

SERMON ON THE MOUNT — PART I

(Inaudible) . . . this is our nature of things because of the greatness of this sermon and we will probably spend today and tomorrow on it. But we ought to preface this with a little introductory explanation, and some comments that will help give us a perspective as to what is involved in the teachings that are there and the . . . (inaudible) . . . that Jesus was making. It is not a sermon as we think of sermons today. That is with a quote mark around the word. We say “the Sermon on the Mount”—we say very commonly that this is perhaps the greatest sermon ever delivered. In a manner of speaking, it is. I do not know how you can say this is the greatest . . . (inaudible) . . . maybe what we term “the Sermon of the Bread of Life” is a greater sermon than this. Maybe what we would term the sermon that preaches that Jesus preached of the Second Coming is a greater sermon than this. And yet none of them, really, are sermons in the sense that we have to use the word. He did not stand before a pulpit. He did not address a congregation in a formal sense of the word. Really, these are the teachings that were given on the Mount, and they were given in dialogue manner. It begins by saying that he went up on the Mount, and when he was there his disciples came to him and he began to teach them. Apparently he sat down in a convenient place, and they assembled around him, and he began to give the teachings. Now, it is difficult to suppose that he just recited the words that we have and call the Sermon on the Mount. What seems to have been the setting was, that he sat there, not for the 45 minutes or the hour that might have been involved in saying these things, but all morning or all day, and he talked back and forth with the disciples. They asked questions; he answered questions; and he made, perhaps, elaborate explanations of what he was talking about, and they ended up writing down records of it; and they wrote the record of it like a newspaper reporter would write the record of what he heard at the Florida Convention or like a newspaper reporter would record what went on in General Conference. He would pick out the things that were headlines. He summarized; he probably gets as best he could, verbatim language, but there would be a reporter who was writing for the Luke Newspaper and a reporter that was writing for the Matthew Newspaper, and they would not pick out the same things to summarize. They would try and get the same thoughts, because both of them would be impressed with the idea that here was a climax that the Lord was reaching, and here was a thought that ought to be preserved, but the likelihood is that he taught for 20 or 30 minutes about it, and then they summarized in one sentence what he said, or they picked out of his teachings one sentence that crystallized the particular thought that was involved.

Now the result is that we have in Matthew and in Luke the same thought in different language. People say, “Oh well, how can this be inspired? How can this be literal revelation, and how can the Holy Ghost be calling to their minds what Jesus said when they write it down in wholly different language?” This is not at all difficult. What Jesus did was talk for an appreciable period of time about something, and Luke lifted one sentence and Matthew lifted another sentence, and what they chose was the same subject and they were saying in substance the same thing, and I can visualize that both of them are verbatim of what He said. Everybody does this in talking. I come here to class and I talk, and we start talking about a subject and we spend 20 minutes on something; and I

may say the crystallized portion of that 20-minute discussion over again three or four or a half a dozen times in one-sentence statements, which are substantially the same, but each one of them is just a little different; and you sit down and you record what I said, and each one of you picks out the sentence (and you may have it verbatim) that you think summarizes what I have said.

Well now, of course I am speculating just a little here on how this sermon was delivered. But on the other hand, we have some very clear indications because of the Book of Mormon account and because of the insertions that are made in the Inspired Version that leave a deep impression. For instance, one of the insertions in the Inspired Version has the disciples talking back and asking questions in the midst of the Sermon on the Mount, and replying to Jesus and saying, "Well, people will say such and such to us when we do what you have told us in this respect," and he says, "Yes that is right, and so you reply accordingly." None of this is in the King James Version, but it is inserted, and you get the idea, the context, the view of what is going is a discussion situation. We call it a sermon, but really it is a teaching situation. It is more like this class situation where I do most of the talking, but where in progress of time you do some of the talking. Well, there are two accounts in the King James Version of this sermon, and one of them, of course, is Matthew 5:57, the major account, and one of them is Luke. Now, what the average sectarian commentator will say is that Matthew assembled together the various items that Jesus said on a host of occasions throughout his entire ministry and put them in consecutive order and made them read like a talk or a sermon. That is in general what they . . . (inaudible) . . . probably they think this in large part because this is a disconnected sermon. This is not taking a subject and talking about it, but it is taking a whole host of subjects. You could call it a sermon like you could say, "Well, this is the sermon; he preached it on the Articles of Faith, and he started with number one and he said a few things, and he went through the list." It is not a sermon in the traditional sense of taking a subject. He preached a sermon on the Articles of Faith, and he talked for a few hours, and he talked for several minutes about each article and somebody wrote it down and crystallized the thought by just writing what the Article of Faith said without the explanations that were made instant to it. Yes?

