*flat ledge or shelf on the side of the mountain;* but more naturally below the mountain: see on Matt. v.1. Whether St. Luke  
could thus have written *with the Gospel of  
St. Matthew before him,* I leave the reader  
to judge: premising, that is, the identity  
of the two discourses.

**19.**] St. Luke uses the same expression, of power going  
forth from our Lord, in ch. viii. 46.

**20—49.**] SERMON ON THE MOUNT (?).  
Peculiar (in this form) to Luke, answering  
to Matt. v.—vii. On the whole question  
of the identity or diversity of the two discourses, see on Matt. v. 1. In Matthew I cannot doubt that we have *the whole discourse much as it was spoken;* the connexion is intimate throughout; the arrangement wonderfully consistent and admirable. Here, on the other hand, the  
discourse is only reported in fragments—  
there is a wide gap between vv. 26 and 27,  
and there are many omissions in other parts;  
besides which, sayings of our Lord, belonging apparently to other occasions, are inserted ; see vv. 39, 40, 45. At the same  
time we must remember, that such central  
sayings would probably be frequently uttered by Him, and might very likely form part of this discourse originally. His  
teaching was not studious of novelty like  
that of men, but speaking with authority  
as He did, He would doubtless utter  
again and again the same weighty sentences when occasion occurred. Hence  
may have arisen much of the difference of  
arrangement observable in the reporte—  
because sayings known to have been uttered together at one time, might be  
thrown together with sayings spoken at  
another, with some one common link perhaps connecting the two groups.  
**20. on his disciples**] The discourse was  
spoken to the disciples generally,—to the  
Twelve particularly,—to the people prospectively ; and its subject, both here and in Matthew, is, *the state and duties of a  
disciple of Christ.*

**ye poor**] To suppose that St. Luke’s report of this discourse  
refers *only to this world’s* poverty, &c.—and the blessings to anticipated *outward*  
prosperity in the Messiah’s Kingdom, is  
surely quite a misapprehension. Comparing these expressions with other passages in St. Luke himself, we must have  
concluded, *even without St. Matthew's re-  
port,* that they bore *a spiritual* sense;  
see ch. xvi. 11, where he speaks of *‘the  
true* riches,’ and ch. xii. 21, where we  
have **rich towards** **God**. And who would  
apply such an interpretation to our ver.  
21?

See on each of these beatitudes the corresponding notes in Matthew.

**the kingdom of God**] *“the kingdom of  
heaven,”* Matthew, but it does not thence  
follow that *“heaven”* is the same as  
*“God,”* but the two are different ways of  
designating the same kingdom—the one  
by its situation—*in heaven,* where its  
*polity* is (*Jerusalem which is above,* Gal.  
iv. 26), the other by *Him,* whose it is.

**22.**] *Separate* and *cast out* must not be understood of Jewish