The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. London: Bagster, 1836 (orig. publ., 1526).
- van Tilborg, Sjef. The Jewish Leaders in Matthew. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1972.
- Vermes, Geza. Jesus the Jew, A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. New York: Macmillan, 1973.
- Vitringa, Campegius. Verklaring van de Evangelische Parabolen. Amsterdam: Hendrik Strik, 1715.

- Weidenschilling, J. M. Studies in St. Matthew's Gospel.
St. Louis: Concordia, 1948.
- Wenger, Frederick S. Exegetical Notes on The Gospel
According to Luke. Springfield, Illinois: Concordia
Mimeo Company, n.d.
- Wesley, John. Explanatory Notes upon the New Testament.
Naperville, Ill.: Allenson, 1950 (orig. publ. 1754).
- Westcott, Brooke Foss and F. J. A. Hort. The New Testament
in the Original Greek. New York: Macmillan, 1951.
- Wettstein, Jacobus. Novum Testamentum Graecum, Tomus 1.
Graz, Austria: Akademische, 1962.
- Wood, Herbert George. "Some Characteristics of the Synoptic
Writers," The Parting of the Roads, Studies in the
Development of Judaism and Early Christianity, ed.
F. J. Foakes Jackson. London: Edward Arnold, 1912.
- Wuest, Kenneth S. Studies in the Vocabulary of the Greek
New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1955.
- Wycliffe [Wiclif] translation, 1380. The English Hexapla.
London: Samuel Bagster and Sons, 1841.
- Ylvisaker, Joh. The Gospels. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1932.

APPENDIX

CHIASMUS IN MATTHEW 7:6

Matthew 7:6 has, over the past several decades, come to be used as an example of chiasmus (ABBA construction), so much so, that the American Bible Society's Today's English Version translates 7:6 as follows:

Do not give what is holy to dogs--they will only turn and attack you; do not throw your pearls in front of pigs--they will only trample them underfoot.²⁰⁷

This view of the relationship of the dependent clause (split into two parts) with the preceding independent clauses has a long history.²⁰⁸ In the English language, it goes all the way back to Wycliffe in 1380, who translated 7:6 thusly:

Nile ze zeue holi thing to houndis,
nether cast ze zoure margaritis bifer swyne:
leest peraventure thei defoule hem with her feet,
and the houndis [emphasis added] be turned : al to
tere zou.²⁰⁹

Tyndale followed Wycliffe in his 1526²¹⁰ and his 1534

²⁰⁷ Good News for Modern Man, The New Testament in Today's English Version (3d ed., New York: American Bible Society, 1971), p. 16.

²⁰⁸ T. Francis Glasson, "Chiasmus in Matthew vii.6," Expository Times 68 (1956-1957), p. 302.

²⁰⁹ Wicflif translation in The English Hexapla.

²¹⁰ William Tyndale, The New Testament of Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ (London: Bagster, 1836, orig. publ. 1526).

edition,²¹¹ using the words "lest they treade them under their fete/and other tourne agayne and all to rent you". Cranmer in 1539²¹² used Tyndale's wording, but the Geneva Bible²¹³ of 1557 deleted any special indication of chiasmus, as did succeeding versions until Moffatt's 1901 translation;²¹⁴ then Today's English Version seems to follow the rendering by Schonfield, who had also inserted the final phrase between the two independent clauses.²¹⁵

Although many commentators have recognized the chiastic structure, few have claimed for it the importance that Lund does, who believes the passage is "unintelligible" before the chiasmus is recognized, but "becomes clear at once" when the chiasmus is seen.²¹⁶ Only a few commentators, among them Morison and Lenski,²¹⁷ have argued against a chiasm here.

It is possible, but not necessary, that 7:6 is chiastic. Supporters of chiasmus maintain that pigs trample, but dogs attack and rend with their sharp teeth, so the

²¹¹Tyndale translation in The English Hexapla.

²¹²Cranmer translation in The English Hexapla.

²¹³Geneva Bible in The English Hexapla.

²¹⁴James Moffatt, The Historical New Testament (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1901), p. 310.

²¹⁵Hugh J. Schonfield, The Bible Was Right (London: Associated Newspapers Ltd., 1959), p. 34.

²¹⁶Lund, p. 32.

²¹⁷Morison, p. 113; Lenski, pp. 291-292.

passage must be chiastic. But the pigs of ancient Palestine were similar to wild boars, and so also violent and capable of tearing. Also, the word translated "rend" may also mean "dash to the ground," as was shown in Chapter 4; the pigs would be as capable, perhaps more so, of this action than are wild dogs. In neither case is the intent of the verse affected.

COMPARISON OF THE ACCOUNTS

MATTHEW 7:1-6

LUKE 6:37-42

- 1 Μὴ κρίνετε 37a Καὶ μὴ κρίνετε,
ἵνα μὴ κριθῇτε καὶ οὐ μὴ κριθῇτε.
 (parallel: Matthew 6:14) b καὶ μὴ καταδικάζετε,
καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῇτε.
 c απολύετε, καὶ ἀπολυθήσεσθε
 38 a δίδετε, καὶ δοθήσεται ὑμῖν
 b μέτρον καλὸν πεπερισμένον σεσαλευμένου
ὑπερεκχυνόμενου
 c δώσουσιν εἰς τὸν κόλπον ὑμῶν.
- 2a ἐν ᾧ ἅρ κρίματι κρίνετε
κριθήσεσθε
 b καὶ ἐν ᾧ μέτρω μετρεῖτε d ᾧ ἅρ μέτρω μετρεῖτε
μετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν. ἀντιμετρηθήσεται ὑμῖν.
 (parallel: Matthew 15:14) 39a Εἶπεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν αὐτοῖς
 (parallel: Matthew 10:24-25a) b Μήτι δύναται τυφλὸς τυφλὸν ὁδηγεῖν;
 c οὐγὶ ἀμφοτέροι εἰς βόθυνον ἐμπεσοῦνται;
 40a οὐκ ἔστιν μαθητὴς ὑπὲρ τὸν διδάσκαλον,
κατηρτισμένος δὲ πᾶς ἔσται,
ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ.
 41a Τί δὲ βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος
τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου,
 b τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ δοκὸν b τὴν δὲ δοκὸν τὴν ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ ὀφθαλμῷ
οὐ κατανοεῖς; οὐ κατανοεῖς;
 4a ἢ πῶς εἰρεῖς τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου 42a πῶς δύνασαι λέγειν τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου,
 b ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου
 c καὶ ἰδοὺ ἡ δοκὸς ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου; c ἄφες ἐκβάλω τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου,
αὐτὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ σου δοκὸν
οὐ βλέπων;
- 5a ὑποκριτὰ, d ὑποκριτὰ,
ἐκράλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν ἐκράλε πρῶτον τὴν δοκὸν
ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου, ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ σου,
 b καὶ τότε διαβλεψείς
 c ἐκβαλεῖν τὸ κάρφος ἐκ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ
τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου. e καὶ τότε διαβλεψείς
 f τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ
τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου ἐκβαλεῖν.
- 6a Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσίν,
 b μηδε βύλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν
ἐμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων,
 c μηποτέ καταπατήσουσιν αὐτοὺς
ἐν τοῖς ποσίν αὐτῶν
 d καὶ στραφέντες ρήξωσιν ὑμᾶς.