Comment: Is the same thing true of the Third Nephi account?

BRM: I think the same thing would be true of the Third Nephi account. Now, let us talk about these comparative accounts a little, to catch a vision of what we have. Or, first, the setting when these were given. Luke says, in effect, that this is an ordination sermon; he does not use that language, but what he says is that it was given after the calling of the Twelve, and he calls it the Sermon on the Plains. Matthew talks about a "mount." So, the immediate problem before a sectarian commentator is, "Is the sermon on the mountain that Matthew talks about and the sermon on the plains where some of the same information is digested, the same thing?" And they drew conclusions (the generality of them) that there were two different sermons.

Well, we have a third account now, which is Third Nephi. And of course, Third Nephi is accurate and clear, and there is no problem and there is no question because the Book of

Mormon is translated correctly. So we turn and we look at Third Nephi to help us evaluate what Luke and Matthew have given. When we do it, we discover that He is giving it after the call of the Twelve, and He is giving it to the Twelve and to the multitudes, and when we read the Third Nephi account, we discover that part of it is directed to all of the people and part of it is limited and given exclusively to the Twelve. So, we reached a very evident conclusion that Luke is talking about what Matthew is talking about, and that it is in effect, an ordination sermon—that is, it is the body of teachings that He gave immediately after He called the Twelve and ordained them and made them apostles. Which means—another conclusion, it means that the Sermon on the Plain and the Sermon on the Mount are the same thing.

Now, we have a fourth account, really. We really have four accounts. The fourth account is the Inspired Version of Matthew—the King James is changed, in Matthew, and amplified. So we start studying this and we have four records of what was said. What is the best record? I suppose by instinct, everybody would just say, “Well obviously the Book of Mormon record is the best.” Really it is not. We have got a much better account in the Inspired Version than that in the Book of Mormon, because there are whole paragraphs inserted in the account in the Inspired Version that are not in Third Nephi. Third Nephi just follows almost sentence for sentence what is in the King James Version of the Bible, inserting a few explanatory comments that give us a little further light, and changing an occasional sentence to conform to Nephi’s manner of speaking—the idioms that they have that contrasted with those that the Jews had. But it is essentially the same sermon. But the Inspired Version changes these things and inserts whole paragraphs that are not in the Book of Mormon account. Now, this immediately raises the question, “Why would the Prophet put in the Book of Mormon what is in Matthew, for all practical purposes, and then after he had done that, with full knowledge that the Book of Mormon account read such and such, why would he proceed to alter and amend and change in effect the Book of Mormon (in the sense that he was changing the same words that were in the Book of Mormon)?” Just for instance, one little illustration, and that is this: the Book of Mormon follows exactly the same language as Matthew where the Lord’s Prayer is concerned. But when the Prophet got into the Bible and began writing the Lord’s Prayer, he changed it. One phrase says, “Lead us not into temptation”—Book of Mormon. All right, that has got to be perfect. In a manner of speaking it has got to be true because it is in the Book of Mormon and the voice of God says the Book of Mormon is translated correctly and it is true--those two things. Well, when he got the Inspired Version he changed it and he made it to read, “Suffer us not to be led into temptation.” There is a difference. It is one thing to say, “lead us not into temptation,” it is another thing to say “suffer us not to be led into temptation” . . . or is it? Is it one thing or is it two things? Well, this obviously means one thing. It means that the expression “lead us not into temptation” was a Jewish idiom or a Nephite idiom that meant to them, “suffer us not to be led into temptation,” and so when he put that in English for us, using our idiom and our way of speaking, he made it read, “suffer us not to be led into temptation.” Obviously from our knowledge of the gospel and our understanding of how God deals with men, we know that that is what that phrase in the Lord’s Prayer has to mean in order to conform to the overall plan.

Put yourself in the position of the Prophet now, and you are translating the Book of Mormon. I think Brother Sperry has made a little explanation—a point of this in some of the things he has written about the Isaiah parts of the Book of Mormon. It just cannot be anything but this, really. If you were translating the Book of Mormon from the plates and you were a poor translator, which the Prophet was in the sense that he was not learned after the manner of the world—if you were making a translation that was verbatim off the plates, or you would go reading along on the plates and you would come to a part of these plates where it had chapters of Isaiah or chapters of Matthew, what would you do? If you had good sense (I think you have got to admit the Prophet would be in that category) you would stop your independent translation and you would open the Bible and you would put it before you and you would read what was on the plates and you would read what was in Isaiah or in Matthew, and if the Matthew language conformed to the thought that was on the plates, you would use it! And if it did not conform, you would change it, and you would do that because these fellows who wrote the King James Version of the Bible had greater linguistic ability than you did—greater craftsmanship and ability to put words together. You are a poor translator from the scholarship standpoint; a poor author as yet. The Prophet became very powerful and mighty in writing, but in these initial stages he was not as mighty as he later became. So he was making a literal translation of the Book of Mormon, and he would just obviously change the thought where it had to be changed, where it happened to be the same language in Bible language. Just a little sidelight: years ago somebody came to Joseph Fielding Smith, who was translating the Book of Mormon into Hebrew, and he was a scholar, not of the Church. And he said, “I have translated documents all my life from English into Hebrew. This is my field; I am a world authority on this.” But he said, “Here I am translating the Book of Mormon, and there is something here that is different than anything I ever did.” He said, “This book falls back naturally into Hebrew.” Well, sure! It came out of Hebrew; it was written in Reformed Egyptian but it was with a Hebrew idiom and a Hebrew perception with different kind of characters. A poor translator would translate a Spanish phrase from Spanish to English, and it would not read “I am going home” like we say it in English, but he is taking it out of Spanish and making a literal translation it would say, “I to home am going.” So that is the structure of the Spanish language. Well, the Prophet is a poor translator scholastically, so he took the Book of Mormon in the literal language of Hebrew and preserved the structure of the Hebrew language and it falls back naturally into Hebrew. There are a couple of sentences of the Book of Mormon that do not have verbs in. Well, that is just a sad thing from a literary standpoint (laughter) as we use language, but really it is a marvelous thing that the Prophet left them without the verbs, because it shows the Hebrew construction of the original language. Those sentences fall back into Hebrew. This is the sort of reason that the Book of Mormon says things like this: “Come listen to the word of me a prophet of the Lord.” A good translator would have said, “Come listen to my words.”

Well, the Prophet translated this Sermon on the Mount, and I think he just used the biblical account because it conformed to the thought, and there is no reason in my mind to think that Jesus may not have inserted a number of added things to the Nephites that are not here. Or for that matter, he may have said a number of interspersed things to the Nephites that they did not record in the Sermon on the Mount because they had the spirit

of inspiration to digest and single out the salient thoughts on the same basis that the Jews were doing when they wrote them down.

What I have been saying, a lot of it is quite evident, some of it may be just a little speculative, but it grows out of the overall manner in which this sermon is written, and it grows particularly out of the insertions that the Prophet made in the Inspired Version. I think the Inspired Version is the best account; it is in my judgment; maybe you will say, "Well, in my judgment it is Third Nephi." But at least the Inspired Version throws more clarity on many of these points by inserting the fact that there were conversations back and forth and related things.

Now, that really is all the time we ought to spend on this unless someone wants to make some comment, but getting an idea about the sermon will put us in a better position to interpret and understand what goes on here. We could spend (or could have spent) our whole period of instruction for this term on the Sermon on the Mount, picking up one subject after another. But, of course that is not wise, and what we will do is just dig into it and take some isolated portions so that we begin to feel the flavor and get the sentiment and the spirit that goes with it.

Comment: Is there any reason to believe that the Sermon on the Mount and the Sermon on the Plain were exactly the same sermon in the light of the fact that the Savior did give some of his sermons more than once?

BRM: That is a possibility. We have some positive, categorical instances that we know of where he delivered the same sermon on more than one occasion, because we have it in Luke . . . (inaudible) . . . if you think about the Second Coming, we have it in Luke and in Matthew, without any question delivered on different occasions but the same subject. Now, conceivably that could have been the case. But on the other hand, in this instance there are a half a dozen still . . . (inaudible) . . . that they are the same because of some historical matters that are involved in each of them. Now, I have summarized that somewhat in three or four pages there in the text. I reached the personal conclusion after analyzing what all the sectarians said and trying to weigh all the evidence, that they were the same. Now, conceivably they could be two different things.

Comment: I just had a question about that so I looked it up where the Savior in Matthew is talking to the Twelve . . . (inaudible) . . . we know in Third Nephi, our required reading, He is talking to the Twelve specifically. Going over to Luke 22 where the same sermon is given and the same content is there.

BRM: Oh yes.

Comment: And if you are saying--if this is the ordination sermon, He would not be giving that same message to the apostles again, where he would . . . (inaudible).

BRM: That is true. This is one of the arguments; there are a half of dozen of them when you begin to weigh and evaluate. It leads you to believe, or led me to believe, that there was no question they were the same. Now, this is the classical instance right here that is mentioned: a part of the sermon being limited to the Twelve and the generality of it being to the people. You see, you read in Matthew and it says, “Take no thought for today,” and the lilies of the valley and all the rest, and your father takes care of them, and people think, “Well, if I live pure Christianity I would not take thought for temporal things.” The Lord never said any such thing as that, at all. When he said that part of the sermon, he stopped talking to the multitude and he turned to the Twelve, and he said in essence, “Now as far as you Twelve are concerned who are going out without purse or script on missionary service, as long as you are on missions take no thought for tomorrow. I will take care of you.” This is—that simple, little insertion in Third Nephi and in the Inspired Version just totally changes the concept. The whole world would say, “Well, the Bible says take no thought for tomorrow.” This is false! The Lord expects people to take thought for tomorrow, and to build houses and to plant crops and to get jobs and to work and care for their families and to have flocks and herds like Abraham had. And yet, here is a revelation that says you do not do that! Well, you see the good, little simple change applying it and limiting it to missionary service, changes the whole concept of what is involved. That is why we stand so well off with the knowledge of this sermon because we have the added things that came by revelation.

Well, let us take a little view of some of these things. In our text it is page 211; we had better open our approaches here; we will make a little different approach now, in our ordinary lessons we were just having, because of the nature of the sermon. And we will do what Jesus was doing; we will just pick out isolated things to talk about. Since we cannot, by any means talk on all of them, I will just arbitrarily pick up a few of them.

Let us take the first one in the fifth verse: “Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth.” (Matthew 5:5.) We call this the Beatitudes. I wish that I knew what Jesus really said when he said that. I would think what he would have done would have said, and maybe he would have taken ten minutes to do it, or maybe he would have had a discussion—a little class here, a little back and forth on it, he would have taken time to talk about the concept that the meek shall inherit the earth, and the summary that he would have made would have been that one sentence: “Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.” Now, what do you think he would have said? It does not mean very much to just come out and make a statement, “Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.” Suppose you are a Lutheran minister, and you read in the Sermon on the Mount, “Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.” What do you think when you get through? What does it mean to you? All you have got is read a little single sentence, “Blessed are the meek.” Now, be a Lutheran for a minute. What does that mean to you?

Comment: It does not mean very much, but it finally said it in a way that I think it . . . (inaudible) . . . someone is humble or submissive, peaceful, in order to inherit the earth.

BRM: Well, maybe.

Comment: This thing means to me that it has not happened yet, but speaks of the future.

BRM: Sure it has not happened yet. The meek have not inherited the earth. Who are the meek?

Comment: Bus drivers and the truck drivers.

BRM: The what?

Comment: The bus drivers and the truck drivers.

BRM: Oh, the bus drivers. All right, I will buy that. The meek are the God-fearing and the righteous, are they not? In Moses—the record says of Moses, that he was the most meek of any man on earth. Jesus said of himself, “I am meek and lowly in heart; take my yoke upon you.” Well, the meek are the God-fearing and the righteous; they are the members of the Church who have got the gift of the Holy Ghost, who are living in conformity to the law. Have they inherited the earth? What part of the earth do you own, Brother . . . (inaudible)? You obviously are in this category now; what part do you own?

Comment: (Inaudible) I bought it.

BRM: You and George . . . (inaudible) . . . category? You see, the meek have not inherited the earth, and here is a statement that says, “Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth.” Now, put yourself in the position of a Jew, and you heard that. And you belong, in effect, to a sectarian church; it is an apostate cult; it has lost the truth; what does it mean to you? I just do not think that Jesus came out and made this little simple announcement and let it go at that. I think he was teaching them the doctrines of salvation—and so what did he teach them? He taught them what is in Section 88 in the Doctrine and Covenants, did he not? Section 88 takes this—picks this up and it explains what it means that the meek shall inherit the earth! And what does it mean? Well, it means that this earth is going to become a celestial globe in due course, and when people are resurrected and have celestial bodies they are going to live on the earth when the Father and the Son are here, and the revelation says that that is the day when the meek shall inherit the earth. So what you really have here in a little simple statement like this, is a text. And that is what this Sermon on the Mount is. It is a series of texts; a series of summary statements that can be used as a launching pad to explain a doctrine of salvation, which seemingly Jesus would have explained to his hearers and arranged to have preserved the text portions of his sermon; the salient summary portion of it. Well now, you could do this with almost all of these. The meek shall inherit the earth: . . . (inaudible) . . . just have to make some explanation of what was involved.

Now look down at this seventh verse . . . (inaudible) . . . no, let us see . . . (inaudible) . . . the eighth: “Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.” (Matthew 5:8.) All right, you are either a Lutheran minister or you are a Jewish believer, and somebody comes to you and says, “Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.” What does

it mean? What does it mean to you, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God”? Does it mean that . . . (inaudible) . . . all right?

Comment: Okay. If I am a sectarian it means to me that there is a real period . . . (inaudible) . . . because the scriptures says no man . . . (inaudible).

BRM: All right. If you are a Jew it does not . . . (inaudible) . . . providentially it does not have that false scripture . . . (inaudible) . . . to you. “Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.”

Comment: Well . . . (inaudible) . . . that I might think this might be . . . (inaudible) . . . looking forward to in the language of our terminology.

BRM: It might. What does it really mean?

Comment: It means . . . (inaudible) . . . into the Celestial Kingdom.

BRM: No, no, no.

Comment: I would think it would mean that literally and certainly in this life you would see God if you were in that category.

BRM: All right, now this said “Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.”

Comment: Clearly?

BRM: Sure! It says that, does it not?

Comment: Yep!

BRM: “Blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.” All right. Suppose you are pure in heart. Do you think you can see God?

Comment: Not if I am a Lutheran.

BRM: Not if you are a Lutheran. I can see a contradiction in terms here. How do you get a pure Lutheran? People do not get pure in heart until they repent and join the Church and get the Holy Ghost, and their souls are cleansed and sin of iniquity is washed out. Now, what is the doctrine on seeing God? Can anybody see God?

Comment: (Inaudible) . . . they are pure in heart.

BRM: Well, this is probably a little something different in Section 84, so let us use some other revelation that enlightens us a little more on this. How about choosing Section 91? Anything in that?

Comment: I was afraid of that. After that I would look over there in . . . (inaudible).

BRM: You look in Section 93 and read us the first verse . . . (inaudible).

Verily, thus saith the Lord: It shall come to pass that every soul who forsaketh his sins and cometh unto me, and calleth on my name, and obeyeth my voice, and keepeth my commandments, shall see my face and know that I am. (D&C 93:1.)

Does that sound like a man can see God, if he does certain things? What are those things?

Comment: You have to forsake your sins; you come unto Christ, call on His name, obey His voice, keep His commandments.

BRM: All right. If you forsake your sins and you come unto Christ and you obey His voice and you keep His commandments, you are thereby . . . (inaudible).

Comment: Purified.

BRM: Pure in heart, are you not? You have got yourself in tune and the Holy Spirit is with you, and you are pure in heart.

Comment: Brother McConkie? I think there is one key to understanding all this too. Back when I think that the first beatitude in the Book of Mormon says “Blessed are those who come unto me,” this means coming unto Christ, you already have to have received the ordinances before you get any of these, right?

BRM: Before really—before we started on this, really, we should have done what you are trying to just indicate. The fact of the matter is that the first sentences of the Sermon on the Mount in the Inspired Version and in Third Nephi say “Come unto me and repent and be baptized and get the Holy Ghost.” Which again gives us a perspective and sets a different scene—gives us a different view of what is involved in these people. That is exactly right; He is talking now in the Sermon on the Mount in a general sense to the world, but primarily to people who repent and in and get the Holy Ghost.

Comment: It is significant that Oliver Cowdery made this very same pronouncement to the twelve in that day to endeavor to see the face of Christ.

BRM: Yes, this is . . . (inaudible).

Comment: This was after ordination.

BRM: This was after their ordination. Now that is a very interesting comparison. Here is an ordination sermon and the Lord says to these people, “Blessed are the pure in heart for ye shall see God” and Oliver Cowdery preached the ordination sermon of the original Counsel of the Twelve and said they would see the Lord. In principle it is the same thing. They have the same promise in effect that these apostles are getting. Thank you; that is good to have here.

Well, open to the Book of Ether; let us just get a little vision of how this is a text for a standard thing. The third chapter; look down at verse 19:

. . . because of the knowledge of [the brother of Jared] *he could not be kept from beholding* within the veil; and he saw the finger of Jesus, which, when he saw, he fell with fear; for he knew that it was the finger of the Lord; and he had faith no longer, for he knew, nothing doubting.

Wherefore, having this *perfect knowledge* of God, he could not be kept from within the veil; therefore he saw Jesus; and he did minister unto him. (Ether 3:19-20; emphasis added.)

Look over at verse 26:

For he said unto him in times before, that if he would believe in him that he could show unto him all things--it should be shown unto him; therefore *the Lord could not withhold anything from him, for he knew that the Lord could show him all things*. (Ether 3:26; emphasis added).

Well, “blessed are the pure in heart for they shall see God.” Now, that first verse of Section 93—this illustration of it in the life of the brother of Jared . . . (inaudible) . . . there is another statement on it in Section 67 verses 10-14; we do not need to go on to amplify it, but what I am saying is, now, the doctrine of the Church is that *anybody* who wholly and completely and fully lives the law, and it is not Joseph Smith and David O. McKay, it is everybody in the Church who lives the law, can see the Lord! There is not any question at all about this. Somebody who gets the Second Comforter is privileged to see the Lord. Now, anybody who managed to live this law gets this blessing. So, our approach to all of Jesus’ teachings is, or ought to be, what doctrinal truth do we learn from the summarized account that has been preserved to us? And you start dipping down to this Sermon on the Mount, and you take a one-sentence thing which in effect is a text, and when you analyze it as a doctrine it just spreads out and here is a glorious doctrine presented.

Well, this is one of the reasons that I think that He made a little explanation as he went along and did not just summarize in the cold words so-to-speak, that are here. He would let those disciples just catch the vision of what was involved *like he has let us catch the vision of it*, by giving us the extended explanation in other revelations. Look over on page 217; let us take another sample of what we are talking about.

Comment: Brother McConkie, did you say that you would even consider the 84th section as talking about the same thing?

BRM: Oh no, I did not exactly intend to say that. All I was intending to say was, let us get onto one that is expressly on the point. Now in Section 84, what are you talking about? The ordinances of the gospel and to see the face of the Father; yes, that is the same but that is a little more than is involved here. Did you have some question about that?

Comment: No, I just sort of considered it the same. They talk about the power of godliness was manifest.

BRM: Well . . . (inaudible).

Comment: The Lord was like, giving . . . (inaudible).

BRM: Yes. What that does in Section 84 is, when correctly read and analyzed (people do not do it because they cannot tell the antecedents from the pronouns), but to look at that verse and take the antecedents and the pronouns, what it is saying is that without the power of godliness, no man could see the face of God, even the Father himself.

Comment: Okay, you are saying that the word “this” in verse 22 means . . . (inaudible).

BRM: I—the word “this” refers to the power of godliness. Now in essence, that is what we have been saying, is it not? That if you are righteous, you have the power of godliness, and you get pure in heart and you keep His commandments and you come unto Him and you have so much faith that you know He cannot withhold himself, and so you see God. Now, in essence that is the same thing as the Second Comforter, even he will reveal the Father unto you. They will take up their abode with him; they will see the Lord. It is the same doctrine; it is a little more than what we were saying because it amplifies on it a little more, but it is the same doctrine.

Well, let us reach down and pick up another thing now, just to get a few concepts of what is involved. On page 217 he is talking about how true saints are as salt and light. “Ye are the salt of the world;” you are the light of the world. Under—in the Inspired Version in Matthew’s account:

Verily, verily, I say unto you, I give unto you to be the salt of the earth; but if the salt shall lose its savour, wherewith shall the earth be salted? the salt shall thenceforth be good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men. (Inspired Version, Matthew 5:15.)

What does it mean to be the salt of the earth? It just does not mean so much to us as it meant to them; this is Jewish idiom. This was in their customs and their traditions; they used salt in a certain way in their sacrifices and so on. Well, what it means to be the salt of the earth is to be the seasoning, savoring, preserving influence in the world—the

influence which would bring peace and blessings to all others (I am quoting myself on the next page). This is the salt of the earth doctrine. It is given us to be the salt. That 16th verse: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, I give unto you to be the light of the world; . . .” (Inspired Version, Matthew 5:16.) What does it mean when Christ says, “I am the light of the world”? It means to be the example, does it not? It means like in Third Nephi; on page 218 we quote Third Nephi:

Behold, I am the light; I have set an example for you, Hold up your light that it may shine unto the world.

Behold I am the light which ye shall hold up—that which ye have seen me do. (3 Nephi 18:16, 24.)

We really do not need to go on, but we could have a whole lesson on what it means to be the salt of the earth and the light of the world, and we talked about the salt; we have picked up the Old Testament passages of how salt was used in their sacrifices and how it was preserved in the savoring things, and how in the symbolical manner the Saints had it given to them to be the preserving and the refining and the culturizing influence; and we take a whole sermon on this other, the light of the world, and we show how Christ was an example and he did this and this and this; he was baptized and he worked miracles and he lived righteously and he taught the gospel and so on, and the Saints—to them was given precisely what was given Him in principle so that they could be a light and a guide to other men like He is to all men.

Comment: In those days it was a precious commodity.

BRM: It was a precious commodity in that day, it sure was. They did not have the Great Salt Lake out here with 600,000 acres for . . . (inaudible) . . . to quarrel about, I am pretty sure. It was a precious commodity.

Well, we do not really need to talk about the law of Moses and its fulfillment (this is page 218), but look over to page 221, and we do not need to talk about this one either, but there is one thing that is here that I would like you to catch a vision of, and it will be used repetitiously throughout this Sermon on the Mount. Let me read this on page 221, and you see if you catch the vision of this, and I will give you this tip-off in advance: this is an illustration on what we spent a whole day on here, a little while ago. Now verse 21:

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment;

But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: . . . (Matthew 5:21-22.)

And so on. Now, here is a doctrine. Here is a doctrine that has nothing to do with the substance of what was recited there, but this is an illustration of it. Did anybody get it? Did anybody catch what Jesus is doing in this instance? All right, let me ask you this question; see if this tips you off. Why did they not pick up stones to stone him when he said that? Why did they not pick up stones and stone him, because of the announcement that he just made? All right, I will go one step farther now. We had a lesson here in which we were picking out just a few of a great host of instances in the gospels where Jesus bore record of his own divine Sonship. Well, what he said would have been blasphemy if it had not been true.

Comment: Well, hold it, perhaps here He had to . . . (inaudible).

BRM: All right, now that is good. Now look, this is a sample of what Jesus does frequently and several times in this Sermon on the Mount. I will paraphrase and not use the same language as here to get the thought over. He says to the people, "The Lord Jehovah, the Almighty God, said to you do thus and thus and thus. But I say to you, do nothing else."

Comment: And he had to be God to be able to say it.

BRM: And he had to be God to do it. Now, what is he doing?

Comment: He is . . . (inaudible).

BRM: Well . . . (inaudible).

Comment: He is simply taking the original law he gave and saying that is still the law, but not becomes a minimum standard to you.

BRM: Well, yes in this instance he is saying and doing that, but in several, several of these instances he is doing more with reference to the law; he is actually changing and modifying. Sometimes he has reversed it. The point that we have got is, that he is saying, "The Lord Jehovah said such and such, but I say something different."

Comment: He is taking the authority to.

BRM: He is taking the authority of God upon himself! Now, if you really analyzed all these passages and understood them, you would come up with the conclusion that things like this are really announcements of his divine Sonship. "Jehovah said something but I say something else." It is just a pure situation where Jesus edits Jehovah. Now, what would you think if Joseph Smith came around and he said, "The Lord says that you have to do thus and thus to be saved, but I say to you, you do not have to do such and such." Would you say, "This is marvelous; you are a wonderful sectarian minister!" "You are changing what the Lord says!" Now, do you catch the vision of this approach? No prophet makes an approach like this. This is woven through all of Jesus' teachings; this is

just a little illustration of it. All the prophets come to you and they say, “The Lord says such and such. This is the gospel. The Holy Spirit revealed to me that the Lord wants you to do such and such.” And once in a while a prophet gets so in tune with the Spirit that when he gets up and speaks, he says, “Thus saith the Lord,” and he talks in the first person as though he were the Lord, or as though the Lord were speaking. “Thus saith the Lord, you shall do such and such.” The Lord’s language. The prophet is always bearing record of somebody else. He is always telling what the Lord thinks about something. Jesus does not do that. His whole perspective of teaching is different than that of any prophet. He does not say what the Lord wants except on isolated occasions he says that what he is teaching is his Father’s doctrine. Nearly always he just assumes the prerogative to—be the Lord. And he says, “Even though God Almighty said such and such, I tell you something else because I am God Almighty and I can change and alter and amend and refine and amplify and so on.” Well, we are not interested in taking the time to study these contrasts in the Mosaic law; you can do that. But this is a vital concept for us to have, that Jesus properly edits Jehovah because Jesus is Jehovah, and this is one of the divine Sonship passages.

Comment: Did the Jews understand like we understand because, with retrospect, that the Mosaic law would end when the Savior came, and something new would come?

BRM: Well I think that the answer to that is what we read in Mosiah the other day when it was said, “They did not all understand.” Now, obviously there were some that were spiritually alert and spiritually alive that they knew these things were going to happen. It is the difference between the Unitarians and the Baptists. Now, the Baptists understand sane things, but the Unitarians do not understand anything! (Inaudible) . . . there are degrees of spiritual insight among the various sects.

Comment: Why does . . . (inaudible).

BRM: Yes, sure, but it is the apostles he is talking to. It is his disciples. It is a congregation of believers. He has got a select group here. This is another thing about the Sermon on the Mount. He is not teaching it in the temple ground, in the market place, where the scribes and the disbelievers are there. Does this not begin by saying: “His disciples came unto him.” It is the believers. He can say more to the believers than he can to somebody else.

Let us take one more statement here, and our time for today will be gone, and then we will pick up some more of these tomorrow. Page 223.

Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery;

But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart. (Matthew 5:27-28; emphasis added.)

This is the same thing we are talking about; the Lord Jehovah said this but I now edit the Lord Jehovah. But in this connection it would be worth our while to just point out (here again, this is a doctrine, or it is a text for a doctrine) that all sins can be forgiven except murder and the sin against the Holy Ghost. So that includes sex immorality. And when I say all sins can be forgiven, I mean by that, that they can be forgiven *so that* a person can be a candidate of the celestial realm. People who have committed sex sins can repent and become clean and be eligible to go to the celestial heavens. I just throw that out as something that ought to be known to us in connection with this, because he mentions this. Now, if we wanted to preach our sermon on this, of course, we would proceed to pick out the passages in modern-day revelation to expand the doctrine and to show that if you have these lustful thoughts in your mind, you would end up being (to a degree at least) guilty of the offense. You take such things as in . . . (inaudible).

Comment: (Inaudible.)

BRM: Oh, is it in Section 63 where in essence it says this same thing about looking on a woman to lust after her, and so on? Well, I guess our time is past; I guess that [inaudible]. Yes?

Comment: Is there any indication by the way it is stated that that they could not . . . (inaudible)?

BRM: No; no there is not. They can gain their exaltation if they repent. All sins can be repented of except the two indicated. Now, the way you test this is this: (inaudible) . . . of the Church is the interpretation of the scriptures, and we excommunicate people for immoral conduct, then we rebaptize them and we restore their blessings to them and they become eligible to get all the blessings.